

EINSTEIN-HILBERT GRAVITY, HIGHER DERIVATIVES AND A SCALAR MATTER FIELD

KLAUS SIBOLD

ABSTRACT. The present paper extends two previous one's on pure gravity dealing with Einstein-Hilbert and higher derivatives by including a massless scalar field as representative of matter. We study the renormalization to all orders of perturbation theory, provide the Slavnov-Taylor identity, symmetric partial differential equations and derive finiteness properties in the Landau gauge. It is shown that beginning with one-loop negative norm states originating from higher derivatives disappear.

CONTENTS

1. Introduction	2
2. Tree approximation	3
2.1. The model and its invariances	3
2.2. Propagators	4
2.3. The Slavnov-Taylor identity in tree approximation	5
2.4. Unitarity in the tree approximation	6
2.5. Parametrization and gauge parameter independence.	8
2.6. Normalization conditions I	11
3. Renormalization	12
3.1. Auxiliary mass	12
3.2. Power counting and convergence	15
3.3. Slavnov-Taylor identity	21
3.4. Normalization conditions II	23
4. Invariant differential operators and invariant insertions	23
5. Removing auxiliary mass dependence via Zimmermann Identities	30
5.1. Shift	31
5.2. Push	32
5.3. Auxiliary mass of the scalar field	33
6. The invariant parametric differential equations	33
6.1. The Lowenstein-Zimmermann equation	33
6.2. The renormalization group equation	35
7. Finiteness Properties	38

INSTITUTE FOR THEORETICAL PHYSICS, LEIPZIG UNIVERSITY, GERMANY. *EMAIL ADDRESS:* sibold(at)physik.uni-leipzig.de.

Date: May 2, 2024.

8. Rigid Weyl Invariance	40
9. No massive higher order zero's	41
10. Projection to physical state space	42
10.1. The single pole fields	42
10.2. Projection to Einstein-Hilbert	45
11. Discussion and Conclusions	47
Appendix A. Appendix	48
A.1. Notations and conventions	48
Acknowledgement	48
References	48

1. INTRODUCTION

In two previous papers Steffen Pottel and the present author discussed the quantization of Einstein-Hilbert gravity (EH) in a perturbative framework [PS21,PS23]. The existence of Green's functions was ensured by adding higher derivative terms (hds) to the action. Those introduce negative norm into the state space and require quite some effort to arrive at meaningful quantities. Although those problems have not yet been fully solved it seems reasonable to study in addition the effect of matter: gravity and matter have to coexist. Here we add a scalar field as representative of matter.

For the benefit of the reader we shall take over at appropriate places not only results of the previous papers, but also main parts of the derivations. Hopefully we arrive in this way at a reasonable view of the entire subject.

For the scalar field we assume that it is massless and invariant under rigid Weyl transformation. The reason is simple: for such a field Elisabeth Kraus and the present author studied the behaviour of a specifically defined energy-momentum tensor under all transformations of the conformal group to all orders of perturbation theory [EKKSI]. The coupling to an external symmetric tensor field $h^{\mu\nu}$ was as crucial as the gauging of translations. It turned out that $g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} + h^{\mu\nu}$ and its covariant companion $g_{\mu\nu}$ were the only solutions of the Ward identity of local translations up to field redefinitions of $h^{\mu\nu}$ as a function of itself and had to transform as gravity requires it for a metric. Hence one arrived just by Noether's procedure at gravity [EKKSII,EKKSIII]. Permitting thereafter propagation of this gravity field yields by sheer power counting as theory to be studied not only the Einstein-Hilbert term $\int \sqrt{-g}R$, but also $\int \sqrt{-g}R^2$ and $\int \sqrt{-g}R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}$. Such a model is power counting renormalizable and closes in itself under renormalization. The most obvious understanding for this claim is provided by the field equation for $g^{\mu\nu}$: the energy-momentum tensor of the scalar field which has canonical dimension four appears on an equal footing with the pure gravity terms. Hence all of the mentioned one's have to be admitted if one thinks in terms of renormalization.

In the present paper we study the renormalization of this model to all orders of perturbation theory. For this we provide first power counting and convergence of our scheme. Then we establish the Slavnov-Taylor (ST) identity, derive the symmetric partial differential equations and prove noteworthy finiteness properties in the Landau gauge. The Ward identity for rigid Weyl transformations is discussed and seen to replace the Callan-Symanzik equation of flat spacetime. Important for interpretation and understanding of the model is the result that beginning with one-loop, the second poles in the propagator $\langle hh \rangle$ are absent. This implies that beginning with one-loop negative norm contributions which had been introduced by the higher derivative terms disappear. Those survive however at tree level. In the conclusions we speculate on how they might be possibly removed.

2. TREE APPROXIMATION

For a decent perturbative treatment it is mandatory to set up the first orders carefully. In the present context this refers to the zero-loop order and the first and second order in the number of fields.

2.1. The model and its invariances. As in the study of pure EH we have also in the present case with an additional scalar matter field to include invariants under diffeomorphisms up to fourth order in the derivatives in order to achieve power counting renormalizability. Since we restrict our considerations to spacetimes which are topologically equivalent to flat one's, it suffices to start with

$$(2.1) \quad \Gamma_{\text{inv}}^{\text{class}} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left(c_3 \kappa^{-2} R + c_2 R^2 + c_1 R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu} \right)$$

$$(2.2) \quad + \int \left((-g)^{1/4} \frac{c_R}{2} \varphi^2 R + (-g)^{1/4} \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \mathcal{D}_\nu \varphi - \frac{\lambda}{4!} \varphi^4 \right),$$

i.e. we can omit the cosmological term. Its absence in all orders will be guaranteed by a normalization condition. κ denotes the gravitational constant, $R_{\mu\nu}$, R the Ricci curvature tensor, resp. scalar. The second line comprises the invariants of dimension four which can be built with a massless scalar field of canonical dimension one. Their peculiar weight factors occur because we have given φ the s transformation law (2.11). That in turn we introduced in [EKKSI] for local translations such that all transformations under the conformal group can be obtained via x -moments of local translations. This invariance under local translations, which is nothing but general coordinate transformations, is to be translated into Becchi-Rouet-Stora-Tyutin invariance (BRST) with respective gauge fixing. The field $h^{\mu\nu}$ is defined via

$$(2.3) \quad h^{\mu\nu} = g^{\mu\nu} - \eta^{\mu\nu}.$$

The propagators of h (s.b.) will tell us that h has canonical dimension 0, hence κ must not show up in its definition.

The classical action

$$(2.4) \quad \Gamma^{\text{class}} = \Gamma_{\text{inv}}^{\text{class}} + \Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \Gamma_{\phi\pi} + \Gamma_{\text{e.f.}}$$

$$(2.5) \quad \Gamma_{\text{gf}} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa} \int g^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu b_\nu + \partial_\nu b_\mu) - \frac{1}{2} \alpha_0 \int \eta^{\mu\nu} b_\mu b_\nu$$

$$(2.6) \quad \Gamma_{\phi\pi} = -\frac{1}{2} \int (D_\rho^{\mu\nu} c^\rho) (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)$$

$$(2.7) \quad D_\rho^{\mu\nu} \equiv -g^{\mu\lambda} \delta_\rho^\nu \partial_\lambda - g^{\nu\lambda} \delta_\rho^\mu \partial_\lambda + \partial_\rho g^{\mu\nu}$$

$$(2.8) \quad \Gamma_{\text{e.f.}} = \int (K_{\mu\nu} \delta h^{\mu\nu} + L_\rho \delta c^\rho + Y \delta \varphi)$$

is invariant under the BRST-transformation

$$(2.9) \quad \delta g^{\mu\nu} = \kappa D_\rho^{\mu\nu} c^\rho \quad \delta c^\rho = -\kappa c^\lambda \partial_\lambda c^\rho \quad \delta \bar{c}_\rho = b_\rho \quad \delta b_\rho = 0$$

$$(2.10) \quad \delta_0 h^{\mu\nu} = -\kappa (\partial^\mu c^\nu + \partial^\nu c^\mu) \quad \delta_1 h^{\mu\nu} = -\kappa (\partial_\lambda c^\mu h^{\lambda\nu} + \partial_\lambda c^\nu h^{\lambda\mu} - c^\lambda \partial_\lambda h^{\mu\nu})$$

$$(2.11) \quad \delta \varphi = c^\lambda \partial_\lambda \varphi + \frac{1}{4} \partial_\lambda c^\lambda \varphi$$

In accordance with the expansion in the number of fields we have introduced the transformations δ_0, δ_1 which maintain the number, resp. raise it by one. $K_{\mu\nu}, L_\rho, Y$ are external fields to be used for generating insertions of non-linear field transformations. The Lagrange multiplier b_μ couples to $\partial_\lambda h^{\mu\lambda}$ and thus fixes eventually these derivatives (deDonder like gauge fixing).

2.2. Propagators. For later convenience we quote here from paper I the bilinear terms of $\Gamma_{\text{inv}}^{\text{class}}$ and add that of the scalar field, all in Fourier space.

$$(2.12) \quad \Gamma_{h_{\mu\nu} h_{\rho\sigma}} = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{KLr} \gamma_{KL}^{(r)}(p^2) (P_{KL}^{(r)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$$

$$(2.13) \quad \Gamma_{b_\rho h_{\mu\nu}} = -\frac{i}{\kappa} \left(\frac{1}{2} (\theta_{\rho\mu} p_\nu + \theta_{\rho\nu} p_\mu) + \omega_{\mu\nu} p_\rho \right)$$

$$(2.14) \quad \Gamma_{b_\rho b_\sigma} = -\alpha_0 \eta_{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(2.15) \quad \Gamma_{c_\rho \bar{c}_\sigma} = -ip^2 (\theta_{\rho\sigma} \xi(p^2) + \omega_{\rho\sigma} \frac{1}{2} \eta(p^2))$$

$$(2.16) \quad \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi} = -p^2.$$

For the h -bilinear terms we introduce projection operators P (see App. A) and general coefficient functions γ . Their values read in tree approximation

$$(2.17) \quad \gamma_{TT}^{(2)} = -p^2 (c_1 p^2 - c_3 \kappa^{-2})$$

$$(2.18) \quad \gamma_{TT}^{(0)} = p^2 ((3c_2 + c_1) p^2 - 2c_3 \kappa^{-2})$$

$$(2.19) \quad \gamma_{SS}^{(1)} = \gamma_{WW}^{(0)} = \gamma_{TW}^{(0)} = \gamma_{WT}^{(0)} = 0.$$

The coefficients of Γ_{bh} and Γ_{bb} turn out to be fixed, whereas those of $\Gamma_{c\bar{c}}$ can be very general with tree values $\xi = \eta = 1$.

For the $\langle hh \rangle$ -propagators we introduce like for the 2-point-vertex functions an expansion in terms of projection operators

$$(2.20) \quad G_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{hh} = 4 \sum_{KLr} \langle hh \rangle_{KL}^{(r)} (P_{KL}^{(r)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}.$$

The gauge parameter independent solutions $\langle hh \rangle_{KL}^{(r)}$ turn out to be

$$(2.21) \quad \langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(2)} = \frac{i}{\gamma_{TT}^{(2)}} \quad \langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(0)} = \frac{i}{\gamma_{TT}^{(0)}},$$

whereas the ‘‘gauge parameter multiplet’’ is given by

$$(2.22) \quad \langle hh \rangle_{SS}^{(1)} = \frac{4i\alpha_0\kappa^2}{p^2} \quad \langle hh \rangle_{WW}^{(0)} = \frac{4i\alpha_0\kappa^2}{p^2}$$

$$(2.23) \quad \langle hh \rangle_{TW}^{(0)} = \langle hh \rangle_{WT}^{(0)} = 0.$$

The gauge parameter independent part is determined by the coefficient functions γ , which depend on the model, i.e. by the invariants and by higher orders, whereas the gauge multiplet is essentially fixed and determined by the specific gauge choice. The remaining bosonic propagators read

$$(2.24) \quad \langle b_\rho h_{\mu\nu} \rangle = \frac{\kappa}{p^2} ((p_\mu \theta_{\nu\rho} + p_\nu \theta_{\mu\rho}) b_1 + p_\rho \omega_{\mu\nu} b_2 + p_\rho \theta_{\mu\nu} b_3) \quad \text{and} \quad \langle b_\rho b_\sigma \rangle = 0.$$

In the tree approximation $b_1 = b_2 = 1$ and $b_3 = 0$. The antighost/ghost propagator has the general form

$$(2.25) \quad \langle \bar{c}_\rho c_\sigma \rangle = \frac{-1}{p^2} \left(\frac{\theta_{\rho\sigma}}{\xi(p^2)} + \frac{\omega_{\rho\sigma}}{\eta(p^2)} \right).$$

The tree approximation values are $\xi = \eta = 1$, s.t.

$$(2.26) \quad \langle \bar{c}_\rho c_\sigma \rangle = -i(\theta_{\rho\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\rho\sigma}) \frac{1}{p^2}.$$

The propagator of the scalar field is simply

$$(2.27) \quad \langle \varphi\varphi \rangle = \frac{i}{p^2}$$

2.3. The Slavnov-Taylor identity in tree approximation. Since the \mathcal{S} -variations of h, c, φ are non-linear in the fields, they are best implemented in higher orders via coupling to external fields (cf. (2.4)), hence the ST identity then reads

$$(2.28) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta K} \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta h} + \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta L} \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta c} + \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta Y} \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta \varphi} + b \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta \bar{c}} \right) = 0.$$

Since the b -equation of motion

$$(2.29) \quad \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta b^\rho} = \kappa^{-1}\partial^\mu h_{\mu\rho} - \alpha_0 b_\rho$$

is linear in the quantized fields, it can be integrated trivially to the original gauge fixing term. Thus it turns out to be useful to introduce a functional $\bar{\Gamma}$ which does no longer depend on the b -field:

$$(2.30) \quad \Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \bar{\Gamma}.$$

One finds

$$(2.31) \quad \kappa^{-1}\partial_\lambda \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta K_{\mu\lambda}} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta \bar{c}_\mu} = 0$$

as restriction. Hence $\bar{\Gamma}$ depends on \bar{c} only via

$$(2.32) \quad H_{\mu\nu} = K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}(\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)$$

and the ST identity takes the form

$$(2.33) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}\bar{\Gamma} = 0$$

$$(2.34) \quad \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta H} \frac{\delta}{\delta h} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta h} \frac{\delta}{\delta H} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta L} \frac{\delta}{\delta c} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta c} \frac{\delta}{\delta L} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta Y} \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta \varphi} \frac{\delta}{\delta Y} \right).$$

This form shows that $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}$ can be interpreted as a variation und thus (2.33) expresses an invariance for $\bar{\Gamma}$.

2.4. Unitarity in the tree approximation. The S -operator can be defined via

$$(2.35) \quad S = : \Sigma : Z(\underline{J})|_{\underline{J}=0} \quad \Sigma \equiv \exp \left\{ \int dx dy \Phi_{\text{in}}(x) K(x-y) z^{-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta \underline{J}(y)} \right\},$$

where \underline{J} denotes the sources $J_{\mu\nu}, j_c^\rho, j_b^\rho, j_\varphi$ for the fields $h^{\mu\nu}, \bar{c}^\rho, c^\rho, b^\rho, \varphi$, respectively, and their in-field versions are collected in Φ_{in} . $K(x-y)z^{-1}$ refers to all in-fields and stands for the higher derivative wave operator, hence removes the complete (tree approximation) propagator matrix. $: \Sigma :$ would then map onto the respective large Fock space of the higher derivative model. In order to clarify the structure of the statespace and to identify first the one of pure EH, we put $c_1 = c_2 = 0$. Now we study the unphysical degrees of freedom which go along with that model. They differ slightly from those studied by [KO78] because we employ a different field h , but the general structure is the same (cf. eqs. (353)..(356) in [PS21]). Here we follow [Bec85] and would like to show, that the S -matrix commutes with the BRST-charge Q by establishing the equations

$$(2.36) \quad [\mathcal{S}, : \Sigma :] Z|_{\underline{J}=0} = -[Q, : \Sigma :] Z|_{\underline{J}=0} = [Q, S] = 0,$$

where

$$(2.37) \quad \mathcal{S} \equiv \int \left(J_{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta}{\delta K_{\mu\nu}} - j_c^\rho \frac{\delta}{\delta L^\rho} - j_\varphi \frac{\delta}{\delta Y} - j_b^\rho \frac{\delta}{\delta j_b^\rho} \right) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{S}Z = 0.$$

The lhs of (2.36) is a commutator in the space of functionals, i.e. of \mathcal{S} , the ST-operator, with the S -matrix defined on the functional level via Z , the generating functional for general Green functions. Now

$$(2.38) \quad [\mathcal{S}, : \Sigma :] Z|_{\underline{J}=0} = 0$$

since the first term of the commutator vanishes because $\mathcal{S} = 0$ for vanishing sources, the second term of the commutator vanishes due to the validity of the ST-identity.

The rhs of (2.36) is an equation in terms of (pre-)Hilbert space operators: S -operator and BRST-charge, both defined on the indefinite metric Fock space of creation and annihilation operators. The claim is that we can find an operator Q such that the rhs holds true. We then know that a subspace defined by $Q|\text{phys}\rangle = 0$ is stable under S , hence physical states are mapped into physical states.

To show that (2.38) indeed holds, we observe first that the commutator $[\mathcal{S}, : \Sigma :]$ is of the form $[\mathcal{S}, e^X]$. If $[\mathcal{S}, X]$ commutes with X , one can reorder the series into $[\mathcal{S}, e^X] = [\mathcal{S}, X]e^X$. This has to be evaluated. Since in the tree approximation $z = 1$, hence $K(x - y)_{\Phi\Phi'} = \Gamma_{\Phi\Phi'}$ we define for the explicit calculation

$$(2.39) \quad X \equiv \int \left(h^{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{hh} \frac{\delta}{\delta J_{\rho\sigma}} + h^{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}^{hb} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\rho}^b} + \varphi \Gamma^{\varphi\varphi} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\varphi}} \right. \\ (2.40) \quad \left. + b^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\alpha\beta}^{bh} \frac{\delta}{\delta J_{\alpha\beta}} + b^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{bb} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\sigma}^b} + c^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{c\bar{c}} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\sigma}^{\bar{c}}} + \bar{c}^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{\bar{c}c} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\sigma}^c} \right).$$

For the desired commutator one finds

$$(2.41) \quad [\mathcal{S}, X] = - \int \left(h^{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{hh} \frac{\delta}{\delta K_{\rho\sigma}} + \varphi \Gamma^{\varphi\varphi} \frac{\delta}{\delta Y} - c^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{c\bar{c}} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\sigma}^b} - \bar{c}^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{\bar{c}c} \frac{\delta}{\delta L_{\sigma}} \right),$$

so it clearly commutes with X .

In the next step we have to consider $:\mathcal{S}, X]e^X : Z$, i.e. terms of the type

$$(2.42) \quad - \int : \left(h^{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{hh} \frac{\delta}{\delta K_{\rho\sigma}} + \varphi \Gamma^{\varphi\varphi} \frac{\delta}{\delta Y} - c^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{c\bar{c}} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\sigma}^b} - \bar{c}^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{\bar{c}c} \frac{\delta}{\delta L_{\sigma}} \right) : X(1) \cdots X(n) \cdot Z(\underline{J})|_{\underline{J}=0}$$

i.e.

$$(2.43) \quad - \int : \left(h^{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{hh} \kappa D_{\lambda}^{\rho\sigma} c^{\lambda} + \varphi \Gamma^{\varphi\varphi} (c^{\lambda} \partial_{\lambda} \varphi + \frac{1}{4} \partial_{\lambda} c^{\lambda} \varphi) - c^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{c\bar{c}} b^{\sigma} \right. \\ \left. - \bar{c}^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{\bar{c}c} c^{\lambda} \partial_{\lambda} c^{\sigma} \right) : X(1) \cdots X(n) \cdot Z(\underline{J})|_{\underline{J}=0}.$$

These terms constitute insertions into the functional Z . A closer look in terms of Feynman diagrams reveals that due to momentum conservation from $D_{\lambda}^{\rho\sigma} c^{\lambda}$ only terms linear in the fields survive, neither the matter nor the last term bilinear in c contribute – when going on mass shell they cannot develop particle poles. We arrive thus at

$$(2.44) \quad :[\mathcal{S}, X] : Z =: \Sigma \left[\int (-h^{\mu\nu} \Gamma_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^{hh} \kappa (\partial^{\alpha} c^{\beta} + \partial^{\beta} c^{\alpha}) + c^{\rho} \Gamma_{\rho\sigma}^{c\bar{c}} b^{\sigma}) \right] : \cdot Z(\underline{J})|_{\underline{J}=0}.$$

The second factors in the insertion are just the linearized BRST-variations of $h^{\alpha\beta}$, resp. \bar{c}^σ . This suggests to introduce a corresponding BRST operator Q which generates these transformations

$$(2.45) \quad Q\Gamma \equiv \int \left[\kappa(\partial^\mu c^\nu + \partial^\nu c^\mu) \frac{\delta}{\delta h^{\mu\nu}} + b^\rho \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{c}^\rho} \right] \Gamma$$

$$(2.46) \quad QZ_c \equiv - \int \left[\kappa(\partial^\mu \frac{\delta Z_c}{\delta j_\nu^c} + \partial^\nu \frac{\delta Z_c}{\delta j_\mu^c}) J_{\mu\nu} + \frac{\delta Z_c}{\delta j_\rho^b} j_\rho^{\bar{c}} \right]$$

$$(2.47) \quad QZ \equiv -i \int \left[J_{\mu\nu} \kappa(\partial^\mu \frac{\delta}{\delta j_\nu^c} + \partial^\nu \frac{\delta}{\delta j_\mu^c}) + j_\rho^{\bar{c}} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_\rho^b} \right] Z,$$

and to calculate the commutator $[Q, : \Sigma :]_{Z|_{\underline{J}=0}}$. And, indeed it coincides with the rhs of (2.44). Following in detail the aforementioned diagrammatic analysis we have a simple interpretation: in the Green functions $G(y; z_1, \dots, z_n)$ a field entry has been replaced by the linearized BRST-transformation of it. Having established (2.36) one can continue along the lines of [KO78], form within the linear subspace of physical states equivalence classes by modding out states with vanishing norm with the well-known result that these factor states have non-vanishing norm and the S -matrix is unitary.

It would now be most natural to extend these considerations by taking into account the additional degrees of freedom going along with the higher derivatives. This requires however identifying those and understanding their behaviour in higher orders. This will be done below, Sect. 10.

2.5. Parametrization and gauge parameter independence. It is a necessary preparation for higher orders to clarify, which parameters the model contains and how they are fixed. Also a glance at the free propagators, (2.21) versus (2.22), shows that they differ in their fall-off properties depending from the value of the gauge parameter α_0 . Since Landau gauge $\alpha_0 = 0$ simplifies calculations enormously we would like to show that it is stable against perturbations. Since these two issues are closely linked we treat them here together. Obvious parameters are the couplings $c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_R, \lambda$. In the next subsection we give a prescription, how to fix them by appropriate normalization conditions. Also obvious is the gauge parameter α_0 . It will be fixed by the equation of motion for the b -field. Since this equation is linear in the b -field it also determines its amplitude. Less obvious is the normalization of the fields $h^{\mu\nu}, c^\rho$ and of the external fields K, L, Y . In order to fix their amplitudes it is convenient to inquire under which linear redefinitions of them the ST (2.28) stays invariant. We define

$$(2.48) \quad \hat{h}^{\mu\nu} = z_1(\alpha_0) h^{\mu\nu} \quad \hat{\varphi} = t_\varphi(\alpha_0) \quad \hat{c}^\rho = y(\alpha_0) c^\rho$$

$$(2.49) \quad \hat{K}_{\mu\nu} = \frac{1}{z_1(\alpha_0)} K_{\mu\nu} \quad \hat{Y} = \frac{1}{t_\varphi(\alpha_0)} \quad \hat{L}_\rho = \frac{1}{y(\alpha_0)} L_\rho,$$

where we admitted a dependence on the gauge parameter because we would like to vary it and detect in this way α_0 -dependence algebraically. Clearly, the values for z_1, t_φ and y have to be prescribed. It is also clear that with α_0 -independent values for z_1, t_φ and

y the ST-identity is maintained. In order to make changes of α_0 visible we differentiate (2.4) with respect to it, i.e.

$$(2.50) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0} \Gamma = \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0} \Gamma_{\text{gf}} = \int \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right) b_\mu b_\nu \eta^{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{J} \int \left(-\frac{1}{4}\right) (\bar{c}_\mu b_\nu + \bar{c}_\nu b_\mu) \eta^{\mu\nu}.$$

We observe that this is an \mathcal{J} -variation and thus, if we introduce a fermionic partner $\chi = \mathcal{J}\alpha_0$ and perform the change

$$(2.51) \quad \Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \Gamma_{\phi\pi} \rightarrow \Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \Gamma_{\phi\pi} + \int \left(-\frac{1}{4}\right) \chi (\bar{c}_\mu b_\nu + \bar{c}_\nu b_\mu) \eta^{\mu\nu}.$$

we have

$$(2.52) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) + \chi \partial_{\alpha_0} \Gamma = 0.$$

We carry over this extended BRST-transformation to Z

$$(2.53) \quad \hat{\mathcal{S}}Z \equiv \mathcal{S}Z + \chi \partial_{\alpha_0} Z = 0,$$

with the implication

$$(2.54) \quad \partial_\chi(\hat{\mathcal{S}}Z) = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \partial_{\alpha_0} Z = -\mathcal{S} \partial_\chi Z$$

showing that α_0 -dependence is a BRST-variation, hence unphysical. This last equation can be easily checked on the free propagators (for propagators connected and general Green functions coincide).

Using for $Z(\underline{J})$ the form

$$(2.55) \quad Z(\underline{J}) = \exp \left\{ i \int \mathcal{L}_{\text{int}} \left(\frac{\delta}{i \delta \underline{J}} \right) \right\} Z_0 \quad Z_0 = \exp \left\{ \int i \underline{J} \langle \Phi \Phi \rangle i \underline{J} \right\}$$

one obtains

$$(2.56) \quad \partial_{\alpha_0} Z(\underline{J}) = \partial_{\alpha_0} Z_0 \cdot Z(\underline{J}) = \left(\partial_{\alpha_0} \int i \underline{J} \langle \Phi \Phi \rangle i \underline{J} \right) \cdot Z.$$

(Here \underline{J} stands for the sources of all propagating fields Φ .) Hence α_0 -dependence remains purely at external lines, if one does not add α_0 -dependent counterterms, and then vanishes on the S -matrix where these lines are amputated. It also means that the power counting for the gauge multiplet is irrelevant because this multiplet shows up only as external lines.

We now step back and analyse α_0 -dependence more systematically. Equations (2.52), (2.53) and the analogous one for connected Green functions

$$(2.57) \quad \mathcal{S}Z_c + \chi \partial_{\alpha_0} Z_c = 0,$$

where α_0 undergoes the change

$$(2.58) \quad \mathcal{J}\alpha_0 = \chi \quad \mathcal{J}\chi = 0$$

have to be solved. The rhs of (2.51) is solution of the extended gauge condition

$$(2.59) \quad \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta b^\rho} = \kappa^{-1} \partial^\mu h_{\mu\rho} - \alpha_0 b^\nu - \frac{1}{2} \chi \bar{c}_\rho.$$

Acting with $\delta/\delta b^\rho$ on the ST (2.52) we find that the ghost equation of motion has changed accordingly

$$(2.60) \quad G^\rho \Gamma \equiv \left(\kappa^{-1} \partial^\mu \frac{\delta}{\delta K_{\mu\rho}} + \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{c}_\rho} \right) \Gamma = \frac{1}{2} \chi b^\rho$$

As in (2.30) and (2.32) we introduce $H_{\mu\nu} = K_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2\kappa}(\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)$ and $\bar{\Gamma}$ by

$$(2.61) \quad \Gamma = \bar{\Gamma} + \int \left(-\frac{1}{2} \alpha_0 b_\mu b_\nu \eta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2\kappa} h^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu b_\nu + \partial_\nu b_\mu) - \frac{1}{4} \chi (\bar{c}_\mu b_\nu + \bar{c}_\nu b_\mu) \eta^{\mu\nu} \right).$$

The extended ST reads in terms of $\bar{\Gamma}$

$$(2.62) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Gamma}) = 0$$

with

$$(2.63) \quad \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Gamma}) \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta K} \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta h} + \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta Y} \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta \varphi} + \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta L} \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta c} + \chi \frac{\partial \bar{\Gamma}}{\partial \alpha_0} \right).$$

$\bar{\Gamma}$ satisfies the homogeneous ghost equation of motion

$$(2.64) \quad G\bar{\Gamma} = 0.$$

We now have to find the most general solution of ghost equation (2.60) and the new ST (2.62). Due to dimension and $\phi\pi$ -charge neutrality $\bar{\Gamma}$ can be decomposed as

$$(2.65) \quad \bar{\Gamma} = \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}(h, c, K, L, Y, \alpha_0) + \chi \int (f_K(\alpha_0) K h + f_Y(\alpha_0) Y \varphi + f_L(\alpha_0) L c)$$

With the choice of linear dependence from h , however, we certainly do not cover the most general case: due to the vanishing dimension of $h^{\mu\nu}$ one could replace the linear factor $h^{\mu\nu}$ by an arbitrary function $\mathcal{F}^{\mu\nu}(h)$ in $K_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu}$. For simplicity we discuss here the linear case, which continues (2.48), whereas for the non-linear we refer to the discussion in [PS21], Section VIII.

From (2.62) and (2.63) we deduce that

$$(2.66) \quad 0 = \mathcal{B}(\bar{\Gamma}) = \mathcal{B}(\bar{\bar{\Gamma}})|_{\chi=0} + \chi \int \left(-f_H h^{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta h^{\mu\nu}} + f_H H^{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta H^{\mu\nu}} \right.$$

$$(2.67) \quad \left. -f_Y \varphi \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta \varphi} + f_Y Y \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta Y} + f_L c \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta c} - f_L L \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta L} \right) + \chi \frac{\partial \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\partial \alpha_0}.$$

At $\chi = 0$ follows first

$$(2.68) \quad \mathcal{B}(\bar{\bar{\Gamma}})|_{\chi=0} = 0,$$

and then

$$(2.69) \quad \int \left(-f_H h^{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta h^{\mu\nu}} + f_H H^{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta H^{\mu\nu}} - f_Y \varphi \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta \varphi} + f_Y Y \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta Y} \right.$$

$$(2.70) \quad \left. + f_L c \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta c} - f_L L \frac{\delta \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\delta L} \right) + \frac{\partial \bar{\bar{\Gamma}}}{\partial \alpha_0} = 0.$$

(2.68) corresponds to (2.28), hence we know that the general solution (of the linear case) is given by

$$(2.71) \quad \bar{\Gamma} = \hat{c}_3 \kappa^{-2} \int \sqrt{-g} R(z_1(\alpha_0)h) + \hat{c}_1 \int \sqrt{-g} R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}(z_1(\alpha_0)h) + \hat{c}_2 \int \sqrt{-g} R^2(z_1(\alpha_0)h) \\ + \hat{c}_R \int (-g)^{1/4} \frac{1}{2} \varphi^2(z_\varphi(\alpha_0)) R(z_1(\alpha_0)h)$$

$$(2.72) \quad + \hat{c}_\varphi \int (-g)^{1/4} \frac{1}{2} g^{\mu\nu} (\mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \mathcal{D}_\nu \varphi)(z_\varphi(\alpha_0)) + \hat{c}_\lambda \int \left(-\frac{\lambda}{4!} \varphi^4(z_\varphi(\alpha_0))\right)$$

$$(2.73) \quad + \hat{c}_H \int \left(\kappa H_{\mu\nu} \left(\frac{y(\alpha_0)}{z_1(\alpha_0)} (-\partial^\mu c^\nu - \partial^\nu c^\mu) - y(\alpha_0) (\partial_\lambda c^\mu h^{\lambda\nu} - c^\lambda \partial_\lambda h^{\mu\nu} + c^\lambda \partial_\lambda h^{\mu\nu}) \right) \right. \\ \left. + t(\alpha_0) Y (c^\rho \partial_\rho \varphi + \frac{1}{4} \partial_\rho c^\rho \varphi) - \kappa y(\alpha_0) L_\rho \partial^\lambda c^\rho \right).$$

(2.71) inserted into (2.69) implies after some calculations that all \hat{c} are independent of α_0 , whereas the functions $f_{H,L}$ satisfy the relations

$$(2.74) \quad \partial_{\alpha_0} z_1 = f_H z_1 \quad \partial_{\alpha_0} y = -f_L y \quad \partial_{\alpha_0} z_\varphi = f_\varphi z_\varphi$$

All parameters \hat{c} can therefore be fixed by normalization conditions independent of α_0 . Since we shall work in Landau gauge, $\alpha_0 = 0$, the functions f_H, f_L, f_Y will be independent of α_0 , as well as z_1, z_φ, y , hence numbers.

2.6. Normalization conditions I. In the tree approximation as studied in this section the free parameters of the model can be prescribed by the following conditions

$$(2.75) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}|_{p^2=0} = c_3 \kappa^{-2} \quad (\text{coupling constant})$$

$$(2.76) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} = -2c_1 \quad (\text{coupling constant})$$

$$(2.77) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} = 2(3c_2 + c_1) \quad (\text{coupling constant})$$

$$(2.78) \quad \Gamma_{h^{\mu\nu}} = -\eta_{\mu\nu} c_0 \doteq 0 \quad (\text{coupling constant})$$

$$(2.79) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^\rho \partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{\varphi h^{\mu\nu}} = \frac{c_R}{2} (\delta_\rho^\mu \delta_\sigma^\nu + \delta_\sigma^\mu \delta_\rho^\nu) \quad (\text{coupling constant})$$

$$(2.80) \quad \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi\varphi\varphi} = -\lambda \quad (\text{coupling constant})$$

$$(2.81) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\sigma} \Gamma_{K^{\mu\nu} c_\rho} = -i\kappa (\eta^{\mu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\nu + \eta^{\nu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\mu - \eta^{\mu\nu} \delta_\rho^\sigma) \quad (\text{amplitude of h and K})$$

$$(2.82) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{L_\rho c^\sigma c^\tau} = -i\kappa (\delta_\sigma^\rho \eta_{\lambda\tau} - \delta_\tau^\rho \eta_{\lambda\sigma}) \quad (\text{amplitude of c and L})$$

$$(2.83) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{Y c^\rho \varphi} = -i\delta_\lambda^\rho \quad (\text{amplitude of } \varphi \text{ and Y})$$

Imposing the b -equation of motion (2.29) fixes α_0 and the b -amplitude. It is worth mentioning that the c_3 -contribution to $\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}$ is an implication of the invariance under $s_1 h$, hence must not be postulated via some normalization condition.

3. RENORMALIZATION

At first we have to specify the perturbative expansion in which we would like to treat the model. Due to the vanishing canonical dimension of the field $h^{\mu\nu}$ we have to expand in the number of this field. Second we expand as usual in the number of loops. Next we have to choose a renormalization scheme in order to cope with the divergences of the loop diagrams. We shall use the Bogoliubov-Parasiuk-Hepp-Zimmermann-Lowenstein (BPHZL) scheme [LE] which is based on momentum subtractions and an auxiliary mass M in order to avoid spurious infrared divergences which otherwise would be introduced by the subtractions at vanishing momenta when dealing with massless propagators. The key ingredients of this scheme are the subtraction operator acting on one-particle-irreducible diagrams (1PI) and the forest formula which organizes the subtractions. The subtraction operator reads

$$(3.1) \quad (1 - \tau_\gamma) = (1 - t_{p^\gamma(s^\gamma-1)}^{\rho(\gamma)-1})(1 - t_{p^\gamma s^\gamma}^{\delta(\gamma)}).$$

Here $t_{x_1 \dots x_n}^d$ denotes the Taylor series about $x_i = 0$ to order d if $d \geq 0$ or 0 if $d < 0$. γ denotes a 1PI diagram, p^γ refers to its external momenta, and s^γ to an auxiliary subtraction variable to be introduced. $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\delta(\gamma)$ are the infrared and ultraviolet subtraction degrees of γ , respectively. Those will be specified below. As far as the forest formula is concerned we refer to the literature (cf. [LE]). For later use we note that

$$(3.2) \quad (1 - \tau_\gamma) = (1 - t_{p^\gamma}^{\delta(\gamma)}) \quad \text{for} \quad \rho(\gamma) = \delta(\gamma) + 1.$$

3.1. Auxiliary mass. In the BPHZ subtraction scheme one removes UV divergences by suitable subtractions at vanishing external momenta. In the massless case those would introduce artificial (off-shell) IR divergences. Hence in an extension, the BPHZL scheme, one introduces an auxiliary mass term of type $M^2(s-1)^2$ for every massless propagator. Subtractions with respect to p, s performed at $p=0, s=0$ take care of the UV divergences. Subtractions with respect to $p, s-1$ thereafter establish correct normalizations for guaranteeing poles at $p=0$ and vanishing of three-point functions (of massless fields) at $p=0$.

For the massless scalar field this auxiliary mass term can simply be taken to read

$$(3.3) \quad \frac{1}{2} \int M^2(s-1)^2 \varphi^2.$$

When trying to introduce such an auxiliary mass term for the massless pole in the double pole propagators one encounters difficulties. Neither with a naive hh -term nor with a Fierz-Pauli type mass term can one invert Γ_{hh} to propagators G_{hh} such that the Lagrange multiplier field b_ρ remains non-propagating. But its propagation would prevent its use in

the quartet formalism of [KO78]. A glance at the propagators (2.21) and the coefficients $\gamma_{\text{KL}}^{(r)}$, (2.17) suggests to replace the overall factor p^2 in the γ 's by

$$(3.4) \quad p^2 - m^2 \equiv p^2 - M^2(s-1)^2.$$

Here m^2 denotes the auxiliary mass contribution. This *Push* in p^2 still maintains restricted invariance, i.e. under $s_0 h$, (see Sect. 5.2), and is fairly easy to carry along as we shall see. Accepting this change of vertices and propagators one has to analyze in some detail what it implies. For the propagators it is clear that the pole at $p^2 = 0$ is shifted, as desired to a pole at $p^2 = m^2$. It affects not only the invariant parts, but also the gauge fixing dependent propagators $\langle bh \rangle$ and $\langle \bar{c}c \rangle$. This can be seen when performing Push in Γ and having a look at the inversion equations. The γ 's (2.17) then read

$$(3.5) \quad \gamma_{TT}^{(2)} = -(p^2 - m^2)(c_1 p^2 - c_3 \kappa^{-2})$$

$$(3.6) \quad \gamma_{TT}^{(0)} = (p^2 - m^2)((3c_2 + c_1)p^2 - 2c_3 \kappa^{-2})$$

$$(3.7) \quad \gamma_{SS}^{(1)} = \gamma_{WW}^{(0)} = \gamma_{TW}^{(0)} = \gamma_{WT}^{(0)} = 0.$$

In the inversion equations one has products of $\gamma_{\text{KL}}^{(r)}$ with its direct counterpart $\langle hh \rangle_{\text{KL}}^{(r)}$, such that this change is not a change there.

For gauge fixing terms we find the effect of Push as follows

$$(3.8) \quad \Gamma_{\mu\nu\rho}^{hb} G^{bh} = \frac{i}{2\kappa} (\eta_{\rho\mu} p_\nu + \eta_{\rho\nu} p_\mu) \frac{\kappa}{p^2} (p^\mu \theta^{\nu\rho} + p^\nu \theta^{\mu\rho} + p^\rho \omega^{\mu\nu}) \quad (\text{local})$$

$$(3.9) \quad = \frac{i}{2\kappa} (\eta_{\rho\mu} p_\nu + \eta_{\rho\nu} p_\mu) \frac{p^2}{p^2} \frac{\kappa}{p^2} (p^\mu \theta^{\nu\rho} + p^\nu \theta^{\mu\rho} + p^\rho \omega^{\mu\nu}) \quad (\text{local})$$

$$(3.10) \quad \xrightarrow{\text{Push}} \frac{i}{2\kappa} (\eta_{\rho\mu} p_\nu + \eta_{\rho\nu} p_\mu) \frac{p^2 - m^2}{p^2} \frac{\kappa}{p^2 - m^2} (\theta^{\rho\mu} p^\nu + \theta^{\rho\nu} p^\mu + p^\rho \omega^{\mu\nu})$$

$$(3.11) \Rightarrow \Gamma(m^2)_{\mu\nu\rho}^{hb} = \frac{-im^2}{2\kappa p^2} (\eta_{\rho\mu} p_\nu + \eta_{\rho\nu} p_\mu) \quad (\text{non - local}),$$

$$(3.12) \quad \Rightarrow G_{\rho\mu\nu}^{bh} = \frac{\kappa}{p^2 - m^2} (p_\mu \theta_{\rho\nu} + p_\nu \theta_{\rho\mu} + p_\rho \omega_{\mu\nu}) \quad (\text{massive propagator})$$

i.e. there appears an additional term in Γ^{hb} and the $\langle bh \rangle$ -propagator becomes massive (with the auxiliary mass). In x -space complete gauge fixing term reads

$$(3.13) \quad \begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\text{gf}} &= -\frac{1}{2\kappa} \int dx dy h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu b_\nu + \partial_\nu b_\mu)(y) \left\{ \delta(x-y) + \frac{m^2}{(x-y)^2} \right\} - \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \int \eta^{\mu\nu} b_\mu b_\nu \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\kappa} \int dx dy h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu b_\nu + \partial_\nu b_\mu)(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\} - \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \int \eta^{\mu\nu} b_\mu b_\nu. \end{aligned}$$

A suitable Faddeev-Popov (FP) term is then

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Gamma_{\phi\pi} &= -\frac{1}{2} \int dx dy D_{\rho}^{\mu\nu} c^{\rho}(x) (\partial_{\mu} \bar{c}_{\nu} + \partial_{\nu} \bar{c}_{\mu})(y) \left\{ \delta(x-y) + \frac{m^2}{(x-y)^2} \right\} \\
 (3.14) \quad &= -\frac{1}{2} \int dx dy D_{\rho}^{\mu\nu} c^{\rho}(x) (\partial_{\mu} \bar{c}_{\nu} + \partial_{\nu} \bar{c}_{\mu})(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\},
 \end{aligned}$$

because it maintains the BRST-doublet structure within the gauge fixing procedure. A comment to the “non-local” terms is in order. Our writing is symbolic shorthand in order to have a simple handling of these terms. Using the explicit form of $s_0 h$ and integration by parts one may observe that the actual non-local part is of projector type in terms of differential operators – quite in line with its first appearance in p -space. There the projectors lead formally to direction dependent integrals. However Zimmermann’s ε , introduced as

$$(3.15) \quad p^2 \rightarrow p^2 + i\epsilon(\mathbf{p}^2 + M^2(s-1)^2),$$

guarantees absolute convergence, hence no serious problem will arise once we have reliable power counting and appropriate correct subtractions. In the limit $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ its contribution vanishes.

We therefore discuss in the next subsection power counting and convergence with positive outcome, and return thereafter to a discussion of the m^2 -dependent terms. Before starting with the presentation of power counting we have to have a look at the basis of naively symmetric insertions once we have introduced an auxiliary mass term. Obviously we can introduce the following *Shift*

$$(3.16) \quad \int \sqrt{-g} c_3 \kappa^{-2} R \rightarrow \int \sqrt{-g} (c_{30} \kappa^{-2} + c_{31} \kappa^{-1} m + c_{32} \frac{1}{2} m^2) R.$$

In the tree approximation these terms are invariant (and for $s = 1$ reduce to the original term), but in higher orders they represent new and independent elements in the basis of symmetric normal products with $\delta = \rho = 4$. So, we have to carry them along as vertices when studying power counting.

3.2. Power counting and convergence. In the Landau gauge, $\alpha_0 = 0$, the only non-vanishing propagators are the following one's:

$$(3.17) \quad \langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(2)} = \frac{i}{(p^2 - m^2)c_1(p^2 - \frac{c_3\kappa^{-2}}{c_1})}$$

$$(3.18) \quad \langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(0)} = \frac{i}{(p^2 - m^2)(3c_2 + c_1)(p^2 - \frac{2c_3\kappa^{-2}}{3c_2 + c_1})}$$

$$(3.19) \quad \langle b_\rho h_{\mu\nu} \rangle = \frac{1}{p^2 - m^2}(p_\mu\theta_{\nu\rho} + p_\nu\theta_{\mu\rho} + p_\rho\omega_{\mu\nu})$$

$$(3.20) \quad \langle \bar{c}_\rho c_\sigma \rangle = -i(\theta_{\rho\sigma} + \frac{1}{2}\omega_{\rho\sigma})\frac{1}{p^2 - m^2}$$

$$(3.21) \quad \langle \varphi\varphi \rangle = \frac{i}{p^2 - m^2}$$

In addition to $m = M(s - 1)$ one needs also Zimmermann's ε -prescription (3.15). This will guarantee absolute convergence of diagrams, once power counting is established and subtractions are correctly performed.

Important note: in all formulas to follow in this section the replacement of c_3 by the sum given in (3.16) is to be understood. Relevant for power counting arguments is never a coefficient in front of a vertex, but the number of lines and derivatives at the vertex and its associated subtraction degree. The $\langle bh \rangle$ propagator will be of no relevance for reasons spelled out after (2.56).

Power counting is based on ultraviolet (UV) and infrared (IR) degrees of propagators and vertices. The upper degree $\overline{\text{deg}}_{p,s}$ gives the asymptotic power for p and s tending to infinity; the lower degree $\underline{\text{deg}}_{p,(s-1)}$ gives the asymptotic power for p and $s - 1$ tending to zero. For propagators they read

$$(3.22) \quad \overline{\text{deg}}_{p,s}(\langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(2)}) = -4 \quad \underline{\text{deg}}_{p,s-1}(\langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(2)}) = -2$$

$$(3.23) \quad \overline{\text{deg}}_{p,s}(\langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(0)}) = -4 \quad \underline{\text{deg}}_{p,s-1}(\langle hh \rangle_{TT}^{(0)}) = -2$$

$$(3.24) \quad \overline{\text{deg}}_{p,s}(\langle \bar{c}c \rangle) = \underline{\text{deg}}_{p,s-1}(\langle \bar{c}c \rangle) = -2$$

$$(3.25) \quad \overline{\text{deg}}_{p,s}(\langle \varphi\varphi \rangle) = \underline{\text{deg}}_{p,s-1}(\langle \varphi\varphi \rangle) = -2.$$

As shorthand we write also $\overline{\text{deg}} \equiv \overline{D}_L$ and $\underline{\text{deg}} \equiv \underline{D}_L$. The degrees of the vertices thus have the values

$$(3.26) \quad \overline{D}_{V(c_1)} = \overline{D}_{V(c_2)} = 4, \quad \overline{D}_{V(c_3)} = \overline{D}_{V(\phi\pi)} = \overline{D}_{V(kin)} = \overline{D}_{V(c_R)} = 2, \quad \overline{D}_{V\varphi} = 0$$

$$(3.27) \quad \underline{D}_{V(c_1)} = \underline{D}_{V(c_2)} = 4, \quad \underline{D}_{V(c_3)} = \underline{D}_{V(\phi\pi)} = \underline{D}_{V(kin)} = \underline{D}_{V(c_R)} = 2, \quad \underline{D}_{V\varphi} = 0$$

In addition to the vertices of the EH theory we have to take into account

$$(3.28) \quad V^{(c_R)} = \frac{c_R}{2} \int (-g)^{1/4} \varphi^2 R \quad V^{(kin)} = \frac{1}{2} \int (-g)^{1/4} g^{\mu\nu} \mathcal{D}_\mu \varphi \mathcal{D}_\nu \varphi \quad V^{(\varphi)} = -\frac{\lambda}{4!} \int \varphi^4$$

Let us now consider a one-particle-irreducible (1PI) diagram γ with m loops, I_{ab} internal lines, $a, b = h, c, \bar{c}$, and V vertices of type $V \in \{c_1, c_2, c_3, \phi\pi, c_R, kin, \varphi\}$ or insertions Q_i as well as N amputated external lines. In the subsequent considerations a more detailed notation is useful: N_a are of type Φ_a , n_{ai} are of type a and are attached to the i^{th} vertex. Then with Q_i

$$(3.29) \quad Q_i(x) = \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x}\right)^{|\mu_i|} \prod_a (\Phi_a^{c_{ai}}(x)),$$

we first find for the UV- and IR-degrees of γ

$$(3.30) \quad d(\gamma) = 4m(\gamma) + \sum_{V \in \gamma} \bar{D}_V + \sum_{L \in \gamma} \bar{D}_L$$

$$(3.31) \quad = 4m(\gamma) + 4V^{(c_1, c_2)} + 2(V^{(c_3)} + V^{(\phi\pi)} + V^{(c_R)} + V^{(kin)}) - 4I_{hh} - 2(I_{c\bar{c}} + I_{\varphi\varphi}),$$

$$(3.32) \quad r(\gamma) = 4m(\gamma) + \sum_{V \in \gamma} \underline{D}_V + \sum_{L \in \gamma} \underline{D}_L$$

$$(3.33) \quad = 4m(\gamma) + 4V^{(c_1, c_2)} + 2(V^{(c_3)} + V^{(\phi\pi)} + V^{(c_R)} + V^{(kin)}) - 2(I_{hh} + I_{\bar{c}c} + I_{\varphi\varphi}).$$

The topological relations

$$(3.34) \quad m = I - V + 1$$

$$(3.35) \quad N_a = \sum_i n_{ai} \quad 2I_{aa} = \sum_i (c_{ai} - n_{ai}) = \sum_i c_{ai} - N_a$$

permit to rewrite these degrees as

$$(3.36) \quad d(\gamma) = 4 + \sum_{V \in \gamma} (\bar{D}_V - 4) + \sum_{L \in \gamma} (\bar{D}_L + 4)$$

$$(3.37) \quad d(\gamma) = 4 - (N_c + N_{\bar{c}}) - 2V^{(c_3)} - N_\varphi$$

$$(3.38) \quad r(\gamma) = 4 + \sum_{V \in \gamma} (\underline{D}_V - 4) + \sum_{L \in \gamma} (\underline{D}_L + 4)$$

$$(3.39) \quad r(\gamma) = 4 - 2V^{(c_3)} + 2I_{hh} - (N_c + N_{\bar{c}} + N_\varphi).$$

The aim is now to associate subtraction degrees to them which are independent of the detailed structure of the respective diagrams. We chose

$$(3.40) \quad \delta(\gamma) = 4 - N_\varphi \quad \rho(\gamma) = 4 - N_\varphi,$$

i.e. make explicit the dependence on the number of external legs N_φ , because these are the standard degrees for a massless scalar field in the case where no h -fields contribute.

(A side remark: In a model with additional massless vector and massless spinor fields and no internal symmetry breaking one would add $-N_V - 3/2N_\psi$ in the rhs of (3.40). Hence the standard model before symmetry breaking would be covered. Symmetry breaking would however require model dependent, “dedicated” degree prescriptions [EK98].)

We now have to check, that Lowenstein's conditions [Lo] are still satisfied. The first one reads

$$(C1) \quad \delta(\gamma) = d(\gamma) + b(\gamma) \quad \text{and} \quad \rho(\gamma) = r(\gamma) - c(\gamma)$$

with $b(\gamma)$ and $c(\gamma)$ being non-negative integers. $b(\gamma) \geq 0$ is obviously satisfied, but for

$$(3.41) \quad c(\gamma) = r(\gamma) - \rho(\gamma) = -2V^{c_3} + I_{hh} - N_c$$

we have to convince ourselves that it is greater or equal to zero. Hence we need the more detailed information given by the line balances

$$(3.42) \quad 2I_{hh} = \sum_{i \in \gamma} (c_{h,i} - n_{h,i}) = \sum_{i \in \gamma} (c_{h,i}) - N_h \quad i \in \{V^{(c_1)}, V^{(c_2)}, V^{(c_3)}, V^{(\phi\pi)}, V^{(c_R)}, V^{(kin)}, V^{(\varphi)}\}$$

$$(3.43) \quad 2I_{c\bar{c}} = \sum_{i \in \phi\pi} (c_{c,i} - n_{c,i}) = \sum_{i \in \phi\pi} c_{c,i} - N_c$$

$$(3.44) \quad 2I_{\varphi\varphi} = \sum_{i=c_R, k, \varphi} (c_{\varphi,i} - n_{\varphi,i}) = \sum_{i=c_R, k, \varphi} (c_{\varphi,i} - N_{\varphi}).$$

We find

$$(3.45) \quad c(\gamma) = \sum_{i \in c_1, c_2} (c_{h,i} - n_{h,i}) + \sum_{i \in c_3} (c_{h,i} - n_{h,i} - 2) + \sum_{i \in \phi\pi} (c_{\bar{c},i} - n_{\bar{c},i} - 2) + \sum_{i \in \phi\pi} (1 - n_{h,\phi\pi})$$

$$(3.46) \quad + \sum_{i \in V^{(c_R)}} (c_{h,V^{(c_R)}} - n_{h,V^{(c_R)}}) + \sum_{i \in V^{(kin)}} (c_{h,V^{(kin)}} - n_{h,V^{(kin)}}) + \sum_{i \in V^{(\varphi)}} (c_{h,V^{(\varphi)}} - n_{h,V^{(\varphi)}})$$

If the vertex i in question is not present in γ , the respective brackets just vanish. If this vertex is present in γ , then (first line) $(c_{h,i} - n_{h,i}) \geq 2$ and $(c_{h,i} - n_{h,i} - 2) \geq 0$ – both for 1PI γ . Since $c_{\bar{c},\phi\pi} = 2$ the third bracket combines with the fourth such that their sum is ≥ 0 – again for 1PI γ – we find two cases: either $n_{h,i_0} = 1$ at vertex i_0 s.t. $n_{\bar{c},i_0} = 0$ (otherwise γ is not 1PI) or $n_{h,i_0} = 0$ at vertex i_0 s.t. $+1$ from here and from $n_{\bar{c},i_0}$ at most 1, i.e. -1 in the sum (otherwise γ is not 1PI), which together is 0, i.e. non-negative. This refers to the old result in I. In the second line every bracket is greater or equal to zero if the respective vertex is in the diagram. Hence equations (C1) are valid.

The next requirements refer to reduced diagrams $\bar{\Lambda} = \Lambda/\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$, which are obtained from Λ by contracting mutually disjoint, non-trivial 1PI subdiagrams λ_i to points (reduced vertices) $V(\lambda_i)$ assigning (for the sake of power counting) the unit polynomial of momenta

to each $V(\lambda_i)$. For 1PI γ one has the relations

$$(3.47) \quad d(\gamma) = d(\gamma/\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n) + \sum_{i=1}^n d(\lambda_i)$$

$$(3.48) \quad r(\gamma) = r(\gamma/\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n) + \sum_{i=1}^n r(\lambda_i).$$

Their analoga are also valid for connected diagrams. Now one can formulate further conditions for convergence, i.e.

$$(C2) \quad \delta(\gamma) \geq d(\gamma/\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n) + \sum_{i=1}^n \delta(\lambda_i)$$

$$(C3) \quad \rho(\gamma) \leq r(\gamma/\lambda_1 \dots \lambda_n) + \sum_{i=1}^n \rho(\lambda_i)$$

$$(C4) \quad \rho(\gamma) \leq \delta(\gamma) + 1$$

for arbitrary reduced 1PI subdiagrams $\gamma/\{\lambda_i\}$ of Γ . In order to verify (C2) one just inserts the values for the respective degrees.

$$(3.49) \quad \delta(\gamma) = 4 - N_\varphi(\gamma)$$

$$(3.50) \quad \delta(\gamma_i) = 4 - N_\varphi(\gamma_i)$$

$$(3.51) \quad d(\gamma) = 4 - 2V^{(c_3)}(\gamma) - (N_{\bar{c}} + N_c)(\gamma) - N_\varphi(\gamma)$$

$$(3.52) \quad d(\gamma_i) = 4 - 2V^{(c_3)}(\gamma_i) - (N_{\bar{c}} + N_c)(\gamma_i) - N_\varphi(\gamma_i)$$

$$(3.53) \quad d(\bar{\gamma}) = 4 - 2V^{(c_3)}(\bar{\gamma}) - (N_{\bar{c}} + N_c)(\bar{\gamma}) - N_\varphi(\bar{\gamma}) - 4n$$

$$(3.54) \quad d(\bar{\gamma}) + \sum_i \delta(\gamma_i) = 4 - 2V^{(c_3)}(\bar{\gamma}) - (N_{\bar{c}} + N_c)(\bar{\gamma}) - N_\varphi(\bar{\gamma})$$

$$(3.55) \quad \delta(\gamma) = 4 - N_\varphi(\gamma) \geq 4 - 2V^{(c_3)}(\bar{\gamma}) - (N_{\bar{c}} + N_c)(\bar{\gamma}) - N_\varphi(\bar{\gamma})$$

The last inequality was to be proved.

For the proof of (C3) one can use literally the proof of (C2) in the opposite direction since $N_\varphi(\gamma) = N_\varphi(\bar{\gamma})$.

(C4) is satisfied by definition of ρ, δ .

We can now refer to [Lo], (theorem 4) in which it is shown that these conditions being satisfied, Green's functions exist as tempered distributions, whereas for non-exceptional momenta (Euclidean sense) vertex functions exist as functions. Due to a theorem of Lowenstein and Speer [LS] in the limit $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ Lorentz covariance is also satisfied. An important improvement concerning Lorentz covariance has been provided by [CL]. If one introduces Zimmermann's ε via a change of metric $\eta_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow \text{diag}(1, -(1-i\varepsilon), -(1-i\varepsilon), -(1-i\varepsilon))$ in addition to multiplying each mass-square by $(1-i\varepsilon)$ then Lorentz covariance already holds for the rhs of ZI's before establishing the $\varepsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit. This is quite helpful for actual work with ZI's.

The above proof of convergence refers to diagrams constructed out of vertices with vanishing Faddeev-Popov (FP) charge. For installing the ST-identity in higher orders one needs however diagrams which once contain the vertex $V^{(-)}$ of types

$$(3.56) \quad \overline{D}(V^{(-)}) = \begin{cases} 3 & \text{for } V^{(-)} \simeq \int c \partial \partial \partial h \cdots h \\ 5 & \text{for } V^{(-)} \simeq \int c \partial \partial \partial \partial h \cdots h \end{cases} \quad \underline{D}(V^{(-)}) = \overline{D}(V^{(-)}),$$

i.e. of FP-charge -1 . Matter field contributions to $V^{(-)}$ have the form

$$(3.57) \quad \overline{D}(V^{(-)}) = \begin{cases} 5 & \text{for } V^{(-)} \simeq \int c \partial \partial \partial \phi \phi h \cdots h \\ 5 & \text{for } V^{(-)} \simeq \int c \partial \phi \phi \phi h \cdots h \end{cases} \quad \underline{D}(V^{(-)}) = \overline{D}(V^{(-)}),$$

The UV- and IR-degrees become resp.

$$(3.58) \quad d(\gamma) = 4m(\gamma) + \sum_{V \in \gamma} \overline{D}_V + \sum_{L \in \gamma} \overline{D}_L + \overline{D}_{V^{(-)}}$$

$$(3.59) \quad r(\gamma) = 4m(\gamma) + \sum_{V \in \gamma} \underline{D}_V + \sum_{L \in \gamma} \underline{D}_L + \underline{D}_{V^{(-)}}.$$

With (3.34) this results into ($V^{(-)} \in \gamma$)

$$(3.60) \quad d(\gamma) = 4 + \sum_{V \in \gamma} (\overline{D}_V - 4) + \sum_{L \in \gamma} (\overline{D}_L + 4)$$

$$(3.61) \quad = 4 - (N_{\bar{e}} + N_c) - N_{\varphi} - 2V^{(c_3)} + (\overline{D}_{V^{(-)}} - 4)$$

$$(3.62) \quad r(\gamma) = 4 + \sum_{V \in \gamma} (\underline{D}_V - 4) + \sum_{L \in \gamma} (\underline{D}_L + 4)$$

$$(3.63) \quad = 4 - N_{\varphi} - 2V^{(c_3)} - 2V^{(\phi\pi)} + (\underline{D}_{V^{(-)}} - 4) + 2I_{hh} + 2I_{c\bar{c}}$$

As subtractions degrees we define

$$(3.64) \quad \delta(\gamma) = d(\gamma) - N_{\varphi} + \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V^{(-)} \notin \gamma \\ 1 & \text{if } V^{(-)} \in \gamma \end{cases}$$

$$(3.65) \quad \rho(\gamma) = r(\gamma) - N_{\varphi} + \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } V^{(-)} \notin \gamma \\ 1 & \text{if } V^{(-)} \in \gamma. \end{cases}$$

$$(3.66) \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \rho(\gamma) = \delta(\gamma)$$

The line balances read now

$$(3.67) \quad 2I_{hh} = \sum_{i \in \gamma} (c_{h,i} - n_{h,i})$$

$$(3.68) \quad = \sum_{i \in \gamma} c_{h,i} - N_h \quad i \in \{(c_1), (c_2), (c_3), (\phi\pi), (c_R), (kin), (\varphi), (-)\}$$

$$(3.69) \quad 2I_{c\bar{c}} = \sum_{i \in \gamma} (c_{c,i} - n_{c,i}) = \sum_{i \in \gamma} c_{c,i} - N_c \quad i \in \{(\phi\pi), (-)\}$$

$$(3.70) \quad 2I_{\varphi\varphi} = \sum_{i \in \gamma} (c_{\varphi,c_i} - n_{\varphi,i}) = \sum_{i \in \gamma} c_{\varphi,i} - N_{\varphi} \quad i \in \{(c_R), (kin), (\varphi), (-)\}$$

We just added the vertex $V^{(-)}$ to the original line balances (3.42).

In order to verify (C1) we have to show that $b(\gamma) = \delta(\gamma) - d(\gamma) \geq 0$.

$$(3.71) \quad b(\gamma) = 5 - N_\varphi - d(\gamma)$$

$$(3.72) \quad = 5 - 4 + 2(V^{(c_3)} + V^{(\phi\pi)}) - (\overline{D}^{V^{(-)}} - 4) - 2I_{c\bar{c}}$$

$$(3.73) \quad = 1 + 2V^{(c_3)} - 1 + \sum_{i \in \phi\pi} n_{\bar{c}, \phi\pi} - (1 - n_{c, V^{(-)}})$$

$$(3.74) \quad = 2V^{(c_3)} + \sum_{i \in \phi\pi} n_{\bar{c}, \phi\pi} - (1 - n_{c, V^{(-)}}).$$

In the transition from first to second line the φ -line contributions cancel and we have used the line balance for $I_{c\bar{c}}$ (3.42) and chosen the more dangerous case $\overline{D}_{V^{(-)}} = 5$. If $n_{c, V^{(-)}} = 0$, there must a +1 coming from the $\phi\pi$ -sum, because the FP-charge is conserved. This is true for the $V^{(-)}$ -vertices depending on field φ as well. Hence the inequality holds.

The control of

$$(3.75)$$

$$c(\gamma) = r(\gamma) - \rho(\gamma)$$

$$(3.76)$$

$$= 4 - 2(V^{(c_3)} + V^{(\phi\pi)} + V^{(c_R)} + V^{(kin)}) - 4V^{(\varphi)} + 2(I_{hh} + I_{c\bar{c}} + I_{\varphi\varphi}) + (\underline{D}(V^{(-)}) - 4) - 5$$

$$(3.77)$$

$$= -2V^{(c_3)} - 2V^{(\phi\pi)} + 2I_{hh} + 2I_{c\bar{c}} + (\underline{D}(V^{(-)}) - 4) - 1$$

$$(3.78)$$

$$= -2V^{(c_3)} - 2V^{(\phi\pi)} + 2I_{hh} + 2I_{c\bar{c}} + \begin{cases} -1 & \text{for } \underline{D}_{V^{(-)}} = 3 \\ +1 & \text{for } \underline{D}_{V^{(-)}} = 5 \end{cases} \geq 0.$$

is similar. In the difference $r(\gamma) - \rho(\gamma)$ the contribution from φ -lines drops out. The effect of the φ -contributions to $V^{(-)}$ -vertices is taken along by their \underline{D} -value. The continuity of $c\bar{c}$ -lines is maintained. Hence one falls entirely back to the analysis of the pure EH-model, with the same result, that indeed $c(\gamma)$ is non-negative.

When checking (C2) and (C3) we encounter the same situation: the φ -lines and their contributions just go through the estimates since $N_\varphi(\gamma) = N_\varphi(\bar{\gamma})$ and the decisive steps are those of the underlying pure EH-model: it is the conservation of the Faddeev-Popov-charge, i.e. the contingency of the $c\bar{c}$ -lines which is relevant and not the specific form of the vertices $V^{(-)}$ depending on φ .

From here on the discussion of [PS21] can be literally taken over with the result that one has convergence for all insertions needed in the sequel. Again, the limiting case $\rho(\gamma) = \delta(\gamma) + 1$ can not be used: The subtractions must be performed with the above indicated degrees $\delta(\gamma), \rho(\gamma)$.

3.3. Slavnov-Taylor identity. The ST identity which we have to establish to higher orders takes the same form as in tree approximation, (2.28), supplemented however by the m^2 -dependent gauge fixing, (3.13), and Faddeev-Popov-terms, (3.14), i.e.

$$(3.79) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta K} \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta h} + \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta L} \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta c} + \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta Y} \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta c} + b \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta \bar{c}} \right) = 0$$

$$(3.80) \quad \Gamma_{\text{gf}} = -\frac{1}{2\kappa} \int dx dy h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu b_\nu + \partial_\nu b_\mu)(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\}$$

$$(3.81) \quad - \int \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \eta^{\mu\nu} b_\mu b_\nu$$

$$(3.82) \quad \Gamma_{\phi\pi} = -\frac{1}{2} \int dx dy s h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\}.$$

The b, \bar{c} -field equations of motion take now the form

$$(3.83) \quad \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta b^\rho} = \kappa^{-1} \int dy \partial^\mu h_{\mu\rho}(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\} - \alpha_0 b_\rho$$

$$(3.84) \quad \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta \bar{c}_\rho(x)} = - \int dy \kappa^{-1} \partial_\lambda \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta K_{\lambda\rho}(y)} \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\}.$$

Again the b -field equation can be integrated trivially back to (3.80) and therefor the functional $\bar{\Gamma}$ be introduced as in the tree approximation

$$(3.85) \quad \Gamma = \Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \bar{\Gamma}.$$

(2.31) is changed into

$$(3.86) \quad \kappa^{-1} \int dy \partial_\lambda \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta K_{\mu\lambda}(y)} \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta \bar{c}_\mu} = 0,$$

whereas (2.32) becomes

$$(3.87) \quad H_{\mu\nu}(x) = K_{\mu\nu}(x) + \frac{1}{2} \int dy (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\}.$$

The relations (2.33) are unchanged:

$$(3.88) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \bar{\Gamma} = 0$$

$$(3.89) \quad \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta H} \frac{\delta}{\delta h} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta h} \frac{\delta}{\delta H} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta Y} \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta \varphi} \frac{\delta}{\delta Y} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta L} \frac{\delta}{\delta c} + \frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}}{\delta c} \frac{\delta}{\delta L} \right).$$

In the BPHZL renormalization scheme the starting point for establishing equations like the above one's to all orders is a Γ_{eff} with which one calculates accordingly subtracted Feynman diagrams. Here we choose

$$(3.90) \quad \Gamma_{\text{eff}} = \Gamma_{\text{inv}}^{\text{class}} + \Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \Gamma_{\phi\pi} + \Gamma_{\text{e.f.}} + \Gamma_{\text{ct}}.$$

In addition to (2.1),(2.4),(3.80), and (3.82) one has to take into account the changes caused by the auxiliary mass term (3.4) in (3.5) and (3.6). Γ_{ct} will collect counterterms

as needed. All these expressions are to be understood as normal products, i.e. insertions into Green functions with power counting degrees $\delta = \rho = 4$.

Starting from Z , the generating functional for general Green functions, and from the definition of \mathcal{S} in (2.35) we postulate

$$(3.91) \quad \mathcal{S}Z = 0.$$

Then the action principle yields

$$(3.92) \quad \mathcal{S}Z = \Delta_Z \cdot Z = \Delta_Z + O(\hbar\Delta_Z),$$

where $\Delta_Z \equiv [\Delta_Z]_5^5$ is an integrated insertion with $Q_{\phi\pi}(\Delta_Z) = +1$. Again, by invoking the action principle one can realize the b -field equation of motion (3.83), with (3.86), now on the renormalized level, as a consequence of (3.79). This admits (3.88) as a postulate and results into

$$(3.93) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = \Delta \cdot \Gamma$$

$$(3.94) \quad \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}\bar{\Gamma} = \Delta + O(\hbar\Delta).$$

Here $\Delta \equiv [\Delta]_5^5$ with $Q_{\phi\pi}(\Delta) = +1$ does not depend on b and \bar{c} . These relations admit a cohomological treatment, since

$$(3.95) \quad \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}\bar{\Gamma} = 0, \quad \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}} = 0,$$

the latter being true as a necessary condition, if (3.88) is to be satisfied. Since in the tree approximation (3.88) holds one has

$$(3.96) \quad \delta\Delta = 0 \quad \text{for} \quad \delta \equiv \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}_{\text{class}}} \quad \text{with} \quad \delta^2 = 0$$

as the final consistency condition to be solved. The standard way to solve this cohomology problem is to list contributions to Δ by starting with terms depending on external fields and then those consisting of elementary fields only, i.e.

$$(3.97) \quad \Delta = \int (K_{\mu\nu}\Delta^{\mu\nu}(h, c) + L_\rho\Delta^\rho(h, c) + Y\Delta^\varphi(\varphi, h, c)) + \Lambda(h, \varphi, c).$$

All terms are insertions compatible with $[\dots]_5^5$ and $Q^{\phi\pi} = +1$. (Recall that $Q^{\phi\pi}(K) = Q^{\phi\pi}(Y) = -1, Q^{\phi\pi}(L) = -2$.) In [BBHa, BBHb] it is shown, that all these contributions eventually are δ -variations. This is true even for the Λ -term. This means that also in the present case no anomalies arise, the solution reads:

$$(3.98) \quad \Delta = \delta\hat{\Delta}$$

with a $\hat{\Delta}$ which can be absorbed into Γ_{eff} . In the quoted references the algebra leading to this result has been performed by using cohomological methods. Without power counting and convergence and not within a concrete renormalization scheme, this represents a classical consideration. In the present context we have, however, supplied it with ‘‘analytic’’ information, i.e. assured the existence of the relevant quantities as insertions into existing Green functions. The result is thus that we have indeed a ST-identity which holds as inserted into general Green’s functions of elementary fields, at non-exceptional momenta

and $s = 1$.

In principle one would now like to prove unitarity of the S -matrix along the lines given in the tree approximation. This is however not directly possible. If c_1 and c_2 are different from zero, the $\langle hh \rangle$ -propagator has two poles which have to be disentangled and associated with respective fields. Then one has to study carefully the norm properties of their particle states and give a prescription for handling the “dangerous” one’s. This will be done in section 9 below.

3.4. Normalization conditions II. The normalization conditions (2.76)-(2.82) have to be modified such that they are compatible with higher orders of perturbation theory: they have to be taken at values in momentum space which are consistent with the subtraction procedure. They read

$$(3.99) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}|_{p=0, s=1} = c_3 \kappa^{-2}$$

$$(3.100) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}|_{p^2=-\mu^2, s=1} = -2c_1$$

$$(3.101) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}|_{p^2=-\mu^2, s=1} = 2(3c_2 + c_1)$$

$$(3.102) \quad \Gamma_{h\mu\nu} = -\eta_{\mu\nu} c_0 = 0$$

$$(3.103) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^\rho \partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi h^{\mu\nu}}|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2), s=1} = \frac{c}{2} (\delta_\rho^\mu \delta_\sigma^\nu + \delta_\sigma^\mu \delta_\rho^\nu)$$

$$(3.104) \quad \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi\varphi\varphi}|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2), s=1} = -\lambda$$

$$(3.105) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p_\sigma} \Gamma_{K^{\mu\nu} c_\rho}|_{p^2=-\mu^2, s=1} = -i\kappa (\eta^{\mu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\nu + \eta^{\nu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\mu - \eta^{\mu\nu} \delta_\rho^\sigma)$$

$$(3.106) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{Y\varphi c^\rho}|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2), s=1} = -i\delta_\lambda^\rho$$

$$(3.107) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{L_\rho c^\sigma c^\tau}|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2), s=1} = -i\kappa (\delta_\sigma^\rho \eta_{\lambda\tau} - \delta_\tau^\rho \eta_{\lambda\sigma}).$$

Imposing the b -equation of motion (2.29) still fixes α_0 and the b -amplitude.

4. INVARIANT DIFFERENTIAL OPERATORS AND INVARIANT INSERTIONS

Here we develop the concept of BRST-invariant differential operators and their one-to-one counterparts, BRST-invariant insertions. One can essentially follow the paper [PS2] and translate from YM to gravity.

Suppose a model satisfies the WI of a linear transformation

$$(4.1) \quad W^a \Gamma \equiv \int \delta^a \phi \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \phi} = 0$$

and λ is a parameter of the theory (e.g. coupling, mass, normalization parameter) of which the WI-operator W^a does not depend. Then $\lambda \partial_\lambda$ commutes with W^a , i.e.

$$(4.2) \quad [\lambda \partial_\lambda, W^a] = 0.$$

Then the action principle tells us that

$$(4.3) \quad \lambda \partial_\lambda \Gamma = \Delta_\lambda \cdot \Gamma.$$

Applying W^a to (4.3) and using (4.2) we find

$$(4.4) \quad W^a(\Delta_\lambda \cdot \Gamma) = W^a \Delta_\lambda + O(\hbar \Delta) = 0,$$

which expresses the invariance of Δ_λ under the symmetry transformation W^a : $\lambda \partial_\lambda$ and Δ_λ are called symmetric with respect to the symmetry W^a .

For the Γ -non-linear BRST-symmetry one has to proceed slightly differently. We shall call an insertion Δ BRST-symmetric if to first order in ϵ

$$(4.5) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma_\epsilon) = O(\epsilon^2)$$

$$(4.6) \quad \text{for } \Gamma_\epsilon = \Gamma + \epsilon \Delta \cdot \Gamma \quad \text{with } \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = 0.$$

If Δ is generated by a differential operator (4.3), this differential operator will be called BRST-symmetric. Writing (4.5) explicitly we have

$$(4.7) \quad \mathcal{S}(\Gamma) + \epsilon \mathcal{S}_\Gamma \Delta \cdot \Gamma = O(\epsilon^2)$$

$$(4.8) \quad \mathcal{S}_\Gamma \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta K} \frac{\delta}{\delta h} + \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta h} \frac{\delta}{\delta K} + \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta L} \frac{\delta}{\delta c} + \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta c} \frac{\delta}{\delta L} + \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta Y} \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi} + \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta \varphi} \frac{\delta}{\delta Y} + b \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{c}} \right) + \chi \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_0},$$

i.e. the symmetry condition reads

$$(4.9) \quad \mathcal{S}_\Gamma \Delta \cdot \Gamma = 0.$$

A comment is in order. Although later we shall exclusively work in Landau gauge, we carry here the gauge parameter α_0 along as preparation for the general solution with arbitrarily many parameters z_{nk} . This facilitates the formulation of the general version. Actually relevant at the end are only the formulae with $\alpha_0 = \chi = 0$. The explicit form of \mathcal{S}_Γ precisely defines how to perform the variation of the fields.¹ The operator \mathcal{S}_Γ is helpful for rewriting the gauge fixing and $\phi\pi$ -contributions to the action (3.80):

$$(4.10) \quad \Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \Gamma_{\phi\pi} = \mathcal{S}_\Gamma \left(-\frac{1}{2\kappa} \int h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\} - \int \frac{\alpha_0}{2} \eta^{\mu\nu} \bar{c}_\mu b_\nu \right).$$

(Note: the last term creates a contribution which has not been taken into account in (3.80), however in (2.50).) When going over to Z , the generating functional for the general

¹This formula shows that it is not the demand ‘‘linearity in Γ ’’ which determines its form, but rather the demand ‘‘correct transformation of an insertion’’.

Green functions, it is clear, that gauge fixing and $\phi\pi$ -term vanish between physical states, because they are a BRST-variation.

A necessary condition for insertions to be BRST-symmetric is obtained by acting with $\delta/\delta b$ on (4.5):

$$(4.11) \quad G\Delta \cdot \Gamma = S_\Gamma \frac{\delta\Delta \cdot \Gamma}{\delta b}, \quad G^\rho \equiv \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{c}_\rho(x)} + \kappa^{-1} \int dy \partial_\lambda \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta K_{\rho\lambda}(y)} \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\}.$$

For b -independent insertions Δ one must ensure the homogeneous ghost equation

$$(4.12) \quad G\Delta \cdot \Gamma = 0.$$

Using the gauge condition

$$(4.13) \quad \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta b_\rho} = -\alpha_0 \eta^{\rho\lambda} b_\rho + \kappa^{-1} \int dy \partial_\mu h^{\mu\rho}(y) \left\{ \left(\frac{\square}{4\pi^2} + m^2 \right) \frac{1}{(x-y)^2} \right\},$$

one can reduce (4.11) to

$$(4.14) \quad \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \Delta \cdot \Gamma = 0.$$

In the tree approximation we have called this operator \mathcal{b} .

Our next task is to construct a *basis* for all symmetric insertions of dimension 4, $\phi\pi$ -charge 0, and independent of b_ρ – first in the tree approximation and then to all orders. A systematic way to find them is to solve the cohomology problem

$$(4.15) \quad \mathcal{b}\Delta = 0$$

for Δ satisfying

$$(4.16) \quad \frac{\delta\Delta}{\delta b} = 0, \quad G\Delta = 0$$

$$(4.17) \quad \dim(\Delta) = 4, \quad Q_{\phi\pi}(\Delta) = 0.$$

Here $\mathcal{b} = \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}^{\text{class}}}$, hence

$$(4.18) \quad \mathcal{b} = \mathcal{J} \quad \text{on all elementary fields}$$

$$(4.19) \quad \mathcal{b}H_{\mu\nu} = \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}^{\text{cl}}}{\delta h^{\mu\nu}} = \frac{\delta \Gamma^{\text{class}}_{\text{inv}}}{\delta h^{\mu\nu}} - \kappa(H_{\lambda\mu} \partial_\nu c^\lambda + H_{\lambda\nu} \partial_\mu c^\lambda + \partial_\lambda(H_{\mu\nu} c^\lambda))$$

$$(4.20) \quad \mathcal{b}Y = \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}^{\text{cl}}}{\delta \varphi} = \frac{\delta \Gamma^{\text{class}}_{\text{inv}}}{\delta \varphi} - \partial_\lambda Y c^\lambda - \frac{3}{4} Y \partial_\lambda c^\lambda$$

$$(4.21) \quad \mathcal{b}L_\rho = \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}^{\text{cl}}}{\delta c^\rho} = \kappa(2\partial^\lambda H_{\lambda\rho} + 2\partial_{\lambda'}(H_{\rho\lambda} h^{\lambda'\lambda} + H_{\lambda'\lambda} \partial_\rho h^{\lambda'\lambda}))$$

$$(4.22) \quad -\kappa(L_\lambda \partial_\rho c^\lambda + \partial_\lambda(L_\rho c^\lambda))$$

$$(4.23) \quad +Y \partial_\rho \varphi - \frac{1}{4} \partial_\rho(Y \varphi).$$

In order to proceed we first separate the α_0 -dependence

$$(4.24) \quad \Delta = \chi_0 \Delta_- + \Delta_0.$$

We now define

$$(4.25) \quad \bar{b} = \begin{cases} b & \text{on } h, c, H, L, Y \\ 0 & \text{on } \alpha_0 \end{cases}$$

and note that

$$(4.26) \quad \partial_{\alpha_0}(\bar{b}\psi) = 0 \quad \text{for } \psi = h, c, H, L, Y$$

with $\bar{b}^2=0$, since $\bar{\Gamma}_{cl}$ is independent of α_0 . (4.15) implies

$$(4.27) \quad \bar{b}\Delta_- - \partial_{\alpha_0}\Delta_0 = 0 \quad \bar{b}\Delta_0 = 0,$$

hence

$$(4.28) \quad \Delta = \bar{b}\hat{\Delta}_- + \hat{\Delta}_0.$$

Here $\hat{\Delta}_0$ is α_0 -independent and \bar{b} -invariant. Since \bar{c} does not occur, a negative $\phi\pi$ -charge can only be generated by external fields, hence

$$(4.29) \quad \hat{\Delta}_- = \int (f_H(\alpha_0)H_{\mu\nu}h^{\mu\nu} + f_Y(\alpha_0)Y\varphi + f_L(\alpha_0)L_\rho c^\rho)$$

which is the precise analogue of (4.19) in [PS23], is certainly a solution. However in the present case the field $h^{\mu\nu}$ has canonical dimension zero, whereas its counterpart in Yang-Mills theory, the vector field A_μ has dimension one. So every function $\mathcal{F}^{\mu\nu}(h)$ is also a solution. For the time being we continue with (4.29) and refer for the discussion of the general solution to papI.

It is worth solving the subproblem

$$(4.30) \quad \partial_{\alpha_0}\hat{\Delta}_0 = 0 \quad \bar{b}\hat{\Delta}_0 = 0$$

explicitly. We start listing the contributions to $\hat{\Delta}_0$ ordered by their external field dependence, i.e.

$$(4.31) \quad \hat{\Delta}_0 = f_Y(0) \int Y c^\lambda \varphi + \dots (\text{indep. of } Y),$$

where $f_Y(0)$ is an arbitrary number independent of α_0 . With (4.23) this can be rewritten as

$$(4.32) \quad \hat{\Delta}_0 = f_Y(0)\bar{b}(\int Y\varphi) + \dots (\text{indep. of } Y)$$

or as

$$(4.33) \quad \hat{\Delta}_0 = \bar{b} \int (f_Y(0))Y\varphi + \dots (\text{indep. of } Y)$$

It is to be noted that to the \bar{b} -variation of Y the invariant kinetic term for φ contributes, hence will turn out to be a variation.

The analogous procedure for the L terms leads to

$$(4.34) \quad \hat{\Delta}_0 = -f_L(0)\kappa \int L_\rho c^\lambda \partial_\lambda c^\rho + \dots (\text{indep. of } L),$$

where $f_L(0)$ is an arbitrary number independent of α_0 . With (4.22) this term can be rewritten as

$$(4.35) \quad \hat{\Delta}_0 = f_L(0)\bar{\delta}\left(\int L_\rho c^\rho\right) + \dots (\text{indep. of } L)$$

$$(4.36) \quad \hat{\Delta}_0 = \delta \int (f_L(0)L_\rho c^\rho) + \dots (\text{indep. of } L).$$

We next make explicit the H -dependence

$$(4.37) \quad \hat{\Delta}_0 = \delta \int (f_L(0)L_\rho c^\rho) + \int H_{\mu\nu}F_{(+)}^{\mu\nu}(h, c) + \dots (L, H) - \text{indep.}$$

The postulate (4.30) reads

$$(4.38) \quad 0 = \bar{\delta}\hat{\Delta}_0 = \int \left(\frac{\delta\bar{\Gamma}_{\text{cl}}}{\delta h} F^{(+)} - H\bar{\delta}F^{(+)} \right) + (L, H) - \text{indep.}$$

$$(4.39) \quad =: - \int HCF^{(+)} + (L, H) - \text{indep.}$$

and defines a transformation \mathcal{C} as the coefficient of H in (4.37):

$$(4.40) \quad \mathcal{C}F_{(+)} = \bar{\delta}F^{(+)} + \kappa(\partial_\lambda c^\mu F_{(+)}^{\nu\lambda} + \partial_\lambda c^\nu F_{(+)}^{\mu\lambda} - c^\lambda \partial_\lambda F_{(+)}^{\mu\nu}).$$

This transformation is nilpotent and satisfies, due to (4.38),

$$(4.41) \quad \mathcal{C}F_{(+)} = 0$$

One solution is

$$(4.42) \quad F_{(+)}^{\mu\nu} = \mathcal{C}(f_H(0)h^{\mu\nu}).$$

Since

$$(4.43) \quad \mathcal{C}(h^{\mu\nu}) = \kappa(-\partial^\mu c^\nu - \partial^\nu c^\mu),$$

it fits correctly to the H -dependent part of (4.19) in (4.38). One thus arrives for this solution at

$$(4.44) \quad \bar{\delta} \int f_H(0)H_{\mu\nu}h^{\mu\nu} = \int H_{\mu\nu}\mathcal{C}(f_H(0)h^{\mu\nu}),$$

i.e. the H -dependent part in $\hat{\Delta}_0$ is also a variation. As mentioned above this is not the most general solution, but the outcome is analogous. The details can be found in papI.

The remaining contributions to $\hat{\Delta}_0$ depend only on h and must not depend on α_0 . The only invariants are those terms appearing in $\Gamma_{\text{inv}}^{\text{class}}$ which come with the couplings:

$c_1, c_2, c_3\kappa^{-2}, c_R, \lambda$. They are not variations, but constitute obstruction terms to the \bar{b} -cohomology. Altogether we thus have

$$(4.45) \quad \Delta_0 = \mathfrak{b} \int \left(f_Y(0)Y\varphi + f_L(0)L_\rho c^\rho + f_H(0)H_{\mu\nu}h^{\mu\nu} \right)$$

$$(4.46) \quad + \int \left\{ (\sqrt{-g}(\hat{c}_3\kappa^{-2}R + \hat{c}_1R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + \hat{c}_2R^2)) + (-g)^{1/4}\frac{\hat{c}_R}{2}\varphi^2R - \frac{\lambda}{4!}\varphi^4 \right\}$$

(The factors \hat{c} are independent of α_0 .) In tree approximation we end up with eight invariant insertions of dimension 4 and $\phi\pi$ -charge 0, which are independent of b_ρ and satisfy the ghost equation:

$$(4.47) \quad \Delta'_Y = \mathfrak{b} \left(f_Y(\alpha_0) \int Y\varphi \right)$$

$$(4.48) \quad \Delta'_L = \mathfrak{b} \left(f_L(\alpha_0) \int L_\rho c^\rho \right)$$

$$(4.49) \quad \Delta'_H = \mathfrak{b} \left(f_H(\alpha_0) \int H_{\mu\nu}h^{\mu\nu} \right)$$

$$(4.50) \quad \Delta_{c_3} = c_3\kappa^{-2} \int \sqrt{-g}\kappa^{-2}R \quad \Delta_{c_1} = c_1 \int \sqrt{-g}R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} \quad \Delta_{c_2} = c_2 \int \sqrt{-g}R^2$$

$$(4.51) \quad \Delta_R = \frac{c_R}{2} \int (-g)^{1/4}\varphi^2R \quad \Delta_\varphi = \frac{\lambda}{4!} \int \varphi^4$$

(Here we renamed the couplings of the non-variations.)

In higher orders we may define easily invariant insertions for those which come with the couplings:

$$(4.52) \quad \Delta_{c_i} := c_i \frac{\partial}{\partial c_i} \Gamma \quad (i = 1, 2, 3, R, \lambda \text{ no sum}),$$

however it is clear that the $(s-1)$ -dependent normal products $c_{31}[\kappa^{-1}m \int \sqrt{-g}R]_4^4$ and $c_{32}1/2[m^2 \int \sqrt{-g}R]_4^4$ also belong to the basis in higher orders and make part of Γ_{eff} . Hence we define them also as invariant by the respective derivation with respect to their coupling

$$(4.53) \quad \Delta_{c_{31}} := c_{31} \frac{\partial}{\partial c_{31}} \Gamma \quad \Delta_{c_{32}} := c_{32} \frac{\partial}{\partial c_{32}} \Gamma.$$

Accordingly we change the notation $c_3 \rightarrow c_{30}$. The other terms we also try to represent as symmetric *differential* operators acting on Γ .

We rewrite Δ'_L :

$$(4.54) \quad \Delta'_L = \mathfrak{b} \left(f_L(\alpha_0)(\alpha_0) \int L_\rho c^\rho \right) = \chi f'_L \int Lc + f_L \int \left(\frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}_{\text{cl}}}{\delta c} + L \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}_{\text{cl}}}{\delta L} \right)$$

$$(4.55) \quad = \chi f'_L \int Lc + f_L \int \left(-c \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}_{\text{cl}}}{\delta c} + L \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}_{\text{cl}}}{\delta L} \right)$$

$$(4.56) \quad = -f_L \mathcal{N}_L \Gamma_{\text{cl}} + \chi f'_L \int Lc,$$

where \mathcal{N} denote a leg-counting operator. This suggests defining Δ_L to all orders by

$$(4.57) \quad \Delta_L \cdot \Gamma = f_L(\alpha_0) \mathcal{N}_L \Gamma - \chi_0 f'_L \int Lc,$$

$$(4.58) \quad \mathcal{N}_L \equiv \int \left(c \frac{\delta}{\delta c} - L \frac{\delta}{\delta L} \right) = N_c - N_L.$$

It is to be noted that the χ -dependent term in (4.57) is well defined since L is an external field, hence the expression is linear in the quantized field (c). Δ_L does obviously not depend on b_ρ , it satisfies the ghost equation and it fulfills (4.14), since it can be written as

$$(4.59) \quad \Delta_L \cdot \Gamma = -\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \left(f_L \int Lc \right),$$

and since $\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}$ is nilpotent. Hence it is a BRST-symmetric operator to all orders. Analogously

$$(4.60) \quad \Delta_Y \cdot \Gamma = \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}} \left(f_Y(\alpha_0) \int Y\varphi \right) = f_Y(\alpha_0) \mathcal{N}_Y \Gamma - \chi_0 f'_Y \int Yc$$

$$(4.61) \quad \mathcal{N}_Y \equiv \int \left(\varphi \frac{\delta}{\delta \varphi} - Y \frac{\delta}{\delta Y} \right) = N_\varphi - N_Y$$

Finally we have to extend Δ'_H . We first rewrite it in the form

$$(4.62) \quad \Delta'_H = \mathfrak{b} \left(f_H(\alpha_0) \int H_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu} \right) = f_H N_H \bar{\Gamma}_{\text{cl}} - f_H N_H \Gamma_{\text{cl}} + \chi f'_H \int H_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu}.$$

Next we go over to Γ_{cl} in the variables K and \bar{c} :

$$(4.63) \quad \Delta'_H = f_H(N_h - N_K - N_b - N_{\bar{c}} + 2\alpha_0 \partial_{\alpha_0} + 2\chi \partial_\chi) \Gamma_{\text{cl}}$$

$$(4.64) \quad + \chi f'_H \left(\int \left(Kh - \bar{c} \frac{\delta \Gamma_{\text{cl}}}{\delta b} \right) + 2\alpha_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi} \Gamma_{\text{cl}} \right).$$

This suggests as definition of Δ_H to all orders

$$(4.65) \quad \Delta_H \cdot \Gamma := f_H \mathcal{N}_K \Gamma$$

$$(4.66) \quad + \chi f'_H \left(\int \left(Kh - \bar{c} \frac{\delta \Gamma_{\text{cl}}}{\delta b} \right) + 2\alpha_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi} \Gamma \right),$$

$$(4.67) \quad \mathcal{N}_K \equiv N_h - N_K - N_b - N_{\bar{c}} + 2\alpha_0 \partial_{\alpha_0} + 2\chi \partial_\chi$$

Or else

$$(4.68) \quad \Delta_H \cdot \Gamma := \mathcal{S}_\Gamma \left(f_H(\alpha_0) \left(\int \left(Kh - \bar{c} \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta b} \right) + 2\alpha_0 \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \chi} \right) \right)$$

In view of

$$(4.69) \quad \mathcal{S}_\Gamma \mathcal{S}_\Gamma = 0$$

for all Γ with $\mathcal{S}(\Gamma) = 0$, Δ_H is BRST symmetric once we have verified that it is independent of b_ρ and satisfies the ghost equation.

$$(4.70) \quad \frac{\delta}{\delta b}(\Delta_H \cdot \Gamma) = 0$$

is readily checked in the form (4.65).

$$(4.71) \quad G(\Delta_H \cdot \Gamma) = 0$$

is best checked in the form (4.68) by observing that

$$(4.72) \quad G\left(\int \left(Kh - \bar{c} \frac{\delta \Gamma}{\delta b}\right) + 2\alpha_0 \frac{\partial \Gamma}{\partial \chi}\right) = 0,$$

and

$$(4.73) \quad \{G, \mathcal{S}_\Gamma\} = 0$$

(this latter property being due to $G\Gamma = -1/2\chi b$).

To summarize in compact notation we denote the above symmetric differential operators by

$$(4.74) \quad \nabla_i \in \{c_1 \partial_{c_1}, c_2 \partial_{c_2}, c_{30} \partial_{c_{30}}, c_{31} \partial_{c_{31}}, c_{32} \partial_{c_{32}}, c_R \partial_{c_R}, \lambda \partial_\lambda, \mathcal{N}_H, \mathcal{N}_L, \mathcal{N}_Y\}$$

and have with (4.52), (4.53), (4.57), (4.60) and (4.65) defined a basis of symmetric insertions to all orders by

$$(4.75) \quad \nabla_i \Gamma \doteq \Delta_i \cdot \Gamma.$$

In parentheses we note that the kinetic term of the scalar field φ does not explicitly appear in this basis. It is taken care of via \mathcal{N}_Y and the respective normalization condition for $Y c \varphi$.

The fact that symmetric differential operators and symmetric insertions are in one-to-one correspondence just means that adding symmetric counterterms Δ_i to Γ is renormalizing the corresponding quantity i indicated by ∇_i of the theory. Fixing the arbitrary parameters in the symmetric insertions (4.47) is again performed by satisfying normalization conditions and the present analysis shows that the conditions (3.99) are appropriate. In higher orders the Euclidean point $-\mu^2$ is relevant. Once one has satisfied these normalization conditions the theory is completely fixed. $\alpha_0 = 0$ and $\chi = 0$ will be chosen at the end (Landau gauge).

5. REMOVING AUXILIARY MASS DEPENDENCE VIA ZIMMERMANN IDENTITIES

Above we have introduced amongst the symmetric insertions several which depend on the auxiliary mass. Here we study to which extent they can be effectively removed by using ZI's.

5.1. **Shift.** In (3.16) we replaced $c_3\kappa^{-2}$ within $\gamma_{KL}^{(r)}$, $r = 2, K = L = T$ by $c_3\kappa^{-2} \rightarrow c_{30}\kappa^{-2} + m\kappa^{-1}c_{31} + \frac{1}{2}m^2c_{32}$, where $m \equiv M(s-1)$. On the level of symmetric insertions this replacement corresponds to enlarging the basis of naively BRST-invariant insertions with $\rho = \delta = 4$ by $c_{31}m\kappa^{-1} \int \sqrt{-g}R$ and $c_{32}\frac{1}{2}m^2 \int \sqrt{-g}R$, which are to be taken into account in Γ_{eff} .

Then the question is, whether one can via ZI's eliminate the m -terms and maintain invariance. The sought invariant $[\dots]_4^4$ insertions are defined to all orders as symmetric insertions via the invariant derivatives

$$(5.1) \quad [\kappa^{-2} \int \sqrt{-g}R]_4^4 = \frac{\partial}{\partial c_{30}}\Gamma$$

$$(5.2) \quad [\kappa^{-1} \int \sqrt{-g}mR]_4^4 = \frac{\partial}{\partial c_{31}}\Gamma$$

$$(5.3) \quad [\int \sqrt{-g}\frac{1}{2}m^2R]_4^4 = \frac{\partial}{\partial c_{32}}\Gamma$$

and the symmetric counting operators $\mathcal{N}_{Y,H,L}$. The relevant ZI's have the form

$$(5.4) \quad \int \sqrt{-g}R]_4^4 = [\kappa^{-2} \int \sqrt{-g}R]_3^3 + [\dots]_4^4$$

$$\text{with } [\dots]_4^4 = \left[\int (\sqrt{-g}(\kappa^{-2}u_0R + u_{31}m\kappa^{-1}R + u_{32}\frac{1}{2}m^2R + u_1R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + u_2R^2) \right.$$

$$(5.5) \quad \left. + (-g)^{1/4}u_R\varphi^2R + u_\varphi\varphi^4) \right.$$

$$(5.6) \quad \left. + u_\varphi\mathcal{N}_Y + u_h\mathcal{N}_H + u_c\mathcal{N}_L\right]_4^4$$

$$(5.7) \quad \int \sqrt{-g}mR]_4^4 = m[\kappa^{-1} \int \sqrt{-g}\kappa^{-1}R]_3^3 + [\dots]_4^4$$

$$(5.8) \quad \text{with } [\dots]_4^4 = \left[\int (\sqrt{-g}(\kappa^{-2}v_{30}R + v_{31}m\kappa^{-1}R + v_{32}\frac{1}{2}m^2R + v_1R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + v_2R^2) \right.$$

$$(5.9) \quad \left. + (-g)^{1/4}v_R\varphi^2R + v_\varphi\varphi^4) \right.$$

$$(5.10) \quad \left. + v_\varphi\mathcal{N}_Y + v_h\mathcal{N}_H + v_c\mathcal{N}_L\right]_4^4$$

and

$$(5.11) \quad \int \sqrt{-g}\frac{1}{2}m^2R]_4^4 = m\left[\int \sqrt{-g}\frac{1}{2}mR\right]_3^3 + [\dots]_4^4$$

$$\text{with } [\dots]_4^4 = \left[\int (\sqrt{-g}(\kappa^{-2}w_{30}R + w_{31}m\kappa^{-1}R + w_0\frac{1}{2}m^2R + w_1R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu} + w_2R^2) \right.$$

$$(5.12) \quad \left. + (-g)^{1/4}w_R\varphi^2R + w_\varphi\varphi^4) \right.$$

$$(5.13) \quad \left. + w_\varphi\mathcal{N}_Y + w_h\mathcal{N}_H + w_c\mathcal{N}_L\right]_4^4.$$

All coefficients u, v, w are of order \hbar . The terms multiplied by u_0, v_0, w_0 resp. will be absorbed on the resp. lhs and then the resp. line divided by $1 - u_0, 1 - v_0, 1 - w_0$, such that the normal products on the rhs have the factors $(1 - u_0)^{-1}, (1 - v_0)^{-1}, (1 - w_0)^{-1}$

in the resp. line. From this representation it is then obvious that all $[\dots]_3^3$ insertions on the rhs are symmetric, because all other insertions are symmetric. Since the relevant determinant in this linear system of equations is clearly non-vanishing, one can solve for all hard insertions $[\int \sqrt{-g}R(\kappa^{-2}, m\kappa^{-1}, \frac{1}{2}m^2)]_4^4$ in terms of the soft one's together with $(c_1, c_2, c_R, c_\varphi, \mathcal{N}_{Y,H,L})$ -terms. But those soft insertions which contain the factor m vanish at $s = 1$, hence all hard m -dependent insertions have been eliminated. And the hard insertion $[\kappa^{-2} \int \sqrt{-g}R]_4^4$ has been effectively replaced by its soft counterpart. These considerations are crucial for deriving the parametric differential equations in symmetric form and without dependence from the auxiliary mass M at $s = 1$.

5.2. Push. Next we consider the problem of removing Push by using appropriate ZI's. First we treat the contributions of Push to $\Gamma_{\text{inv}}^{\text{class}}$ (cf. (3.5)). They occur in the second power of h and have the form (see (3.5)),(3.6))

$$(5.14) \quad \Gamma_{(hh)}(m^2) = \int h^{\mu\nu} (m^2 \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + m^2 \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} h^{\rho\sigma}.$$

In higher orders we have just the same terms, but now to be understood as normal products $[\dots]_4^4$ in Γ_{eff} . We use the ZI

$$(5.15) \quad \left[\int h^{\mu\nu} (m^2 \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + m^2 \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} h^{\rho\sigma} \right]_4^4 \cdot \Gamma_{(hh)} \\ = M(s-1) \left[\int h^{\mu\nu} (m \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + m \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} h^{\rho\sigma} \right]_3^3 \cdot \Gamma_{(hh)} + [\text{corr.s}]_4^4 \cdot \Gamma_{(hh)}.$$

Here the $\hat{\gamma}$'s are interpreted as differential operators and $m \equiv M(s-1)$ is to be recalled. The corrections comprise first of all the starting term from the lhs with a coefficient $q = O(\hbar)$. We bring it to the lhs and divide by $1 - q$. This yields

$$(5.16) \quad \left[\int h^{\mu\nu} (m^2 \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + m^2 \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} h^{\rho\sigma} \right]_4^4 \cdot \Gamma_{(hh)} \\ = \frac{M(s-1)}{1-q} \left[\int h^{\mu\nu} (m \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + m \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} h^{\rho\sigma} \right]_3^3 \cdot \Gamma_{(hh)} + \frac{1}{1-q} [\text{corr.s}]_4^4 \cdot \Gamma_{(hh)}.$$

As correction terms appear the hh -vertex functions with all $[\dots]_4^4$ -insertions. We now can demand \mathfrak{s}_0 -invariance because this is a linear transformation. Amongst the $\hat{\gamma}_{\text{K,L}}^{(r)}$ -contributions precisely those with $r = 2, 0; K = L = T$ are \mathfrak{s}_0 -invariant, hence they have been absorbed already. The other contributions go with the symmetric differential operators $\mathcal{N}_{Y,H,L}$. These are however BRST-variations and thus vanish between physical states. Therefore this part of Push does at $s = 1$ not contribute to physical quantities.

The second (and last) appearance of Push is within gauge fixing and $\phi\pi$ -terms.

$$\begin{aligned}
(\Gamma_{\text{gf}} + \Gamma_{\phi\pi})(m^2) &= -\frac{1}{2} \int \left(\frac{1}{\kappa} h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu b_\nu + \partial_\nu b_\mu)(y) \frac{m^2}{(x-y)^2} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + D_\rho^{\mu\nu} c^\rho(x) (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)(y) \frac{m^2}{(x-y)^2} \right) \\
(5.17) \qquad \qquad \qquad &= -\frac{1}{2} \int \delta_\Gamma \left(h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)(y) \frac{m^2}{(x-y)^2} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

The product in the last line is point split in $(x \leftrightarrow y)$. Divergences can be developed at coinciding points in such a way that they can be controlled by a ZI

$$(5.18) \quad [h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)(y) m^2]_4^4 \cdot \Gamma = m [h^{\mu\nu}(x) (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu)(y) m]_3^3 \cdot \Gamma + [\text{corr.s}]_4^4 \cdot \Gamma$$

Amongst the corrections, again, appears the normal product of the lhs, which can be absorbed there, such that on the rhs only all other insertions of dimension 4 and $\phi\pi$ -charge -1 show up. These are $Y\varphi$, $K_{\mu\nu}h^{\mu\nu}$, $L_\rho c^\rho$ which are all naively defined because they are linear in the quantized fields. At $s = 1$ they are the only surviving terms which contribute in (5.17) and then eventually vanish after integration between physical states.

5.3. Auxiliary mass of the scalar field. Since the respective term is not δ invariant, it has to be treated separately. Relevant is the Zimmermann identity

$$(5.19) \quad \left[\int M^2 (s-1)^2 \varphi^2 \right]_4^4 = \frac{M(s-1)}{1+q'} \left[\int M(s-1) \varphi^2 \right]_3^3 + \text{corr.s}$$

Here the correction terms consist of all $[\cdot \cdot \cdot]_4^4$ which form the respective basis. These are first of all the symmetric terms $\int(\sqrt{-g}(R^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}, R^2)$, $\int(-g)^{1/4}\varphi^2 R$, $\int\frac{1}{4!}\varphi^4$ and the differential operators $\mathcal{N}_{H,L,Y}$; however also all non-symmetric counterterms which contribute to Γ_{eff} . They all come with coefficients of order $O(\hbar)$.

6. THE INVARIANT PARAMETRIC DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

6.1. The Lowenstein-Zimmermann equation. Green functions must be independent of the auxiliary mass M at $s = 1$, so one has to know the action of $M\partial_M$ on them. Since the ST-identity does not depend on M , $M\partial_M$ is a BRST-invariant differential operator and can be expanded in the basis provided by (4.74). In fact with the ZI's (5.7) and (5.11) and the discussion there we can consider the basis of symmetric differential operators to be given by $c_{30}\partial_{c_{30}}, c_1\partial_{c_1}, c_2\partial_{c_2}, c_R\partial_{c_R}, \lambda\partial_\lambda$ complemented with the symmetric counting operators $\mathcal{N}_{Y,H,L}$. Furthermore we have shown that the contributions coming from Push (5.16) and the contributions from Shift go at most into the symmetric counting operators. Hence

$$(6.1) \quad M\partial_M\Gamma = (-\beta_{30}^{\text{LZ}} c_{30}\partial_{c_{30}} - \beta_1^{\text{LZ}} c_1\partial_{c_1} - \beta_2^{\text{LZ}} c_2\partial_{c_2} - \beta_{c_R}^{\text{LZ}} c_R\partial_{c_R} - \beta_\lambda^{\text{LZ}} \partial_\lambda + \gamma_Y^{\text{LZ}} \mathcal{N}_Y + \gamma_h^{\text{LZ}} \mathcal{N}_H + \gamma_c^{\text{LZ}} \mathcal{N}_L)\Gamma.$$

The coefficient functions $\beta^{\text{LZ}}, \gamma^{\text{LZ}}$ can be determined by testing on the normalization conditions. The test on (6.1) involving external fields

$$(6.2) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{Yc\rho c\sigma} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} = -i\eta_{\rho\sigma}$$

implies

$$(6.3) \quad M\partial_M \partial_p \Gamma_{Ycc} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} - \gamma_\varphi^{\text{LZ}}(\partial_p \Gamma_{Ycc} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)}) = 0.$$

Since the M -derivative in the first term is not in conflict with going to the argument of Γ , the first term vanishes and hence $\gamma_\varphi^{\text{LZ}} = 0$.

The test on

$$(6.4) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{L\rho c^\sigma c^\tau} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} = -i\kappa(\delta_\sigma^\rho \eta_{\lambda\tau} - \delta_\tau^\rho \eta_{\lambda\sigma})$$

implies

$$(6.5) \quad M\partial_M \partial_p \Gamma_{Lcc} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} - \gamma_c^{\text{LZ}}(\partial_p \Gamma_{Lcc} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)}) = 0.$$

Since the M -derivative in the first term is not in conflict with going to the argument of Γ the first term vanishes and hence $\gamma_c^{\text{LZ}} = 0$. Quite analogously we may proceed for

$$(6.6) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{K^{\mu\nu} c_\rho} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2} = -i\kappa(\eta^{\mu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\nu + \eta^{\nu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\mu - \eta^{\mu\nu} \delta_\rho^\sigma).$$

Here this test on (6.1) yields

$$(6.7) \quad M\partial_M \partial_p \Gamma_{Kc} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2} - \gamma_h^{\text{LZ}}(-\partial_p \Gamma_{Kc} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2}) - \gamma_c^{\text{LZ}}(-\partial_p \Gamma_{Kc} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2}) = 0.$$

With the same argument as before, $\gamma_c^{\text{LZ}} = 0$ and $\gamma_h^{\text{LZ}} = 0$ follows.

The next test reads

$$(6.8) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{Yc\rho\varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} = -i\delta_\rho^\sigma.$$

(6.9)

$$M\partial_M \partial_p \Gamma_{Yc\varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} - \gamma_h^{\text{LZ}}(-\partial_p \Gamma_{Yc\varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)}) - \gamma_c^{\text{LZ}}(-\partial_p \Gamma_{Yc\varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)}) = 0.$$

With the same argument as before, $\gamma_\varphi^{\text{LZ}} = 0$ follows.

For obtaining the β -functions we use the normalization conditions (3.99) for $\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}$ and $\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}$, for β_{c_R} and β_λ (3.105). The test

$$(6.10) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} \Big|_{p^2=0} = c_{30} \kappa^{-2}$$

implies

$$(6.11) \quad M\partial_M \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} \Big|_{p^2=0} + c_{30} \kappa^{-2} \beta_{c_{30}}^{\text{LZ}} = 0.$$

Since the normalization does not involve M , the first term is zero, hence $\beta_{c_{30}}^{\text{LZ}} = 0$.

Tests on the normalization conditions (3.105) which fix c_R, λ

$$(6.12) \quad \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^\rho \partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi h^{\mu\nu}} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} = \frac{c_R}{2} (\delta_\rho^\mu \delta_\sigma^\nu + \delta_\sigma^\mu \delta_\rho^\nu)$$

$$(6.13) \quad \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi\varphi\varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} = -\lambda$$

lead to

$$(6.14) \quad M \partial_M \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^\rho \partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi h^{\mu\nu}} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} + \beta_{c_R}^{\text{LZ}} \frac{c_R}{2} (\delta_\rho^\mu \delta_\sigma^\nu + \delta_\sigma^\mu \delta_\rho^\nu) = 0$$

$$(6.15) \quad M \partial_M \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi\varphi\varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} + \beta_\lambda^{\text{LZ}} \left(-\frac{\lambda}{4!}\right) = 0$$

Since at the test values none of the vertex functions depends on M , all β -functions vanish too.

Hence at $s = 1$ the LZ-equation

$$(6.16) \quad M \partial_M \Gamma \Big|_{s=1} = 0$$

holds and reveals that the vertex functions, hence all other Green's functions too, are independent of M at $s = 1$.

6.2. The renormalization group equation. The RG-equation formulates the response of the system to the variation of the normalization parameter μ , (see (3.99)), where e.g. couplings or field amplitudes are defined. Since the ST-operator does not depend on μ the partial differential operator $\mu \partial_\mu$ is symmetric and can be expanded in the basis (4.74). Quite analogously to the LZ-equation (by removing Push and Shift) we end up with

$$(6.17) \quad \mu \partial_\mu \Gamma \Big|_{s=1} = (-\beta_{c_{30}}^{\text{RG}} c_{30} \partial_{c_{30}} - \beta_{c_1}^{\text{RG}} c_1 \partial_{c_1} - \beta_{c_2}^{\text{RG}} c_2 \partial_{c_2} - \beta_{c_R}^{\text{RG}} c_R \partial_{c_R} - \beta_\lambda^{\text{RG}} \partial_\lambda$$

$$(6.18) \quad + \gamma_\varphi^{\text{RG}} \mathcal{N}_Y + \gamma_h^{\text{RG}} \mathcal{N}_H + \gamma_c^{\text{RG}} \mathcal{N}_L) \Gamma \Big|_{s=1}.$$

We observe that some normalization conditions involve μ , hence performing derivatives wrt μ does not commute with choosing arguments for the relevant vertex functions and we expect non-trivial coefficient functions. Again we start with those tests which involve external fields. The normalization condition

$$(6.19) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{Y c^\rho \varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} = -i \eta_{\rho\lambda}$$

implies

$$(6.20) \quad \mu \partial_\mu \partial_p \Gamma_{Y c^\rho \varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} - \gamma_\varphi^{\text{RG}} (\partial_p \Gamma_{Y c^\rho \varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1}) = 0.$$

Now $\mu \partial_\mu$ does not commute with choosing a μ -dependent argument, hence this determines $\gamma_\varphi^{\text{RG}}$.

$$(6.21) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{L_\rho c^\sigma c^\tau} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} = -i\kappa(\delta_\sigma^\rho \eta_{\lambda\tau} - \delta_\tau^\rho \eta_{\lambda\sigma}).$$

Now $\mu\partial_\mu$ does not commute with choosing a μ -dependent argument, hence

$$(6.22) \quad \mu\partial_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\lambda} \Gamma_{L_\rho c^\sigma c^\tau} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} + i\gamma_c^{\text{RG}} \kappa(\delta_\sigma^\rho \eta_{\lambda\tau} - \delta_\tau^\rho \eta_{\lambda\sigma}) = 0$$

which determines γ_c^{RG} . For the normalization condition

$$(6.23) \quad \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{K^{\mu\nu} c_\rho} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2} \Big|_{s=1} = -i\kappa(\eta^{\mu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\nu + \eta^{\nu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\mu - \eta^{\mu\nu} \delta_\rho^\sigma)$$

the structure is exactly the same as in the preceding example such that the result is

$$(6.24) \quad \mu\partial_\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{K^{\mu\nu} c_\rho} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2} \Big|_{s=1} + (\gamma_c^{\text{RG}} - \gamma_h^{\text{RG}}) i\kappa(\eta^{\mu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\nu + \eta^{\nu\sigma} \delta_\rho^\mu - \eta^{\mu\nu} \delta_\rho^\sigma) = 0.$$

This equation gives γ_h^{RG} . The β -functions will be determined by the normalization conditions for the couplings. The normalization condition

$$(6.25) \quad \partial_{p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} \Big|_{p^2=0} \Big|_{s=1} = c_{30} \kappa^{-2}$$

is independent from μ hence it implies

$$(6.26) \quad \mu\partial_\mu \partial_{p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} \Big|_{p^2=0} \Big|_{s=1} = 0 = -\beta_{30}^{\text{RG}} c_{30} \kappa^{-2} + 2c_{30} \kappa^{-2} \gamma_h^{\text{RG}}.$$

This determines β_{30}^{RG} . The other normalization conditions, however depend on μ and thus result into

$$(6.27) \quad \mu\partial_\mu \partial_{p^2} \partial_{p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2} \Big|_{s=1} = 2c_1 \beta_1^{\text{RG}} - 2c_1 \gamma_h^{\text{RG}}$$

$$(6.28) \quad \mu\partial_\mu \partial_{p^2} \partial_{p^2} \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} \Big|_{p^2=-\mu^2} \Big|_{s=1} = -6c_2 \beta_{c_2}^{\text{RG}} + 2c_1 \beta_1^{\text{RG}} c_1 + 2(3c_2 - c_1) \gamma_h^{\text{RG}}$$

$$(6.29) \quad \mu\partial_\mu \frac{\partial^2}{\partial p^\rho \partial p^\sigma} \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi h^{\mu\nu}} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} = (-\beta_{c_R}^{\text{RG}} + 2\gamma_\varphi + \gamma_h) c_R (\delta_\rho^\mu \delta_\sigma^\nu + \delta_\sigma^\mu \delta_\rho^\nu)$$

$$(6.30) \quad \mu\partial_\mu \Gamma_{\varphi\varphi\varphi\varphi} \Big|_{p=p_{\text{sym}}(-\mu^2)} \Big|_{s=1} = (-\beta_\lambda^{\text{RG}} + 4\gamma_\varphi^{\text{RG}}) \lambda$$

These equations determine $\beta_1^{\text{RG}}, \beta_2^{\text{RG}}, \beta_{c_R}^{\text{RG}}, \beta_\lambda^{\text{RG}}$. They depend on the product $\mu\kappa$. Since we work in Landau gauge, they do not depend on a gauge parameter.

We now anticipate from “finiteness properties” that $\gamma_\varphi^{\text{RG}} = \gamma_h^{\text{RG}} = \gamma_c^{\text{RG}} = 0$ which implies that also $\beta_{30}^{\text{RG}} = 0$. Hence if we would like to solve the RG-equation for specific vertex functions we can start from

$$(6.31) \quad (\mu\partial_\mu + \beta_1^{\text{RG}} c_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_1} + \beta_2^{\text{RG}} c_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_2} + \beta_{c_R}^{\text{RG}} \frac{\partial}{\partial c_R} + \beta_\lambda^{\text{RG}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda}) \gamma_{\text{fields}} = 0$$

The resulting linear partial differential equations are homogeneous and can be solved via characteristics. We define the variables

$$(6.32) \quad t = \ln\left(-\frac{p^2}{\mu^2}\right) \quad u = \frac{c_3\kappa^{-2}}{p^2} \quad \text{i.e.} \quad ue^t = -\frac{c_3\kappa^{-2}}{\mu^2}$$

and the RG-equations become

$$(6.33) \quad \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial t} - \frac{1}{2}\beta_1(ue^t, g_1, g_2, g_R, g_\lambda)g_1\frac{\partial}{\partial g_1} - \frac{1}{2}\beta_2(ue^t, g_1, g_2, g_R, g_\lambda)g_2\frac{\partial}{\partial g_2} - \frac{1}{2}\beta_R(ue^t, g_1, g_2, g_R, g_\lambda)g_R\frac{\partial}{\partial g_R} - \frac{1}{2}\beta_\lambda(ue^t, g_1, g_2, g_R, g_\lambda)g_\lambda\frac{\partial}{\partial g_\lambda}\right)\gamma_{\text{fields}}(e^t, e^tu, g_1, g_2, g_R, g_\lambda) = 0.$$

Here the running couplings $g_i \leftarrow c_i, i = 1, 2, c_R, \lambda$ have to solve

$$(6.34) \quad \frac{dg_i}{dt} = -\frac{g_i}{2}\beta_i^{\text{RG}} \quad i = 1, 2, c_R, \lambda \quad (\text{no sum})$$

(Prefactor and sign originate from using $\mu\partial_\mu$ instead of $\mu^2\partial_{\mu^2}$ and the explicit sign in the definition of t .) Their solutions are given by

$$(6.35) \quad g_i(t) = g_i(0)e^{-\frac{1}{2}\int_0^t d\tau\beta_i(ue^\tau, g_1(\tau), g_2(\tau), g_R(\tau), g_\lambda(\tau))},$$

whereas

$$(6.36) \quad \frac{du}{dt} = 0 \Rightarrow u(t, u_0, g_i(0)) = u_0.$$

The most important examples in the following will be the $r = 2, 0; L = K = T$ components of Γ_{hh} (The solution for other vertex functions runs along similar lines.) According to naive dimensional considerations one first makes explicit factors p^2p^2 , then one separates tree contributions from higher orders. The result is given by

$$(6.37) \quad \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} = p^2p^2\hat{\gamma}^{(2)} = p^2c_3\kappa^{-2} + p^2p^2\hat{\gamma}^{(2)}(e^t, u_0, g_i(t)) \quad \text{all } i$$

$$(6.38) \quad \gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} = p^2p^2\hat{\gamma}^{(0)} = -2p^2c_3\kappa^{-2} + p^2p^2\hat{\gamma}^{(0)}(e^t, u_0, g_i(t)) \quad \text{all } i$$

This separation determines the starting points of $\hat{\gamma}$:

$$(6.39) \quad \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}(t, u_0, g_i)|_{t=0} = -g_1(0) = -c_1$$

$$(6.40) \quad \hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}(t, u_0, g_i)|_{t=0} = 3g_2(0) + g_1(0) = 3c_2 + c_1$$

Obviously the solutions become trivial when putting $c_1 = c_2 = 0$.

A further restriction originates from the scheme, which fixes $\partial_{p^2}\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}$ at $p^2 = 0, s = 1$ and accordingly we are not allowed to admit counterterms which would change this. Hence the dependence of $\hat{\gamma}^{(r)}$ from $u = -c_3\kappa^{-2}/p^2$ is restricted to the value $u_0 = -c_3\kappa^{-2}/\mu^2$. Actually, this is just the content of (6.36). It fits to the fact, that $c_3\kappa^{-2}$ does not run.

The interpretation is as follows: the $c_3\kappa^{-2}$ terms are tree values which are not corrected by higher orders. The $\hat{\gamma}$ terms provide for the value $t = 0$ the tree approximation contributions going with c_1, c_2 . For $t > 0$ they comprise all higher order corrections expressed in terms of the running couplings. One should note that these results hold at $s = 1$, the

physical value.

We underline, by repeating: the separation in tree, resp. higher order contributions in $\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(r)}$, $r = 0, 2$, (6.37), together with the non-renormalization of κ^{-2} and c_3 just means that only the higher derivatives and the scalar interactions are responsible for the running of couplings, i.e. of c_1, c_2, c_R, λ . In this respect the EH part is only a kind of spectator.

It is appropriate at this point to have a look back to [EKKSI, EKKSII]. There it was possible and interesting to reduce the coupling λ to c_R , i.e. to express λ as a function of c_R consistent with renormalization. As a matter of fact this is no longer possible in the wider framework discussed here. The gravity selfinteraction prevents such a dependence.

The common understanding of running couplings and their use in phenomenology (QCD, electroweak standard model) is that inserting them in place of a tree coupling at a given order in perturbation theory “improves” the results of that order, i.e. in some qualitative sense extends those to all orders.

For the model under consideration, in the literature mostly an expansion in terms of κ^2 has been performed. This we do not do because the renormalization of the electroweak standard model teaches us an important lesson. If one wants to ensure there poles for physical particles one has to use on-shell normalization conditions. But then the couplings have to be realized as mass ratios. This in turn implies that even their β^{CS} -functions can no longer be expanded as power series in the couplings, but only in the number of loops [KW99]. (CS- β functions are, as a rule, simpler than those of the RG equation.) The reason for this is the same as here: they are complicated polylogarithmic functions of the couplings. Hence an expansion in terms of κ^2 , here, may very well be misleading. E.g. the pure fact that after using such an expansion the β -functions come out as rational functions in the couplings is suspicious. Relying on this outcome and concluding from there on the asymptotic behaviour seems to be courageous.

7. FINITENESS PROPERTIES

It is well-known [BPS91] that in ordinary pure Yang-Mills theory the anomalous dimension of the vector field vanishes as well as that of the Faddeev-Popov ghost c when working in Landau gauge. In papII we extended this result by showing that the analogue is true for the fields $h^{\mu\nu}, c^\mu$. There it implied that β_3 also vanishes. In the present paper we shall see that correspondingly $\gamma_\varphi = 0$.

Like in papII one starts from the integrated antighost equation of motion

$$(7.1) \quad \int \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta c^\mu} \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta\Gamma_{\phi\pi}}{\delta c^\mu} + \frac{\delta\Gamma_{\text{ext.f.}}}{\delta c^\mu} \right)$$

$$(7.2) \quad = \int \left(-\kappa \left(\frac{1}{2} D^{\mu\nu} (\partial_\mu \bar{c}_\nu + \partial_\nu \bar{c}_\mu) - K_{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho h^{\mu\nu} + L_\lambda \partial_\rho c^\lambda \right) - \frac{3}{4} Y \partial_\mu \varphi + \frac{1}{4} \partial_\mu Y \varphi \right)$$

and combines it with the gauge condition to form

$$(7.3) \quad \bar{\mathcal{G}}\Gamma \equiv \int \left(\frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta c^\rho} + \kappa \partial_\rho \bar{c}_\lambda \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta b_\lambda} \right) = \int \left(\kappa (K_{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho h^{\mu\nu} - L_\lambda \partial_\rho c^\lambda) - \frac{3}{4} Y \partial_\rho \varphi + \frac{1}{4} \partial_\rho Y \varphi \right).$$

Since this expression is linear in the quantized fields it can be naively extended to all orders in the form as it arises in tree approximation (s. papII Appendix, A₁) for more details).

Potential counterterms, one could have been obliged to add, must be independent of b_μ , could depend on \bar{c} only via $H_{\mu\nu}$ and must satisfy the ghost equation

$$(7.4) \quad \kappa \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta \bar{c}_\mu} + \partial_\lambda \frac{\delta \bar{\Gamma}}{\delta K_{\mu\lambda}} = 0.$$

The candidates for this are given by

$$(7.5) \quad \Delta_L \cdot \Gamma = f_L(\alpha_0) \mathcal{N}_L \Gamma - \chi f_L \int Lc = -\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}(f_L \int Lc) \quad \mathcal{N}_L \equiv \int c \frac{\delta}{\delta c} - \int L \frac{\delta}{\delta L}$$

In Landau gauge $\alpha_0 = 0, \chi = 0$, hence f_L is a number. To be satisfied is (7.3), but

$$(7.6) \quad \Delta_L \cdot \Gamma = -\mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}\left(\int Lc\right) = \kappa \int L_\rho c^\lambda \partial_\lambda c^\rho + L - \text{independent},$$

would contribute to the rhs of (7.3) a term $\int L_\lambda \partial_\rho c^\lambda$, which would, however, change the coefficient of the term already present. This is forbidden, hence this term is excluded as a counterterm, the field c is not renormalized: $\gamma_c^{\text{RG}} = 0$. The next candidate is Δ_H .

$$(7.7) \quad \Delta_H \cdot \Gamma = f_H \mathcal{N}_K \Gamma + \chi f'_H(\alpha_0) \left(\int (Kh - \bar{c} \frac{\delta \Gamma_{\text{class}}}{\delta b}) + 2\alpha_0 \frac{\partial}{\partial \chi} \Gamma_{\text{class}} \right) \quad \mathcal{N}_K \equiv N_h - N_K - N_b$$

Again, in Landau gauge $\alpha_0 = 0, \chi = 0$, f_H is a number.

$$(7.8) \quad \Delta_H = f_H \int (-\kappa K_{\mu\nu} D_\rho^{\mu\nu} c^\rho)$$

This would contribute to the rhs of (7.3) a term $\int \kappa K_{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho h^{\mu\nu}$, again a term which is already present and whose coefficient must not be changed. So, this counterterm, too, is forbidden. The field $h^{\mu\nu}$ is not renormalized: $\gamma_h^{\text{RG}} = 0$, hence, in view of the normalization conditions, $\beta_3^{\text{RG}} = 0$.

As further, matter dependent contribution, we have identified

$$(7.9) \quad \Delta_Y \cdot \Gamma = \mathcal{B}_{\bar{\Gamma}}(f_Y \int Y\varphi) = f_Y \mathcal{N}_Y \Gamma + \chi f'_Y(\alpha_0) \left(\int Y\varphi \right) \quad \mathcal{N}_Y \equiv N_\varphi - N_Y$$

In Landau gauge f_Y is a number.

$$(7.10) \quad \Delta_Y \cdot \Gamma = f_Y \int Y \left(c^\lambda \partial_\lambda \varphi + \frac{1}{4} \partial_\lambda c^\lambda \varphi \right)$$

As a counterterm this would add to (7.3) a term $-\frac{3}{4} Y \partial_\mu + \frac{1}{4} \partial_\mu Y \varphi$ which also is already present, hence forbidden.

This implies $\gamma_\varphi^{\text{RG}} = 0$, the field amplitude of φ is not renormalized in Landau gauge.

8. RIGID WEYL INVARIANCE

From [PS23] we know that a proper substitute of scaling in flat spacetime, described there by the Callan-Symanzik equation, is rigid Weyl invariance in curved spacetime. Its ST-symmetric functional differential operator on Γ reads

$$(8.1) \quad \frac{1}{2\sigma} W_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}} \equiv \int (g^{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}} - K_{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta}{\delta K_{\mu\nu}} - \bar{c}_\mu \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{c}_\mu} - b_\mu \frac{\delta}{\delta b_\mu}),$$

because the field φ and hence also its counting operator \mathcal{N}_Y are invariant under rigid Weyl transformations, hence do not show up here.

It leads to

$$(8.2) \quad W_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}} \Gamma|_{s=1} = -2\sigma \hat{\alpha} c_3 \kappa^{-2} \left[\int \sqrt{-g} R \right]_4^4 \cdot \Gamma|_{s=1}$$

$$(8.3) \quad = -2\sigma \{ \hat{\alpha} c_3 \kappa^{-2} \left[\int \sqrt{-g} R \right]_3^3 \cdot \Gamma|_{s=1}$$

$$(8.4) \quad + \left[\int (\sqrt{-g} (u_1 R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu} + u_2 R^2) + u_R (-g)^{1/4} \varphi^2 R + u_\lambda \varphi^4) \right]_4^4$$

$$(8.5) \quad + u_h \mathcal{N}_H + u_c \mathcal{N}_L + u_\varphi \mathcal{N}_Y \} \cdot \Gamma|_{s=1}$$

Here we have used appropriate Zimmermann identities in order to replace the hard EH-insertion by its soft partner and the respective symmetric hard corrections.

The $[\cdot \cdot \cdot]_4^4$ insertions can be replaced by the symmetric derivatives with respect to their couplings

$$(8.6) \quad \frac{1}{-2\sigma} W_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}} \Gamma|_{s=1} = \hat{\alpha} c_3 \kappa^{-2} \left[\int \sqrt{-g} R \right]_3^3 \cdot \Gamma|_{s=1}$$

$$(8.7) \quad + \left\{ u_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_1} + u_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_2} + u_R \frac{\partial}{\partial c_R} + u_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \right.$$

$$(8.8) \quad \left. + u_h \mathcal{N}_H + u_c \mathcal{N}_L + u_\varphi \mathcal{N}_Y \right\} \Gamma|_{s=1}$$

This form clearly shows that the rigid Weyl identity plays the role of a Callan-Symanzik equation: the soft $[\dots]_3^3 \cdot \Gamma$ vanishes in the deep Euclidian region, the $u\partial$ terms correspond to $\beta\partial$ and the leg counting operators \mathcal{N} appear with the anomalous dimensions u as factors. In the present context u_h, u_c, u_φ correspond to anomalous Weyl weights of the fields h, c, φ .

It is also interesting to explore what this equation implies on-shell, i.e. after projection to Fock space. One first goes over via Legendre transformation to connected Green's

functions $Z_c(\underline{\mathbf{J}})$, then by exponentiation to general Green's functions $Z = \exp(iZ_c)$.

(8.9)

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{-2\sigma} W_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}}(\underline{\mathbf{J}}) Z_{|s=1} &= \hat{\alpha} c_3 \kappa^{-2} \left[\int \sqrt{-g} R]_3^3 \cdot Z_{|s=1} \right. \\ &\left. + \left\{ u_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_1} + u_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_2} + u_R \frac{\partial}{\partial c_R} + u_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} + u_h \mathcal{N}_H + u_c \mathcal{N}_L + u_\varphi \mathcal{N}_Y \right\} Z_{|s=1} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (8.10)$$

The application of the projector $:\Sigma:$ from (10.30) changes the lhs into rigid Weyl transformations of the quantum in-fields applied to the S -operator, whereas the soft term on the rhs becomes its operator equivalent, the derivatives wrt the couplings act on the S -operator and the number operators \mathcal{N} are projected to zero.

$$(8.11) \quad \frac{1}{-2\sigma} W_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}} \equiv \int \left\{ z_\phi^{-1} \phi^{\mu\nu} \frac{\delta}{\delta \phi^{\mu\nu}} + z_{\bar{c}}^{-1} \bar{c} \frac{\delta}{\delta \bar{c}} - z_b^{-1} b \frac{\delta}{\delta b} \right\}$$

$$(8.12) \quad \frac{1}{-2\sigma} W_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}} S^{\text{op}} = \hat{\alpha} c_3 \kappa^{-2} \left(\int \sqrt{-g} R]_3^3 \right)^{\text{op}}$$

$$(8.13) \quad + \left(u_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_1} + u_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial c_2} + u_R \frac{\partial}{\partial c_R} + u_\lambda \frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \right) S^{\text{op}}$$

Several comments are in order. As compared with (8.1) we went over from $g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} + h^{\mu\nu}$ to $h^{\mu\nu}$. Then, recalling that in the two-field-approximation of $h^{\mu\nu}$ those are to be described by the fields $\phi^{\mu\nu}, \Sigma^{\mu\nu}$, we used that $\delta_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}} \phi = 2\sigma \phi^{\mu\nu}$, however $\delta_{\text{rig}}^{\text{W}} \Sigma^{\mu\nu} = 0$. Here all fields are free quantum “in” fields as they show up in the projector $:\Sigma:$. The factors z^{-1} are the residues of the respective propagators.

There is no explicit appearance of the matter field φ because it is invariant under rigid Weyl.

9. NO MASSIVE HIGHER ORDER ZERO'S

Most important for the physical interpretation of the model is the understanding of the zero's of $\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(r)}$. The one's at $p^2 = 0$ are fixed, guaranteed by the scheme and RG invariant: they are physical. But the second zero's can not be continued to higher orders as we shall show now.

We consider the case $r = 2$ up to and including one-loop.

$$(9.1) \quad (\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})_{|s=1}^{(\leq 1)} = p^2 c_3 \kappa^{-2} - c_1 p^2 p^2 - c_1^{(1)} p^2 p^2 + p^2 p^2 (\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})_{|\text{nt}}$$

Here $c_1^{(1)}$ is the coefficient of the one-loop counterterm to the invariant $\int \sqrt{-g} R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu}$; nt means “non-trivial” i.e. these are the contributions of the non-trivial diagrams in one-loop order (the counterterm is pointlike, hence a trivial diagram). The first zero at $p^2 = 0$ is obvious. We claim that

$$(9.2) \quad 0 = c_3 \kappa^{-2} - c_1 p^2 - c_1^{(1)} p^2 + p^2 (\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})_{|\text{nt}}$$

has no solution for $p^2 = c_3\kappa^{-2}/c_1$ and the counterterm coefficient with its value as given by the normalization condition for c_1

$$(9.3) \quad c_1^{(1)} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} (\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})^{(1)}|_{p^2=-\mu^2, s=1}$$

$$(9.4) \quad = (\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})^{(1)}|_{p^2=-\mu^2, s=1} + [(2p^2\partial_{p^2} + \frac{1}{2}p^2\partial_{p^2}\partial_p^2)(\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})^{(1)}]|_{p^2=-\mu^2, s=1}.$$

Hence (9.2) boils down to

$$(9.5) \quad \frac{c_3\kappa^{-2}}{c_1}(-c_1^{(1)} + (\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})_{\text{nt}}) = 0,$$

with the arguments of γ being $(-p^2/\mu^2, c_3\kappa^{-2}/p^2, c_1, c_2, c_R, \lambda) \rightarrow (-c_3\kappa^{-2}/(c_1\mu^2), c_1, c_1, c_2, c_R, \lambda)$. More explicitly

$$(9.6)$$

$$- \left((\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})^{(1)}(1, -\frac{c_3\kappa^{-2}}{c_1\mu^2}, c_1, c_2, c_R, \lambda) + [(-2\mu^2\partial_{p^2} + \frac{1}{2}\mu^2\partial_{p^2}\partial_p^2)(\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)})^{(1)}]|_{p^2=-\mu^2, s=1} \right)_{\text{nt}}$$

$$(9.7) \quad + \left((\hat{\gamma}_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}(-\frac{c_3\kappa^{-2}}{c_1\mu^2}, c_1, c_1, c_2, c_R, \lambda) \right)_{\text{nt}} = 0,$$

all taken at $s = 1$. (In this explicit form also the first bracket refers to the non-trivial diagrams.) It is to be noted that for the γ in the first line the p^2 -argument is at an unphysical value, whereas for the γ in the second line it is at a physical point. Therefor this equation can not be satisfied. Hence beginning with one loop the respective propagator, $\langle hh \rangle_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}$, has no second pole. Obviously this is also true for the case $r = 0$.

Hence, this argument from papII holds completely unchanged also in the present case, where in addition to all other fields of EH + hds we have an interacting matter field: the γ 's in question just depend also on the couplings c_R and λ , but this dependence does not change the outcome.

10. PROJECTION TO PHYSICAL STATE SPACE

10.1. The single pole fields. The field $h^{\mu\nu}$ which we used up to now has double poles, hence is not suited for the construction of a conventional Fock space. The idea, due to Stelle, is to decompose its bilinear contributions in field space into those of single pole fields, $\phi^{\mu\nu}, \Sigma^{\mu\nu}$, for which ordinary Fock spaces can be constructed and to describe eventually scattering etc in the tensor product of these two spaces. Interaction should still be described in terms of the double pole field h , such that all results obtained up to now can be taken over, however truly physical, on-shell quantities always require additional treatment.

Starting point is the decomposition of the $h^{\mu\nu}$ propagators into partial fractions which

have only simple poles, as presented in [PS21, eqs. C_1, C_2].

$$(10.1) \quad \langle hh \rangle_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} = \frac{-i}{p^2 - m^2} \cdot \frac{1}{c_1 p^2 - c_3 \kappa^{-2}} = \frac{1}{c_3 \kappa^{-2} - c_1 m^2} \cdot \frac{i}{p^2 - m^2} + \frac{-i}{c_3 \kappa^{-2} (p^2 - \frac{c_3 \kappa^{-2}}{c_1})}$$

$$(10.2) \quad \langle hh \rangle_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} = \frac{i}{p^2 - m^2} \cdot \frac{1}{(3c_2 + c_1)p^2 - 2c_3 \kappa^{-2}} = \frac{1}{2c_3 \kappa^2 + 2(3c_2 + c_1)m^2} \cdot \frac{i}{p^2 - m^2} \\ - \frac{1}{2c_3 \kappa^{-2}} \cdot \frac{i}{p^2 + \frac{c_3 \kappa^{-2}}{2(3c_2 + c_1)}}$$

We are looking for fields $\phi^{\mu\nu}, \Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ whose bilinear terms in the action just yield these simple pole propagators: ϕ the massless, Σ the massive ones. With this aim in mind one decomposes the field-bilinear part of the classical invariants of EH + hds with the help of a Lagrange multiplier $Z^{\mu\nu}$ such that only second derivatives of $h^{\mu\nu}$ and $Z^{\mu\nu}, \Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ respectively show up. Since in [Ste78] in an analogous context this problem has been solved we can proceed the other way round: we start from

$$(10.3) \quad h^{\mu\nu} = \phi^{\mu\nu} + \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \quad Z^{\mu\nu} = \phi^{\mu\nu} - \Sigma^{\mu\nu}$$

as desired field decomposition and from

$$(10.4) \quad \Gamma(\phi) = \Gamma_{\text{EH}}(\phi)$$

$$(10.5) \quad \Gamma(\Sigma) = -\Gamma_{\text{EH}}(\Sigma) + \Gamma_{\text{mass}}(\Sigma)$$

$$(10.6) \quad \Gamma_{\text{EH}}(\phi) = \frac{\tilde{c}_3 \kappa^{-2}}{4} \int (-\phi^{\mu\nu} \square \phi_{\mu\nu} + \phi_\rho^\rho \square \phi_\sigma^\sigma - 2\phi^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \phi^\lambda_\lambda + 2\phi^{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \partial_\nu \phi_\mu^\rho)$$

$$(10.7) \quad -\Gamma_{\text{EH}}(\Sigma) + \Gamma_{\text{mass}} = \frac{\tilde{c}_3 \kappa^{-2}}{4} \int (\Sigma^{\mu\nu} \square \Sigma_{\mu\nu} - \Sigma_\rho^\rho \square \Sigma_\sigma^\sigma + 2\Sigma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\mu \partial_\nu \Sigma^\lambda_\lambda - 2\Sigma^{\mu\nu} \partial_\rho \partial_\nu \Sigma_\mu^\rho \\ + a_2 \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \Sigma_{\mu\nu} + a_0 (\Sigma^\lambda_\lambda)^2)$$

as desired bilinear action in order to identify at a convenient stage in our conventions the mass a_2, a_0 and coupling $\tilde{c}_3 \kappa^{-2}$ parameters. The relative minus sign of the two actions just represents the negative residue sign of massive propagators in [PS21, eqs. C_1, C_2]. As an aside we note that the mass term is not of Fierz-Pauli type, since it will turn out that $a_2 + a_0 \neq 0$. Hence it contains some spin 0 component. (The Fierz-Pauli condition $a_2 + a_0 = 0$ would remove within $\gamma_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}$ the second zero, hence ruin UV convergence.)

For the subsequent treatment we give here the actions in projector form (s. Appendix).

$$(10.8) \quad \Gamma_{\text{EH}}(\phi) = \frac{\tilde{c}_3 \kappa^{-2}}{4} \int (-\phi^{\mu\nu} \square (P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)} + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \phi^{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(10.9) \quad + \phi^{\mu\nu} \square (3P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} + \sqrt{3}(P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)}) + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \phi^{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(10.10) \quad - \phi^{\mu\nu} \square (\sqrt{3}(P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)}) + 2P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \phi^{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(10.11) \quad + \phi^{\mu\nu} \square (P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)} + 2P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \phi^{\rho\sigma})$$

$$(10.12) \quad \Gamma(\Sigma) = -\Gamma_{\text{EH}}(\Sigma) + \Gamma_{\text{mass}}(\Sigma)$$

$$(10.13) \quad = \frac{\tilde{c}_3 \kappa^{-2}}{4} \int (\Sigma^{\mu\nu} (\square + a_2) (P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)} + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \Sigma^{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(10.14) \quad - \Sigma^{\mu\nu} (-\square + a_0) (3P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} + \sqrt{3}(P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)}) + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \Sigma^{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(10.15) \quad + \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \square (\sqrt{3}(P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)}) + 2P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \Sigma^{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(10.16) \quad - \Sigma^{\mu\nu} \square (P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)} + 2P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}) \Sigma^{\rho\sigma}$$

In the next step we replace the fields: $\phi = h + Z$, $\Sigma = h - Z$ and go over to a total action

$$(10.17) \quad \Gamma(\phi) + \Gamma(\Sigma) = \Gamma_{\text{total}} \rightarrow \Gamma(h, Z)$$

We find

$$(10.18) \quad \Gamma_{\text{total}}(h, Z) = \frac{\tilde{c}_3 \kappa^{-2}}{4} \int (-2h(P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}(2\square + a_2) + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)}a_2 + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}(-4\square + a_2 + 3a_0))$$

$$(10.19) \quad + \sqrt{3}(P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)})a_0 + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}(a_2 + a_0))Z$$

$$(10.20) \quad + h(P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}a_2 + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)}a_2 + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}(a_2 + 3a_0))$$

$$(10.21) \quad + (\sqrt{3}P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)})a_0 + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}(a_2 + a_0))h$$

$$(10.22) \quad + Z(P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}a_2 + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)}a_2 + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}(a_2 + 3a_0))$$

$$(10.23) \quad + (\sqrt{3}P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)})a_0 + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}(a_2 + a_0))Z$$

This action has the desired structure $\int (h\mathcal{D}_{hZ}Z + hM_{\text{hh}}h + ZM_{ZZ}Z)$ with Z representing the Lagrange multiplier field. This explicit form has not been presented in [Ste78].

The final form $\Gamma(h)$, which can be compared with EH+hds, is now obtained by eliminating Z via its equation of motion

$$(10.24) \quad \frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta Z}(h, Z) = 0.$$

One obtains

$$(10.25) \quad (P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}a_2 + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)}a_2 + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}(a_2 + 3a_0) + \sqrt{3}(P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)})a_0 + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}(a_2 + a_0))Z$$

$$(10.26) \quad = (P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}(2\square + a_2) + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)}a_2 + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}(-4\square + a_2 + 3a_0))$$

$$(10.27) \quad + \sqrt{3}(P_{\text{TW}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WT}}^{(0)})a_0 + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)}(a_2 + a_0))h$$

Suitably projecting and equating coefficients one can solve for Z in terms of h . Inserting into (10.18) one arrives finally at

$$(10.28) \quad \Gamma_{\text{total}}(h) = \frac{\tilde{c}_3 \kappa^{-2}}{4} \int h(P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)}(-\frac{4}{a_2}\square(\square + a_2)) + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)}(-\frac{8}{a_2 + 3a_0}\square(\square + (a_2 + 3a_0))))h$$

This result permits identification of the parameters:

$$(10.29) \quad \frac{1}{4}\tilde{c}_3\kappa^{-2} = c_3\kappa^{-2} \quad a_2 = \frac{4c_3\kappa^{-2}}{c_1} \quad a_0 = -\frac{3c_2 + 2c_1}{3c_1(3c_2 + c_1)}c_3\kappa^{-2}$$

10.2. Projection to Einstein-Hilbert. We start from the model constructed to all orders in [PS21] in terms of the double pole field $h^{\mu\nu}$ and indicate now, how to identify the fields $\phi^{\mu\nu}$, $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ and their use within that given model.

The massive field $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ will beginning with one loop no longer refer to the propagation of a particle: its propagator could have at the very best a complex pole. (Due to the properties of the polylogs it could also have another singular character.) However as we have seen above this would-be pole can not be reached – beginning with one-loop. There are no parameters available which could in accord with the s -symmetry protect the real part of the possible singularity from being shifted in higher orders. This is the meaning of the non-invariance under RG in accordance with (9.2). This is a clear hint that it is unphysical, apart from its negative norm properties in the tree approximation. We continue this discussion after having described the projection procedure to the physical Hilbert space.

We identify the massless spin two field $\phi^{\mu\nu}$ with the massless spin two graviton field, together with the fields c, \bar{c}, b as companions for building up the Kugo-Ojima [KO78] doublets. We can proceed for ϕ this way because it satisfies all requirements which one expects for such a field. It has the correct covariance under s and can in all respects be derived from [PS21]: one replaces there $h^{\mu\nu}$ within $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = \Gamma^{\text{class}} + \Gamma^{\text{countert}}$ by $h^{\mu\nu} = \phi^{\mu\nu} + \Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ in the field expansion with number of fields n greater or equal to three. (In particular for the counterterms too $h = \phi + \Sigma$.) In tree approximation bilinear terms and in gauge fixing, Faddeev-Popov and external field terms, $h^{\mu\nu}$ is simply replaced by $\phi^{\mu\nu}$, whereas the field $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ comes along with the terms given in (10.4) (upon replacing the mass parameters a_2, a_0 with their values given in (10.29)).

The general Green's functions in terms of h give rise to those of $\phi^{\mu\nu}, \Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ for number of fields n greater or equal to three by introducing respective sources j_ϕ, j_Σ , fitting to $h = \phi + \Sigma$. We now go over to the S -operator by projecting general Green's functions $Z(\underline{\mathbf{J}})$ down to Fock space. The fields appearing in the projector are free in-fields and related to their corresponding wave function operators K

$$(10.30) \quad S^{\text{op}} =: \Sigma : Z(\underline{\mathbf{J}})|_{\underline{\mathbf{J}}=0} \quad : \Sigma :=: \exp(X) :$$

$$(10.31) \quad X \equiv \int dx dy (\phi^{\mu\nu}(x) K_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{\phi\phi}(x-y) z^{-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\rho\sigma}^{\phi}}(y) + \phi^{\mu\nu}(x) K_{\mu\nu\rho}^{\phi b}(x-y) z^{-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\rho}^b}(y))$$

$$(10.32) \quad + b^{\rho}(x) K_{\rho\alpha\beta}^{b\phi}(x-y) z^{-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\alpha\beta}^{\phi}}(y) + \Sigma^{\mu\nu}(x) K_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{\Sigma\Sigma}(x-y) z^{-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\rho\sigma}^{\Sigma}}(y)$$

$$(10.33) \quad + c^{\rho}(x) K_{\rho\sigma}^{c\bar{c}}(x-y) z^{-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\sigma}^{\bar{c}}}(y) + \bar{c}^{\rho}(x) K_{\rho\sigma}^{\bar{c}c}(x-y) z^{-1} \frac{\delta}{\delta j_{\sigma}^c}(y))$$

The factors z^{-1} stand for the inverse residues of the respective propagators. The reference to which one, we have suppressed for notational convenience.

A rather explicit construction of the Fock space for the spin two fields can be found in [AII23].

The Hilbert space for the $\phi^{\mu\nu}$ quartets is defined following [KO78]. Amongst the states $|\phi, c, \bar{c}, b\rangle$, made up by the fields indicated, one selects those which are annihilated by the BRST-charge Q : $Q|\text{phys}\rangle = 0$. Since $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ is s -invariant its Fock space which contains negative norm states is still part of it. All of them build up the state $\mathcal{V}_{\text{phys}}$. The norms of all states not containing $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$'s is known to be non-negative.

We now recall that the $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ fields are projected to zero in higher orders. This is due to the fact that their original real poles in the tree approximation have been shifted on the real axis and into the complex p^2 plane and changed their singularity character. This change we could not prohibit via (symmetric) counter terms, because those are not available. They have been used for fixing the symmetric invariants $\int \sqrt{-g}(c_1 R^{\mu\nu} R_{\mu\nu} + c_2 R^2)$. In tree approximation there are, however, still nonvanishing contributions. One might be tempted to put there “by hand” $c_1 = c_2 = 0$, with the argument that in tree approximation no higher derivatives are required. But this is in conflict with the solutions $g_i(t)$ of the RG-equation (6.34) which then vanish.

Hence one has to live with some loss of probability in tree approximation: All initial states made up from $\phi^{\mu\nu}$'s which go into final states made up from $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$'s prohibit that positivity is realized. One can consult in this context the paper [AII23], where (although with another aim in mind) explicitly such processes have been studied and one can see that the higher derivatives play already in tree approximation the important role of damping amplitudes. E.g. pure EH + scalar leads to scattering amplitudes which grow too fast for large momenta.

Beginning with one-loop the Σ -states can no longer be excited as outgoing states, hence there one has as final states the above described quartet states.

It is to be noted, that in internal lines of diagrams the field Σ is present and plays its growth limiting role, since there $h = \phi + \Sigma$ and the propagators still have their UV-fall-off with $(p^2)^{-2}$.

The internal lines consist of $\langle \phi\phi \rangle + \langle \Sigma\Sigma \rangle$ (+ other members of the quartet). In the appendix of pap II we discussed how the optical theorem can be realized.

Hence the $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ fields and their interactions are not irrelevant as far as physics is concerned. The transition amplitudes of the $\phi^{\mu\nu}$ fields amongst their quartet states will in

general depend on the couplings c_1, c_2 and thereby exhibit the influence of the “shadow world” spanned by $\Sigma^{\mu\nu}$ ’s.

11. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

The present paper extends two previous one’s by including a massless scalar field as representative of matter. This is important because gravity lives, of course, essentially with and from matter and conversely. In particular the inclusion of higher derivative terms on the side of gravity gains full credit from considering the interplay with matter. Power counting renormalizability is valid from the outset, but nevertheless convergence has to be and has been shown, because this is the backbone of the BPHZL subtraction scheme which we employ. The proof shows that it can be easily extended to cover also the presence of spin one and spin one half fields as long as respective gauge invariance is not spontaneously broken. The broken symmetry case requires dedicated, model dependent considerations as presented, e.g. in [EK98] for the electroweak standard model.

For the case at hand we discuss the standard machinery: invariant partial differential equations. First the Lowenstein-Zimmermann equation which shows that at the value $s = 1$ all dependence from M , the auxiliary mass, vanishes for Green’s functions. (s is an auxiliary subtraction variable in the scheme which is needed to avoid off-shell infrared divergences which otherwise would be introduced by Taylor subtractions with respect to momenta.). Second, the renormalization group equation is established and solved. The solution is easy in Landau gauge because there finiteness properties hold. As further result we derive rigid Weyl invariance which replaces in the presence of gravity dilatations, respectively the Callan-Symanzik equation of ordinary flat spacetime.

The main problem of this model is the (necessary) presence of higher derivatives. We show that also in the presence of matter, beginning with one loop the massive poles in the propagator of the gravitational field $h^{\mu\nu}$ can not be reached, hence are projected away when going on the mass shell. In tree approximation they contribute however and cause loss of probability. This rather counterintuitive result (one would expect troubles rather in higher orders) leads us to the speculation that already at the classical level some physical effect should be at work and cure this defect. For instance, in presence of Kerr black holes with their very peculiar ergosphere this problem might be solved: the positive energy field associated with massless poles would be swallowed by the black hole, the negative energy field associated with the massive poles would be converted to positive energy and scattered to spatial infinity. Of course, such a bold speculation would require a detailed study.

APPENDIX A. APPENDIX

A.1. **Notations and conventions.** In this work, we are employing the conventions below, which are the “timelike conventions” of Landau-Lifschitz.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \text{flat metric} \quad \eta^{\mu\nu} &= \text{diag} (+1, -1, -1, -1) \\
 \text{Christoffel} \quad \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma} &= \frac{1}{2}g^{\sigma\rho}(\partial_{\nu}g_{\rho\mu} + \partial_{\mu}g_{\rho\nu} - \partial_{\rho}g_{\mu\nu}) \\
 \text{Riemann} \quad \otimes R_{\nu\rho\sigma}^{\lambda} &= \partial_{\rho}\Gamma_{\nu\sigma}^{\lambda} - \partial_{\sigma}\Gamma_{\nu\rho}^{\lambda} + \Gamma_{\tau\rho}^{\lambda}\Gamma_{\nu\sigma}^{\tau} - \Gamma_{\tau\sigma}^{\lambda}\Gamma_{\nu\rho}^{\tau} \\
 \text{Ricci} \quad R_{\mu\nu} &= \partial_{\sigma}\Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma} - \partial_{\nu}\Gamma_{\mu\sigma}^{\sigma} + \Gamma_{\mu\nu}^{\sigma}\Gamma_{\sigma\rho}^{\rho} - \Gamma_{\mu\sigma}^{\rho}\Gamma_{\nu\rho}^{\sigma} \\
 \text{curvature scalar} \quad R &= g^{\mu\nu}R_{\mu\nu}
 \end{aligned}$$

A.1.1. *Projection operators.* In order to cope with the spin properties of the field $h^{\mu\nu}$ it is useful to introduce projection operators. They are based on the transverse and longitudinal projectors for vectors

$$(A.1) \quad \theta_{\mu\nu} \equiv \eta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{p_{\mu}p_{\nu}}{p^2} \quad \omega_{\mu\nu} \equiv \frac{p_{\mu}p_{\nu}}{p^2}$$

the projectors are defined as

$$(A.2) \quad P_{\text{TT}\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(2)} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\theta_{\mu\rho}\theta_{\nu\sigma} + \theta_{\mu\sigma}\theta_{\nu\rho}) - \frac{1}{3}\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(A.3) \quad P_{\text{SS}\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(1)} \equiv \frac{1}{2}(\theta_{\mu\rho}\omega_{\nu\sigma} + \theta_{\mu\sigma}\omega_{\nu\rho} + \theta_{\nu\rho}\omega_{\mu\sigma} + \theta_{\nu\sigma}\omega_{\mu\rho})$$

$$(A.4) \quad P_{\text{TT}\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0)} \equiv \frac{1}{3}(\theta_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\rho\sigma})$$

$$(A.5) \quad P_{\text{WW}\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0)} \equiv \omega_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(A.6) \quad P_{\text{TW}\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0)} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\theta_{\mu\nu}\omega_{\rho\sigma}$$

$$(A.7) \quad P_{\text{WT}\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(0)} \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}\omega_{\mu\nu}\theta_{\rho\sigma}.$$

They satisfy the closure relation

$$(A.8) \quad (P_{\text{TT}}^{(2)} + P_{\text{SS}}^{(1)} + P_{\text{TT}}^{(0)} + P_{\text{WW}}^{(0)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{1}{2}(\eta_{\mu\rho}\eta_{\nu\sigma} + \eta_{\mu\sigma}\eta_{\nu\rho}).$$

Acknowledgement. The author is grateful to Steffen Pottel for helpful discussions in the course of writing this paper.

REFERENCES

- [AB85] I.G. Avramidy and A.O. Barvinsky. Asymptotic freedom in higher-derivative quantum gravity. *Physics Letters B*, 159(4-6):269–274, 1985.
- [AII23] Y. Abe, T. Inami, and K. Izumi. High-energy properties of the graviton scattering in quadratic gravity. *Journal of High Energy Physics*, 2023(3):1–61, 2023.

- [BBHa] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux. General solution of the Wess-Zumino consistency condition for Einstein gravity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 51:1435–1439, 1995.
- [BBHb] G. Barnich, F. Brandt, and M. Henneaux. Local BRST cohomology in Einstein Yang-Mills theory. *Nuclear Physics B*, 455:537–408, 1995.
- [Bec85] C. Becchi. Lectures on the Renormalization of Gauge Theories. In *Les Houches Summer School on Theoretical Physics: Relativity, Groups and Topology*, pages 787–821, 1985.
- [BPS91] A. Blasi, O. Piguet, and S. P. Sorella. Landau gauge and finiteness. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 356:154–162, 1991.
- [BRS76] C. Becchi, A. Rouet, and R. Stora. Renormalization of gauge theories. *Annals of Physics*, 98(2):287–321, 1976.
- [BS59] N.N. Bogolyubov and D.V. Shirkov. *Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields*, volume 3. 1959.
- [CL] T. E. Clark and J. H. Lowenstein. Generalization of Zimmermann’s normal-product identity. *Nuclear Physics B*, 113: 109–134, 1976
- [KO78] T. Kugo and I. Ojima. Subsidiary Conditions and Physical S Matrix Unitarity in Indefinite Metric Quantum Gravitational Theory. *Nucl. Phys. B*, 144:234–252, 1978.
- [Kug97] T. Kugo. *Eichtheorie*. 1997.
- [EKKSI] E. Kraus and K. Sibold. Conformal transformation properties of the energy momentum tensor in four dimensions. *Nuclear Physics B*, 372: 113–144, 1992
- [EKKSII] E. Kraus and K. Sibold. Local couplings, double insertions and the Weyl consistency condition. *Nuclear Physics B*, 398: 125–154, 1993
- [EKKSIII] E. Kraus and K. Sibold. The general transformation law of the gravitational field via Noether’s procedure. *Annals of Physics*, 219: 349–363, 1992
- [EK98] E. Kraus. Renormalization of the electroweak standard model to all orders. *Annals of Physics*, 262: 155–259, 1998
- [KW99] E. Kraus and G. Weiglein. The callan-symanzik equation of the electroweak standard model and its one-loop functions. *Nuclear Physics B*, 551(1-2):117–154, 1999.
- [Lo] J. H. Lowenstein. Convergence theoreme for renormalized Feynman integrals with zero-mass propagators. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 47: 53, 1976.
- [LS] J. H. Lowenstein and E. R. Speer. Distributional limit of renormalized Feynman integrals with zero mass denominators. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 47: 43–51, 1976.
- [LE] J. H. Lowenstein. BPHZ renormalization *International School of Mathematical Physics, 2nd course: Renormalization Theory* (Springer, Dordrecht, 1975).
- [NA12] G. Narain and R. Anishetty. Short distance freedom of quantum gravity. *Physics Letters B*, 711(1):128–131, 2012.
- [Nie10] M. Niedermaier. Gravitational fixed points and asymptotic safety from perturbation theory. *Nuclear Physics B*, 833(3):226–270, 2010.
- [PS2] O. Piguet, and K. Sibold. Gauge independence in ordinary {Yang-Mills} theories *Nuclear Physics B*, 253:517–540, 1984.
- [PS21] S. Pottel and K. Sibold. Perturbative quantization of einstein-hilbert gravity embedded in a higher derivative model. *Physical Review D*, 104(8):086012, 2021.
- [PS23] S. Pottel and K. Sibold. Perturbative quantization of Einstein-Hilbert gravity embedded in a higher derivative model II. arxiv:2308.15824v2 [hep-th]
- [Ste77] K.S. Stelle. Renormalization of Higher Derivative Quantum Gravity. *Phys. Rev. D*, 16:953–969, 1977.
- [Ste78] K.S. Stelle. Classical gravity with higher derivatives. *General Relativity and Gravitation*, 9:353–371, 1978.