

Two mass scales for the Higgs field?

Paolo Cea^{†1}, Maurizio Consoli^{‡2} and Leonardo Cosmai^{†3}

[†]*INFN - Sezione di Bari, I-70126 Bari, Italy*

[‡]*INFN - Sezione di Catania, I-95129 Catania, Italy*

Abstract

In the original version of the theory, the driving mechanism for spontaneous symmetry breaking was identified in the pure scalar sector. However, this old idea requires a heavy Higgs particle that, after the discovery of the 125 GeV resonance, seems to be ruled out. We argue that this is not necessarily true. If the phase transition is weakly first order, as indicated by most recent lattice simulations, one should consider those approximation schemes that are in agreement with this scenario. Then, even in a simple one-component theory, it becomes natural to introduce two mass scales, say M_h and m_h with $m_h \ll M_h$. This resembles the coexistence of phonons and rotons in superfluid helium-4, which is the non-relativistic analogue of the scalar condensate, and is potentially relevant for the Standard Model. In fact, vacuum stability would depend on M_h and not on m_h and be nearly insensitive to the other parameters of the theory (e.g. the top quark mass). By identifying $m_h = 125$ GeV, and with our previous estimate from lattice simulations $M_h = 754 \pm 20$ (stat) ± 20 (syst) GeV, we thus get in touch with a recent, independent analysis of the ATLAS + CMS data which claims experimental evidence for a scalar resonance around 700 GeV.

¹Electronic address: paolo.cea@ba.infn.it

²Electronic address: maurizio.consoli@ct.infn.it

³Electronic address: leonardo.cosmai@ba.infn.it

1. Introduction

The phenomenon of spontaneous symmetry breaking, that is the generation of all particle masses from the vacuum expectation value $\langle\Phi\rangle \neq 0$ of the Higgs field, is an essential ingredient of the Standard Model. The idea is remarkably simple and has a long history which dates back to more than fifty years ago [1, 2]. Moreover, there has been an important experimental confirmation after the observation, at the Large Hadron Collider of CERN [3], of a narrow scalar resonance, of mass $m_h \sim 125$ GeV whose phenomenology fits well with the perturbative predictions of the theory. Thus, one might think that, by now, very little remains to be understood.

Yet, a notable aspect of the theory remains unclear, namely the order of the phase transition in pure Φ^4 theories. As we will illustrate, this is an important issue that may have substantial phenomenological implications. In this respect, recent lattice simulations of Φ^4 theory in four space-time dimensions [4, 5] have added new precious evidence. In fact, these calculations, performed in the Ising limit of the theory with different algorithms, indicate that on the largest lattices available so far the phase transition is (weakly) first-order.

With this non-perturbative numerical evidence, to explore the possible implications, it would be natural to restrict to those analytical approximations that indeed predict a weakly first-order scenario. However, since there are several subtleties, for sake of clarity we will first re-capitulate the general problem along the lines of Refs. [6, 7].

Let us therefore start from scratch with the classical Φ^4 potential

$$V_{\text{class}} = \frac{1}{2}r_B\Phi^2 + \frac{1}{4!}\lambda\Phi^4 \quad (1)$$

which gives an unambiguous indication: as one varies the bare r_B mass parameter, there is a second-order phase transition at $r_B = 0$.

In the quantum theory, the question is more subtle and, to be formulated, requires to consider the mass squared parameter, say m_Φ^2 , introduced by quantizing the theory in the symmetric phase at $\langle\Phi\rangle = 0$. Clearly, this symmetric vacuum is *locally* stable if its excitations have a physical mass $m_\Phi^2 > 0$. However, is this vacuum also *globally* stable? Namely, could the phase transition actually be first order, i.e. occurring at some very small but still positive m_Φ^2 as originally suggested by Coleman and Weinberg [8]?

Here, for a pure Φ^4 (no gauge couplings), the standard approximation methods for the quantum effective potential $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ give contradictory results [8]. The straightforward one-loop approximation predicts a first-order transition occurring at a small critical value of mass squared, $m_\Phi^2 = m_c^2 > 0$.

On the other hand, the usual Renormalization Group (RG) “improvement”, obtained by resumming the leading-logarithmic terms, predicts a second-order transition at $m_\Phi^2 = 0$. The conventional view is that the latter result is trustworthy while the former is not. The argument is that, for $0 \leq m_\Phi^2 < m_c^2$, the one-loop potential’s non-trivial minimum occurs where the one-loop “correction” term is as large as the tree-level term. However, also this standard RG-improved result can hardly be trusted because amounts to resumming a geometric series of leading logs that is actually a divergent series [9].

To understand the reason of the discrepancy, a crucial observation is that the quanta of the symmetric phase, the “phions” [6], besides the $+\lambda\delta^3(\mathbf{r})$ contact repulsion, also feel a $-\lambda^2 \frac{e^{-2m_\Phi r}}{r^3}$ attraction which shows up at the one-loop level and whose range becomes longer and longer in the $m_\Phi \rightarrow 0$ limit. By taking into account both effects, a calculation of the energy density in the dilute-gas approximation [6], which is equivalent to the one-loop potential, indicate that for small m_Φ the lowest-energy state is not the empty state with no phions but a state with a non-zero density of phions Bose condensed in the zero-momentum mode. The instability corresponds to spontaneous symmetry breaking and happens when the phion’s physical mass m_Φ^2 is still positive; it does not wait until m_Φ^2 passes through zero and becomes negative. Though the critical mass m_c^2 is extremely small so that it is a very weak first-order transition which becomes indistinguishable from a second-order transition if one does not look on a fine enough scale.

Now, since symmetry breaking originates from two qualitatively different competing effects, one can understand why the standard RG-analysis fails. In fact, the one-loop attractive term is *ultraviolet finite*. Therefore, the correct way to include higher order terms is to renormalize *both* the tree-level repulsion and the long-range attraction, as in a theory with *two* coupling constants. This strategy, which is clearly different from the usual one, has been implemented by Stevenson [7]. By avoiding double counting, he has shown that one-loop result and its RG-group improvement, in this new scheme, now agree very well so that the weak first-order scenario is confirmed.

On the other hand, as an additional check, one can also compare with other non-perturbative approximations, for instance the Gaussian approximation [10] that, in principle, should be the most natural scheme. In fact, at least in the continuum limit, it respects the generally accepted “triviality” of the theory in 3+1 dimensions. This other calculation produces a result in agreement with the one-loop effective potential [11]. The agreement is not because it contains no non-vanishing corrections beyond the one-loop level; it does but those additional terms do not alter the functional form of the result. Once more, the weak first-order scenario in Φ^4 theories is confirmed.

Notwithstanding, all this has gone practically unnoticed within the high-energy community. The main reason dates back again to Coleman and Weinberg [8] who observed that no conflict, between one-loop potential and its standard RG-improvement, arises in the presence of gauge bosons, for instance in scalar electrodynamics, at least if the scalar self-coupling is not too large. Because of this result, which is considered as the only relevant for the Standard Model, the problem and the implications of the phase transition in pure Φ^4 theories have been left aside.

However, once all couplings are put on the same level, the scalar sector becomes strongly constrained. Therefore, the original picture where symmetry breaking was only determined by the pure scalar sector, the other couplings just producing small corrections, has been abandoned. The consistency of that original picture would, in fact, require a substantially heavy Higgs boson which by now seems to be in conflict with experiment.

Our scope in this Letter is to show that this is not necessarily true. If some aspects of the phase transition in Φ^4 theories have been overlooked there may be some ambiguity concerning the role and the meaning of what, in this context, is understood by ‘‘Higgs particle mass’’. To this end, we will re-reconsider in Sect.2 the one-loop calculation of the effective potential (or the equivalent Gaussian approximation) in the cutoff theory. Formally, there is nothing new in this elementary calculation. But, if this were accepted as the correct description of symmetry breaking, its *interpretation* could now become completely different. Namely there might be *two* vastly different mass scales in the broken phase, say M_h and m_h with $m_h \ll M_h$. The important point is that the stability of the vacuum depends on the larger M_h and not on m_h . Therefore, spontaneous symmetry breaking could be determined by the pure scalar sector regardless of the other parameters of the theory (e.g. the vector boson and top quark mass).

To help physical intuition, one can exploit the analogy with the non-relativistic limit of the scalar condensate, namely superfluid helium-4. The elementary constituents of the superfluid are the helium-4 atoms but at low energy only collective excitations of the system are observable, first its gapless compressional modes (the phonons) and then the vortical modes (rotons) that possess an energy gap. For very low momenta $\mathbf{k} \rightarrow 0$ only phonons propagate. But, by increasing the energy also rotons can be excited. In this analogy the lower mass m_h would correspond to phonons while the heavy mass M_h would play the role of mass gap for the roton branch.

Then, with our previous estimate [12, 13] from lattice simulations $M_h = 754 \pm 20$ (stat) ± 20 (syst) GeV, we will get in touch with a recent, independent analysis [14] of the ATLAS + CMS data which claims evidence for a scalar

resonance around 700 GeV. These more phenomenological aspects will be addressed in Sect.3.

2. Two mass scales for the Higgs field?

Let us assume the scalar Φ^4 Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \Phi}{\partial x_\mu} \right)^2 - \frac{r_B \Phi^2}{2} - \frac{\lambda \Phi^4}{4!} \quad (2)$$

and shift $\Phi = \phi + h(x)$. The long discussion given in the Introduction indicates that the one-loop potential, or the equivalent gaussian effective potential, are expected to give the correct description of symmetry breaking. Let us thus consider the self energy in the one-loop approximation

$$\Pi^{1\text{-loop}}(p) = -r_B - \frac{\lambda \phi^2}{2} - \frac{\lambda}{2} A_0(M) + \frac{\lambda^2 \phi^2}{2} B_0(p, M, M) \quad (3)$$

where

$$A_0(M) = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{k^2 + M^2} \quad (4)$$

and

$$B_0(p, M, M) = \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{[(p+k)^2 + M^2](k^2 + M^2)} \quad (5)$$

Now, by fixing the mass counterterm as in Coleman-Weinberg, i.e.

$$r_B = -\frac{\lambda}{2} A_0(M=0) \quad (6)$$

one finds their expression for the effective potential in the presence of a large ultraviolet cutoff Λ_s for the scalar sector

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \frac{\lambda}{4!} \phi^4 + \frac{\lambda^2}{256\pi^2} \phi^4 \left[\ln(\frac{1}{2} \lambda \phi^2 / \Lambda_s^2) - \frac{1}{2} \right] \quad (7)$$

whose first few derivatives are

$$V'_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \frac{\lambda}{6} \phi^3 + \frac{\lambda^2}{64\pi^2} \phi^3 \ln(\frac{1}{2} \lambda \phi^2 / \Lambda_s^2) \quad (8)$$

and

$$V''_{\text{eff}}(\phi) = \frac{\lambda}{2} \phi^2 + \frac{3\lambda^2}{64\pi^2} \phi^2 \ln(\frac{1}{2} \lambda \phi^2 / \Lambda_s^2) + \frac{\lambda^2 \phi^2}{32\pi^2} \quad (9)$$

This second derivative is equivalent to compute $-\Pi^{1\text{-loop}}(p=0)$ in Eq.(3) by replacing the tree-level mass $M^2(\phi) = \frac{\lambda\phi^2}{2}$ as the mass which runs in the loops. In standard perturbation theory, this would be the first step of an iterative procedure where one starts with a zeroth-order mass, say $M^{0\text{-loop}}$, and replace in the loops of $\Pi^{1\text{-loop}}$. Then, by performing corresponding renormalization of the coupling constant, one can define the mass at one-loop, say $M^{1\text{-loop}}$. In general, to order n, $M^{0\text{-loop}}$ should be replaced in the diagrams with n loops, $M^{1\text{-loop}}$ in the diagrams with (n-1) loops and so on. In this way, together with coupling constant and wave function renormalization, one can extend the analysis to any desired order.

However, by following this strategy one predicts the wrong second-order phase transition. Instead, for the reasons explained in the Introduction, we expect that it is the one-loop effective potential to display the correct physical interpretation. At its minima, say $\phi = \pm v$, and by defining $M^2(\pm v) = M_h^2$, this gives two different informations:

- i) its depth $V_{\text{eff}}(\pm v) \sim -M_h^4$
- ii) its quadratic shape $V_{\text{eff}}''(\pm v) \equiv m_h^2 \ll M_h^2$

On this basis, we will argue that the two mass scales m_h and M_h describe the propagator in two vastly different regions of momenta, respectively $p \rightarrow 0$ and $p^2 \gg m_h^2$.

To explore the $p \rightarrow 0$ limit, let us first look at the minima of $V_{\text{eff}}(\phi)$ where

$$M_h^2 = \frac{\lambda v^2}{2} = \Lambda_s^2 \exp\left(-\frac{32\pi^2\lambda}{3}\right) \quad (10)$$

so that

$$-\Pi^{1\text{-loop}}(p=0) = V_{\text{eff}}''(\pm v) = \frac{\lambda^2 v^2}{32\pi^2} = \frac{\lambda}{16\pi^2} M_h^2 \equiv m_h^2 \quad (11)$$

and for large $L \equiv \ln \frac{\Lambda_s}{M_h}$

$$m_h^2 = \frac{M_h^2}{3L} \ll M_h^2 \quad (12)$$

Notice that the energy density depends on M_h and *not* on m_h , because

$$V_{\text{eff}}(\pm v) = -\frac{M_h^4}{128\pi^2} \quad (13)$$

therefore the critical temperature at which symmetry can be restored is $k_B T_c \sim M_h$. This means that the stability conditions of the broken phase depends solely on the large scale M_h and not on the much smaller scale m_h which determines the propagator for $p \rightarrow 0$

$$G^{-1}(p) = p^2 - \Pi(p) = p^2 + m_h^2 - m_h^2 \int_0^1 dx \ln \frac{p^2 x(1-x) + M_h^2}{M_h^2} \quad (14)$$

One can thus approximate the vanishing of the inverse propagator as

$$p^2 + m_h^2 - m_h^2 \frac{p^2}{6M_h^2} = 0 \quad (15)$$

By defining $\alpha \equiv \frac{m_h^2}{6M_h^2} \ll 1$, in Minkowski space this is a pole whose approximate location is very close to m_h^2

$$(p_0^2 - \mathbf{p}^2) \sim \frac{m_h^2}{1 - \alpha} \sim m_h^2(1 + \alpha) \quad (16)$$

Let us now consider the higher- p^2 region. Strictly speaking, the effective potential generates the vertices at $p = 0$. However, insight into $p \neq 0$ can be obtained by comparing with the general expression of the zero-point energy: the trace of the log of the inverse propagator $G^{-1}(p) = p^2 - \Pi(p)$, namely

$$\frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \ln(p^2 - \Pi(p)). \quad (17)$$

After subtractions, its value can be reproduced by imposing appropriate lower and upper limits to the p -integration in the logarithmic divergent part

$$-\frac{1}{4} \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\Pi^2(p)}{p^4}. \quad (18)$$

so that, for ϕ close to $\pm v$, one can compare directly with the one-loop form

$$-\frac{M^4(\phi)}{64\pi^2} \left[\ln \frac{\Lambda_s^2}{M^2(\phi)} + \frac{1}{2} \right] \quad (19)$$

It is then clear that $M^2(\phi)$ cannot be a purely infrared scale, i.e. whose only role is to regulate the infrared divergences. In fact, besides entering the log, it controls, through the value of $M^4(\phi)$, an effect which gets contributions from the whole range of p . Therefore the corresponding value M_h^2 for $\phi = \pm v$ will reflect the magnitude of $|\Pi(p)|$ in some *intermediate* region $m_h^2 \ll p^2 \ll \Lambda_s^2$ (it cannot be $p \rightarrow 0$ since we have seen that there $|\Pi(0)| = V_{\text{eff}}''(\pm v) = m_h^2 \ll M_h^2$).

Note that we are not saying that M_h^2 is the higher- p^2 limit of $\Pi^{1\text{-loop}}(p)$. Trusting in the one-loop potential, only the two basic relations $V_{\text{eff}}(\pm v) \sim -M_h^4$ and $V_{\text{eff}}''(\pm v) = |\Pi(0)| = m_h^2 \ll M_h^2$ are reliable. But then, from Eq.(18) it follows that there must be a higher momentum region $p^2 \gg m_h^2$ where $|\Pi(p)| \sim M_h^2$. Together with the complementary $p \rightarrow 0$ region where $|\Pi(0)| \sim m_h^2$, this means that, even in a one-component theory, the shifted

field of the broken phase (the equivalent of the Standard Model Higgs boson) can hardly be considered a simple massive field. Somehow, it materializes in two different mass scales, m_h and M_h , whose quadratic ratio is suppressed by the inverse logarithm of the cutoff Λ_s .

In a more complete derivation, the inverse propagator should then emerge as a suitable interpolation⁴ between these two regimes, say

$$G^{-1}(p) = (p^2 + M_h^2)f(p^2/m_h^2) \quad (20)$$

with $f(p) \sim (m_h/M_h)^2$ in the $p \rightarrow 0$ limit and $f(p^2/m_h^2) \rightarrow 1$ for momenta $p^2 \gg m_h^2$. At present, as a definite example, by defining the Φ^4 theory as a limit where, from the very beginning, one starts with a hard-sphere repulsion + non-local long-range attraction, a form for such interpolating function is given in Stevenson's Eqs.(16)-(22) of Ref. [7]. Note that his Eq.(23) should be read as $G^{-1}(p)$ and that he considers the continuum limit $(m_h/M_h)^2 \rightarrow 0$. Then $f(x)$ becomes a step function which is unity for any finite p except for a discontinuity at $p = 0$ where $f = 0$. Up to this discontinuity in the zero-measure set $p = 0$, one then re-discovers the usual trivial continuum limit with *only one* free massive particle.

As anticipated, an equivalent description is found in the Gaussian approximation where one re-sums all one-loop bubbles. This other calculation can be cast in a form which is similar to Eq.(7) with a simultaneous re-definition of the mass and of the classical background:

$$V_{\text{eff}}^G(\phi) = \frac{\hat{\lambda}\phi^4}{4!} + \frac{\Omega^4(\phi)}{64\pi^2} \left[\ln(\Omega^2(\phi)/\Lambda_s^2) - \frac{1}{2} \right] \quad (21)$$

with

$$\hat{\lambda} = \frac{\lambda}{1 + \frac{\lambda}{16\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda_s}{\Omega(\phi)}} \quad (22)$$

⁴Sometimes, one can guess the right form of the spectrum in two different limits but, as in the case of the phonon-roton spectrum in superfluid helium-4, describing the detailed transition between the two regimes remains a difficult task. In our case, numerical evidence for two different mass scales was found in lattice simulation of the spontaneously broken phase in the Ising limit [15]. To this end, the high-momentum region of the connected propagator was fitted to have an estimate of $M_h^2 \equiv m_{\text{latt}}^2$. Analogously, the inverse zero-momentum two-point function was computed through the lattice susceptibility to have an estimate of $\frac{1}{m_h^2} \equiv \chi_{\text{latt}}$. Then, the product $m_{\text{latt}}^2 \chi_{\text{latt}} = (M_h/m_h)^2$ was computed and found to increase, consistently with a logarithmic trend, in the continuum limit. On the other hand, no evidence for such two-scale structure was found in the symmetric phase. There, the value of m_{latt}^2 , fitted from the high-momentum propagator, describes the data remarkably well down to $p = 0$.

and

$$\Omega^2(\phi) = \frac{\hat{\lambda}\phi^2}{2} \quad (23)$$

This explains why the one-loop potential can also admit a non-perturbative interpretation. It is the prototype of all gaussian and post-gaussian [16, 17] calculations where the energy density is given as a classical background + zero-point energy of a field with a ϕ -dependent mass.

3. Getting in touch with phenomenology

The large $m_h - M_h$ difference reflects an effective potential which is extremely flat because reaching its depth $V_{\text{eff}}(\pm v) \sim -M_h^4$ will take a very large distance if V_{eff} is plotted in units of the ϕ -field with second derivative $V_{\text{eff}}''(\phi = \pm v) = m_h^2$. For this reason, in refs. [11] a large re-scaling⁵ of the vacuum field $Z = Z_\phi$ was introduced through the relation

$$V_{\text{eff}}''(\pm v) = m_h^2 = \frac{\lambda}{16\pi^2} M_h^2 \equiv \frac{M_h^2}{Z_\phi} \quad (24)$$

In this way, one can define a re-scaled field ϕ_R , with $\phi^2 = Z_\phi \phi_R^2$, such that the quadratic shape of the effective potential, in terms of ϕ_R , now matches exactly with M_h^2 .

Therefore, a question naturally arises: if symmetry breaking were generated in the pure scalar sector, when one couples scalar and gauge fields, which is the correct definition of the expectation value $\langle \Phi \rangle \sim 246$ GeV entering the W mass $M_w^2 \sim \frac{g^2 \langle \Phi \rangle^2}{4}$ (and then the Fermi constant through $\frac{G_F}{\sqrt{2}} \sim \frac{g^2}{8M_w^2}$)? In fact, this $\langle \Phi \rangle$ could be the same v considered so far which in general, i.e. beyond the Coleman-Weinberg limit, is related to M_h through a relation similar to Eq.(10) ($L \equiv \ln \frac{\Lambda_s}{M_h}$) say

$$M_h^2 = \frac{c_1 v^2}{L} \quad (25)$$

⁵We emphasize that this is the re-scaling of the *vacuum* field and, as such, is quite unrelated to the more conventional definition $Z = Z_{\text{prop}} = 1 + O(\lambda)$ which enters the residue of the *shifted* field propagator. By “triviality”, the latter is constrained to approach unity in the continuum limit. To better understand the difference, it is useful to regard symmetry breaking as a true condensation phenomenon associated with the macroscopic occupation the same quantum state $\mathbf{k} = 0$. Then ϕ is related to the condensate while the shifted field is related to the modes at $\mathbf{k} \neq 0$ which are not macroscopically populated.

where c_1 is some constant. Or, instead, it could be the much smaller v_R

$$v_R^2 = \frac{v^2}{Z_\phi} = v^2 \frac{m_h^2}{M_h^2} = \frac{c_2 v^2}{L} \ll v^2 \quad (26)$$

c_2 being another constant which replaces Eq.(12) in the general case.

Now, in Ref. [11], one argued as follows. M_h determines the vacuum energy, and thus the temperature T_c of the phase transition. In this sense, it is the natural cutoff-independent quantity. At the same time, $\langle \Phi \rangle \sim 246$ GeV is a basic entry of the theory (as the electron mass and fine structure constant in QED). Therefore, it would be natural to consider the definition $v_R \equiv \langle \Phi \rangle \sim 246$ GeV which is finitely related to M_h through some proportionality constant K

$$M_h = K v_R \quad (27)$$

This scheme was then compared with lattice simulations in the Ising limit that traditionally is considered a convenient laboratory to study the properties of the theory. The result of this analysis [12, 13] was $K = 3.06 \pm 0.08$ (stat) ± 0.08 (syst) or

$$M_h = 754 \pm 20 \text{ (stat)} \pm 20 \text{ (syst)} \text{ GeV} \quad (28)$$

The crucial question is then the following: is there any experimental indication for M_h ? Namely, if we identify $m_h = 125$ GeV, there could be one more massive excitation of the Higgs field which fits with our M_h ?

Here, we get in touch with a recent, independent analysis [14] of the ATLAS + CMS data where experimental evidence for an excess in the 4-lepton final state (at the 5σ level) was claimed. The natural interpretation of the excess would be in terms of a scalar resonance around 700 GeV which decays into two Z bosons and then into leptons. If the excess will be confirmed, it could represent indeed the second heavier mass scale discussed in this paper. This is not too far from the usual triviality bounds, but the phenomenology of such heavy resonance (i.e. its production cross sections and decay rates) may differ sizeably from the perturbative expectations, see Ref. [18]. For this reason, we will stop here and wait for more experimental information, if any.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Paul Stevenson for information about Ref. [5] and for many useful discussions.

References

- [1] P. W. Higgs, Phys. Lett. **12** (1964) 132.
- [2] F. Englert and R. Brout, Phys. Rev. Lett. **13** (1964) 321.
- [3] ATLAS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **716** (2012) 1; CMS Collaboration, Phys. Lett. B **716** (2012) 30.
- [4] P. H. Lundow and K. Markström, Phys. Rev. E **80** (2009) 031104; Nucl. Phys. B **845** [FS] (2011) 120.
- [5] S. Akyiama, et al. Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) 054510.
- [6] M. Consoli and P. M. Stevenson, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15** (2000) 133.
- [7] P. M. Stevenson, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **24** (2009) 261.
- [8] S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **7**, (1973) 1888.
- [9] M. Consoli and P. M. Stevenson, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **11** (1996) 2511.
- [10] T. Barnes and G. I. Ghandour, Phys. Rev. **D22** (1980) 924; P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. **D32** (1985) 1389.
- [11] M. Consoli and P. M. Stevenson, Z. Phys. **C63** (1994) 427; Phys. Lett. **B391** (1997) 144.
- [12] P. Cea, M. Consoli and L. Cosmai, Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) **129** (2004) 780; hep-lat/0309050.
- [13] P. Cea and L. Cosmai, ISRN High Energy Physics, vol. 2012, Article ID 637950, arXiv:0911.5220.
- [14] P. Cea, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **34** (2019) 1950137.
- [15] P. Cea, M. Consoli, L. Cosmai and P. M. Stevenson. Mod. Phys. Lett. A **14** (1999) 1673.
- [16] I. Stancu and P. M. Stevenson, Phys. Rev. D **42** (1990) 2710.
- [17] P. Cea and L. Tedesco, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 4967.
- [18] P. Castorina, M. Consoli and D. Zappalà, J. Phys. G **35** (2008) 075010.