arXiv:2105.12176v1 [hep-th] 24 May 2021

Interplay Between Approximation Theory and Renormalization Group

V.I. Yukalov

Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia

and

Instituto de Fisica de São Carlos, Universidade de São Paulo,
CP 369, São Carlos 13560-970, São Paulo, Brazil

E-mail: yukalov@theor.jinr.ru

Abstract

The review presents general methods for treating complicated problems that cannot be solved exactly and whose solution encounters two major difficulties. First, there are no small parameters allowing for the safe use of perturbation theory in powers of these parameters, and even when small parameters exist, the related perturbative series are strongly divergent. Second, such perturbative series in powers of these parameters are rather short, so that the standard resummation techniques either yield bad approximations or are not applicable at all. The emphasis in the review is on the methods advanced and developed by the author. One of the general methods is *Optimized Perturbation Theory* now widely employed in various branches of physics, chemistry, and applied mathematics. The other powerful method is *Self-Similar Approximation Theory* allowing for quite simple and accurate summation of divergent series. These theories share many common features with the method of renormalization group, which is briefly sketched in order to stress the similarities in their ideas and their mutual interconnection.

Keywords: optimized perturbation theory, self-similar approximation theory, renormalization group, nonlinear problems

Contents

1. Introduction

2. Optimized perturbation theory

2.1. Control functions
2.2. Fastest convergence
2.3. Optimization conditions
2.4. Asymptotic conditions
2.5. Partition functions
2.6. Thermodynamic potentials
2.7. Eigenvalue problem
2.8. Exact solutions
2.9. Sequence convergence
2.10. Reexpansion trick: induced form
2.11. Reexpansion trick: arbitrary form
2.12. Critical temperature: initial conditions
2.13. Critical temperature: reexpansion trick
2.14. Critical temperature: trapped bosons
2.15. Fluid string
2.16. Fluid membrane
2.17. Linear Hamiltonians
2.18. Nonlinear Hamiltonians
2.19. Hamiltonian envelopes
2.20. Magnetic systems
2.21. Field-theory models

3. Self-similar approximation theory

3.1. Approximation cascade
3.2. Approximation flow
3.3. Stability analysis
3.4. Free energy
3.5. Eigenvalue problem
3.6. Choice of initial approximation
3.7. Fractal transform
3.8. Self-similar root approximants
3.9. Self-similar nested approximants
3.10. Self-similar exponential approximants
3.11. Self-similar additive approximants
3.12. Self-similar factor approximants
3.13. Self-similar combined approximants
3.14. Acceleration of convergence
3.15. Electron gas
3.16. Harmonium atom
3.17. Schwinger model

3.18. Large-variable prediction: partition function
3.19. Large-variable prediction: eigenvalue problem
3.20. Exact solutions: initial-value problem
3.21. Exact solutions: boundary-value problem
3.22. Vortex-line equation
3.23. Critical phenomena: spin systems
3.24. Critical phenomena: Bose gas
3.25. Critical exponents
3.26. Time series
3.27. Probabilistic scenarios
3.28. Discrete scaling
3.29. Complex renormalization
3.30. Quark-gluon plasma
3.31. Gell-Mann-Low function: Quantum Chromodynamics
3.32. Gell-Mann-Low function: Quantum Electrodynamics
3.33. Gell-Mann-Low function: Quartic Field Theory
3.34. Other applications

4. Basics of renormalization group

4.1. Renormalization-group classes
4.2. Critical phenomena
4.3. Universality classes
4.4. Kadanoff transformations
4.5. Momentum scaling
4.6. Fixed points
4.7. Wilson method
4.8. Fractional dimension
4.9. Differential formulation
4.10. Decimation procedure
4.11. Exact semigroup
4.12. Field-theory group
4.13. Invariant charge

5. Discussion

1 Introduction

The overwhelming majority of problems describing realistic phenomena and systems cannot be solved exactly. Sometimes it is possible to resort to cumbersome computer calculations. However, such a numerical treatment is not always realizable and, moreover, is not sufficient for understanding the physics of the considered phenomenon. The most widespread way of analyzing complicated problems is by invoking some kind of perturbation theory with respect to parameters characterizing the system. But it is a rare occasion when there exist small parameters making perturbation theory sensible. Usually, such small parameters are absent. Even when there happens a small parameter, the resulting perturbative series, nevertheless, are usually divergent.

There exist methods allowing for the extrapolation of series, derived for asymptotically small parameters, to finite values of the latter. The most popular are the method of Padé approximants [1] and Borel summation (see, e.g. [2]). However, these methods not always are applicable. For instance, Borel summation requires the knowledge of large-order behaviour of perturbative terms, which in the majority of cases is not known.

The present article reviews an original approach based on the methods developed by the author, which are *Optimized Perturbation Theory* (Sec. 2) and *Self-Similar Approximation Theory* (Sec. 3). These methods are essentially more general than that of Padé approximants, including the latter as just a particular case. They provide accurate approximations having in hands only a few perturbative terms. It becomes possible to extrapolate asymptotic series in powers of small parameters to finite and even to infinite values of the latter. In those cases, when a number of perturbative terms are known, the approach results in approximants being in very good agreement with numerical calculations, when these are available. In those cases, when the considered problem enjoys an exact solution, the described theory usually also yields this exact solution. The approach shares many ideas with the method of renormalization group. And vice versa, in the method of renormalization group it is possible to use the ideas of optimal control theory. This is why the basics of the renormalization group approach are sketched in Sec. 4. The parallel exposition of approximation theory and renormalization group not only explains the underlying grounds of the former, but may also give hints on the possible development and mutual enrichment of both approaches. Section 5 contains a brief summary of the main ideas of the described approaches and emphasizes the common points in approximation theory and renormalization group techniques.

Throughout the paper, the system of units is used, where the Planck and Boltzmann constants are set to unity.

2 Optimized Perturbation Theory

In literature, one often manipulates by the term "perturbation theory", as opposed to "non-perturbative methods", keeping in mind that perturbation theory gives only asymptotic series with respect to some parameter, while nonperturbative methods result in a sequence of approximants that do not form asymptotic series, possessing a more complicated structure. However, such a counterposition is basically senseless. From the mathematical point of view, there already exists a distinction between asymptotic and nonasymptotic series.

So, there is no need to involve such an ugly term as "nonperturbative methods". In the general mathematical definition, perturbation theory is a systematic method of defining successive approximations [3]. In the present section, we describe a method called Optimized Perturbation Theory.

Optimized Perturbation Theory is a systematic method defining a sequence of successive approximants, whose convergence is governed by control functions.

2.1 Control Functions

Optimized perturbation theory was advanced in Refs. [4, 5]. Then it has been applied to treating anharmonic quantum crystals [4–9], the theory of melting [6, 11], and many other systems and phenomena. The basic idea of this theory is the introduction of control functions making divergent series convergent. This theory sometimes appears in literature under different names, such as modified perturbation theory, renormalized perturbation theory, variational perturbation theory, controlled perturbation theory, self-consistent perturbation theory, oscillator-representation method, delta expansion, optimized expansion, nonperturbative expansion, and so on. However all these guises imply the same idea of introducing control functions optimizing the convergence of a perturbative sequence.

Suppose we are looking for a real function $f(x)$ of a real variable x. For simplicity, we consider here real-valued functions and variables, while the extension to complex-valued quantities can be straightforwardly done by considering several functions and variables. When the sought function is defined by a complicated problem that cannot be solved exactly one invokes a kind of perturbation theory yielding a sequence of approximations $f_k(x)$, with $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. As a rule, the sequence $\{f_k(x)\}$ is divergent. The main idea of optimized perturbation theory is to rearrange the sequence $\{f_k(x)\}$ to another form $\{F_k(x, u_k)\}$ by introducing control parameters u_k that become control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$ making the rearranged sequence convergent. Such a rearrangement, that can be denoted as

$$\hat{R}[u_k] f_k(x) = F_k(x, u_k) \; , \tag{2.1}$$

can be realized is three ways.

First of all, we need to incorporate control parameters u_k into the considered sequence. For a while, we assume that control functions can be defined by some optimization conditions to be discussed later. And here we only describe the ways how control functions can be incorporated into a perturbative sequence.

A. *Introducing control parameters through initial conditions*

It is possible to start the solution procedure with an initial approximation containing trial parameters u_k. For example, let the sought function be defined by an equation

$$\hat{E}[f(x)] = 0 \; . \tag{2.2}$$

We can start solving the equation with an initial approximation $F_0(x, u)$ following an iterative procedure

$$F_{k+1}(x, u_{k+1}) = F_k(x, u_k) + \hat{E}[F_k(x, u_k)] \; . \tag{2.3}$$

Then, defining the control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$ so that to make the sequence $\{F_k(x, u_k)\}$ convergent, we get the optimized approximants

$$\tilde{f}_k(x) = F_k(x, u_k(x)) \; . \tag{2.4}$$

Or, suppose we consider a system characterized by a Hamiltonian H. If the system is complicated and cannot be solved exactly, we can take as a zero approximation a simpler Hamiltonian $H_0(u)$ containing a parameter u. Then the system Hamiltonian can be represented as

$$H = H_0(u) + \varepsilon[H - H_0(u)] \qquad (\varepsilon \to 1) \; , \tag{2.5}$$

where ε is a dummy parameter to be set to one at the end, after using perturbation theory in powers of this parameter. Calculating in the k-th order of the perturbation theory an observable quantity

$$F_k(x, u_k) = \langle \hat{A}(x) \rangle_k \; , \tag{2.6}$$

corresponding to an operator of local observable $\hat{A}(x)$, and defining control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$, we get the optimized approximant (2.4).

As is clear, it is straightforward to deal in the same way with several types of control functions and with several observable quantities. Instead of a Hamiltonian one can consider a Lagrangian.

B. *Introducing control parameters by means of functional transformation*

The other way of introducing control parameters is by transforming each member of the sequence $\{f_k(x)\}$ by means of a transformation containing a parameter u_k, which can be denoted as

$$\hat{T}[u_k] f_k(x) = F_k(x, u_k) \; . \tag{2.7}$$

Then, defining control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$, we make the inverse transformation and obtain the optimized approximants

$$\tilde{f}_k(x) = \hat{T}^{-1}[u_k(x)] F_k(x, u_k(x)) \; . \tag{2.8}$$

One of the simplest examples is the fractal transform

$$\hat{T}[u] f_k(x) = x^u f_k(x)$$

to be considered in Sec. 3.

C. *Introducing control parameters by reexpansion trick*

The third method of introducing control parameters is by making the change of variables and invoking a reexpansion procedure that can be done is several ways.

(i) It is possible to make the change of the variable

$$x = \alpha(x, z, u) \; , \qquad z = z(x, u)$$

containing a parameter u. Then one reexpands $f_k(\alpha(x, z, u))$ in powers of x keeping z and u fixed, thus getting

$$f_k(\alpha(x, z, u)) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(z, u) x^n \qquad (x \to 0) \; .$$

After this, one substitutes here $z = z(x,u)$, which gives

$$F_k(x,u_k) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(z(x,u_k),u_k)x^n \; .$$

Defining control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$, one comes to the optimized approximant (2.4).

(ii) The other possible way is to make the change of the variable

$$x = x(z,u) \; , \qquad z = z(x,u)$$

and then reexpand $f_k(x(z,u))$ in powers of z getting

$$f_k(x(z,u)) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(u) z^n \qquad (z \to 0) \; .$$

Substituting here $z = z(x,u)$ yields

$$F_k(x,u) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(u) z^n(x,u) \; .$$

Defining control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$ results in the optimized approximant (2.4).

(iii) One more method is as follows. Let $f_k(x,m)$ depend on a parameter m. One makes the substitution

$$m \to u + \varepsilon(m-u) \; , \qquad x \to \varepsilon x$$

and expands f_k in powers of ε, obtaining

$$f_k(\varepsilon x, u + \varepsilon(m-u)) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(x,m,u)\varepsilon^n \; .$$

Then one sets $\varepsilon = 1$, which gives

$$F_k(x,m,u) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(x,m,u) \; .$$

Defining control functions $u_k = u_k(x,m)$, one obtains the optimized approximant

$$\tilde{f}_k(x,m) = F_k(x,m,u_k(x,m)) \; . \tag{2.9}$$

(iv) One sometimes needs to find the value $f(x)$ at large x including $x \to \infty$. Then it is possible to change the variable $x = x(z,u)$ so that $z \to 1$ when $x \to \infty$. Expanding f_k in powers of z, one gets

$$f_k(x(z,u)) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(u) z^n \qquad (z \to 0) \; .$$

After defining control functions $u_k = u_k(z)$, the optimized approximant for $f(\infty)$ reads as

$$\tilde{f}_k(\infty) = \lim_{z\to 1} \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(u_k(z)) z^n \; . \tag{2.10}$$

As examples of the corresponding changes of the variable, we can mention

$$x = \frac{cz}{(1-z)^u} \; ,$$

where c is a parameter, and the conformal mapping

$$x = \frac{4u^2 z}{(1-z)^2} \; , \qquad z = \frac{\sqrt{x+u^2}-u}{\sqrt{x+u^2}+u} \; .$$

The latter is a variant of the Euler transformation.

2.2 Fastest Convergence

Let the control parameters u_k be incorporated into the rearranged sequence by means of one of the ways described above. But we need to formulate conditions for defining control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$, such that the sequence $\{F_k(x, u_k)\}$ be convergent.

By the Cauchy criterion the sequence $\{F_k(x, u_k)$ is convergent if and only if, for any $\varepsilon > 0$ there exists a number n_ε such that

$$|F_{k+p}(x, u_{k+p}) - F_k(x, u_k)| < \varepsilon \tag{2.11}$$

for all $k \geq n_\varepsilon$ and $p \geq 0$.

The Cauchy convergence criterion and the methods of optimal control theory motivate us to define the optimal control functions serving as minimizers of the fastest convergence cost functional [12]

$$C[u] = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |F_{k+p}(x, u_{k+p}) - F_k(x, u_k)| \; .$$

This is equivalent to looking for control functions satisfying the *fastest convergence criterion* that defines the control functions as the minimizers of the difference of the terms in the Cauchy criterion:

$$\min_u |F_{k+p}(x, u_{k+p}) - F_k(x, u_k)| \qquad (k \geq 0, \; p \geq 0) \; . \tag{2.12}$$

The value of $F_k(x, u_k)$ varies under the variation of the control function u_k and the variation of the approximation order index k. Therefore, approximately, we can write

$$F_{k+p}(x, u_{k+p}) \cong F_{k+p}(x, u_k) + \frac{\partial F_k(x, u_k)}{\partial u_k} \, (u_{k+p} - u_k) \; . \tag{2.13}$$

Hence criterion (2.12) takes the form

$$\min_u \left| F_{k+p}(x, u_k) - F_k(x, u_k) + \frac{\partial F_k(x, u_k)}{\partial u_k} \, (u_{k+p} - u_k) \right| \; . \tag{2.14}$$

If either the value of $F_k(x, u_k)$ weakly depends on u_k or the control functions slowly vary with varying the order index k, then the main term in expression (2.14) is the difference of the first two terms. Therefore we have to minimize this difference by means of the *minimal difference condition*

$$\min_u |F_{k+p}(x, u_k) - F_k(x, u_k)| \; . \tag{2.15}$$

The absolute minimum is given by the equation

$$F_{k+p}(x, u_k) - F_k(x, u_k) = 0 \; . \tag{2.16}$$

On the other hand, if the value of $F_k(x, u_k)$ weakly varies with the change of the the approximation order index k, then the main term in criterion (2.14) is that containing the derivative. Thence this term is to be minimized by the *minimal derivative condition*

$$\min_u \left| \frac{\partial F_k(x, u_k)}{\partial u_k} \, (u_{k+p} - u_k) \right| \; . \tag{2.17}$$

The absolute minimum of the latter condition implies that

$$(u_{k+p} - u_k) \, \frac{\partial F_k(x, u_k)}{\partial u_k} = 0 \; . \tag{2.18}$$

This has to be understood in the following way. If the control functions of different orders are not equal to each other, then the derivative has to be zero,

$$\frac{\partial F_k(x, u_k)}{\partial u_k} = 0 \qquad (u_{k+p} \neq u_k) \; . \tag{2.19}$$

But if the latter equation has no solutions for the control function $u_k = u_k(x)$, then we can assume the equality of the control functions,

$$u_{k+p} = u_k \; , \qquad \frac{\partial F_k(x, u_k)}{\partial u_k} \neq 0 \; . \tag{2.20}$$

When the derivative equation (2.19) has no solution, the control functions can be found from the minimization of this derivative,

$$\min_u \left| \frac{\partial F_k(x, u_k)}{\partial u_k} \right| \; , \qquad u_k = u_k(x) \; . \tag{2.21}$$

As is easy to see, the minimal difference and minimal derivative conditions are equivalent to each other. Really, if the minimal difference condition (2.16) is valid, then the fastest convergence criterion (2.14) yields the minimal derivative condition (2.18). While, if the latter condition holds true, then the minimal difference condition (2.16) follows. In practice, one can employ that condition which is more convenient. These conditions are analogous to fixed-point conditions in the renormalization group approach (see Sec. 4).

2.3 Optimization Conditions

The previous section shows how the fastest convergence criterion generates the optimization conditions defining control functions. Two such optimization conditions, being equivalent to each other, are obtained: the minimal difference and minimal derivative conditions. These conditions follow from the fastest convergence criterion (2.12), with the use of representation (2.13). This representation has the meaning of the low-order expansion of $F_k(x,u_k)$ as a function of two variables, the approximation order k and the variable u_k, while x being fixed.

Generally, a function $f(t,z)$ of two continuous variables can be represented as a Taylor expansion with respect to points t_0 and z_0,

$$f(t,z) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{m!n!} \left[\frac{\partial^{m+n} f(t,z)}{\partial t^m \partial z^n} \right]_{t_0,z_0} (t-t_0)^m (z-z_0)^n \; .$$

In our case, one of the variables, that is k, is discrete. Therefore for this variable, instead of the derivative, we need to employ the finite difference

$$\Delta_p F_k \equiv F_{k+p} - F_k \; .$$

In the second order, the finite difference is

$$\Delta_p^2 F_k = F_{k+2p} - 2F_{k+p} + F_k \; ,$$

and so on. Then the general expansion of $F_{k+p}(x,u_{k+p})$ reads as

$$F_{k+p}(x,u_{k+p}) = \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\Delta_p^m}{m!n!} \, \frac{\partial^n F_k(x,u_k)}{\partial u_k^n} \, (u_{k+p}-u_k)^n \; . \tag{2.22}$$

In the first order, we return back to representation (2.13). In the second order, we have

$$F_{k+p}(x,u_{k+p}) \cong F_{k+p}(x,u_k) + \frac{\partial F_k(x,u_k)}{\partial u_k} \, (u_{k+p}-u_k) + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial^2 F_k(x,u_k)}{\partial u_k^2} \, (u_{k+p}-u_k)^2 +$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} [F_{k+2p}(x,u_k) - 2F_{k+p}(x,u_k) + F_k(x,u_k)] + (u_{k+p}-u_k) \, \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} \, [F_{k+p}(x,u_k) - F_k(x,u_k)] \; . \tag{2.23}$$

With the general expansion (2.22), the fastest convergence criterion (2.12) leads to the minimization

$$\min_u |F_{k+p}(x,u_{k+p}) - F_k(x,u_k)| \leq \min_u \sum_{m,n=0}^{\infty} \frac{|u_{k+p}-u_k|^n}{m!n!} \left| \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k^n} \, \Delta_p^m F_k(x,u_k) \right| \; . \tag{2.24}$$

To second order, this gives

$$\min_u |F_{k+p}(x,u_{k+p}) - F_k(x,u_k)| \leq \min_u \left\{ |F_{k+p}(x,u_k) - F_k(x,u_k)| + \left| (u_{k+p}-u_k) \, \frac{\partial F_k(x,u_k)}{\partial u_k} \right| + \right.$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}\,|F_{k+2p}(x,u_k)-2F_{k+p}(x,u_k)+F_k(x,u_k)|+\frac{1}{2}\,\left|(u_{k+p}-u_k)^2\,\frac{\partial^2 F_k(x,u_k)}{\partial u_k^2}\right|+$$
$$+\left|(u_{k+p}-u_k)\frac{\partial}{\partial u_k}[F_{k+p}(x,u_k)-F_k(x,u_k)]\right|\Bigg\}\ . \tag{2.25}$$

Minimizing here the first difference term, we get the minimal difference condition (2.16). The minimization of the second term yields the minimal derivative condition (2.18) or (2.19). When these conditions do not have solutions or suffer from the multiplicity of solutions, one can resort to the minimization of other terms in criterion (2.24). In that way, we can employ the higher-order minimal difference conditions, as

$$F_{k+2p}(x,u_k)-2F_{k+p}(x,u_k)+F_k(x,u_k)=0\ , \tag{2.26}$$

the higher-order minimal derivative conditions

$$\frac{\partial^n F_k(x,u_k)}{\partial^n u_k}=0 \qquad (n=1,2,\ldots)\ , \tag{2.27}$$

and mixed minimal derivative-difference conditions, such as

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u_k}\,[F_{k+p}(x,u_k)-F_k(x,u_k)]=0\ . \tag{2.28}$$

Note that when the considered problem can be described by several quantities of interest, say $f(x)$ and $h(x)$, it is admissible to introduce control functions for one of these sought quantities, also using it for the other. That is, if we have the sequences $F(x,u_k)$ and $H(x,v_k)$, corresponding to $f(x)$ and $h(x)$, but associated with the same problem, we may define control functions $u_k=u_k(x)$ and then set $u_k(x)=v_k(x)$. This is allowed because both these sought quantities follow from the same problem and in that sense are interrelated. For instance, studying various characteristics of an anharmonic system, we can define the control functions through the optimization conditions related to the moments $\langle r^n\rangle$ characterizing the properties of wave functions [5–11].

2.4 Asymptotic Conditions

When the behaviour of the sought function $f(x)$ in the vicinity of a point x_0 is known, so that

$$f(x)\simeq g(x) \qquad (x\to x_0)\ , \tag{2.29}$$

then control functions can be found from the asymptotic condition

$$F_k(x,u_k)\simeq g(x) \qquad (x\to x_0)\ . \tag{2.30}$$

If the behaviour of the sought function is known near several points x_i, with $i=1,2,\ldots$, where

$$f(x)\simeq g_i(x) \qquad (x\to x_i)\ , \tag{2.31}$$

then it is possible to introduce several control functions satisfying the given asymptotic conditions

$$F_k(x,u_{1k},u_{2k},\ldots)\simeq g_i(x) \qquad (x\to x_i) \tag{2.32}$$

defining $u_{ik}=u_{ik}(x)$. In that case, the optimized approximant is

$$\tilde{f}_k(x)=F_k(x,u_{1k}(x),u_{2k}(x),\ldots)\ . \tag{2.33}$$

2.5 Partition Functions

Optimized perturbation theory has been used for a variety of problems. To show how the theory works, it is instructive to illustrate it by several simple examples, whose mathematical structure is typical of many problems of statistical physics and field theory.

One such a case illustrates the calculation of partition functions in statistical physics or effective potentials in field theory. Let us consider the so-called zero-dimensional φ^4 theory represented by the partition function

$$Z(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-H[\varphi]}\, d\varphi \; , \tag{2.34}$$

with the effective Hamiltonian

$$H[\varphi] = \varphi^2 + g\varphi^4 \; , \tag{2.35}$$

where $g \geq 0$ is a coupling parameter. This example has been treated in several publications, e.g. in [2,13]. Below we follow Ref. [13].

Perturbation theory for this problem can be compared with the known exact expression

$$Z(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi g}}\; \exp\left(\frac{1}{8g}\right) K_{1/4}\left(\frac{1}{8g}\right) = \frac{1}{(2g)^{1/4}} \exp\left(\frac{1}{8g}\right) D_{-1/2}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2g}}\right) \; , \tag{2.36}$$

in which K_ν is a MacDonald function and D_ν is the function of parabolic cylinder. For a large variable $x \to \infty$, we have

$$K_\nu(x) \simeq \left(\frac{\pi}{2x}\right)^{1/2} e^{-x} \left[1 + \frac{4\nu^2 - 1}{8x} + \frac{(4\nu^2 - 1)(4\nu^2 - 3^2}{2(8x)^2}\right] \qquad (x \to \infty) \; ,$$

from where the weak-coupling expansion of $Z(g)$ becomes

$$Z(g) \simeq 1 - \frac{3}{4}\, g + \frac{105}{32}\, g^2 \qquad (g \to 0) \; . \tag{2.37}$$

For the small variable $x \to 0$, the MacDonald function is

$$K_\nu(x) \simeq \frac{\pi}{2\sin(\pi\nu)} \left[\frac{(x/2)^{-\nu}}{\Gamma(1-\nu)} - \frac{(x/2)^{\nu}}{\Gamma(1+\nu)} + \frac{(x/2)^{2-\nu}}{\Gamma(2-\nu)} - \frac{(x/2)^{2+\nu}}{\Gamma(2+\nu)}\right] \qquad (x \to 0) \; ,$$

where

$$\Gamma(x)\Gamma(1-x) = \frac{\pi}{\sin(\pi x)} \; .$$

Then the strong-coupling limit of $Z(g)$ reads as

$$Z(g) \simeq \frac{1}{2\sqrt{\pi}} \left[\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) g^{-1/4} - \Gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}\right) g^{-3/4}\right] \qquad (g \to \infty) \; . \tag{2.38}$$

With the values of the gamma function

$$\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) = 3.625609 \; , \qquad \Gamma\left(\frac{3}{4}\right) = 1.225417 \; ,$$

we get

$$Z(g) \simeq 1.022765 g^{-1/4} - 0.345684 g^{-3/4} \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{2.39}$$

If we employ the expansion in powers of g, then, using the integral

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x^{2n} \exp(-x^2) \, dx = \frac{\sqrt{\pi}}{2^n} \, (2n-1)!! = \Gamma\left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \; ,$$

we come to the sum

$$Z(g) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{\sqrt{\pi} \, n!} \, \Gamma\left(2n + \frac{1}{2} \right) g^n \; . \tag{2.40}$$

This sum is strongly divergent at any nonzero g because of the factorial growth of the coefficients

$$\frac{1}{n!} \, \Gamma\left(2n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \simeq \left(\frac{4n}{e} \right)^n \rightarrow \infty \qquad (n \rightarrow \infty) \; .$$

Such a divergence is typical of many problems in statistical physics and field theory.

In the optimized perturbation theory, we start with the initial Hamiltonian

$$H_0[\varphi] = u + \omega^2 \varphi^2 \; , \tag{2.41}$$

containing the trial parameters u and ω. Hamiltonian (2.35) can be rewritten as

$$H[\varphi] = H_0[\varphi] + \varepsilon \Delta H \qquad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 1) \; , \tag{2.42}$$

with the perturbative term

$$\Delta H = H[\varphi] - H_0[\varphi] = u + (\omega^2 - 1)\varphi^2 - g\varphi^4 \; . \tag{2.43}$$

Expanding the partition function (2.34) in powers of ε and setting the latter to one, we find the successive terms $Z_k(g, u, \omega)$ of zero order

$$Z_0(g, u, \omega) = \frac{e^{-u}}{\omega} \; , \tag{2.44}$$

first order

$$Z_1(g, u, \omega) = Z_0(g, u, \omega) + e^{-u} \left(\frac{u}{\omega} + \frac{\omega^2 - 1}{2\omega^3} \; - \; \frac{3g}{4\omega^5} \right) \; , \tag{2.45}$$

second order

$$Z_2(g, u, \omega) = Z_1(g, u, \omega) + e^{-u} \left[\frac{u^2}{2\omega} + \frac{u(\omega^2 - 1)}{2\omega^3} + \right.$$
$$\left. + \frac{3(\omega^2 - 1)^2 - 6gu}{8\omega^5} \; - \; \frac{15g(\omega^2 - 1)}{8\omega^7} + \frac{105 g^2}{32\omega^9} \right] \; , \tag{2.46}$$

and so on.

We can define the control functions $u_k = u_k(g)$ and $\omega_k = \omega_k(g)$ from the optimization conditions

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} \, Z_k(g, u_k, \omega_k) = 0 \; , \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial \omega_k} \, Z_k(g, u_k, \omega_k) = 0 \; . \tag{2.47}$$

To first order $k = 1$, these conditions yield the equations

$$2(1+2u)\omega^4 - 2\omega^2 - 3g = 0 \; , \qquad 2(3+2u)\omega^4 - 6\omega^2 - 15g = 0 \; , \tag{2.48}$$

in which $u = u_1$ and $\omega = \omega_1$. From these equations, one has the relations

$$\omega^2 = \frac{1}{1+4u} \; , \qquad u = -\frac{\omega^2 - 1}{4\omega^2} = -\frac{3g}{4\omega^4} \; , \tag{2.49}$$

using which, we come to the equation

$$\omega^4 - \omega^2 - 3g = 0 \; . \tag{2.50}$$

The real solution of the latter equation gives the control function

$$\omega(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \, (1 + \sqrt{1+12g})^{1/2} \; , \tag{2.51}$$

from where the other control function is

$$u(g) = -\frac{3g}{(1+\sqrt{1+12g})^2} \; . \tag{2.52}$$

In the weak-coupling limit, the control functions behave as

$$\omega(g) \simeq 1 + \frac{3}{2} \, g \; - \; \frac{45}{8} \, g^2 \; ,$$

$$u(g) \simeq -\frac{3}{4} \, g + \frac{9}{2} \, g^2 - 27g^3 \qquad (g \rightarrow 0) \; , \tag{2.53}$$

and in the strong-coupling limit, as

$$\omega(g) \simeq (3g)^{1/4} + \frac{1}{4} \, (3g)^{-1/4} + \frac{1}{32} \, (3g)^{-3/4} \; ,$$

$$u(g) \simeq -\frac{1}{4} + \frac{1}{4} \, (3g)^{-1/2} + \frac{9}{16} \, (3g)^{-1} \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{2.54}$$

In the second order $k = 2$, conditions (2.47) do not provide real solutions, because of which we can set $u_2(g) = u_1(g) \equiv u(g)$ and $\omega_2(g) = \omega_1(g) \equiv \omega(g)$. Then the optimized approximants for the first and second orders are

$$\tilde{Z}_k(g) \equiv Z_k(g, u(g), \omega(g)) \qquad (k = 1, 2) \; . \tag{2.55}$$

In the weak-coupling limit, these approximants behave as

$$\tilde{Z}_1(g) \simeq 1 - \; \frac{3}{4} \, g + \frac{81}{32} \, g^2 \; , \quad \tilde{Z}_2(g) \simeq 1 - \; \frac{3}{4} \, g + \frac{105}{32} \, g^2 \qquad (g \rightarrow 0) \tag{2.56}$$

and in the strong-coupling limit, as

$$\tilde{Z}_1(g) \simeq e^{1/4} \left[(3g)^{-1/4} - \; \frac{1}{4} \, (3g)^{-3/4} \right] \; ,$$

$$\tilde{Z}_2(g) \simeq e^{1/4}\left[\frac{13}{12}\,(3g)^{-1/4} - \frac{7}{6}\,(3g)^{-3/4}\right] \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{2.57}$$

Simplifying the latter, we get

$$\tilde{Z}_1(g) \simeq 0.975648 g^{-1/4} - 0.140823 g^{-3/4} \; ,$$

$$\tilde{Z}_2(g) \simeq 1.056952 g^{-1/4} - 0.246440 g^{-3/4} \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{2.58}$$

The optimized approximants provide good approximations in the whole range of the coupling parameter $g \in [0, \infty)$. The overall accuracy of the approximants can be characterized by the maximal error

$$\varepsilon_k \equiv \sup_g \left| \frac{\tilde{Z}_k(g)}{Z(g)} - 1 \right| \times 100\% \; . \tag{2.59}$$

For the approximants (2.55), we find $\varepsilon_1 = 5\%$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 3\%$.

Let us stress that here two control functions are used. One describing an effective uniform potential u_k and the other, an effective frequency (or mass) ω_k. If we use only one control function, say ω_k, setting $u_k \equiv 0$, the accuracy of the approximants becomes slightly worse [13], giving $\varepsilon_1 = 7\%$ and $\varepsilon_2 = 5\%$.

2.6 Thermodynamic Potentials

A dimensionless thermodynamic potential can be expressed through the partition function by the definition

$$f(g) = -\ln Z(g) \; . \tag{2.60}$$

In field theory, this is called a generating functional.

Let us accept the partition function (2.34) from the previous section. Following Ref. [14], we take for the zero approximation the Hamiltonian

$$H_0[\varphi] = \omega^2 \varphi^2 \; , \tag{2.61}$$

containing one trial parameter ω. The total Hamiltonian takes the form

$$H[\varphi] = H_0[\varphi] + \varepsilon \Delta H \qquad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 1) \; , \tag{2.62}$$

with the perturbative term

$$\Delta H = H[\varphi] - H_0[\varphi] = (1 - \omega^2)\varphi^2 + g\varphi^4 \; . \tag{2.63}$$

We expand the free energy (2.60) in powers of ε. Starting with the zero-order free energy

$$F_0(g, \omega) = \ln \omega \; , \tag{2.64}$$

and introducing the notations

$$\alpha \equiv 1 - \frac{1}{\omega^2} \; , \qquad \beta \equiv \frac{3g}{\omega^4} \; , \tag{2.65}$$

we find in the higher orders

$$F_k(g,\omega) = F_{k-1}(g,\omega) + \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_{kn} \alpha^{k-n} \beta^n \; , \tag{2.66}$$

where $k \geq 1$. The coefficients c_{kn}, depending on the order k, are here as follows: to first order,

$$c_{10} = -\frac{1}{2} \; , \qquad c_{11} = \frac{1}{4} \qquad (k=1) \; ,$$

to second order,

$$c_{20} = -\frac{1}{4} \; , \qquad c_{21} = \frac{1}{2} \; , \qquad c_{22} = -\frac{1}{3} \qquad (k=2) \; ,$$

to third order,

$$c_{30} = -\frac{1}{6} \; , \qquad c_{31} = \frac{3}{4} \; , \qquad c_{32} = -\frac{4}{3} \; , \qquad c_{33} = \frac{11}{12} \qquad (k=3) \; ,$$

to fourth order,

$$c_{40} = -\frac{1}{8} \; , \qquad c_{41} = 1 \; , \qquad c_{42} = -\frac{10}{3} \; , \qquad c_{43} = \frac{11}{2} \; , \qquad c_{44} = -\frac{34}{9} \qquad (k=4) \; ,$$

and so on.

The control functions $\omega_k = \omega_k(g)$ for odd orders are defined by the optimization condition

$$\frac{\partial F_k(g,\omega_k)}{\partial \omega_k} = 0 \qquad (k = 1, 3, \ldots) \; . \tag{2.67}$$

For even orders, the similar condition has no real solutions, and we set $u_k = u_{k-1}(g)$ for $k = 2, 4, \ldots$.

Equation (2.67) yields

$$\omega_k(g) = \left[\frac{1}{2} \, \left(1 + \sqrt{1 + 12 s_k g} \right) \right]^{1/2} \; , \tag{2.68}$$

where

$$s_1 = s_2 = 1 \; , \qquad s_3 = s_4 = 2.239674 \; .$$

For large orders k, we have

$$\omega_k(g) \sim g^{1/4} k^{\gamma} \qquad \left(\frac{1}{4} \leq \gamma \leq \frac{1}{2} \; , \; k \to \infty \right) \; .$$

The optimized approximant is

$$\tilde{f}_k(g) = F_k(g, \omega_k(g)) \; . \tag{2.69}$$

Its accuracy can be characterized by the maximal error (2.59) giving

$$\varepsilon_1 = 7\% \; , \qquad \varepsilon_2 = 4\% \; , \qquad \varepsilon_3 = 0.2\% \; , \qquad \varepsilon_4 = 0.2\% \; .$$

2.7 Eigenvalue Problem

One often needs to find the eigenvalues of Hermitian operators representing observable quantities. Most often, one looks for the eigenvalues of Hamiltonians, describing energy spectra and satisfying the Schrödinger equation

$$\hat{H}|n\rangle = E_n|n\rangle \; . \tag{2.70}$$

The common touchstones for checking the accuracy of calculational procedures are anharmonic models, such as the anharmonic oscillator for a single particle and anharmonic crystals for many-body systems. The simplest case corresponds to the one-dimensional anharmonic oscillator with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{1}{2}\,x^2 + gx^4 \tag{2.71}$$

in dimensionless units, where $x \in (-\infty, \infty)$ and the anharmonicity parameter $g \in [0, \infty)$. Optimized perturbation theory has been applied to both anharmonic crystals [4–10] and to the simple anharmonic oscillator [2, 15–24]. Usually, one considers only the ground-state energy of Hamiltonian (2.71). Here we show the application of the theory to the whole spectrum of this Hamiltonian, as is done in Ref. [25].

Choosing for the initial approximation the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\omega^2}{2}\,x^2 \; , \tag{2.72}$$

we have the perturbative term

$$\Delta H \equiv \hat{H} - \hat{H}_0 = \frac{1-\omega^2}{2}\,x^2 + gx^4 \; . \tag{2.73}$$

So, the total Hamiltonian can be written as

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \varepsilon \Delta H \qquad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 1) \; . \tag{2.74}$$

Employing the Rayleigh-Scrödinger perturbation theory with respect to the dummy parameter ε, which afterwards is set to one, we find the spectrum of the k-th order

$$E_{kn} = E_{kn}(g, \omega) \qquad (k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots) \; , \tag{2.75}$$

with the quantum index $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ enumerating the energy levels. The spectrum can be represented as the sum

$$E_{kn} = E_{0n} + \Delta_{1n} + \Delta_{2n} + \ldots + \Delta_{kn} \; , \tag{2.76}$$

starting from the zero approximation

$$E_{0n} = \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \omega \; , \tag{2.77}$$

and where

$$\Delta_{kn} = \Delta_{kn}(g,\omega) \tag{2.78}$$

are the perturbative corrections.

In the first order, we have

$$\Delta_{1n} = V_{nn} \; , \qquad V_{mn} \equiv \langle m|\Delta H|n\rangle \; . \tag{2.79}$$

The second order correction is

$$\Delta_{2n} = \sum_{m(\neq n)} \frac{|V_{nm}|^2}{E_{0n} - E_{0m}} \; . \tag{2.80}$$

The third order correction writes as

$$\Delta_{3n} = \sum_{m,i(\neq n)} \frac{V_{nm}V_{mi}V_{in}}{(E_{0n} - E_{0m})(E_{0n} - E_{0i})} - V_{nn} \sum_{m(\neq n)} \frac{|V_{nm}|^2}{(E_{0n} - E_{0m})^2} \; . \tag{2.81}$$

And to fourth order, we get

$$\Delta_{4n} = \sum_{m,i,j(\neq n)} \frac{V_{nm}V_{mi}V_{ij}V_{jn}}{(E_{0n} - E_{0m})(E_{0n} - E_{0i})(E_{0n} - E_{0j})} -$$

$$- \sum_{m,i(\neq n)} \frac{|V_{nm}|^2|V_{ni}|^2 + 2V_{nn}V_{nm}V_{mi}V_{in}}{(E_{0n} - E_{0m})^2(E_{0n} - E_{0i})^2} + |V_{nn}|^2 \sum_{m(\neq n)} \frac{|V_{nm}|^2}{(E_{0n} - E_{0m})^3} \; . \tag{2.82}$$

It is convenient to introduce the notation

$$E_{kn}(g,\omega) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right) F_k(g,\omega) \; , \tag{2.83}$$

dealing with the function $F_k(g,\omega)$, whose zero order is

$$F_0(g,\omega) = \omega \qquad (k = 0) \; . \tag{2.84}$$

For the orders $k \geq 1$, we have

$$F_k(g,\omega) = F_{k-1}(g,\omega) - \frac{\omega}{2^{k+1}} \sum_{n=0}^{k} d_{kn} \alpha^{k-n} \beta^n \; , \tag{2.85}$$

where

$$\alpha \equiv 1 - \frac{1}{\omega^2} \; , \qquad \beta \equiv 6\gamma \, \frac{g}{\omega^3} \; , \qquad \gamma \equiv \frac{n^2 + n + 1/2}{n + 1/2} = n + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{4(n+1/2)} \; , \tag{2.86}$$

and the coefficients, depending on the order, are as follows. In the first order,

$$d_{10} = 2 \; , \qquad d_{11} = -1 \qquad (k = 1) \; ,$$

in the second order,

$$d_{20} = 1 \; , \qquad d_{21} = -2 \qquad d_{22} = 2a \qquad (k = 2) \; ,$$

in the third order,

$$d_{30} = 1 \; , \qquad d_{31} = -4 \qquad d_{32} = 10a \; , \qquad d_{33} = -3b \qquad (k = 3) \; ,$$

and in the fourth order,

$$d_{40} = \frac{5}{4} \; , \qquad d_{41} = -8 \qquad d_{42} = 35a \; , \qquad d_{43} = -24b \; , \qquad d_{44} = 4c \qquad (k = 4) \; ,$$

where the notation is used:

$$a \equiv \frac{17n^2 + 17n + 21}{(6\gamma)^2} \; , \qquad b \equiv \frac{125n^4 + 250n^3 + 472n^2 + 347n + 111}{(n + 1/2)(6\gamma)^3} \; ,$$

$$c \equiv \frac{1}{8(6\gamma)^4} \left(10689n^4 + 21378n^3 + 60616n^2 + 49927n + 30885 \right) \; .$$

The first-order control function is found from the optimization condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \, F_{1n}(g, \omega) = 0 \; , \qquad \omega = \omega_1(g) \; , \tag{2.87}$$

which gives the equation

$$\omega_1^3 - \omega_1 - 6\gamma g = 0 \; . \tag{2.88}$$

The values

$$\alpha_k \equiv \alpha(\omega_k) \; , \qquad \beta_k \equiv \beta(\omega_k) \tag{2.89}$$

are connected as

$$\alpha_1 = \beta_1 = 1 - \frac{1}{\omega_1^2} \; . \tag{2.90}$$

In the second order, the equation similar to (2.87) does not have real solutions, so we set $\omega_2 = \omega_1$. Thus, for the first and second order, function (2.85) becomes

$$F_{k+1}(g, \omega_1) = F_k(g, \omega_1) - \frac{\omega_1}{2^{k+2}} A_{1k} \alpha_1^{k+1} \; , \tag{2.91}$$

where $k = 0, 1$ and

$$A_{10} = 1 \; , \qquad A_{11} = 2a - 1 \; .$$

In the third order, the optimization condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \omega} \, F_3(g, \omega) = 0 \; , \qquad \omega = \omega_3(g) \tag{2.92}$$

yields the equation

$$\omega_3^3 - \omega_3 - 6\gamma\lambda g = 0 \; , \tag{2.93}$$

in which the quantity

$$\lambda \equiv \frac{\alpha_3}{\beta_3} = \frac{\omega_3^2 - 1}{6\gamma g}\,\omega_3 \tag{2.94}$$

satisfies the equation

$$5\lambda^3 - 24\lambda^2 + 70a\lambda - 24b = 0 \; . \tag{2.95}$$

Now the parameters from Eq. (2.86) are connected as

$$\alpha_3 = \alpha(\omega_3) = 1 - \frac{1}{\omega_3^2} \; , \qquad \beta_3 \equiv \beta(\omega_3) = \frac{\alpha_3}{\lambda} \; . \tag{2.96}$$

In the fourth order, the equation similar to condition (2.92) does not have real solutions, because of which we can set $\omega_4 = \omega_3$.

Then, for the third and fourth orders, function (2.85) reduces to the form

$$F_{k+1}(g,\omega_3) = F_k(g,\omega_3) - \frac{\omega_3}{2^{k+2}} A_{3k}\alpha_3^{k+1} \; , \tag{2.97}$$

in which $k = 2, 3$ and

$$A_{32} = 1 - \frac{4}{\lambda} + \frac{10a}{\lambda^2} - \frac{3b}{\lambda^3} \; , \qquad A_{33} = \frac{5}{4} - \frac{8}{\lambda} + \frac{35a}{\lambda^2} - \frac{24b}{\lambda^3} + \frac{4c}{\lambda^4} \; .$$

The optimized approximant for the spectrum reads as

$$\tilde{E}_{kn}(g) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) F_k(g, \omega_k(g)) \; . \tag{2.98}$$

The accuracy of a k-th order approximant can be characterized by the percentage error

$$\varepsilon_{kn}(g) \equiv \left[\frac{\tilde{E}_{kn}(g)}{E_n(g)} - 1 \right] \times 100\% \tag{2.99}$$

compared with the numerical solution of the eigenvalue problem [26] giving $E_n(g)$. It is also instructive to define the maximal error of a given energy level

$$\varepsilon_{kn}(g) \equiv \sup_g |\varepsilon_{kn}(g)| \tag{2.100}$$

and the maximal percentage error for all levels

$$\varepsilon_k \equiv \sup_n \varepsilon_{kn} = \sup_{n,g} |\varepsilon_{kn}(g)| \; . \tag{2.101}$$

The latter errors are

$$\varepsilon_1 = 2\%, \qquad \varepsilon_2 = 0.8\%, \qquad \varepsilon_3 = 0.8\%, \qquad \varepsilon_4 = 0.5\% \; .$$

The ground-state level is often of special interest. For this level, we get

$$\varepsilon_{10} = 2\%, \qquad \varepsilon_{20} = 0.8\%, \qquad \varepsilon_{30} = 0.04\%, \qquad \varepsilon_{40} = 0.03\% \; .$$

Thus, the optimized approximants provide good accuracy for all coupling parameters and all energy levels. This accuracy is essentially better than that of quasi-classical approximation, whose maximal error is close to 20%. Padé approximants are also much less accurate. For instance the best Padé approximant of 10-th order has the error of 3%.

2.8 Exact Solutions

When the studied problem enjoys an exact solution, the optimized perturbation theory can recover this solution. To illustrate this, let us consider the case treated in Ref. [27].

Let us consider a two-frequency oscillator, with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\,x^2 + \frac{m\omega_1^2}{2}\,x^2 \;, \tag{2.102}$$

in which $x \in (-\infty, \infty)$, and ω_0 and ω_1 are different frequencies. We can treat the term with ω_0 as the main, while that with ω_1 as a perturbation. The related perturbation parameter is defined as

$$g \equiv \frac{\omega_1^2}{\omega_0^2} \;. \tag{2.103}$$

The Hamiltonian (2.102) takes the form

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\,(1+g)x^2 \;. \tag{2.104}$$

Representing the spectrum as

$$E_n(g) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)\omega_0 f(g) \;, \tag{2.105}$$

we need to find the function $f(g)$. The result of perturbation theory can be compared with the exact solution

$$f(g) = \sqrt{1+g} \;. \tag{2.106}$$

The first and second approximations of the simple perturbation theory in powers of g are

$$f_1(g) = 1 + \frac{g}{2} \;, \qquad f_2(g) = 1 + \frac{g}{2} \; - \; \frac{g^2}{8} \;, \tag{2.107}$$

which is quite different from the exact solution (2.106).

In the optimized perturbation theory, we start with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = -\frac{1}{2m}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{m\omega^2}{2}\,x^2 \tag{2.108}$$

containing a trial parameter ω. Then the perturbative term is

$$\Delta H \equiv \hat{H} - \hat{H}_0 = \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\,(1 + g - u^2)x^2 \;, \tag{2.109}$$

where

$$u \equiv \frac{\omega}{\omega_0} \tag{2.110}$$

is the dimensionless control parameter. Perturbation theory in powers of term (2.109) yields the spectrum

$$E_{kn}(g,u) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2}\right)\omega_0 F_k(g,u) \;, \tag{2.111}$$

with the perturbative expressions

$$F_0(g,u) = u \; , \qquad F_1(g,u) = \frac{1+g+u^2}{2u} \; ,$$

$$F_2(g,u) = F_1(g,u) - \frac{(1+g-u^2)^2}{8u^3} \; , \tag{2.112}$$

and so on.

The control function $u_k(g)$ can be found either from the minimal derivative condition

$$\frac{\partial F_k(g,u_k)}{\partial u_k} = 0 \; , \qquad u_k = u_k(g) \; , \tag{2.113}$$

or from the minimal difference condition

$$F_{k+1}(g,u_k) - F_k(g,u_k) = 0 \; , \qquad u_k = u_k(g) \; . \tag{2.114}$$

In both the cases and in all orders, we get

$$u_k(g) = \sqrt{1+g} \; . \tag{2.115}$$

Then the optimized approximants of any order

$$\tilde{E}_{kn}(g,u) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \omega_0 F_k(g, u_k(g)) \tag{2.116}$$

coincide with the exact solution

$$E_n(g) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) \omega_0 \; \sqrt{1+g} \; . \tag{2.117}$$

From this example we see that an optimized approximant of a finite order k corresponds to the standard perturbation theory of infinite order.

2.9 Sequence Convergence

As is shown in Sec. 2.2, control functions in the optimized perturbation theory are defined by optimization conditions following from the fastest convergence criterion. One therefore could expect that the resulting sequence of optimized approximants should converge. But, since the optimization conditions are anyway approximate, the convergence is not guaranteed for sure and one should check numerical convergence for each concrete case.

For some simple models, for which the structure of approximants can be found for large orders, it is possible to prove convergence analytically. These simple models are the partition function integral of Sec. 2.5 and the one-dimensional anharmonic oscillator of Sec. 2.7. In papers [28–31] the following has been proved.

(i) Consider the partition function integral

$$Z(g) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-H[\varphi]) \; \frac{d\varphi}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \; , \tag{2.118}$$

with the Hamiltonian

$$H[\varphi] = \frac{1}{2}\,\omega_0^2\varphi^2 + \frac{1}{4}\,g\varphi^4 \; . \tag{2.119}$$

The optimized perturbation theory, starting with the initial Hamiltonian

$$H_0[\varphi] = \frac{1}{2}\,\omega^2\varphi^2 \; , \tag{2.120}$$

with the trial parameter ω generating control functions $\omega_k(g)$, yields the sequence of optimized approximants $\tilde{Z}_k(g)$ converging to the exact values defined by the expression

$$Z(g) = \frac{1}{(2g)^{1/4}}\; \exp\left(\frac{\omega_0^4}{8g}\right) D_{-1/2}\left(\frac{\omega_0^4}{\sqrt{2g}}\right) \; , \tag{2.121}$$

provided that either

$$\frac{\omega_k(g)}{\omega_0} \simeq Ck^{\gamma} \qquad \left(\frac{1}{4} < \gamma < \frac{1}{2}\; ,\; C > 0,\; k \rightarrow \infty\right) \tag{2.122}$$

or

$$\frac{\omega_k(g)}{\omega_0} \simeq Ck^{1/4} \qquad \left(C \geq \alpha_c g^{1/4},\; k \rightarrow \infty\right) \; . \tag{2.123}$$

The minimal derivative optimization condition gives $\alpha_c = 0.972780$, and the minimal difference condition, $\alpha = 1.072986$.

(ii) Let us consider the one-dimensional anharmonic oscillator defined by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\,\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\omega_0^2}{2}\,x^2 + \frac{g}{4}\,x^4 \; . \tag{2.124}$$

The optimized perturbation theory, starting with the initial Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = -\,\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{\omega^2}{2}\,x^2 \; , \tag{2.125}$$

with the trial parameter ω generating control functions $\omega_k(g)$, results in the sequence of energy levels $\tilde{E}_k(g)$ converging to the exact numerical values $E_k(g)$, provided that either

$$\frac{\omega_k(g)}{\omega_0} \simeq Ck^{\gamma} \qquad \left(\frac{1}{3} < \gamma < \frac{1}{2}\; ,\; C > 0,\; k \rightarrow \infty\right) \; , \tag{2.126}$$

or

$$\frac{\omega_k(g)}{\omega_0} \simeq Ck^{1/3} \qquad \left(C \geq \alpha_c g^{1/3},\; k \rightarrow \infty\right) . \tag{2.127}$$

Here $\alpha_c = 0.570875$ found from the minimal derivative condition.

Thus, in the simple cases, when the structure of large-order perturbative terms is known, it is straightforward to prove the convergence of optimized approximants to the exact numerical values:

$$\lim_{k\rightarrow\infty} \tilde{f}_k(g) = f(g) \; . \tag{2.128}$$

Unfortunately, for realistic physical problems the large-order expansion terms practically always are unknown. Moreover the exact solution may not be available.

2.10 Reexpansion Trick: Induced Form

In Sec. 2.1, it was mentioned that control functions can be introduced using a reexpansion trick. Sometimes such a trick is not arbitrary but is directly motivated by the chosen initial conditions.

For example, let us consider Hamiltonian (2.119) from the previous section and take for the initial Hamiltonian form (2.120). According to the standard procedure, one defines the Hamiltonian

$$H_\varepsilon[\varphi] = H_0[\varphi] + \varepsilon(H[\varphi] - H_0[\varphi]) \; , \tag{2.129}$$

which can be written as

$$H_\varepsilon[\varphi] = \frac{1}{2}\left[\varepsilon\omega_0^2 + (1-\varepsilon)\omega^2\right]\varphi^2 + \varepsilon\,\frac{g}{4}\,\varphi^4 \; . \tag{2.130}$$

Comparing Hamiltonians (2.119) and (2.130), we see that passing from $H[\varphi]$ to $H_\varepsilon[\varphi]$ implies the replacement

$$\omega_0^2 \to \varepsilon\omega_0^2 + (1-\varepsilon)\omega^2 \; , \qquad g \to \varepsilon g \; . \tag{2.131}$$

Therefore, if the terms $f_k(\omega_0^2, g)$ of an expansion, derived for $H[\varphi]$, are known, then the related terms for $H_\varepsilon[\varphi]$ are given by the transformation

$$f_k(\omega_0^2, g) \to f_k(\varepsilon\omega_0^2 + (1-\varepsilon)\omega^2, \varepsilon g) \; . \tag{2.132}$$

Then the optimized perturbation theory is equivalent to the reexpansion procedure in powers of ε,

$$f_k(\varepsilon\omega_0^2 + (1-\varepsilon)\omega^2, \varepsilon g) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_n(\omega_0, g, \omega)\varepsilon^n \; . \tag{2.133}$$

Setting here $\varepsilon = 1$, we get

$$F_k(\omega_0, g, \omega) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_n(\omega_0, g, \omega) \; . \tag{2.134}$$

Defining control functions $\omega_k(\omega_0, g)$, we come to the optimized approximants

$$\tilde{f}_k(\omega_0, g) = F_k(\omega_0, g, \omega_k(\omega_0, g)) \; . \tag{2.135}$$

The same reexpansion trick can be used for the anharmonic oscillator with Hamiltonian (2.124).

In these examples, the reexpansion trick is motivated by the chosen initial Hamiltonians. And the introduction of control functions through the reexpansion trick is equivalent to their introduction through initial conditions. Reexpansion trick can also be motivated by selecting the initial conditions taking account of the symmetry properties of the Hamiltonian [32].

2.11 Reexpansion Trick: Arbitrary Form

Generally, as is mentioned in Sec. 2.1, one can introduce control functions by reexpansion tricks that are not motivated by the choice of initial conditions, but whose form is rather arbitrary. We shall illustrate here this trick by the Kleinert reexpansion [2].

Suppose the sought function is approximated by an expansion

$$f_k(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_n x^n \tag{2.136}$$

derived for an asymptotically small variable $x \to 0$. It is possible to invent an identity rewriting x in a different form, for instance as

$$x = \frac{u}{(1-z)^q} \; , \tag{2.137}$$

where

$$z \equiv 1 - \left(\frac{u}{x}\right)^{1/q} \; . \tag{2.138}$$

Identity (2.137) slightly differs form the original one [2], but completely equivalent to it [33]. Thus we consider

$$F_k(x,u,q) \equiv f_k\left(\frac{u}{(1-z)^q}\right) \; , \tag{2.139}$$

where u and q are trial parameters for generating control functions.

Expression (2.139) is expanded in powers of z up to order $k-n$, with the use of the binomial expansion

$$(1-z)^p \simeq \sum_{m=0}^{k-n} C_m^p (-z)^m \qquad (z \to 0) \; ,$$

where u and q are fixed and

$$C_m^p \equiv \frac{\Gamma(p+1)}{\Gamma(m+1)\Gamma(p-m+1)} \; .$$

This yields

$$F_k(x,u,q) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} \sum_{m=0}^{k-n} (C_m^{-n})^q (-z)^m c_n u^n \; , \tag{2.140}$$

where z is given by definition (2.138). Then one should define control functions $u_k(x)$ replacing the trial parameter u. And the parameter q is usually found from asymptotic conditions, as is exemplified below.

Suppose we need to find only the value of the sought function at infinity, where this function is finite. And assume that the values of control functions $u_k(\infty)$ at infinity are finite. Because of this,

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} z = \lim_{x\to\infty} \left[1 - \left(\frac{u_k}{x}\right)^{1/q}\right] = 1 \; , \tag{2.141}$$

where $u_k = u_k(\infty)$. Then Eq. (2.140) gives

$$F_1(\infty, u, q) = c_0 + c_1 u \; , \qquad F_2(\infty, u, q) = F_1(\infty, u, q) + c_1 q u + c_2 u^2 \; ,$$

$$F_2(\infty, u, q) = F_2(\infty, u, q) + \frac{c_1}{2}\, q(1+q)u + 2c_2 q u^2 + c_3 u^3 \; , \tag{2.142}$$

and so on.

The optimization condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u_2}\, F_2(\infty, u_2, q) = 0 \tag{2.143}$$

defines the second-order control function

$$u_2 = -\, \frac{c_1}{2c_2}\, (1+q) \; . \tag{2.144}$$

The optimization condition, similar to (2.143), for the third order term $F_3(\infty, u, q)$ displays two solutions. In order to avoid the multiplicity of solutions, we can resort to the condition

$$\frac{\partial^2}{\partial u_3^2}\, F_3(\infty, u_3, q) = 0 \tag{2.145}$$

giving the unique solution

$$u_3 = -\, \frac{c_2}{3c_1}\, (1+2q) \; . \tag{2.146}$$

In this way, we get

$$F_2(\infty, u_2, q) = c_0 - \frac{c_1^2}{4c_2}\, (1+q)^2 \; ,$$

$$F_3(\infty, u_3, q) = c_0 - \frac{c_1 c_2}{6c_3}\, (1+q)(1+2q)(2+q) + \frac{2c_2^3}{27c_3^2}\, (1+2q)^2 \; . \tag{2.147}$$

As is said above, the parameter q should be found form asymptotic conditions. Assume that we know the asymptotic behaviour of the sought function at infinity, where

$$f(x) \simeq B x^{\beta} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; . \tag{2.148}$$

Hence the power-law at infinity is described by the exponent

$$\beta = \lim_{x \to \infty}\, \frac{d \ln f(x)}{d \ln x} \; . \tag{2.149}$$

Respectively, for each approximation of order k, we can introduce the function

$$\beta_k(x) \equiv \frac{d \ln f_k(x)}{d \ln x} \tag{2.150}$$

reminding us the Gell-Mann-Low function (see Sec. 4). Expanding this in powers of x yields

$$\beta_k(x) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n x^n \qquad (x \to 0) \; , \tag{2.151}$$

where the coefficients are defined through the coefficients c_n of expansion (2.136), depending on whether $c_0 \neq 0$,

$$b_0 = 0 \; , \qquad b_1 = \frac{c_1}{c_0} \; , \qquad b_2 = \frac{2c_2}{c_0} \; - \; \frac{c_1^2}{c_0^2} \; , \qquad b_3 = \frac{c_1^3}{c_0^3} \; - \; \frac{3c_1c_2}{c_0^2} + \frac{3c_3}{c_0} \qquad (c_0 \neq 0) \; ,$$

or if $c_0 = 0$,

$$b_0 = 1 \; , \qquad b_1 = \frac{c_2}{c_1} \; , \qquad b_2 = \frac{2c_3}{c_1} \; - \; \frac{c_2^2}{c_1^2} \; , \qquad b_3 = \frac{c_2^3}{c_1^3} \; - \; \frac{3c_2c_3}{c_1^2} + \frac{3c_4}{c_1} \qquad (c_0 = 0) \; .$$

Then expansion (2.151) is treated with the reexpansion trick, in order to derive $B_k(\infty, q_k)$, in the same way as is described above, when obtaining Eqs. (2.147). To second order, the result is

$$B_2(\infty, q) = b_0 - \; \frac{b_1^2}{4b_2} \; (1+q)^2 \; . \tag{2.152}$$

By assumption, we know the behaviour of the sought function at infinity, which is prescribed by Eq. (2.148). Therefore we have to set

$$B_2(\infty, q) = \beta \; , \qquad q = q_2 \; , \tag{2.153}$$

which results in

$$q_2 = 2 \sqrt{(b_0 - \beta) \; \frac{b_2}{b_1^2}} \; - \; 1 \; . \tag{2.154}$$

Thus, the optimized approximant at infinity reads as

$$\tilde{f}_k(\infty) = F_k(\infty, u_k, q_k) \; . \tag{2.155}$$

Since the accepted representation (2.137) is not unique, but suggested more or less arbitrarily, one could take another representation. When the exponent q cannot be defined from asymptotic conditions, it is admissible to fix it. As examples of other representations that could be taken, it is possible to mention the conformal map [34]

$$x = \frac{4uz}{(1-z)^2} \; , \qquad z = \frac{\sqrt{x+u} - \sqrt{u}}{\sqrt{x+u} + \sqrt{u}} \; ,$$

or the more general form

$$x = u \left[\left(\frac{1+z}{1-z} \right)^q - 1 \right] \; , \qquad z = \frac{(x+u)^{1/q} - u^{1/q}}{(x+u)^{1/q} + u^{1/q}} \; .$$

Of course, the results can strongly depend on the chosen representation.

2.12 Critical Temperature: Initial Conditions

Defining phase-transition temperature is one of the most important problems in statistical physics. Here we discuss the use of the optimized perturbation theory for calculating the Bose-Einstein condensation temperature of a three-dimensional weakly nonideal homogeneous Bose gas. This problem turned out to be highly nontrivial, since Bose-Einstein condensation is accompanied by strong fluctuations making impossible the use of perturbation theory with respect to atomic interactions (see review articles [35–37]).

The Bose-Einstein condensation temperature of an ideal gas is known to be

$$T_0 = \frac{2\pi}{m}\left[\frac{\rho}{\zeta(3/2)}\right]^{2/3} , \tag{2.156}$$

where m is mass, ρ is average atomic density, and $\zeta(\cdot)$ is the Riemann zeta function. The problem of interest is how switching on weak interactions changes the transition temperature T_0 of an ideal gas to the condensation temperature T_c of an interacting gas. This change can be described by the relative shift

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_0} \equiv \frac{T_c - T_0}{T_0} . \tag{2.157}$$

Atomic interactions in dilute Bose gas can be characterized by the local potential

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = 4\pi\,\frac{a_s}{m}\,\delta(\mathbf{r}) , \tag{2.158}$$

in which a_s is scattering length. A convenient dimensionless interaction characteristic is the gas parameter

$$\gamma \equiv \rho^{1/3} a_s . \tag{2.159}$$

At asymptotically small gas parameter, the critical temperature shift behaves as

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_0} \simeq c_1\gamma + (c_2 + c_2'\ln\gamma)\gamma^2 \qquad (\gamma \to 0) . \tag{2.160}$$

The coefficient c_2' can be found by means of perturbation theory [38] giving

$$c_2' = -\,\frac{64\pi\zeta(1/2)}{3[\zeta(3/2)]^{5/3}} = 19.7518 , \tag{2.161}$$

while c_1 and c_2 cannot be found by perturbation theory. Numerical Monte Carlo simulations for three dimensional lattice $O(2)$ field theory give $c_1 = 1.32\pm0.02$ [39,40] and $c_1 = 1.29\pm0.05$ [41,42], while $c_2 = 75.7 \pm 0.4$ [38].

Optimized perturbation theory, by introducing control functions into an initial approximation, has been employed in Refs. [43–51].

The problem of Bose-Einstein condensation in a homogeneous Bose gas can be reduced to considering the phase transition in the three-dimensional $O(N)$ scalar field theory with the Euclidean action

$$S[\varphi] = \int \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(\frac{\partial\varphi}{\partial x}\right)^2 + \frac{m^2}{2}\,\varphi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!}\,\varphi^4\right] dx , \tag{2.162}$$

in which

$$\varphi = \varphi(x) = \{\varphi_n(x) : \ n = 1, 2, \ldots, N\} , \qquad x = \{x_\alpha : \ \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, d\} ,$$

with $d = 3$ for three dimensions.

For an initial approximation, one takes the action

$$S_0[\varphi] = \int \left[\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial x} \right)^2 + \frac{\omega^2}{2} \varphi^2 \right] dx , \tag{2.163}$$

with a trial parameter ω. Then the total action can be written as

$$S[\varphi] = S_0[\varphi] + \Delta S , \tag{2.164}$$

where

$$\Delta S \equiv S[\varphi] - S_0[\varphi] = \int \left(\frac{m^2 - \omega^2}{2} \varphi^2 + \frac{\lambda}{4!} \varphi^4 \right) dx . \tag{2.165}$$

Introducing a dummy parameter ε, one defines

$$S[\varphi] = S_0[\varphi] + \varepsilon \Delta S \qquad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 1) . \tag{2.166}$$

The optimization is done with respect to the quantity

$$F_k(\lambda, \omega) \equiv \langle \varphi^2 \rangle_k , \tag{2.167}$$

in which k is a perturbation order with respect to ε. The control functions are defined either by the minimal derivative condition

$$\frac{\partial F_k(\lambda, \omega)}{\partial \omega} = 0 \tag{2.168}$$

or by the minimal difference condition $F_k - F_{k-1} = 0$ both of which give close results [45]. When there arise multiple solutions for ω, one chooses that which provides the better convergence. Thus one finds [44] the coefficients $c_1^{(k)}$ in the order k as $c_1^{(2)} = 3.08$, $c_1^{(3)} = 2.45$, $c_1^{(4)} = 1.48$, while for the coefficient $c_2^{(k)}$ one gets $c_2^{(2)} = 101.4$, $c_2^{(3)} = 98.2$, $c_2^{(4)} = 82.9$. These results show the convergence to the Monte Carlo simulations for the three dimensional lattice $O(2)$ field theory giving $c_1 = 1.32 \pm 0.02$ [39, 40] and $c_1 = 1.29 \pm 0.05$ [41, 42], while $c_2 = 75.7 \pm 0.4$ [38].

It is clear that introducing several control functions allows for the improvement of results. This can be done as follows. First, let us notice that when we pass from action (2.162) to action (2.166), we actually make the replacement

$$m^2 \rightarrow \varepsilon m^2 + (1 - \varepsilon)\omega^2 , \qquad \lambda \rightarrow \varepsilon \lambda . \tag{2.169}$$

It is admissible to introduce one more control function a replacing in the right-hand side of the above substitution ω^2 by

$$\omega^2 \rightarrow [1 + (1 - a)\varepsilon)]\omega^2 , \tag{2.170}$$

with defining the control functions by the conditions

$$\frac{\partial F_k(\lambda,\omega)}{\partial\omega} = 0 \; , \qquad \frac{\partial^2 F_k(\lambda,\omega)}{\partial\omega^2} = 0 \; . \tag{2.171}$$

Similarly, one can introduce, in addition to ω, two control functions a and b through the replacement

$$\omega^2 \rightarrow \left[1 + (1-a)\varepsilon + b\varepsilon^2 \right] \omega^2 \; , \tag{2.172}$$

imposing three optimization conditions

$$\frac{\partial F_k(\lambda,\omega)}{\partial\omega} = 0 \; , \qquad \frac{\partial^2 F_k(\lambda,\omega)}{\partial\omega^2} = 0 \; , \qquad \frac{\partial^3 F_k(\lambda,\omega)}{\partial\omega^3} = 0 \; . \tag{2.173}$$

In this way, for the two-component theory, to the sixth order of optimized perturbation theory, one gets $c_1 = 1.3$ and in the fifth order, $c_2 = 73.46$ [49].

The coefficient c_1 has also been found by Monte Carlo simulations for $N = 1$, being $c_1 = 1.09 \pm 0.09$ and for $N = 4$, being $c_1 = 1.60 \pm 0.10$ [52]. The six-th order optimized perturbation theory gives $c_1 = 1.11$ for $N = 1$ and $c_1 = 1.56$ for $N = 4$ [49].

2.13 Critical Temperature: Reexpansion Trick

The other way to find the coefficient c_1 in the critical temperature shift (2.160) is to consider the loop expansion [53–55]

$$c_1(x) \simeq \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^n \qquad (x \rightarrow 0) \tag{2.174}$$

in powers of the variable

$$x = \frac{\lambda_{eff}}{\mu_{eff}} \, (N+2) \; , \tag{2.175}$$

in which λ_{eff} is the effective interaction parameter and μ_{eff} is the effective chemical potential. The known coefficients a_n can be found in the articles [37, 56].

The difficulty in using the loop expansion is that at the point of the phase transition $\mu_{eff} \rightarrow 0$, hence $x \rightarrow \infty$. That is, we need to find the limit

$$c_1 = \lim_{x\rightarrow\infty} c_1(x) \; . \tag{2.176}$$

As is evident, the asymptotic series (2.174), derived for small $x \rightarrow 0$, has no sense for $x \rightarrow \infty$. But it is necessary to define the effective limit of these series.

In its turn, the coefficient c_2 in shift (2.160) can be written as

$$c_2 = \frac{32\pi\zeta(1/2)}{3[\zeta(3/2)]^{5/3}} \left\{ \ln \frac{[\zeta(3/2)]^{2/3}}{128\pi^2} + \frac{\ln 2}{\sqrt{\pi}} \, \zeta\left(\frac{1}{2}\right) - \frac{\sqrt{\pi} + 0.270166}{\zeta(1/2)} - 1 \right\} +$$

$$+ \frac{7}{4} \, c_1^2 + \frac{8\zeta(1/2)}{[\zeta(3/2)]^{1/3}} \, (3d_2 - 2c_1) \; , \tag{2.177}$$

Table 1: Monte Carlo results for the coefficients c_1 and d_N for a different number of field components N.

N	c_1	d_N
1	1.09± 0.09 [52]	0.898± 0.004 [52]
2	1.32± 0.02 [39]	1.059± 0.001 [40]
	1.29± 0.05 [41]	
4	1.60± 0.10 [52]	1.255± 0.006 [52]

where the loop expansion yields

$$d_N(x) = \frac{1}{x^2}\left(\sum_{n=0}^{7} b_n x^n + b_2' x^2 \ln x \right) , \tag{2.178}$$

with the several first coefficients given explicitly,

$$b_0 = (N+2)A_0 , \qquad b_1 = \frac{N+2}{24\pi}\, A_0 , \qquad b_2 = \frac{1-4\ln 6}{576\pi^2}\, A_0 = -2.393297 ,$$

$$b_2' = \frac{A_0}{288\pi^2} = 0.776158 , \qquad A_0 = \frac{256\pi^3}{[\zeta(3/2)]^{4/3}} = 2206.18611757 ,$$

and the numerical values of the other coefficients can be found in review [37]. Again, at the critical point, the variable $x \to \infty$, so that one has to find

$$d_N = \lim_{x\to\infty} d_N(x) . \tag{2.179}$$

The effective summation of the divergent series has been done [53–55] using the optimized perturbation theory, with introducing control functions by means of the Kleinert reexpansion trick (see Sec. 2.11). The results for c_1 and d_N are close to those calculated by Monte Carlo simulations that are summarized in Table 1. For the coefficient c_2 Monte Carlo calculations give [40] the value $c_2 = 75.7 \pm 0.4$.

2.14 Critical Temperature: Trapped Bosons

Finite quantum systems are often considered as being trapped in an external confining potential [57, 58]. Deep potentials are usually modelled by the harmonic potential

$$U(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{m}{2}\, \left(\omega_x^2 x^2 + \omega_y^2 y^2 + \omega_z^2 z^2 \right) . \tag{2.180}$$

Genuine phase transitions, as a rule, happen only in thermodynamic limit, except some shape transitions [58] and nonequilibrium transitions [59]. For a trapped system, effective thermodynamic limit implies [60, 61] that any extensive observable quantity A_N increases proportionally to the number of particles N in the system,

$$N \to \infty , \qquad A_N \to \infty , \qquad \frac{A_n}{N} \to const . \tag{2.181}$$

For a system trapped in the harmonic potential, this reduces to

$$N \rightarrow \infty , \qquad \omega_0 \rightarrow 0 , \qquad N\omega_0^3 \rightarrow const , \tag{2.182}$$

where

$$\omega_0 \equiv (\omega_x \omega_y \omega_z)^{1/3} . \tag{2.183}$$

In a finite system, there happens not the genuine condensation, but quasi-condensation, although for large N it is hardly distinguishable from the genuine condensation. So, for short, we also call it Bose-Einstein condensation.

The ideal Bose gas condenses at the critical temperature

$$T_0 = \left[\frac{N}{\zeta(3)} \right]^{1/3} \omega_0 . \tag{2.184}$$

The dimensionless interaction parameter is conveniently defined as the ratio

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{a_s}{\lambda_0} \qquad \left(\lambda_0 = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi}{mT_0}} \right) \tag{2.185}$$

of the scattering length to the thermal wavelength at the critical point.

Switching on weak atomic interactions shifts the critical temperature according to the formula

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_0} \simeq \overline{c}_1 \alpha + (\overline{c}_2 + \overline{c}_2' \ln \alpha)\alpha^2 \qquad (\alpha \rightarrow 0) . \tag{2.186}$$

The coefficients $\bar{c}_1$ and $\bar{c}_2'$ can be found from perturbative calculations [62],

$$\overline{c}_1 = -3.426032 , \qquad \overline{c}_2' = -\frac{32\pi\zeta(2)}{3\zeta(3)} = -45.856623 . \tag{2.187}$$

The coefficient $\bar{c}_2$ can be connected to lattice simulations in three-dimensional $O(2)$ field theory [62], resulting in the form

$$\overline{c}_2 = 21.4 - \frac{16\pi\zeta(2)}{3\zeta(3)} \left[\ln(32\pi^3) + 3.522272 \right] + 12\zeta(2) \left[\zeta\left(\frac{3}{2} \right) \right]^{4/3} d_2 , \tag{2.188}$$

with the same d_2 as in (2.178). Invoking the value of $d_2 = 1.059$ from Monte Carlo simulations [40] results in $\bar{c}_2 = -155.0 \pm 0.1$. Calculations of Kastening [55], employing the introduction of control functions through the Kleinert reexpansion give a close result.

2.15 Fluid String

Membranes are frequent structures in different chemical and biological systems. An important class of membranes are the so-called fluid membranes, whose constituent molecules are able to move inside these membranes. The problem of interest is the calculation of the pressure of a membrane between two rigid walls.

The calculational procedure starts with considering soft walls modelled by a smooth potential. The dimensionless pressure $\alpha(x)$ is expressed as a function of the expansion

parameter x and determined by perturbation theory in powers of this parameter. Passing to rigid walls implies the limit $x \to \infty$.

In the one-dimensional case of a fluctuating string between the rigid walls, the problem reduces to finding the ground state energy of a particle moving between hard walls. This problem serves as a touchstone for checking the accuracy of calculational methods, since its exact solution is known. In dimensionless units, the pressure of a string between soft walls reads as

$$\alpha(x) = \frac{\pi^2}{128}\left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{16}{\pi^4 x^2} + \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{1 + \frac{64}{\pi^4 x^2}}\right) . \tag{2.189}$$

From here, it is straightforward to find the limit of hard walls

$$\lim_{x\to\infty} \alpha(x) = \frac{\pi^2}{128} = 0.0771063 . \tag{2.190}$$

By perturbation theory in powers of x, expression (2.189) results in the expansion

$$\alpha(x) \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi^2 x^2}\, f_k(x) \qquad (x \to 0) , \tag{2.191}$$

where

$$f_k(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^n . \tag{2.192}$$

The first several coefficients here are

$$a_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{4} = 2.467401 , \qquad a_2 = \frac{\pi^4}{32} = 3.044034 , \qquad a_3 = \frac{\pi^6}{512} = 1.877713 , \qquad a_4 = 0 ,$$

$$a_5 = -\frac{\pi^{10}}{131072} = -0.7144779 , \qquad a_6 = 0 , \qquad a_7 = \frac{\pi^{14}}{16777216} = 0.5437238 ,$$

$$a_8 = 0 , \qquad a_9 = -\frac{5\pi^{18}}{8589934592} = -0.5172230 , \qquad a_{10} = 0 ,$$

$$a_{11} = \frac{7\pi^{22}}{10995116127776} = 0.5510556 , \qquad a_{12} = 0 ,$$

$$a_{13} = -\frac{21\pi^{26}}{281474976710656} = -0.6290370 , \qquad a_{14} = 0 .$$

At the end, one needs to find the limit

$$\alpha = \lim_{x\to\infty} \alpha(x) . \tag{2.193}$$

Kastening [63] has found the effective limit for $x \to \infty$ for the series (2.192) of sixth order, by introducing control functions through the Kleinert reexpansion. However, he confronted the problem that the consecutive determination of the power q in the change of the variable (see Sec. 2.11) turned out to yield imprecise results. Because of this, the parameter q was fixed by hands. Of course, varying q influences the sought answer. Thus for $q = 1$, he got $\alpha = 0.0769910$, while for $q = 2$, $\alpha = 0.0770973$.

2.16 Fluid Membrane

A two-dimensional fluid membrane between two walls is a problem, similar to that of the fluctuating string. The pressure of the membrane reads as

$$p = \frac{8T^2}{\varkappa L^3}\,\alpha\ ,$$

where T is temperature, $\varkappa$ is bending rigidity, L is the distance between the walls, and α is a dimensionless function that can be found by perturbation theory for the case of soft walls as the expansion

$$\alpha(x) \simeq \frac{1}{8\pi^2 x^2}\, f_k(x) \qquad (x \rightarrow 0)\ , \tag{2.194}$$

with the same form of $f_k(x)$ as in Eq. (2.192), but with the coefficients

$$a_1 = \frac{\pi^2}{4} = 2.467401\ , \qquad a_2 = \frac{\pi^4}{32} = 3.044034\ , \qquad a_3 = 2.092317\ ,$$

$$a_4 = 0.524451\ , \qquad a_5 = -0.675653\ , \qquad a_6 = -1.643210\ .$$

While the case of hard walls corresponds to $x \rightarrow \infty$. So that we need to find the limit (2.193).

Introducing control functions through the Kleinert reexpansion, with fixing the power q, Kastening [63] has found $\alpha = 0.0820175$ for $q = 1$ and $\alpha = 0.0815743$ for $q = 2$. This is a bit larger than the value $\alpha = 0.0798 \pm 0.0003$ obtained by Monte Carlo simulations [64].

2.17 Linear Hamiltonians

The optimized perturbation theory has been applied to many quantum-mechanical problems with linear Hamiltonians. A great number of papers is devoted to the one-dimensional anharmonic oscillator, as in Sec. 2.7, considering its eigenvalues [2, 15–25, 65–68] and wave functions [69].

The three-dimensional spherical anharmonic oscillator, with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\,\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2mr^2} + \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\, r^2 + \lambda m^2 r^4\ , \tag{2.195}$$

where $r \in [0, \infty)$ and $l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$, has also been treated [22, 23, 70], as well as the anharmonic oscillator of arbitrary dimensionality, with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\,\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{2mr^2}\,\left(l + \frac{d-3}{2}\right)\left(l + \frac{d-1}{2}\right) + \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\, r^2 + \lambda m^2 r^4\ , \tag{2.196}$$

where $d = 1, 2, 3, \ldots$ is space dimensionality [71].

Different power-law potentials have been considered, with one-dimensional Hamiltonians [14, 72]

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + Ax^\nu\ , \tag{2.197}$$

spherically symmetric power-law potentials in three dimensions [14, 22, 23, 73–75],

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2mr^2} + Ar^\nu \; , \tag{2.198}$$

and spherically-symmetric Hamiltonians of arbitrary dimensionality [14, 72],

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{2mr^2}\left(l + \frac{d-3}{2}\right)\left(l + \frac{d-1}{2}\right) + Ar^\nu \; . \tag{2.199}$$

Two cases can occur in the power-law potentials, when both A and ν are positive, or when both of them are negative.

Quasistationary states, characterized by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\,x^2 - \lambda m^2 x^4 \; , \tag{2.200}$$

are studied [66, 76–78].

A double-well oscillator, described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{d^2}{dx^2} - \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\,x^2 + \lambda m^2 x^4 \tag{2.201}$$

has been considered [2, 66, 78, 79].

The Hamiltonians with the Yukawa potential [2, 22, 23, 80],

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2mr^2} - \frac{A}{r}\,e^{-\alpha r} \; , \tag{2.202}$$

and with the logarithmic potential [14, 22, 23],

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2m}\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2mr^2} + B\,\ln\,\frac{r}{b} \; , \tag{2.203}$$

have been treated. An interesting point in the case of the Yukawa potential is to find the critical value of α, when no bound states exist [81].

A hydrogen-like atom in an external magnetic field, described by the Hamiltonian [2, 82]

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega_0^2}{2}\,(x^2 + y^2) - \frac{e^2}{r} - \omega_0 L_z \; , \tag{2.204}$$

in which e is the electron charge,

$$L_z = [\mathbf{r} \times \mathbf{p}]_z \; , \qquad \mathbf{p} = -i\nabla \; , \qquad \omega_0 = \frac{eB_0}{2mc} \; ,$$

and in an external electric field, with the Hamiltonian [83]

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} - \frac{e^2}{r} + Az \; , \tag{2.205}$$

have been considered.

A semi-relativistic Schrödinger equation, with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sqrt{-\nabla^2 + m^2} \; + U(r) \; ,$$

in which $U(r)$ is the Cornell potential

$$U(r) = -\frac{A}{r} + Br \; ,$$

and three-body Coulomb systems have also been considered [23]. For the initial approximation, one usually takes a harmonic oscillator or the Coulomb potential. Although one can also take other Hamiltonians, for which exact solutions are available [84, 85].

For a one-dimensional anharmonic oscillator, the related free energy and propagators have been studied [86, 87].

Quite a number of other papers have been devoted to the use of optimized perturbation theory in quantum mechanics. Here some typical examples are given, without the intension of listing all numerous publications.

Optimized perturbation theory yields accurate energy spectra, with a much higher accuracy than other methods, such as quasiclassical approximation. Employing just a couple of perturbative terms, it is straightforward to get accurate expressions of energy levels for all quantum numbers and all coupling (anharmonicity) parameters. Recall that the method of Padé approximants is not applicable at all, when only a couple of terms in an expansion are available.

2.18 Nonlinear Hamiltonians

A system of bosonic atoms in Bose-Einstein condensate is described by the Nonlinear Schrödinger (NLS) equation [35, 36, 61, 88, 89]. For a system of N condensed atoms, interacting through the local interaction potential

$$\Phi(\mathbf{r}) = \Phi_0 \delta(\mathbf{r}) \qquad \left(\Phi_0 \equiv 4\pi \, \frac{a_s}{m} \right) \; , \tag{2.206}$$

where a_s is scattering length, the stationary NLS equation is

$$\hat{H}[\psi]\psi(\mathbf{r}) = E\psi(\mathbf{r}) \; , \tag{2.207}$$

with the nonlinear Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}[\psi] = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + U(\mathbf{r}) + N\Phi_0 |\psi|^2 \; . \tag{2.208}$$

Here the external potential $U(\mathbf{r})$ plays the role of a confining potential trapping the atoms. Usually, it is modeled by a cylindric harmonic potential

$$U(\mathbf{r}) = \frac{m}{2} \, \omega_\perp^2 (x^2 + y^2 + \alpha^2 z^2) \; , \tag{2.209}$$

in which

$$\alpha \equiv \frac{\omega_z}{\omega_\perp} = \left(\frac{l_\perp}{l_z} \right)^2 \tag{2.210}$$

is called aspect ratio, where ω_z and $\omega_\perp$ are the longitudinal and transverse trapping frequencies, respectively, and

$$l_\perp \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{m\omega_\perp}} , \qquad l_z \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{m\omega_z}}$$

are the oscillator lengths.

It is convenient to pass to dimensionless units, defining the dimensionless coupling parameter

$$g \equiv 4\pi \, \frac{a_s}{l_\perp} \, N , \tag{2.211}$$

dimensionless spatial variables

$$r \equiv \frac{\sqrt{x^2 + y^2}}{l_\perp} , \qquad \overline{z} \equiv \frac{z}{l_\perp} , \tag{2.212}$$

and the dimensionless wave function

$$\overline{\psi}(r, \varphi, \overline{z}) \equiv l_\perp^{3/2} \psi(\mathbf{r}) , \tag{2.213}$$

in which φ is a polar angle. With the nonlinear Hamiltonian in units of $\omega_\perp$, the NLS equation reads as

$$\hat{H}[\overline{\psi}_{nmj}]\overline{\psi}_{nmj} = E_{nmj}\overline{\psi}_{nmj} , \tag{2.214}$$

where $n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ is the radial quantum number, $m = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ is the azimuthal quantum number, and $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$ is the axial quantum number. The eigenvalue E_{nmj} is measured in units of $\omega_\perp$.

In what follows, for the simplicity of notations, we omit the bars above z and ψ. Then the dimensionless nonlinear Hamiltonian becomes

$$\hat{H}[\psi] = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \, (r^2 + \alpha^2 z^2) + g|\psi|^2 . \tag{2.215}$$

The ground state, with $n = m = j = 0$ describes the equilibrium Bose-Einstein condensate, while the higher energy levels correspond to coherent topological modes [90–93].

Solving the NLS equation by the optimized perturbation theory, we start with the harmonic oscillator

$$\hat{H}_0[\psi] = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \, (u^2 r^2 + v^2 z^2) , \tag{2.216}$$

in which u and v are control parameters. The zero-order wave function is given by the Hermite-Laguerre modes

$$\psi_{nmj}(r, \varphi, z) = \left[\frac{2n! u^{|m|+1}}{(n + |m|)!} \right]^{1/2} r^{|m|} \exp\left(-\frac{u}{2} \, r^2 \right) L_n^{|m|}(ur^2) \, \frac{e^{im\varphi}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \, \left(\frac{v}{\pi} \right)^{1/4} \times$$

$$\times \, \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^j j!}} \, \exp\left(-\frac{v}{2} \, z^2 \right) H_j(\sqrt{v} \, z) . \tag{2.217}$$

So that the zero-order spectrum is

$$E_{nmj}^{(0)} \equiv E_0(g, u, v) = (2n + |m| + 1)u + \left(\frac{1}{2} + j \right) v . \tag{2.218}$$

The first-order approximation for the energy levels can be written as

$$E^{(1)}_{nmj} \equiv E_1(g,u,v) = \frac{p}{2}\,\left(u + \frac{1}{u}\right) + \frac{q}{4}\,\left(v + \frac{\alpha^2}{v}\right) + u\sqrt{v}\; I_{nmj} g \;, \tag{2.219}$$

where

$$p \equiv 2n + |m| + 1 \;, \qquad q \equiv 2j + 1$$

and

$$I_{nmj} \equiv \frac{1}{u\sqrt{v}} \int |\psi_{nmj}(r,\varphi,z)|^4 \; r \; dr d\varphi dz \;.$$

Control functions can be found from the optimization conditions

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial u}\; E_1(g,u,v) = 0 \;, \qquad \frac{\partial}{\partial v}\; E_1(g,u,v) = 0 \;. \tag{2.220}$$

This gives the equations

$$p\left(1 - \; \frac{1}{u^2}\right) + \frac{J}{\alpha p}\; \sqrt{\frac{v}{q}} = 0 \;, \qquad q\left(1 - \; \frac{\alpha^2}{v^2}\right) + \frac{uJ}{\alpha p\sqrt{vq}} = 0 \;, \tag{2.221}$$

defining the control functions $u = u(g)$ and $v = v(g)$, where

$$J \equiv J_{nmj}(g) = 2\alpha p\sqrt{q}\; I_{nmj} g \;. \tag{2.222}$$

Substituting these control functions into expression (2.219) yields the optimized approximant

$$\tilde{E}_1(g) \equiv E_1(g, u(g), v(g)) \;. \tag{2.223}$$

The found approximant (2.223) is valid for all quantum numbers and for any strength of the coupling parameter g. Keeping in mind that $J \to 0$ together with $g \to 0$, we have for the control functions

$$u \simeq 1 - \; \frac{J}{2p^2\sqrt{\alpha q}} \;, \qquad v \simeq \alpha - \; \frac{\alpha J}{2p^2(\alpha q)^{3/2}} \qquad (J \to 0) \;.$$

Then energy (2.223) behaves as

$$\tilde{E}_1(g) \simeq p + \frac{\alpha q}{2} + \frac{J}{2p\sqrt{\alpha q}} \qquad (J \to 0) \;. \tag{2.224}$$

In the opposite limit, when $J \to \infty$ together with $g \to \infty$, the control functions diminish as

$$u \simeq \frac{p}{J^{2/5}} \;, \qquad v \simeq \frac{\alpha^2 q}{J^{2/5}} \qquad (J \to \infty) \;.$$

In this strong-coupling limit, energy (2.223) tends to

$$\tilde{E}_1(g) \simeq \frac{5}{4}\; J^{2/5} + \frac{2p^2 + (\alpha q)^2}{4}\; J^{-2/5} \qquad (J \to \infty) \;. \tag{2.225}$$

The first term here corresponds to the Thomas-Fermi approximation that is asymptotically exact in the strong-coupling limit.

More information on the use of optimized perturbation theory to the problems with nonlinear Hamiltonians can be found in Refs. [94–97].

2.19 Hamiltonian Envelopes

The general idea in choosing an initial Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ in the optimized perturbation theory is that this Hamiltonian should provide an explicit solution, at the same time modeling the considered Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$. Keeping in mind that the Hamiltonians have the forms

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + V(\mathbf{r}) \; , \qquad \hat{H}_0 = -\frac{\nabla^2}{2m} + V_0(\mathbf{r}) \; , \tag{2.226}$$

in which $V(\mathbf{r})$ and $V_0(\mathbf{r})$ are the corresponding potential energies, it is clear that $\hat{H}_0$ models $\hat{H}$, if the potential $V_0(\mathbf{r})$ in some sense models the potential $V(\mathbf{r})$. However, it is not always possible to have such a potential $V_0(\mathbf{r})$ that would be similar to $V(\mathbf{r})$ and at the same time allowing for an exact solution. To overcome this difficulty, the choice of initial Hamiltonians can be extended by resorting to the method of Hamiltonian envelopes [98].

Recall that if a Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ satisfies the eigenproblem

$$\hat{H}_0 \psi_n = E_n \psi_n \; , \tag{2.227}$$

then a function $h(\hat{H}_0)$ of this Hamiltonian satisfies the eigenproblem

$$h(\hat{H}_0)\psi_n = h(E_n)\psi_n \tag{2.228}$$

with the same eigenfunctions. When the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_0$ is not a good initial choice, then it is possible to find a function $h(\hat{H}_0)$ that could play the role of a better initial Hamiltonian. Therefore, one can consider the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_\varepsilon = h(\hat{H}_0) + \varepsilon[\hat{H} - h(\hat{H}_0)] \qquad (\varepsilon \rightarrow 1) \; , \tag{2.229}$$

with a more appropriate initial approximation and a smaller perturbative term. The function $h(\hat{H}_0)$ can be called the *Hamiltonian envelope*.

The envelope $h(\hat{H}_0)$ models well the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$, provided that the effective potential $h(V_0(\mathbf{r}))$ is of the order of the potential $V(\mathbf{r})$, which can be denoted as the relation

$$h(V_0(\mathbf{r})) \sim V(\mathbf{r}) \; . \tag{2.230}$$

To illustrate how the Hamiltonian envelope can be chosen, let us consider the case of power-law potentials of Sec. 2.17. For the potentials with positive power ν, one can take as $V_0(\mathbf{r})$ the harmonic potential, so that we have

$$V(\mathbf{r}) \propto r^\nu \; , \qquad V_0(\mathbf{r}) \propto r^2 \qquad (\nu > 0) \; . \tag{2.231}$$

To satisfy relation (2.230), we need to have

$$h(V_0(\mathbf{r})) \propto [V_0(\mathbf{r})]^{\nu/2} \propto r^\nu \; .$$

Thence the Hamiltonian envelope should be chosen such that

$$h(\hat{H}_0) \propto (\hat{H}_0)^{\nu/2} \; . \tag{2.232}$$

For the potentials with negative powers, one takes as $V_0(\mathbf{r})$ the Coulomb potential,

$$V(\mathbf{r}) \propto r^{-\nu} , \qquad V_0(\mathbf{r}) \propto r^{-1} \qquad (\nu > 0) . \tag{2.233}$$

Relation (2.230) is valid when

$$h(V_0(\mathbf{r})) \propto [V_0(\mathbf{r})]^{\nu} \propto r^{-\nu} .$$

Hence the Hamiltonian envelope is to be such that

$$h(\hat{H}_0) \propto (\hat{H}_0)^{\nu} . \tag{2.234}$$

2.20 Magnetic Systems

Optimized perturbation theory can be applied to any system. The present section demonstrates its application to the two-dimensional Ising model, whose Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j - B_0 \sum_j \sigma_j , \tag{2.235}$$

in which $J > 0$, the notation $\langle ij \rangle$ implies the nearest neighbors, and $\sigma_i = \pm 1$, with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, N_L$. Introducing the dimensionless coupling parameter g and magnetic field h_0 as

$$g \equiv \beta J , \qquad h_0 \equiv \beta B_0 , \tag{2.236}$$

where β is inverse temperature, we have the partition function

$$Z = \mathrm{Tr} e^{-\beta \hat{H}} = \mathrm{Tr} \exp \left(-g \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j - h_0 \sum_j \sigma_j \right) . \tag{2.237}$$

The free energy per site is

$$f(g, h_0) \equiv - \frac{1}{N_L} \ln Z . \tag{2.238}$$

And the dimensionless magnetization is defined as

$$m(g, h_0) \equiv - \frac{\partial f(g, h_0)}{\partial h_0} . \tag{2.239}$$

The initial Hamiltonian can be chosen, following Ref. [99], as

$$\hat{H}_0 = -B \sum_j \sigma_j , \tag{2.240}$$

with a control parameter B. Then for the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_\varepsilon = \hat{H}_0 + \varepsilon(\hat{H} - \hat{H}_0) \qquad (\varepsilon \to 1) , \tag{2.241}$$

we have

$$\hat{H}_\varepsilon = -\varepsilon J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j - [B + \varepsilon(B_0 - B)] \sum_j \sigma_j . \tag{2.242}$$

This shows that passing form $\hat{H}$ to $\hat{H}_\varepsilon$ is equivalent to the replacement

$$J \to \varepsilon J \; , B_0 \to B + \varepsilon(B_0 - B) \; , \tag{2.243}$$

or, in dimensionless units, to the replacement

$$g \to \varepsilon g \; , \qquad h_0 \to h + \varepsilon(h_0 - h) \; , \tag{2.244}$$

where

$$h \equiv \beta B \; . \tag{2.245}$$

Therefore, it is possible to use the reexpansion trick, as described in Sec. 2.10. To this end, we can derive an expansion of free energy (2.238) in powers of g, after which to invoke replacement (2.244). The weak-coupling expansion of free energy (2.238) reads as

$$f_k(g, h_0) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_n(h_0) g^n \; , \tag{2.246}$$

with the coefficients

$$c_0 = -\ln(2\cosh h_0) \; , \qquad c_1 = -2t_0^2 \; , \qquad c_2 = -1 - 6t_0^2 + 7t_0^4 \; ,$$

$$c_3 = -\frac{52}{3}\, t_0^2 + 56 t_0^4 - \frac{116}{3}\, t_0^6 \; , \qquad c_4 = -\frac{5}{6} - 46 t_0^2 + \frac{937}{3}\, t_0^4 - 526 t_0^6 + \frac{521}{2}\, t_0^8 \; ,$$

where

$$t_0 = \tanh(h_0) \; . \tag{2.247}$$

The free energy

$$f_\varepsilon(g, h_0, h) \equiv -\frac{1}{N_L}\, \ln \mathrm{Tr} \exp(-\beta \hat{H}_\varepsilon) \tag{2.248}$$

is obtained from expression (2.238 by making replacement (2.244),

$$f_\varepsilon(g, h_0, h) = f(\varepsilon g, h + \varepsilon(h_0 - h)) \; . \tag{2.249}$$

Accomplishing the reexpansion in powers of ε in sum (2.246), we have

$$f_k(\varepsilon g, h + \varepsilon(h_0 - h)) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_n(h + \varepsilon(h_0 - h))(\varepsilon g)^n \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(g, h_0, h)\varepsilon^n \; . \tag{2.250}$$

Setting here $\varepsilon = 1$, we get

$$F_k(g, h_0, h) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(g, h_0, h) \; . \tag{2.251}$$

Thus, in the first two approximations, we find

$$F_0(g, h_0, h) = -\ln[2\cosh(h)] \; , \qquad F_1(g, h_0, h) = F_0(g, h_0, h) + t(h - h_0) - 2t^2 g \; , \tag{2.252}$$

where

$$t \equiv \tanh(h) \; . \tag{2.253}$$

The related magnetization

$$M_k(g,h_0,h) \equiv -\frac{\partial F_k(g,h_0,h)}{\partial h_0} \; , \tag{2.254}$$

becomes

$$M_0(g,h_0,h) = t \; , \qquad M_1(g,h_0,h) = t + (t^2-1)(h-h_0) + 4t(1-t^2)g \; . \tag{2.255}$$

Control functions $h_k(g,h_0)$ are found from the optimization condition

$$\frac{\partial^2 F_k(g,h_0,h)}{\partial h_k^2} = 0 \; , \qquad h_k = h_k(g,h_0) \; . \tag{2.256}$$

This gives the optimized approximant for the free energy

$$\tilde{f}_k(g,h_0) = F_k(g,h_0,h_k(g,h_0)) \; . \tag{2.257}$$

Condition (2.256) is valid for all g, including the critical value g_c, where external magnetic fields are zero. Hence the critical g_c can be found from the condition

$$\lim_{h\rightarrow 0} \frac{\partial^2 F_k(g,0,h)}{\partial h^2} = 0 \; . \tag{2.258}$$

In the fourth order, this yields $g_c = 0.37681$ [99], which is close to the known exact value

$$g_c = \frac{1}{2}\; \ln(1+\sqrt{2}) = 0.44067 \; .$$

It is important to stress that the reexpansion trick leads to reasonable results, provided the reexpansion is motivated by the choice of an initial Hamiltonian, as is explained in Sec. 2.10. If the reexpansion is arbitrary, but not induced by initial conditions, it may result in inappropriate conclusions. To illustrate this, let us consider the free energy (2.238) as a function of the variables

$$\lambda \equiv e^{-4g} \; , \qquad x \equiv e^{-2h_0} \; . \tag{2.259}$$

And let us examine the strong-field expansion

$$f_k(x,\lambda) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} d_n(\lambda) x^n \; . \tag{2.260}$$

To fourth order, this reads as

$$f_4(x,\lambda) = \frac{1}{2}\; \ln(\lambda x) - \lambda^2 x - 2\left(1 - \frac{5}{4}\;\lambda\right)\lambda^3 x^2 -$$

$$-6\left(1 - \frac{8}{3}\;\lambda + \frac{31}{18}\;\lambda^2\right)\lambda^4 x^3 - \left(1 + 18\lambda - 85\lambda^2 + 96\lambda^3 - \frac{121}{4}\;\lambda^4\right)\lambda^4 x^4 \; .$$

If we make here the replacement

$$x \rightarrow \varepsilon x \; , \qquad \lambda \rightarrow u + \varepsilon(\lambda - u) \; ,$$

that is not motivated by initial conditions, and follow the same way as in the case of the initial-condition induced replacement (2.244), then we come to the conclusion that there is no critical g_c, that is, there is no phase transition [99].

2.21 Field-Theory Models

Optimized perturbation theory has been used for considering several field-theory models. Among them: the $O(N)$- symmetric φ^4 theory [51, 100–110], charged scalar field in an external field [111], Walecka nuclear-matter model [112], massive Schwinger model on a lattice [113], $U(2)$ theory on a lattice [114], and Gross-Neveu model [115–119]. Note that the so-called screened perturbation theory and hard-thermal-loop resummation, used in field theory are just variants of optimized perturbation theory [120].

Optimized perturbation theory has been applied as well in quantum electrodynamics and quantum chromodynamics [121–128].

The choice of scheme and scale parameters in renormalization group [129–133] can also be treated as an application of optimized perturbation theory, where the scheme and scale parameters play the role of control functions [134].

Optimized perturbation theory can be combined with renormalization group providing fast convergent scale invariant sequence of optimized approximants [135–137]. For example, considering a field theory with mass m and coupling parameter g, it is possible to use the reexpansion trick described in Secs. 2.10 and 2.11. This can be accomplished as follows. Starting with an initial Lagrangian, one introduces mass, coupling, and vacuum energy counterterms canceling the original divergences. This renormalization defines the running coupling parameter $g(\mu)$ as a function of an arbitrary renormalization scale μ, usually appearing in the process of dimensional regularization in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme. Then, for a quantity of interest, one can employ the usual perturbation theory in powers of g getting an expansion

$$f_k(g,\mu,m) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_n(\mu,m) g^n \; . \tag{2.261}$$

This is reorganized by means of the substitution

$$m^2 \to (1-\varepsilon)^{2a} m^2 \; , \qquad g \to \varepsilon g \; , \tag{2.262}$$

keeping in mind that m represents a control parameter. The value of a is fixed by the condition of preserving the renormalization group invariance. Then one reexpands the studied quantity in powers of the dummy parameter ε,

$$f_k(\varepsilon g, \mu, (1-\varepsilon)^a m) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(g,\mu,m)\varepsilon^n \; . \tag{2.263}$$

Setting here $\varepsilon = 1$, one obtains

$$F_k(g,\mu,m) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(g,\mu,m) \; . \tag{2.264}$$

The standard renormalization group equation reads as

$$\mu \, \frac{d}{d\mu} \, F_k(g,\mu,m) = 0 \; , \tag{2.265}$$

where the renormalization group operator is

$$\mu \frac{d}{d\mu} \equiv \mu \frac{\partial}{\partial\mu} + \beta(g) \frac{\partial}{\partial g} - \gamma(g) m \frac{\partial}{\partial m} . \tag{2.266}$$

The control parameter m is to be turned into a control function by an optimization condition. For instance, we can accept the minimal derivative condition

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m} F_k(g, \mu, m) = 0 , \tag{2.267}$$

as a result of which the renormalization group equation simplifies to

$$\left(\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial\mu} + \beta(g) \frac{\partial}{\partial g} \right) F_k(g, \mu, m) = 0 . \tag{2.268}$$

Equations (2.267) and (2.268) define the control functions

$$g_k = g_k(\mu) , \qquad m_k = m_k(\mu) . \tag{2.269}$$

So that the optimized approximant becomes

$$\tilde{f}_k(\mu) \equiv F_k(g_k(\mu), \mu, m_k(\mu)) . \tag{2.270}$$

The renormalization scale is often chosen as $\mu = 2\pi T$ to avoid the logarithmic terms $\ln(\mu/2\pi T)$ coming from remnant scale dependence. This method was used for considering the $O(N)$- symmetric φ^4 theory, a three-color Nambu-Jona-Lasinio model, and quantum chromodynamics [138–142].

3 Self-Similar Approximation Theory

Despite very wide and successful application of Optimized Perturbation Theory, some questions have remained:

(I) Is it possible to improve the accuracy of the optimized approximants within the given number of perturbative terms?

(II) How to select the best way of introducing control functions, when there are several such ways, but the exact solution is not known?

(III) How to prove the stability of a calculational procedure, if the exact solution of the considered problem is not available, hence the accuracy of approximants cannot be defined by the direct comparison with the exact solution?

(IV) When the asymptotic behaviour of a sought function is known at the boundaries of an interval, what is the best explicit analytical interpolation of the function between these two limits?

(V) When the asymptotic behaviour of a function is known only at one boundary, what is the best explicit analytical extrapolation of the function to its whole domain?

The answers to these questions have been given by Self-Similar Approximation Theory advanced in Refs. [143–150].

3.1 Approximation Cascade

The main idea of self-similar approximation theory is to reformulate perturbation theory in terms of dynamical theory, treating the approximation order as discrete time, so that the approximation sequence be isomorphic to the trajectory of a discrete-time dynamical system, called cascade. Then the effective limit of the perturbative sequence corresponds to a fixed point of the cascade. Analyzing the stability of the constructed dynamical system gives information on the stability of the calculational procedure. Reformulating perturbation theory to the language of dynamical theory makes it straightforward to invoke the rich mathematical techniques of the latter [151–153].

At the first step, we follow the idea of optimized perturbation theory by reorganizing a perturbative sequence of terms $f_k(x)$ to a sequence of terms $F_k(x,u)$ through incorporating control parameters u. Introducing, instead of the parameters u, control functions $u_k = u_k(x)$, as is explained in the previous Chapter, we obtain optimized approximants

$$\widetilde{f}_k(x) = F_k(x, u_k(x)) \; .$$

Then we define an *expansion function* $x_k(f)$ by the reonomic constraint

$$F_0(x, u_k(x)) = f \; , \qquad x = x_k(f) \; , \tag{3.1}$$

whose inverse is

$$x_k(F_0(x, u_k(x))) = x \; . \tag{3.2}$$

The endomorphism

$$y_k(f) \equiv \widetilde{f}_k(x_k(f)) \tag{3.3}$$

acts in the range of all possible values of f composing a measurable space. From this definition it follows that

$$y_k(F_0(x, u_k(x))) = \widetilde{f}_k(x) \; , \tag{3.4}$$

and the initial condition, with respect to the varying k, is

$$y_0(f) = f \; . \tag{3.5}$$

By this construction, the sequence of the approximants $\{\tilde{f}_k(x)\}$ is bijective to the sequence of the endomorphisms $\{y_k(f)\}$.

Because the sequences $\{\tilde{f}_k(x)\}$ and $\{y_k(f)\}$ are bijective, they converge together. If a limit $\tilde{f}(x)$ of the sequence $\{\tilde{f}_k(x)\}$ exists, then a limit $y^*(f)$ of the sequence of the endomorphisms, corresponding to $\tilde{f}(x)$ also exists. The sequence $\{y_k(f)\}$ satisfies the Cauchy criterion following from Eq. (2.11): For any $\varepsilon > 0$, there exists a number n_ε, such that

$$|y_{k+p}(f) - y_k(f)| < \varepsilon \; ,$$

for all $k \geq n_\varepsilon$ and $p \geq 0$. The limit of a sequence of endomorphisms is an attractive fixed point, for which

$$y_k(y^*(f)) = y^*(f) \; . \tag{3.6}$$

In the vicinity of a fixed point, the endomorphism enjoys the property of *functional self-similarity* [143, 144, 147, 149, 150, 154, 155]

$$y_{k+p}(f) = y_k(y_p(f)) \; , \tag{3.7}$$

which is easy to check noticing that relation (3.7) reduces to the identity $y^*(f) = y^*(f)$, when $f \to y^*(f)$. Functional self-similarity [156] is a generalization of scale self-similarity [157].

The property of self-similarity is equivalent to the semigroup property

$$y_k \cdot y_p = y_{k+p} \; , \qquad y_0 = 1 \; .$$

The semigroup of endomorphisms, with discrete time, forms a dynamical system in discrete time, termed cascade [158, 159]. In the present case, the semigroup of endomorphisms

$$\{y_k : \; \mathbb{Z}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\} \tag{3.8}$$

is called *approximation cascade*, since its trajectory is bijective with the approximation sequence,

$$\{y_k(f) : \; k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \longleftrightarrow \{\widetilde{f}_k(x) : \; k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \; . \tag{3.9}$$

Summarizing, a sequence of the approximants $F_k(x, u)$, with introduced control parameters u, can be transformed into a sequence of endomorphisms. Assuming the existence of a fixed point, the sequence of these endomorphisms exhibits the property of self-similarity, which results in a dynamical system in discrete time, whose role is played by the approximation order k. This dynamical system is named approximation cascade. The trajectory of the cascade, by construction, is bijective with the approximation sequence. And the fixed point of the cascade is isomorphic to the sought function $f(x)$. Hence, to find the latter, one needs to study the evolution of the cascade for defining its fixed point. Being limited by a finite number of perturbative terms, usually we can find only an approximate fixed point $y_k^*(f)$. Respectively, the latter yields a self-similar approximant $f_k^*(x)$ for the sought function, so that

$$f_k^*(x) \equiv y_k^*(F_0(x, u_k(x))) \; . \tag{3.10}$$

Note that, in addition to, or instead of control functions defined by optimization conditions, it is possible to introduce control functions prescribed by asymptotic conditions, as will be shown in the following sections.

3.2 Approximation Flow

It is more convenient to deal with a dynamical system in continuous time then with a system in discrete time. To pass to a system in continuous time, we embed the approximation cascade into a flow,

$$\{y_k(f) : \; k \in \mathbb{Z}_+\} \subset \{y(t, f) : \; t \in \mathbb{R}_+\} \; . \tag{3.11}$$

The flow is a semigroup of endomorphisms, transforming a measurable space into itself,

$$\{y(t, f) : \; \mathbb{R}_+ \times \mathbb{R} \to \mathbb{R}\} \; , \tag{3.12}$$

and satisfying the semigroup property, that is, the same self-similarity relation

$$y(t + t', f) = y(t, y(t', f)) \; . \tag{3.13}$$

And embedding requires that the trajectory of the flow passes through all points of the cascade trajectory,

$$y(t, f) = y_k(f) \qquad (t = k) \; . \tag{3.14}$$

Thus the flow, embedding the approximation cascade, can be called the approximation flow.

For a dynamical system in continuous time, with the self-similarity relation (3.13), it is possible to write the Lie equation

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t}\, y(t,f) = v(y(t,f)) \; , \tag{3.15}$$

with the velocity field

$$v(y(t,f)) = \lim_{\tau\to 0} \frac{\partial}{\partial \tau}\, y(\tau, y(t,f)) \; . \tag{3.16}$$

The Lie evolution equation can be integrated between a point $y_k = y_k(f)$ of the approximation cascade and an approximate fixed point $y_k^* = y_k^*(f)$ that can be termed a quasi-fixed point. The integration gives the evolution integral

$$\int_{y_k}^{y_k^*} \frac{dy}{v(y)} = t_k \; , \tag{3.17}$$

where t_k is the effective time needed for moving from the point y_k to the point y_k^*. The motion time t_k is defined by additional conditions, e.g., from asymptotic conditions. The velocity in the interval between y_k and y_k^* is given by the cascade velocity v_k.

By the construction in the previous section, the cascade trajectory point $y_k(f)$ corresponds to the approximant $\tilde{f}_k(x)$, while the quasi-fixed point $y_k^*(f)$, to a self-similar approximant $f_k^*(x)$. Therefore the evolution integral can be rewritten as

$$\int_{\tilde{f}_k}^{f_k^*} \frac{df}{v_k(f)} = t_k \; , \tag{3.18}$$

with $\tilde{f}_k = \tilde{f}_k(x)$ and $f_k^* = f_k^*(x)$.

If the cascade velocity were zero, then the self-similar approximant $f_k^*(x)$ would coincide with the approximant $\tilde{f}_k(x)$. But generally, the cascade velocity can be defined by the finite difference

$$v_k(f) = y_{k+1}(f) - y_k(f) \; , \tag{3.19}$$

which is equivalent to the difference

$$v_k(f) = F_{k+1}(x_{k+1}, u_{k+1}) - F_k(x_k, u_k) \; , \tag{3.20}$$

in which $x_k = x_k(f)$ and $u_k = u_k(x_k)$. To reach faster the quasi-fixed point, the cascade velocity is to be as small as possible, which can be achieved by choosing the appropriate control functions. Thus we come to the minimization condition

$$\min_u \left| F_{k+1}(x_{k+1}, u_{k+1}) - F_k(x_k, u_k) \right| \; . \tag{3.21}$$

This is nothing but the fastest convergence criterion (2.12) of Sec 2.2. Using here the expansion of $F_{k+1}(x_{k+1}, u_{k+1})$ of Sec. 2.2 and limiting ourselves by the first order, we get the cascade velocity

$$v_k(f) = F_{k+1}(x_k, u_k) - F_k(x_k, u_k) + (u_{k+1} - u_k)\, \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k}\, F_k(x_k, u_k) \; . \tag{3.22}$$

Defying the control functions from the optimization condition

$$(u_{k+1} - u_k) \frac{\partial}{\partial u_k} F_k(x_k, u_k) = 0 \; , \tag{3.23}$$

we obtain the velocity

$$v_k(f) = F_{k+1}(x_k, u_k) - F_k(x_k, u_k) \; . \tag{3.24}$$

Note that the cascade velocity could be defined by the Euler discretization of the evolution equation (3.15) yielding either Eq. (3.19) or

$$v_k(f) = y_k(f) - y_{k-1}(f) \; ,$$

with control functions given by some of the optimization conditions of Secs. 2.2 and 2.3.

3.3 Stability Analysis

For a dynamical system, we can accomplish its stability analysis, which in our case is equivalent to studying the stability of the calculational procedure in the corresponding approximation theory [12–14, 27, 150, 155, 160–162].

The stability of a cascade is characterized by the local map multipliers

$$\mu_k(f) \equiv \frac{\delta y_k(f)}{\delta y_0(f)} = \frac{\partial y_k(f)}{\partial f} \tag{3.25}$$

and the maximal map multipliers

$$\mu_k \equiv \sup_f |\mu_k(f)| \; , \tag{3.26}$$

where the supremum is taken with respect to the whole range of $\tilde{f}_k(x)$. The stability of the quasi-fixed points is described by the local map multipliers

$$\mu_k^*(f) \equiv \frac{\delta y_k^*(f)}{\delta y_0^*(f)} \tag{3.27}$$

and the maximal map multiplier

$$\mu_k^* \equiv \sup_f |\mu_k^*(f)| \; , \tag{3.28}$$

with the supremum over the whole range of $f_k^*(x)$. The corresponding conditions of local stability are

$$|\mu_k(f)| < 1 \; , \qquad \mu_k < 1 \; , \tag{3.29}$$

and

$$|\mu_k^*(f)| < 1 \; , \qquad \mu_k^* < 1 \; . \tag{3.30}$$

When a multiplier equals one, this corresponds to neutral stability.

Equivalently, we can define the local map multipliers

$$m_k(x) \equiv \frac{\delta \widetilde{f}_k(x)}{\delta \widetilde{f}_0(x)} = \mu_k(F_0(x, u_k(x)) \tag{3.31}$$

and the maximal map multipliers

$$m_k \equiv \sup_x |m_k(x)| \; , \tag{3.32}$$

with the supremum over the whole domain of x. And the stability of the quasi-fixed points is defined by the local multipliers

$$m_k^*(x) \equiv \frac{\delta f_k^*(x)}{\delta f_0^*(x)} \tag{3.33}$$

and the maximal multipliers

$$m_k^* \equiv \sup_x |m_k^*(x)| \; , \tag{3.34}$$

with the supremum over the domain of x. Under $f_0^*(x)$ we mean here the first nontrivial approximant, since the zero, in the direct sense, self-similar approximant maybe not defined. Respectively, the conditions of local stability are

$$|m_k(x)| < 1 \; , \qquad m_k < 1 \tag{3.35}$$

and

$$|m_k^*(x)| < 1 \; , \qquad m_k^* < 1 \; . \tag{3.36}$$

The above multipliers characterize stability, with respect to the variation of initial conditions, at a k-th step of the calculational procedure. It is also possible to introduce the ultralocal multipliers

$$\overline{\mu}_k(f) \equiv \frac{\delta y_k(f)}{\delta y_{k-1}(f)} = \frac{\mu_k(f)}{\mu_{k-1}(f)} \tag{3.37}$$

and maximal ultralocal multipliers

$$\overline{\mu}_k \equiv \sup_f |\overline{\mu}_k(f)| \; , \tag{3.38}$$

characterizing the stability at a k-th step with respect to the variation of the previous step. Respectively, the images of these ultralocal multipliers are

$$\overline{m}_k(x) \equiv \frac{\delta \widetilde{f}_k(x)}{\delta \widetilde{f}_{k-1}(x)} = \frac{m_k(x)}{m_{k-1}(x)} = \overline{\mu}_k(F_0(x, u_k(x))) \tag{3.39}$$

and the maximal ultralocal multiplier

$$\overline{m}_k \equiv \sup_x |\overline{m}_k(x)| \; . \tag{3.40}$$

The procedure is ultralocally stable if either

$$|\overline{\mu}_k(f)| < 1 \; , \qquad \overline{\mu}_k < 1 \; , \tag{3.41}$$

or

$$|\overline{m}_k(x)| < 1 \; , \qquad \overline{m}_k < 1 \; . \tag{3.42}$$

Finally, we can define the ultralocal multipliers in the vicinity of quasi-fixed points,

$$\overline{\mu}_k^*(f) \equiv \frac{\delta y_k^*(f)}{\delta y_{k-1}^*(f)} = \frac{\mu_k^*(f)}{\mu_{k-1}^*(f)} \tag{3.43}$$

and the related maximal multipliers

$$\overline{\mu}_k^* \equiv \sup_f |\overline{\mu}_k^*(f)| \; . \tag{3.44}$$

The images of these multipliers are

$$\overline{m}_k^*(x) = \frac{\delta f_k^*(x)}{\delta f_{k-1}^*(x)} = \frac{m_k^*(x)}{m_{k-1}^*(x)} = \overline{\mu}_k^*(F_0(x, u_k(x))) \tag{3.45}$$

and

$$\overline{m}_k^* \equiv \sup_x |\overline{m}_k^*(x)| \; . \tag{3.46}$$

The corresponding stability conditions are either

$$|\overline{\mu}_k^*(f)| < 1 \; , \qquad \overline{\mu}_k^* < 1 \; , \tag{3.47}$$

or

$$|\overline{m}_k^*(x)| < 1 \; , \qquad \overline{m}_k^* < 1 \; . \tag{3.48}$$

It is also possible to introduce the local Lyapunov exponents

$$\lambda_k(f) \equiv \frac{1}{k} \; \ln |\mu_k(f)| \; . \tag{3.49}$$

Then the local stability requires that $\lambda_k(f) < 0$. Considering the variation

$$\delta y_k(f) = y_k(f + \delta f) - y_k(f) \simeq \mu_k(f) \delta f$$

for a small δf, one sees that the local stability implies the exponential stability, since

$$|\delta y_k(f)| \simeq |\delta f| \exp\{\lambda_k(f) k\} \; .$$

In rough words, one can say that when $\lambda_k(f) < 0$, there is exponential convergence.

A dynamical system not necessarily enjoys the existence of an attractive fixed point, but may possess other kinds of attractors or repellers, including chaotic attractors, periodic or quasi-periodic orbits, and like that [163–165]. If a dynamical system exhibits unstable motion, then its points of the trajectory may fluctuate without approaching a limit. However convergence on average may exist, when the effective limit is defined as an ergodic average [166]. If such a case happens for an approximation cascade, then the resulting approximants should be understood in the sense of the ergodic average

$$\overline{f}_k(x) \equiv \frac{1}{k} \sum_{n=1}^{k} f_n^*(x) \; . \tag{3.50}$$

3.4 Free Energy

Self-similar approximation theory has been applied to solving numerous problems. In the present review, we illustrate its application just for several typical cases. One such a typical case is the zero-dimensional φ^4 theory, with the partition function (2.34). We calculate the free energy

$$f(g) = -\ln Z(g) \; . \tag{3.51}$$

Details of the procedure can be found in Refs. [14, 167, 168].

At the first step, we have to introduce control functions, which we can accomplish as has been done in Secs. 2.5 and 2.6, starting from the initial approximating Hamiltonian (2.61). Then we follow the approach described in the previous sections.

The equation defining an expansion function (3.1) now reads as

$$F_0(g, \omega_k(g)) = f \; , \qquad g = g_k(f) \; , \tag{3.52}$$

which is equivalent to the equality

$$\ln \omega_k(g) = f \; .$$

The control functions $\omega_k(g)$ are defined by condition (3.23), as in Sec. 2.6, which results in the expansion function

$$g_k(f) = \frac{e^{2f}}{3s_k} \left(e^{2f} - 1 \right) \; , \tag{3.53}$$

where s_k are given in Sec. 2.6.

The endomorphism (3.3) takes the form

$$y_k(f) = f + \sum_{n=1}^{k} A_{kn} \alpha^n(f) \; , \tag{3.54}$$

where

$$A_{kn} = \sum_{m=0}^{n} \frac{C_{nm}}{s_k^m} \qquad (n \leq k)$$

and

$$\alpha(f) \equiv 1 - e^{-2f} \; .$$

The coefficients A_{kn} are as follows: In first order,

$$A_{11} = -\frac{1}{4} \qquad (k = 1) \; .$$

In second order,

$$A_{21} = -\frac{1}{4} \; , \qquad A_{22} = -\frac{1}{12} \qquad (k = 2) \; .$$

In third order,

$$A_{31} = -0.388377 \; , \qquad A_{32} = -0.093205 \; , \qquad A_{33} = -0.016011 \qquad (k = 3) \; .$$

And in fourth order,

$$A_{41} = A_{31} \; , \qquad A_{42} = A_{32} \; , \qquad A_{43} = A_{33} \; , \qquad A_{44} = -0.003606 \qquad (k = 4) \; .$$

The cascade velocity (3.24) reads as

$$v_k(f) = B_k \alpha^{k+1}(f) \qquad (B_k \equiv A_{k+1,k+1}) \; . \tag{3.55}$$

By introducing the notations

$$f_k^*(g) \equiv \ln \sqrt{1 + z_k^*(g)} \; , \qquad f_k(g) \equiv \ln \sqrt{1 + z_k(g)} \; , \tag{3.56}$$

the evolution integral (3.18) can be written as

$$\int_{z_k}^{z_k^*} \frac{(1+z)^k}{z^{k+1}} \, dz = 2B_k t_k \; , \tag{3.57}$$

where $z_k = z_k(g)$ and $z_k^* = z_k^*(g)$. After integrating, we get the expression

$$z_k^* = z_k \exp\left\{ P_k\left(\frac{1}{z_k^*}\right) - P_k\left(\frac{1}{z_k}\right) + 2B_k t_k \right\} \; , \tag{3.58}$$

in which

$$P_k(x) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{k-1} C_k^n \, \frac{x^{k-n}}{k-n} \; , \qquad C_k^n \equiv \frac{k!}{(k-n)!n!} \; .$$

The map multiplier (3.25) is

$$\mu_k(f) = 1 + 2[1 - \alpha(f)] \sum_{n=1}^{k} n A_{kn} \alpha^{n-1}(f) \; . \tag{3.59}$$

For $g \in [0, \infty)$, the function $f_k(g)$ is in the range $[0, \infty)$ and $\alpha(f) \in [0, 1]$. Then the maximal multiplier (3.26) is smaller than unity, $\mu_k < 1$. This means that the procedure is stable and we can set $t_k = 1$.

The accuracy of the procedure is characterized by the percentage errors

$$\varepsilon_k^*(g) \equiv \left[\frac{f_k^*(g)}{f(g)} \; - \; 1 \right] \times 100\% \tag{3.60}$$

and the maximal percentage error

$$\varepsilon_k^* \equiv \sup_g |\varepsilon_k^*(g)| \; . \tag{3.61}$$

We find

$$\varepsilon_1^* = 3\% \; , \qquad \varepsilon_2^* = 2\% \; , \qquad \varepsilon_3^* = 0.1\% \; .$$

Comparing with the optimized approximants of Sec. 2.6, we see that $\varepsilon_k^* < \varepsilon_k$.

3.5 Eigenvalue Problem

As a typical example of an eigenvalue problem (2.70), let us consider the anharmonic oscillator of Sec. 2.7. We are looking for the energy levels

$$E_{kn}(g,\omega) = \left(n + \frac{1}{2} \right) F_k(g,\omega) \; , \tag{3.62}$$

where the index n enumerates the levels. Here we show the main steps of calculations, while the details can be found in Refs. [14, 25, 162, 169, 170].

The expansion function follows from the equation

$$F_0(g,\omega_k(g)) = f \; , \qquad g = g_k(f) \; , \tag{3.63}$$

giving

$$\omega_k(g) = f \; .$$

Control functions are defined as in Sec. 2.7, being the solutions to the equation

$$\omega_k^3 - \omega_k - 6\gamma\lambda_k g = 0 \; , \tag{3.64}$$

in which $\lambda_1 = 1$, $\lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda$, with λ given by equations (2.94) and (2.95).

Then the expansion function becomes

$$g_k(f) = \frac{f(f^2-1)}{6\gamma\lambda_k} \; . \tag{3.65}$$

And the cascade velocity (3.24) is

$$v_k(f) = C_k f \left(1 - \frac{1}{f^2} \right)^{k+1} \; , \tag{3.66}$$

where

$$C_0 = -\frac{A_{10}}{2^2} \; , \qquad C_1 = -\frac{A_{11}}{2^3} \; , \qquad C_2 = -\frac{A_{32}}{2^4} \; , \qquad C_3 = -\frac{A_{33}}{2^5} \; .$$

The evolution integral, setting $t_k = 1$, reads as

$$\int_{f_k}^{f_k^*} \frac{f^{2k+1}}{(f^2-1)^{k+1}} \, df = C_k \; . \tag{3.67}$$

Using the notations

$$f_k^*(g) \equiv \sqrt{1 + z_k^*(g)} \; , \qquad f_k(g) \equiv \sqrt{1 + z_k(g)} \; ,$$

we obtain

$$z_k^* = z_k \exp\left\{ P_k\left(\frac{1}{z_k^*} \right) - P_k\left(\frac{1}{z_k} \right) + 2C_k \right\} \; , \tag{3.68}$$

where the polynomial $P_k(x)$ is defined in the previous Sec. 3.4.

The endomorphism

$$y_k(f) = F_k(g_k(f), \omega_k(g_k(f)) = \widetilde{f}_k(g_k(f))$$

takes the form

$$y_k(f) = f + f \sum_{j=1}^{k} C_{j-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{f^2} \right)^j \; . \tag{3.69}$$

The local map multipliers are

$$\mu_k(f) = \frac{\partial y_k(f)}{\partial f} = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{k} C_{j-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{f^2} \right)^{j-1} \left(1 - \frac{1-2j}{f^2} \right) \; . \tag{3.70}$$

For all $f \in [1, \infty)$ and any n, we have $\mu_k < 1$, hence the procedure is stable. But ultralocal multipliers (3.37) for some energy levels become larger then one, because of which the numerical convergence is not monotonic. The related maximal errors are

$$\varepsilon_1^* = 0.4\% \; , \qquad \varepsilon_2^* = 0.4\% \; , \qquad \varepsilon_3^* = 0.65\% \; .$$

Nevertheless, for all considered k, the accuracy of the self-similar approximants is better than that of the optimized approximants of Sec. 2.7, since $\varepsilon_k^* < \varepsilon_k$.

Several other eigenvalue problems have been treated employing the self-similar approximation theory, as in the present section. Among them: the three-dimensional spherical anharmonic oscillator, with Hamiltonian (2.195) [70], the anharmonic oscillator of arbitrary dimensionality, with Hamiltonian (2.196) [71], power-law potentials, with one-dimensional Hamiltonians (2.197) [14, 72], spherically symmetric power-law potentials in three dimensions, with Hamiltonians (2.198) [14, 74, 75], spherically-symmetric power-law Hamiltonians (2.199) of arbitrary dimensionality [14, 72], quasistationary states characterized by the Hamiltonian (2.200) [78], double-well oscillator, described by Hamiltonian (2.201) [78, 79], Hamiltonians (2.202) with the Yukawa potential [80], and logarithmic potential [14], with Hamiltonian (2.203). These examples show that the accuracy of self-similar approximants is higher than that of optimized approximants.

3.6 Choice of Initial Approximation

Self-similar approximation theory makes it possible to improve the accuracy of optimized approximants and analyze the stability of the procedure. Also, it allows us to choose the best initial approximation, when several such approximations are admissible. Here we illustrate this by considering the spherically symmetric Hamiltonian with a logarithmic potential,

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} + g \ln r \; , \tag{3.71}$$

where $r > 0$ and $l = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$. Perturbation theory for this Hamiltonian can be started either with the harmonic-oscillator Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = -\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} + \frac{\omega^2}{2} r^2 \; , \tag{3.72}$$

in which ω is a control parameter, or with the Coulomb Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = -\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{d^2}{dr^2} + \frac{l(l+1)}{2r^2} + \frac{u}{r}\;, \tag{3.73}$$

where u is a control parameter.

Accomplishing calculations for both these cases [14], we find that the procedure starting from the harmonic oscillator is more stable than that starting from the Coulomb potential, since the map multipliers μ_k are about twice smaller for the former procedure than that for the latter. In the present case, the higher stability is in agreement with the better accuracy, since the errors ε_k of the energy levels for the procedure, starting with the harmonic oscillator, are about twice smaller than those for the procedure starting with the Coulomb potential.

Thus, when it is possible to take several initial approximations, and the exact answers are not known, one should select that initial approximation that provides the most stable calculational procedure. In the considered case, it was possible to also check the accuracy of the results for the energy levels, comparing them with numerical calculations based on the direct solution of the Schrödinger equation, which confirmed that the higher accuracy is in line with the higher stability.

3.7 Fractal Transform

In Sec. 2.1, it was mentioned that control functions can be introduced through series transformations. For this purpose, we opt for a transformation that, by the use of the self-similar approximation theory, could extract a hidden similarity between the sequence of perturbative terms and would allow for the derivation of recurrence relations making it possible to obtain an explicit sequence of self-similar approximants. Here we show that this can be done by using *fractal transform* [171–173].

First, let us define the *fractal transform*. For a function $f(x)$, the fractal transform is given by the equation

$$F(x,s) \equiv x^s f(x)\;, \tag{3.74}$$

with the inverse transformation

$$f(x) = x^{-s} F(x,s)\;. \tag{3.75}$$

Here s, playing the role of a control function, is called *scaling exponent*, since it enters the following scaling relation:

$$\frac{F(\lambda x, s)}{f(\lambda x)} = \lambda^s\,\frac{F(x,s)}{f(x)}\;. \tag{3.76}$$

Scaling relations of this type appear in several physical problems considering fractal systems [174]. This is why, we call the expression $F(x,s)$, defined by equation (3.74), fractal transform.

Suppose we are looking for a function $f(x)$ for which we can get only an asymptotic expansion at small $x \to 0$,

$$f(x) \simeq f_k(x) \qquad (x \to 0)\;, \tag{3.77}$$

where

$$f_k(x) = f_0(x)\left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^{\alpha_n}\right) , \tag{3.78}$$

with the powers arranged in increasing order,

$$\alpha_n < \alpha_{n+1} \qquad (n = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) ,$$

and $f_0(x)$ being a known function.

For what follows, it is sufficient to consider the expansions in the form

$$f_k(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^{\alpha_n} , \tag{3.79}$$

since, the initial form (3.78) is easily obtained by the substitution

$$f_k(x) \to f_0(x) f_k(x) .$$

The fractal transform of expansion (3.79) is

$$F_k(x, s_k) = x^{s_k} f_k(x) . \tag{3.80}$$

In order to show the result of the application of self-similar approximation theory to asymptotic expansions, let us consider a first-order expansion

$$f_1(x) = 1 + a_1 x^{\alpha_1} , \tag{3.81}$$

whose fractal transform is

$$F_1(x, s_1) = x^{s_1} + a_1 x^{\alpha_1 + s_1} . \tag{3.82}$$

The equation

$$F_0(x, s_k) = x^{s_k} = f \tag{3.83}$$

gives the expansion function

$$x_k(f) = f^{1/s_k} . \tag{3.84}$$

Then we get the first-order endomorphism

$$y_1(f) \equiv F_1(x_1(f), s_1) = f + a_1 f^{1+\alpha_1/s_1} , \tag{3.85}$$

with the initial condition

$$y_0 = f . \tag{3.86}$$

The evolution integral (3.17) reads as

$$\int_{y_0}^{y_1^*} \frac{df}{v_1(f)} = t_1 , \tag{3.87}$$

with the cascade velocity

$$v_1(f) = y_1(f) - y_0(f) = a_1 f^{1+\alpha_1/s_1} . \tag{3.88}$$

From here, the first-order fixed point is

$$y_1^*(f) = \left(f^{1/n_1} + A_1 \right)^{n_1} \; , \tag{3.89}$$

where

$$n_1 \equiv - \frac{s_1}{\alpha_1} \; , \qquad A_1 \equiv \frac{a_1 t_1}{n_1} \; .$$

And the corresponding first-order self-similar approximant

$$f_1^*(x) = x^{-s_1} y_1^*(x^{s_1}) \tag{3.90}$$

becomes

$$f_1^*(x) = (1 + A_1 x^{\alpha_1})^{n_1} \; . \tag{3.91}$$

The control functions A_1 and n_1 can be found from asymptotic conditions, as will be explained below. The procedure of using the fractal transform and constructing self-similar approximants, as is done above, will be called, for short, self-similar renormalization.

3.8 Self-Similar Root Approximants

Applying the techniques of the previous section to the asymptotic expansion (3.79), it is possible to derive different variants of self-similar approximants. In the present section, we derive root approximants [12, 78, 175–177].

Accomplishing the fractal transform (3.80) for the asymptotic series (3.79), we have

$$F_k(x, s_k) = x^{s_k} + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^{\alpha_n + s_k} \; . \tag{3.92}$$

With the reonomic constraint (3.83), we get the expansion function (3.84). Then the cascade endomorphism reads as

$$y_k(f) = f + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n f^{1+\alpha_n/s_k} \; . \tag{3.93}$$

Integrating the evolution equation (3.15) between $y_{k-1}^*(f)$ and $y_k^*(f)$, we get the integral

$$\int_{y_{k-1}^*}^{y_k^*} \frac{df}{v_k(f)} = t_k \; . \tag{3.94}$$

The cascade velocity can be taken as

$$v_k(f) = y_k(f) - y_{k-1}(f) = a_n f^{1+\alpha_k/s_k} \; . \tag{3.95}$$

Hence integral (3.94) yields the recurrent relation

$$y_k^*(f) = \left\{ \left[y_{k-1}^*(f) \right]^{1/m_k} + A_k \right\}^{m_k} \; , \tag{3.96}$$

in which

$$m_k \equiv - \frac{s_k}{\alpha_k} \; , \qquad A_k \equiv \frac{a_k t_k}{m_k} \; .$$

This, for the self-similar approximant

$$f_k^*(x) = x^{-s_k} y_k\left(x^{s_k}\right) \tag{3.97}$$

transforms into the recurrent relation

$$f_k^*(x) = \left\{ \left[f_{k-1}^*(x) \right]^{1/m_k} + A_k x^{\alpha_k} \right\}^{m_k} \; . \tag{3.98}$$

Iterating this relation $k-1$ times and using the notation

$$n_j \equiv \frac{m_j}{m_{j+1}} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; ,$$

we come to the *self-similar root approximant*

$$f_k^*(x) = (((1 + A_1 x^{\alpha_1})^{n_1} + A_2 x^{\alpha_2})^{n_2} + \ldots + A_k x^{\alpha_k})^{m_k} \; . \tag{3.99}$$

The control parameters A_j, n_j, and m_k can be found from asymptotic conditions. There can happen several cases.

(i) *Large-variable expansion with k terms is available.*

This expansion can be written as

$$f(x) \simeq \sum_{n=1}^{k} b_n x^{\beta_n} \qquad (x \rightarrow \infty) \; , \tag{3.100}$$

where $b_1 \neq 0$, $\beta_1 \neq 0$, and the powers are arranged in the descending order,

$$\beta_{n+1} < \beta_n \qquad (n = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; .$$

All control parameters can be found by equating the large-variable expansion of the self-similar root approximant (3.99) with the given expansion (3.100), that is, by equating

$$\sum_{n=1}^{k} b_n x^{\beta_n} \simeq f_k^*(x) \qquad (x \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{3.101}$$

The powers n_j and m_k satisfy the equations [12]

$$\alpha_k m_k = \beta_1 \; , \qquad \alpha_j n_j = \alpha_{j+1} - \beta_{k-j} + \beta_{k-j+1} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; . \tag{3.102}$$

In the particular case of expansion (3.79) with integer powers $\alpha_n = n$,

$$f_k(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^n \; , \tag{3.103}$$

the self-similar root approximant (3.99) becomes

$$f_k^*(x) = \left(\left((1 + A_1 x)^{n_1} + A_2 x^2 \right)^{n_2} + \ldots + A_k x^k \right)^{m_k} \; . \tag{3.104}$$

Then its powers are defined by the equations

$$km_k = \beta_1 \; , \qquad jn_j = j + 1 - \beta_{k-j} + \beta_{k-j+1} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; . \tag{3.105}$$

The parameters A_j are defined through the values of b_j. For instance

$$(((A_1^{n_1} + A_2)^{n_2} + A_3)^{n_3} + \ldots + A_k)^{m_k} = b_1 \; . \tag{3.106}$$

(ii) *Only one term of the large-variable expansion is known, while $k-1$ terms of the small-variable expansion are available.*

Let the known term of the large-variable expansion be

$$f(x) \simeq Bx^{\beta} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; . \tag{3.107}$$

Notice that the previous case reduces to the present one by setting $\beta_n = \beta$. Then Eqs. (3.102) reduce to the equalities

$$m_k = \frac{\beta}{\alpha_k} \; , \qquad n_j = \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\alpha_j} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; . \tag{3.108}$$

The $k-1$ parameters A_j can be found by expanding the self-similar root approximant (3.99) in powers of small x and equating the like terms with those of the small-variable expansion (3.79),

$$f_k(x) \simeq f_k^*(x) \qquad (x \to 0) \; .$$

And the additional equation is Eq. (3.106).

In the case of integer $\alpha_j = j$, we have

$$m_k = \frac{\beta}{k} \; , \qquad n_j = \frac{j+1}{j} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; . \tag{3.109}$$

So that the root approximant takes the form

$$f_k^*(x) = \left(\left((1 + A_1 x)^2 + A_2 x^2 \right)^{3/2} + \ldots + A_k x^k \right)^{\beta/k} \; . \tag{3.110}$$

The control parameters A_j are defined by the asymptotic condition at small variable plus the equation

$$\left(\left(\left(A_1^2 + A_2 \right)^{3/2} + A_3 \right)^{4/3} + \ldots + A_k \right)^{\beta/k} = b_1 \; . \tag{3.111}$$

(iii) *The known large-variable expansion contains p terms and the small-variable expansion, $k-p$ terms.*

When the large-variable expansion is

$$f(x) \simeq \sum_{n=1}^{p} b_n x^{\beta_n} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; , \tag{3.112}$$

with $p < k$, then the lower powers are given by the expressions

$$n_j = \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\alpha_j} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-p) \; , \tag{3.113}$$

while the higher powers, by the equations

$$\alpha_k m_k = \beta_1 \; ,$$

$$\alpha_j n_j = \alpha_{j+1} - \beta_{k-j} + \beta_{k-j+1} \quad (j = k-p+1, k-p+2, \ldots, k-1) \; . \tag{3.114}$$

(iv) *Only a small-variable expansion is given*

In this case, we set the internal powers according to the rule

$$n_j = \frac{\alpha_{j+1}}{\alpha_j} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; ,$$

while the external power m_k and all parameters A_j are defined by the accuracy-through-order procedure [178].

In a particular situation of case (i), it may happen that $n_j = 1$ for $j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, which occurs if

$$\alpha_{j+1} - \alpha_j = \beta_{k-j} - \beta_{k-j+1} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; ,$$

$$\alpha_k m_k = \beta_1 \qquad (n_j = 1) \; .$$

In such a case, the root approximant reads as

$$f_k^*(x) = (1 + A_1 x^{\alpha_1} + A_2 x^{\alpha_2} + \ldots + A_k x^{\alpha_k})^{m_k} \; . \tag{3.115}$$

In the case of integer $\alpha_j = j$, n_j can be equal to one, if

$$\beta_{k-j} - \beta_{k-j+1} = 1 \qquad (n_j = 1, \; \alpha_j = j) \; , .$$

Then approximant (3.115) becomes

$$f_k^*(x) = \left(1 + A_1 x + A_a x^2 + \ldots + A_k x^k\right)^{m_k} \; . \tag{3.116}$$

From their structure, it is clear that the root approximants are convenient for the problem of interpolation between two asymptotic limits of the sought function.

Also, notice that setting in approximant (3.104) all powers $n_j = \pm 1$, we get different variants of Padé approximants $P_{M/N}(x)$, with $M + N = k$. And setting the internal powers $n_j = \pm 1$, while keeping the external power m_k such that the asymptotic condition (3.107) be valid, we get different variants $[P_{M/N}(x)]^{m_k}$ of the modified Padé approximants of Baker and Gammel [179], where $(M - N)m_k = \beta$. So, Padé approximants, including the modified Padé approximants, can be considered as just a particular case of the root approximants. However, the root approximants are essentially more general, allowing for the use of more information on the studied function and, as has been checked [12,78,175–177], guaranteeing much better accuracy.

3.9 Self-Similar Nested Approximants

Applying the self-similar renormalization, discussed in Sec. 3.7, in a bit different way, it is straightforward to derive other types of self-similar approximants. For instance, expansion (3.79) can be rewritten in the form

$$f_k(x) = 1 + p_1(x) \; , \tag{3.117}$$

in which

$$p_1(x) = a_1 x^{\alpha_1}(1 + p_2(x)) \; , \qquad p_2(x) = \frac{a_2}{a_1} \; x^{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1} \; (1 + p_3(x)) \; , \tag{3.118}$$

and so on till the last term

$$p_k(x) = \frac{a_k}{a_{k-1}} \; x^{\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}} \; . \tag{3.119}$$

The general relation between the terms $p_j(x)$ reads as

$$p_j(x) = \frac{a_j}{a_{j-1}} \; x^{\alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}} (1 + p_{j+1}(x)) \; , \tag{3.120}$$

where

$$j = 1, 2, \ldots, k \; ; \qquad a_0 \equiv 1 \; , \; \alpha_0 \equiv 0 \; , \; a_{k+1} \equiv 0 \; .$$

Applying the self-similar renormalization to $f_k(x)$, with $p_1(x)$ as a variable, and to $p_j(x)$, with $p_{j+1}(x)$ as a variable, we obtain

$$f_k^*(x) = (1 + A_1 p_1^*(x))^{n_1} \tag{3.121}$$

and the recurrence relation

$$p_j^*(x) = \frac{a_j}{a_{j-1}} \; x^{\alpha_j - \alpha_{j-1}} \left(1 + A_{j+1} p_{j+1}^*(x)\right)^{n_{j+1}} \; , \tag{3.122}$$

where

$$A_j \equiv \frac{t_j}{n_j} \; , \qquad n_j \equiv -s_j \quad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \; .$$

Iterating relation (3.120) $k - 1$ times, and employing the notation

$$B_j \equiv \frac{a_j}{a_{j-1}} \; A_j = - \; \frac{a_j t_j}{a_{j-1} s_j} \; ,$$

we come to the self-similar nested approximant

$$f_k^*(x) = \left(1 + B_1 x^{\alpha_1} \left(1 + B_2 x^{\alpha_2 - \alpha_1} \ldots \left(1 + B_k x^{\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}}\right)^{n_k}\right)^{n_{k-1}} \ldots\right)^{n_1} \; . \tag{3.123}$$

The parameters B_j and n_j are control parameters that need to be defined from additional conditions. These parameters, of course, depend on the order of the considered approximation k, so that, $B_j = B_j(k)$ and $n_j = n_j(k)$. We do not use the complicated notations showing this dependence in order to keep formulas more compact.

The form of approximants (3.123) resembles that of nested radicals [180,181], because of which we call them nested approximants.

At large x, approximant (3.123) behaves as

$$f_k^*(x) \simeq B_k^* x^{n_1 S_k} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; , \tag{3.124}$$

with the amplitude

$$B_k^* = (B_1 B_2^{n_2} B_3^{n_2 n_3} \ldots B_k^{n_2 n_3 \ldots n_k})^{n_1} \tag{3.125}$$

and the notation

$$S_k \equiv \alpha_1 + (\alpha_2 - \alpha_1) n_2 + (\alpha_3 - \alpha_2) n_2 n_3 + \ldots + (\alpha_k - \alpha_{k-1}) n_2 n_3 \ldots n_k \; . \tag{3.126}$$

If the behavior of the sought function at large variable is known, being

$$f(x) \simeq B x^{\beta} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; , \tag{3.127}$$

then we have two conditions defining

$$B_k^* = B \; , \qquad n_1(k) = \frac{\beta}{S_k} \; . \tag{3.128}$$

In the case, when the powers $\alpha_j = j$ in expansion (3.117) are integers, approximant (3.123) simplifies to the form

$$f_k^*(x) = (1 + B_1 x \, (1 + B_2 x \ldots (1 + B_k x)^{n_k})^{n_{k-1}} \ldots)^{n_1} \tag{3.129}$$

and sum (3.126) becomes

$$S_k = 1 + n_2 + n_2 n_3 + \ldots + n_2 n_3 \ldots n_k \; . \tag{3.130}$$

Generally, we can try to define the control parameters B_j from the accuracy-through-order procedure at small variable by equating the expansion of approximant (3.123) with expansion (3.117). For example, for B_j of low orders this gives

$$B_1 = \frac{a_1}{n_1} = \frac{a_1}{\beta} \, S_k \; , \qquad B_2 = \frac{a_1^2 + n_1(2a_2 - a_1^2)}{2a_1 n_1 n_2} = \frac{a_1^2 S_k + \beta(2a_2 - a_1^2)}{2a_1 \beta n_2} \; .$$

However the powers n_j cannot be uniquely defined from such a procedure, either at small or large variables. To define the powers n_j, some additional conditions are needed. Also, to avoid complex numbers the coefficients B_j should be positive for keeping the function $f_k^*(x)$ real valued. But B_j can be negative, if the described problem has critical points.

Notice that setting in Eq. (3.129) all powers $n_j = \pm 1$, we get Padé approximants $P_{M/N}(x)$ or continued fractions, while setting the internal powers $n_j = \pm 1$, with the external power n_1 given by condition (3.128), we come to the modified Padé approximants $[P_{M/N}(x)]^{\beta/(M-N)}$. However, such a choice is not uniquely defined, since it is possible to construct several Padé approximants satisfying the condition $M + N = k$. In addition, dealing with Padé approximants, we confront the known difficulty of unphysical poles.

The other way could be by setting all powers, including n_1, equal, $n_j = q$, and defining q by the expression $q = \beta / S_k$ following from condition (3.128). Then

$$S_k = \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} q^j = \frac{1 - q^k}{1 - q} \qquad (k \geq 1)$$

But in this way, to define q uniquely, it is necessary to neglect the term q^k, which disturbs condition (3.128) (see Ref. [182]).

One more possibility could be as follows. We can take the same number q only for all internal powers n_j, with $j = 2, 3, \ldots, k$. But the external power $n_1(k)$ should be defined, as earlier, by condition (3.128), so that $n_1(k)S_k = \beta$. This leads to the self-similar nested approximant

$$f_k^*(x) = (1 + B_1 x\,(1 + B_2 x \ldots (1 + B_k x)^q)^q \ldots)^{m_k} \ .,$$

in which

$$m_k \equiv n_1(k) = \frac{\beta}{S_k} = \frac{1-q}{1-q^k}\,\beta \ .$$

This way does not impose constraints on the value of β. The power q can be defined from additional conditions that would guarantee good numerical convergence of the sequence $\{f_k^*(x)\}$.

To make the internal expressions nonnegative, we may set $q = 2$, which gives

$$m_k = \frac{\beta}{2^k - 1} \qquad (q = 2) \ .$$

3.10 Self-Similar Exponential Approximants

An important particular case of the nested approximants can be derived by setting the powers s_j of the fractal transform (3.80) as $s_j \to \infty$. Consequently, $n_j \to -\infty$, $A_j \to 0$, and $B_j \to 0$. Then expression (3.123) reduces to a self-similar exponential approximant [173,183]

$$f_k^*(x) = \exp\left(C_1 x^{\alpha_1} \exp\left(C_2 x^{\alpha_2-\alpha_1} \ldots \exp\left(C_k x^{\alpha_k-\alpha_{k-1}}\right)\right)\right) \ , \tag{3.131}$$

in which

$$C_j \equiv \frac{a_j}{a_{j-1}}\,t_j \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \ , \tag{3.132}$$

where $a_0 = 1$. For integer $\alpha_j = j$, this leads to the expression

$$f_k^*(x) = \exp\left(C_1 x \exp\left(C_2 x \ldots \exp\left(C_k x\right)\right)\right) \ . \tag{3.133}$$

It is useful to stress that the obtained self-similar exponential approximants are rather different from the iterated Euler [184] exponentials (see also [185, 186]). The latter have the same radius of convergence as the initial series (3.103). Hence, if the series (3.103) are divergent, the Euler exponentials do not allow for an effective extrapolation. This is because the coefficients in the Euler exponentials are defined by the accuracy-through-order procedure. While the parameters of the self-similar exponentials are given by definition (3.132).

The control functions t_j should be found from additional conditions. For example by minimizing a cost functional [12, 187]. The other way could be as follows [173, 183]. Let us set in function (3.133) the control parameters $t_j = 1$ for $j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k-1$, denoting the result as $F_k(x, t_k)$. The control parameters can be defined by the minimal difference optimization condition

$$F_k(x, t_k) - F_{k-1}(x, t_k) = 0 \ , \tag{3.134}$$

which yields the equation for the control function $t_k = t_k(x)$,

$$t_k = \exp\left(\frac{a_k}{a_{k-1}}\, t_k x \right) \; . \tag{3.135}$$

This defines the exponential approximant

$$f_k^*(x) = F_k(x, t_k(x)) \; .$$

As is mentioned above, it is possible to define the parameters C_n by minimizing some cost functionals [12, 187], which gives other forms of the control parameters, for instance

$$C_n = \frac{a_n(1+a_1^2)}{n a_{n-1}(1+a_n^2)} \qquad (n = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \; .$$

3.11 Self-Similar Additive Approximants

The small-variable expansion (3.103) can be reorganized using the asymptotic relation

$$1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^n \simeq \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j (1 + \lambda x)^j \qquad (x \to 0) \; , \tag{3.136}$$

where d_j are defined through a_n, with the condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j = 1 \; .$$

Accomplishing the self-similar renormalization of the linear terms, as in Sec. 3.7, we get the approximant

$$f_k^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} d_j (1 + \lambda_j x)^{n_j} \; . \tag{3.137}$$

Here d_j are known from relation (3.136), while $2k$ parameters λ_j and n_j are control parameters. Rewriting the above approximant in a bit different way, as

$$f_k^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} D_j (1 + \lambda x)^{n_j} \; , \tag{3.138}$$

we have $2k + 1$ control parameters D_j, λ, and n_j. But only $2k$ of them are independent, since there is the additional condition

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k} D_j = 1 \; .$$

Let the large-variable expansion be

$$f(x) \simeq \sum_{j=1}^{k} b_j x^{\beta_j} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; , \tag{3.139}$$

where the powers are arranged in the descending order,

$$\beta_j > \beta_{j+1} \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k-1) \; .$$

Requiring that the approximant (3.138) would reproduce the terms of the large-variable expansion (3.139), we set

$$n_j = \beta_j \qquad (j = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \; . \tag{3.140}$$

This gives

$$f_k^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} D_j (1 + \lambda x)^{\beta_j} \; . \tag{3.141}$$

However, strictly speaking, expanding expression (3.141) at a large variable x, in addition to the terms with the powers β_j, we also will get the terms with the powers $\beta_j - 1$. If such terms pertain to the set $\{\beta_j\}$, then there is no problem. However, if they are not in that set, then we need to add to expression (3.141) compensating terms canceling the terms of wrong powers arising at $x \to \infty$. Thus the general form of the additive approximant is

$$f_k^*(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{k} D_j (1 + \lambda x)^{\beta_j} + \sum_j C_j (1 + \lambda x)^{\beta_j - 1} \; . \tag{3.142}$$

The parameters D_j and λ are defined by the accuracy-through-order procedure either at small or at large variable, or at both, while the role of C_j is to cancel the terms yielding wrong powers at the large variable expansion. Employing the accuracy-through-order procedure, we confront the problem of multiple solutions. Among them there are real as well as complex-valued solutions. The latter come in complex conjugate pairs, so that their sum is real. It is admissible to either select only real solutions or to take the sum of all solutions. In both these cases, the results are of comparable accuracy [188].

3.12 Self-Similar Factor Approximants

Self-similar renormalization of the expansion

$$f_k(x) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n x^n \tag{3.143}$$

can also be done in the following way [189–192]. The above sum can be rewritten as

$$f_k(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{k} (1 + b_j x) \; , \tag{3.144}$$

with the coefficients b_j expressed through a_n. Applying the procedure of the self-similar renormalization to each of the factors results in the transformation

$$1 + b_j x \longrightarrow (1 + A_j x)^{n_j} \; .$$

Then we get the self-similar factor approximant

$$f_k^*(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{N_k} (1 + A_j x)^{n_j} \; , \tag{3.145}$$

where the number of factors N_k is prescribed by the number of terms in the initial expansion (3.143). This number N_k will be specified below.

When the order k of the expansion (3.143) is even, then we can take $N_k = k/2$ and define all control parameters A_j and n_j from the accuracy-through-order procedure at small variables,

$$f_k^*(x) \simeq f_k(x) \qquad (x \rightarrow 0) \; , \tag{3.146}$$

resulting in the equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^{k/2} n_j A_j^n = D_n \qquad (n = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \; , \tag{3.147}$$

where

$$D_n \equiv \frac{(-1)^{n-1}}{(n-1)!} \lim_{x \rightarrow 0} \frac{d^n}{dx^n} \ln \left(1 + \sum_{m=1}^{n} a_m x^m \right) \; . \tag{3.148}$$

Thus we have $k/2$ parameters A_j and $k/2$ parameters n_j that are uniquely defined by k equations (3.147).

When k is odd, we take $N_k = (k+1)/2$, obtaining the equations

$$\sum_{j=1}^{(k+1)/2} n_j A_j^n = D_n \qquad (n = 1, 2, \ldots, k) \; . \tag{3.149}$$

Now we have $(k+1)/2$ parameters A_j and $(k+1)/2$ parameters n_j, hence altogether $k+1$ parameters, but only k equations (3.149). Thus all parameters A_j and n_j can be expressed through one of the parameters, say through A_1. The latter is to be defined by an additional condition.

The accuracy-through-order equations with respect to the control parameters A_j are polynomial, the first equation being of first order, the second, of second order, and so on, with the last equation being of order k. Each polynomial equation of order n possesses n solutions. So that the total number of solutions is $1 \times 2 \times 3 \times \ldots \times k = k!$. At the same time, from the form of the factor approximants it is evident that each of them is invariant with respect to the $k!$ permutations

$$A_i \longrightarrow A_j \; , \qquad n_i \longrightarrow n_j \; .$$

Therefore, the multiplicity of solutions for A_j is trivial, being related to the enumeration of the parameters. Up to this enumeration, the solutions are unique. If the parameters A_j are given, then we get the linear algebraic equations with respect to n_j that are uniquely defined [37].

In the large-variable limit, approximant (3.145) behaves as

$$f_k^*(x) \simeq B_k x^{\beta_k} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; , \tag{3.150}$$

with the amplitude and power given by the expressions

$$B_k = \prod_{j=1}^{N_k} A_j^{n_j} \; , \qquad \beta_k = \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} n_j \; , \tag{3.151}$$

and with the number of factors

$$N_k = \begin{cases} k/2 \; , & k = 2, 4, \ldots \\ (k+1)/2 \; , & k = 3, 5, \ldots \end{cases} \; . \tag{3.152}$$

Note that the values of the parameters $A_j = A_j(k)$ and $n_j = n_j(k)$ depend on the considered approximation order k. If the large-variable behavior of the sought function is known, being

$$f(x) \simeq B x^{\beta} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; , \tag{3.153}$$

then we have two additional equations

$$B_k = B \; , \qquad \beta_k = \beta \; . \tag{3.154}$$

As is mentioned above, in the case of an odd approximation order k, one of the parameters A_j remains undefined. It would be possible to fix $A_1 = A_1(k)$ in the odd order k equal to $A_1(k-1)$ from the previous even order $k-1$ or to define A_1 in the odd order approximant by a variational procedure [193]. Another way could be based on scaling arguments [192]. One more possibility could be based on the assumption of convergence.

Assume that the sequence $\{f_k^*(x)\}$ converges. This implies that the sequence of the large-variable amplitudes B_k also converges, so that there exists a limit

$$\lim_{k\to\infty} B_k = B^* \; . \tag{3.155}$$

For an even approximation order $k = 2p$, we have

$$B_{2p} = \prod_{j=1}^{p} A_j^{n_j} \; , \tag{3.156}$$

where $A_j = A_j(2p)$ and $n_j = n_j(2p)$. And for the next, odd, approximation order $k = 2p+1$, the amplitude is

$$B_{2p+1} = \prod_{j=1}^{p+1} A_j^{n_j} \; , \tag{3.157}$$

where $A_j = A_j(2p+1)$ and $n_j = n_j(2p+1)$. The latter expression can be represented as

$$B_{2p+1} = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{p} A_j^{n_j} \right) A_{p+1}^{n_{p+1}} \; . \tag{3.158}$$

Taking here the limit $p \to \infty$ gives

$$B^* = B^* \lim_{p\to\infty} A_{p+1}^{n_{p+1}} \; , \tag{3.159}$$

from where

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} A_{p+1}^{n_{p+1}} = 1 \; . \tag{3.160}$$

Generally, there are two possibilities: either A_{p+1} tends to a finite value and n_{p+1} tends to zero, or A_{p+1} tends to one, while n_{p+1} tends to a finite value. Aiming at using the limiting behavior as an approximation at finite orders, we cannot take n_{p+1} as zero, since then the term $(1 + A_{p+1}x)^{n_{p+1}}$ disappears at al. In order that the term $(1 + A_{p+1}x)^{n_{p+1}}$ in the general form of approximant (3.145) be nontrivial and unambiguously defined, the parameters A_{p+1} and n_{p+1} have to be finite and nonzero. Therefore we have to accept that limit (3.160) yields

$$\lim_{p\to\infty} A_{p+1} = 1 \; , \tag{3.161}$$

which does not exclude that n_{p+1} simultaneously tends to zero. Moreover, if n_{p+1} tends to zero, then a finite value of A_{p+1} is not of importance, hence can be set to one. Thus condition (3.161) is sufficient for the validity of limit (3.160). This suggests that for large approximation orders one of the parameters A_j in the odd approximant can be set to one. Keeping in mind this asymptotic equality, we can apply it, as an approximation, for finite orders k. By re-enumerating the parameters, it is admissible to set to one the term A_1. Since setting $A_1 = 1$ for finite odd approximation orders is an approximation, we have to accept that the most reliable are the even factor approximants that do not involve such an additional condition. But considering odd factor approximants gives us information how close we are to the saturation limit of large k, where even and odd approximants should coincide.

Obtaining the sequence of the factor approximants $f_k^*(x)$, it is possible to estimate their accuracy by the error bar

$$\pm \frac{1}{2} \; \left| f_k^*(x) - f_{k-1}^*(x) \right| \; . \tag{3.162}$$

It may happen that the accuracy-through-order equations result in complex-valued parameters A_j and n_j. But this is not a problem, since such solutions come in complex conjugated pairs, so that the total approximant is always real.

Factor approximants can provide good approximations for various functions, rational, irrational, as well as transcendental [189–192]. Moreover, there exists a large class of functions that can be reproduced exactly by self-similar approximants of finite order. This class is composed of the functions of the form

$$R_k(x) = \prod_{j=1}^{M} P_{m_j}^{\alpha_j}(x) \qquad \left(k = \sum_{j=1}^{M} m_j \right) \; ,$$

where $P_m(x)$ is a polynomial and α_j are complex-valued numbers. Transcendental functions arise as limits of the above form. For instance, applying factor approximants to the series

$$e^x \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} \frac{x^n}{n!} \; ,$$

we exactly reconstruct the exponential for any order $k \geq 2$ because of the limit

$$\lim_{a\to 0}(1+ax)^{1/a} = e^x \; .$$

Note that the number of factors in a factor approximant, defined in Eq. (3.152), corresponds to the case when only a small-variable expansion (3.143) is available. In the case, when the large-variable asymptotic behavior (3.153) is also given, the number of the factors depends on what information is additionally used. Thus, if both the amplitude B as well as the power β are used as known values, then

$$N_k = \begin{cases} (k+2)/2 \; , & k = 2,4,\ldots \\ (k+3)/2 \; , & k = 3,5,\ldots \end{cases} \qquad (B_k = B \; , \; \beta_k = \beta) \; ,$$

with the additional condition $A_1 = 1$ for odd approximants.

And if only the power β is employed, while the amplitude B is not known, then the number of factors is

$$N_k = \begin{cases} (k+2)/2 \; , & k = 2,4,\ldots \\ (k+1)/2 \; , & k = 3,5,\ldots \end{cases} \qquad (\beta_k = \beta) \; ,$$

with the additional condition $A_1 = 1$ for even approximants.

It is also useful to mention that, defining the parameters A_j and powers n_j, one can meet complex values. However, the related parameters and powers appear in complex conjugate pairs, which makes the overall approximant real, since

$$|(1+Ax)^m| = |1+Ax|^{\mathrm{Re}\, m} \exp\left\{-(\mathrm{Im}\; m)\mathrm{arg}(1+Ax)\right\} \; .$$

3.13 Self-Similar Combined Approximants

It is possible to combine different self-similar approximants in the following way [194]. Suppose we have expansion (3.143) of order k. We may consider a subexpansion of order $n < k$,

$$f_n(x) = 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{n} a_j x^j \qquad (n < k) \; , \tag{3.163}$$

for which we can construct a self-similar approximant $f_n^*(x)$. Then we introduce the function

$$C_{k/n}(x) \equiv \frac{f_k(x)}{f_n^*(x)} \; , \tag{3.164}$$

which is expanded in powers of x, giving

$$C_{k/n}(x) \simeq 1 + \sum_{j=n+1}^{k} b_j x^j \qquad (x \to 0) \; , \tag{3.165}$$

with the coefficients b_j expressed through a_j. On the basis of the latter expansion, we construct another self-similar approximant $C_{k/n}^*(x)$. The result is the combined approximant

$$f_k^*(x) = f_n^*(x) C_{k/n}^*(x) \; . \tag{3.166}$$

Such combined approximants, composed of two (or more) factors, can be used if one of the factors catches better the behavior at small variables, while the other is more accurate at large variables.

On the basis of expansion (3.165), it is also admissible to construct a Padé approximant $P_{M/N}(x)$, with $M + N = k - n$, defining the Padé approximant parameters by the standard condition

$$P_{M/N}(x) \simeq C_{k/n}(x) \qquad (x \to 0) \; .$$

In that way, we obtain the combined expression

$$f_k^*(x) = f_n^*(x) P_{M/N}(x) \tag{3.167}$$

that is a self-similarly corrected Padé approximant. Such combined approximants are useful when one tries to approximate an irrational function that cannot be well approximated by Padé approximants [195] and when the latter are not applicable because of the problems typical of Padé approximants, such as the appearance of spurious poles, incompatibility of small-variable and large-variable behaviors, and like that [196].

3.14 Acceleration of Convergence

Obtaining a sequence $\{f_k^*(x)\}$ of self-similar approximants, it is possible to accelerate its convergence by employing additional tricks. One method for this purpose is by using splines based on several last approximants [37].

For example, we can treat the last approximants $f_{k-2}^*(x)$, $f_{k-1}^*(x)$, and $f_k^*(x)$ as the terms of a new sequence. Then we define a polynomial spline, say a quadratic one,

$$g(x,t) = a(x) + b(x)t + c(x)t^2 \; , \tag{3.168}$$

whose coefficients are prescribed by the conditions

$$g(x,0) = f_{k-2}^*(x) \; , \qquad g(x,1) = f_{k-1}^*(x) \; , \qquad g(x,2) = f_k^*(x) \; , \tag{3.169}$$

which give

$$a(x) = f_{k-2}^*(x) \; , \qquad b(x) = -\frac{1}{2}\left[f_k^*(x) - 4f_{k-1}^*(x) + 3f_{k-2}^*(x) \right] \; ,$$

$$c(x) = \frac{1}{2}\left[f_k^*(x) - 2f_{k-1}^*(x) + f_{k-2}^*(x) \right] \; .$$

Considering spline (3.168) as an expansion in powers of t, we construct a self-similar approximant

$$g^*(x,t) = a(x)[1 + A(x)t]^{n(x)} \; , \tag{3.170}$$

in which the control functions $A(x)$ and $n(x)$ are defined by the accuracy-through-order procedure at small t, resulting in

$$A(x) = \frac{b^2(x) - a(x)c(x)}{a(x)b(x)} \; , \qquad n(x) = \frac{b^2(x)}{b^2(x) - a(x)c(x)} \; .$$

The final answer is given by the expression

$$g^*(x) = \frac{1}{2}\,\left[g^*(x,2) + g^*(x,3)\right] \;, \tag{3.171}$$

with the error bar

$$\pm\;\frac{1}{2}\,|g^*(x,2) - g^*(x,3)| \;. \tag{3.172}$$

Note that if $f_k^*(x) \propto x^\beta$, then also $g^*(x) \propto x^\beta$.

It is possible to employ some other tricks improving convergence. For example, one can treat the sequence of self-similar approximants $\{f_k^*(x)\}$ similarly to a set of expansions $f_k(x)$, defining a new approximation cascade, whose trajectory is bijective to the sequence $\{f_k^*(x)\}$. Then, following the standard scheme, one can construct a twice renormalized self-similar approximant [196].

It is also possible to introduce more control functions, for instance by using power transforms [197]

$$P_k(x,m) \equiv [f_k(x)]^m \;,$$

with the power m playing the role of a control parameter. Then the transformed expression is re-expanded in powers of x resulting in

$$P_k(x,m) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n(m) x^n \qquad (x \rightarrow 0) \;,$$

with $b_n(m)$ expressed through a_n. On the basis of the latter expansion, we construct a self-similar approximant $P_k^*(x,m)$. Accomplishing the inverse power transformation, we get

$$F_k^*(x,m) = [P_k^*(x,m)]^{1/m} \;.$$

Defining control functions $m_k = m_k(x)$ by some optimization conditions, we come to the self-similar approximant

$$f_k^*(x,m) = F_k^*(x, m_k(x)) \;.$$

This way, however, is quite cumbersome. The method of using splines looks much easier, being rather accurate.

3.15 Electron Gas

Self-similar approximation theory has been used for solving hundreds of problems, as can be inferred from the cited references. Here we illustrate its application just for a few examples.

Let us consider the correlation energy of one-dimensional uniform electron gas as a function of the Wigner-Seitz radius r_s defined by the relation

$$r_s \equiv \frac{1}{2\rho} \qquad \left(\rho \equiv \frac{N}{L}\right) \;,$$

in which ρ is mean density. The asymptotic behavior of the correlation energy at small r_s, or high density, is given [198] by the expansion

$$E_{cor}(r_s) \simeq -\,\frac{\pi^2}{360} + 0.00845 r_s \qquad (r_s \rightarrow 0) \;. \tag{3.173}$$

At large r_s, hence low density, the behavior is also known [198] being

$$E_{cor}(r_s) \simeq \frac{b_1}{r_s} + \frac{b_2}{r_s^{3/2}} \qquad (r_s \rightarrow \infty) \; , \tag{3.174}$$

with the coefficients

$$b_1 = -\left(\ln \sqrt{2\pi} \; - \; \frac{3}{4} \right) = -0.168939 \; , \qquad b_2 = 0.359933 \; .$$

When the small, as well as large, variable behaviors are known, it is reasonable to resort to self-similar root approximants. The root approximant, satisfying both the small and large r_s expansions reads as [199]

$$E_3^*(r_s) = -\frac{\pi^2}{360} \left(\left((1 + A_1 r_s)^{3/2} + A_2 r_s^2 \right)^{5/4} + A_3 r^3 \right)^{-1/3} \; , \tag{3.175}$$

where

$$A_1 = 0.493150 \; , \qquad A_2 = 0.056122 \; , \qquad A_3 = 0.004274 \; .$$

This correlation energy has been calculated by diffusion Monte Carlo simulations [198] in the interval of the Wigner-Seitz radius $r_s \in [0, 20]$. Comparing the numerical results [198] with the root approximant (3.175), we find that the maximal error of the latter is 8% for r_s in that interval.

3.16 Harmonium Atom

An N-electron harmonium atom is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left(-\nabla_i^2 + \omega^2 r_i^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j}^{N} \frac{1}{r_{ij}} \; , \tag{3.176}$$

in which dimensionless units are used and

$$r_i \equiv |\mathbf{r}_i| \; , \qquad r_{ij} \equiv |\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j| \; .$$

This Hamiltonian provides a realistic modeling of many finite quantum systems, such as trapped ions, quantum dots, atomic nuclei, and metallic grains [58]. Here we consider the ground-state energy of a two-electron harmonium ($N = 2$).

When the trapping is weak, so that ω is small, the ground-state energy reads as

$$E(\omega) \simeq c_0 \omega^{3/2} + c_1 \omega + c_2 \omega^{4/3} \qquad (\omega \rightarrow 0) \; , \tag{3.177}$$

with the coefficients

$$c_0 = \frac{3}{2^{4/3}} = 1.19055 \; , \qquad c_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left(3 + \sqrt{3} \right) = 2.36603 \; , \qquad c_2 = \frac{7}{36 \cdot 2^{2/3}} = 0.122492 \; .$$

And for a hard trapping by a rigid potential with a large ω, the energy behaves as

$$E(\omega) \simeq b_0 \omega + b_1 \omega^{1/2} + b_2 + b_3 \omega^{-1/2} \qquad (\omega \rightarrow \infty) \; , \tag{3.178}$$

where

$$b_0 = 3 \; , \qquad b_1 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} = 0.797885 \; , \qquad b_2 = -\frac{2}{\pi}\left(1 - \frac{\pi}{2} + \ln 2\right) = -0.077891 \; ,$$

$$b_3 = \left(\frac{2}{\pi}\right)^{3/2}\left[2 - 2G - \frac{3}{2}\,\pi + (3+\pi)\ln 2 + \frac{3}{2}\,(\ln 2)^2 - \frac{\pi^2}{24}\right] = 0.0112528 \; ,$$

and G is the Catalan constant

$$G \equiv \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^n}{(2n+1)^2} = 0.91596559 \; .$$

Having both the small-variable and large-variable expansions, it is again reasonable to employ self-similar root approximants. Such a root approximant, satisfying both asymptotic expansions, at small as well as at large ω, is [199]

$$E_6^*(\omega) = c_0\omega^{2/3}\left(\left(\left(\left(\left(\left(1 + A_1\omega^{1/3}\right)^{1/2} + A_2\omega^{2/3}\right)^{3/4} + A_3\omega\right)^{5/6} + \right.\right.\right.$$

$$\left.\left.\left. + A_4\omega^{4/3}\right)^{7/8} + A_5\omega^{5/3}\right)^{9/10} + A_6\omega^2\right)^{1/6} \; , \qquad (3.179)$$

where

$$A_1 = 48.4532 \; , \qquad A_2 = 564.108 \; , \qquad A_3 = 1088.39 \; ,$$

$$A_4 = 1221.08 \; , \qquad A_5 = 796.791 \; , \qquad A_6 = 256 \; .$$

The accuracy of this approximant, as compared with numerical calculations [200], is very good, having an error of only 0.9%. Note that Padé approximants cannot be used in the case of harmonium, since the small-variable and large-variable asymptotic expansions are incompatible.

3.17 Schwinger Model

The Schwinger model [201, 202] is a lattice gauge theory in $1 + 1$ dimensions representing Euclidean quantum electrodynamics with a Dirac fermion field. It possesses many properties in common with QCD, such as confinement, chiral symmetry breaking, and charge shielding. For this reason, it has become a standard test bed for the study of numerical techniques in field theory. Here we consider the ground state of the model, corresponding to a vector boson of mass $M(x)$ as a function of the variable $x = m/g$, where m is the electron mass and g is the coupling parameter having the dimension of mass, so that x is dimensionless. The energy is given by the relation $E = M - 2m$.

The small-x expansion for the ground-state energy [203–206] is

$$E(x) \simeq 0.5642 - 0.219x + 0.1907x^2 \qquad (x \to 0) \; . \qquad (3.180)$$

While the large-x expansion [206–209] reads as

$$E(x) \simeq 0.6418x^{-1/3} - \frac{1}{\pi}\,x^{-1} - 0.25208x^{-5/3} \qquad (x \to \infty) \; . \qquad (3.181)$$

Table 2: Ground-state energy of the Schwinger model, for varying dimensionless parameter $x = m/g$, obtained by using a density matrix renormalization group, E_{DMRG}; fast moving frame estimates, E_{FMFE}; and the self-similar root approximants, E_5^*.

x	E_{DMRG}	E_{FMFE}	E_5^*
0.125	0.540	0.528	0.540
0.25	0.519	0.511	0.519
0.5	0.487	0.489	0.487
1	0.444	0.455	0.444
2	0.398	0.394	0.392
4	0.340	0.339	0.337
8	0.287	0.285	0.284
16	0.238	0.235	0.235

Using again self-similar root approximants, we find the form agreeing with both asymptotic expansions,

$$E_5^*(x) = A\left(\left(\left(\left((1+A_1x)^{4/3} + A_2x^2\right)^{7/6} + A_3x^3\right)^{10/9} + \right.\right.$$
$$\left.\left. + \; A_4x^4\right)^{13/12} + A_5x^5\right)^{-1/15} , \qquad (3.182)$$

where

$$A = 0.5642 , \qquad A_1 = 3.109547 , \qquad A_2 = 3.640565 ,$$
$$A_3 = 4.028571 , \qquad A_4 = 1.070477 , \qquad A_5 = 0.144711 .$$

The root approximant (3.182) provides a very good accuracy, as compared with the calculations using a density-matrix renormalization group approach [210] and fast moving frame estimates [211]. Table 2 shows that the root approximant $E_5^*(x)$ gives the results coinciding with those of these numerical techniques, in the frame of their accuracy.

3.18 Large-Variable Prediction: Partition Function

It is often of great interest to learn the behavior of a function at large variables, while only a small-variable expansion is available. This problem can be solved by resorting to self-similar factor approximants.

To illustrate how it is possible to predict the large-variable behavior, let us consider the partition function of the so-called zero-dimensional field theory

$$Z(g) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} e^{-\varphi^2 - g\varphi^4} \, d\varphi , \qquad (3.183)$$

whose structure is mathematically typical of many problems in statistical physics and field theory.

The weak-coupling expansion yields

$$Z_k(g) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n g^n \qquad (g \to 0) \; , \tag{3.184}$$

with the coefficients

$$a_n = \frac{(-1)^n}{\sqrt{\pi}\, n!}\, \Gamma\left(2n + \frac{1}{2} \right)$$

factorially diverging for large orders n. We wish to find out what would be the behavior of the partition function in the strong-coupling limit $g \to \infty$. No information from this limit is supposed to be used, just the weak-coupling expansion. The accuracy of the predicted result can be defined from the exact asymptotic limit

$$Z(g) \simeq 1.022765 g^{-1/4} \qquad (g \to \infty) \; . \tag{3.185}$$

Constructing the factor approximants $Z_k^*(g)$, we find the strong-coupling limit

$$Z_k^*(g) \simeq B_k g^{-\beta_k} \qquad (g \to \infty) \; . \tag{3.186}$$

The amplitude B and power β are predicted within the errors of the order of 20%, starting from the seventh approximation [192].

If we are interested solely in the value of the power β, then it is possible to employ another procedure. We define

$$\beta_k(g) \equiv \frac{d \ln Z_k(g)}{d \ln g} \tag{3.187}$$

and expand it in powers of g,

$$\beta_k(g) \simeq a_1 g \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} b_n g^n \right) \; . \tag{3.188}$$

On the basis of this expansion, we construct the corresponding factor approximants

$$\beta_k^*(g) \simeq a_1 g \prod_{j=1}^{N_k} (1 + A_j g)^{n_j} \; , \tag{3.189}$$

imposing an additional constraint requiring the finiteness of the limit $g \to \infty$,

$$1 + \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} n_j = 0 \; . \tag{3.190}$$

Then the sought answer is given by the limit

$$\beta_k^* \equiv \lim_{g \to \infty} \beta_k^*(g) = a_1 \prod_{j=1}^{N_k} A_j^{n_j} \; . \tag{3.191}$$

Applying this method to the considered problem gives the exponent with an error close to, although slightly larger, than the direct method of constructing $Z_k^*(g)$.

3.19 Large-Variable Prediction: Eigenvalue Problem

As another example, illustrating the use of factor approximants for predicting the large-variable behavior, we take the anharmonic oscillator with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{1}{2}\,\frac{d^2}{dx^2} + \frac{1}{2}\,x^2 + gx^4 \; . \tag{3.192}$$

The weak-coupling expansion for the ground-state energy reads as [26, 212]

$$E_k(g) \simeq \frac{1}{2}\,\left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n g^n \right) \; , \tag{3.193}$$

with the first ten coefficients

$$a_1 = 1.5 \; , \qquad a_2 = -5.25 \; , \qquad a_3 = 41.625 \; , \qquad a_4 = -482.578125 \; ,$$

$$a_5 = 7161.9609375 \; , \qquad a_6 = -127965.6269532 \; , \qquad a_7 = 2659467.4541 \; ,$$

$$a_8 = -62896429.3856 \; , \qquad a_9 = 1667083206.526 \; , \qquad a_{10} = -48957881405.6 \; .$$

And the strong-coupling limit is known to be

$$E(g) \simeq 0.667986 g^{1/3} \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{3.194}$$

Using factor approximants, we get

$$E_k^*(g) \simeq B_k g^{\beta_k} \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{3.195}$$

Starting from the seventh order, the amplitude and power are predicted [192] within the errors of about 10%.

3.20 Exact Solutions: Initial-Value Problem

As has been mentioned above, in some cases self-similar factor approximants provide exact answers. This is illustrated below by solving nonlinear differential equations [213]. An equation is termed singular, if it does not allow for finding a solution by using perturbation theory in powers of ε [214–216].

(i) *Linear singular problem*

Consider the singular differential equation

$$\varepsilon\,\frac{d^2 f}{dt^2} + 2\,\frac{df}{dt} + \frac{f}{\varepsilon} = 0 \tag{3.196}$$

for a function $f(t)$ with $t \geq 0$ and with the initial conditions

$$f(0) = 1 \; , \qquad \left. \frac{df}{dt} \right|_{t=0} = -\,\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \; .$$

Looking for the solution at small time t, we get the expansion

$$f(t) \simeq 1 - \frac{t}{\varepsilon} + \frac{t^2}{2\varepsilon^2} + \ldots \qquad (t \to 0) \; . \tag{3.197}$$

Constructing factor approximants, we find in any order, starting from $k = 2$, the form

$$f_k^*(t) = e^{-t/\varepsilon} \qquad (k \geq 2) \; , \tag{3.198}$$

which is the exact solution of Eq. (3.196).

(ii) *Nonlinear singular problem*

Let us consider the singular equation

$$(\varepsilon f + t)\, \frac{df}{dt} + f - 1 = 0 \; , \tag{3.199}$$

with the initial condition $f(0) = 2$.

Using again factor approximants, we get [213], in any order starting from the fourth order, the exact solution

$$f_k^*(t) = \sqrt{4 + \frac{2t}{\varepsilon} + \frac{t^2}{\varepsilon^2}} \; - \; \frac{t}{\varepsilon} \qquad (k \geq 4) \; . \tag{3.200}$$

(iii) *Singular logistic equation*

Logistic equations are widespread in various applications [217]. Here we consider a singular logistic equation

$$\varepsilon\, \frac{df}{dt} = f(1 - f) \; , \tag{3.201}$$

with an initial condition $f(0) = f_0$.

Factor approximants for any order after the second, give [213] the exact solution

$$f_k^*(t) = \frac{f_0}{f_0 - (f_0 - 1)e^{-t/\varepsilon}} \qquad (k \geq 3) \; . \tag{3.202}$$

3.21 Exact Solutions: Boundary-Value Problem

Factor approximants also allow for finding exact solutions for some boundary-value problems [213], as is shown below.

(i) *Kink soliton equation*

The φ^4 model, with particle mass $1/\varepsilon$, is described by the nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\, \frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} + f - f^3 = 0 \; . \tag{3.203}$$

As boundary conditions, we take

$$f(-\infty) = -1 \; , \qquad f(\infty) = 1 \; . \tag{3.204}$$

Considering expansions near the boundaries and employing factor approximants, we find [213], in any order starting from the fourth, the exact kink soliton solution

$$f_k^*(x) = \tanh\left(\frac{x}{\sqrt{\varepsilon}}\right) \qquad (k \geq 4) \; . \tag{3.205}$$

Such solitons are called topological [218].

(ii) *Bell soliton equation*

A nonlinear Schrödinger equation, with mass $-1/\varepsilon$ is

$$\frac{\varepsilon}{2}\,\frac{d^2 f}{dx^2} - f + f^3 = 0 \; . \tag{3.206}$$

We assume the boundary conditions

$$f(-\infty) = 0 \; , \qquad f(\infty) = 0 \; . \tag{3.207}$$

Again, we derive expansions near the boundaries and use factor approximants, which results [213], in any order after the second, in the exact bell soliton solution

$$f_k^*(x) = \sqrt{2}\,\mathrm{sech}\left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{\varepsilon}}\,x\right) \qquad (k \geq 3) \; . \tag{3.208}$$

This is an example of a nontopological soliton [218].

3.22 Vortex-Line Equation

The radial nonlinear Schrödinger equation

$$\frac{d^2 f}{dr^2} + \frac{1}{r}\,\frac{df}{dr} \; - \; \frac{f}{r^2} + f - f^3 = 0 \; , \tag{3.209}$$

where $r > 0$ is a dimensionless radial variable, can be met in different branches of physics. Complimented by the boundary conditions

$$f(0) = 0 \; , \qquad f(\infty) = 1 \; , \tag{3.210}$$

it describes vortex lines.

At short radius r, we can find the expansion

$$f_k(r) \simeq cr\left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n r^{2n}\right) \qquad (r \to 0) \; , \tag{3.211}$$

with the coefficients

$$a_1 = -\,\frac{1}{8} \; , \qquad a_2 = \frac{1 + 8c^2}{192} \; , \qquad a_3 = -\,\frac{1 + 80c^2}{9216} \; , \qquad a_4 = \frac{1 + 656c^2 + 1152c^4}{737280} \; .$$

The coefficient c is defined from the boundary conditions.

On the basis of expansion (3.211), we construct factor approximants

$$f_k^*(r) \simeq c_k r \prod_{j=1}^{N_k} (1 + A_j r^2)^{n_j} \; . \tag{3.212}$$

The boundary condition $f_k^*(0) = 0$ is automatically valid. And the boundary condition $f_k^*(\infty) = 1$ imposes the constraints

$$c_k \prod_{j=1}^{N_k} A_j^{n_j} = 1 \; , \qquad 1 + 2 \sum_{j=1}^{N_k} n_j = 0 \; , \tag{3.213}$$

defining the coefficient c_k.

To characterize the accuracy of differential equations, it is possible to proceed as follows [219]. Denoting the equation in the symbolic form as

$$\hat{E}[f(r)] = 0 \; , \tag{3.214}$$

one defines the *solution defect* of $f_k^*(r)$ as

$$D[f_k^*(r)] \equiv |\hat{E}[f_k^*(r)]| \; . \tag{3.215}$$

The *maximal solution defect* is given by the maximal value

$$D[f_k^*] \equiv \sup_r D[f_k^*(r)] \; . \tag{3.216}$$

The other characteristic of accuracy is the *solution error*

$$\Delta[f_k^*(r)] \equiv |f_k^*(r) - f(r)| \tag{3.217}$$

defining the deviation of the approximant from the exact solution at each point r. Respectively, the *maximal solution error* is

$$\Delta[f_k^*] \equiv \sup_r \Delta[f_k^*(r)] \; . \tag{3.218}$$

The advantage of using as the characteristics of accuracy the solution defects is that they can be defined without knowing the exact solution. For the factor approximants (3.212), the maximal solution defects (3.216), are found to be

$$D[f_2^*] = 0.12 \; , \qquad D[f_3^*] = 0.017 \; ,$$

$$D[f_4^*] = 0.015 \; , \qquad D[f_5^*] = 0.002 \; , \qquad D[f_6^*] = 0.0018 \; .$$

These results demonstrate a high accuracy of the factor approximants and their good numerical convergence.

If we wish to employ self-similar root approximants from Sec. 3.8 for approximating the solutions to Eq. (3.209), we need to find out the asymptotic expansion at large r. The latter is

$$f(r) \simeq 1 - \frac{1}{2}\, r^{-2} - \frac{9}{8}\, r^{-4} - \frac{161}{16}\, r^{-6} \qquad (r \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{3.219}$$

The first several self-similar root approximants, that we denote as $R_k^*(r)$ to distinguish them from the factor approximants, are

$$R_2^*(r) = \frac{r}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{4}\,r^2\right)^{-1/2} , \qquad R_3^*(r) = \frac{r}{\sqrt{2}}\left(1 + \frac{1}{2}\,r^2 + \frac{1}{4}\,r^4\right)^{-1/4} ,$$

$$R_4^*(r) = \frac{r}{4^{1/3}}\left(1 + \frac{3}{4}\,r^2 + \frac{3}{16}\,r^4 + \frac{1}{16}\,r^6\right)^{-1/6} ,$$

$$R_5^*(r) = \frac{r}{136^{1/8}}\left(1 + r^2 + \frac{9}{68}\,r^4 + \frac{1}{34}\,r^6 + \frac{1}{136}\,r^8\right)^{-1/8} .$$

Their maximal solution defects are close to 0.1, which is worse than that of the factor approximants.

3.23 Critical Phenomena: Spin Systems

Self-similar approximants allow for a straightforward description of critical phenomena. As and example, let us consider the three-dimensional spin - 1/2 cubic Ising model with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -J \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z , \tag{3.220}$$

where $\sigma_j = \pm 1$, the summation is over the nearest neighbors and $J > 0$. Thermodynamic characteristics of the model can be calculated by perturbation theory with respect to the parameter

$$v = \tanh\left(\frac{J}{T}\right) , \tag{3.221}$$

in which T is temperature. Series in powers of v correspond to the weak-coupling or high-temperature asymptotic expansions.

One often considers the second derivative of the susceptibility

$$f(v) \equiv \left.\frac{d^2\chi}{dB^2}\right|_{B=0} . \tag{3.222}$$

The related weak-coupling expansion [220] reads as

$$f_k(v) = -2\left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{k} a_n v^n\right) , \tag{3.223}$$

where the several first coefficients are

$$a_1 = 24 , \qquad a_2 = 318 , \qquad a_3 = 3240 , \qquad a_4 = 28158 .$$

The fourth-order factor approximant is

$$f_4^*(v) = -2(1 + A_1 v)^{n_1}(1 + A_2 v)^{n_2} , \tag{3.224}$$

with the parameters

$$A_1 = -4.602 , \quad n_1 = -4.30 , \qquad A_2 = 7.373 , \quad n_1 = 0.571 , \qquad .$$

The critical point, corresponds to the closest to zero pole of the considered function, with the related power defining the critical exponent, which gives

$$v_c = \frac{1}{|A_1|} = 0.217 , \qquad |n_1| = 4.3 . \tag{3.225}$$

These results are in good agreement with the values found by Monte Carlo simulations [220,221] yielding $v_c = 0.218092$ and $|n_1| = 4.37$. The accuracy of the best Padé approximant of the same order is much worse, leading to $v_c = 0.153$ and to the critical exponent equal to one.

Critical points and related critical exponents can also be found by employing self-similar root approximants [171, 222].

3.24 Critical Phenomena: Bose Gas

Calculation of the critical temperature shift of the Bose-Einstein condensation for a weakly interacting Bose gas is discussed in Secs. 2.12 and 2.13, where optimized perturbation theory is employed. Recall that the aim is to find the coefficient c_1 in the temperature shift

$$\frac{\Delta T_c}{T_0} \simeq c_1\gamma \qquad (\gamma \rightarrow 0) \tag{3.226}$$

for an asymptotically weak gas parameter $\gamma \equiv \rho^{1/3} a_s$. Resorting to loop expansion in $O(N)$ field theory φ^4 yields [53–55] the expansion

$$c_1(x) \simeq \sum_{n=1}^{5} a_n x^n \qquad (x \rightarrow 0) \tag{3.227}$$

in powers of the variable (2.175) and with the coefficients listed in Table 3. The required answer is given by the limit

$$c_1 = \lim_{x\rightarrow\infty} c_1(x) .$$

Employing for this purpose self-similar factor approximants, we construct the second-order approximant

$$f_2^*(x) = a_1 x(1+x)^{n_1}(1+A_2x)^{n_2} , \tag{3.228}$$

with the condition

$$n_1 + n_2 + 1 = 0 ,$$

the third-order approximant

$$f_3^*(x) = a_1 x(1+A_1x)^{n_1}(1+A_2x)^{n_2} , \tag{3.229}$$

with the same condition $n_1 + n_2 + 1 = 0$, and the fourth-order approximant

$$f_4^*(x) = a_1 x(1+x)^{n_1}(1+A_2x)^{n_2}(1+A_3x)^{n_3} , \tag{3.230}$$

Table 3: Coefficients a_n of the asymptotic expansion for $c_1(x)$ for a different number of field components N.

N	0	1	2	3	4
a_1	0.111643	0.111643	0.111643	0.111643	0.111643
a_2	−0.0264412	−0.0198309	−0.0165258	−0.0145427	−0.0132206
a_3	0.0086215	0.00480687	0.00330574	0.00253504	0.0020754
a_4	−0.0034786	−0.00143209	−0.000807353	−0.000536123	−0.000392939
a_5	0.00164029	0.00049561	0.000227835	0.000130398	0.0000852025

Table 4: Coefficient c_1 of the critical temperature shift for a different number of components N, found by using self-similar factor approximants, and compared with the available Monte Carlo simulations.

N	c_1	Monte Carlo
0	0.77± 0.03	
1	1.06± 0.05	1.09± 0.09 [52]
2	1.29± 0.07	1.29± 0.05 [41] 1.32± 0.02 [39]
3	1.46± 0.08	
4	1.60± 0.09	1.60± 0.10 [52]

with the constraint

$$n_1 + n_2 + n_3 + 1 = 0.$$

Then, using the convergence acceleration scheme of Sec. 3.14, we find [37,56] the values of c_1 for a different number of field components N. Our results are presented in Table 4 together with the results of the known Monte Carlo simulations. As is seen, our results coincide with the Monte Carlo ones, within the accuracy of the latter.

3.25 Critical Exponents

Critical exponents describe the behavior of thermodynamic characteristics in the vicinity of second order phase transitions (see, e.g., Ref. [223] and also Sec. 4). Here we show how such exponents can be calculated by using self-similar factor approximants. Asymptotic series for critical exponents can be derived by employing the so-called epsilon expansion (see Sec. 4). One usually derives the series in powers of $\varepsilon = d - 4$ for the critical exponents η, ν^{-1}, and ω. The other exponents can be found from the scaling relations

$$\alpha = 2 - \nu d \; , \qquad \beta = \frac{\nu}{2} \left(d - 2 + \eta \right) \; , \qquad \gamma = \nu(2 - \eta) \; , \qquad \delta = \frac{d + 2 - \eta}{d - 2 + \eta} \; , \qquad (3.231)$$

where d is space dimensionality. For the three-dimensional space ($d = 3$), we have

$$\alpha = 2 - 3\nu \; , \qquad \beta = \frac{\nu}{2} \; (1 + \eta) \; ,$$

$$\gamma = \nu(2 - \eta) \; , \qquad \delta = \frac{5 - \eta}{1 + \eta} \qquad (d = 3) \; . \tag{3.232}$$

Different N correspond to different physical systems. Thus $N = 0$ corresponds to dilute polymer solutions, $N = 1$, to the Ising model, $N = 2$, to magnetic XY models and to superfluids, and $N = 3$ characterizes the Heisenberg model. But, in general, it is possible to consider other N.

For $N = -2$, the critical exponents for any d are defined exactly:

$$\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \; , \qquad \beta = \frac{1}{4} \; , \qquad \gamma = 1 \; , \qquad \delta = 5 \; ,$$

$$\eta = 0 \; , \qquad \nu = \frac{1}{2} \qquad (N = -2) \; . \tag{3.233}$$

In the limit of $N \to \infty$, the exponents also are known exactly:

$$\alpha = \frac{d - 4}{d - 2} \; , \qquad \beta = \frac{1}{2} \; , \qquad \gamma = \frac{2}{d - 2} \; , \qquad \delta = \frac{d + 4}{d - 2} \; ,$$

$$\eta = 0 \; , \qquad \nu = \frac{1}{d - 2} \; , \qquad \omega = 4 - d \qquad (N \to \infty) \; , \tag{3.234}$$

which for the three dimensional space reduces to

$$\alpha = -1 \; , \qquad \beta = \frac{1}{2} \; , \qquad \gamma = 2 \; , \qquad \delta = 5 \; ,$$

$$\eta = 0 \; , \qquad \nu = 1 \; , \qquad \omega = 1 \qquad (d = 3, \; N \to \infty) \; . \tag{3.235}$$

The ε- expansions for the critical exponents η, ν^{-1}, and ω, in three dimensions for arbitrary N can be found in the book [224]. Applying to these expansions self-similar factor approximants for small ε and then setting $\varepsilon = 1$, we obtain [225,226] the results summarized in Table 5. For the components $N = -2$ and $N \to \infty$, factor approximants give the exact values. The results for all N are in good agreement with the known experimental exponents, as well as with Monte Carlo simulations, Borel-Padé summation, and other methods, as can be inferred from reviews [33, 224, 227, 228] (see also [229–232]).

3.26 Time Series

There exist various time series consisting of sets of data f_n at different moments of time t_n. One of the most important tasks concerning time series is the possibility of forecasting their future behavior being based on the knowledge of their past data.

Let a time series be characterized by a data set

$$\mathbb{D}_k = \{ f_n, \; t_n : \; n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k \} \; , \tag{3.236}$$

Table 5: Critical exponents for the N-component φ^4 field theory, obtained by the summation of ε-expansions using self-similar factor approximants.

N	α	β	γ	δ	η	ν	ω
-2	0.5	0.25	1	5	0	0.5	0.79838
-1	0.36612	0.27742	1.0791	4.8897	0.01874	0.54463	0.79380
0	0.23466	0.30268	1.1600	4.8323	0.02875	0.58845	0.79048
1	0.10645	0.32619	1.2412	4.8050	0.03359	0.63118	0.78755
2	-0.01650	0.34799	1.3205	4.7947	0.03542	0.67217	0.78763
3	-0.13202	0.36797	1.3961	4.7940	0.03556	0.71068	0.78904
4	-0.23835	0.38603	1.4663	4.7985	0.03476	0.74612	0.79133
5	-0.33436	0.40208	1.5302	4.8057	0.03347	0.77812	0.79419
6	-0.41963	0.41616	1.5873	4.8142	0.03197	0.80654	0.79747
7	-0.49436	0.42836	1.6376	4.8231	0.03038	0.83145	0.80108
8	-0.55920	0.43882	1.6816	4.8320	0.02881	0.85307	0.80503
9	-0.61506	0.44774	1.7196	4.8406	0.02729	0.87169	0.80935
10	-0.66297	0.45530	1.7524	4.8489	0.02584	0.88766	0.81408
50	-0.98353	0.50113	1.9813	4.9537	0.00779	0.99451	0.93176
100	-0.93643	0.49001	1.9564	4.9926	0.00123	0.97881	0.97201
1000	-0.99528	0.49933	1.9966	4.9986	0.00023	0.99842	0.99807
10000	-0.99952	0.49993	1.9997	4.9999	0.00002	0.99984	0.99979
∞	-1	0.5	2	5	0	1	1

in which all t_n are distinct and ordered either in ascending or descending order. It is straightforward to define the interpolating polynomial

$$f_k(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} c_n t^n \tag{3.237}$$

that passes through all point of the data set,

$$f_k(t_n) = f_n \qquad (n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k) \; . \tag{3.238}$$

The latter condition is nothing but a system of linear algebraic equations with respect to the coefficients c_m,

$$\sum_{m=0}^{k} c_m t_n^m = f_n \; . \tag{3.239}$$

The solution to this system of equations involves the Vandermonde determinant

$$V_k = \begin{vmatrix} 1 & t_0 & t_0^2 & \ldots & t_0^k \\ 1 & t_1 & t_1^2 & \ldots & t_1^k \\ \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots & \ldots \\ 1 & t_k & t_k^2 & \ldots & t_k^k \end{vmatrix} = \prod_{0 \leq i < j \leq k} (t_j - t_i) \; .$$

For all t_n distinct, the determinant is nonzero, hence the solution is unique.

The other way of defining the interpolating polynomial is by composing a function

$$f_k(t) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} f_n \lambda_n^k(t) \; , \tag{3.240}$$

which is an expansion over the Lagrange basis polynomials

$$\lambda_n^k(t) \equiv \prod_{j(\neq n)}^{k} \frac{t - t_j}{t_n - t_j} \qquad (n \leq k) \; ,$$

having the property

$$\lambda_n^k(t_m) = \delta_{mn} \; .$$

On the basis of the interpolating polynomial $f_k(t)$, it is possible to construct a self-similar approximant $f_k^*(t)$ that allows for the extrapolation of the data set for times t larger than the maximal of t_n. Thus we obtain a forecast $f_k^*(t)$ for future time. Such an extrapolation can be done using exponential approximants [173, 187, 233–238] or factor approximants.

3.27 Probabilistic Scenarios

Quite regularly, accomplishing measurements for the same process may result in different data. This can be due, e.g., to the existence of poorly controlled noise, because the measurements have been accomplished by different devices or with differing methodics, or just realized in slightly different times. Then the results composing different data sets have

to be characterized in a probabilistic picture. The idea of a probabilistic approach comes from the problem of pattern selection in the case of multiple solutions of nonlinear equations [187, 237, 239–241].

Suppose we have several data sets enumerated by an index $\alpha = 1, 2, \ldots$,

$$\mathbb{D}_{k\alpha} = \{ f_{n\alpha},\ t_{n\alpha} :\ n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, k \} \ . \tag{3.241}$$

For each data set, we can construct, as is explained in the previous section, a self-similar approximant $f^*_{k\alpha}(t)$ forecasting for times outside the data set. Following Sec. 3.3, we interpret the sequence of $f^*_{k\alpha}(t)$ as the points corresponding to a trajectory of a dynamical system for which we can define the map multipliers

$$m^*_{k\alpha}(t) = \frac{\delta f^*_{k\alpha}(t)}{\delta f^*(t)} = \frac{\partial f^*_{k\alpha}(t)/\partial t}{\partial f^*(t)/\partial t} \ , \tag{3.242}$$

where $f^*(t)$ is a first nontrivial self-similar approximant. Then we introduce the average multiplier $M_k(t)$ by the relation

$$\frac{1}{M_k(t)} \equiv \sum_\alpha \frac{1}{|m^*_{k\alpha}(t)|} \ . \tag{3.243}$$

The probability of a scenario α at time t is

$$p_\alpha(t) = \left| \frac{M_k(t)}{m^*_{k\alpha}(t)} \right| \ . \tag{3.244}$$

By construction, it is normalized,

$$\sum_\alpha p_\alpha(t) = 1 \ . \tag{3.245}$$

The optimal scenario corresponds to the maximal probability

$$p_{opt}(t) \equiv \sup_\alpha p_\alpha(t) \ . \tag{3.246}$$

3.28 Discrete Scaling

One calls a function $f(x)$ scale invariant, when it satisfies the scaling relation

$$f(\lambda x) = \mu f(x) \ . \tag{3.247}$$

The evident solution to this equation is the power-law behavior

$$f(x) = C x^\alpha \ , \tag{3.248}$$

with the condition

$$\lambda^\alpha = \mu e^{i 2\pi n} \qquad (n = 0, 1, 2, \ldots) \ . \tag{3.249}$$

Therefore the power α writes as

$$\alpha = \frac{\ln \mu}{\ln \lambda} + i\, \frac{2\pi n}{\ln \lambda} \ . \tag{3.250}$$

In the case of continuous scaling, the scale λ can be taken as $\lambda = 1$, which requires to set $n = 0$. Then

$$\alpha = \frac{\ln \mu}{\ln \lambda} \qquad (n = 0) \; . \tag{3.251}$$

This defines the power α as a real number, provided λ and μ are real.

But for discrete scaling, λ can pertain to a set not including $\lambda = 1$. In such a case, the power α becomes complex-valued [242]. The processes with complex-valued exponents, resulting in log-periodic oscillations, occur, for instance, in financial time series [243–250] and materials rupture [251].

3.29 Complex Renormalization

Under discrete scaling, when characteristic exponents become complex-valued, there appears the necessity of considering renormalization equations on a complex plane. Below, we give an example of such a procedure.

Let us study a system characterized by a function $I(t)$. This can be a market price, financial index, or the intensity of acoustic radiation from a loaded material as a function of time [252, 253]. The function is considered on the time interval $0 < t < t_c$, with t_c being a critical point, where $I(t)$ experiences a sharp increase or a drastic fall. It is convenient to introduce the dimensionless variable

$$x \equiv \frac{t_c - t}{t_c} = x(t) \; , \tag{3.252}$$

with the boundary conditions

$$x(0) = 1 \; , \qquad x(t_c) = 0 \; . \tag{3.253}$$

Also, we define the dimensionless function

$$f(x) \equiv \frac{I(t_c) - I(t)}{I(t_c) - I(0)} \tag{3.254}$$

satisfying the boundary conditions

$$\begin{aligned} f(0) = 0 \qquad & (t = t_c \; , \; x(t_c) = 0) \; , \\ f(1) = 1 \qquad & (t = 0 \; , \; x(0) = 1) \; . \end{aligned} \tag{3.255}$$

The function $I(t)$ is expressed through function (3.254) as

$$I(t) = I(t_c) - [I(t_c) - I(0)] f(x(t)) \; . \tag{3.256}$$

Since we keep in mind a discrete scaling, requiring to work on the complex plane, we analytically continue the real function $f(x)$ to a complex function $F(x)$, such that

$$f(x) = \mathrm{Re} F(x) \; . \tag{3.257}$$

And $F(x)$ is assumed to obey the same boundary conditions as $f(x)$,

$$F(0) = 0 \; , \qquad F(1) = 1 \; . \tag{3.258}$$

The renormalization-group equation for $F(x)$ reads [243] as

$$\frac{d\ln F}{d\ln x} = G \; , \tag{3.259}$$

where $G = G(x)$ is a Gell-Mann law function. This equation has to be complemented either by an equation for the complex-conjugate function $F^*(x)$ or by an equation for the function

$$W = |F|^2 = W(x) \; , \tag{3.260}$$

with the boundary conditions

$$W(0) = 0 \; , \qquad W(1) = 1 \; . \tag{3.261}$$

From Eq. (3.259), we get

$$\frac{d\ln W}{d\ln x} = 2\mathrm{Re}G \; . \tag{3.262}$$

The function W equals the squared amplitude of F describing the main tendency of the variance of F, while F itself also contains a phase producing oscillations around the main tendency. Therefore it is reasonable to treat F as a fast function, as compared to the slow function W. Then it is admissible to employ the idea of the averaging techniques and solve the equation for the fast function F, keeping the slow function as an integral of motion. This gives

$$F = x^G \; . \tag{3.263}$$

Generally, G is a complex function, hence the previous expression can be represented as

$$F = x^{\mathrm{Re}G} \left\{ \cos\left[(\mathrm{Im}G)\ln x\right] + i \sin\left[(\mathrm{Im}G)\ln x\right] \right\} \; . \tag{3.264}$$

Note that the necessary and sufficient condition for classifying the function F as fast, while W as slow is $\mathrm{ReG} \ll \mathrm{ImG}$.

We need to find out the dependence of G on x. If we assume that the function $W(x)$ can be expanded in powers of some x^s then from equation (3.262) it follows that $G(x)$ is expandable in the same powers, so that its k-th order expansion reads as

$$G(x) \simeq G_k(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{k} a_n x^{sn} \qquad (x \rightarrow 0) \; , \tag{3.265}$$

under the relation

$$s = 2\mathrm{Re}a_0 \equiv 2\alpha \; . \tag{3.266}$$

The extrapolation of the small variable asymptotic expansion (3.265) to the finite values of x can be done by means of the self-similar exponential approximants (see Sec. 3.10). This yields

$$G_k^*(x) = a_0 \exp\left(C_1 x^{2\alpha} \exp\left(C_2 x^{2\alpha} \ldots \exp\left(C_k x^{2\alpha} \right) \right) \right) \; , \tag{3.267}$$

where C_j are control parameters. To first order, we have

$$G_1^*(x) = a_0 \exp\left(C_1 x^{2\alpha} \right) \; . \tag{3.268}$$

Taking into account that the parameters, in general, are complex, we separate their real and imaginary parts,

$$a_0 = \alpha + i\omega \; , \qquad C_1 = \beta + i\gamma \; . \tag{3.269}$$

Then we get

$$G_1^*(x) = (\alpha + i\omega) \exp\left\{(\beta + i\gamma)x^{2\alpha}\right\} =$$

$$= \exp\left(\beta x^{2\alpha}\right)\left\{\alpha\cos\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right) - \omega\sin\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right) + i\left[\alpha\sin\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right) + \omega\cos\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right)\right]\right\} \; . \tag{3.270}$$

Using the approximant (3.270), we obtain the sought function

$$f(x) = \mathrm{Re}F(x) = \exp[(\mathrm{Re}G)\ln x]\cos[(\mathrm{Im}G)\ln x] \; , \tag{3.271}$$

in which

$$\mathrm{Re}G = \left[\alpha\cos\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right) - \omega\sin\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right)\right]\exp\left(\beta x^{2\alpha}\right) \; ,$$

$$\mathrm{Im}G = \left[\alpha\sin\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right) + \omega\cos\left(\gamma x^{2\alpha}\right)\right]\exp\left(\beta x^{2\alpha}\right) \; . \tag{3.272}$$

The four parameters, α, β, γ, and ω should be found from additional conditions, or from empirical data.

Note that close to the critical point t_c, where

$$x \to 0 \; , \qquad \mathrm{Re}G \to \alpha \; , \qquad \mathrm{Im}G \to \omega \; ,$$

function (3.271) reduces to

$$f(x) \simeq x^{\alpha}\cos(\omega\ln x) \qquad (x \to 0) \; ,$$

which is the simple case of a power law behavior decorated by log-periodic oscillations.

Taking higher orders of approximant (3.267) makes the function $f(x)$ more complicated and increases the number of parameters. In the k-th order, the number of control parameters is $2(1+k)$.

3.30 Quark-Gluon Plasma

In Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD), perturbation theory with respect to the coupling parameter is valid at asymptotically large temperatures. One assumes that the temperature is so high that it is admissible to set the chemical potential zero and to neglect quark masses. The weak-coupling free energy expansion can be represented either in powers of the quantum chromodynamics coupling α_s or in powers of the coupling parameter g, using the relation

$$\alpha_s = \frac{g^2}{4\pi} \; . \tag{3.273}$$

The perturbative expansion for the pressure of high-temperature $SU(N_c)$ gauge theory, with massless fermions, in four dimensions, with $N_c = 3$ colours and with n_f quark flavors in the fundamental representation, has been calculated to fourth order [254] and to fifth order [255, 256]. In terms of α_s, the expansion of pressure reads as

$$P(\alpha_s) \simeq \frac{8\pi^2}{45}\, T^4 \left[\sum_{n=0}^{5} a_n \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^{n/2} + a_4' \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^2 \ln\, \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right] \; , \tag{3.274}$$

with the coefficients

$$a_0 = 1 + \frac{21}{32}\, n_f \;, \qquad a_1 = 0 \;, \qquad a_2 = -\,\frac{15}{4}\,\left(1 + \frac{15}{12}\, n_f\right) \;, \qquad a_3 = 30\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right)^{3/2} \;,$$

$$a_4 = 273.2 + 15.97\, n_f - 0.413\, n_f^2 + \frac{135}{8}\,\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right) \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right) -$$

$$- \frac{165}{8}\left(1 + \frac{5}{12}\, n_f\right)\left(1 - \,\frac{2}{32}\, n_f\right) \ln\,\frac{\mu}{2\pi T} \;,$$

$$a_5 = \left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right)^{1/2}\left[\frac{495}{2}\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right)\left(1 - \,\frac{2}{33}\, n_f\right) \ln\,\frac{\mu}{2\pi T} - 799.2 - 21.96\, n_f - 1.926\, n_f^2\right] \;,$$

$$a_4' = \frac{135}{2}\,\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right) \;.$$

Here, μ is the renormalization scale parameter in the $\overline{\rm MS}$ scheme and the dimensional regularization is used.

The weak-coupling expansion for the pressure in terms of g is

$$P(g) \simeq \frac{8\pi^2}{45}\, T^4 \left(\sum_{n=0}^{5} c_n g^n + c_4' g^4 \ln g\right) \;, \tag{3.275}$$

with the coefficients

$$c_0 = 1 + \frac{21}{32}\, n_f \;, \qquad c_1 = 0 \;, \qquad c_2 = -\,\frac{15}{(4\pi)^2}\,\left(1 + \frac{5}{12}\, n_f\right) = -0.09499\left(1 + \frac{5}{12}\, n_f\right) \;,$$

$$c_3 = \frac{240}{(4\pi)^3}\,\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right)^{3/2} = 0.12094\,\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right)^{3/2}$$

$$c_4 = 0.04331\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right) \ln\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right) + 0.01733 - 0.00763\, n_f - 0.00088\, n_f^2 -$$

$$-0.01323\left(1 + \frac{5}{12}\, n_f\right)\left(1 - \,\frac{2}{33}\, n_f\right) \ln\,\frac{\mu}{T} \;,$$

$$c_5 = 0.02527\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right)^{3/2}\left(1 - \,\frac{2}{33}\, n_f\right) \ln\,\frac{\mu}{T} -$$

$$- \left(0.12806 + 0.00717\, n_f - 0.00027\, n_f^2\right)\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right)^{1/2} \;,$$

$$c_4' = 0.08662\left(1 + \frac{1}{6}\, n_f\right) \;.$$

It is convenient to introduce the reduced pressure

$$p_k \equiv \frac{P_k}{P_0} = p_k(g, \mu, T) \;, \tag{3.276}$$

that is the ratio of a k-th order pressure P_k, to the Stefan-Boltzmann pressure

$$P_0 = \frac{8\pi^2}{45}\, T^4 \left(1 + \frac{21}{32}\, n_f\right) \,. \tag{3.277}$$

The expansion for the reduced pressure reads as

$$p_k = 1 + \sum_{n=0}^{5} \overline{c}_n g^n + \overline{c}'_4 g^4 \ln g \,, \tag{3.278}$$

where

$$\overline{c}_n \equiv \frac{c_n}{c_0} \,, \qquad \overline{c}'_4 \equiv \frac{c'_4}{c_0} \,.$$

The parameter g is the running coupling, whose dependence $g(\mu)$ on the renormalization scale μ is given by the renormalization group equation

$$\mu\, \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu} = \beta(g) \,. \tag{3.279}$$

The weak-coupling expansion for the Gell-Mann-Low function $\beta(g)$ can be written as

$$\beta_k(g) = -\sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n g^{2n+3} \,. \tag{3.280}$$

The coefficients for $N_c = 3$ have been calculated in four-loop order [257, 258] and, recently, in five-loop order [259, 260]. These coefficients are

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2}\, \left(11 - \frac{2}{3}\, n_f\right) \,, \qquad b_1 = \frac{2}{(4\pi)^4}\, \left(51 - \frac{19}{3}\, n_f\right) \,,$$

$$b_2 = \frac{1}{2(4\pi)^6}\, \left(2857 - \frac{5033}{9}\, n_f + \frac{325}{27}\, n_f^2\right) \,,$$

$$b_3 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^8}\, \left[\frac{149753}{6} + 3564\zeta(3) - \left(\frac{1078361}{162} + \frac{6508}{27}\, \zeta(3)\right) n_f + \right.$$
$$\left. + \left(\frac{50065}{162} + \frac{6472}{81}\, \zeta(3)\right) n_f^2 + \frac{1093}{729}\, n_f^3\right] \,,$$

$$b_4 = \frac{1}{(4\pi)^{10}}\, \left[\frac{8157455}{16} + \frac{621885}{2}\, \zeta(3) - \frac{88209}{2}\, \zeta(4) - 288090\zeta(5) - \right.$$
$$- \left(\frac{336460813}{1944} + \frac{4811164}{81}\, \zeta(3) - \frac{33935}{6}\, \zeta(4) - \frac{1358995}{27}\, \zeta(5)\right) n_f +$$
$$+ \left(\frac{25960913}{1944} + \frac{698531}{81}\, \zeta(3) - \frac{10526}{9}\, \zeta(4) - \frac{381760}{81}\, \zeta(5)\right) n_f^2 -$$
$$\left. - \left(\frac{630559}{5832} + \frac{48722}{243}\, \zeta(3) - \frac{1618}{27}\, \zeta(4) - \frac{460}{9}\, \zeta(5)\right) n_f^3 + \left(\frac{1205}{2916} - \frac{152}{81}\, \zeta(3)\right) n_f^4\right] \,.$$

As an initial condition for Eq. (3.277), we can take the value of the running coupling $\alpha_s(m_Z) = 0.119$ for the Z^0 boson mass m_Z. In terms of the coupling g, this initial condition is

$$g(m_Z) = 1.222856 \qquad (m_Z = 91187 \text{ MeV}) \; . \tag{3.281}$$

The equation of state for quantum chromodynamics, employing exponential self-similar approximants (see Sec. 3.10), has been derived in Ref. [261]. The procedure has been as follows. The renormalization scale μ is treated as a control function defined by the minimal difference condition $p_4 - p_3 = 0$, which gives $\mu = \mu(g, T)$. By using the expansions $\beta_k(g)$ and $p_k(g, T)$, exponential self-similar approximants $\beta_k^*(g)$ and $p_k^*(g, T)$ are constructed. The renormalization group equation (3.276), with the initial condition (3.278), yields $g = g(\mu)$. From $\mu = \mu(g, T)$ and $g = g(\mu)$, we find $\mu(T)$ and $g(T)$. Then the self-similar approximant $p_k^*(g, \mu, T)$ defines the pressure as a function of temperature $p_k^*(T)$. When diminishing temperature, the pressure varies from the Stefan-Boltzmann limit to a sharp drop to zero at temperature $T_c \approx 150$ Mev. This temperature T_c can be associated with the confinement-deconfinement phase transition. These results agree with other models of confinement [262–264], as well as with lattice data [265]. Hard-thermal-loop perturbation theory, that is a variant of optimized perturbation theory, also yields a similar behavior of the QCD pressure [266].

3.31 Gell-Mann-Low Function: Quantum Chromodynamics

The overall behavior of a Gell-Mann-Low function, as a function of a scaling variable provides important information on the related field theory. Of special interest is the large variable asymptotic form of the function. In Secs. 3.18 and 3.19, it has been shown that the large-variable behavior of a function can be predicted by extrapolating its small-variable expansion by means of self-similar factor approximants. The accuracy of such a prediction is about 10%. Using these approximants, we also can estimate the large-variable behavior of Gell-Mann-Low functions.

The Gell-Mann-Low function for QCD can be defined as

$$\beta(a_s) = \mu^2 \, \frac{da_s}{d\mu^2} \qquad \left(a_s \equiv \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right) \; . \tag{3.282}$$

In the space-time four dimensions, within the minimal subtraction scheme ($\overline{\text{MS}}$), a weak-coupling expansion of the beta function in powers of a_s, in five-loop order [260, 267], reads as

$$\beta(a_s) \simeq -\sum_{n=0}^{k} \beta_n a_s^{n+2} \qquad (a_s \to 0) \; , \tag{3.283}$$

with the coefficients β_n expressed through the coefficients b_n from the previous section by the relation

$$\beta_n = (2\pi)^{2n+2} b_n \; . \tag{3.284}$$

In numerical form, these coefficients are

$$\beta_0 = 2.75 - 0.166667 \, n_f \; , \qquad \beta_1 = 6.375 - 0.791667 \, n_f \; ,$$

$$\beta_2 = 22.3203 - 4.36892\, n_f + 0.0940394\, n_f^2 \; ,$$

$$\beta_3 = 114.23 - 27.1339\, n_f + 1.58238\, n_f^2 + 0.0058567\, n_f^3 \; ,$$

$$\beta_4 = 524.56 - 181.8\, n_f + 17.16\, n_f^2 - 0.22586\, n_f^3 - 0.0017993\, n_f^4 \; .$$

Applying self-similar factor approximants for summing series (3.283), we can find the strong-coupling limit

$$\beta(a_s) \simeq -B a_s^{\gamma} \qquad (a_s \rightarrow \infty) \tag{3.285}$$

that is connected with the limit of the function $\beta(g)$, defined by Eq. (3.279), as

$$\beta(g) = \frac{(2\pi)^2}{g}\, \beta(a_s) \simeq -\frac{B}{(2\pi)^{2\gamma-2}}\, g^{2\gamma-1} \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; .$$

It turns out that for the factor approximants with the n_f from zero to five the limit g tending to infinity does not exist, since the approximants become complex-valued. For the physically reasonable number of flavors $n_f = 6$, there exist the real-valued approximants:

$$\beta_2^*(a_s) = -1.75 a_s^2 (1 + 1.1554 a_s)^{0.598} \; ,$$

$$\beta_3^*(a_s) = -1.75 a_s^2 (1 + a_s)^{0.912} (1 + 32.53 a_s)^{0.0005} \; , \tag{3.286}$$

whose strong-coupling asymptotics are

$$\beta_2^*(a_s) \simeq -2.277 a_s^{2.598} \; ,$$

$$\beta_3^*(a_s) \simeq -1.753 a_s^{2.913} \qquad (a_s \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{3.287}$$

Similarly, applying self-similar factor approximants for the beta function defined in equation (3.279), with expansion (3.280), we obtain

$$\beta_2^*(g) = -0.044 g^3 (1 + 0.039 g^2)^{0.598} \; ,$$

$$\beta_3^*(g) = -0.044 g^3 (1 + g^2)^{0.000277} (1 + 0.028 g^2)^{0.833} \; .$$

The strong-coupling limit for these approximants gives

$$\beta_2^*(g) \simeq -0.0064 g^{4.195} \; , \qquad \beta_3^*(g) \simeq -0.0022 g^{4.667} \qquad (g \rightarrow \infty) \; .$$

It seems that there are no reliable estimates of the strong-coupling behavior of the QCD beta function, which it would be possible to compare with the above results. There exists an estimate [268, 269] of $\gamma = -13$ for $n_f = 0$ and the negative g tending to minus infinity. The change of the sign of g is motivated by the fact that the used Borel-Leroy summation can be applied to alternating series, while the series (3.238) are not alternating, so that, strictly speaking, the Borel summation is not applicable. Changing the sign of g produces a kind of alternating series. However, the expansions for $g \rightarrow \infty$ and $g \rightarrow -\infty$ can be drastically different [270].

3.32 Gell-Mann-Low Function: Quantum Electrodynamics

The Gell-Mann-Low function in Quantum Electrodynamics (QED) is known in the five-loop approximation [267, 271]. The weak-coupling expansion of the beta-function depends on the used renormalization scheme.

(i) *Minimal subtraction scheme*

In the modified minimal subtraction scheme ($\overline{\rm MS}$), the Gell-Mann-Low function is defined by the renormalization group equation

$$\beta_{MS}(\overline{\alpha}) = \mu^2 \, \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}}{\pi} \right) \, , \tag{3.288}$$

in which $\overline{\alpha}$ is the renormalized ($\overline{\rm MS}$) scheme QED coupling parameter and μ is a scale parameter. In the five-loop approximation for the beta-function of an electron, neglecting the contributions of leptons with higher masses, that is, of muons and tau-leptons, the expansion of the beta-function with respect to $\overline{\alpha}$ [271] has the form

$$\beta_{MS}(\overline{\alpha}) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n \left(\frac{\overline{\alpha}}{\pi} \right)^{n+2} \, , \tag{3.289}$$

with the coefficients

$$b_0 = \frac{1}{3} \, , \qquad b_1 = \frac{1}{4} \, , \qquad b_2 = - \, \frac{31}{288} \, , \qquad b_3 = - \, \frac{2785}{31104} \, - \, \frac{13}{36} \, \zeta(3) \, ,$$

$$b_4 = - \, \frac{195067}{497664} \, - \, \frac{25}{96} \, \zeta(3) - \, \frac{13}{96} \, \zeta(4) + \frac{215}{96} \, \zeta(5) \, .$$

In numerical form, the coefficients are

$$b_0 = 0.3333 \, , \qquad b_1 = 0.25 \, , \qquad b_2 = -0.1076 \, , \qquad b_3 = -0.5236 \, , \qquad b_4 = 1.471 \, .$$

(ii) *On-shell scheme*

In the on-shell scheme (OS), one sets $\mu = m$, with m being the electron mass. The beta-function, is defined by the equation

$$\beta_{OS}(\alpha) = m^2 \, \frac{\partial}{\partial m^2} \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi} \right) \, , \tag{3.290}$$

where $\alpha = e^2/4\pi$ is the QED coupling parameter. The weak-coupling expansion reads as

$$\beta_{OS}(\alpha) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n \left(\frac{\alpha}{\pi} \right)^{n+2} \qquad (\alpha \to 0) \, , \tag{3.291}$$

with the coefficients

$$b_0 = 0.3333 \, , \qquad b_1 = 0.25 \, , \qquad b_2 = -0.4201 \, , \qquad b_3 = -0.5712 \, , \qquad b_4 = -0.3462 \, .$$

The latter are denoted here by the same notation b_n, which should not lead to confusion.

(iii) *Momentum subtraction scheme*

In the frame of the momentum subtraction scheme (MOM), the beta-function expansion can be written as in Eq. (3.289), but with different coefficients:

$$b_0 = 0.3333 , \qquad b_1 = 0.25 , \qquad b_2 = 0.04999 , \qquad b_3 = -0.6010 , \qquad b_4 = 1.434 .$$

Constructing self-similar factor approximants using the beta-function expansions for each of the scheme, we take those of them that are defined for all coupling parameters $\alpha \in [0, \infty]$. The highest orders of these approximants give the strong-coupling limits

$$\beta^*_{MS}(\overline{\alpha}) \simeq 0.476\, \overline{\alpha}^{2.096} , \qquad \beta^*_{OS}(\alpha) \simeq 0.433\, \alpha^{2.189} ,$$

$$\beta^*_{MOM}(\overline{\alpha}) \simeq 0.493\, \overline{\alpha}^{2.309} . \tag{3.292}$$

As is seen, the strong-coupling asymptotic behavior of the beta function is practically the same for all schemes. This suggests that self-similar factor approximants provide scheme independent expressions. The Borel-Leroy summation [269, 272] in the MOM scheme gives the strong-coupling limit with the beta function proportional to $\overline{\alpha}$ in first order.

3.33 Gell-Mann-Low Function: Quartic Field Theory

The Gell-Mann-Low function for the $O(N)$-symmetric φ^4 field theory, within the minimal subtraction scheme, is known in the six-loop approximation [273]. Defining the beta-function as

$$\beta(g) = \mu \frac{\partial g}{\partial \mu} , \tag{3.293}$$

where $g = \lambda/(4\pi)^2$, for its weak-coupling expansion one has

$$\beta(g) \simeq \sum_{n=0}^{k} b_n g^{n+2} . \tag{3.294}$$

The six coefficients b_n for a different number of components are given in Table 6.

Schnetz [274] derived the coefficients for $N = 1$ to seven-loop order:

$$b_0 = 3 , \qquad b_1 = -5.66667 , \qquad b_2 = 32.5497 , \qquad b_3 = -271.606 ,$$

$$b_4 = 2848.57 , \qquad b_5 = -34776.1 , \qquad b_6 = 474651 .$$

The general six-loop expansion of the beta function for the N-component field theory [273] has the coefficients

$$b_0 = \frac{N+8}{3} , \qquad b_1 = -\frac{3N+14}{3} ,$$

$$b_2 = \frac{1}{216}\left[96(5N+22)\zeta(3) + 33N^2 + 922N + 2960\right] ,$$

$$b_3 = -\frac{1}{3888}\left[1920\left(2N^2 + 55N + 186\right)\zeta(5) - 288(N+8)(5N+22)\zeta(4) +\right.$$

$$+ 96\left(63N^2 + 764N + 2332\right)\zeta(3) - \left(5N^3 - 6320N^2 - 80456N - 196648\right)\Big] \ ,$$

$$b_4 = \frac{1}{62208}\Big[112896\left(14N^2 + 189N + 526\right)\zeta(7) - 768\left(6N^3 + 59N^2 - 446N - 3264\right)\zeta^2(3) -$$

$$-9600(N+8)\left(2N^2 + 55N + 186\right)\zeta(6) + 256\left(305N^3 + 7466N^2 + 66986N + 165084\right)\zeta(5) -$$

$$-288\left(63N^3 + 1388N^2 + 9532N + 21120\right)\zeta(4) -$$

$$-16\left(9N^4 - 1248N^3 - 67640N^2 - 552280N - 1314336\right)\zeta(3) +$$

$$+ 13N^4 + 12578N^3 + 808496N^2 + 6646336N + 13177344\Big] \ ,$$

$$b_5 = -\frac{1}{41990400}\Big[204800\left(1819N^3 + 97823N^2 + 901051N + 2150774\right)\zeta(9) +$$

$$+14745600\left(N^3 + 65N^2 + 619N + 1502\right)\zeta^3(3) +$$

$$+995328\left(42N^3 + 2623N^2 + 25074N + 59984\right)\zeta(3,5) -$$

$$-20736\left(28882N^3 + 820483N^2 + 6403754N + 14174864\right)\zeta(8) -$$

$$-5529600\left(8N^3 - 635N^2 - 9150N - 25944\right)\zeta(3)\zeta(5) +$$

$$+11520\left(440N^4 + 126695N^3 + 2181660N^2 + 14313152N + 29762136\right)\zeta(7) +$$

$$+207360(N+8)\left(6N^3 + 59N^2 - 446N - 3264\right)\zeta(3)\zeta(4) -$$

$$-23040\left(188N^4 + 132N^3 - 93363N^2 - 862604N - 2207484\right)\zeta^2(3) -$$

$$-28800\left(595N^4 + 20286N^3 + 277914N^2 + 1580792N + 2998152\right)\zeta(6) +$$

$$+5760\left(4698N^4 + 131827N^3 + 2250906N^2 + 14657556N + 29409080\right)\zeta(5) +$$

$$+2160\left(9N^5 - 1176N^4 - 88964N^3 - 1283840N^2 - 6794096N - 12473568\right)\zeta(4) -$$

$$-720\left(33N^5 + 2970N^4 - 477740N^3 - 10084168N^2 - 61017200N - 117867424\right)\zeta(3) -$$

$$- 45\left(29N^5 + 22644N^4 - 3225892N^3 - 88418816N^2 - 536820560N - 897712992\right)\Big] \ .$$

Here $\zeta(3,5)$ implies the double zeta function

$$\zeta(3,5) = \sum_{1\le n<m} \frac{1}{n^3 m^5} = 0.037707673 \ .$$

Employing self-similar factor approximants for the six-loop expansions, we find the beta-functions for a different number of components. We present below the approximants of even orders that are more reliable then those of odd orders, although all of them are close to each other. Thus for $N = 0$, we have

$$\beta_2^*(g) = \frac{2.667g^2}{(1 + 9.161g)^{0.191}} \qquad (N = 0) \ ,$$

$$\beta_4^*(g) = \frac{2.667g^2}{(1 + 6.083g)^{0.194}(1 + 15.544g)^{0.0366}} \ , \tag{3.295}$$

which yields the strong-coupling behavior

$$\beta_2^*(g) \simeq 1.747g^{1.809} \ , \qquad \beta_4^*(g) \simeq 1.699g^{1.769} \qquad (N = 0, \ g \to \infty) \ . \tag{3.296}$$

Table 6: Coefficients of weak-coupling expansion for the Gell-Man-Low function of the N-component φ^4 field theory, in the six-loop approximation.

N	0	1	2	3	4
b_0	2.667	3.000	3.333	3.667	4.000
b_1	−4.667	−5.667	−6.667	−7.667	−8.667
b_2	25.46	32.55	39.95	47.65	55.66
b_3	−200.9	−271.6	−350.5	−437.6	−533.0
b_4	2004	2849	3845	4999	6318
b_5	−23315	−34776	−48999	−66243	−86768

For $N = 2$, we get

$$\beta_2^*(g) = \frac{3.333g^2}{(1+9.984g)^{0.2003}} \qquad (N=2)\ ,$$

$$\beta_4^*(g) = \frac{3.333g^2}{(1+5.812g)^{0.206}(1+16.234g)^{0.0493}}\ , \tag{3.297}$$

with the strong-coupling limit

$$\beta_2^*(g) \simeq 2.102g^{1.7997}\ , \qquad \beta_4^*(g) \simeq 2.020g^{1.7443} \qquad (N=2,\ g\to\infty)\ . \tag{3.298}$$

In the case of $N = 3$, we find

$$\beta_2^*(g) = \frac{3.667g^2}{(1+10.339g)^{0.202}} \qquad (N=3)\ ,$$

$$\beta_4^*(g) = \frac{3.667g^2}{(1+5.544g)^{0.213}(1+16.537g)^{0.055}}\ , \tag{3.299}$$

giving the limit

$$\beta_2^*(g) \simeq 2.286g^{1.798}\ , \qquad \beta_4^*(g) \simeq 2.183g^{1.732} \qquad (N=3,\ g\to\infty)\ . \tag{3.300}$$

And the case of $N = 4$ results in

$$\beta_2^*(g) = \frac{4g^2}{(1+10.677g)^{0.203}} \qquad (N=4)\ ,$$

$$\beta_4^*(g) = \frac{4g^2}{(1+5.274g)^{0.219}(1+16.866g)^{0.05988}}\ , \tag{3.301}$$

with the strong-coupling limit

$$\beta_2^*(g) \simeq 2.474g^{1.797}\ , \qquad \beta_4^*(g) \simeq 2.345g^{1.721} \qquad (N=4,\ g\to\infty)\ . \tag{3.302}$$

Using the seven-loop expansion for $N = 1$ yields the beta functions

$$\beta_2^*(g) = \frac{3g^2}{(1 + 9.599g)^{0.197}} \qquad (N = 1) ,$$

$$\beta_4^*(g) = \frac{3g^2}{(1 + 6.014g)^{0.2004}(1 + 15.9204g)^{0.0479}} ,$$

$$\beta_6^*(g) = \frac{3g^2}{(1 + 5.357g)^{0.187}(1 + 13.72g)^{0.0597}(1 + 22.096)^{0.00316}} , \tag{3.303}$$

whose strong-coupling behavior is

$$\beta_2^*(g) \simeq 1.922g^{1.803} , \qquad \beta_4^*(g) \simeq 1.859g^{1.757} ,$$

$$\beta_6^*(g) \simeq 1.857g^{1.750} \qquad (N = 1,\ g \to \infty) . \tag{3.304}$$

As is seen, all powers of the strong-coupling asymptotic behavior $\beta(g) \propto g^\gamma$ are close to each other, being between $\gamma = 1.7$ and $\gamma = 1.8$. In literature, it is possible to find the estimates for the single-component field theory with $N = 1$. For example, Kazakov [275] gives the estimate of $\gamma = 2$. Borel summation, with conformal mapping [276] gives $\gamma = 1.9$. The use of optimized perturbation theory [277] results in $\gamma = 1.5$. Borel-Leroy summation [269, 278, 279] leads to $\gamma = 1$. So, our result is between that of optimized perturbation theory [277] and that of Borel summation [275, 276].

3.34 Other Applications

Self-similar approximation theory has been applied to hundreds of various problems, as can be inferred from the literature cited in this review. In addition to the cited publications, it is possible to mention here several more applications. For example, self-similar approximants were used for describing systems with Bose-Einstein condensate [280–284], barrier crossing processes [285,286], stochastic processes [287], seismological phenomena [288–290], and time series [291,292]. Self-similar approximants have been widely used for a large class of problems in the theory of structured media [293, 294].

4 Basics of Renormalization Group

Throughout the previous chapters, it has been mentioned several times that the ideas of optimized perturbation theory and especially of self-similar approximation theory share many properties with the method of renormalization group. Here we recall the basics of the latter approach in order to better explain the similarities in the foundations of the different theories.

4.1 Renormalization-Group Classes

It is necessary to distinguish two main classes among the available variants of renormalization group [295]. One class incorporates the methods where the introduction of a renormalization group is based on the existence of some properties of internal symmetry of a studied

physical system formulated in the language of natural variables of this system. Here, as an example, one may point to the derivation of the quantum-field renormalization group, as is described in the book [296]. In the models of condensed matter physics, one also sometimes tries to discover internal symmetries allowing one, at least approximately, involving several simplifications, to formulate renormalization group equations [297–300].

The other class derives renormalization group equations from the construction of a set of models differing from each other by the scale of some variable. It is this class of renormalization group that is used in considering critical phenomena [301–304]. This class, actually, corresponds to semigroups, since the inverse operation is not defined.

Thus, the first class reflects internal symmetries of the considered systems and is formed by groups. While the second class describes scaling transformations and represents semigroups. Below we briefly sketch the main ideas of both these classes.

4.2 Critical Phenomena

Under critical phenomena one understands the peculiarities of a system behavior in the vicinity of a continuous phase transition, that is, near a second order phase transition [223, 305, 306]. At the critical point, two thermodynamic phases become indistinguishable. The point, where several phases are indistinguishable, is termed multicritical [307]. A multicritical point on a critical line usually separates second- and first-order phase transitions. The critical behavior near a multicritical point is more complicated than in the vicinity of a critical point. Below we keep in mind critical points.

The vicinity of a system to a critical temperature T_c is described by the relative temperature deviation

$$\tau \equiv \frac{T - T_c}{T_c} \; . \tag{4.1}$$

The asymptotic behavior of a statistical system near a critical point is characterized by critical exponents. Thus the asymptotic behavior of specific heat is

$$C_V \propto \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (-\tau)^{\alpha'} \; , & T < T_c \\ \tau^{\alpha} \; , & T > T_c \end{array} \right. \; . \tag{4.2}$$

The order parameter, such as magnetization, behaves as

$$M \propto \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (-\tau)^{\beta'} \; , & T < T_c \\ \tau^{\beta} \; , & T > T_c \end{array} \right. \; . \tag{4.3}$$

For the dependence of a magnetic field B on magnetization, at the critical temperature, one has

$$B \propto M^{\delta} \qquad (T = T_c) \; . \tag{4.4}$$

Susceptibility diverges as

$$\chi \propto \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (-\tau)^{-\gamma'} \; , & T < T_c \\ \tau^{-\gamma} \; , & T > T_c \end{array} \right. \; . \tag{4.5}$$

Correlation length also diverges as

$$\xi \propto \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} (-\tau)^{\nu'} \; , & T < T_c \\ \tau^{-\nu} \; , & T > T_c \end{array} \right. \; . \tag{4.6}$$

The spatial dependence of correlation function at the critical temperature,

$$C(r) \propto r^{-(d-2+\eta)} \qquad (T = T_c) \; , \tag{4.7}$$

where d is the space dimensionality, is characterized by the exponent η. The derivative of the Gell-Mann-Low function at a fixed-point coupling defines the exponent

$$\omega \equiv \lim_{g \rightarrow g^*} \frac{d\beta(g)}{dg} \tag{4.8}$$

specifying the correction to the critical scaling behavior.

Assuming that the critical exponents are the same above as well as below the critical temperature, one gets the symmetry relations

$$\alpha = \alpha' \; , \qquad \beta = \beta' \; , \qquad \gamma = \gamma' \; , \qquad \nu = \nu' \; . \tag{4.9}$$

And one also assumes the validity of the scaling relations

$$\alpha + 2\beta + \gamma = 2 \; , \qquad \alpha + \beta(1+\delta) = 2 \; , \qquad \gamma + \beta(1-\delta) = 0 \; ,$$

$$\gamma + \nu(\eta - 2) = 0 \; , \qquad \alpha + \nu d = 2 \tag{4.10}$$

motivated by thermodynamic equalities.

In the case of a multicritical point, the symmetry relations do not hold. Approaching a multicritical point from the side of a second-order transition, it is possible to introduce the critical exponents as above. But at the point itself, the exponents change by a jump.

4.3 Universality Classes

When all critical exponents for two systems coincide, one tells that these systems are equivalent in the sense of their critical behavior. And the collection of the critical exponents is termed the set of universal quantities.

Historically, the assumption on the universality of critical behavior has been based on the results of mean-field theory, where all critical exponents are the same for all physical systems [308]. A particular case of mean-field theory is the Landau method [309] of expanding the free energy of an N-particle system

$$f \equiv \frac{F}{N} = - \frac{T}{N} \; \ln \mathrm{Tr} e^{-\hat{H}/T} \tag{4.11}$$

in powers of an order parameter, say magnetization,

$$f \simeq f_0 + f_2 M^2 + f_4 M^4 \qquad (M \ll 1 \; , \; T < T_c) \; . \tag{4.12}$$

If $(f_0 - f)/f_2 \propto \tau$, then

$$M \propto (-\tau)^\beta \qquad \left(\beta = \frac{1}{2} \right) \; ,$$

irrespectively of the system nature.

The Landau expansion is applicable in the temperature region, where the order parameter is already small, while the fluctuations, increasing in the vicinity of the critical temperature, are not yet too large, so that the Ginzburg criterion be valid:

$$Gi \propto |\tau|^{(d-4)/2} \ll 1 \; .$$

This criterion shows that in the space of dimensionality $d > 4$ critical exponents can be defined by mean-field theory. While for dimensionality $d < 4$ the Landau expansion is not appropriate. The dimensionality $d = 4$ is marginal, requiring a separate investigation.

Experiments have demonstrated that critical exponents of the majority of systems are not of the mean-field type, being quite different for different systems. At the same time, there are many systems demonstrating very similar critical behavior, with the critical exponents being practically the same, within the accuracy of experiments. Thus the notion of universality classes has arisen.

A universality class is a family of systems, equivalent in the sense of their critical behavior, hence possessing the same set of critical exponents.

Among the characteristics of physical systems there are the main that define a class of universality of a system. The systems having at least one of such characteristics different, pertain to different universality classes. These main characteristics are:

(I) The system dimensionality.

(II) The number of the order parameter components.

(III) The order parameter symmetry.

(IV) The range of particle interactions.

(V) The interaction potential anisotropy.

Particle interactions can be of the following types.

Long-range potentials. For a discrete system, such potentials

$$J_{ij} \equiv J(\mathbf{r}_{ij}) \qquad (\mathbf{r}_{ij} \equiv \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j) \; ,$$

in thermodynamic limit, satisfy the limiting property

$$\lim_{N\to\infty} J_{ij} = 0 \; , \qquad \lim_{N\to\infty} \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i\neq j}^{N} J_{ij} = const \neq 0 \; . \tag{4.13}$$

The equivalent property for a continuous system is

$$\lim_{V\to\infty} \Phi(\mathbf{r}) = 0 \; , \qquad \lim_{V\to\infty} \int_V \Phi(\mathbf{r}) \, d\mathbf{r} = const \neq 0 \; . \tag{4.14}$$

The models with such long-range potentials allow for asymptotically exact solutions in thermodynamic limit [310] and enjoy the critical exponents of mean-field type.

Short-range potentials. These are the potentials with a finite interaction radius. For instance, the exponential potentials

$$J_{ij} \propto \exp\left(- \frac{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}|}{b} \right) , \tag{4.15}$$

or a sufficiently quickly decaying power-law potentials

$$J_{ij} \propto \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}|^{d+n}} \qquad (n > 2) . \tag{4.16}$$

Short-range potentials can be well classified into different universality classes.

Mid-range potentials. These potentials are intermediate between long-range and short-range potentials, e.g.,

$$J_{ij} \propto \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}|^{d+n}} \qquad (0 < n < 2) . \tag{4.17}$$

Such potentials do not allow for classifying systems into universality classes, since critical exponents depend on the power n.

Anisotropic potentials. This is a type of potentials depending on the angles and requiring a special consideration. Thus the dipolar potential

$$J_{ij} \propto \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}|^d} \left(\delta_{\alpha\beta} - \frac{r_{ij}^\alpha r_{ij}^\beta}{|\mathbf{r}_{ij}|^2} \right) , \tag{4.18}$$

although it looks like a long-range potential, but has the critical exponents coinciding, up to logarithmic corrections, with those of short-range systems. This is because of the property

$$\frac{1}{N} \sum_{i \neq j} J_{ij} = 0 ,$$

valid for sufficiently large systems. Dipolar potentials also lead to some complications in describing the systems with such forces. Thus the Fourier transform of a dipolar potential is ill-defined, so that to overcome this problem one needs to take into account screening effects [311–313].

The reason why the universality classes do exist is as follows. In the vicinity of critical points, large-scale fluctuations become predominant and the correlation length tends to infinity. This makes small-scale peculiarities less important, while the system behavior is governed by long-range fluctuations. But let us recall that the concept of universality classes is not applicable to mid-range interactions and to some anisotropic models [314].

In practice, the universality can be employed by describing critical phenomena resorting to the simplest system in the given universality class.

4.4 Kadanoff Transformations

Let a statistical system be characterized by a Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$ being a functional of a set of variables s. It is convenient to define the dimensionless Hamiltonian

$$H[s] \equiv \frac{\hat{H}}{T} , \tag{4.19}$$

where T is temperature. Thermodynamic characteristics are described by the free energy

$$f = -\frac{T}{N}\ln Z\ , \tag{4.20}$$

in which Z is the partition function

$$Z = \mathrm{Tr}_s \exp(-H[s])\ . \tag{4.21}$$

The Kadanoff idea is to define a set of transformations moving from small to large scales and allowing for a step-by-step simplification of the Hamiltonian [315]. At the first step, one splits the set of variables s into two subsets, s_1 and s_1', and integrates out (or sums out) the variables s_1' according to the rule

$$\exp(-H_1[s_1]) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{s_1'} \exp(-H[s_1, s_1']) \tag{4.22}$$

defining the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_1[s_1] = -\ln \mathrm{Tr}_{s_1'} \exp(-H[s_1, s_1'])\ . \tag{4.23}$$

Hence the partition function Z becomes

$$Z = \mathrm{Tr}_{s_1} \exp(-H_1[s_1])\ . \tag{4.24}$$

Splitting again the set of variables s_1 into two subsets, s_2 and s_2', and summing out the variables s_2',

$$\exp(-H_2[s_2]) \equiv \mathrm{Tr}_{s_2'} \exp(-H_1[s_2, s_2'])\ , \tag{4.25}$$

one introduces the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_2[s_2] = -\ln \mathrm{Tr}_{s_2'} \exp(-H_1[s_2, s_2'])\ . \tag{4.26}$$

This yields the partition function

$$Z = \mathrm{Tr}_{s_2} \exp(-H_2[s_2])\ . \tag{4.27}$$

Repeating this procedure n times results in the recurrence relation

$$H_n[s_n] = -\ln \mathrm{Tr}_{s_n'} \exp(-H_{n-1}[s_n, s_n']) \tag{4.28}$$

and in the partition function

$$Z = \mathrm{Tr}_{s_n} \exp(-H_n[s_n])\ , \tag{4.29}$$

where $H_0[s_0] \equiv H[s]$.

Introducing the renormalization transformation

$$\hat{R}(s_n')H_{n-1}[s_n, s_n'] \equiv -\ln \mathrm{Tr}_{s_n'} \exp(-H_{n-1}[s_n, s_n']) \tag{4.30}$$

makes it straightforward to rewrite the recurrence relation (4.28) as

$$H_n[s_n] = \hat{R}(s_n')H_{n-1}[s_n, s_n'] \qquad (n \geq 1)\ . \tag{4.31}$$

Defining the double transformation

$$\hat{R}(s'_m, s'_n) H_k \equiv - \ln \mathrm{Tr}_{s'_m} \mathrm{Tr}_{s'_n} \exp(-H_k) \tag{4.32}$$

and the identity transformation

$$\hat{R}(0) \equiv 1 \tag{4.33}$$

gives us the property

$$\hat{R}(s'_m, s'_n) = \hat{R}(s'_m)\hat{R}(s'_n) = \hat{R}(s'_n)\hat{R}(s'_m) \; . \tag{4.34}$$

This tells us that the family of the renormalization operators $\hat{R}(s'_j)$ forms a commutative semigroup. This is a semigroup, since the inverse operation is not defined.

The free energy (4.20) acquires the form

$$f = \frac{T}{N} \hat{R}(s_n) H_n[s_n] = \frac{T}{N} \hat{R}(s_n)\hat{R}(s'_n)\hat{R}(s'_{n-1}) \ldots \hat{R}(s'_1) H[s] =$$

$$= - \frac{T}{N} \ln \mathrm{Tr}_{s_n} \exp(-H_n[s_n]) \; . \tag{4.35}$$

The above scheme lies in the core of renormalization semigroups used in statistical physics. Practical realizations can be different, but the principal idea is as described above.

4.5 Momentum Scaling

A widely employed approach of introducing renormalization operations is based on different variants of scaling in the momentum space [301,303,316–318]. The typical procedure can be characterized as follows.

Let the Hamiltonian $H[\varphi]$ be a functional of a field depending on momentum,

$$\varphi = \varphi(\mathbf{k}) \qquad (0 \leq k \leq \Lambda \; , \; k \equiv |\mathbf{k}|) \; , \tag{4.36}$$

with Λ being an ultraviolet cutoff. The partition function, or generating functional, is given by the functional integral

$$Z = \int \exp(-H[\varphi]) \, \mathcal{D}\varphi \; . \tag{4.37}$$

One separates the momenta into two regions, one is the region of low energy, where

$$0 \leq k \leq \frac{\Lambda}{b} \; , \tag{4.38}$$

and the other is the region of high energy, where

$$\frac{\Lambda}{b} < k \leq \Lambda \; , \tag{4.39}$$

with $b \geq 1$ being an arbitrary real number. Then the field splits into two parts:

$$\varphi(k) = \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} \varphi_b(\mathbf{k}) \; , & k \leq \Lambda/b \\ \varphi'_b(\mathbf{k}) \; , & k > \Lambda/b \end{array} \right. \; . \tag{4.40}$$

Hence partition function (4.37) takes the form

$$Z = \int \exp(-H[\varphi_b, \varphi_b']) \, \mathcal{D}\varphi_b \mathcal{D}\varphi_b' \, . \tag{4.41}$$

One defines the effective Hamiltonian $H_b[\varphi_b]$ by integrating out high-energy momenta in the equality

$$\exp(-H_b[\varphi_b]) \equiv \int \exp(-H[\varphi_b, \varphi_b']) \, \mathcal{D}\varphi_b' \, , \tag{4.42}$$

which gives

$$H_b[\varphi_b] = -\ln \int \exp(-H[\varphi_b, \varphi_b']) \, \mathcal{D}\varphi_b' \, . \tag{4.43}$$

So that the partition function reads as

$$Z = \int \exp(-H_b[\varphi_b]) \, \mathcal{D}\varphi_b \, . \tag{4.44}$$

The domain of the momenta in the field $\varphi_b(k)$ can be extended to the whole momentum space by the change

$$\mathbf{k} \to b\mathbf{k} \, , \qquad \varphi_b(\mathbf{k}) \to \zeta\varphi(\mathbf{k}) \, , \tag{4.45}$$

in which ζ is a scale factor to be specified later. Then partition function (4.44) transforms into

$$Z = \int \exp(-H_b[\varphi]) J(\zeta) \, \mathcal{D}\varphi \, , \tag{4.46}$$

where $J(\zeta)$ is the Jacobian of transformation (4.45) and the effective Hamiltonian is

$$H_b[\varphi] \equiv -\ln \int \exp(-H[\zeta\varphi, \varphi_b']) \, \mathcal{D}\varphi_b' \, . \tag{4.47}$$

The procedure of obtaining the effective Hamiltonian (4.47) can be symbolically denoted as the action of a renormalization transformation $\hat{R}(b)$,

$$\hat{R}(b) H[\varphi] = H_b[\varphi] \, . \tag{4.48}$$

The unitary element is defined by the equality

$$H_1[\varphi] = H[\varphi] \, , \qquad \hat{R}(1) = 1 \, . \tag{4.49}$$

The transformation $\hat{R}(b)$ enjoys the property

$$\hat{R}(b_1 b_2) = \hat{R}(b_1)\hat{R}(b_2) = \hat{R}(b_2)\hat{R}(b_1) \, . \tag{4.50}$$

Thus the family of transformations $\hat{R}(b)$ forms a commutative renormalization semigroup.

4.6 Fixed Points

The renormalization transformations $\hat{R}(b)$ generate a continuous sequence of effective Hamiltonians (4.48) starting from the initial Hamiltonian $H[\varphi]$. One says that the Hamiltonian moves along a trajectory parameterized by the scaling factor $b \in [1, \infty)$. However, in that motion the form of the Hamiltonian varies. Thus, if the initial Hamiltonian contains a set of coupling parameters g, in the effective renormalized Hamiltonian, not merely the coupling parameters become renormalized, but also there appear new terms with additional coupling parameters. This can be formulated as the motion in the space of coupling parameters:

$$g \rightarrow \overline{g}(b, g) = \{\overline{g}_1(b, g), \overline{g}_2(b, g), \ldots\} \tag{4.51}$$

with the initial condition

$$\overline{g}(1, g) = g \; . \tag{4.52}$$

During this motion, one confronts with the problem of proliferation of coupling parameters. Even if initially the Hamiltonian $H[\varphi]$ had a finite number of such parameters, with increasing b, their number tends to infinity.

But the hope is that in the vicinity of a critical point the Hamiltonian becomes invariant with respect to the renormalization transformations, since at a critical point the correlation length diverges, making irrelevant the fine structure of the Hamiltonian. The Hamiltonian invariance implies the existence of a fixed point $H^*[\varphi]$, where

$$\hat{R}(b) H^*[\varphi] = H^*[\varphi] \; . \tag{4.53}$$

In the space of coupling parameters, this is equivalent to the equation

$$\overline{g}(b, g^*) = g^* \; . \tag{4.54}$$

As far as at the fixed point the Hamiltonian is invariant, conversely, assuming the Hamiltonian invariance, one could approximately find the fixed point.

4.7 Wilson Method

To be more specific, let us illustrate how the Wilson method works by considering the scalar φ^4 field theory. We shall follow the scheme of Refs. [301, 303, 319].

The Hamiltonian of the scalar φ^4 field theory can be represented in the form

$$H[\varphi] = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^\Lambda \left(m^2 + k^2 \right) |\varphi(\mathbf{k})|^2 \, d\mathbf{k} +$$

$$+ g \int_0^\Lambda \varphi(\mathbf{k}_1) \varphi(\mathbf{k}_2) \varphi(\mathbf{k}_3) \varphi(\mathbf{k}_4) \delta_d(\mathbf{k}_1 + \mathbf{k}_2 + \mathbf{k}_3 + \mathbf{k}_4) \, d\mathbf{k}_1 d\mathbf{k}_2 d\mathbf{k}_3 d\mathbf{k}_4 \; , \tag{4.55}$$

where the momentum is a vector in a d-dimensional space,

$$\mathbf{k} = \{k_\alpha : \; \alpha = 1, 2, \ldots, d\} \; ,$$

and the notations are used:

$$\int_0^\Lambda d\mathbf{k} \equiv \left(\frac{a}{2\pi}\right)^d \prod_{\alpha=1}^d \int_0^\Lambda dk_\alpha \; , \qquad \delta_d(\mathbf{k}) \equiv \left(\frac{2\pi}{a}\right)^d \prod_{\alpha=1}^d \delta(k_\alpha) \; .$$

Here $1/a^d \sim N/V$ plays the role of an effective density.

Integrating out the high-energy momenta, as is explained in Sec. 4.5, the integrals are calculated involving perturbation theory with respect to the coupling parameter g. And, assuming that we are close to a fixed point, hence the Hamiltonian has to be invariant under the renormalization transformation, the terms spoiling the Hamiltonian structure are neglected. Then the term $m^2 + k^2$ transforms as

$$m^2 + k^2 \rightarrow m^2(b) + f(b)k^2 \; , \tag{4.56}$$

where

$$m^2(b) = \frac{\zeta^2}{b^d} \left[m^2 + 12g \int_{\Lambda/b}^\Lambda \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{m^2 + k^2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(g^2) \; , \qquad f(b) = \frac{\zeta^2}{b^{d+2}} + \mathcal{O}(g^2) \; . \tag{4.57}$$

The coupling parameter experiences the transformation

$$g \rightarrow g(b) \; , \tag{4.58}$$

in which

$$g(b) = \frac{\zeta^4}{b^{3d}} \left[g - 36g^2 \int_{\Lambda/b}^\Lambda \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(m^2 + k^2)^2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(g^3) \; . \tag{4.59}$$

The scaling parameter, introduced in scaling (4.45), is arbitrary and can be chosen such that the factor at k^2 be unchanged, that is, setting it to one, which means

$$f(b) = 1 \; , \qquad \zeta^2 = b^{d+2} \; . \tag{4.60}$$

Thus we get the recurrence relations

$$m^2(b) = b^2 \left[m^2 + 12g \int_{\Lambda/b}^\Lambda \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{m^2 + k^2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(g^2) \; ,$$

$$g(b) = b^{4-d} g \left[1 - 36g \int_{\Lambda/b}^\Lambda \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(m^2 + k^2)^2} \right] + \mathcal{O}(g^2) \; . \tag{4.61}$$

The fixed point in the parameter space is defined by the equations

$$(m^*)^2 = b^2 \left[(m^*)^2 + 12g^* \int_{\Lambda/b}^\Lambda \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(m^*)^2 + k^2} \right] \; ,$$

$$g^* = b^{4-d} g^* \left[1 - 36g^* \int_{\Lambda/b}^\Lambda \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{((m^*)^2 + k^2)^2} \right] \; . \tag{4.62}$$

These equations have a trivial fixed point, where both m^* and g^* are zero. But we wish to find a nontrivial fixed point. By noticing that $(m^*)^2$ is of order g^*, the integrals in Eqs (4.62) can be simplified:

$$\int_{\Lambda/b}^{\Lambda} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(m^*)^2 + k^2} \simeq \int_{\Lambda/b}^{\Lambda} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{k^2} = \frac{C_d}{d-2} \left[\Lambda^{d-2} - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{b} \right)^{d-2} \right] ,$$

$$\int_{\Lambda/b}^{\Lambda} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{((m^*)^2 + k^2)^2} \simeq \int_{\Lambda/b}^{\Lambda} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{k^4} = \frac{C_d}{d-4} \left[\Lambda^{d-4} - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{b} \right)^{d-4} \right] ,$$

where

$$C_d = \left(\frac{a}{2\pi} \right)^d \int d^d\Omega = \frac{a^d}{2^{d-1}\pi^{d/2}\Gamma(d/2)} . \tag{4.63}$$

Thus we come to the fixed point characterized by the approximate values

$$(m^*)^2 = - \frac{12 g^* b^2 C_d}{(b^2-1)(d-2)} \left[\Lambda^{d-2} - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{b} \right)^{d-2} \right] ,$$

$$g^* = \frac{(1-b^{d-4})(d-4)}{36 C_d} \left[\Lambda^{d-4} - \left(\frac{\Lambda}{b} \right)^{d-4} \right]^{-1} . \tag{4.64}$$

This answer, however, is not yet satisfactory, since it contains an arbitrary scaling factor b that makes the obtained values unphysical.

4.8 Fractional Dimension

We may notice that the dependence on b disappears for dimension $d = 4$, although then the fixed point reduces to trivial zero. But it would be possible to get rid of b dependence supposing that the deviation from the dimension $d = 4$ is small, however not zero. This suggests to introduce the variable

$$\varepsilon \equiv 4 - d \tag{4.65}$$

assumed to be small. Then it is admissible to expand the quantities containing ε in powers of ε employing the expansion

$$x^\varepsilon = \exp(\varepsilon \ln x) \simeq 1 + \varepsilon \ln x .$$

Such an ε- expansion for the fixed point (4.64), to first order in ε, gives

$$(m^*)^2 = - \frac{\Lambda^2}{6} \varepsilon , \qquad g^* = \frac{\Lambda}{36 C_d} \varepsilon . \tag{4.66}$$

At the end, one has to remember that the real space is not $d = 4$, but it is $d = 3$, or in the limiting cases it can be $d = 1$ or $d = 2$. Respectively, one should set $\varepsilon = 1$ or even $\varepsilon = 2$ or $\varepsilon = 3$. For instance, quantity (4.63) becomes

$$C_1 = \frac{a}{\pi} \qquad (d = 1 , \ \varepsilon = 3) ,$$

$$C_2 = \frac{a^2}{2\pi} \qquad (d = 2\ ,\ \varepsilon = 2)\ ,$$

$$C_3 = \frac{a^3}{2\pi^2} \qquad (d = 3\ ,\ \varepsilon = 1)\ .$$

And for the fixed point (4.66), we find

$$\left(\frac{m^*}{\Lambda}\right)^2 = \begin{cases} -0.5\ , & d = 1 \\ -0.333\ , & d = 2 \\ -0.167\ , & d = 3 \end{cases} \quad , \qquad g^*\,\frac{a^d}{\Lambda} = \begin{cases} 0.262\ , & d = 1 \\ 0.349\ , & d = 2 \\ 0.548\ , & d = 3 \end{cases} \quad . \tag{4.67}$$

The described ε - expansion results in asymptotic series. Substituting there finite values of ε, strictly speaking, is not correct. Before such a substitution, the series have to be extrapolated to finite values of ε, e.g., as is done in Sec. 3.25.

4.9 Differential Formulation

It is possible to derive differential equations for the renormalized parameters [303, 320] by considering infinitesimally small variations of the scaling factor

$$b = 1 + \delta x \qquad (\delta x \to 0)\ . \tag{4.68}$$

Then the integrals in the recurrence relations (4.61) can be represented as

$$\int_{\Lambda/b}^{\Lambda} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{m^2 + k^2} \simeq \frac{C_d \Lambda^d}{m^2 + \Lambda^2}\,\delta x\ , \qquad \int_{\Lambda/b}^{\Lambda} \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(m^2 + k^2)^2} \simeq \frac{C_d \Lambda^d}{(m^2 + \Lambda^2)^2}\,\delta x\ .$$

Hence for the quantities

$$m^2(b) = m^2(1 + \delta x)\ , \qquad g(b) = g(1 + \delta x) \tag{4.69}$$

we obtain the relations

$$\frac{m^2(1 + \delta x) - m^2}{\delta x} = 2m^2 + \frac{12 C_d \Lambda^d}{m^2 + \Lambda^2}\,g\ ,$$

$$\frac{g(1 + \delta x) - g}{\delta x} = (4 - d)g - \frac{36 C_d \Lambda^d}{(m^2 + \Lambda^2)^2}\,g^2\ . \tag{4.70}$$

Thus we come to the differential equations

$$\frac{dm^2(x)}{dx} = 2m^2(x) + \frac{12 C_d \Lambda^d}{m^2(x) + \Lambda^2}\,g(x)\ ,$$

$$\frac{dg(x)}{dx} = (4 - d)g(x) - \frac{36 C_d \Lambda^d}{(m^2(x) + \Lambda^2)^2}\,g^2(x)\ , \tag{4.71}$$

with the initial conditions

$$m(0) = m\ , \qquad g(0) = g\ . \tag{4.72}$$

The fixed points of the dynamical system are defined by the zero derivatives

$$\left.\frac{dm^2(x)}{dx}\right|_{m^*,g^*} = 0 \; , \qquad \left.\frac{g(x)}{dx}\right|_{m^*,g^*} = 0 \; , \tag{4.73}$$

which leads to the equations

$$6g^*C_d\Lambda^d + (m^*)^2\left((m^*)^2 + \Lambda^2\right) = 0 \; ,$$

$$36g^*C_d\Lambda^d - (4-d)\left((m^*)^2 + \Lambda^2\right)^2 = 0 \; . \tag{4.74}$$

Taking into account that the ultraviolet cutoff is sufficiently large, such that $\Lambda \gg |m|$, we find

$$(m^*)^2 = -\frac{4-d}{6}\,\Lambda^2 \; , \qquad g^* = \frac{4-d}{36C_d}\,\Lambda^{4-d} \; . \tag{4.75}$$

Let us stress that in this way, we have not involved the ε-expansion. Nevertheless, if we set $4 - d = \varepsilon$, we return to the fixed point (4.66). That is, the differential formulation is equivalent to the ε-expansion, resulting in the same form of fixed points.

4.10 Decimation Procedure

Renormalization group in real space can be accomplished employing the Kadanoff transformations described in Sec. 4.4. Summing out a part of variables leads to the coarsening of the real-space scale [315, 321]. Such a procedure is often called *decimation*. This term is borrowed from the language of the ancient Rome, where the decimation meant the killing of one in every ten of soldiers from a mutinous or retreated Roman legion.

Let us consider the two-dimensional Ising model with the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = N\,\frac{U}{2} \; - \; \frac{1}{2}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle} J\sigma_i\sigma_j \; , \tag{4.76}$$

where the spin variables take the values $\sigma_j = \pm 1$ and the summation is over the nearest neighbors. We keep here a constant term to show that it also needs renormalization [319]. The set of all spin variables is denoted as

$$s = \{\sigma_j = \pm 1 \; : \; j = 1, 2, \ldots, N\} \; . \tag{4.77}$$

Introducing the dimensionless parameters

$$u \equiv \frac{U}{2T} \; , \qquad g \equiv \frac{J}{2T} \; , \tag{4.78}$$

gives us the dimensionless Hamiltonian (4.19) in the form

$$H[s] = Nu - g\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\sigma_i\sigma_j \; . \tag{4.79}$$

Considering a square lattice with the side a, we sum out the nearest neighbors, which coarsens the lattice side into $\sqrt{2}a$. The effective Hamiltonian (4.23) becomes

$$H_1[s_1] = Nu_2 - g_2 \sum_{\langle ij \rangle} \sigma_i \sigma_j - g_2' \sum_{(ij)} \sigma_i \sigma_j - g_2'' \sum_{[ijkl]} \sigma_i \sigma_j \sigma_k \sigma_l \; , \tag{4.80}$$

where the initial parameters u and g are renormalized into

$$u_2 = 2u - \ln 2 - \frac{1}{8} \left[\ln \cosh(4g) + 4 \ln \cosh(2g) \right] , \qquad g_2 = \frac{1}{4} \ln \cosh(4g) \; , \tag{4.81}$$

and there arise two additional terms, with the couplings

$$g_2' = \frac{1}{2} g_2 \; , \qquad g_2'' = \frac{1}{8} \left[\ln \cosh(4g) - 4 \ln \cosh(2g) \right] . \tag{4.82}$$

In these additional terms, the notation (ij) implies the next to nearest neighbors, and $[ijkl]$ denotes a placket, that is a square of sites containing no sites inside.

As is seen, the number of the coupling parameters has been doubled,

$$\{u, g\} \to \{u_2, g_2, g_2', g_2''\} \; .$$

This is an example of the coupling-parameter proliferation, discussed in Sec. 4.4.

Assuming that near a fixed point the Hamiltonian is invariant under the renormalization transformation, one neglects the appearance of the additional terms. It is straightforward to continue the procedure, as is explained in Sec. 4.4. If we limit ourselves by one transformation, we get the fixed point equations

$$u^* = \ln 2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[g^* + \ln \cosh(2g^*) \right] , \qquad g^* = \frac{1}{4} \ln \cosh(4g^*) \; . \tag{4.83}$$

However, these equations have only a trivial solution $u^* = \ln 2$ and $g^* = 0$ yielding incompatible values for the critical temperature. Thus the first equality gives $T_c = U/2 \ln 2$, while the second equality means that $T_c \to \infty$. This signifies that just one step of the renormalization procedure is not sufficient for defining a nontrivial fixed point. But the procedure has to be continued.

4.11 Exact Semigroup

There exist rather rare cases, when the proliferation of parameters does not occur. In such exceptional cases, the renormalization procedure can be realized exactly. As an illustration, let us consider the one-dimensional Ising model with the Hamiltonian

$$H[s] = \sum_{j=1}^{N} (u - g \sigma_j \sigma_{j+1}) \; , \tag{4.84}$$

in which $\sigma_j = \pm 1$ and the periodic boundary condition

$$\sigma_{N+1} = \sigma_1 \tag{4.85}$$

is imposed.

Following the scheme of Sec. 4.4, we split the set of spin variables into two subsets, s_1 and s_1', the first subset comprising the spins with odd indices, while the second, containing even spins,

$$s_1 = \left\{ \sigma_{2j+1} : \; j = 0, 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{N}{2} \right\} , \qquad s_1' = \left\{ \sigma_{2j} : \; j = 1, 2, \ldots, \frac{N}{2} \right\} .$$

Summing out the even spins at the first renormalization step, we pass from a chain with the interspin distance a to that with the distance $2a$. For the effective Hamiltonian (4.23), we get

$$H_1[s_1] = \sum_{j=0}^{N/2} (u_2 - g_2 \sigma_{2j+1} \sigma_{2j+3}) , \tag{4.86}$$

with the renormalized parameters

$$u_2 = 2u - \ln 2 - 2 \ln \cosh g + \ln \cosh g_2 ,$$

$$g_2 = \operatorname{arctanh} \left(\tanh^2 g \right) . \tag{4.87}$$

To simplify the recurrence relations, it is useful to introduce the notations

$$c \equiv e^{-u} \cosh g , \qquad t \equiv \tanh g ,$$

$$c_n \equiv e^{-u_n} \cosh g_n , \qquad t_n \equiv \tanh g_n . \tag{4.88}$$

Then relations (4.87) take the form

$$c_2 = 2u^2 , \qquad t_2 = t^2 . \tag{4.89}$$

At the second renormalization step, we pass to the chain with the interspin distance $4a$. The related twice renormalized parameters read as

$$c_4 = 2c_2^2 = 2^3 c^4 , \qquad t_4 = t_2^2 = t^4 . \tag{4.90}$$

After the third renormalization, we get a chain with the interspin distance $8a$, and with the parameters

$$c_8 = 2^7 c^8 , \qquad t_8 = t^8 . \tag{4.91}$$

Accomplishing k renormalizations results in the parameters

$$c_n = 2^{n-1} c^n , \qquad t_n = t^n \qquad (n = 2^k) , \tag{4.92}$$

which can be rewritten as

$$u_n = nu - (n-1) \ln 2 - n \ln \cosh g + \ln \cosh g_n ,$$

$$g_n = \operatorname{arctanh} \left(\tanh^n g \right) \qquad (n = 2^k) . \tag{4.93}$$

At all renormalization steps, no additional parameters arise.

Fixed points are given by the equations

$$c^* = 2^{n+1}(c^*)^n \; , \qquad t^* = (t^*)^n \; , \tag{4.94}$$

having the solutions $c^* = 0, 1/2$ and $t^* = 0, 1$. The sole solution, yielding compatible values in terms of the parameters u and g, is

$$u^* = \infty \; , \qquad g^* = \infty \; . \tag{4.95}$$

This defines the critical point $T_c = 0$, which is the exact answer for the one-dimensional Ising model.

The k times renormalized effective Hamiltonian is

$$H_k[s_k] = H_{1,n+1} + H_{n+1,2n+1} + H_{2n+1,3n+1} + \ldots \tag{4.96}$$

containing N/n terms

$$H_{i,j} \equiv u_n - g_n \sigma_i \sigma_j \qquad (n = 2^k) \; .$$

Increasing the number k of renormalizations, we get the parameters

$$u_n \simeq n[u - \ln(2\cosh g)] \; , \qquad g_n \simeq 0 \qquad (n \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{4.97}$$

Then the effective Hamiltonian (4.96) tends to

$$H_k[s_k] \simeq u_n \qquad (n = 2^k \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{4.98}$$

The free energy (4.35) becomes

$$f \simeq \frac{T}{N} \, u_n \qquad (n \rightarrow \infty) \; . \tag{4.99}$$

Since the maximal number of the described renormalizations is connected with the number of spins by the relations

$$N = 2^k \; , \qquad \max \; k = \frac{\ln N}{\ln 2} \; ,$$

we finally obtain the free energy

$$f \simeq T[u - \ln(2\cosh g)] \; . \tag{4.100}$$

This result is asymptotically exact in thermodynamic limit.

Recall that the situation when there is no proliferation of parameters is quite exceptional. In general, the process of renormalization generates additional terms with additional coupling parameters. To overcome this problem, it is possible to use the idea of optimized perturbation theory and to introduce control functions canceling the appearing additional terms [322].

4.12 Field-Theory Group

Statistical renormalization groups, considered above, are actually semigroups, since they do not include inverse transformations. They are based on some kind of scaling transformations resulting in the consecutive coarse graining of the system and constructing a sequence of effective models. Thus in the Wilson method, it is the scaling of momentum variables, while in the decimation procedure, it is the real-space coarsening of a lattice.

Field-theory renormalization groups are groups, containing inverse transformations. It is based on discovering the natural symmetries of the system. This approach can be used in field theory as well as in statistical physics. As an application of the latter kind, the field-theory approach is illustrated below for the Ising model [323].

The spin variables in the Ising model can be scaled by the transformation $\sigma_j \rightarrow \nu\sigma_j$, which results in the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_\nu = -\frac{\nu^2}{2}\sum_{\langle ij\rangle} J\sigma_i\sigma_j - \nu\sum_j B_j\sigma_j \; , \tag{4.101}$$

where B_j is an external magnetic field. With the dimensionless parameters

$$g \equiv \frac{J}{2T} \; , \qquad h_j \equiv \frac{B_j}{T} \; , \tag{4.102}$$

we have the dimensionless Hamiltonian

$$H_\nu[s] = -\nu^2 g\sum_{\langle ij\rangle}\sigma_i\sigma_j - \nu\sum_j h_j\sigma_j \; . \tag{4.103}$$

The partition function reads as

$$Z(\nu, g, h) = \sum_s \exp(-H_\nu[s]) \; , \tag{4.104}$$

where h is the set of the fields h_j.

We wish to find such a transformation of the parameters

$$\nu \rightarrow z_1\nu \; , \qquad g \rightarrow z_2 g \; , \qquad h_j \rightarrow z_3 h_j \tag{4.105}$$

that would leave invariant the partition function,

$$Z(z_1\nu, z_2 g, z_3 h) = Z(\nu, g, h) \; . \tag{4.106}$$

From Eq. (4.104), it follows that the condition of invariance is satisfied if

$$z_1^2 z_2 = 1 \; , \qquad z_1 z_3 = 1 \; .$$

This tells us that of the three quantities z_1, z_2, and z_3 only one is independent. Denoting one of them, say $z_2 \equiv z$, we have

$$z_1 = z^{-1/2} \; , \qquad z_2 = z \; , \qquad z_3 = z^{1/2} \; . \tag{4.107}$$

The property of invariance (4.106) takes the form

$$Z(z^{-1/2}\nu, zg, z^{1/2}h) = Z(\nu, g, h) \; . \tag{4.108}$$

Because of invariance (4.108), the correlation function

$$C_{ij}(\nu, g) \equiv \left. \frac{\partial^2 \ln Z(\nu, g, h)}{\partial h_i \partial h_j} \right|_{h=0} \tag{4.109}$$

enjoys the property

$$C_{ij}(z^{-1/2}\nu, zg) = z^{-1} C_{ij}(\nu, g) \; . \tag{4.110}$$

The Fourier transform

$$C(\mathbf{k}, \nu, g) \equiv \frac{1}{N} \sum_{ij} C_{ij}(\nu, g) e^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}_{ij}} \; , \tag{4.111}$$

in which $\mathbf{r}_{ij} \equiv \mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j$, possesses the same property

$$C(\mathbf{k}, z^{-1/2}\nu, zg) = z^{-1} C(\mathbf{k}, \nu, g) \; . \tag{4.112}$$

Keeping in mind a spatially isotropic situation, we can define the function

$$K(k^2, \nu, g) \equiv g C(\mathbf{k}, \nu, g) \tag{4.113}$$

that is invariant under the transformation

$$K(k^2, z^{-1/2}\nu, zg) = K(k^2, \nu, g) \; . \tag{4.114}$$

The latter means that this function actually depends on two combinations of the variables,

$$K(k^2, \nu, g) = \overline{K}(k^2, \nu^2 g) \; . \tag{4.115}$$

In the vicinity of a critical point, where the correlation length diverges, it is possible [323] to introduce the dimensionless function

$$D\left(\frac{k^2}{\lambda^2} \, , g \right) \equiv \frac{\overline{K}(k^2, g)}{\overline{K}(\lambda^2, g)} \tag{4.116}$$

having the boundary condition

$$D(1, g) = 1 \; . \tag{4.117}$$

Representing the correlation functions as series in powers of the coupling parameter g, it is possible [323] to explicitly demonstrate that function (4.116) is invariant under the transformation

$$\lambda \to \mu \; , \qquad g \to zg \; , \qquad D \to zD \; , \tag{4.118}$$

satisfying the relation

$$D\left(\frac{k^2}{\lambda^2} \, , g \right) = zD\left(\frac{k^2}{\mu^2} \, , zg \right) \; , \tag{4.119}$$

with the property

$$D\left(\frac{\mu^2}{\lambda^2} \, , g \right) = z \; . \tag{4.120}$$

From here, with the use of the dimensionless variables,

$$x \equiv \frac{k^2}{\lambda^2} , \qquad t \equiv \frac{\mu^2}{\lambda^2} , \tag{4.121}$$

we come to the renormalization group equation

$$D(x, g) = D(t, g) D \left(\frac{x}{t} , g D(t, g) \right) \tag{4.122}$$

for which condition (4.117) is valid.

4.13 Invariant Charge

The renormalization group equations of type (4.122) are often met in quantum field theory. The other form of such equations can be given by introducing the invariant charge

$$G(x, g) \equiv g D(x, g) \tag{4.123}$$

with the boundary condition

$$G(1, g) = g . \tag{4.124}$$

Scaling the variable x as $x \rightarrow tx$, we get the renormalization group equation

$$g G(tx, g) = G(t, g) G(x, G(t, g)) . \tag{4.125}$$

Differentiating with respect to x and setting $x \rightarrow 1$ and $t \rightarrow x$, we obtain the renormalization group equation in differential form

$$\frac{\partial G(x, g)}{\partial \ln x} = \beta(G(x, g), g) , \tag{4.126}$$

where the Gell-Mann-Low function is

$$\beta(G(x, g), g) = \frac{G(x, g)}{g} \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial y} G(y, G(x, g)) \right] \Bigg|_{y=1} . \tag{4.127}$$

Integrating this equation yields

$$\int_g^G \frac{df}{\beta(f, g)} = \ln x . \tag{4.128}$$

Fixed points correspond to the condition

$$G(x, g^*) = g^* , \tag{4.129}$$

hence to the zero of the Gell-Mann-Low function,

$$\beta(g^*, g^*) = 0 . \tag{4.130}$$

Thus the field-theory group is a Lie group of continuous transformations, possessing the inverse transformation and allowing for the presentation in the form of a differential equation.

5 Discussion

The aim of this review has been twofold: First, it presents two approaches in approximation theory, developed by the author, Optimized Perturbation Theory and Self-Similar Approximation Theory. Secondly, it emphasizes that these approaches are based on the ideas having several similarities with renormalization group techniques.

The main idea of *Optimized Perturbation Theory* is to reorganize a divergent sequence into a convergent sequence by introducing control functions. Such a reorganization of the approximants for the sought quantity is analogous to the renormalization of these approximants. The optimization conditions for control functions follow from the Cauchy criterion, which for sequences plays the role of a fixed-point condition. The derivation of the optimization conditions from the Cauchy criterion makes the theory logical and self-consistent. This makes the theory principally different from ad hoc prescriptions used by some authors. The developed theory allows for the derivation of different optimization conditions, justifying them on the basis of the Cauchy criterion. Since the latter plays the role of a fixed-point condition, different particular forms of optimization conditions, such as the minimal-difference and minimal-derivative conditions, have the same meaning of fastest-convergence conditions. Control functions can be incorporated either into an initial approximation or into the perturbative series with respect to an asymptotically small variable by means of a change of the variable. The theory makes it possible to obtain good approximation accuracy with just a few perturbative terms.

In *Self-Similar-Approximation Theory*, the passage between subsequent approximations is treated as a motion with respect to the approximation order. The sequence limit is equivalent to a fixed point. In the vicinity of a fixed point, there exists a self-similar relation analogous to a renormalization group equation. The transformation between subsequent approximants forms a dynamical system in discrete time, called an approximation cascade, whose trajectory is bijective to the sequence of the approximants. By embedding the approximation cascade into a flow results in an approximation flow, where the approximation order is considered as a continuous variable. Using a continuous approximation order reminds us the use of a continuous dimensionality in the Wilson renormalization group. Since both the equations of renormalization group and self-similar approximation theory can be written either in a functional form or as Lie differential equations, they allow for the analysis of stability by considering the related map multipliers, as for dynamical systems. Control functions can be introduced either into an initial approximation or by a transformation of the treated sequence. A very convenient is the fractal transform effectively rising the approximation order. By employing the fractal transform it is possible to derive different forms of approximants, such as self-similar root approximants, self-similar nested approximants, self-similar exponential approximants, self-similar additive approximants, self-similar factor approximants, and self-similar combined approximants. The wide applicability of these approximants is illustrated by several examples. The main features of the self-similar approximants is their generality, simplicity, and good accuracy. In the cases, where a problem enjoys an exact solution, these approximants reconstruct this exact solution.

The main equation of self-similar approximation theory is based on the assumption of the existence of the sequence limit, similarly to the assumption of the existence of a critical point in statistical renormalization group. The field-theory renormalization group equations

are derived by employing the natural symmetry of the considered system. The efficiency of both optimized perturbation theory and self-similar approximation theory can be understood as being due to their ability of discovering the hidden symmetry in asymptotic sequences. By their formulation, they make it possible to discover the hidden transformation law when moving from one to another terms of a perturbative sequence. The discovered transformation law allows us to represent it as an equation of motion analogous to renormalization group equations. The difference is that in the renormalizaion group equations the motion is with respect to some kind of a scaling parameter. While in self-similar approximation theory, the motion is considered with respect to the approximation order.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful for many useful discussions and collaboration to S. Gluzman and E.P. Yukalova.

References

[1] G.A. Baker and P. Graves-Moris, *Padé Approximants* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1996).

[2] H. Kleinert, *Path Integrals* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2003).

[3] A.H. Nayfeh, *Perturbation Methods* (Wiley, New York, 1973).

[4] V.I. Yukalov, "Theory of perturbations with a strong interaction", Moscow Univ. Phys. Bull. **31**, 10–15 (1976).

[5] V.I. Yukalov, "Model of a hybrid crystal", Theor. Math. Phys. **28**, 652–660 (1976).

[6] V.I. Yukalov, "Quantum crystal with jumps of particles", Physica A **89**, 363–372 (1977).

[7] V.I. Yukalov, "Quantum theory of localized crystal", Ann. Physik **36**, 31–39 (1979).

[8] V.I. Yukalov, "Superharmonic approximation for crystal", Ann. Physik **37**, 171–182 (1980).

[9] V.I. Yukalov, "Construction of propagators for quantum crystals", Ann. Physik **38**, 419–433 (1981).

[10] V.I. Yukalov and V.I. Zubov, "Localized-particles approach for classical and quantum crystals", Fortschr. Phys. **31**, 627–672 (1983).

[11] V.I. Yukalov, "Theory of melting and crystallization", Phys. Rev. B **32**, 436–446 (1985).

[12] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Self-similar structures and fractal transforms in approximation theory", Chaos Solit. Fract. **14**, 839–861 (2002).

[13] V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar renormalization near unstable fixed points", Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **7**, 1711–1730 (1993).

[14] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Self-similar perturbation theory", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **277**, 219–254 (1999).

[15] W.E. Caswell, "Accurate energy levels for the anharmonic oscillator and a summable series for the double-well potential in perturbation theory", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **123**, 153–184 (1979).

[16] R. Seznec and J. Zinn-Justin, "Summation of divergent series by order dependent mappings: application to the anharmonic oscillator and critical exponents in field theory", J. Math. Phys. 20, 1398–1408 (1979).

[17] I.G. Halliday and P. Suranyi, "Anharmonic oscillator: a new approach", Phys. Rev. D **21**, 1529–1537 (1980).

[18] J. Killingbeck, "Renormalized perturbation series", J. Phys. A **14** 1005–1008 (1981).

[19] P.M. Stevenson, "Optimized perturbation theory", Phys. Rev. D. **23**, 2916–2944 (1981).

[20] I.D. Feranchuk abd L.I. Komarov, "The operator method of the approximate solution of the Schrödinger equation", Phys. Lett. A **88**, 211–214 (1982).

[21] A. Okopinska, "Accurate energy levels and partition function of a quantum-mechanical anharmonic oscillator", Phys. Rev. D. **36**, 1273–1275 (1987).

[22] M. Dineykhan, G.V. Efimov, G. Gandbold, and S.N. Nedelko, *Oscillator Representation in Quantum Physics*, (Springer, Berlin, 1995).

[23] M. Dineykhan and G.V. Efimov, "The Schrödinger equation for bound state systems in the oscillator representation", Rep. Math. Phys. **36**, 287–308 (1995).

[24] I. Feranchuk, A. Ivanov, V.H. Le, and A. Ulyanenkov, *Nonperturbative Description of Quantum Systems* (Springer, Cham, 2015).

[25] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Spectral characteristics of anharmonic models in self-similar approximation", Laser Phys. **5**, 154– 169 (1995).

[26] F.T. Hioe, D. MacMillen, and E.W. Montroll, "Quantum theory of anharmonic oscillators: energy levels of a single and a pair of coupled oscillators with quartic coupling", Phys. Rep. **43**, 305–335 (1978).

[27] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Self-similar approximations and evolution equations", Nuovo Cimento B **108**, 1017–1041 (1993).

[28] I.R.C. Buckley, A. Duncan, and H.F. Jones, "Proof of the convergence of the linear delta expansion: zero dimensions", Phys. Rev. D **47**, 2554–2559 (1993).

[29] A. Duncan and H. F. Jones, "Convergence proof for optimized expansion: anharmonic oscillator", Phys. Rev. D **47**, 2560–2572 (1993).

[30] C.M. Bender, A. Duncan, and H.F. Jones. "Convergence of the optimized expansion for the connected vacuum amplitude: zero dimensions", Phys. Rev. D **49**, 4219–4225 (1994).

[31] R. Guida, K. Konishi, and H. Suzuki, "Convergence of scaled delta expansion: anharmonic oscillator", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **241**, 152–184 (1995).

[32] E.J. Weniger, "Construction of the strong coupling expansion for the grond state energy of the quartic, sextic, and octic anharmonic oscillator via a renormalized strong coupling expansion", Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 2859–2862 (1996).

[33] H. Kleinert and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar variational perturbation theory for critical exponents", Phys. Rev. E **71**, 026131 (2005).

[34] R.R. Parwani, "Free energy of hot gauge theories", Phys. Rev. D **64**, 025002 (2001).

[35] V.I. Yukalov, "Principal problems in Bose-Einstein condensation of dilute gases", Laser Phys. Lett. **1** 435–461 (2004).

[36] J.O. Andersen, "Theory of the weakly interacting Bose gas", Rev. Mod. Phys. **76**, 599–639 (2004).

[37] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Bose-Einstein condensation temperature of weakly interacting atoms", Laser Phys. Lett. **14**, 073001 (2017).

[38] P. Arnold, G. Moore, and B. Tomašik, "T_c for homogeneous dilute Bose gases: a second-order result", Phys. Rev. A **65**, 013606 (2001).

[39] P. Arnold and G. Moore, "BEC transition temperature of a dilute homogeneous imperfect Bose gas", Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 120401 (2001).

[40] P. Arnold and G. Moore, "Monte Carlo simulation of $O(2)$ φ^4 field theory in three dimensions", Phys. Rev. E **64**, 066113 (2001).

[41] V.A. Kashurnikov, N. Prokof'ev, and B. Svistunov, "Critical temperature shift in weakly interacting Bose gas", Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 120402 (2001).

[42] N. Prokof'ev and B. Svistunov, "Worm algorithms for classical statistical models", Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 160601 (2001).

[43] F.F. de Souza Cruz, M.B. Pinto, and R.O. Ramos, "Transition temperature for weakly interacting homogeneous Bose gases", Phys. Rev. B **64**, 014515 (2001).

[44] F.F. de Souza Cruz, M.B. Pinto, R.O. Ramos, and P. Sena, "Higher-order evaluation of the critical temperature for interacting homogeneous dilute Bose gases", Phys. Rev. A **65**, 053613 (2002).

[45] J.L. Kneur, M.B. Pinto, and R.O. Ramos, "Convergent resummed linear delta expansion in the critical $O(N)$ $(\varphi_i^2)^2_{3d}$ model", Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 210403 (2002).

[46] E. Braaten and E. Radescu, "Convergence of the linear delta expansion in the critical $O(N)$ field theory", Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 271602 (2002).

[47] E. Braaten and E. Radescu, "Convergence of the linear delta expansion for the shift in T_c for Bose-Einstein condensation", Phys. Rev. A **66**, 063601 (2002).

[48] J.L. Kneur, M.B. Pinto, and R.O. Ramos, "Asymptotically improved convergence of optimized perturbation theory in the Bose-Einstein condensation problem", Phys. Rev. A **68**, 043615 (2003).

[49] J.L. Kneur, A. Neveu, and M.B. Pinto, "Improved optimization of perturbation theory: applications to the oscillator energy levels and Bose-Einstein condensate critical temperature", Phys. Rev. A **69**, 053624 (2004).

[50] J.L. Kneur and M.B. Pinto, "Exact $1/N$ and optimized perturbative evaluation of μ_c for homogeneous interacting Bose gases", Phys. Rev. A **71**, 033613 (2005).

[51] R.L.S. Farias, G. Krein, and R.O. Ramos, "Applicability of the linear delta expansion for the $\lambda\varphi^4$ field theory at finite temperature in the symmetric and broken phases", Phys. Rev. D **78**, 065046 (2008).

[52] X. Sun, "Monte Carlo studies of three-dimensional $O(1)$ and $O(4)$ φ^4 theory related to Bose-Einstein condensation phase transition temperatures", Phys. Rev. E **67**, 066702 (2003).

[53] B. Kastening, "Bose-Einstein condensation temperature of a homogeneous weakly interacting Bose gas in variational perturbation theory through six loops", Phys. Rev. A **68**, 061601 (2003).

[54] B. Kastening, "Bose-Einstein condensation temperature of a homogenous weakly interacting Bose gas in variational perturbation theory through seven loops", Phys. Rev. A **69**, 043613 (2004).

[55] B. Kastening, "Nonuniversal critical quantities from variational perturbation theory and their application to the Bose-Einstein condensation temperature shift", Phys. Rev. A **70**, 043621 (2004).

[56] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Critical temperature in weakly interacting multicomponent field theory", Eur. Phys. J. Conf. Ser. **138**, 03011 (2017).

[57] J.P. Blaizot and G. Ripka, *Quantum Theory of Finite Systems* (MIT Press, Cambridge, 1986).

[58] J.L. Birman, R.G. Nazmitdinov, and V.I. Yukalov, "Effects of symmetry breaking in finite quantum systems", Phys. Rep. **526**, 1–91 (2013).

[59] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Effects of symmetry breaking in resonance phenomena", Condens. Matter **3**, 5 (2018).

[60] V.I. Yukalov, "Modified semiclassical approximation for trapped Bose gases", Phys. Rev. A **72**, 033618 (2005).

[61] V.I. Yukalov, "Theory of cold atoms: Bose-Einstein statistics", Laser Phys. **26**, 062001 (2016).

[62] P. Arnold and B. Tomašik, "T_c for trapped dilute Bose gases: a second-order result", Phys. Rev. A **64**, 053609 (2001).

[63] B. Kastening, "Fluctuation pressure of a fluid membrane between walls through six loops", Phys. Rev. E **73**, 011101 (2006).

[64] G. Gompper and D.M. Knoll, "Steric interactions in multimembrane systems: a Monte Carlo study", Eur. Phys. Lett. **9**, 59–64 (1989).

[65] E.P. Yukalova and V.I. Yukalov, One-dimensional anharmonic oscillator in self-similar approximation", Bulg. J. Phys. **19**, 12–23 (1992).

[66] I.D. Feranchuk, L.I. Komarov, I.V. Nichipor, and A.P. Ulyanenkov, "Operator method in the problem of anharmonic oscillator", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **238**, 370–440 (1995).

[67] W. Janke and H. Kleinert, "Convergent strong-coupling expansion from divergent weak-coupling perturbation theory", Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2787–2791 (1995).

[68] I.V. Dobrovolska and R.S. Tutik, "A recursion technique for deriving renormalized perturbation expansions for one-dimensional anharmonic oscillator", Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **16**, 2493–2504 (2001).

[69] T. Hatsuda, T. Kunihiro, and T. Tanaka, "Optimized perturbation theory for wave functions of quantum systems", Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3229–3232 (1997).

[70] E.P. Yukalova and V.I. Yukalov, "Spherical anharmonic oscillator in self-similar approximation", J. Phys. A **26**, 2011–2019 (1993).

[71] E.P. Yukalova and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar approximation for an anharmonic oscillator of arbitrary dimensionality", Phys. Lett. A **175**, 27–35 (1993).

[72] E.P. Yukalova and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar eigenvalues for Schrödinger operators with power-law potentials", Phys. Scr. **47**, 610–617 (1993).

[73] T. Imbo, A. Pagnamenta, and U. Sukhatme, "Energy eigenstates of spherically symmetric potentials using shifted $1/N$ expansion", Phys. Rev. D **29**, 1669–1681 (1994).

[74] A.J. Coleman, E.P. Yukalova, and V.I. Yukalov, "Pairon distributions and the spectra of reduced Hamiltonians", Int. J. Quantum Chem. **54**, 211–222 (1995).

[75] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Evaporation and condensation of clusters", Physica A **223**, 15–33 (1996).

[76] C.Z. An, I.D. Feranchuk, and L.I. Komarov, "Operator method of calculation of the quasi-steady state eigenvalues", Phys. Lett. A **125**, 123–128 (1987).

[77] R. Karrlein and H. Kleinert, "Precise variational tunneling rates of anharmonic oscillator for $g < 0$", Phys. Lett. A **187**, 133–139 (1994).

[78] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and S. Gluzman, "Self-similar interpolation in quantum mechanics", Phys. Rev. A **58**, 96–115 (1998).

[79] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Asymptotic properties of eigenvalues in variational calculations for double-well oscillators", J. Phys. A **29**, 6429–6442 (1996).

[80] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and F.A. Oliveira, "Renormalization-group solutions for Yukawa potential", J. Phys. A **31**, 4337–4348 (1998).

[81] X.Q. Luo and Y.Y. Li, "Bound states and critical behavior of the Yukawa potential", Sci. China G **35**, 631–642 (2006).

[82] M. Dineykhan and G.V. Efimov, "Zeeman effect in the oscillator representation", Phys. At. Nucl. **59**, 824–831 (1996).

[83] I.D. Feranchuk and L.X. Hai, "Analytic estimation of the energies and widths of the Rydberg states of a Hydrogen atom in an electric field", Phys. Lett. A **137**, 385–388 (1989).

[84] M. Znojil, "Two-sided estimates of energies and the forgotten exactly solvable potential $V(r) = -a^2 r^{-2} + b^2 r^{-4}$", Phys. Lett. A **189**, 1–6 (1994).

[85] M. Znojil, "Bound states of the Kratzer plus polynomial potentials and the new form of perturbation theory", J. Math. Chem. **26**, 157–172 (1999).

[86] A. Okopinska, "Optimized perturbation method for the propagation in the anahrmonic oscillator potential", Phys. Lett. A **249**, 259–264 (1998).

[87] F. Weissbach, A. Pelster, and B. Hamprecht, "Higher-order variational perturbation theory for the free energy", Phys. Rev. E **66**, 036129 (2002).

[88] C.J. Pethick and H. Smith, *Bose-Einstein Condensation in Dilute Gases* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 2008).

[89] V.I. Yukalov, "Basics of Bose-Einstein condensation", Phys. Part. Nucl. **42**, 460–513 (2011).

[90] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Non-ground-state Bose-Einstein condensates of trapped atoms", Phys. Rev. A **56**, 4845–4854 (1997).

[91] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Excited coherent modes of ultracold trapped atoms", Laser Phys. **10**, 26–30 (2000).

[92] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Nonground state condensates of ultracold trapped atoms", Laser Phys. **11**, 455–459 (2001)

[93] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Nonlinear coherent modes of trapped Bose-Einstein condensates", Phys. Rev. A **56**, 043602 (2002).

[94] P.W. Courteille, V.S. Bagnato, and V.I. Yukalov, "Bose-Einstein condensation of trapped atomic gases", Laser Phys. **11**, 659–800 (2001).

[95] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Spectrum of coherent modes for trapped Bose gas", Laser Phys. **12**, 1325–1331 (2002).

[96] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Resonant Bose condensate: analog of resonant atom", Laser Phys. **13**, 551–561 (2003).

[97] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Coherent resonance in trapped Bose condensates", Laser Phys. **13**, 861–870 (2003).

[98] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Degenarate trajectories and Hamiltonian envelopes in the method of self-similar approximations", Can. J. Phys. **71**, 537–546 (1993).

[99] T. Aoyama, T. Matsuo, and Y. Shibusa, "Improved Taylor expansion method in the Ising model", Prog. Theor. Phys. **115**, 473–486 (2006).

[100] I. Stancu and P.M. Stevenson, "Second-order corrections to the Gaussian effective potential of $\lambda\varphi^4$ theory", Phys. Rev. D, **42**, 2710–2725 (1990).

[101] I. Stancu, "Post-Gaussian effective potential in scalar and scalar-fermion theories", Phys. Rev. D **43**, 1283–1299 (1991).

[102] H. Haugerud and F. Ravndal, "Finite-temperature Gaussian effective potential from a variational principle", Phys. Rev. D **43**, 2736–2738 (1991).

[103] A. Okopinska, "Optimized expansion for the effective action and multi-particle states in the scalar quantum field theory", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **228**, 19–42 (1993).

[104] H. Kleinert, "Strong-coupling φ^4- theory in $4-\epsilon$ dimensions and critical exponents", Phys. Lett. B **434**, 74–79 (1998).

[105] S. Chiku and T. Hatsuda, "Optimized perturbation theory at finite temperature", Phys. Rev. D **58**, 076001 (1998).

[106] J. Honkonen and M. Nalimov, "Convergent expansion for critical exponents in the $O(n)$- symmetric φ^4 model for large ϵ", Phys. Lett. B **459**, 582–588 (1999).

[107] H. Kleinert and B. Van den Bossche, "Three-loop critical exponents, amplitude functions, and amplitude ratios from variational perturbation theory", Phys. Rev. E **63**, 056113 (2001).

[108] J. Honkonen, M. Komarova, and M. Nalimov, "Large-order asymptotics and convergent perturbation theory for critical indices of the φ^4 model in $4-\epsilon$ expansion", Acta Phys. Slovaca **52**, 303–310 (2002).

[109] M. Strösser and V. Dohm, "Minimal renormalization without ϵ expansion: four-loop free energy in three dimensions for general n above and below T_c", Phys. Rev. E **67**, 056115 (2003).

[110] D.S. Rosa, R.L.S. Farias, and R.O. Ramos, "Reliability of the optimized perturbation theory in the 0-dimensional $O(N)$ scalar field model", Physica A **464**, 11–26 (2016).

[111] D.C. Duarte, R.L.S. Farias, and R.O. Ramos, "Optimized perturbation theory for charged scalar field at finite temperature and in an external field", Phys. Rev. D. **84**, 083525 (2011).

[112] G. Krein, R.S. Marques de Caravalho, D.P. Menezes, M. Nielsen, and M.B. Pinto, "Optimized expansion for relativistic nuclear models", Eur. Phys. J. A **1**, 45–53 (1998).

[113] T.M.R. Birnes, C.J. Hamer, Z. Weihong, and S. Morrison, "Application of Feynman-Kleinert approximants to the massive Schwinger model on a lattice", Phys. Rev. D **68**, 016002 (2003).

[114] T.S. Evans, H.J. Jones, and D. Winder, "Non-perturbative calculations of a global $U(2)$ theory at finite density and temperature", Nucl. Phys. B **598**, 578–600 (2001).

[115] J.L. Kneur and D. Reynaud, "Borel convergence of the variationally improved mass expansion and the $O(N)$ Gross-Neveu model mass gap", Phys. Rev. D **66**, 085020 (2002).

[116] J.L. Kneur and D. Reynaud, "Renormalon disappearance in the Borel sum of the $1/N$ expansion of the Gross-Neveu model mass gap", J. High En. Phys. **301**, 014 (2003).

[117] J.L. Kneur, M.B. Pinto, and R.O. Ramos, "Critical and tricritical points for the massless $2D$ Gross-Neveu model beyond large N", Phys. Rev. D **74**, 125020 (2006).

[118] J.L. Kneur, M.B. Pinto, R.O. Ramos, and E. Staudt, "Updating the phase diagram of the Gross-Neveu model in $2+1$ dimensions", Phys. Lett. B **657**, 136–142 (2007).

[119] J.L. Kneur, M.B. Pinto, R.O. Ramos, and E. Staudt, "Emergence of tricritical point and liquid-gas phase in the massless $2+1$ dimensional Gross-Neveu model", Phys. Rev. D **76**, 045020 (2007).

[120] U. Kraemmer and A. Rebhan, "Advances in perturbative thermal field theory", Rep. Prog. Phys. **67**, 351–431 (2004).

[121] J.H. Field, "Optimised perturbation theory and on-shell renormalisation in QED and QCD", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **226**, 209–247 (1993).

[122] A.C. Mattingly and P.M. Stevenson, "Optimization of $R_{e^+e^-}$ and freezing of the QCD couplant at low energies", Phys. Rev. D **49**, 437–450 (1994).

[123] C. Arvanitis, F. Geniet, J.L. Kneur, and A. Neveu, "Chiral symmetry breaking in QCD: a variational approach", Phys. Lett. B **390**, 385–391 (1997).

[124] J.L. Kneur, "Dynamical chiral symmetry breaking from variationally improved perturbative expansion", Nucl. Phys. B Proc. Suppl. **64**, 296–300 (1998).

[125] J.L. Kneur, "Variational quark mass expansion and the order parameters of chiral symmetry breaking", Phys. Rev. D **57**, 1–21 (1998).

[126] A.N. Sissakian and I.L. Solovtsov, "Variational expansions in quantum chromodynamics", Phys. Part. Nucl. **30**, 1057–1119 (1999).

[127] M. Inoui, A. Niegawa, and H. Ozaki, "Improvement of the hot QCD pressure by the minimal sensitivity criterion", Prog. Theor. Phys. **115**, 411–424 (2006).

[128] P.M. Stevenson, "Exploring arbitrarily high orders of optimized perturbation theory in QCD with $n_f \to 16\frac{1}{2}$", Nucl. Phys. B **910**, 469–495 (2016).

[129] D.F. Litim, Optimisation of the exact renormalization group", Phys. Lett. B **486**, 92–99 (2000).

[130] D.F. Litim, Opimized renormalization group flows", Phys. Rev. D **64**, 105007 (2001).

[131] D.F. Litim, "Derivative expansion and renormalisation group flows", J. High En. Phys. **11**, 059 (2001).

[132] D.F. Litim, "Mind the gap", Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **16**, 2081–2087 (2001).

[133] D.F. Litim, "Critical exponents from optimised renormalisation group flows", Nucl. Phys. B **631**, 128–158 (2002).

[134] X.G. Wu, Y. Ma, S.Q. Wang, H.B. Fu, H.H. Ma, S.J. Brodsky, and M. Mojaza, "Renormalization group invariance and optimal QCD renormalization scale-setting: a key issues review", Rep. Prog. Phys. **78**, 126201 (2015).

[135] J.L. Kneur and A. Neveu, "Renormalization group improved optimized perturbation theory: revisiting the mass gap of the $O(2N)$ Gross-Neveu model", Phys. Rev. D **81**, 125012 (2010).

[136] J.L. Kneur and A. Neveu, "Λ_{MS}^{QCD} from renormalization group optimized perturbation", Phys. Rev. D **85** 014005 (2012).

[137] J.L. Kneur and A. Neveu, "α_S from F_π and renormalization group optimized perturbation", Phys. Rev. D **88**, 074025 (2013).

[138] J.L. Kneur and A. Neveu, "The chiral condensate from the renormalization group optimized perturbation", Phys. Rev. D **92**, 074027 (2015).

[139] J.L. Kneur and M.B. Pinto, "Renormalization group optimized perturbation theory at finite temperatures", Phys. Rev. D **92**, 116008 (2015).

[140] J.L. Kneur and M.B. Pinto, "Scale invariant resummed perturbation at finite temperatures", Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 031601 (2016).

[141] D.C. Duarte, R.L.S. Farias, P.H.A. Manso, and R.O. Ramos, "Optimized perturbation theory applied to the study of the thermodynamics and BEC-BCS crossover in the three-color Nambu–Jona-Lasinio model", Phys. Rev. D **96**, 056009 (2017).

[142] G.N. Ferrari, J.L Kneur, M.B. Pinto, and R.O. Ramos, "Asymptotically free theory with scale invariant thermodynamics", Phys. Rev. D **96** 116009 (2017).

[143] V.I. Yukalov, *Renormalization Group in Statistical Physics: Field-Theory and Iteration Formulations* (JINR, Dubna, 1988).

[144] V.I. Yukalov, "Algorithm for calculating functions in method of successive approximations", Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **3**, 1691–1702 (1989).

[145] V.I. Yukalov, "Strongly interacting particles with strongly singular potentials", Int. J. Theor. Phys. **28**, 1237–1254 (1989).

[146] V.I. Yukalov "Statistical mechanics of strongly nonideal systems", Phys. Rev. A **42**, 3324–3334 (1990).

[147] V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar approximations for strongly interacting systems", Physica A **167**, 833–860 (1990).

[148] V.I. Yukalov, "Group of transformations for continuous iteration", Proc. Lebedev Phys. Inst. **188**, 297–300 (1991).

[149] V.I. Yukalov, "Method of self-similar approximations", J. Math. Phys. **32**, 1235–1239 (1991).

[150] V.I. Yukalov, "Stability conditions for method of self-similar approximations", J. Math. Phys. **33**, 3994–4001 (1992).

[151] J. Guckenheimer and P. Holmes, *Nonlinear Oscillations, Dynamical Systems abd Bifurcations of Vector Fields* (Springer, New York, 1983).

[152] J.K. Hale, L.T. Magalhaes, and W.M. Oliva, *Introduction to Infinite Dimensional Dynamical Systems- Geometric Theory* (Springer, New York, 1984).

[153] Y.G. Sinai, *Dynamical Systems* (Springer, Berlin, 1989).

[154] E.P. Yukalova and V.I. Yukalov, "Renormalization-group induced convergence for divergent sequences", in *Renormalization Group*, edited by D.V. Shirkov and V.B. Priezzhev (World Scientific, Singapore, 1992), p. 218–229.

[155] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Self-similar renormalization as equation of motion", Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **7**, 2367–2396 (1993).

[156] N.N. Bogolubov and D.V. Shirkov, *Quantum Fields* (Benjamin, London, 1983).

[157] L.I. Sedov, *Similarity and Dimensional Methods in Mechanics* (Academic, New York, 1959).

[158] S. Smale, "Differentiable dynamical systems", Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **73**, 747–817 (1967).

[159] S.H. Saperstone, *Semidynamical Systems in Infinite Dimensional Spaces* (Springer, New York, 1981).

[160] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Iterative procedure as equation of motion", in *Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Dynamical Systems*, edited by V. Makhankov, I. Puzynin, and O. Pashaev (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993), p. 18–27.

[161] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Perturbation theory as dynamical theory", in *Nonlinear Evolution Equations and Dynamical Systems*, edited by V.G. Makhankov, A.R. Bishop, and D.D. Holm (World Scientific, Singapore, 1995), p. 356–364.

[162] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Temporal dynamics in perturbation theory", Physica A **225**, 336–362 (1996).

[163] J.P. Eckmann, "Roads to turbulence in dissipative dynamical systems", Rev. Mod. Phys. **53**, 643–654 (1981).

[164] J.P. Eckmann and D. Ruelle, "Ergodic theory of chaos and strange attractors", Rev. Mod. Phys. **57**, 617–656 (1985).

[165] J. Ford, "The Fermi-Pasta-Ulam problem: paradox turns discovery", Phys. Rep. **213**, 271–310 (1992).

[166] P.R. Halmos, *Lectures on Ergodic Theory* (Chelsea, New York, 1956).

[167] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Self-similar approximatios for thermodynamic potentials", Physica A **198**, 573–546 (1993).

[168] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Higher orders of self-similar approximations for thermodynamic potentials", Physica A **206**, 553–580 (1994).

[169] E.P. Yukalova and V.I. Yukalov, "Calculation of eigenvalues of Schrödinger operators for arbitrary coupling", in *Polarons and Applications*, edited by V.D. Lakhno (Wiley, Chichester, 1994), p. 467–478.

[170] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Application of method of self-similar approximations for eigenvalue problem", in *Programming and Mathematical Techniques in Physics*, edited by Y.Y. Lobanov and E.P. Zhidkov (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994), p. 240–242.

[171] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Critical indices as limits of control functions", Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 333–336 (1997).

[172] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Algebraic self-similar renormalization in the theory of critical phenomena", Phys. Rev. E **55**, 3983–3999 (1997).

[173] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Self-similar bootstrap of divergent series", Phys. Rev. E **55**, 6552–6565 (1997).

[174] P. Meakin, *Fractals, Scaling and Growth far From Equilibrium* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1998).

[175] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Unified approach to crossover phenomena", Phys. Rev. E **58**, 4197–4209 (1998).

[176] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Self-similar crossover in statistical physics", Physica A **273**, 401–415 (1999).

[177] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Self-similar interpolation in high energy physics", Phys. Rev. D **91**, 125023 (2015).

[178] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and S. Gluzman, "Extrapolation and interpolation of asymptotic series by self-similar approximants", J. Math. Chem. **47**, 959–983 (2010).

[179] G.A. Baker and J.L. Gammel, "The Padé approximant", J. Math. Anal. Appl. **2**, 21–30 (1961).

[180] S. Landau, "Simplification of nested radicals", SIAM J. Comput. **21**, 85–110 (1992).

[181] S. Landau, "How to tangle with a nested radical", Math. Intell. **16**, 49–55 (1994).

[182] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar continued root approximants", Phys. Lett. A **377**, 124–128 (2012).

[183] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Self-similar exponential approximants", Phys. Rev. E **58**, 1359–1382 (1998).

[184] L. Euler, "De formulis exponentialibus replicatis", Acta Acad. Petropolitanae **1**, 38–60 (1777).

[185] R.A. Knoebel, "Exponentials reiterated", Am. Math. Monthly **88**, 235–252 (1981).

[186] C.M. Bender and J.P. Vinson, "Summation of power series by continued exponentials", J. Math. Phys. **37**, 4103–4120 (1996).

[187] V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar extrapolation of asymptotic series and forecasting for time series", Mod. Phys. Lett. B **14**, 791–800 (2000).

[188] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Additive self-similar approximants", J. Math. Chem. **55**, 607–622 (2017).

[189] V.I. Yukalov, S. Gluzman, and D. Sornette, "Summation of power series by self-similar factor approximants", Physica A **328**, 409–438 (2003).

[190] S. Gluzman, V.I. Yukalov, and D. Sornette, "Self-similar factor approximants", Phys. Rev. E **67**, 026109 (2003).

[191] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Etrapolation of power series by self-similar factor and root approximants", Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **18**, 3027–3046 (2004).

[192] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Method of self-similar factor approximants", Phys. Lett. A **368**, 341–347 (2007).

[193] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Optimization of self-similar factor approximants", Mol. Phys. **107**, 2237–2244 (2009).48

[194] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar extrapolation from weak to strong coupling", J. Math. Chem. **48**, 883–913 (2010).

[195] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similarly corrected Padé approximants for the indeterminate problem", Eur. Phys. J. Plus **131** 340 (2016).

[196] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Extrapolation of perturbation-theory expansions by self-similar approximants", Eur. J. Appl. Math. **25**, 595–628 (2014).

[197] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar power transforms in extrapolation problems", J. Math. Chem. **39**, 47–56 (2006).

[198] P.F. Loos, "High-density correlation energy expansion of the one-dimensional uniform electron gas", J. Chem. Phys. **138**, 064108 (2013).

[199] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Effective summation and interpolation of series by self-similar root approximants", Mathematics **3**, 510–526 (2015).

[200] E. Matito, J. Cioslowski, and S.F. Vyboishchikov, "Properties of harmonium atoms from FCI calculations: Calibration and benchmarks for the ground state of the two-electron species", Phys. Chem. Chem. Phys. bf 12, 6712–6716 (2010).

[201] J. Schwinger, "Gauge invariance and mass", Phys. Rev. **128**, 2425–2428 (1962).

[202] T. Banks, L. Susskind, and J. Kogut, "Strong-coupling calculations of lattice gauge theories: $(1+1)$-dimensional exercises", Phys. Rev. D **13**, 1043–1053 (1976).

[203] A. Carrol, J. Kogut, D.K. Sinclair, and L. Susskind, "Lattice gauge theory calculations in $1+1$ dimensions and the approach to the continuum limit", Phys. Rev. D **13**, 2270–2277 (1976).

[204] J.P. Vary, T.J. Fields, and H.J. Pirner, "Chiral perturbation theory in the Schwinger model", Phys. Rev. D **53**, 7231–7238 (1996).

[205] C. Adam, "The Schwinger mass in the massive Schwinger model", Phys. Lett. B **382**, 383–388 (1996).

[206] P. Striganesh, C.J. Hamer, and R.J. Bursill, "New finite lattice study of the massive Schwinger model", Phys. Rev. D **62**, 034508 (2000).

[207] S. Coleman, "More about the massive Schwinger model", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **101**, 239–267 (1976).

[208] C.J. Hamer, "Lattice model calculations for $SU(2)$ Yang-Mills theory in $1+1$ dimensions", Nucl. Phys. B **121**, 159–175 (1977).

[209] C.J. Hamer, Z. Weihong, and J. Oitmaa, "Series expansions for the massive Schwinger model in Hamiltonian lattice theory", Phys. Rev. D **56**, 55–67 (1997).

[210] T.M.R. Byrnes, P. Striganesh, R.J. Bursill, and C.J. Hamer, "Density matrix renormalization group approach to the massive Schwinger model", Phys. Rev. D **66**, 013002 (2002).

[211] H. Kröger and N. Scheu, "The massive Schwinger model – a Hamiltonian lattice study in a fast moving frame", Phys. Lett. B **429**, 58–63 (1998).

[212] C.M. Bender and T.T. Wu, "Anharmonic oscillator", Phys. Rev. **184**, 1231–1260 (1969).

[213] E.P. Yukalova, V.I. Yukalov, and S. Gluzman, "Self-similar factor approximants for evolution equations and boundary-value problems", Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **323**, 3074–3090 (2008).

[214] J. Kevorkian and J. Cole, *Perturbation Methods in Applied Methematics* (Springer, New York, 1981).

[215] E.J. Hinch, *Perturbation Methods* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 1991).

[216] L.Y. Chen, N. Goldenfeld, and Y. Oono, "Renormalization group and singular perturbations: multiple scales, boundary layers, and reductive perturbation theory", Phys. Rev. E **54**, 376–394 (1996).

[217] Y.M. Svirezhev, *Nonlinear Waves, Dissipative Structures and Catastrophes in Ecology* (Nauka, Moscow, 1987).

[218] T.D. Lee and Y. Pang, "Nontopological solitons", Phys. Rep. **221**, 251–359 (1992).

[219] H.J. Stetter, *Analysis of Discretization Methods for Ordinary Differential Equations* (Springer, Berlin, 1973).

[220] A.J. Guttmann, "Validity of hyperscaling for the $d = 3$ Ising model", Phys. Rev. B **33**, 5089–5092 (1986).

[221] M.N. Barber, R.B. Pearson, D. Toussaint, and J.L. Richardson, "Finite-size scaling in the three-dimensional Ising model", Phys. Rev. B **32**, 1720–1730 (1985).

[222] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Critical indices from self-similar root approximants", Eur. Phys. J. Plus **132**, 535 (2017).

[223] V.I. Yukalov and A.S. Shumovsky, *Lectures on Phase Transitions* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1990).

[224] H. Kleinert and V. Schulte-Frohlinde, *Critical Properties of φ^4-Theories* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2006).

[225] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Calculation of critical exponents by self-similar factor approximants", Eur. Phys. J. B **55**, 93–99 (2007).

[226] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Phase transition in multicomponent field theory at finite temperature", Proc. Sci. (ISHEPP) **2014**, 080 (2014).

[227] D.I. Kazakov and D.V. Shirkov, "Asymptotic series of quantum field theory and their summation", Fortsch. Phys. **28**, 465–499 (1980).

[228] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, "Critical phenomena and renormalization-group theory", Phys. Rep. **368**, 549–727 (2002).

[229] J.A. Lipa, J.A. Nissen, D.A. Stricker, D.R. Swanson, and T.C.P. Chui, "Specific heat of liquid helium in zero gravity very near the lambda point", Phys. Rev. E **68**, 174518 (2003).

[230] J. Garcia and J.A. Gonzalo, "Accurate Monte Carlo critical exponents for Ising lattices", Phyisica A **326**, 464–472 (2003).

[231] A.A. Pogorelov and I.M. Suslov, "On the critical exponents for the λ transition in liquid helium", JETP Lett. **86**, 39–45 (2007).

[232] A.A. Pogorelov and I.M. Suslov, "Critical exponents from field-theoretical renormalization group: mathematical meaning of the standard values", J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **106**, 1118–1129 (2008).

[233] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Resummation methods for analyzing time series", Mod. Phys. Lett. B **12**, 61–74 (1998).

[234] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Renormalization group analysis of October market crashes", Mod. Phys. Lett. B **12**, 75–84 (1998).

[235] S. Gluzman and V.I. Yukalov, "Booms and crashes in self-similar markets", Mod. Phys. Lett. B **12**, 575–587 (1998).

[236] V.I. Yukalov and S. Gluzman, "Weighted fixed points in self-similar analysis of time series", Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **13**, 1463–1476 (1999).

[237] V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar approach to market analysis", Eur. Phys. J. B **20**, 609–617 (2001).

[238] S. Gluzman, D. Sornette, and V.I. Yukalov, "Reconstructing generalized exponential laws by self-similar exponential approximants", Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **14**, 509–527 (2003).

[239] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Cooperative electromagnetic effects", Phys. Part. Nucl. **31**, 561–602 (2000).

[240] V.I. Yukalov, "Principle of pattern selection for nonequilibrium phenomena", Phys. Lett. A **284**, 91–98 (2001).

[241] V.I. Yukalov, "Probabilistic approach to pattern selection", Physica A **291**, 255–274 (2001).

[242] D. Sornette, "Discrete scale invariance and complex dimensions", Phys. Rep. **297**, 239–270 (1998).

[243] D. Sornette and A. Andersen, "Large financial crashes", Physica A **245**, 411–422 (1997).

[244] A. Johansen and D. Sornette, "Modeling the stock market prior to large crashes", Eur. Phys. J. B **9**, 167–174 (1999).

[245] S. Drozdz, F. Ruf, J. Speth, and M. Wojcik, "Imprints of log-periodic self-similarity in the stock market", Eur. Phys. J. B **10**, 589–593 (1999).

[246] A. Johansen and D. Sornette, "Financial anti-bubbles: log-periodicity in gold and Nikkei collapses", Int. J. Mod. Phys. C **10**, 563–575 (1999).

[247] A. Johansen and D. Sornette, "Bubbles abd anti-bubbles in Latin-American, Asian and western markets: an empirical study", Int. J. Theor. Appl. Finance **4**, 853–920 (2001).

[248] J.A. Feigenbaum, "More on a statistical analysis of log-periodic precursor to financial crashes", Quant. Finance **1**, 527–532 (2001).

[249] D. Sornette and A. Johansen, "Significance of log-periodic precursors to financial crashes", Quant. Finance **1**, 452–471 (2001).

[250] J. Feigenbaum, "Financial physics", Rep. Prog. Phys. **66**, 1611–1649 (2003).

[251] A. Johansen and D. Sornette, "Critical ruptures", Eur. Phys. J. B **18**, 163–181 (2000).

[252] A. Moura and V.I. Yukalov, "Self-similar extrapolation for the law of acoustic emission before failure of heterogeneous materials", Int. J. Fract. **118**, 63–68 (2002).

[253] V.I. Yukalov, A. Moura, and H. Nechad, "Self-similar law of energy release before materials fracture", J. Mech. Phys. Solids **52**, 453–465 (2004).

[254] P. Arnold and C.X. Zhai, "The three-loop free energy for high temperature QED and QCD with fermons", Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1906–1918 (1995).

[255] C.X. Zhai and B. Kastening, "Free energy of hot gauge theories with fermions through g^5", Phys. Rev. D **52**, 7232–7246 (1995).

[256] E. Braaten and A. Nieto, "Free energy of QCD at high temperature", Phys. Rev. D **53**, 3421–3437 (1996).

[257] T. van Ritbergen, J. Vermaseren, and S. Larin, "The four–loop β-function in quantum chromodynamics", Phys. Lett. B **400**, 379–384 (1997).

[258] M. Czakon, "The four–loop QCD beta–function and anomalous dimensions", Nucl. Phys. B **710**, 485–498 (2005).

[259] T. Luthe, A. Maier, P. Marquard, and Y. Schröder, "Towards the five–loop beta function for a general gauge group", J. High En. Phys. **7**, 127 (2016).

[260] P.A. Baikov, K.G. Chetyrkin, and J.H. Kühn, "Five–loop running of the QCD coupling constant", Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 082002 (2017).

[261] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Equation of state in quantum chromodynamics", in *Relativistic Nuclear Physics and Quantum Chromodynamics*, edited by A.M. Baldin and V.V. Burov (JINR, Dubna, 2000), Vol. 2, p. 238–245.

[262] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Thermodynamics of strong interactions", Phys. Part. Nucl. **28**, 37–65 (1997)

[263] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Multichannel approach to clustering matter", Physica A **243**, 382–414 (1997).

[264] V.I. Yukalov, "Conditions for nuclear-matter lasers", Laser Phys. **8**, 1249–1256 (1998).

[265] S. Borsanyi, G. Endrődi, Z. Fodor, A. Jakovac, S.D. Katz, S. Krieg, C. Ratti, and K.K. Szabo, "The QCD equation of state with dynamical quarks", J. High En. Phys. **11**, 077 (2010).

[266] J.O. Andersen, N. Haque, M.G. Mustafa, M. Strickland, and N. Su, "Equation of State for QCD at finite temperature and density: Resummation versus lattice data", AIP Conf. Proc. **1701**, 020003 (2016).

[267] F. Herzog, B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J.A.M. Vermaseren, and A. Vogt, "The five-loop beta function of Yang-Mills theory with fermions", J. High En. Phys. **02**, 090 (2017).

[268] I.M. Suslov, "On the Gell-Mann-Low function in QCD", JETP Lett. **76**, 387–391 (2002).

[269] I.M. Suslov, "Divergent perturbation series", J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **100**, 1188–1233 (2005).

[270] D.I. Kazakov and V.S. Popov, "Asymptotic behavior of the Gell-Mann-Low function in quantum field theory", JETP Lett. **77**, 453–457 (2003).

[271] A.L. Kataev and S.A. Larin, "Analytical five-loop expressions for the renormalization group QED β-function in different renormalization schemes", JETP Lett. **96**, 64–67 (2012).

[272] I.M. Suslov, "Gell-Mann-Low function in quantum electrodynamics", JETP Lett. **74**, 211–215 (2001).

[273] M.V. Kompaniets and E. Panzer, "Minimally subtracted six-loop renormalization of $O(N)$-symmetric φ^4 theory and critical exponents", Phys. Rev. D **96**, 036016 (2017).

[274] O. Schnetz, "Numbers and functions in quantum field theory", Phys. Rev. D **97**, 085018 (2018).

[275] D.I. Kazakov, O.V. Tarasov, and D.V. Shirkov, "Analytic continuation of the results of perturbation theory for the model $g\varphi^4$ to the region $g \geq 1$", Theor. Math. Phys. **38**, 9–16 (1979).

[276] K.G. Chetyrkin, S.G. Gorishny, S.A. Larin, and F.V. Tkachev, "Five-loop renormalization group calculations in the $g\varphi^4$ theory", Phys. Lett. B **132**, 351– (1983).

[277] A.N. Sissakian, I.L. Solovtsov, and O.P. Solovtsova, "β-function for the φ^4 model in variational perturbation theory", Phys. Lett. B **321**, 381–384 (1994).

[278] I.M. Suslov, "Gell-Mann-Low fucntion in the φ^4 theory", JETP Lett. **71**, 217–221 (2000).

[279] I.M.Suslov, "Summation of divergent series of perturbation theory in the strong coupling limit: Gell-Mann Low function of φ^4 theory", J. Exp. Theor. Phys. **120**, 5–30 (2001).

[280] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, and V.S. Bagnato, "Self-similar approximations for a trapped Bose-Einstein condensate", Phys. Rev. A **66**, 025602 (2002).

[281] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Optimal trap shape for a Bose gas with attractive interactions", Phys. Rev. A **72**, 063611 (2005).

[282] V.I. Yukalov and R. Graham, "Bose-Einstein condensed systems in random potentials", Phys. Rev. A **75**, 023619 (2007).

[283] V.I. Yukalov, E.P. Yukalova, K.V. Krutitsky, and R. Graham, "Bose-Einstein condensed gases in arbitrarily strong random potentials", Phys. Rev. A **76**, 053623 (2007).

[284] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Ground state of a homogeneous Bose gas of hard spheres", Phys. Rev. A **90**, 013627 (2014).

[285] A.N. Drozdov and S. Hayashi, "Self-similar renormalization approach to barrier crossing processes", Phys. Rev. E **60**, 3804–3813 (1999).

[286] A.N. Drozdov, 'Two novel approaches to the Kramers rate problem in the spatial diffusion regime", J. Chem. Phys. **111**, 6481–6491 (1999).

[287] S. Chaturverdi and P.D. Drummond, "Stochastic diagrams for critical point spectra", Eur. Phys. J. B **8**, 251–268 (1999).

[288] S. Gluzman, J. Andersen, and D. Sornette, "Functional renormalization prediction of rupture", Comput. Seismol. **32**, 122–137 (2001).

[289] S. Gluzman and D. Sornette, "Self-consistent theory of rupture by porgressive diffuse damage", Phys. Rev. E **63**, 066129 (2001).

[290] D. Sornette, A. Helmstetter, J.V. Andersen, S. Gluzman, J.R. Grasso, and V. Pisarenko, "Towards landslide predictions: two case studies", Physica A **338**, 605–632 (2004).

[291] J.V. Andersen, S. Gluzman, and D. Sornette, "Fundamental framework for technical analysis of market prices", Eur. Phys. J. B **14**, 579–601 (2000).

[292] S. Gluzman and D. Sornette, "Classification of possible finite-time singularities by functional renormalization", Phys. Rev. E **66**, 016134 (2002).

[293] S. Gluzman and D. Sornette, "Self-similar approximants of the permeability in heterogeneous porous media from moment equation expansions", Transp. Porous Med. **71**, 75–97 (2008).

[294] S. Gluzman, V. Mityushev, and W. Nawalaniec, *Computational Analysis of Structured Media* (Academic, London, 2017).

[295] D.V. Shirkov, A.S. Shumovsky, and V.I. Yukalov, *On Interrelation of Different Renormalization Groups* (JINR, Dubna, 1986).

[296] N.N. Bogolubov and D.V. Shirkov, *Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields* (Wiley, New York, 1980).

[297] E. Papp, "Derivation of quantum-mechanical β functions from ground-state energy", Phys. Lett. A **178**, 231–235 (1993).

[298] E. Papp, "Energy and β-function solutions to relativistic Hamiltonians with Coulombic and linear potentilas", Phys. Rev. A **48**, 4091–4096 (1993).

[299] J. Hanckowiak, "Theoretical mechanics analysis of coupled equations for n-point functions", Fortschr. Phys. **42**, 281–300 (1994).

[300] A.R. Altenberger and J.S. Dahler, "Application of a new renormalization group to the equation of state of a hard-sphere fluid", Phys. Rev. E **54**, 6242–6252 (1996).

[301] K.G. Wilson and J. Kogut, "The renormalization group and the ϵ expansion", Phys. Rep. **12**, 75–199 (1974).

[302] B. Hu, "Introduction to real-space renormalization-group methods in critical and chaotic phenomena", Phys. Rep. **91**, 233–295 (1982).

[303] S.K. Ma, *Modern Theory of Critical Phenomena* (Routledge, New York, 2009).

[304] V.I. Yukalov, *Renormalization Group in Statistical Physics: Analysis of General Principles* (JINR, Dubna, 1988).

[305] M.E. Fisher, *The Nature of Critical Points* (University of Colorado, Boulder, 1965).

[306] H.E. Stanley, *Introduction to Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena* (Oxford University, Oxford, 1987).

[307] I. Lawrie and S. Sarbach, "Theory of tricritical points", Phase Trans. Crit. Phenom. **9**, 2–31 (1984).

[308] R. Brout, *Phase Transitons* (Benjamin, New York, 1965).

[309] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics* (Elsevier, Oxford, 1980).

[310] N.N. Bogolubov, *Quantum Statistical Mechanics* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2015).

[311] V.I. Yukalov and E.P. Yukalova, "Bose-condensed atomic systems with nonlocal interaction potentials", Laser Phys. **26**, 045501 (2016).

[312] V.I. Yukalov, "Statistical systems with nonintegrable interaction potentials", Phys. Rev. E **94**, 012106 (2016).

[313] V.I. Yukalov, "Dipolar and spinor bosonic systems", Laser Phys. **28**, 053001 (2018).

[314] R.J. Baxter, *Exactly Solvable Models in Statistical Mechanics* (Academic, London, 1982).

[315] L.P. Kadanoff, *Statistical Physics: Statics, Dynamics and Renormalization* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2000).

[316] J. Polchinski, "Renormalization and effective Lagrangians", Nucl. Phys. **231**, 269–295 (1984).

[317] J. de Boer, "The holographic renormalization group", Fortschr. Phys. **49**, 339–358 (2001).

[318] I. Heemskerk and J. Polchinski, "Holographic and Wilsonian renormalization group", J. High En. Phys. **6**, 031 (2011).

[319] V.I. Yukalov, *Renormalization Group in Statistical Physics: Momentum and Real Spaces* (JINR, Dubna, 1988).

[320] T.S. Cheng, D.D. Vvedensky, and J.F. Nicoll, "Differential renormalization-group generators for static and dynamic critical phenomena", Phys. Rep. **217**, 279–362 (1992).

[321] E. Efrati, Z. Wang, A. Kolan, and L.P. Kadanoff, "Real-space renormalization in statistical mechanics", Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 647–669 (2014).

[322] R.H. Swendsen, "Optimization of real-space renormalization-group transformations", Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 2321–2323 (1984).

[323] F. De Pasquale, C. Di Castro, and G. Jona-Lasinio, "Field theory approach to phase transitions", in: *Critical Phenomena*, edited by M.S. Green (Academic, New York, 1971), p. 123–156.