arXiv:2111.14442v5 [hep-lat] 5 Mar 2023

Anomaly cancellation in the lattice effective electroweak theory

Vieri Mastropietro

University of Milano, Italy

vieri.mastropietro@unimi.it

March 7, 2023

Abstract

The anomaly cancellation is at the basis of the perturbative consistence of the Standard Model and it provides a partial explanation of charge quantization. We consider an effective Electroweak theory on a lattice, with a quartic interaction describing the weak forces and an interaction with the e.m. field. We prove the validity of the anomaly cancellation at a non perturbative level and with a finite lattice cut-off, even if the lattice breaks some important symmetries, on which perturbative arguments for the cancellation are based. The method of the proof has analogies with the one adopted for establishing universality in transport of quantum materials.

1 Introduction and Main results

1.1 The Electroweak theory

The *Standard Model* describes the interaction of all the known elementary particles by three of the four fundamental forces (electromagnetic, weak and strong interactions). The first two are described by the *Electroweak* sector of the theory, see e.g. [1], [2],[3]; the e.m. forces are long ranged while the weak ones are short ranged and *chiral*, that is left and right handed fermions interact in a different way. A basic property of the theory is its *perturbative* consistence or *renormalizability*, that is the physical observables are series which are order by order finite if a proper choice of the parameter is done. Such requirement is quite restrictive and allowed one to select the number of possible theories. Renormalizability was indeed lacking in the first theory of weak interactions, the Fermi theory [4] (the "Tentativo"), where forces are transmitted via a current-current contact interaction. The degree of divergence D of a graph with n_ψ external fermion lines of order n is $D = 4 - 3n_\psi/2 + 2n$, where dependence on the order signal non-renormalizability. In QED the forces are instead mediated by a boson and the degree of divergence is, if n_G are the external boson lines, $D = 4 - 3n^\psi/2 - n^G$, corresponding to a renormalizable theory. This suggested the idea that forces are mediated by W, Z bosons derived by a gauge principle (Yang-Mills theory), and indeed the corresponding theory is renormalizable if the bosons are massless. Weak forces are however short ranged and bosons must be massive, and adding a mass in the action can break the renormalizability. The massive vector boson propagator has the form $\frac{1}{k^2+M^2}(\delta_{\mu\nu} + \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{M^2})$ and the second piece is non-decaying; the scaling dimension is $D = 4+(2-z)n/2-3n^\psi/2-(4-z)n^G/2$ with $z = 0$. Even if the dimension D correspond to a non-renormalizable theory, there can be a reduction making it renormalizable. This is what happens

in QED with a massive photon breaking gauge invariance; conservation of current $k_\mu \widehat{j}_\mu = 0$, and the corresponding Ward Identities with dimensional regularization, ensures that the non decaying part of the propagator does not contribute and $z = 2$ in D. In a chiral gauge theory this does not happen, as the conservation of the chiral currents is broken by the fermion mass. A perturbatively renormalizable theory for electroweak forces was then proposed by Weinberg [5]; the fermion and gauge boson masses are not added to the action but generated by the interaction with a boson Higgs field which was unobserved at that time. Renormalizability was conjectured in [5] and proved by t'Hooft [6]. Even if present at a classical level, the conservation of the current is broken by the *anomalies* [7] and the perturbative renormalizability requires that the anomalies cancel out exactly. Anomalies are associated to the three-current correlation, which is given by a series of terms; it turns out that the lowest order, expressed by "triangle graphs", cancels out provided that the electric charges verify an algebraic "anomaly cancellation condition" and higher order terms vanish due to the Adler-Bardeen property [8]. The anomaly cancellation condition [9] provides an explanation of the charge quantization, that is the principle that all charges of elementary particles are integer multiple of a quantum of charge (1/3 of the electron charge). Therefore, the requirement of renormalizability of the theory leads to the prediction of the existence of W, Z particles, of the Higgs and to explain the charge quantization.

The Standard Model gives the best understanding of the fundamental level of reality but its mathematical status is unclear. Perturbative renormalizability only implies that the physical properties are expressed by a series order by order finite, but it is unclear if such series are the expansion of something; they are most likely divergent and even not asymptotic, see e.g. [10]. The triviality phenomenon, rigorously proved only for ϕ^4 models [11],[12] but expected also in QED and electroweak theory, says that the theory is indeed gaussian. The search for a non-perturbative version of the Standard Model leads to the proposal of a *lattice* formulation, whose step is kept finite and acts as an ultraviolet cut-off. The physical motivation is to look at the Standard Model as an *effective theory*, see e.g. [13],[14], [15], valid up to a certain energy scale and emerging from some more fundamental and unknown theory. Physical consistence only requires that the cut-off must be higher than the experiment energy scale, so that its effect is essentially invisible in particle experiments. With this approach the counterpart of non-renormalizability or renormalizability is the size of the maximum cut-off allowed, that is the range of validity of the theory. With a finite cut-off, the Fermi theory is a meaningful theory expressed by *convergent* series, with radius proportional to the square of the inverse of the cut-off; this has been proved with a momentum cut-off in [16], [17],and with a lattice cut-off in [18] and [19] (in the context of condensed matter models which are essentially equivalent to QFT on a lattice), using the fermionic Renormalization Group, see e.g. [20]. The non-perturbative validity of lattice Fermi theory is valid up to energies (much) smaller than $m_W \sim 89 Gev$, an energy range typical of experiments before the Eighties. The perturbative renormalizability of the Standard Model suggests that a non-perturbative construction of the electroweak sector with a finite cut-off is possible up to scale exponentially high in the inverse coupling, a value $\sim e^{286} Ev$ much higher even than the Plank scale. This exponentially high result is suggested both from perturbative lowest order computations (the solution of the Renormalization Group flow equations describing the effective coupling is $O(1)$ only close to such scale, see e.g. [2]) and in general from perturbative dimensional arguments. Nevertheless, even the lattice formulation of the electroweak theory (leaving outside the mathematical control of functional integrals) has proven to be extremely hard, see e.g. [21]- [30]. One needs that the anomaly cancels with a finite lattice under the same condition on the charges as in the continuum, in order to have an improvement in the degree of divergence as in the perturbative case. The argument holding in the continuum relies on relativistic and chiral symmetries which are broken by the lattice [31]; in particular if one requires to get the

correct continuum limit a Wilson term has to be added, coupling the L and R part of fermions breaking chiral symmetry. Even if the terms due to the lattice are irrelevant in the RG terms, formally vanishing in the limit, at finite cut-off they can nevertheless add finite contributions breaking the cancellation. More elaborate lattice constructions [26], [27] claim anomaly cancellation but are based on an order by order analysis and non-perturbative contributions cannot be excluded. Functional integral arguments, extending the approach in [32], are tipically one loop results. Topological arguments work with classical gauge fields [33], but but in presence of the interaction they require massive fermion, as for topological insulators [34]. While there is no non-perturbative proof of the anomaly cancellation on a lattice, support for it comes from apparently unrelated properties of quantum materials. Dirac semimetals can be considered as condensed matter realization of interacting Dirac fermions on a lattice [35] and transport coefficients are related to anomalies [36],[37]. Recent experiments in Graphene [38] showed that the optical conductivity, related to the parity anomaly of the emerging $d = 2 + 1$ QFT, is universal and equal to its non interacting continuum value; lattice or interactions, which are surely present in such materials, do not modify the anomaly. This experimental result has been rigorously explained in the case of weak Hubbard interactions in [39]. Universality of the Chiral anomaly in $3 + 1$ dimensional Weyl semimetals has been also established [40]. It is therefore natural to apply such methods to latttice QFT.

In the electroweak theory one has a family of particles composed by two fermions (the electron ε and the neutrino ν) and two quarks, the up u and down d). Two regimes can be identified. A first high energy regime from the cut-off up to W, Z mass scale generated by the Higgs, expressed in terms of the gauge fields W^k_μ, $k = 1, 2, 3$ and B_μ (associated to $SU(2)$ and $U(1)$ invariance) and the fermionic fields ψ_i. The current associated to B_μ is $j^B_\mu = \sum_{i=e,\nu,u,d} \sum_{s=L,R} Y_{i,s}/2 \bar{\psi}_i \gamma_\mu (1 + \varepsilon_e \gamma_5)\psi_i$ where $\varepsilon_L = -\varepsilon_R = 1$, $Y_{i,s}$ is the hypercharge of the i-particle with chirality s and ; the current associated to W^k_μ is $j^{k,W}_\mu = \bar{\Psi}_{l,x}\tau^k\gamma_\mu\Psi_{l,x} + \bar{\Psi}_{l,x}\tau^k\gamma_\mu\Psi_{l,x}$ with τ^k pauli matrices, $\Psi_{l,x} = (\psi_{\nu,L,x}, \psi_{\varepsilon,L,x})$ (the leptonic doublet) and $\Psi_{q,x} = (\psi_{u,L,x}, \psi_{d,,x})$ (the quark doublet). The $W^\pm_\mu$ becomes massive due to the interaction with the Higgs and the W^3_μ, B_μ are combined in a massive Z_μ field and massless A_μ. The *anomaly* is the non-vanishing value of $p_\mu < j^{B,A}_\mu j^{B,V}_\nu j^{B,V}_\rho >$, where $j^{B,A}_\mu$ and $j^{B,V}_\nu$ are the axial and vector part of the current, and it signals the non-conservation of the current (in the classical case it would be vanishing by Noether theorem). In the second lower energy regime from the W, Z mass scale to zero, the non-local nature of the W, Z interaction cannot be detected and an effective description is valid, of the form

$$\sum_\mu [\frac{g^2}{2M^2_W} j^{W+}_{\mu,x} j^{W-}_{\mu,x} + \frac{\bar{g}^2}{2M^2_Z} j^Z_{\mu,x} j^Z_{\mu,x} + eA_{\mu,x} j^{e.m.}_{\mu,x}] \tag{1}$$

We introduce a lattice version of the effective electroweak model (1) inspired by [21], [24], with a Wilson term, square lattice and boson mass. The volume is sent to infinity. Our main result can be informally stated as follows.

The correlations of the lattice electroweak theory are given by convergent series ("expansion of anything") for an inverse lattice step of the order of boson mass and the anomaly is vanishing up to subleading corrections under the condition $\sum_i (Y^3_{i,R} - Y^3_{i,L}) = 0$.

The vanishing of the anomaly, obtained up to now only at a purely perturbative level, is proved with a finite lattice cut-off, even if the cut-off breaks important symmetries on which the perturbative cancellation were based, like the Lorentz or the chiral one. The anomaly vanishes if

$$(Y_{e,L})^3 + (Y_{\nu,L})^3 + 3(Y_{u,L})^3 + 3(Y^{d,L})^3 - (Y_{e,R})^3 - (Y_{\nu,R})^3 - 3(Y_{u,R})^3 - 3(Y^{d,R})^3 = 0 \tag{2}$$

which is indeed verified by particles in nature; electric charges are given by $Q_i = \frac{\varepsilon}{2}(\tau_{i,s} + Y_{i,s})$, $\tau_{e,L} = \tau_{d,L} = -1$, $\tau_{\nu,L} = \tau_{e,L} = 1$, $\tau_{i,R} = 0$, and $Y_{\nu,L} = Y_{e,L} = -1$, $Y_{u,L} = Y_{d,L} = 1/3$, $Y_{\nu,R} = 0$, $Y_{e,R} = -2$, $Y_{u,R} = 4/3$, $Y_{d,R} = -2/3$ so that $6(1/3)^3 + 2(-1)^3 - 3(4/3)^3 - 3(-2/3)^3 - (-2)^3 = 0$. The lattice cut-off plays an essential role as it ensure the validity of Ward Identities; by other regularizations, like the momentum one, only a partial cancellation can be proved [17]. The method of the proof has analogies with the one adopted for establishing universality in transport of quantum materials [39],[40]. The vanishing of the anomaly with a finite lattice is established for a lattice cut-off of the order of boson mass; its validity for such cut-off is a prerequisite for its validity at higher values, where is an essential ingredient for the (possible) construction of the theory up to exponentially high scales.

In trying to go to an higher cut-off one needs to perform also a decomposition in the boson fields (replacing the effective interaction with the gauge one), while in the present analysis the multiscale analysis is only for fermions. The anomaly cancellation and the associated Ward Identities should ensure the decrease of the degree of divergence (from non-renormalizable to renormalizable, with massive boons and massless fermions), even in absence of full gauge invariance; a (non chiral) realization of this property in $d = 1 + 1$ at a non perturbative level is in the Sommerfield model [41] (from renormalizable to superrenormalizable). Moreover one needs to use Ward Identities at each Renormalization Group iteration as done for the renormalizable $d = 1 + 1$ Thirring model [42], to control the flow of the effective couplings.

1.2 The model

We consider a set of *Grassmann variables* $\psi^{\pm}_{i,s,j,x}$ with

1. $x \in \Lambda$ is the coordinate, $\Lambda = [0, L]^4 \cap a\mathbb{Z}^4$, $L = Na$ with N integer;
2. $i \in (\nu_1, e_1, u_{1,c}, d_{1,c}, \nu_2, e_2, u_{2,c}, d_{2,c})$ is the *particle index* and $i_1 \in (\nu_1, e_1, u_{1,c}, d_{1,c})$, or $i_2 \in (\nu_2, e_2, u_{2,c}, d_{2,c})$;
3. c is the *colour index* $c \in (r, g, b)$;
4. $s \in (L, R)$ is the *chiral index*;
5. $j \in (1, 2)$ the component index

Anti-periodic boundary conditions are imposed. We use also the notation $\psi^{\pm}_{i,x} = (\psi^{\pm}_{i,L,x}, \psi^{\pm}_{i,R,x})$ and $\psi^{\pm}_{i,s,x} = (\psi^{\pm}_{i,s,1,x}, \psi^{\pm}_{i,s,2,x})$. The *fermionic integration* is

$$P(d\psi) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_\psi}[\prod_{i,x} d\psi^+_{i,x} d\psi^-_{i,x}]e^{-S} \tag{3}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_\psi$ is a normalization constant and

$$S = \frac{1}{2a}a^4 \sum_x \sum_i [\sum_{\mu=0}^{3} (\psi^+_{i,x}\gamma_0\gamma_\mu\psi^-_{i,x+a_\mu} - \psi^+_{i,x+a_\mu}\gamma_0\gamma_\mu\psi^-_{i,x}) + r(\psi^+_{i,x}\gamma_0\psi^-_{i,x+a_\mu} + \psi^+_{i,x+a_\mu}\gamma_0\psi^-_{i,x} - \psi^+_{i,x}\gamma_0\psi^-_{i,x})] \tag{4}$$

with $a_0 = (a, 0, 0, 0)$,...,$a_3 = (0, 0, 0, a)$, the gamma matrices are γ_μ, γ_5, $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ $\gamma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ $\gamma_j = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\sigma_j \\ -i\sigma_j & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $\gamma_5 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & -I \end{pmatrix}$. We set $\sigma^L_\mu = (\sigma_0, i\sigma)$ e $\sigma^R_\mu = (\sigma_0, -i\sigma)$

and the matrices $\sigma_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ $\sigma_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ $\sigma_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$. We equivalently write S as

$$S = \frac{1}{2a}\sum_i a^4 \sum_x [\sum_s \sum_\mu (\psi^+_{i,s,x}\sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x+a_\mu} - \psi^+_{i,s,x+a_\mu}\sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x}) + r(\psi^+_{i,L,x}\psi^-_{i,R,x+a_\mu} + \psi^+_{i,L,x+a_\mu}\psi^-_{i,c,R,x} - 2\psi^+_{i,L,x}\psi^-_{i,c,R,x} + \psi^+_{i,R,x}\psi^-_{i,L,x+a_\mu} + \psi^+_{i,R,x+a_\mu}\psi^-_{i,L,x} - 2\psi^+_{i,R,x}\psi^-_{i,L,x})] \tag{5}$$

The Fermi interaction is given by

$$V_F = \frac{g^2}{2M_W^2}\sum_\mu a^4 \sum_x j^{+W}_{\mu,x} j^{-W}_{\mu,x} + \frac{\bar{g}^2}{2M_Z^2}\sum_\mu a^4 \sum_x j^Z_{\mu,x} j^Z_{\mu,x} \tag{6}$$

where the charged weak currents are

$$j^{+W}_{\mu,x} = \psi^+_{\nu_1,L,x}\sigma^L_\mu \psi^-_{e_1,L,x} + \sum_c \psi^+_{u_{1,c},L,x}\sigma^L_\mu \psi^-_{d_{1,c},L,x}; \quad j^{-W}_{\mu,x} = \psi^+_{e_1,L,x}\sigma^L_\mu \psi^-_{\nu_1,L,x} + \sum_c \psi^+_{u_{1,c},L,x}\sigma^L_\mu \psi^-_{d_{1,c},L,x} \tag{7}$$

and the neutral current is

$$j^Z_{\mu,x} = \sum_{i_1}(1 - \sin^2\theta Q_i)\psi^+_{x,i_1,L}\sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{x,i_1,L} + \sum_{i_2}(-1 - \sin^2\theta Q_i)\psi^+_{x,i_2,R}\sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{x,i_2,R} \tag{8}$$

with $\cos\theta = g/g'$, $\bar{g} = \sqrt{g^2 + g'^2}$. The fermionic mass counterterm is

$$V_c = \sum_i a^{-1}\nu_i a^4 \sum_x (\psi^+_{i,L,x}\psi^-_{i,R,x} + \psi^+_{i,R,x}\psi^-_{i,L,x}) \tag{9}$$

We introduce the e.m. field $A_\mu(x) : \Lambda \to \mathbb{R}^4$ with periodic boundary conditions; the bosonic integration is

$$P(dA) = \frac{1}{\mathcal{N}_A}[\prod_{x\in\Lambda}\prod_{\mu=0}^3 dA_\mu(x)] e^{-\frac{1}{2}a^4 \sum_x \sum_{\mu=0}^3 A_\mu(x)(-\Delta + M^2)A_\mu(x)} \tag{10}$$

where $\mathcal{N}_A$ is the normalization, $\Delta f = \frac{1}{a^2}\sum_{\mu=0}^3 (f(x+a_\mu) + f(x-a_\mu) - 2f(x))$.

The *generating function* is

$$e^{\mathcal{W}_\Lambda(J,J^5,\phi)} = \int P(dA) \int P(d\psi) e^{V_c(\psi) + V_{e.m.}(\psi,A,J) + V_F(\psi) + B(\psi,J^5,\phi)} \tag{11}$$

where

$$V_{e.m.}(\psi,A,J) = \frac{1}{2a}\sum_i a^4 \sum_x [\sum_s \sum_\mu (\psi^+_{i,s,x} G^+_{\mu,i,s}\sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x+a_\mu} - \psi^+_{i,s,x+a_\mu} G^-_{\mu,i,s}\sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x}) + r(\psi^+_{i,L,x}\widetilde{G}^+_{\mu,i}\psi^-_{i,R,x+e_\mu a} + \psi^+_{i,L,x+a_\mu}\widetilde{G}^-_{\mu,i}\psi^-_{i,R,x} + \psi^+_{i,R,x}\widetilde{G}^+_{\mu,i}\psi^-_{i,L,x+a_\mu} + \psi^+_{i,R,x+a_\mu}\widetilde{G}^-_{\mu,i}\psi^-_{i,L,x}] \tag{12}$$

with

$$G^\pm_{\mu,i,s} = a^{-1}(: e^{\pm ia(\varepsilon Q_i b_{i,s} A_\mu(x) + Y_i J_{\mu,x})} : -1) \qquad \widetilde{G}^\pm_{\mu,i} = a^{-1}(e^{\pm iaY_i J_{\mu,x}} - 1) \tag{13}$$

and

$$b_{i_1,L} = b_{i_2,R} = 1 \qquad b_{i_1,R} = b_{i_2,L} = 0 \tag{14}$$

with $Q_{i_1} = Q_{i_2}$ and $: e^{\pm i\varepsilon Q_i b_{i,s} a A_\mu(x)} := e^{\pm i\varepsilon Q_i a b_{i,s} A_\mu(x)} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon Q_i)^2 a^2 b_{i,s}^2 g^A_{\mu,\mu}(0,0))}$. The source term is

$$B(\psi, J^5, \phi) = a^4 \sum_x [j^5_{\mu,x} J^5_{\mu,x} + \sum_{i,s} (\psi^+_{i,s,x}\phi^-_{i,s,x} + \psi^-_{i,s,x}\phi^+_{i,s,x})]$$

where

$$j^5_{\mu,x} = \sum_{i,s} \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i \varepsilon_s Y_i Z^5_{i,s} \psi^+_{x,i,s} \sigma^L_\mu \psi^+_{x,i,s} \tag{15}$$

with $\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{i_1} = -\widetilde{\varepsilon}_{i_2} = 1$ and $\varepsilon_L = -\varepsilon_R = 1$. We assume that the hypercharges Y_i are such that

$$Y_{\nu_1} - Y_{e_1} = Y_{u_1} - Y_{d_1} \tag{16}$$

The *Schwinger functions* are derivatives of the generating function. The fermionic 2-point function is

$$S^\Lambda_{i,s,s'}(x,y) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial\phi^+_{i,s,x}\partial\phi^-_{i,s',y}} \mathcal{W}_\Lambda(J, J^5, \phi)|_0 \tag{17}$$

where $|_0$ means that all the external fields are set to zero, and the Fourier transform is $\widehat{S}^\Lambda_{i,s,s'}(k) = a^4 \sum_x S^\Lambda_{i,s,s'}(x,0) e^{-ikx}$. The vertex functions are

$$\Gamma^\Lambda_{\mu,i',s}(z,x,y) = \frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{W}_\Lambda(J, J^5, \phi)}{\partial J_{\mu,z} \partial\phi^+_{i',s,x} \partial\phi^-_{i',s,y}}|_0 \quad \Gamma^{5,\Lambda}_{\mu,i,s}(z,x,y) = \frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{W}_\Lambda(J, J^5, \phi)}{\partial J^5_{\mu,z} \partial\phi^+_{i',s,x} \partial\phi^-_{i',s,y}}|_0 \tag{18}$$

The Fourier transform is

$$\widehat{\Gamma}^\Lambda_{\mu,i',s}(k,p) = a^4 \sum_x a^4 \sum_y S_{2,i,s}(x,0) e^{-ipz - iky} \Gamma^\Lambda_{\mu,i',s}(z,0,y) \tag{19}$$

and similarly is defined $\widehat{\Gamma}^{5,\Lambda}_{\mu,i,i's}(k,p)$. The three-current vector and chiral correlations are

$$\Pi^\Lambda_{\mu,\nu,\rho}(z,y,x) = \frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{W}_\Lambda}{\partial J_{\mu,z} \partial J_{\nu,y} \partial J_{\rho,x}}|_0 \qquad \Pi^{5,\Lambda}_{\mu,\nu,\rho}(z,y,x) = \frac{\partial^3 \mathcal{W}_\Lambda}{\partial J^5_{\mu,z} \partial J_{\nu,y} \partial J_{\rho,x}}|_0 \tag{20}$$

We define $\lim_{L\to\infty} S^\Lambda_{i,s,s'}(x,y) = S_{i,s,s'}(x,y)$ and similarly for the other correlations.

The parameters ν_i, Z^5 must be chosen to ensure the validity of suitable renormalization conditions. The amputated vertex functions are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\mu,i,s}(k,p) &= \widehat{S}^{-1}_{i,s,s}(k) \widehat{\Gamma}_{\mu,i,s}(k,p) \widehat{S}^{-1}_{i,s,s}(k+p) \\ \gamma^5_{\mu,i,s}(k,p) &= \widehat{S}^{-1}_{i,s,s}(k) \widehat{\Gamma}^5_{\mu,i,s}(k,p) \widehat{S}^{-1}_{i,s,s}(k+p) \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

The parameters $Z^5_{i,s,s'}$ must be chosen so that they are the same, that is

$$\lim_{k,p\to 0} \frac{\gamma_{\mu,i,s}(k,p)}{\gamma^5_{\mu,i,s}(k,p)} = \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i \varepsilon_s I_2 \tag{22}$$

with $\varepsilon_L = -\varepsilon_R = 1$ and $I_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$. The above condition says that the charges associated to the vector and axial current are the same, a condition that has to be imposed also in a perturbative context [7]. Finally the mass counterterms ν_i must be chosen so that the theory is massless, that is

$$\lim_{k\to 0} S_{i,s,s}(k)|_{i,j} = \infty \tag{23}$$

1.3 Formal continuum theory

The term proportional to r in (4) is the Wilson term. Its role is crucial in eliminating unphysical poles in the lattice propagator by introducing a coupling between the L and R fermions. In the formal continuum limit $a \to 0$ the Wilson term disappears and $S + V_{e.m.}$ becomes equal to, if $J = 0$

$$\int dx \sum_{i_1} [\psi^+_{i_1,L,x} \sigma^L_\mu (\partial_\mu + \varepsilon Q_{i_1} A_\mu) \psi^-_{i_1,L,x} + \psi^+_{i_2,R,x} \sigma^R_\mu \partial_\mu \psi^-_{i_1,R,x}] +$$
$$\int dx \sum_{i_2} [\psi^+_{i_2,L,x} \sigma^L_\mu \partial_\mu \psi^-_{i_2,L,x} + \psi^+_{i_2,R,x} \sigma^R_\mu (\partial_\mu + \varepsilon Q_{i_2} A_\mu) \psi^-_{i_2,R,x}] \tag{24}$$

The R fermions of kind i_1 and the L fermions of kind i_2 decouple in the limit and can be ignored; they are non interacting fictitious degrees of freedom useful in the lattice regularization, see [21], [24]. Therefore in the continuum limit i_1 are the left handed components and i_2 the right handed of the leptons and quarks, $Q_{i_1} = Q_{i_2}$. The B current is $j^B_{\mu,x} = \sum_{i_1} Y_i \psi^+_{x,i_1,L} \sigma^L_\mu \psi^+_{x,i_1,L} + \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2} \psi^+_{x,i_2,R} \sigma^R_\mu \psi^+_{x,i_1,R}$ and vector and axial currents are

$$2j^{B,V}_{\mu,x} = \sum_{i_1} Y_{i_1} j_{\mu,i_1,x} + \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2} j_{\mu,i_2,x} \qquad 2j^{B,A}_{\mu,x} = \sum_{i_1} Y_{i_1} j^5_{\mu,i_1,x} - \sum_{i_2} Y_{i_2} j^5_{\mu,i_2,x} \tag{25}$$

as $2\psi^+_{i,s} \sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s} = \bar{\psi}_i \gamma_\mu (1 + \varepsilon_s \gamma_5) \psi_i$, $\varepsilon_L = -\varepsilon_R = 1$. In the formal continuum limit $8\Pi^\Lambda_{\mu,\nu,\rho,}(z,y,x)$ corresponds to $\left\langle j^{B,V}_{\mu,x}\, j^{B,V}_{\nu,x}\, j^{B,V}_{\rho,x} \right\rangle$ and $8\Pi^{\Lambda.5}_{\mu,\nu,\rho,}(z,y,x)$ to $\left\langle j^{B,A}_{\mu,x}\, j^{B,V}_{\nu,x}\, j^{B,V}_{\rho,x} \right\rangle$.

1.4 Ward Identities

By performing the change of variables

$$\psi^\pm_{i,x} \to \psi^\pm_{i,x} e^{\pm i Y_i \alpha_x} \qquad Y_{\nu_1} - Y_{e_1} = Y_{u_1} - Y_{d_1} \tag{26}$$

we get

$$W(J, J^5, \phi) = W(J + d\alpha, J^5, e^{iY\alpha}\phi) \tag{27}$$

where $J + d\alpha$ is a shorthand for $J_{\mu,x} + d_\mu \alpha_x$, $d_\mu f(x) = (f(x + a_\mu) - f(x))/a$ and $e^{iY\alpha}\phi$ is a shorthand for $e^{\pm i Y_i \alpha_x} \phi^\pm_{i,x}$. Note that the quartic interaction is left invariant by this transformation. By differentiating with respect to $\alpha_z, \phi^+_y, \phi^-_z$ and passing to Fourier transform we get the Ward Identities, if $\sigma_\mu(p) = (1 - e^{ip_\mu a})/a$ and

$$\sum_\mu \sigma_\mu(p) \widehat{\Gamma}^\Lambda_{\mu,i,s}(k,p) = Y_i (\widehat{S}_{i,s,s}(k) - \widehat{S}_{i,s,s}(k+p)) \tag{28}$$

and

$$\sum_\nu \sigma_\nu(p_1 + p_2) \widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\rho}(p_1, p_2) = 0 \tag{29}$$

expressing the conservation of the current; similarly

$$\sum_\nu \sigma_\nu(p_1) \widehat{\Pi}^5_{\mu,\nu,\rho}(p_1, p_2) = \sum_\rho \sigma_\rho(p_2) \widehat{\Pi}^5_{\mu,\nu,\rho}(p_1, p_2) = 0 \tag{30}$$

1.5 Main result

In the following we prove the following result. We set $\bar{M} = \min(M, M_W, M_Z)$.

Theorem 1.1. *There exists ε_0 such that, for $\varepsilon^2, g^2, \bar{g}^2 \leqslant \varepsilon_0(\bar{M}a)^2$, $\bar{M}a > 1$ it is possible to choose $\nu_i, Z^5_{i,s}$ such that the limit $L \to \infty$ of the Schwinger functions exists, (22) and (23) hold and, if $p = p_1 + p_2$, $\theta \geqslant 1/2$*

$$\sum_{\mu_1} \sigma_{\mu_1}(p) \widehat{\Pi}^5_{\mu_1,\mu_2,\mu_3}(p_1, p_2) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} \varepsilon_{\mu_2,\mu_3,\alpha,\beta} p^1_\alpha p^2_\beta [\sum_{i_1} Y^3_{i_1} - \sum_{i_2} Y^3_{i_2}] + O(a^\theta p^{2+\theta}) \tag{31}$$

The lattice effective model is well defined, in the sense that correlations are expressed by convergent expansions uniformly in the volume and up to a inverse lattice step of the order of the mass of the gauge fields. The choice of ν ensures that the theory is massless, that is fermionic Schwinger have a power law decay. The presence of the lattice breaks the Lorentz and chiral symmetry of the theory. Lorentz symmetry is recovered for energies far from the cut-off; in particular, see below, the fermionic 2-point function $S_2(k)$ is equal to the relativistic one up to small corrections for momenta far from the cut-off and a finite wave function renormalization, depending on the particle and chirality. While the current is conserved (29), by (31) we see that the axial current is generically non conserved, unless $[\sum_{i_1} Y^3_{i_1} - \sum_{i_2} Y^3_{i_2}] = 0$; noting that in the continuum limit the particles with label i_1 are the left ones and with i_2 the right ones, one recovers the condition (2). The anomaly therefore vanishes under the same condition found in the continuum, with a finite inverse step of the order the order of the boson masses, even if the lattice breaks a number of symmetries on which the cancellation in the continuum limit was based. The $O(a^\theta p^{2+\theta})$ are a bound on the subleading corrections, which does not exclude that also such terms are indeed vanishing.

The rest of this paper is organized in the following way. In §2 we integrate the A fields reducing to a fermionic theory. In §3 the fermionic sector is analyzed by multiscale Renormalization Group using a tree expansion and determinant bounds for fermions. In §4 the flow of running coupling constants is analyzed and finally in §5 the cancellation is established; in the appendix some properties of truncated expectations are recalled.

2 Integration of the e.m. field

The *bosonic simple expectation* is defined as

$$\mathcal{E}_A(A_{\mu_1}(x_1)...A_{\mu_n}(x_n)) = \int P(dA) A_{\mu_1}(x_1)...A_{\mu_n}(x_n) \tag{32}$$

and is expressed by the Wick rule with covariance

$$g^A_{\mu,\nu}(x,y) = \delta_{\mu,\nu} \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_k \frac{e^{ik(x-y)}}{c(k)^2 + M^2} \tag{33}$$

with $c^2(k) = \sum_\mu (1 - \cos k_\mu a) a^{-2}$, $k = 2\pi n/L$ and $k \in [-\pi/a, \pi/a]^4$, $n_i = -L/a, (L-a)/a$. We will need also formulas for the exponentials which are given by

$$\mathcal{E}_A(\prod_{j=1}^n e^{ib_j A_{\mu_j}(x_j)}) = e^{-\frac{1}{2}\sum_{j,j'} b_j b_{j'} g^A_{\mu_i,\mu_j}(x_j,x_{j'})} \tag{34}$$

We integrate the A_μ fields obtaining

$$e^{V_A(\psi,J)} = \int P(dA) e^{V_{e.m.}(\psi,A,J)} \tag{35}$$

Note that using the notation $\int dx = a^4 \sum_x$, $\alpha = \pm$

$$V_A(\psi,J) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \mathcal{E}_A^T(V_{e.m.};...;V_{e.m.}) = \int dx \sum_{i,\alpha} a^{-1}(e^{ia\alpha Y_i J_\mu(x)} - 1) O^\alpha_{\mu,i}(\psi) +$$
$$\sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{\mu},\underline{i}} \frac{1}{n!} \int dx_1 ... \int dx_n a^{-n} [\prod_{j=1}^{n} O^{\alpha_j}_{\mu_j,i_j}(\psi) e^{i\alpha_j a Y_{i_j} J_{\mu_j}(x_j)} \tag{36}$$
$$\mathcal{E}_A^T(: e^{i\alpha_1 b_{i_1,s_1} \varepsilon Q_1 a A_{\mu_1}(x_1)} :;...;: e^{i\alpha_n b_{i_n,s_n} \varepsilon Q_n a (A_{\mu_n}(x_n)} :)$$

where $\mathcal{E}_A^T$ is the truncated expectation, defined as $\mathcal{E}_A^T(O;..;O) = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial \lambda^n} \log \int P(dA) e^{\lambda O}|_0$ (for O such that the integral is well-defined) and $O^+_\mu(\psi) = \psi^+_{i,s,x} \sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x+a_\mu}$ and $O^-_\mu(\psi) = -\psi^+_{i,s,x+a_\mu} \sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x}$. Note that the only non-vanishing terms are such that all the $b_{i,s}$ in the truncated expectations are $= 1$. The above expression can be rewritten as, properly defining the kernels $W_{n,m}$

$$V_A(\psi,J) = \sum_{\substack{l,m \geqslant 0 \\ l+m \geqslant 1}} \sum_{\underline{\alpha},\underline{\mu},\underline{i}} \int d\underline{x} [\prod_{j=1}^{n} O^{\alpha_j}_{\mu_j,i_j}(\psi)][\prod_{j=1}^{m} J_{\mu_i}(x_i))] W_{n,m}(\underline{x}) \tag{37}$$

Lemma 2.1. *The kernels in (37) verify the following bound, for $n \geqslant 2$*

$$\frac{1}{L^4} \int d\underline{x} |W_{n,m}(\underline{x})| \leqslant C^n a^{-(4-3n-m)} \varepsilon^n (Ma)^{2-2n} \tag{38}$$

Proof. By definition : $e^{\pm i\varepsilon Q_i a b_{i,s} A_\mu(x)} := e^{\pm ieQ_i a A_\mu(x)} e^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon Q_i)^2 a^2 b^2_{i,s} g^A_{\mu,\mu}(0,0))}$ and $e^{\frac{1}{2}(\varepsilon Q_i)^2 a^2 b^2_{i,s} g^A_{\mu,\mu}(0,0))}$ is bounded by a constant as $|g^A_{\mu,\mu}(0,0)| \leqslant Ca^{-2}$. By (34) we can write, $\alpha_j = \pm$

$$\mathcal{E}_A(\prod_{j \in X} e^{i\varepsilon \alpha_j Q_j a A_{\mu_j}(x_j)}) = e^{-V(X)} \quad V(X) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j,j' \in X} V_{j,j'} \tag{39}$$

where $X = (1,..,n)$ and, if $\beta_j = \alpha_j Q_j$

$$V_{j,j'} = \varepsilon^2 \beta_j \beta_{j'} \mathcal{E}(a A_{\mu_j}(x_j) a A_{\mu_{j'}}(x_{j'})) = \varepsilon^2 \beta_j \beta_{j'} a^2 g^A_{\mu_j,\mu_{j'}}(x_j, x_{j'}) \tag{40}$$

The truncated expectation $\mathcal{E}_A^T = e^{-V(X)}|_T$ are obtained by solving recursively

$$e^{-V(X)} = \sum_{\pi} \prod_{Y \in \pi} e^{-V(Y)}|_T \tag{41}$$

where π are the partitions of X. An explicit expression for the connected part is, (see [44])

$$e^{-V(X)}|_T = \sum_{g \in G} \prod_{(j,j') \in g} (e^{-V_{j,j'}} - 1) \prod_{j \in X} e^{-V_{j,j}/2} \tag{42}$$

where G is the set of the connected graphs in X. A different representation for (42) is however more convenient [44] (see also [45],[42]) , whose derivation is recalled in App. I

$$e^{-V(X)}|_T = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \prod_{(j,j') \in T} V_{j,j'} \int dp_T(\underline{s}) e^{-V_T(\underline{s})} \tag{43}$$

where

- $\mathcal{T}$ is the set of tree graphs T on X
- $\underline{s} \in (0,1)^{\mathcal{P}_X}$ with $\mathcal{P}_X$ the set of unordered pairs in X
- $V_T(\underline{s})$ is a convex linear combination of $V(Y) = \sum_{j,j' \in Y} V_{j,j'}$, Y subsets of X.
- $dp_T(\underline{s})$ is a probability measure

Note that $V(Y)$ is stable, that is

$$V(Y) = \sum_{j,j' \in Y} V_{j,j} = \sum_{j,j' \in Y} \varepsilon^2 \beta_j \beta_{j'} a^2 g^A_{\mu_i,\mu_j}(x_i,x_j) = \mathcal{E}([\sum_{i \in Y} \varepsilon \beta_j a A_{\mu_i}(x_i)]^2) \geqslant 0 \tag{44}$$

hence

$$V(\underline{s}) \geqslant 0 \tag{45}$$

and

$$\int dp_T(\underline{s}) e^{-V(\underline{s})} \leqslant 1 \tag{46}$$

We can therefore write

$$a^{-n} |\mathcal{E}^T_A(e^{i\beta_1 \varepsilon a A_{\mu_1}(x_1)}; ...; e^{i\beta_n \varepsilon Q_n a A_{\mu_n}(x_n)})| \leqslant C^n \varepsilon^n a^{-n} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \prod_{(i,j) \in T} |a^2 g^A_{\mu_i,\mu_j}(x_i,x_j)| \tag{47}$$

Using that $|g^A_{\mu,\mu}|_1 \leqslant CM^{-2}$ we get

$$a^{-n} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \prod_{(i,j) \in T} |a^2 g^A(x_i,x_j)|_1 \leqslant \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} C^n \varepsilon^n a^{-n} (\frac{a^2}{M^2})^{n-1} \leqslant C^n \varepsilon^n n! a^{-n} a^{4n-4} (\frac{1}{a^2 M^2})^{n-1} \tag{48}$$

where we have used that the number of T is $\leqslant C^n n!$. Finally we can expand $e^{i\alpha_i a J_{\mu_i}}$ in series obtaining an extra a for any J. ∎

3 Integration of the fermionic field

3.1 Multiscale decomposition

The *fermionic simple expectation*

$$\mathcal{E}_\psi(\psi^{\varepsilon_1}_{i_1,x_1} ... \psi^{\varepsilon_n}_{i_n,x_n}) = \int P(d\psi) \psi^{\varepsilon_1}_{i_1,x_1} ... \psi^{\varepsilon_n}_{i_n,x_n} \tag{49}$$

is expressed by the anticommutative Wick rule with covariance, $k = \frac{2\pi}{L}(n + \frac{1}{2})$, $n \in \mathcal{N}$, $k \in [-\pi/a, \pi/a]^4$

$$g_i(x,y) = \int P(d\psi) \psi^-_{i,x} \psi^+_{i,y} = \frac{1}{L^4} \sum_k e^{ik(x-y)} (\sum_\mu i\gamma_0 \gamma_\mu a^{-1} \sin(k_\mu a) + r a^{-1} \gamma_0 \sum_\mu (1 - \cos k_\mu a))^{-1} \tag{50}$$

The truncated expectations are $\mathcal{E}^T_\psi(O; ...; O) = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial \lambda^n} \log \int P(d\psi) e^{\lambda O}|_0$.

In contrast with the integration of the A fields, the ψ fields are massless and a multiscale integration procedure is necessary. If $\chi_0(t)$ is a Gevray function which is $= 1$ for $t \leqslant 1$ and $= 0$ for $t \geqslant \gamma$ with $\gamma > 1$, we define

$$1 = \chi_N(k) + f_{N+1}(k) \tag{51}$$

where $\chi_N(k) = \sum_{h=-\infty}^{N} f_h(k)$ with $f_h(k) = \chi_0(\gamma^{-h}|k|) - \chi_0(\gamma^{-h+1}|k|)$ and $f_h(k)$ non-vanishing for $\gamma^{h-1} \leqslant |k| \leqslant \gamma^{h+1}$; therefore $\chi_N(k) = 0$ for $|k| \geqslant \gamma^{N+1} = \pi/4a$ then $f_{N+1}(k)$ has support for $|k| \geqslant \pi/4a$. We define $\widehat{g}_i^{(N+1)}(k) = f_{N+1}(k)\widehat{g}_i(k)$; by (50)

$$a^{-2}\sum_{\mu}(\sin k_\mu a)^2 + a^{-2}\sum_{\mu}(1-\cos k_\mu a)^2 \geqslant a^{-2}\sum_{\mu}(1-\cos k_\mu a))^2 \geqslant C/a^2 \tag{52}$$

for $|k| \geqslant \pi/4a$, and using that the volume of the support is $O(a^{-4})$, we get

$$|g^{(N+1)}(x,y)| \leqslant C\gamma^{3N} e^{-(c\gamma^N|x-y|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{53}$$

Regarding $g^{(h)}(x,y)$ in the support of f^h one has that

$$a^{-2}\sum_{\mu}(\sin k_\mu a)^2 + a^{-2}\sum_{\mu}(1-\cos k_\mu a))^2 \geqslant a^{-2}\sum_{\mu}(\sin k_\mu a)^2 \geqslant C\gamma^{2h} \tag{54}$$

so that

$$|g^{(h+1)}(x,y)| \leqslant C\gamma^{3h} e^{-(c\gamma^h|x-y|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{55}$$

Finally

$$g(x,y) = \sum_{h=-\infty}^{N+1} g^{(h)}(x,y) \tag{56}$$

The multiscale integration is defined inductively in the following way; assume that we have integrated the fileds $\psi^{(N+1)}, \psi^{(N-1)}, ...\psi^{(h)}$ obtaining (in the $\phi = 0$ for definiteness)

$$e^{W(J,J^5,0)} = \int P_{Z_h}(d\psi^{(\leqslant h)}) e^{V^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_h}\psi^{(\leqslant h)}, J, J^5)} \tag{57}$$

with $P(d\psi^{(\leqslant h)})$ given by

$$\widehat{g}_i^{(\leqslant h)}(k) = \chi_h(k)(\sum_{\mu}\gamma_0\widetilde{\gamma}_\mu^h a^{-1} i\sin(k_\mu a) + a^{-1}\widehat{\gamma}_0^h\sum_{\mu}(1-\cos k_\mu a))^{-1} \tag{58}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widetilde{\gamma}_0^h &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & Z_{h,L,i}I \\ Z_{h,R,i}I & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \widetilde{\gamma}_j^h = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & iZ_{h,L,i}\sigma_j \\ -iZ_{h,R,i}\sigma_j & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\gamma}_0^h &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & r_h\sqrt{Z_{h,L,i}Z_{h,R,i}}I \\ r_h\sqrt{Z_{h,L,i}Z_{h,R,i}}I & 0 \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

and

$$V^{(h)}(\psi^{(\leqslant h)}, J, J^5) = \sum_{\substack{l,m\geqslant 0 \\ l+m\geqslant 1}} \sum_{\underline{s},\underline{i},\underline{\alpha},\underline{\mu}} \int d\underline{x}d\underline{y}[\prod_{j=1}^{l}\partial^{\alpha_j}\psi^{(\leqslant h)\varepsilon_j}_{i_j,s_j,x_j}][\prod_{j=1}^{m}J^{\sigma_j}_{\mu_i,x_i}]W^h_{l,m,\underline{\mu},\underline{s},\underline{i},\underline{\alpha}}(\underline{x},\underline{y}) \tag{60}$$

with $\sigma_j = 0, 1$ and $J^0_{\mu,x} = J_\mu$, $J^1_{\mu,x} = J^5_{\mu,x}$; in $W^h_{l,m,\underline{\mu},\underline{s},\underline{i},\underline{\alpha}}$. We define a localization operator $\mathcal{L}$ such that

$$\begin{aligned}
&\mathcal{L}\int dxdyW^h_{2,0}(x,y)\psi^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,x}\psi^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',y} = \int dxdyW^h_{2,0}(x,y)\psi^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,x}(\psi^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',x} + (x-y)_\mu\widetilde{\partial}_\mu\psi^{-,(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',x}) \\
&\mathcal{L}\int dxdydzW^h_{2,1,\mu}(x,y,z)J^\sigma_{\mu,z}\psi^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,x}\psi^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',y} = \int dxdydzW^h_{2,1,\mu}(x,y,z)J^\sigma_{\mu,z}\psi^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,z}\psi^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',z}
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

where $\widetilde{\partial}_\mu f_x = \frac{f_{x+e_\mu a} - f_{x-e_\mu a}}{2a}$; $\mathcal{L} = 0$ otherwise. In momentum space the localization operator can be written as

$$\mathcal{L} \int dk \widehat{W}^h_{2,0}(k) \widehat{\psi}^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,k} \widehat{\psi}^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',k} = \int dk (\widehat{W}_{2,0}(0) + i \frac{\sin k_\mu a}{a} \partial_\mu \widehat{W}_{2,0}(0)) \widehat{\psi}^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,k} \widehat{\psi}^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',k} \tag{62}$$

$$\mathcal{L} \int dk dp \widehat{W}^h_{2,1,\mu}(k, k+p) \widehat{J}^\sigma_{\mu,p} \widehat{\psi}^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,k} \widehat{\psi}^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',k+p} = \int dk dp \widehat{W}^h_{2,1,\mu}(0,0) J^\sigma_{\mu,p} \widehat{\psi}^{+(\leqslant h)}_{i,s,k} \widehat{\psi}^{-(\leqslant h)}_{i',s',k+p}$$

The action of $\mathcal{L}$ gives

$$\mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_h}\psi, J, J^5) = \int dx \sum_{i,s} n_{h,i} \sqrt{Z_{h,i,L} Z_{h,i,R}} \gamma^h (\psi^+_{i,L,x} \psi^-_{i,R,x} + \psi^+_{i,R,x} \psi^-_{i,L,x}) +$$

$$\sum_{i,s} z_{h,i,s} Z_{h,i,s} \int dx \sigma^s_\mu \psi^+_{i,s,x} \widetilde{\partial}_\mu \psi^+_{i,s,x} +$$

$$+ \sum_{i,s} Z^J_{h,i,s} Y_i \int dx J_{\mu,x} \psi^+_{i,s,x} \sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x} + \sum_{i,s} \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i \varepsilon_s Y_i \int Z^5_{h,i,s} J^5_{\mu,x} \psi^+_{i,s,x} \sigma^s_\mu \psi^-_{i,s,x} \tag{63}$$

Note that the local part of the electromagnetic and axial current, see the last line of (63), is equal (up to a sign), even if the corresponding expression at scale N were different (the vector current is non local while the axial current is local). Some symmetry considerations restrict the possible terms obtained by the $\mathcal{L}$ operation. By the invariance under $\psi^\pm_{i,s} \to e^{\pm i\alpha_i} \psi^\pm_{i,s}$ with $\alpha_\nu - \alpha_\varepsilon = \alpha_u - \alpha_d$ and $\alpha_i \neq \alpha_{i'}$ we get $\widehat{\psi}^+_{i,s,k} \widehat{\psi}^-_{i',s',k} \to e^{i(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'})} \widehat{\psi}^-_{i,s,k} \widehat{\psi}^+_{i',s',k}$ so that $i = i'$. Regarding the chiral indices in $W_{2,0}$ if $s = s'$ then $\widehat{W}^h_{2,0}(k)$ is odd and the kernel with opposite chirality is even. This says that in the $\widehat{W}^h_{2,0}(0)$ terms the fields have opposite chirality and $\partial_\mu \widehat{W}^h_{2,0}(0)$ the same chirality; for the same reason in $\widehat{W}^h_{2,1}(0)$ they have the same chirality. Finally $\partial_\mu W^h_{2,0}(0), W^h_{\mu,2,1}(0)$ are proportional to σ^s_μ.

3.2 Anomalous integration

We can write

$$\widetilde{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{V}^{(h)}(\psi, J, J^5) = \mathcal{L}\mathcal{V}^{(h)} + \sum_{i,s} z_{h,i,s} \int dx \sigma^s_\mu \psi^+_{i,s,x} \widetilde{\partial}_\mu \psi^+_{i,s,x} \tag{64}$$

so that

$$e^{W(J,J^5,0)} = \int P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(\leqslant h)}) e^{\widetilde{\mathcal{L}} V^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_h}\psi^{(\leqslant h)}, J, J^5) + \mathcal{R} V^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_h}\psi^{(\leqslant h)}, J, J^5)} \tag{65}$$

where $P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(\leqslant h)})$ has propagator given by (58) with $Z_{h,i,s}$ replaced by

$$Z_{h-1,i,s}(k) = Z_{h,i,s} + \chi_h(k) z_{h,i,s} \tag{66}$$

Setting $Z_{h-1,i,s}(0) \equiv Z_{h-1,i,s}$, we can write

$$P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(\leqslant h)}) = P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(\leqslant h-1)}) P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(h)}) \tag{67}$$

with $P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(\leqslant h-1)})$ with propagator (58) with h replaced by $h-1$ and $P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(h)})$ has propagator which can be written as

$$g^{(h)}(x,y) = g^{(h)}_{rel}(x,y) + r^{(h)}(x,y) \tag{68}$$

with

$$g^{(h)}_{rel}(x,y) = \frac{1}{L^4}\sum_k e^{ik(x-y)} f_h(k) \begin{pmatrix} Z_{h-1,i,L}(k)(ik_0 I + \sum_j \sigma_j k_j) & 0 \\ 0 & Z_{h-1,i,R}(k)(ik_0 I - \sum_j \sigma_j k_j)] \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \tag{69}$$

and

$$|g^{(h)}_{rel}(x,y)| \leqslant C\frac{\gamma^{3h}}{Z_{h-1,i,L}} e^{-(\gamma^h|x-y|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad |r^{(h)}_i(x,y)| \leqslant C\gamma^{3h}\gamma^{h-N} e^{-(\gamma^h|x-y|)^{\frac{1}{2}}} \tag{70}$$

Finally we define

$$e^{V^{(h-1)}(\sqrt{Z_{h-1}}\psi^{(\leqslant h-1)},J,J^5)} = \int P_{Z_{h-1}}(d\psi^{(h)}) e^{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}V^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_{h-1}}\psi^{(\leqslant h)},J,J^5)+\mathcal{R}V^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_{h-1}}\psi^{(\leqslant h)},J,J^5)} \tag{71}$$

with

$$\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\mathcal{V}^{(h)}(\sqrt{Z_{h-1}}\psi, J, J^5) = \int dx \sum_{i,s} \nu_{h,i}\sqrt{Z_{h-1,i,L}Z_{h-1,i,L}}\gamma^h(\psi^+_{i,L,x}\psi^-_{i,R,x} + \psi^+_{i,R,x}\psi^-_{i,L,x}) +$$

$$+ \sum_{i,s} Z^J_{h-1,i,s} Y_i \int dx J_{\mu,x}\psi^+_{i,s,x}\sigma^s_\mu\psi^-_{i,s,x} + \sum_{i,s}\tilde{\varepsilon}_i\varepsilon_s Y_i \int Z^5_{h-1,i,s} J^5_{\mu,x}\psi^+_{i,s,x}\sigma^s_\mu\psi^-_{i,s,x} \tag{72}$$

and the procedure can be iterated.

3.3 Convergence and analyticity

We prove the following lemma, setting $\nu_{i,h} = \tilde{\nu}_{i,h}(a\bar{M})^{-2}$.

Lemma 3.1. *There exists a constant $\bar{\varepsilon}$ such that, for $|r_h|, |Z_{h,i,s}| \leqslant e^{C\bar{\varepsilon}(a\bar{M})^2}$, $\max(|\tilde{\nu}_{i,s,h}|, g^2, \bar{g}^2, \varepsilon^2) \leqslant \bar{\varepsilon}(a\bar{M})^2$ then*

$$\frac{1}{L^4}\int d\underline{x}d\underline{y}|W^{(h)}_{l,m,\underline{\mu},\underline{s},\underline{i},\underline{\alpha}}(\underline{x},\underline{y})| \leqslant C^{l+m}\gamma^{(4-(3/2)l-m)h}\bar{\varepsilon}^{\max(l/2-1,1)} \tag{73}$$

Proof We write the kernels $W^{(h)}_{l,m,\underline{\mu},\underline{s},\underline{i},\underline{\alpha}}$ in in terms of *Gallavotti-Nicoló trees* , see Fig.1, defined in the following way (for details see e.g. §3 of [20]) .




Figure 1: A labeled tree

Let us consider the family of all trees which can be constructed by joining a point r, the *root*, with an ordered set of $n \geqslant 1$ points, the *endpoints* of the *unlabeled tree*, so that r is not a

branching point. n will be called the *order* of the unlabeled tree and the branching points will be called the *non trivial vertices*. The unlabeled trees are partially ordered from the root to the endpoints in the natural way; we shall use the symbol $<$ to denote the partial order. The number of unlabeled trees is 4^n. The set of labeled trees $\mathcal{T}_{h,n}$ is defined associating a label $h \leqslant N-1$ with the root; moreover we introduce a family of vertical lines, labeled by an integer taking values in $[h, N+1]$ intersecting all the non-trivial vertices, the endpoints and other points called trivial vertices. The set of the *vertices* v of τ will be the union of the endpoints, the trivial vertices and the non trivial vertices. The scale label is h_v and, if v_1 and v_2 are two vertices and $v_1 < v_2$, then $h_{v_1} < h_{v_2}$. Moreover, there is only one vertex immediately following the root, which will be denoted v_0 and can not be an endpoint; its scale is $h+1$.

There are two kinds of end-points, normal and special, and $n = \bar{n} + m$. The normal end-points are $\bar{n}$ and are associated to terms in the effective potential not depending on the external fields J. The ν-end-points are associated with the first line of (72) and have scale $h_v \leqslant N+1$ and there is the constraint that $h_v = h_{v'} + 1$, if v' is the first non trivial vertex immediately preceding v. The V_F-endpoints have scale $h_v = N+1$ and are associated to one of the terms in (6), and to the V_A-endpoints is associated one of the terms in (37) with $m = 0$. The special end-endpoints have associated terms with at least an external J fields; the Z^J, Z^5 end-points have $h_v \leqslant N+1$ and there is the constraint that $h_v = h_{v'} + 1$, and are associated with one of the terms in the second line of (72); the V_A end-points have scale N and are associated to the terms with $(n, m) \neq (1, 1)$ in (37).

The effective potential can be written as

$$\mathcal{V}^{(h)}(\psi^{(\leqslant h)}, J, J^5) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{h,n}} \mathcal{V}^{(h)}(\tau) \ , \tag{74}$$

where, if v_0 is the first vertex of τ and $\tau_1, .., \tau_s$ ($s = s_{v_0}$) are the subtrees of τ with root v_0, $\mathcal{V}^{(h)}$ is defined inductively by the relation, $h \leqslant N-1$

$$\mathcal{V}^{(h)}(\tau) = \frac{(-1)^{s+1}}{s!} \mathcal{E}^T_{h+1}[\bar{\mathcal{V}}^{(h+1)}(\tau_1); ..; \bar{\mathcal{V}}^{(h+1)}(\tau_s)]$$

where $\mathcal{E}^T_{h+1}$ is the *truncated expectation* and $\bar{\mathcal{V}}^{(h+1)}(\tau) = \mathcal{R}\mathcal{V}^{(h+1)}(\tau)$ if the subtree τ_i contains more then one end-point. We define P_v as the set of field labels of v representing the external fields and if $v_1, \dots, v_{s_v}$ are the s_v vertices immediately following v, then we denote by Q_{v_i} the intersection of P_v and P_{v_i}; this definition implies that $P_v = \cup_i Q_{v_i}$. The union of the subsets $P_{v_i} \backslash Q_{v_i}$ are the internal fields of v. Therefore if $\mathbf{P}_\tau$ is the familiy of all such choices and $\mathbf{P}$ an element we can write

$$\mathcal{V}^{(h)}(\tau) = \sum_{\mathbf{P} \in \mathbf{P}_\tau} \int dx_{v_0} W^{(h+1)}_{\tau,\mathbf{P}}(x_{v_0}) [\prod_{f \in P_{v_0}} \psi^{\varepsilon(f)(\leqslant h)}_{x(f)}] [\prod_f J(x_f)] \tag{75}$$

where $W^{(h_v)}_{\tau,\mathbf{P}}(x_{v_0})$ is defined inductively by the equation

$$W^{(h+1)}_{\tau,\mathbf{P}}(x_v) = \frac{1}{s_v!} [\prod_{i=1}^{s_{v_i}} W^{(h_v+1)}_{\tau,\mathbf{P}}(x_{v_i})] \mathcal{E}^T_{h_v}(\tilde{\psi}^{(h_v)}(P_{v_1}/Q_{v_1}); ...; \tilde{\psi}^{(h)v}(P_{v_{s_v}}/Q_{v_{s_v}}) \tag{76}$$

where $\tilde{\psi}^{(h)}(P) = \prod_{f \in P} \psi^{(h)\varepsilon(f)}_{x(f)}$ and x_v are the coordinates associated to the vertex v.

We get

$$W^{(h)} = \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_{h,n}} \sum_{\mathbf{P}, |P_{v_0}| = l+m} W^{(h)}_{\tau,\mathbf{P}}(x_v) \tag{77}$$

We use the analogue of (43) for fermionic truncated expectation,

$$\mathcal{E}_h^T(\widetilde{\psi}^{(h)}(P_1);\widetilde{\psi}^{(h)}(P_2);...;\widetilde{\psi}^{(h)}(P_s)) = \sum_T \prod_{l\in T} g^{(h)}(x_l - y_l) \int dP_T(\mathbf{t}) \det G^{h,T}(\mathbf{t}) \tag{78}$$

where

1. T is a set of lines, which becomes a tree graph if one identifies all the points in the same cluster.

2. $\mathbf{t} = \{t_{i,i'} \in [0,1], 1 \leqslant i, i' \leqslant s\}$ and $dP_T(\mathbf{t})$ is a probability measure with support on a set of $\mathbf{t}$ such that $t_{i,i'} = \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i'}$ for some family of vectors $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^s$ of unit norm.

3. $G^{h,T}(\mathbf{t})$ is a $(n-s+1)\times(n-s+1)$ matrix, whose elements are given by $G^{h,T}_{ij,i'j'} = t_{i,i'} g^{(h)}(x_{ij} - y_{i'j'})$.

4. If $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{R}^s \otimes \mathcal{H}_0$, where $\mathcal{H}_0$ is the Hilbert space of complex two dimensional vectors with scalar product $< F, G >= \int dk F_i^*(k) G_i(k)$. It is easy to verify that

$$G^{h_v,T_v}_{ij,i'j'} = t_{i,i'} g^{(h_v)}(x_{ij} - y_{i'j'}) =< \mathbf{u}_i \otimes A^{(h_v)}_{x(f_{ij}^-)}, \mathbf{u}_{i'} \otimes B^{(h_v)}_{x(f^+_{i'j'})} > \tag{79}$$

   where $\mathbf{u}_i \in \mathbb{R}^s$, $i = 1,\dots,s$, are the vectors such that $t_{i,i'} = \mathbf{u}_i \cdot \mathbf{u}_{i'}$ and A, B suitable functions.

By inserting the above representation we can write $W^{(h+1)}_{\tau,\mathbf{P}} = \sum_T W^{(h+1)}_{\tau,\mathbf{P},T}$ where $\mathbf{T}$ is the union of all the trees T.

The determinants are bounded by the *Gram-Hadamard inequality*, stating that, if M is a square matrix with elements M_{ij} of the form $M_{ij} =< A_i, B_j >$, where A_i, B_j are vectors in a Hilbert space with scalar product $< \cdot, \cdot >$, then

$$|\det M| \leqslant \prod_i ||A_i|| \cdot ||B_i|| \tag{80}$$

where $||\cdot||$ is the norm induced by the scalar product.

The tree T connects a set of n-endpoints; to each point v are associated i_v ψ-fields and j_v J-fields; we define $m_v^{i,j}$ the number of end-points following v with i ψ fields and j J fields. The integral over the difference of coordinates associated to propagators gives a factor $\prod_v \gamma^{-4h_v(s_v-1)}$; to the normal V_F end-points is associated $\gamma^{-2N}(1/(\bar{M}a)^2)$; to the V_A endpoints is associated a factor $\gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)N}(\varepsilon^{i_v/2}(a\bar{M})^{2-i_v})$ with $(4-3i_v/2-j_v) < 0$ and $i_v \geqslant 4$ and $(a\bar{M})^{2-i_v} < (a\bar{M})^{-2}$. In conclusion we get

$$\int dx_{v_0} |W_{\tau,\mathbf{P},T}(x_{v_0})| \leqslant L^4 \prod_{v\, not\, e.p.} \frac{1}{s_v!} C^{\sum_{i=1}^{s_v} |P_{v_i}| - |P_v|} \gamma^{-4h_v(s_v-1)} \tag{81}$$
$$\gamma^{3/2h_v(\sum_i |P_{v_i}|-|P_v|)} [\prod_v \gamma^{-z_v(h_v - h_{v'})}] [\prod_{v\ e.p.\ not\ \nu} \gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)N}] [\prod_{v\ e.p.\ \nu} \gamma^{h_v}] \bar{\varepsilon}^{\bar{n}}$$

where $\prod_{v\ e.p.\ not;\nu}$ is the product over the end-points excluded the ν ones, $\bar{n}$ is the number of normal end-points,$\prod_v \gamma^{-z_v(h_v-h_{v'})}$ is produced by the $\mathcal{R}$ operation and $z_v = 2$ if $|P_v| = 2$ and there are no J fields, $z_v = 1$ if $|P_v| = 2$ and there is a single J field, $z_v = 0$ otherwise.

Note that $\prod_{v\ e.p.\ not\ \nu}\gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)N}$ includes the contributions of the Z special end-points, where $4-3i_v/2-j_v=0$. By using that

$$\sum_v (h_v-h)(s_v-1)=\sum_v (h_v-h_{v'})(\sum_{i,j} m_v^{i,j}-1)$$
$$\sum_v (h_v-h)(\sum_i |P_{v_i}|-|P_v|)=\sum_v (h_v-h_{v'})(\sum_{i,j} i m_v^{i,j}-|P_v|) \tag{82}$$

where $m_v^{i,j}$ is the number of end-points following v with i ψ fields and j J fields , we get, if $\bar n$ is the number of normal endpoints

$$\int dx_{v_0}|W_{\tau,\mathbf{P},T}(x_{v_0})|\leqslant L^4\gamma^{-h[-4+\frac{3|P_{v_0}|}{2}-\sum_{i,j}(3i/2-4)m_{v_0}^{i,j}]}\bar\varepsilon^{\bar n}$$
$$\prod_{v\ not\ e.p.}\left\{\frac{1}{s_v!}C^{\sum_{i=1}^{s_v}|P_{v_i}|-|P_v|}\gamma^{-(-4+\frac{3|P_v|}{2}-\sum_{i,j}(3i/2-4)m_v^{i,j}+z_v)(h_v-h_{v'})}\right\}$$
$$[\prod_{v\ e.p.\ not\ \nu}\gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)N}][\prod_{v\ e.p.\ \nu}\gamma^{h_v}]$$

We use now that

$$\gamma^{h\sum_{i,j}m_{v_0}^{i,j}}\prod_{v\ not\ e.p.}\gamma^{\sum_{i,j}(h_v-h_{v'})m_v^{i,j}}=\prod_{v\ e.p.}\gamma^{h_{v^*}} \tag{83}$$

where v^* is the first non trivial vertex following v; this implies

$$\gamma^{h\sum_{i,j}(3i/2-4)m_{v_0}^{i,j}}\prod_{v\ not\ e.p.}\gamma^{\sum_{i,j}(3i/2-4)m_v^{i,j}(h_v-h_{v'})}=\prod_{v\ e.p\ not\ \nu}\gamma^{h_{v^*}(3i_v/2-4)}\prod_{v\ e.p.\ \nu}\gamma^{-h_v} \tag{84}$$

so that

$$\int dx_{v_0}|W_{\tau,\mathbf{P},T}(x_{v_0})|\leqslant L^4\gamma^{-h[-4+\frac{3|P_{v_0}|}{2}]}\bar\varepsilon^{\bar n}\prod_{v\ e.p\ not\ \nu}\gamma^{h_{v^*}(3i_v/2-4)}\varepsilon^{\bar n}$$
$$\prod_{v\ not\ e.p.}\left\{\frac{1}{s_v!}C^{\sum_{i=1}^{s_v}|P_{v_i}|-|P_v|}\gamma^{-(-4+\frac{3|P_v|}{2}+z_v)(h_v-h_{v'})}\right\}[\prod_{v\ e.p.\ not\ \nu}\gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)N}] \tag{85}$$

Finally we use the relation

$$[\prod_{v\ e.p.}\gamma^{h_{v^*}j_v}][\prod_{v\ e.p.}\gamma^{-h_{v^*}j_v}]=[\prod_{v\ e.p.}\gamma^{h_{v^*}j_v}]\gamma^{-h\sum_{i,j}jm_{v_0}^{i,j}}\prod_{v\ not\ e.p.}\gamma^{-\sum_{i,j}(h_v-h_{v'})jm_v^{i,j}} \tag{86}$$

and using that $\sum_{i,j}jm_v^{i,j}=n_v^J$ we finally get ($j_v=0$ if v is a ν-e.p.)

$$\int dx_{v_0}|W_{\tau,\mathbf{P},T}(x_{v_0})|\leqslant L^4\gamma^{-h[-4+\frac{3|P_{v_0}|}{2}+n_{v_0}^J]}\bar\varepsilon^{\bar n}$$
$$\prod_{v\,\mathrm{not\ e.p.}}\left\{\frac{1}{s_v!}C^{\sum_{i=1}^{s_v}|P_{v_i}|-|P_v|}\gamma^{-(-4+\frac{3|P_v|}{2}+z_v+n_v^J)(h_v-h_{v'})}\right\}[\prod_{v\ e.p.\ not\ \nu}\gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)(N-h_{v^*})}]$$

In conclusion

$$\int dx_{v_0}|W_{\tau,\mathbf{P},T}(\mathbf{x}_{v_0})|\leqslant L^4\gamma^{-hd_{v_0}}C^n\bar\varepsilon^{\bar n}$$
$$[\prod_{\tilde v}\frac{1}{s_{\tilde v}!}\gamma^{-d_{\tilde v}(h_{\tilde v}-h_{\tilde v'})}][\prod_{v\ e.p.\ not;\nu}\gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)(N-h_{v^*})}] \tag{87}$$

where: $\widetilde{v} \in \widetilde{V}$ are the vertices on the tree such that $\sum_i |P_{v_i}| - |P_v| \neq 0$, $\widetilde{v}'$ is the vertex in $\widetilde{V}$ immediately preceding $\widetilde{v}$ or the root; $d_v = -4 + \frac{3|P_v|}{2} + n_v^J + z_v$. Finally the number of addenda in $\sum_{T \in \mathbf{T}}$ is bounded by $\prod_v s_v!\, C^{\sum_{i=1}^{s_v} |P_{v_i}| - |P_v|}$. In order to bound the sums over the scale labels and $\mathbf{P}$ we first use the inequality

$$\prod_{\widetilde{v}} \gamma^{-d_{\widetilde{v}}(h_{\widetilde{v}} - h_{\widetilde{v}'})} \leqslant [\prod_{\widetilde{v}} \gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}(h_{\widetilde{v}} - h_{\widetilde{v}'})}][\prod_{\widetilde{v}} \gamma^{-\frac{3|P_{\widetilde{v}}|}{4}}] \tag{88}$$

where $\widetilde{v}$ are the non trivial vertices, and $\widetilde{v}'$ is the non trivial vertex immediately preceding $\widetilde{v}$ or the root. The factors $\gamma^{-\frac{1}{2}(h_{\widetilde{v}} - h_{\widetilde{v}'})}$ in the r.h.s. allow to bound the sums over the scale labels by C^n. ∎

An immediate corollary of the above proof is the following.

Lemma 3.2. *If $\mathcal{T}^*$ is the set of trees with at least an end-point not of ν, Z type then, for $0 < \theta < 1$*

$$\sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}^*} \sum_{\mathbf{P}, T} \int dx_{v_0} |W_{\tau, \mathbf{P}, T}(x_{v_0})| \leqslant L^4 \gamma^{(4-(3/2)l-m)h} \gamma^{\theta(h-N)} \bar{\varepsilon}^{\max(l/2-1,1)} \tag{89}$$

Proof Let be $\widehat{v}$ the non trivial vertex following an end-point not of ν, Z type; hence we can rewrite in (87)

$$[\prod_{\widetilde{v}} \gamma^{-d_{\widetilde{v}}(h_{\widetilde{v}} - h_{\widetilde{v}'})}] = [\prod_{\widetilde{v}} \gamma^{-(d_{\widetilde{v}} - \theta)(h_{\widetilde{v}} - h_{\widetilde{v}'})}] \gamma^{\theta(h - h_{\widehat{v}})} \tag{90}$$

and

$$\gamma^{\theta(h-h_{\widehat{v}})} [\prod_{v \ e.p. \ not \ \nu} \gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)(N-h_{v^*})}] \leqslant \gamma^{\theta(h-N)} \tag{91}$$

as $\prod_{v \ e.p. \ not \ \nu} \gamma^{(4-3i_v/2-j_v)(N-h_{v^*})} \leqslant \gamma^{-\theta(N-h_{\widehat{v}})}$ as there is at least an end-point not ν, Z. Noting that $d_{\widetilde{v}} - \theta > 0$ one can perform the sum as in Lemma 4.1, and the same bound is obtained with an extra $\gamma^{\theta(h-N)}$. ∎

4 Running coupling constants

It is a byproduct of the tree expansion defined in the previous section that $\nu_{h,i}$ verifies the following equation

$$\nu_{h-1,i} = \gamma \nu_{h,i} + \beta_{\nu,i}^{(h)} \tag{92}$$

where

$$\beta_{\nu,i}^{(h)} = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \sum_{\tau \in \mathcal{T}_n^*} \sum_{\mathbf{P}, T} \frac{1}{L^4} \int dx_{v_0} |W_{\tau, \mathbf{P}, T}(\mathbf{x}_{v_0})| \tag{93}$$

where $|P_{v_0}| = 2$, $h_{v_0} = h+1$ is a non trivial vertex and $\mathcal{T}^*$ is the set of trees with at least a normal end-points not of ν, Z type; this last condition is due to the fact that in momentum space the kernels are computed at vanishing momenta and when only end-points ν are present only chain graphs contribute; therefore they are vanishing as $\widehat{g}^{(h)}(0) = 0$ by the compact support properties of the single scale propagator. Therefore by (89), if $\widetilde{g}^2 = \max(g^2, \bar{g}^2, \varepsilon^2)$

$$|\beta_{\nu,i}^{(h)}| \leqslant C \gamma^{\theta(h-N)} [\max(\widetilde{g}^2, \widetilde{\nu}_h)(Ma)^{-2}]^2 \tag{94}$$

The tree expansion is convergent provided that $(g^2, \bar{g}^2, \varepsilon^2, \widetilde{\nu}_h)(Ma)^{-2}$ is smaller than some constant; this condition can be verified choosing $\widetilde{g}^2 \leqslant c(Ma)^2$, a condition which can be always

verified. One needs however a similar condition on ν_h, which according to (95) is generically $O(\gamma^{-h})$; it is possible however to suitably choose $\nu \equiv \nu_N$ so that ν_h is bounded for any h. We can rewrite (95) as

$$\nu_{h-1,i} = \gamma^{-h}(\gamma^N \nu_i + \sum_{k=h}^{N} \gamma^k \beta_{\nu,i}^{(k)}) \tag{95}$$

We consider the system, by imposing the condition $\nu_{-\infty,i} = 0$

$$\nu_{h-1,i} = \gamma^{-h}(-\sum_{k\leqslant h} \gamma^k \beta_{\nu,i}^{(k)}) \tag{96}$$

Note that $\beta_{\nu,i}^{(h)}$ is a function of $g, \bar{g}, e$ and of the effective parameters $\nu_{i,k}$ with $k \geqslant h$. Therefore, we can regard the right side of (96) as a function of the whole sequence $\nu_{i,k}$, which we can denote by $\underline{\nu} = \{\nu_k\}_{k\leqslant N}$ so that (96) can be read as a fixed point equation $\underline{\nu} = T(\underline{\nu})$ on the Banach space of sequences ν such that $||\nu|| = \sup_{k\leqslant N} \gamma^{\theta(k-N)}|\nu_k| \leqslant C\tilde{g}^2(Ma)^{-2}$. It is a corollary of the proof in Lemma 4.1 (see e.g. App A5 of [43] for details) that there is a choice of ν_i such that the sequence is bounded for any h. Therefore for a proper ν

$$|\nu_k| \leqslant C\gamma^{\theta(h-N)}\tilde{g}^2(Ma)^{-2} \tag{97}$$

It remains to check the condition on boundedness of the effective renormalizations. They verify recursive equations, if $\mathcal{Z}_h = (Z_{h,i,s}, Z^J_{h,i,s}, Z^5_{h,i,s})$

$$\mathcal{Z}_{h-1} = \mathcal{Z}_h + \beta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(h)}(\mathcal{Z}_h, .., \mathcal{Z}_N) \qquad |\beta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(h)}| \leqslant C\gamma^{\theta(h-N)}(g^2, \bar{g}^2, \varepsilon^2)(Ma)^{-2} \tag{98}$$

from which

$$\mathcal{Z}_{h-1} = \mathcal{Z}_N + \sum_{k=h}^{N} \beta_{\mathcal{Z}}^{(k)}(\lambda; \mathcal{Z}_k, .., \mathcal{Z}_N) \tag{99}$$

Therefore

$$|\mathcal{Z}_{-\infty} - \mathcal{Z}_h| \leqslant C\gamma^{\theta(h-N)}\tilde{g}^2(Ma)^{-2} \tag{100}$$

By the above bound it follows that we can choose $Z^5_{i,s}$ so that

$$Z^5_{-\infty,i,s} = Z^J_{-\infty,i,s} \tag{101}$$

The existence of the limit $L \to \infty$ for the kernels and expectations is an immediate consequence of the tree expansion; for an explicit derivation see e.g. App. D of [18]. Analyticity of the correlations is an immediate consequence of the proof. Note that the denominator of the correlations (the partition function) at finite L is analytic in the whole complex plane as it is a finite dimensional Grasmann integral; on the other hand the RG analysis above provides an expansion which coincides order by order and is analytic in a finite domain, so that it fully reconstructs the partition function. The correlation is also analytic, as the denominator is non vanishing in a finite disk for small $\varepsilon^2, g^2, \bar{g}^2$ for any L and the numerator is a finite dimensional integral; it coincides order by order with the expansion found analyzing the generating function by RG which is also analytic in the same domain so that they coincide.

5 Proof of Theorem 1.1

In order to compute the 2-point function we have to consider the generating function with $\phi \neq 0$; by a straightforward adaptation of the tree expansion, (for details see e.g. §3.D of [18]), one gets

$$\widehat{S}_i(k) = (\sum_{\mu} \widetilde{\gamma}_{\mu}^{-\infty} a^{-1} \sin(k_\mu a) + a^{-1}\gamma_0 \sum_{\mu}(1-\cos k_\mu a))^{-1}(I + R(k)) \tag{102}$$

with

$$\widetilde{\gamma}_0^{-\infty} = \begin{pmatrix} Z_{-\infty,i,L} I & 0 \\ 0 & Z_{-\infty,i,R} I \end{pmatrix} \quad \widetilde{\gamma}_j^{-\infty} = \begin{pmatrix} iZ_{-\infty,i,L}\sigma_j & 0 \\ 0 & -iZ_{-\infty,i,R}\sigma_j \end{pmatrix} \tag{103}$$

and

$$|R(k)| \leqslant C\widetilde{g}^2 |ka|^\theta \tag{104}$$

where the extra factor $|ka|^\theta$ follows from (89).

Regarding the vertex function, we can again separate the contribution from trees involving only Z vertex from the rest, which has by lemma 3.2 an improvement in the bound $O(|a\kappa|^\theta)$, with $\kappa = max(|k|, |k+p|)$, so that

$$\widehat{\Gamma}_{\mu,i,s}(k,p) = \widehat{g}_{i,s,s}(k)\widehat{g}_{i,s,s}(k+p)[\sigma_\mu^s \frac{Z^J_{-\infty,i,s}}{Z^2_{-\infty,i,s}} + O(|a\kappa|^\theta)] \tag{105}$$

We consider now the three current correlations defined above; it turns out that

$$\widehat{\Pi}^5_{\mu_1,\mu_2,\mu_3}(p_1,p_2) = \sum_{h=-\infty}^{N} \int dx_2 dx_3 W^h_{0,3}(0,x_2,x_3) e^{-ip_1 x_2 - ip_2 x_3} \tag{106}$$

and using (73),(97), (99) we get

$$|\widehat{\Pi}^5_{\mu_1,,\mu_2,\mu_3}(p_1,p_2)| \leqslant \sum_{h=-\infty}^{N} C\gamma^h \leqslant \widetilde{C} \tag{107}$$

with $\widetilde{C}$ dependent on N. The Fourier transform is therefore bounded and, in the limit $L \to \infty$, continuous in p_1, p_2; it is however non differentiable. We call $\mathcal{T}_h^0$ the trees with only three special end-points $\mathcal{Z}_h$ and $\mathcal{T}_h^1$ the set of the remaining trees, see Fig. 2 . The contributions from $\mathcal{T}_h^1$ to $\partial\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu_1,\mu_2,\mu_3}(p_1,p_2)$ have an extra $\gamma^{\theta(h-N)}$, by Lemma 3.1 and (97) and bounded by

$$\sum_{h=-\infty}^{N} \widetilde{g}^2 \gamma^{\theta(h-N)} \leqslant C\widetilde{g}^2 \tag{108}$$

hence are differentiable. We consider now the contribution from $\mathcal{T}_h^0$. We can write the propagator as (68); the contribution with at least a propagator $r^{(h)}_{i,s,s'}$ have an extra factor γ^{h-N} and are therefore differentiable. We consider now the terms belonging to $\mathcal{T}_h^0$ with only propagators $g^{(h)}_{rel}(\mathbf{x},\mathbf{y})$; they are given by triangle graphs and to the axial vertex is associated $Z^5_{h,i,s}$ and to the vector vertex is associated $Z^J_{h,i,s}$ (with the same i,s as the index is conserved in the loop). We can replace the renormalizations $\mathcal{Z}_h$ with $\mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}$ and use (101), (30); the corrections has again an extra $\gamma^{\theta(h-N)}$ by (100) and are therefore differentiable. We finally get

$$\widehat{\Pi}^5_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}(p_1,p_2) = \widehat{\Pi}^a_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}(p_1,p_2) + \widehat{\Pi}^b_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}(p_1,p_2) \tag{109}$$




Figure 2: Decomposition in terms of trees $\mathcal{T}_h^0$ and $\mathcal{T}_h^1$.

where $\Pi^b_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}$ is differentiable and

$$\widehat{\Pi}^a_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}(p_1,p_2) = \sum_{\substack{h_1\\ h_2,h_3}} \sum_{i,s} \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i \varepsilon_s Y_i^3 \frac{Z^5_{-\infty,i,s}}{Z_{-\infty,i,s}} \frac{Z^J_{-\infty,i,s}}{Z_{-\infty,i,s}} \frac{Z^J_{-\infty,i,s}}{Z_{-\infty,i,s}}$$
$$\int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4} \mathrm{Tr} \frac{f_{h_1}(k)}{i\sigma^s_\mu k_\mu} i\sigma^s_\mu \frac{f_{h_2}(k)}{i\sigma^s_\mu (k_\mu + p_\mu)} i\sigma^s_\nu \frac{f_{h_3}(k)}{i\sigma^s_\mu (k_\mu + p^2_\mu)} (i\sigma^s_\rho) \tag{110}$$

The renormalizations $\mathcal{Z}_{-\infty}$ depend from the particle species and the chirality. They are however the same appearing in the 2-point and vertex correlations so that we can use the Ward Identities; by inserting (102), (105) in (28) we get

$$\frac{Z^J_{-\infty,i,s}}{Z_{-\infty,i,s}} = 1 \tag{111}$$

In conclusion

$$\widehat{\Pi}^5_{\mu,\rho,\sigma} = \widehat{I}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma} + \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma} \tag{112}$$

with $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ with Hölder continuous derivative and

$$\widehat{I}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}(p_1,p_2) = (\sum_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3) \int \frac{dk}{(2\pi)^4} \mathrm{Tr} \frac{\chi(k)}{\not{k}} \gamma_\mu \gamma_5 \frac{\chi(k+p)}{\not{k}+\not{p}} \gamma_\nu \frac{\chi(k+p^2)}{\not{k}+\not{p}^2} \gamma_\sigma \tag{113}$$

Note that $\widehat{I}$ is the anomaly for relativistic continuum fermions with a momentum regularization which violates the vector current conservation [40], §3.6

$$\sum_\mu (p_{1,\mu} + p_{2,\mu}) \widehat{I}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma} = \frac{(\sum_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3)}{6\pi^2} p_{1,\alpha} p_{2,\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\nu\sigma} \quad \sum_\nu p_{1,\nu} \widehat{I}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma} = \frac{(\sum_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3)}{6\pi^2} p_{1,\alpha} p_{2,\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} \tag{114}$$

up to $O(a^\theta |\bar{p}|^{2+\theta})$ corrections. In contrast with $\widehat{I}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}$, we have that $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}$ has not a simple explicit expression, being expressed in terms of a convergent series depending on all the lattice and interaction details. We use the differentiability of $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\rho,\sigma}(p_1,p_2)$ to expand it at first order obtaining, again up to $O(a^\theta |\bar{p}|^{2+\theta})$ corrections, using the current conservation (30)

$$\frac{1}{6\pi^2} (\sum_i \widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3) p_{1,\alpha} p_{2,\beta} \varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\mu\sigma} + \sum_\nu p_{1,\nu} \Big(\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}(0,0) + \sum_{a=1,2} \sum_\rho p_{a,\rho} \frac{\partial \widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}}{\partial p_{a,\rho}}(0,0) \Big) = 0$$

This implies that

$$\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}(0,0) = 0 \tag{115}$$

and

$$\frac{\partial\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}}{\partial p_{2,\beta}}=-\frac{1}{6\pi^2}\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\mu\sigma}(\sum_i\widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3)\qquad\frac{\partial\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}}{\partial p_{1,\beta}}(0,0)=\frac{1}{6\pi^2}\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\mu\sigma}(\sum_i\widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3) \tag{116}$$

Finally using such values we get

$$\sum_\mu(p_{1,\mu}+p_{2,\mu})\widehat{\Pi}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}(p_1,p_2)=\sum_{\alpha,\beta}\frac{(\sum_i\widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3)}{6\pi^2}p_{1,\alpha}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\alpha\beta\nu\sigma} \tag{117}$$

$$+\sum_{\mu,\beta}(p_{1,\mu}+p_{2,\mu})(\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}}{\partial p_{2,\beta}}(0,0)p_{2,\beta}+\frac{\widehat{\mathcal{R}}_{\mu,\nu,\sigma}}{\partial p_{1,\beta}}(0,0)p_{1,\beta})$$

and the second term in the r.h.s. is

$$-\frac{1}{6\pi^2}(p_{1,\mu}+p_{2,\mu})\sum_{a=1,2}(-1)^a p_{a,\beta}\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\mu\sigma}(\sum_i\widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3) \tag{118}$$

which is equal to

$$\frac{1}{3\pi^2}p_{1,\mu}p_{2,\beta}\varepsilon_{\nu\beta\mu\sigma}(\sum_i\widetilde{\varepsilon}_i Y_i^3) \tag{119}$$

which implies the result (31). ∎

Note that, in contrast to what happens in condensed matter problems [40], the renormalizations depend on the chirality and kind of particles and the anomaly itself is sum of different terms which can cancel is a suitable condition is ensured.

6 Appendix I. Truncated expectations

For completeness we recall the proof of (42), referring for more details to App. B of [44] (see also [20], [45]). If $X=(1,2,..,n)$, we call $V(X)=\sum_{i,j\in X}\bar{V}_{i,j}=\sum_{i\leqslant j}V_{i,j}$ with $\bar{V}_{i,i}=V_{i,i}$ and $V_{i,j}=(\bar{V}_{i,j}+\bar{V}_{j,i})/2$ symmetric. The starting point is the following formula

$$e^{-V(X)}=\sum_{Y\subset X}K(Y)e^{-V(X/Y)} \tag{120}$$

with $Y=X_1$, $|X_1|=1$ then $K(X_1)=e^{-V(X_1)}$ and for $r\geqslant 2$

$$K(X_r)=\sum_T[\prod_{l\in T}V_l][\sum_{r=2}^{n-1}\sum_{X_1,..,X_{r-1}}\int_0^1 dt_1...\int_0^1 dt_{r-1}\frac{\prod_{k=1}^{r-1}t_k(l)}{t_{n(l)}}e^{-W_{X_r}(X_1,..,X_{r-1};t_1,..,t_{r-1})}] \tag{121}$$

where T is a tree connecting the points $(1,..,n)$, l are bonds in T, $X_1\subset X_2\subset ...X_{r-1}$ are sets such that $|X_i|=i$ and each boundary ∂X_i is crossed by at least a $l\in T$,

$$W_X(X_1,..,X_r;t_1,..,t_r)=\sum_l t_1(l)t_2(l)...t_r(l)V_l \tag{122}$$

with $t_i(l)=t_i$ if l crosses ∂X_i and $t_i(l)=1$ otherwise, $n(l)$ is the max over k such that l crosses ∂X_k. In order to prove (120) we start noting that we can reverse the sum over T and X

$$\sum_T\sum_{X_1,..,X_{r-1}}=\sum_{X_1,..,X_{r-1}}\sum_T \tag{123}$$

where in the r.h.s. T is a tree composed by $r-1$ lines l such that all the boundaries ∂X_k are intersected at least by a line l. We write by (122), if $X_1 = \{1\}$

$$W_X(X_1; t_1) = \sum_{\ell} t_1(l) V_l \tag{124}$$

with $t_1(l) = t_1$ if l crosses ∂X_1 and $= 1$ otherwise; that is

$$\begin{aligned} &W_X(X_1, t_1) = V_{1,1} + t_1 \sum_{k \geqslant 2} V_{1,k} + \sum_{2 \leqslant k \leqslant k'} V_{k,k'} = \\ &t_1(V_{1,1} + \sum_{k \geqslant 2} V_{1,k} + \sum_{2 \leqslant k \leqslant k'} V_{k,k'}) + (1-t_1)(V_{1,1} + \sum_{2 \leqslant k \leqslant k'} V_{k,k'}) = \\ &t_1 V(X) + (1-t_1)(V(X_1) + V(X/X_1)) \end{aligned} \tag{125}$$

We get $W_X(X_1, 0) = V(X_1) + V(X/X_1)$ and $\partial_1 W(X_1, t_1) = \sum_{k \geqslant 2} V_{1,k} = \sum_{l_1} V_{l_1}$ so that

$$e^{-V(X)} = \int_0^1 dt_1 \partial_1 e^{-W_X(X_1, t_1)} + e^{-W_X(X_1, 0)} = \int_0^1 dt_1 \sum_{k \geqslant 2} V_{1,k} e^{-W_X(X_1, t_1)} + e^{-V(X_1)} e^{-V(X/X_1)} \tag{126}$$

Therefore $e^{-V(X)}$ is decomposed in the sum of two terms; in the first there is a bond $(1, k)$ between X_1 and the rest, in the second X_1 is decoupled. If $n = 2$ coincides with (120), $Y = X_1, X_2$ with $X_2 = X$, $e^{-V(X/X_2)} = 1$.

If $X_2 \neq X$ we further decompose the first term in the r.h.s of (126); we write $X_2 = \{1, k\}$ and

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 dt_1 \sum_{k \geqslant 2} V_{1,k} e^{-W_X(X_1, t_1)} = \\ &\int_0^1 dt_1 \sum_{k \geqslant 2} V_{1,k} \int_0^1 dt_2 \partial_{t_2} e^{-W_X(X_1, X_2; t_1, t_2)} + \int_0^1 dt_1 \sum_{k \geqslant 2} V_{1,k} e^{-W_X(X_1, X_2; t_1, 0)} \end{aligned} \tag{127}$$

where

$$W_X(X_1, X_2, t_1, t_2) = (1-t_2)[W_{X_2}(X_1, t_1) + V(X/X_2)] + t_2 W_X(X_1, t_1) \tag{128}$$

If for instance $X_2 = \{1, 2\}$ then

$$W_X(X_1, X_2, t_1, t_2) = V_{1,1} + V_{2,2} + t_1 t_2 \sum_{k \geqslant 3} V_{1,k} + t_1 V_{1,2} + t_2 \sum_{k \geqslant 3} V_{2,k} + \sum_{3 \leqslant k \leqslant k'} V_{k,k'} \tag{129}$$

Suppose that $X = \{1, 2, 3\}$ and $X_2 = \{1, 2\}$, then

$$\begin{aligned} &\int_0^1 dt_1 V_{1,2} e^{-W_X(X_1, t_1)} = \\ &\int_0^1 dt_1 V_{1,2} \int_0^1 dt_2 (t_1 V_{1,3} + V_{2,3}) e^{-W_X(X_1, X_2; t_1, t_2)} + [\int_0^1 dt_1 V_{1,2} e^{-W_{X_2}(X_1; t_1)}] e^{-V(X/X_2)} \end{aligned} \tag{130}$$

The first term is $Y = X_3$ and the trees are $l_1 = (1,2), l_2 = (2,3)$ so that $t_1(l_1) = t_1$, $t_1(l_2) = 1$, $t_2(l_2) = t_2$; and $l_1 = (1,2)$, $l_2 = (1,3)$ so that $t_1(l_1) = t_1$ and $t_1(l_2) = t_1$,$t_2(l_2) = t_2$; the second $Y = X_2$ and $K(X_2) e^{-V(X/X_2)}$. If X is larger than X_3, we further proceed

$$e^{-W_X(X_1, X_2, t_1, t_2)} = \int_0^1 dt_3 \partial_{t_3} e^{-W_X(X_1, X_2, X_3 t_1, t_2 . t_3)} + e^{-W_{X_3}(X_1, X_2, t_1, t_2)} e^{-V(X/X_3)} \tag{131}$$

and in particular if $X_3 = (1,2,3)$ one writes

$$W(X_1, X_2, X_3, t_1, t_2, t_3) = t_1 t_2 V_{1,3} + t_2 V_{2,3} + \tag{132}$$
$$V_{1,1} + V_{2,2} + V_{3,3} + t_1 t_2 t_3 \sum_{k \geqslant 4} V_{1,k} + t_2 t_3 \sum_{k \geqslant 4} V_{2,k} + t_3 \sum_{k \geqslant 4} V_{3,k} + \sum_{k,k' \geqslant 4} V_{k,k'}$$

If $X = X_4 = \{1,2,3,4\}$ we get

$$\int_0^1 dt_1 V_{1,2} \int_0^1 dt_2 (t_1 V_{1,3} + V_{2,3}) \int_0^1 dt_3 (t_1 t_2 V_{1,4} + t_2 V_{2,4} + V_{3,4}) e^{-W_X(X_1, X_2, X_3 t_1, t_2 . t_3)} \tag{133}$$

and the trees T are; $l_1 = (1,2), l_2 = (1,3), l_3 = (1,4)$ with $t_1(l_1) = t_1$, $t_1(l_2) = t_1, t_2(l_2) = t_2, t_1(l_3) = t_1, t_2(l_3) = t_2, t_3(l_3) = t_3$; $l_1 = (1,2), l_2 = (1,3), l_3 = (2,4)$, with $t_1(l_2) = t_1$, $t_1(l_3) = 1, t_2(l_3) = t_2, t_3(l_3) = t_3$; $l_1 = (1,2), l_2 = (2,3), l_3 = (1,4)$ with $t_1(l_2) = 1, t_2(l_2) = t_2$ and so on. They are all possible trees compatible with $X_1 = 1, X_2 = 1,2, X_3 = 1,2,3$; then one has to sum over all the possible X_i. Proceeding in this way one gets (120).

Note finally that, see e.g. [44] or [20]

$$\sum_{X_1, .., X_{r-1}} \int_0^1 dt_1 ... \int_0^1 dt_{r-1} \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{r-1} t_k(l)}{t_{n(l)}} = 1 \tag{134}$$

In order to prove (43) we note that by iterating (120) we get

$$e^{-V(X)} = \sum_{\pi} \prod_{Y \in \pi} K(Y) \tag{135}$$

where π us the set of all possible partitions of X; on the other hand from (39) we have $\mathcal{E}_A(X) = e^{-V(X)}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}_A(X) = \sum_{\pi} \prod_{Y \in \pi} \mathcal{E}^T(Y) \tag{136}$$

hence $K = \mathcal{E}^T$ from which (43) follows.

Regarding the truncated fermionic expectations (78) we proceed in a similar way. We can write the simple expectations as

$$\mathcal{E}(\widetilde{\psi}(P_1) ... \widetilde{\psi}(P_r)) = \int \prod d\eta_{i,j} e^{\sum_{j,j'} V_{jj'}} \tag{137}$$

with $V_{jj'} = \sum_{i=1}^{|P_j|} \sum_{i'=1}^{|P'_j|} \eta^+_{x_{ij}} g(x_{ij}, x_{i'j'}) \eta^-_{x_{i'j'}}$ and $\eta_{i,j}$ is a set of Grassmann variables. We can write therefore

$$\mathcal{E}(\widetilde{\psi}(P_1) ... \widetilde{\psi}(P_r)) = \tag{138}$$
$$\int \prod d\eta_{i,j} \sum_T [\prod_{l \in T} V_l] [\sum_{r=2}^{n-1} \sum_{X_1, .., X_{r-1}} \int_0^1 dt_1 ... \int_0^1 dt_{r-1} \frac{\prod_{k=1}^{r-1} t_k(l)}{t_{n(l)}} e^{-W_{X_r}(X_1, .., X_{r-1}; t_1, .., t_{r-1})}]$$

with $V_{j,j'} = \sum_i \sum_{i'} \eta^+_{i,j} g(x_{ij}, x_{i'j'} \eta^-_{i,j}$; for each T we divide the η in the ones appearing in T and η' is the rest; note that

$$\int d\eta_2 e^{\sum_l t_1(l) t_2(l) ... t_r(l) V_l} = \det G \tag{139}$$

where we have used that

$$\sum_l t_1(l)t_2(l)...t_r(l)V_l = \sum_l t_{n'(l)}...t_{n(l)-1}(l)V_l \tag{140}$$

where $n(l)$ is the max k such that l intersects ∂X_k and $n'(l)$ is the min k such that l intersects ∂X_k; moreover G is the matrix with elements $t_{n'(jj')}...t_{n(jj')-1}g(x_{i,j}, x_{i',j'})$; for each sequence X_k we can relabel the points so that $X_1 = \{1\}$, $X_2 = \{1, 2\}$ and so on; therefore given a line j, j' then $n'(jj') = j, n(jj') = j'$ so that $t_j...t_{j'-1}$; one can find a family of vectors $u_1 = v_1, u_2 = t_1u_1 + v_1\sqrt{1-t_1^2}, u_3 = t_2u_2 + v_2\sqrt{1-t_2^2}, ...v_i$ orthonormal, such that $t_j...t_{j'-1} = u_ju_{j'}$.

Acknowledgements The work has been partly done as member of the Institute of Advanced Study in Princeton which we thank for support. We got support also from MUR, project MaQuMA, PRIN201719VMAST01 and INDAM-GNFM.

References

[1] L. P. Okun. Quarks and Leptons, North Holland 1985

[2] F. Mandl, G. Shaw. Quantum Field Theory. John Wiley and Sons, 2010

[3] L.Maiani Electroweak Interactions CRC Press,2020

[4] E. Fermi Tentativo di una Teoria Dei Raggi β, Il Nuovo Cimento, vol. 11, 1, 1-19 (1934)

[5] S. Weinberg A Model of Leptons Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 1264 (1967)

[6] G. 't Hooft, Renormalizable Lagrangians for massive Yang-Mills fields Nuclear Physics 167-188 (1971)

[7] S. L. Adler. Axial-vector vertex in spinor electrodynamics. Phys. Rev. 177, 2426-2438 (1969).

[8] S. L. Adler, W. A. Bardeen. Absence of higher-order corrections in the anomalous axialvector divergence equation. Phys. Rev. 182, 1517 (1969).

[9] Bouchiat, C., Iliopoulos, J., Meyer, P. An anomaly-free version of Weinberg's model. Phys. Lett. B 38, 519 (1972)

[10] K. Fredenhagen, K. Rehren, E. Seiler Quantum Field Theory: Where We Are An Assessment of Current Paradigms in the Physics of Fundamental Phenomena, Lect.NotesPhys.721:61-87,2007

[11] J. Froehlich. On the triviality of $\lambda\phi^4$ theories and the approach to the critical point in d¿ 4 dimensions. Nuclear Physics B, 200, 2, 1 281-296 (1982)

[12] M. Aizenman. H. Duminil-Copin Marginal triviality of the scaling limits of critical 4D Ising and $\lambda\phi^4$ models Ann. of Math. (2) 194(1): 163-235 (July 2021)

[13] S. Weinberg Effective Field Theory, Past and Future arXiv:0908.1964 [hep-th]

[14] J. Polchinski Effective field theory and the Fermi surface Xiv:hep-th/9210046

[15] G. 't Hooft Gauge theory and renormalization arXiv:hep-th/9410038

[16] V. Mastropietro Renormalization group and Ward identities for infrared QED4 J. Math. Phys. 48, 102303 (2007)

[17] V. Mastropietro. Anomaly cancellation condition in an effective non-perturbative electroweak theory. Phys. Rev. D 103, 013009 (2021)

[18] A. Giuliani V. Mastropietro The Two-Dimensional Hubbard Model on the Honeycomb Lattice Communications in Mathematical Physics volume 293, 301 (2010)

[19] V. Mastropietro Weyl Semimetallic Phase in an Interacting Lattice System, 57,4-5, Jour. Stat- Phys 830 - 854 (2014)

[20] V.Mastropietro Non-perturative renormalization, World Scientific (2008)

[21] A. Borrelli, L. Maiani, G. C. Rossi, R. Sisto, M. Testa. Phys. Lett. B221 (1989) 360; Nucl. Phys. B333 (1990) 335

[22] D. B. Kaplan, A Method for Simulating Chiral Fermions on the Lattice Phys. Lett. B 288, 342 (1992).

[23] R. Narayanan and H. Neuberger. Infinitely many regulator fields for chiral fermions Phys. Lett. B 302, 62 (1993).

[24] M. Testa. The Rome Approach to chirality. PCTP - ICTP Joint International Conference (AIJIC 97) on Recent Developments in Nonperturbative Quantum Field Theory, 114-127

[25] M. Luscher. Abelian chiral gauge theories on the lattice with exact gauge invariance Nucl. Phys. B 549 295 (1999)

[26] M. Luscher. Lattice regularization of chiral gauge theories to all orders of perturbation theory JHEP 0006:028 (2000)

[27] H. Neuberger. Noncompact chiral U(1) gauge theories on the lattice Phys.Rev. D63 (2001) 014503

[28] Juven Wang, Xiao-Gang Wen. A Non-Perturbative Definition of the Standard Models Phys. Rev. Research 2, 023356 (2020)

[29] M. Golterman. Lattice chiral gauge theories Nucl. Phys. B (Proc. Suppl.) 94 189 (2001)

[30] A K De. Non-perturbative chiral gauge theories: an overview of a gauge non-invariant approach Indian Journal of Physics volume 95, pages1639–1649 (2021)

[31] H.B. Nielsen, M. Ninomiya. A no-go theorem for regularizing chiral fermions. Physics Letters B. 105, 219 (1981)

[32] K. Fujikawa. Path integral measure for gauge-invariant theories, Phys. Rev. Lett. 42, 1195-1198 (1979).

[33] N. K. Nielsen and B. Schroer Nucl. Phys. B127 (1977) 493

[34] B. Hastings, S. Michalakis. Quantization of Hall conductance for interacting electrons on a torus. Comm. Math. Phys. 334, 433-471 (2015); Michalakis, S. Why is the Hall conductance quantized? Nature Reviews Physics, 2 (8). pp. 392-393

[35] M. I. Katsnelson Graphene. Cambridge University Press (2012)

[36] G. W. Semenoff, Condensed Matter Simulation Of A Three-Dimensional Anomaly, Phys. Rev. Lett. 53, 2449 (1984)

[37] F. D. M. Haldane. Model for a Quantum Hall Effect without Landau Levels: Condensed-Matter Realization of the "Parity Anomaly". Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2015 (1988)

[38] R. R. Nair, P. Blake, A. N. Grigorenko, K. S. Novoselov, T. J. Booth, T. Stauber, N. M. R. Peres, and A. K. Geim: "Fine Structure Constant Defines Visual Transparency of Graphene", Science 320, 1308 (2008).

[39] A.Giuliani, V.Mastropietro, M.Porta. Universality of conductivity in interacting graphene. Comm. Math. Phys. 311, 317 - 355 (2012).

[40] A. Giuliani, V. Mastropietro, M. Porta Anomaly Non-renormalization in Interacting Weyl Semimetals Comm. Math. Phys. 384,997–1060 (2021); V. Mastropietro Emergent Adler Bardeen theorem. JHEP 95, 2020

[41] V.Mastropietro Nonperturbative renormalization of the lattice Sommerfield vector model Phys. Rev. D 105, 114502 (2022)

[42] G.Benfatto, P.Falco, V.Mastropietro. Functional Integral Construction of the Thirring model: axioms verification and massless limit. Comm.Math. Phys. 273, 1, 67–118 (2007)

[43] A. Giuliani, V.Mastropietro. Anomalous universality in the anisotropic Ashkin-Teller model.Comm. Math. Phys. 256, 681-735 (2005)

[44] D. Brydges . A short course on Cluster Expansions, Les Houches 1984, K. Osterwalder, R. Stora eds., North Holland Press, 1986.

[45] G. Benfatto. An iterated Mayer expansion for the Yukawa gas J. Stat. Phys. 41, 671–684 (1985)