

Renormalization group and effective potential: a simple non-perturbative approach

José Gaité

*Applied Physics Dept., ETSIAE,
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid,
E-28040 Madrid, Spain*

Abstract

We develop a simple non-perturbative approach to the calculation of a field theory effective potential that is based on the Wilson or exact renormalization group. Our approach follows Shepard *et al*'s idea [Phys. Rev. D51, 7017 (1995)] of converting the exact renormalization group into a self-consistent renormalization method. It boils down to a simple second order differential equation for the effective potential. The equation can be solved and its solution is compared to the the results of Shepard *et al* and to results of perturbation theory. In three dimensions, we show that we are led to study the full sextic field theory ($\lambda\phi^4 + g\phi^6$), even for the renormalization group fixed point that corresponds to ordinary critical behavior. We work out the full two-loop order perturbation theory for the sextic field theory in three dimensions and find the non-perturbative approach to be superior.

PACS numbers: 11.10.Gh, 11.10.Kk, 11.15.Tk

I. INTRODUCTION

Wilson is the main author of the modern theory of the renormalization group as well as of its formulation for statistical systems as a transformation of the full probability distribution, defined by an unbounded set of parameters [1]. The exact renormalization group (ERG) is the group (or semigroup) formed by such transformations. The ERG equation is a functional differential equation that admits several formulations [2–7]. The solution of the ERG equation should provide the exact infrared-cutoff-dependent generator of the Green functions and, hence, a full solution of the field theory in question. Of course, the exact renormalization group is not the only approach that establishes functional equations that provide the exact Green functions. The well-known Dyson-Schwinger equations constitute another set of functional equations with the same goal [8, 9]. These equations involve no cutoff, in principle, but actually need ultraviolet regularization. In fact, the presence of a running infrared cutoff in the ERG equation is actually an asset [5].

At any rate, neither the Dyson-Schwinger equations nor the ERG equation are easy to handle, since they involve functionals. Naturally, functions are easier to handle, and a field theory function that contains considerable information is the *effective potential* [8]. The ERG equation admits an approximation in terms of a *local potential* which plays the role of effective potential [4, 10–13]. Of course, the expression of the full action or Hamiltonian as a series expansion in field derivatives is old and is the origin of the Landau-Ginzburg Lagrangian model of critical phenomena [14]. The ERG equation in the local potential approximation is a partial differential equation with derivatives respect to the renormalization group parameter and the field. At a fixed point, it becomes a nonlinear ordinary differential equation, which is nonetheless too hard to solve analytically. However, this equation has allowed to find, in three dimensions, the Wilson-Fisher fixed point and to compute quite accurate critical exponents [6].

An interesting connection between the Wegner-Houghton sharp-cutoff ERG equation for the local potential [4, 13] and an integral equation for the effective potential has been proposed by Shepard *et al* [15]. Essentially, they “bootstrap” the relation between the classical and the one-loop effective potential to define a self-consistent “Dyson-Schwinger effective potential”. This potential constitutes an approximate solution of the exact renormalization group equation and gives rise to equations that can be related to the Dyson-Schwinger equa-

tions. We believe that the “Dyson-Schwinger effective potential” is a very interesting idea in non-perturbative field theory. In particular, the idea fleshes out the connection between the exact renormalization group and the standard renormalization of coupling constants in field theory.

Shepard *et al* restrict their study to the ϕ^4 -theory and, hence, to two equations, for mass and coupling constant renormalization [15]. We further elaborate their idea and find that the self-consistency of the full effective potential leads to a second order differential equation for it which involves a classical potential that can have several coupling constants. This equation can actually be written in an explicit form that lends itself to be expressed as a new non-perturbative method of renormalization. We present here the general idea for this construction and we construct, as an example, the non-perturbative renormalization of scalar field theory in three dimensions.

Shepard *et al* [15] also carry out numerical calculations, namely, Monte Carlo calculations in a lattice and continuous and lattice ERG calculations (all for ϕ^4 -theory). The lattice Monte Carlo method for the effective potential of three-dimensional ϕ^4 -theory had already been employed by Tsypin [16]. Of course, calculations in a lattice are affected by the limitation on the number of sites. Shepard *et al*'s continuous ERG calculations do not have this limitation, but a different problem arises: in the decomposition of the range of the field, which is finite, there appear instabilities in the vicinity of the end point of the range. In connection with this problem, we show that a proper treatment of the boundary conditions for large fields is mandatory in our approach.

The standard calculation of the ERG *fixed-point* effective potential [4, 13] boils down to the solution of a second order differential equation for the effective potential. This equation indeed requires a careful study of the the boundary conditions for large fields. Morris [13] explains how to obtain the large-field asymptotic form of the fixed-point effective potential and, thus, how to resolve the ambiguity in the boundary conditions for vanishing field. The differential equation for the (no fixed-point) effective potential that we obtain is different from the fixed-point equation in Refs. 4 and 13, but it also lends itself to a successful study of the boundary conditions needed for physical solutions.

The effective potential can also be calculated in perturbation theory [8]. We discuss the connection of our non-perturbative calculation in three dimensions with perturbative calculations [17–22], which are still ongoing work [23]. This connection is indeed fruitful and

unveils advantages and disadvantages of each approach. In contrast, the connection between the fixed-point ERG effective potential and perturbative renormalization is indirect (see the discussion by Morris [24]).

Our approach begins with a classical potential, and later obtains indirect information about it. We shall discover that a natural solution for the “Dyson-Schwinger effective potential” involves, for a single scalar field ϕ in three dimensions, not just the ϕ^4 -theory considered by Shepard *et al* [15] but the full renormalizable ϕ^6 -theory. The ϕ^6 -theory has two *relevant* control parameters and encompasses a broader range of applications, including the description of *tricritical* behavior [14, 25, 26].

The tricritical behavior of three-dimensional scalar field theory features among the multicritical RG fixed points in dimension $d > 2$, which have been the focus of recent interest, e.g., in the work of Codello *et al* in Refs. 27 and 28 and in references therein. These references apply a combination of perturbation theory and non-perturbative methods based on conformal field theory. A possible connection of these methods with our approach to the non-perturbative calculation of the effective potential should be very interesting.

Perturbative calculations in the epsilon expansion for multi-critical RG fixed points are compared with the ERG equation in the local potential approximation (and beyond) by O’Dwyer and Osborn [29]. This work is possibly related to the comparison of our non-perturbative approach with perturbation theory that we make in Sect. VI A. However, we do not employ the epsilon expansion, which turns out to be problematic.

Non-perturbative methods in field theory, namely, the Dyson-Schwinger method and the ERG method, are gaining an increasingly important role in a variety of problems in quantum field theory and, because of this, computer packages that can work out both types of equations have been built [30]. The computational power of such packages can possibly be used to construct approximations of the effective potential better than Shepard *et al*’s, which is our basis here. This goal is beyond the scope of the present work.

Here is our plan. Following Shepard *et al*, we introduce in Sect. II the Dyson-Schwinger effective potential, with a slight improvement. In Sect. III, the integral in the equation for this potential is worked out in three dimensions to obtain an ordinary differential equation for the effective potential. This equation is thoroughly studied in Sect. IV, which includes: a natural but special solution in the form of a sixth-degree polynomial (Sect. IV A), the general solution (Sect. IV B), and a study in Sect. V of its asymptotic behavior, based

on the differential equation itself, whence follow some numerical examples (Sect. V A). A comparison of numerical results of our approach with the numerical results of Shepard *et al* is made in Sect. VI. This section includes Sect. VI A, with a comparison to results of perturbation theory and a short discussion of the scope of perturbative approaches. Finally, because the massless limit is most problematic in all these approaches, Sect. VI B contains some remarks about this limit. We end with a discussion of our results (Sect. VII).

II. THE DYSON-SCHWINGER EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL

Let us first introduce the ‘‘Dyson-Schwinger effective potential’’, as defined by Shepard *et al* [15]. Starting from the equation for the regularized one-loop effective potential in terms of the classical potential, namely,

$$U_1(\phi) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Lambda_0} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \ln [k^2 + U''_{\text{clas}}(\phi)], \quad (1)$$

Shepard *et al* heuristically define the ‘‘Dyson-Schwinger effective potential’’ U_{DS} as the solution of the integro-differential equation

$$U_{\text{DS}}(\phi) = U_{\text{clas}}(\phi) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Lambda_0} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \ln [k^2 + U''_{\text{DS}}(\phi)]. \quad (2)$$

Shepard *et al* show that the derivatives with respect to ϕ of this equation yield equations analogous to the standard Dyson-Schwinger equations. Furthermore, they connect the equation with the sharp-cutoff ERG equation, written as

$$\frac{dU(\phi, \Lambda)}{d\Lambda} = -\frac{A_d}{2} \Lambda^{d-1} \ln [\Lambda^2 + U''(\phi, \Lambda)], \quad (3)$$

where $A_d = \int d\Omega_d / (2\pi)^d$ (the angular integral such that $d^d k / (2\pi)^d = A_d k^{d-1}$, for any integrand that only depends on k). Indeed, Shepard *et al* regard Eq. (2) as a crude integration of the ERG equation (3), ‘‘namely one in which the integration of the differential equation . . . is carried out in a single step.’’

Actually, it is possible to exactly integrate Eq. (3), that is to say, it is possible to transform it into an integral equation, namely,

$$U(\phi, \Lambda) = U(\phi, \Lambda_0) + \frac{1}{2} \int_{\Lambda}^{\Lambda_0} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \ln [k^2 + U''(\phi, k)]. \quad (4)$$

It becomes, in the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow 0$,

$$U(\phi, 0) = U(\phi, \Lambda_0) + \frac{1}{2} \int_0^{\Lambda_0} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \ln [k^2 + U''(\phi, k)]. \quad (5)$$

This equation is similar to Eq. (2), provided that we identify $U_{\text{DS}}(\phi) = U(\phi, 0)$ and $U_{\text{clas}}(\phi) = U(\phi, \Lambda_0)$. Of course, the second derivative U'' in the integrand now depends on the integration variable, in contrast with U''_{DS} in Eq. (2). This dependence makes hard to solve the integro-differential equation (4) to find $U(\phi, \Lambda)$ and hence $U(\phi, 0)$, which is the effective potential that we seek.

The assumption that leads to Eq. (2) is that one can replace $U''(\phi, k)$ in the integral in the right-hand side of Eq. (5) by its value at the lower integration limit. Notice that, if we replace $U''(\phi, k)$ in the integral in Eq. (5) by its value at the upper integration limit, then, with the identification $U_{\text{clas}}(\phi) = U(\phi, \Lambda_0)$, we simply have that $U(\phi, 0)$ is the one-loop effective potential. In this case, the identification $U(\phi, \Lambda_0)$ with $U_{\text{clas}}(\phi)$ is natural as a renormalization procedure: the UV cutoff Λ_0 has to be absorbed in the parameters present in U_{clas} for the theory to be renormalizable and the limit $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \infty$ to be possible [8]. We shall assume henceforth that the transformation of $U_{\text{clas}}(\phi)$ to $U_{\text{DS}}(\phi)$ induces a non-perturbative renormalization of coupling constants.

As noted by Shepard *et al* [15], the standard Dyson-Schwinger “gap equation” (or “cactus approximation”) for the ϕ^4 -theory [5, 9] is obtained by taking the second derivative of Eq. (2) with respect to ϕ at $\phi = 0$; *but* provided that one replaces the renormalized coupling λ_{DS} in $U_{\text{DS}}(\phi)$ by the bare coupling λ_0 present in $U_{\text{clas}}(\phi)$, giving

$$m_{\text{DS}}^2 = m_0^2 + 12\lambda_0 \int_0^{\Lambda_0} \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{k^2 + m_{\text{DS}}^2} \quad (6)$$

(here $U_{\text{clas}}(\phi) = m_0^2 \phi^2/2 + \lambda_0 \phi^4$). The substitution of λ_{DS} by λ_0 actually constitutes a sort of hybrid approach, in which one replaces $U''(\phi, k)$ in the integral in Eq. (5) by its value at neither the upper nor the lower integration limit but by an expression that combines the renormalized mass and the bare coupling. This hybrid approach can be made systematic, as we now argue.

The assumption that one can replace $U''(\phi, k)$ in the integral in the right-hand side of Eq. (5) by its value at the lower integration limit is consistent with Shepard *et al*'s idea [15] of integrating the ERG equation (3) “in a single step.” However, the constancy of $U''(\phi, k)$ in the integration over k produces certain error. Naturally, if we manage somehow to account for the dependence of $U''(\phi, k)$ on k , at least partially, we must have a better approximation. A simple way of doing it consists in a two-step integration, in which one splits the integration range $[0, \Lambda_0]$ in two parts, using U_{clas} in the upper part and U_{DS} in the

lower part. This procedure still gives an equation of the type of Eq. (2), namely, an equation with just the unknown function U_{DS} and the input function U_{clas} . Of course, a multi-step integration would be more accurate but considerably more complicated.

Both Eq. (2) or the improved version proposed here allow us to express the renormalized couplings in U_{DS} in terms of the bare couplings in U_{clas} . To obtain a relation between U_{DS} and U_{clas} that is more direct, we shall confine ourselves to a given dimension d . Our main interest in this paper is the case $d = 3$. The integrals in Eq. (2) or in its improved version are easily carried out in (integer) dimension d , like in the calculation of the one-loop effective potential U_1 with Eq. (1). The result of such integration will just be a nonlinear second-order differential equation for U_{DS} , given U_{clas} .

III. EQUATION FOR THE DYSON-SCHWINGER EFFECTIVE POTENTIAL IN 3D

In $d = 3$, when we integrate over k in Shepard *et al*'s equation (2), we obtain:

$$U_{\text{DS}}(\phi) = U_{\text{clas}}(\phi) + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \Lambda_0 U_{\text{DS}}''(\phi) - \frac{1}{12\pi} [U_{\text{DS}}''(\phi)]^{3/2}. \quad (7)$$

In this equation we have suppressed the part that only depends on Λ_0 , which is divergent when $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \infty$, and we have neglected corrections that are suppressed by inverse powers of Λ_0 . The term proportional to Λ_0 must be kept, but its coefficient is dependent on the regularization method (a different method can be employed, such as, for example, the lattice regularization method of Shepard *et al* [15]). Naturally, it is required that the potential be convex, namely, $U_{\text{DS}}''(\phi) \geq 0$, to integrate over k in Eq. (2). This condition makes the 3/2-power well defined.

Equation (7) can be suitably transformed by rescaling the field and the potential by powers of Λ_0 , in analogy with the standard rescaling by powers of Λ that renders dimensionless the ERG equation for the local potential [4, 12, 13, 15]. Indeed, defining

$$x = \phi/\Lambda_0^{1/2}, \quad \tilde{U}(x) = U(\phi)/\Lambda_0^3,$$

equation (7) adopts the form:

$$U_{\text{DS}}(x) = U_{\text{clas}}(x) + \alpha U_{\text{DS}}''(x) - \frac{1}{12\pi} [U_{\text{DS}}''(x)]^{3/2}, \quad (8)$$

where we have suppressed the tildes, for simplicity, and we have introduced the numerical coefficient α , which is regularization dependent. In our integration over continuous k with a sharp cutoff, $\alpha = 1/(4\pi^2)$. The regularization dependence of Eq. (8) corresponds to the scheme dependence of the ERG [6, 7], which is herein condensed in just one parameter and is easier to control.

Now we intend to improve on Eq. (2) by means of a two-step integration in Eq. (5), namely, by splitting the integration range $[0, \Lambda_0]$ into an upper part, where we replace $U(\phi, k)$ by $U_{\text{clas}}(\phi)$, and a lower part, where we replace $U(\phi, k)$ by $U_{\text{DS}}(\phi)$. Let the dividing point be Λ_i . It is evident that we obtain, in $d = 3$, instead of Eq. (7),

$$U_{\text{DS}}(\phi) = U_{\text{clas}}(\phi) + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} (\Lambda_0 - \Lambda_i) U''_{\text{clas}}(\phi) + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \Lambda_i U''_{\text{DS}}(\phi) - \frac{1}{12\pi} [U''_{\text{DS}}(\phi)]^{3/2}. \quad (9)$$

The ERG parameter actually is $t = \log(\Lambda_0/\Lambda)$ [1], and most of the coupling constant “running” takes place for large t , that is to say, for $\Lambda \ll \Lambda_0$. Thus, we choose $\Lambda_i \ll \Lambda_0$. Therefore, it seems reasonable to remove small terms from Eq. (9) and write

$$U_{\text{DS}}(\phi) = U_{\text{clas}}(\phi) + \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \Lambda_0 U''_{\text{clas}}(\phi) - \frac{1}{12\pi} [U''_{\text{DS}}(\phi)]^{3/2}, \quad (10)$$

which is only slightly different from Eq. (7).

Naturally, it is also convenient to transform Eq. (10) by rescaling the field and the potential by powers of Λ_0 , obtaining

$$U_{\text{DS}}(x) = U_{\text{clas}}(x) + \alpha U''_{\text{clas}}(x) - \frac{1}{12\pi} [U''_{\text{DS}}(x)]^{3/2}, \quad (11)$$

where $\alpha = 1/(4\pi^2)$, in principle. Equation (11) is the basis of our approach.

Both Eqs. (7) and (10) are self-consistent. In the former, the self-consistency is due to the substitution of U_{clas} by U_{DS} in the integral for the one-loop effective potential (1) to have the original equation (2). If U_{clas} is characterized by some coupling constants and we assume that U_{DS} can be written in terms of the same coupling constants, the substitution of U_{clas} by U_{DS} amounts to the substitution of the bare coupling constants by the renormalized ones. Such substitution is actually made in perturbation theory through the definition of the *renormalized loop expansion*, as explained by Zinn-Justin in Ref. 32, p. 246 ff. In this case, the effect is that only *superficially divergent* Feynman diagrams need to be renormalized, because the divergent subdiagrams are taken into account self-consistently. Of course, this is what the “cactus approximation” to the Dyson-Schwinger equation, Eq. (6), achieves just for the mass renormalization (with bare coupling constant λ_0).

Therefore, Eq. (7) is a sort of renormalized one-loop equation for the potential. It reproduces one-loop renormalized perturbation theory for the mass, but not for λ or other coupling constants, because it introduces higher order vertices (the sixth order vertex in the equation for λ , obtained by taking the fourth derivative with respect to ϕ at $\phi = 0$). In this respect, Eq. (7) works like the actual Dyson-Schwinger equations. Eq. (10) has a no direct connection with the renormalized loop expansion, because it mixes the renormalized coupling constants in the last term of the right-hand side with the bare coupling constants in the term proportional to Λ_0 . The equations for the mass and coupling constant renormalization that derive from Eq. (10) are compared with one-loop renormalized perturbation theory in Sect. IV A.

IV. SOLUTION OF THE DIFFERENTIAL EQUATION

The Dyson-Schwinger effective potential is given by the nonlinear second-order differential equation (11), which contains the input function U_{clas} . This second-order differential equation can be rewritten in several ways. The obvious one consists in solving for U_{DS}'' . A convenient transformation is to redefine the dependent variable as

$$w = U_{\text{DS}} - U_{\text{clas}} - \alpha U_{\text{clas}}'',$$

to have the second derivative of the dependent variable expressed as the sum of two terms, one with the dependent variable and another with the independent variable, namely,

$$w''(x) = [-12\pi w(x)]^{2/3} - U_{\text{clas}}''(x) - \alpha U_{\text{clas}}''''(x). \quad (12)$$

Either way, we can think of an analogy with the problem of the one-dimensional motion of a particle under an arbitrary force in mechanics, supposing that the dependent variable represents the position and the independent variable represents the time. This analogy is more useful in the form (12), which corresponds to the sum of a conservative force and a time-dependent force in mechanics. In fact, we can add $-(U_{\text{clas}}'' + \alpha U_{\text{clas}}''''(0))$ to the conservative force and subtract it from the “time-dependent force”, so that the latter initially vanishes.

We have two integration constants that can be determined by standard “initial” conditions at $x = 0$, namely, by the values of the dependent variable and its first derivative at $x = 0$. Naturally, the presence of the “time-dependent force” in Eq. (12) implies that

there is no “energy” first integral; unless there is no such force, as happens when $U_{\text{clas}}(x)$ is a quadratic polynomial, that is to say, in the trivial Gaussian case. The first derivative at $x = 0$ is imposed by the reflection symmetry of the potential, namely, $U'_{\text{DS}}(0) = 0$ or $w'(0) = 0$ (we assume that $U_{\text{clas}}(x)$ is symmetric, of course).

Differential equation (11) can also be transformed into a simpler second order equation by taking its derivative with respect to x and replacing U'_{DS} by a new dependent variable (as done to the differential equation for the ERG fixed-point local potential [4]). With this procedure, the initial conditions consist of the values $U'_{\text{DS}}(0)$ and $U''_{\text{DS}}(0)$. As said above, the former must vanish whereas the latter has an important physical meaning: it gives the field-theory mass (or correlation length). Therefore, it is crucial for the study of the massless limit and critical behavior. If $U''_{\text{DS}}(0) = 0$, then the differential equation is singular, that is to say, it does not satisfy the theorem that guarantees existence and uniqueness of the solution: the point $(0, 0, 0)$ in the space spanned by x , U'_{DS} , and U''_{DS} is a singular point.

The singular behavior of the effective potential in the massless case is, of course, a problem that is beyond any approximation of Eq. (5), because, when $U''(0, 0) = 0$, the logarithm tends to $\ln k^2$ as $k \rightarrow 0$. Indeed, *infrared* divergences manifest themselves as one takes derivatives of the equation with respect to ϕ : the second derivative gives an equation like Eq. (6), which does not have an infrared divergence for $m_{\text{DS}} = 0$ in $d = 3$ yet, but the next derivative does have an infrared divergence.

A general problem with nonlinear differential equations such as (11) is that they can exhibit singularities which depend on the initial conditions and are called “spontaneous” or “movable” singularities. Note that such singularities can occur in one equation for most initial conditions. This is the case of the differential equation for the ERG fixed-point local potential [4, 13], and the presence of singularities for most initial conditions actually allowed Morris [13] to *determine* the initial conditions, by imposing the absence of singularities. Equation (12) can indeed develop a sort of singularities which depend on the initial conditions, although the absence of them does not fully determine the initial value $w(0)$.

Indeed, the solution of Eq. (12) may be *non extendable* whenever w vanishes, because of the 2/3-power. In general, we must choose the initial condition $w(0) < 0$, so that the 2/3-power is well defined. This condition is equivalent to the convexity of U_{DS} . For some initial condition $w(0) < 0$, the dynamics given by Eq. (12) is intuitive: the “conservative force” drives w towards zero whereas the “time-dependent force” drives w towards more

negative values, because we assume that the even derivatives of U_{clas} are positive at $x = 0$. The “time-dependent force” initially vanishes, whereas the first “force” is initially larger the larger is $-w(0)$ and makes w go towards zero for an interval of x . If w does hit zero with non-vanishing “velocity” w' , then the solution stops at the corresponding value of x .

In conclusion, we can have a singularity right at the start, if $w(0) = 0$, that is to say, if $U_{\text{DS}}''(0) = 0$, but we can also have a non-extendable solution. Nonetheless, we can have non-singular and extendable solutions, provided that $-w(0)$ is small and non-vanishing (Sect. IV B). At any rate, our intention is not to carry out a detailed study of the singularities of the general solution of Eq. (11) and we proceed on a different tack. First, we present the solution for a particular form of U_{clas} (Sect. IV A). Second, we consider in Sect. IV B the local properties of the general solution at $x = 0$, taking into account what one learns from the particular solution. In Sect. V, we combine this study with the study of asymptotic properties.

A. Polynomial solution

In a quantum field theory in some dimension d , the input function $U_{\text{clas}}(x)$ is a polynomial and the renormalizability of the effective potential implies a bound to the degree of the polynomial that depends on d [8, 31–33]. In $d = 3$, the maximum degree is 6. If we set $\alpha = 0$ and put $U_{\text{clas}}(x) \propto x^6$ in Eq. (11), then we have a solution $U_{\text{DS}}(x) \propto x^6$, because the consequent homogeneity in the variable x allows us to adjust the coefficients to satisfy Eq. (11). All of this suggests us to choose $U_{\text{clas}}(x)$ as a sixth-degree polynomial, with only even powers, to make it symmetrical; namely,

$$U_{\text{clas}}(x) = g_0 x^6 + \lambda_0 x^4 + r_0 x^2 + b_0. \quad (13)$$

Hence, we seek a particular solution of Eq. (11) in the form of a symmetrical sixth-degree polynomial, namely,

$$U_{\text{DS}}(x) = g x^6 + \lambda x^4 + r x^2 + b. \quad (14)$$

Some simple but lengthy algebra shows that this is indeed a solution, provided that a set of 7 algebraic equations for the 8 coefficients is satisfied. The 7 algebraic equations are easily obtained by solving for $[U_{\text{DS}}''(x)]^{3/2}$ in Eq. (11), squaring, and equating the coefficients of the two twelfth-degree polynomials in x . By squaring, we introduce sign ambiguities, but the

signs can be determined by always referring to the positive square root in Eq. (11). Let us discuss the nature of the equations.

First of all, the solution could actually be determined, because in the set of 7 algebraic equations only appears the combination $b - b_0$, and therefore the number of independent unknowns is 7 as well. Naturally, we set $b_0 = 0$ (this additive constant in U_{clas} is not significant). In general, $b \neq 0$. Let us consider the equations given by each subsequent power of x .

- The first and simplest equation (x^0) can be written as

$$b = 2\alpha r_0 - \frac{2^{1/2}}{6\pi} r^{3/2}, \quad (15)$$

which just expresses the unimportant constant b in terms of r_0 and r .

- Next equation (x^2), after substituting for b according to Eq. (15), can be written as

$$r - r_0 = 12\alpha\lambda_0 - \frac{3}{2^{1/2}\pi} r^{1/2}\lambda. \quad (16)$$

This equation is similar to the one-loop mass renormalization equation for the ϕ^4 -theory [which appears in appendix as Eq. (A.2) to $O(h)$]. However, Eq. (16) contains $r^{1/2}\lambda$ in place of $r_0^{1/2}\lambda_0$ in the right hand side. In the cactus approximation, Eq. (6), $r^{1/2}\lambda$ is replaced by $r^{1/2}\lambda_0$, whereas the renormalized one-loop expression for the mass corresponds to Eq. (6) with λ instead of λ_0 [31, 32], and hence to λ in the two terms in the right hand side of Eq. (16) [see Eq. (A.8) to $O(h)$]. Equation (16) is a better approximation of the actual Schwinger-Dyson equation for the two-point function, as we shall see.

- Next equation (x^4), after the pertinent substitutions, gives $\lambda - \lambda_0$ in terms of r, λ, g (we assume that $r = U''_{\text{DS}}(0)/2 \neq 0$):

$$\lambda - \lambda_0 = 30\alpha g_0 - \frac{3r^{1/2}}{2^{1/2}\pi} (5g + 3r^{-1}\lambda^2). \quad (17)$$

It can be understood as a modified λ -renormalization equation [Eq. (A.9) to $O(h)$]. In particular, if we make $g = g_0 = 0$, then Eq. (17) is the renormalized one-loop expression for the $\lambda\phi^4$ theory [31, 32].

- Next equation (x^6) gives $g - g_0$ in terms of r, λ, g :

$$g - g_0 = \frac{9}{2^{2^{1/2}}\pi} \lambda r^{-1/2} (-5g + r^{-1}\lambda^2). \quad (18)$$

It is the g -renormalization equation [Eq. (A.10) to $O(\hbar)$]. Notice that it does not involve α , which is associated with terms divergent in the limit $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \infty$.

The last three equations allow us to express the bare parameters as explicit functions of the renormalized parameters. Solving for the renormalized parameters r, λ, g , we could express them in terms of the bare ones. Interestingly, the next two equations (x^8, x^{10}) reduce to one equation, upon replacing r_0, λ_0, g_0 in accord to the preceding equations. The equation is:

$$5rg = 3\lambda^2. \quad (19)$$

The remaining seventh equation (x^{12}) can be written as

$$(30g)^{3/2} = -12\pi(g - g_0), \quad (20)$$

or

$$g_0 = g + \frac{30^{3/2}}{12\pi} g^{3/2}. \quad (21)$$

This relation is precisely the one that is obtained by making $\alpha = 0$ and setting $U_{\text{clas}}(x) = g_0 x^6$ and $U_{\text{DS}}(x) = g x^6$ in Eq. (11).

Excluding b (which we can calculate at the end), we have 5 independent equations for r, λ, g and r_0, λ_0, g_0 . Therefore, we can choose one variable, say r , and solve for the others in terms of it. The simplest procedure seems to be the following. We can eliminate g_0 between Eqs. (18) and (20), so that we have an equation for r, λ, g . This equation turns out to be satisfied provided that Eq. (19) is satisfied. Therefore, we can choose arbitrarily two variables, say r and λ , and then g is given by Eq. (19). As regards the application to the theory of phase transitions, potential (14) can have three minima, that is to say, three phases, and two relevant variables are necessary for tricritical behavior [25, 26] (also Ref. 32, p. 608).

It seems more natural to let the input parameters be the bare ones. However, the constraint that affects r, λ, g implies a constraint on r_0, λ_0, g_0 , leaving independent only two of them, which can be r_0 and λ_0 . (But we shall set r and λ_0 in Sect. VI, to compare with the calculations of Shepard *et al* [15].) It may seem odd that g_0 is determined and non-vanishing,

because it vanishes in the ϕ^4 -theory. We can legitimately ask what happens if we arbitrarily fix the three bare parameters r_0, λ_0, g_0 and just solve for the renormalized parameters by means of Eqs. (16), (17), and (18). This possibility is discussed below.

Let us now study the meaning of Eq. (19). It appears that, when this equation is fulfilled, $U''_{\text{DS}}(x)$ is a perfect square, namely, $U''_{\text{DS}}(x) = 2(r + 3\lambda x^2)^2/r$. Naturally, then we have that

$$[U''_{\text{DS}}(x)]^{3/2} = (2/r)^{3/2} |r + 3\lambda x^2|^3,$$

and it is a polynomial in x , provided that $r + 3\lambda x^2 \geq 0$. Note that convexity of the potential, namely, $U''_{\text{DS}}(x) \geq 0$, is a primary requirement and it holds for $5rg \geq 3\lambda^2$. If $5rg < 3\lambda^2$ and $\lambda > 0$, then $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$ is still convex. In fact, to have $r + 3\lambda x^2 \geq 0$ for all x , we must have $r, \lambda \geq 0$.

We conclude that Eq. (19) or, rather, its expression in terms of the bare coupling constants is the closure equation for polynomial solutions of Eq. (11) with input Eq. (13). If Eq. (19) holds, then Eq. (11) boils down to the set of equations from (15) to (18) [with the substitution $g = 3\lambda^2/(5r)$]. The role of this set of equations is further clarified by the study of the general solution of Eq. (11).

B. General solution

So far, we have found an interesting but particular solution of Eq. (11), namely, a sixth-degree polynomial with coefficients that can be determined sequentially. The procedure employed suggests us to look for the general solution of Eq. (11) as a power series expansion at $x = 0$; namely, we assume that

$$U_{\text{DS}}(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} c_k x^{2k} \quad (22)$$

and try to determine the coefficients c_k from Eq. (11). The sixth-degree polynomial solution in Eq. (14) corresponds to the truncation to $k = 3$, and we preserve the former names of c_0, \dots, c_3 . It is the only *exact* polynomial solution. Naturally, the analyticity assumption implicit in Eq. (22) is only valid if $U''_{\text{DS}}(0) \neq 0$, that is to say, it is not valid at the singular point of Eq. (11). We must caution that the expansion of the effective potential in powers of x ceases to be valid for $x \gg (r/\lambda)^{1/2}$, on general grounds [20, 21].

The sixth-degree polynomial solution in Eq. (14) imposes that $U_{\text{clas}}(x)$ is also a sixth-degree even polynomial, with three coefficients and a constraint on them. However, if $U_{\text{clas}}(x)$ is an arbitrary sixth-degree (even) polynomial, then we can still find a solution of Eq. (11), as the *infinite* series in Eq. (22). We try to determine the coefficients c_k sequentially, but we no longer assume Eq. (19), which makes c_k vanish for $k \geq 4$. Equations (15), (16), and (17) are not modified but Eq. (18) picks up c_4 in an additional term:

$$g - g_0 = -\frac{45g\lambda}{2\sqrt{2\pi}r^{1/2}} + \frac{9\lambda^3}{2\sqrt{2\pi}r^{3/2}} - \frac{14c_4r^{1/2}}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \quad (23)$$

Equations (16), (17), and (23) allow us to express the renormalized parameters r, λ, g in terms of the bare ones and c_4 . To determine c_4 we have to look to the following equations. Next one is

$$c_4 = -\frac{3(60c_5r^3 + 112c_4r^2\lambda + 75g^2r^2 - 90gr\lambda^2 + 27\lambda^4)}{8\sqrt{2\pi}r^{5/2}}. \quad (24)$$

Naturally, we face the usual problem of non-perturbative approaches: the issue of an infinite tower of equations that has to be truncated somehow to obtain definite solutions. If we just make $c_5 = 0$, then Eqs. (16), (17), (23), and (24) are a closed system for r, λ, g , and c_4 .

Of course, if we make $c_4 = 0$, then Eq. (24) and all the following equations are automatically satisfied provided that Eq. (19) holds, which implies that $c_k = 0$ for $k \geq 4$. With this particular truncation, we have the *exact* sixth-degree polynomial solution. If we make $c_5 = 0$ but assume that $c_4 \neq 0$, then we can solve for c_4 in Eq. (24), obtaining:

$$c_4 = -\frac{9(5gr - 3\lambda^2)^2}{8r^2(\sqrt{2\pi}\sqrt{r} + 42\lambda)}. \quad (25)$$

Hence, we can substitute for c_4 in Eq. (23) and obtain a correction to Eq. (18) that has larger magnitude the larger is the deviation from Eq. (19). By assuming that $c_4 = 0$ in Eq. (23), we are introducing a truncation error, which can be evaluated by computing what c_4 should be according to Eq. (25) for the found solution. We can also substitute for c_4 in Eq. (23) according to Eq. (25) before solving it. However, if $c_4 \neq 0$, then we do not have that c_k for all $k \geq 5$, and some high-degree coefficients could be large.

For small $|x|$ and fixed r_0, λ_0, g_0 , the recursive reduction of the sequence of c_k to one definite unknown is straightforward, as we now describe. From the two initial conditions for Eq. (11), the non-trivial one is the value of r ($r \neq 0$). Once we have chosen it, let us solve Eq. (16) for $\lambda(r)$, substitute in Eq. (17) and solve for $g(r)$, substitute in Eq. (23) and solve

for $c_4(r)$, etc. However, the found solution may not have the right behavior for large $|x|$. Indeed, we have seen at the beginning of Sect. IV that a singularity appears when the value of

$$-w(0) = \alpha U''_{\text{clas}}(0) - U_{\text{DS}}(0) = 2\alpha r_0 - b = \frac{2^{1/2}}{6\pi} r^{3/2}$$

is large enough. Therefore, the range of r is restricted. The study of the large- $|x|$ behavior leads to further restrictions and, in fact, to a definite solution, as explained in Sect. V.

Naturally, the variable r plays a special role in the equations for c_k , as we know from its physical meaning and also because it features in the denominators of Eqs. (17), (23), and (24). There are two interesting limits, namely, $r \rightarrow \infty$ and $r \rightarrow 0$. The former is a sort of “classical” limit, that is to say, the limit in which fluctuations are negligible. To understand this limit, it is useful to recall that our coupling constants are dimensionless, after the rescaling by powers of Λ_0 , and the limit $r \rightarrow \infty$ is achieved when the dimensional coefficient of the ϕ^2 -term is $\gg \Lambda_0^2$. In principle, if we make $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow 0$ in Eq. (2), then $U_{\text{DS}}(\phi) \rightarrow U_{\text{clas}}(\phi)$ and the renormalized parameters should tend to the bare ones. However, we have neglected corrections that are suppressed by inverse powers of Λ_0 in Eq. (7), making that limit non-trivial. The opposite limit $r \rightarrow 0$ determines critical behavior, which is further studied in Sect. VIB.

V. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOR FOR LARGE FIELDS

An interesting question is how the effective potential behaves for large values of the field. In other words, we ask the behavior of the differential equation in the neighborhood of $x = \infty$ or, more rigorously, in the neighborhood of $y = 0$, where $y = 1/x$. Effecting this change of the independent variable, accompanied by a convenient change of the dependent variable, we obtain the associated equation:

$$y^2 g''(y) - 10y g'(y) + 30g(y) = (-12\pi [g(y) - \tilde{u}(y)])^{2/3}, \quad (26)$$

where

$$g(y) = y^6 U_{\text{DS}}(1/y)$$

and

$$\tilde{u}(y) = y^6 [U_{\text{clas}}(1/y) + \alpha U''_{\text{clas}}(1/y)].$$

Differential equation (26) contains g' in addition to g'' and is, therefore, a bit more complicated than the equations in terms of x . However, it has some interesting properties at $y = 0$, which we now study.

Naturally, $y = 0$ is a singular point of Eq. (26). Nevertheless, if $\tilde{u}(0)$ is finite, then we can have an analytic solution for $g(y)$, thus justifying the definitions of g and \tilde{u} . Of course, $\tilde{u}(0)$ is finite only if the growth of $U_{\text{clas}}(x)$ is $O(x^6)$ at the most, that is to say, only if it has the sextic form (13). We can now expand $g(y)$ in powers of y at $y = 0$, substitute for it in Eq. (26), and solve in sequence for the coefficients, namely, for the derivatives of $g(y)$ at $y = 0$. Given that the polynomial $\tilde{u}(y)$ has no odd powers, the odd derivatives of $g(y)$ vanish (as expected). The even coefficients are expressed in terms of r_0, λ_0, g_0 . In particular, the first coefficient, $g(0)$, is given by the g in Eq. (20).

It is to be remarked that the power expansion of $g(y)$ at $y = 0$ does not end at any finite power, for generic values of r_0, λ_0, g_0 , unlike in the case that these values satisfy the constraint that makes $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$ a sextic polynomial and, therefore, that it also makes $g(y)$ a sextic polynomial (Sect. IV A). Of course, the truncation of the power expansion of $g(y)$ to $O(y^6)$ makes $U_{\text{DS}}(0)$ finite, whereas higher-order terms make it divergent. Of course, the power expansion of $g(y)$ at $y = 0$ is not expected to have an infinite radius of convergence and it does not serve to calculate $U_{\text{DS}}(0)$. In consequence, we cannot *directly* deduce from the asymptotic behavior the missing boundary condition at $x = 0$, which is the value of $U_{\text{DS}}(0)$.

It is to be remarked as well that the phase-space point with $g'(0) = 0$ and $g(0)$ given by Eq. (20) is a singular point of Eq. (26) and there is no unique solution through it. Indeed, the calculation of the power expansion of $g(y)$ ignores possible non-analytic terms. Numerical experiments show that the integration of Eq. (20) with the given boundary conditions is unstable, resulting in oscillations of increasing amplitude. Therefore, the analytic solution is unstable under small perturbations that bring in the non-analytic terms. At any rate, the analytic solution is dependable, because the power series seems to converge well for reasonably large values of y (small x).

The preceding remarks suggest a procedure to obtain a unique solution for $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$, that is to say, to determine one solution within the uniparametric family of solutions with parameter $U_{\text{DS}}(0)$ or $U_{\text{DS}}''(0)$. To wit, we can try a sort of asymptotic matching. The procedure is best explained with some examples.

A. Asymptotic matching: numerical examples

Let us see how the asymptotic matching works in a generic example, with

$$U_{\text{clas}}(x) = 0.1x^6 + 0.641391x^4 + 0.1x^2 \quad (27)$$

(there is a reason, which is given in Sect. VI, for choosing such six-digit number as quartic coefficient). Assuming a truncated power series for $g(y)$ in Eq. (26), with the corresponding $\tilde{u}(y)$, we obtain

$$g(y) = 0.0505146 + 0.451816y^2 + 0.0523064y^4 + 0.137535y^6 - 0.140594y^8 + 0.201719y^{10} + O(y^{12}).$$

The function $x^6 g(1/x)$ is to be matched to a solution $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$ of Eq. (11) in the form (22). The matching is to be performed at a value of y so small that the $O(y^{10})$ expansion is sufficient, and at a value of $x = 1/y$ such that we can also keep few terms of the expansion (22). We choose the value of x that makes the last two terms of the power expansion of $g(y)$ of equal magnitude, namely, $x = 1/y = 1.2$ (at this value, $g(y) = 0.435$ and $0.201719y^{10} = 0.0326$). Furthermore, we keep in (22) up to $O(x^{10})$. After solving the equations for the coefficients, we find

$$U_{\text{DS}}(x) = -0.00131719 + 0.193442x^2 + 0.341827x^4 + 0.143405x^6 - 0.0954937x^8 + 0.0478979x^{10} + O(x^{12}). \quad (28)$$

Naturally, this procedure involves numerical errors and the coefficients may not be very precise. The precision can be tested with various numerical experiments. For example, we can (laboriously) include higher powers of x in (22) before solving for the coefficients. If we match $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$ up to $O(x^{12})$, then the coefficients change: we observe that the coefficients of powers up to $O(x^6)$ are quite stable, but the coefficients of x^8 and x^{10} become -0.12 and 0.17 , respectively. At any rate, they stay small and, therefore, seem to justify the truncation of $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$ at some low order. For instance, we can truncate the expansion (22) at $O(x^8)$ ($c_5 x^{10} = 0$) and use Eq. (25) with the values of r , λ , and g in (28), to obtain $c_4 = -0.083$, which is surely not very imprecise.

Of course, we can also check on the truncation at $O(x^6)$ given by Eqs. (16), (17), and (18) (somehow connected with renormalized one-loop perturbation theory). For the potential (27), we obtain, by solving these equations, that $r = 0.191997$, $\lambda = 0.347995$, $g = 0.120942$,




FIG. 1. Matching of power series at $x = 1$ for $r = U''_{\text{DS}}(0)/2 = 0.0059$.

which agree well with (28). Therefore, the truncation at $O(x^6)$ is good for $r = 0.19$, notably smaller than one. However, let us remark that a truncation at $O(x^6)$ does not imply that the sextic effective potential is an *exact* solution of Eq. (11), as would occur if Eq. (19) were verified (it is definitely not verified in this case).

We may notice that $r_0 = 0.1$ in (27) has grown to $r = 0.19$ in (28). In fact, we expect, according to Eq. (6) and Sect. IV A, that $r > r_0$ and, furthermore, that we need $r_0 < 0$ to attain $r = 0$. The results that correspond to (27) with $r_0 = -0.1$ instead of $r_0 = 0.1$ are the following: $r = 0.053$, $\lambda = 0.27$, and $g = 0.32$. We see that r is small, so we expect that a more negative value of r_0 must make $r \rightarrow 0$. Actually, from Eq. (16), we deduce that $r = 0$ when $r_0 = -12\alpha\lambda_0 = -0.194959$. However, we find that the fitting of the power expansion (22) becomes very tricky when we approach this value. We must not be surprised, since we have already seen that then the solution of Eq. (11) for $U''_{\text{DS}}(0) = 0$ is not analytic at $x = 0$ (Sect. IV). However, we still have an acceptable matching of power series for $r_0 = -0.18$ (with $\lambda_0 = 0.641391$ and $g_0 = 0.1$). It yields:

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{\text{DS}}(x) = & -0.00915248 + 0.00585087x^2 + 0.176356x^4 + 1.00058x^6 - 0.705973x^8 \\
 & + O(x^{10}).
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{29}$$

Here we have included only up to $O(x^8)$ because higher powers actually worsen the fit, which is a symptom of a reduced radius of convergence. Function (29) is plotted in Fig. 1 together with the matching function $x^6g(1/x)$. For r_0 a bit smaller than -0.18 , we can still get a sensible power series of $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$, but the matching is progressively worse and the results are less reliable.

It is interesting to note that the truncation at $O(x^6)$ given by Eqs. (16), (17), and (18), agrees well with (29), in spite of the magnitude of c_4 in this potential. Indeed, by solving the equations, we obtain $r = 0.00584496$, $\lambda = 0.176559$, $g = 0.990523$. This good result is due to the small contribution of the term that contains c_4 to the right-hand side of Eq. (23), which is therefore almost equivalent to Eq. (18).

VI. COMPARISON WITH OTHER RESULTS

Here we compare the foregoing results with other results, encompassing numerical and analytic results. Of course, we must first compare to Shepard *et al*'s numerical work [15]. Since we consider an improved equation and the ϕ^6 -term, we should be able to improve on their results. It is easiest to compare the equation that relates r , r_0 and λ (Shepard *et al* use the mass m instead of $r = m^2/2$). The equation that Shepard *et al* actually employ in their numerical work is Eq. (6) (the ‘‘cactus’’ approximation), which, in $d = 3$, amounts to replacing $r^{1/2}\lambda$ by $r^{1/2}\lambda_0$ in Eq. (16). Thus one obtains a closed equation for r , given r_0 and λ_0 ; or a closed equation for r_0 , given r and λ_0 , as is employed by Shepard *et al*.

Shepard *et al* make $\lambda_0 = 10$, but their bare coupling λ_0 is not to be identified with ours, which is divided by Λ_0 when we undo the change of variables that removes Λ_0 . Furthermore, our normalization of the ϕ^4 -term is different, by a factor of 4. Shepard *et al* show that $\Lambda_0 = (6\pi^2)^{1/3}$ for the lattice calculations in $d = 3$. When both differences are taken into account, we have $\lambda_0 = (10/4)/(6\pi^2)^{1/3} = 0.641391$, the value used in Sect. V A. This value is smaller than one but not very small. If we replace λ with λ_0 in Eq. (16) and use this value of λ_0 , then we have a relation between the bare and renormalized values of r (or m). For $r \gg 1$, r hardly differs from r_0 , as expected in the ‘‘classical’’ limit of negligible fluctuations. Shepard *et al* actually set $m = 0.285$ for their ‘‘latticized’’ version of the cactus approximation. This is, with our normalization, equivalent to $m = 0.285/(6\pi^2)^{1/3} = 0.07312 \ll 1$ and $r = m^2/2 = 0.002673$, being in the regime of strong fluctuations. With the plain cactus approximation, we obtain $r_0 = -0.17$, whereas the ‘‘latticized’’ cactus approximation yields $m_0 = 2.61i$ [15], equivalent to $r_0 = -0.224$. The result of Monte Carlo calculations by Shepard *et al* is $r_0 = -0.154$.

Actually, the substitution of $r^{1/2}\lambda$ by $r^{1/2}\lambda_0$ in Eq. (16) is irrelevant when $r \ll 1$, because either of them hardly contributes to the right-hand side of the equation. Therefore, $r_0 \approx$

$-12\alpha\lambda_0$ for $r \rightarrow 0$. This is $r_0 = -0.19$, for $\lambda_0 = 0.6414$, as already seen in Sect. V A. In that section, we also see, in Eq. (29), that we obtain $r > 0.005$ for $r_0 = -0.18$, which suggests that $-0.19 < r_0 < -0.18$ for Shepard *et al's* $r = 0.002673$. However, Eq. (29) is derived from the potential (27), with $g_0 \neq 0$, whereas Shepard *et al* just consider the ϕ^4 -theory.

At any rate, we should not expect a very accurate value of r_0 when lattice and continuum results are compared, because r_0 is regularization-scheme dependent (that is, non-universal), as shown by the presence of α in Eq. (16). Actually, we should be more interested in coupling constant renormalization, namely, in the value of λ , given λ_0 and r .

In our non-perturbative approach, truncated at $O(x^6)$, the coupling constant λ of the ϕ^4 -theory is given by Eqs. (17) and (18) with $g_0 = 0$ (equations that do not contain α). Given λ_0 and r , both these equations constitute a soluble system for λ, g . Alternatively, we can employ Eq. (23) and Eq. (25) instead of Eq. (18). With $\lambda_0 = 0.6414$ and $r = 0.002673$, both methods do not differ much and yield $\lambda = 0.14$ and $g = 1.4$ – 1.6 . Shepard *et al* obtain (in our normalization of λ) $\lambda = 0.096$ with Monte Carlo and $\lambda = 0.12$ with their continuous ERG calculation, making numerical fits that assume $g = 0$. In the case of Eq. (29), with the same λ_0 but $g_0 = 0.1$ and $r = 0.0059$, we have $\lambda = 0.18$ and $g = 1.0$.

A remark is due here. Although it may seem that we can obtain better results by matching the asymptotic behavior (Sect. V) than by employing equations that involve a truncation (Sect. IV B), the former is problematic when we want to employ it to compare to Shepard *et al's* ϕ^4 -theory results: the asymptotic behavior becomes very complicated when $g_0 = 0$, and $g(y)$ seems to be non-analytic at $y = 0$. A generalization of the method could work, but this generalization would surely require sophisticated mathematical methods and it is beyond the scope of the present work. At any rate, the value $g_0 = 0.1$ is probably sufficiently small to warrant the comparison.

Now we quote the ratios $\lambda/m = \lambda/(2r)^{1/2}$, for later use (in Sects. VI A and VI B). Shepard *et al's* results obtain $\lambda/m = 1.3$ with Monte Carlo and $\lambda/m = 1.7$ with their continuous ERG calculation (with our normalization of λ), while we obtain $\lambda/m = 1.9$ with truncation and 1.6 with Eq. (29) (for $g_0 = 0.1$). Shepard *et al's* DS-like 4-point coupling equation [see Eq. (16) or Eq. (38) in Ref. 15] yields a too low $\lambda/m = 0.57$.

A. Comparison with perturbation theory

We have remarked in Sect. IV the connection of Eqs. (16) and (17) with one-loop renormalized perturbation theory. In standard perturbative ϕ^4 -theory at one-loop order, we actually have Eq. (17) with $g_0 = g = 0$, which yields $\lambda/m = 2.2$ for $\lambda_0 = 0.6414$ and $r = 0.002673$ (the values above). In view of the various non-perturbative results quoted above, the value $\lambda/m = 2.2$ is less accurate than our non-perturbative result $\lambda/m = 1.6$ – 1.9 . Moreover, it behooves us to proceed to higher orders in the renormalized perturbation series. Renormalization of the ϕ^4 -theory at the two-loop level is described in detail by Amit, Ref. 33, p. 117 ff. Applying Amit’s formulas to $d = 3$ with momentum cutoff regularization and neglecting inverse powers of the cutoff Λ_0 , the result is:

$$m_0^2 = m^2 - \frac{6\Lambda_0}{\pi^2}\lambda + \frac{3m\lambda}{\pi} - 27 \left(\frac{\Lambda_0}{\pi^3 m} - \frac{8 + \pi^2}{2\pi^4} \right) \lambda^2 + \frac{6\lambda^2}{\pi^2} \left(\log \frac{\Lambda_0}{m} - 1.5247 \right), \quad (30)$$

$$\lambda_0 = \lambda + \frac{9\lambda^2}{2\pi m} + \frac{63\lambda^3}{4\pi^2 m^2}. \quad (31)$$

(The last parenthesis in Eq. (30) results from the calculation of the cutoff “sunset” Feynman graph, whose Λ_0 -independent part is computed numerically). On account of our definition of the field and effective potential, we have to put $\Lambda_0 = 1$ in Eq. (30) (note that terms with Λ_0 are non universal).

Naturally, the magnitude of the two-loop correction to λ is given by the magnitude of $(\lambda/m)^2$, namely, by the magnitude of the $O(\lambda^3)$ term of Eq. (31) in relation to the preceding terms. For example, in potential (28), $\lambda/m = 0.55$ and

$$\frac{63\lambda^2}{4\pi^2 m^2} = 0.48.$$

Consequently, the power series expansion seems to show certain degree of convergence in this case and higher-order corrections should improve the result (in fact, these series are known to be asymptotic and not convergent [31, 32], and only a limited number of terms can be used). Given λ_0 , we could solve for λ and obtain an approximate value. However, it is not pertinent to try the values $\lambda_0 = 0.641391$ and $r_0 = 0.1$ of (27) which lead to (28) in order to solve for m and λ in Eqs. (30) and (31), because $g_0 \neq 0$ in (27).

In contrast with potential (28), the case $r = 0.053$ and $\lambda = 0.27$ (also considered in Sect. V A) yields $\lambda/m = 0.83$ and

$$\frac{63\lambda^2}{4\pi^2 m^2} = 1.1.$$

Naturally, the cases with $\lambda/m \gtrsim 1$ are totally unsuitable. Actually, the raw form of λ_0/m as a series expansion in powers of λ/m is hardly useful for small m , and series summation methods are the standard procedure in perturbative ϕ^4 -theory [31, 32]. Therefore, a non-perturbative method should be more reliable. This is in general the case when we consider small values of m , namely, when we approach the critical behavior.

The perturbative expansion of the effective potential of the ϕ^4 -theory in $d = 3$ is known to the five-loop order [20]. However, the calculations have been done in dimensional regularization with minimal subtraction, instead of being done with a physical momentum cutoff. Dimensional regularization introduces an unknown scale μ , besides missing powers of Λ_0 . The redefinition to the physical mass scheme is a very laborious task [20]. On the other hand, the calculation of Feynman graphs with a momentum cutoff is very laborious as well.

Of course, perturbative ϕ^6 -theory is even more complicated. Although its study was initiated long ago [34–36], there seem to be only very partial results. While perturbative ϕ^4 -theory is *super-renormalizable* in $d = 3$, ϕ^6 -theory is just renormalizable and divergences proliferate, according to the general theory [32]. For example, the coupling constant λ is divergent in the limit $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \infty$; say, it is non universal, as one can already see in Eq. (17). Perturbative computations with dimensional regularization and minimal subtraction by McKeon and Tsoupros [37] or Huish and Toms [38, 39], are hardly useful in our context, because they are restricted to the poles in $\varepsilon = 3 - d$ and omit the finite parts. Much the same can be said of the six-loop calculation of Hager [40], which applies strictly to tricritical behavior. Lawrie and Sarbach discuss in Ref. 26, Sect. V this type of renormalization group and its limitations. Sokolov [36] calculated in the physical mass scheme but only retained quadratic terms in the coupling constants (as do McKeon and Tsoupros [37], while Huish [39] has completed a four-loop order calculation). Therefore, Sokolov’s [36] non-trivial RG fixed point (the Wilson-Fisher fixed point) is not correct: at that fixed point, $g = 0$, but later calculations contradict it [19, 20].

We present in the appendix the full two-loop renormalization of $(\lambda\phi^4 + g\phi^6)_3$ theory, regularized with the momentum cutoff Λ_0 in the physical mass scheme. The one-loop part is related to Eqs. (16), (17) and (18), as already noticed. The difference between the non-perturbative equations and the perturbative ones is in detriment of the latter. Indeed, while the results of Eqs. (16), (17) and (18) are fine for the potential (27), that is to say, they agree with the non-perturbative potential (28) within a few percent in the case of r and λ , the one-

loop perturbative results, namely, $r = 0.122808$, $\lambda = 0.338735$, $g = 0.172128$, deviate more, in general.

Moreover, in the preceding case, the two-loop contribution actually spoils the one-loop approximation obtained with the bare values in (27). To begin with, given the bare coupling constants, it is difficult to find numerical solutions for the renormalized coupling constants from Eqs. (A.8), (A.9), and (A.10), which are very complex. On the other hand, the perturbation series for $g(m, \lambda, g_0)$ in Eq. (A.7) appears to be strongly non-convergent, as is manifest in a negative and relatively large two-loop contribution to g , when we put $g_0 = 0.1$, $m = \sqrt{2r} = 0.622$ and $\lambda = 0.3418$ [Eq. (28)]. In the simple case with $g_0 = 0$, Eq. (A.7) simplifies to

$$g(m, \lambda, 0) = \frac{9\lambda^3}{\pi m^3} \left(1 - \frac{3\lambda}{\pi m} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^5), \quad (32)$$

as previously derived by other authors [19, 20], who noticed that these expansions are not useful for λ/m close to one. The expansions actually get worse at higher loop order and demand resummation methods [19, 20, 23] (unless λ/m is small, of course).

The convergence of series expansions with $g_0 \neq 0$ is worse than with $g_0 = 0$, and no resummation method has ever been tried in that case. In fact, we can see in the series for $g(m, \lambda, g_0)$ of Eq. (A.7) that the term with $\log(m/\Lambda_0)$ will grow without bound as $m \rightarrow 0$. This growth is harmless in regard to the tricritical point and actually gives the expected logarithmic correction to scaling [34–36] but it shows the problems that arise to reach ordinary critical behavior in perturbation theory when $g_0 \neq 0$. One obvious problem arises in the ε -expansion, because it requires a different dimension base for either tricritical behavior or critical behavior, as discussed in Ref. 26, Sect. V.

B. The massless limit: critical behavior

Our approach leads us to consider, in $d = 3$, the ϕ^6 -theory instead of just the ϕ^4 -theory. In the classical limit, $g \approx g_0$, and this still holds for shrinking r , down to $r = 0.2$, as shown by Eqs. (27) and (28). However, the result of the perturbative renormalization group [34–36] is that $g\phi^6$ is RG-irrelevant with respect to the trivial RG fixed point, which corresponds to tricritical behavior ($\lambda/m = 0$). Of course, $g\phi^6$ is also irrelevant with respect to the non-trivial fixed point which corresponds to ordinary critical behavior ($\lambda/m \neq 0$). Thus, one can take any value of g_0 to study the critical behavior or the tricritical behavior, because

the renormalized value of g should be independent of g_0 . In contrast, λ is irrelevant with respect to the non-trivial fixed point but is relevant with respect to the trivial fixed point. In the three-dimensional space of bare parameters r_0 , λ_0 , and g_0 , we have the critical surface $r = 0$ [which, at two-loop order, for example, is given by Eq. (A.2) with $m = 0$]. Within the surface, there is a RG trajectory that departs from the trivial fixed point and leads to the non-trivial fixed point. The higher stability of the non-trivial fixed point implies that the massless theory will be controlled by this fixed point, for generic values of the bare couplings [1, 25, 26, 36].

Our coupling constants g and λ are already dimensionless, but it is convenient here to redefine λ to compare with the standard definition of dimensionless coupling constants, which do not involve the cutoff Λ_0 ; so we make:

$$u = \lambda/m = \lambda/(2r)^{1/2}.$$

In terms of this variable, for example, Eq. (19) adopts a standard non-dimensional form, independent of Λ_0 :

$$g = 6u^2/5 \tag{33}$$

(of course, we do not expect this relation to be exact).

Let us recall how the RG fixed point value u^* that controls the critical behavior is derived in perturbative ϕ^4 -theory at fixed dimension [31, 32]. While ordinary perturbation theory yields $u(m, \lambda_0, \Lambda_0)$ as an expansion in powers of λ_0 , renormalized perturbation theory, in $d = 3$, simply yields λ_0/m as an expansion in powers of u [e.g., Eq. (31)]. This expansion can be reversed to obtain the expansion of $u(\lambda_0/m)$. The value u^* is determined by the vanishing β -function condition

$$\left(\frac{\partial u}{\partial m} \right)_{\lambda_0} = 0. \tag{34}$$

In fact, λ_0/m as a function of u should have a vertical asymptote at u^* , such that the solution of Eq. (34) takes place for $m \rightarrow 0$ and $\lambda_0/m \rightarrow \infty$ (as explained by Parisi, Ref. 31, §8.1). The vertical asymptote at u^* corresponds to a horizontal asymptote of $u(\lambda_0/m)$, that is to say, to a maximum value of u for $m \rightarrow 0$ at fixed λ_0 . However, any truncated perturbative series of λ_0/m in powers of u is a polynomial and does not have a vertical asymptote [e.g., Eq. (31)]. Nevertheless, if one *assumes* that one can derive $\beta(u)$ as a power series expansion truncated at the same order, then one can solve the equation $\beta(u^*) = 0$ and determine u^* .

Of course, this value necessarily corresponds to a finite value of λ_0/m and hence to $m > 0$. Moreover, the expansion of $u(\lambda_0/m)$, truncated at the same order, may or may not have a maximum [the inverse expansion of (31) does not]; and if it does have a maximum, it may not be at the value u^* determined by $\beta(u^*) = 0$.

The above arguments show that the perturbative calculations of critical behavior are questionable. At low orders, the RG fixed point is found at $\lambda_0/m \sim 1$ rather than $\lambda_0/m \gg 1$. Nevertheless, λ_0/m grows as higher-order terms are added, e.g., as higher-order terms are added to the right-hand side of Eq. (31). In fact, perturbation theory at fixed dimension can be arranged to yield good results at higher orders [31, 32]. At any rate, the higher-order terms make a substantial contribution, as already seen for moderately small m in Sect. VI A. The calculation of u^* demands sophisticated series summation methods (described by Zinn-Justin in Ref. 32, ch. 42).

The question here is whether our kind of non-perturbative approach can outdo perturbation theory in the critical regime, when $m \rightarrow 0$. The first hint is already provided by the good agreement with Shepard *et al's* Monte Carlo and continuous ERG calculations with $r = 0.0027 \ll 1$ and $\lambda_0/m = 0.64/0.073 = 8.8$. Arguably, the value $r = 0.0027$ corresponds to near critical behavior, and thus the value of $u = \lambda/m$ should be near u^* . The numerical results of our method in Sect. V A may be more reliable than the results of perturbation theory, as assessed in Sect. VI A.

Let us consider various results of perturbative and non-perturbative calculations of critical behavior. Work done years ago by Tsy-pin [16] on the effective potential of the 3d Ising universality class, ruled by the ϕ^4 -theory, employing Monte Carlo simulations, yields $u^* = 0.97 \pm 0.02$ and $g^* = 2.05 \pm 0.15$. The consensus value according to Tsy-pin [16] is $u^* \simeq 1$. Zinn-Justin reports (a value equivalent to) $u^* = 0.985$ in Ref. 32, table 29.4, obtained with perturbative calculations (see also Ref. 22, table 8). The values of u found with Shepard *et al's* Dyson-Schwinger approach or with our improved approach are larger: Shepard *et al's* Monte Carlo calculation gives $u = 1.3$ for $r = 0.0027$ and our approach gives $u = 1.6$ for $r = 0.0059$. The latter actually comes from $\lambda\phi^4 + g\phi^6$ theory, but u^* should be the same as in just the ϕ^4 theory.

The sixth degree coupling g is surely more interesting than u . Tsy-pin [16] refers to results of perturbation theory in fixed dimension $d = 3$ as well as to results of the ε -expansion. He also refers to results of the ERG in the local potential approximation. In

summary, the quoted results are $g(u^*) \in (1.6, 2.3)$. Guida and Zinn-Justin [20] or Sokolov and collaborators, in Ref. 19 and later in Ref. 23, with a more modern treatment, obtain $g(u^*) = 1.65$. If $u^* \simeq 1$ and Eq. (33) held, then we would have that $g(u^*) \sim 6/5 = 1.2$. For $\lambda_0 = 0.6414$ and $r = 0.002673$, with the truncated non-perturbative potential, we have found $g = 1.4\text{--}1.6$, whereas the asymptotic matching technique yields $g = 1.0$ in Eq. (29), for a somewhat larger r .

VII. DISCUSSION

We have explored the connection between bare and renormalized couplings that can be derived from the integral form of the Wilson or exact renormalization group, after the simplification proposed by Shepard *et al.* A slight generalization of Shepard *et al.*'s integral equation, consisting in a sort of a “two-step” rather than a “one-step” integration over the momentum scale, gives rise, in three dimensions, to a second-order differential equation for the effective potential, namely, Eq. (11).

The first and basic question to discuss is the scope of differential equation (11). To assess it, we have compared it to other approaches, chiefly, to Shepard *et al.*'s original approach and, from a different perspective, to perturbation theory. The first point to test is the correctness of equation (16) for mass renormalization. It yields better results than Shepard *et al.*'s original equation, which is actually equivalent to the renormalized one-loop equation. This is most evident in the massless limit, because, in renormalized perturbation theory, if $m \rightarrow 0$, then $\lambda \rightarrow 0$ and therefore $m_0 \rightarrow 0$, whereas $r_0 = m_0^2$ really takes a negative value (which depends on λ_0). Equation (16) and the numerical experiments of Sect. V A show why and how r_0 needs to be more negative as we take $m \rightarrow 0$ (for fixed λ_0).

As regards coupling constant renormalization, both Shepard *et al.*'s original approach and our modified approach suffer from the same problem of truncation; namely, both approaches produce an infinite tower of equations that need to be truncated or resolved in some way. Our truncation seems to work better than Shepard *et al.*'s, as shown by the values of λ/m quoted in the paragraph just before Sect. VI A. At any rate, our crucial result is that the indeterminacy in the infinite tower of equations corresponds to the indeterminacy of the initial value problem for the second order differential equation. Moreover, we can avoid any truncation and obtain sensible results by appealing to the asymptotic behavior of the

general solution of the differential equation, namely, by demanding that the solution has no singular behavior for large fields.

An essential innovation in our approach is that it naturally leads us to consider, in $d = 3$, the renormalizable ϕ^6 -theory rather than the super-renormalizable ϕ^4 -theory. The standard treatments of the ERG compare, in three dimensions, to results of perturbative ϕ^4 -theory, because they focus on the *non-trivial* RG fixed point, which can be found with just the ϕ^4 -theory. However, there are interesting phenomena related to the trivial (tricritical) fixed point and, especially, to the crossover from one point to another. These phenomena have not been considered within a non-perturbative approach, but we have shown that it is natural to do so. This is an aspect to develop in future non-perturbative studies of three-dimensional scalar field theory.

On the other hand, $(\lambda\phi^4 + g\phi^6)_3$ theory can also be studied with perturbative methods, but it is quite complicated and our non-perturbative approach seems definitely superior. To further assess this question, we should avail results of the perturbative methods more extensive than currently available.

The massless limit of the effective potential deserves more discussion. Naturally, an expansion of the effective potential in powers of the field is only possible for a small magnitude of the field, because it has to fail for $\phi \gg m/\lambda^{1/2}$ (as can be argued from first principles and can also be deduced from the perturbative expansion in the appendix). The massless limit is troublesome, in perturbation theory as well as in our non-perturbative approach. The massless (or critical) theory must have a non-analytic effective potential. We have seen how this is, in our approach, a consequence of the form of the differential equation for the effective potential. In fact, the non-analyticity of the solution does not prevent us from carrying out a numerical integration. However, the nature of the singularity is not easily established by numerical methods. Further investigation of this question is left for the future.

Finally, let us remark that the requirement of convexity of the effective potential forbids the study of symmetry breaking, which is, in general, an interesting application of the effective potential. Although Shepard *et al* argue that convexity is not always a fundamental property of the effective potential, our methods certainly need further elaboration to study symmetry breaking.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Sergey Apenko for comments on the manuscript.

Appendix: Two-loop perturbative $(\lambda\phi^4 + g\phi^6)_3$ theory in the physical mass scheme



The effective potential at two-loop order is calculated with the background-field method (succinctly exposed by Honerkamp [41]):

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_{\text{eff}}(x) = & U_{\text{clas}}(x) + h \left(\frac{\Lambda_0 U''_{\text{clas}}(x)}{4\pi^2} - \frac{U''_{\text{clas}}(x)^{3/2}}{12\pi} \right) + \frac{3h^2 U_{\text{clas}}^{(4)}(x)}{4!} \left(\frac{\Lambda_0^2}{4\pi^4} - \frac{\Lambda_0 \sqrt{U''_{\text{clas}}(x)}}{4\pi^3} \right) \\
 & + \frac{(8 + \pi^2) U''_{\text{clas}}(x)}{16\pi^4} - \frac{3h^2 U_{\text{clas}}^{(3)}(x)^2}{(3!)^2 (16\pi^2)} \left(A - \log \frac{\sqrt{U''_{\text{clas}}(x)}}{\Lambda_0} \right) + O(h^3). \quad (\text{A.1})
 \end{aligned}$$

Here, the loop counting parameter is h . The $O(h)$ term is standard. There are two $O(h^2)$ terms, given by the “double bubble” and the “sunset” Feynman graphs, drawn above. The corresponding integrals are calculated with momentum cutoff Λ_0 (the finite part of the “sunset” graph integral is computed numerically, yielding $A = -1.5247$). Both h and Λ_0 are to be set to 1 at the end, to compare with the non-perturbative potential $U_{\text{DS}}(x)$. Of course, we put

$$U_{\text{clas}}(x) = \frac{m_0^2}{2} x^2 + \lambda_0 x^4 + g_0 x^6,$$

in accord with Eq. (13) (the constant term can be suppressed). Let us remark that, if we make $g_0 = 0$, then we reproduce the results in several references (calculated at higher loop order) [17–22].

The renormalization is carried out as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m^2 = U''_{\text{eff}}(0) = & m_0^2 + h \left(\frac{6\lambda_0\Lambda_0}{\pi^2} - \frac{3m_0\lambda_0}{\pi} \right) + h^2 \left[\frac{45g_0\Lambda_0^2}{2\pi^4} - \frac{45g_0m_0\Lambda_0}{2\pi^3} + \left(\frac{45}{8\pi^2} + \frac{45}{\pi^4} \right) g_0m_0^2 \right. \\
 & \left. - \frac{9\Lambda_0\lambda_0^2}{\pi^3m_0} + \left(\frac{9}{2\pi^2} + \frac{36}{\pi^4} - \frac{6A}{\pi^2} \right) \lambda_0^2 + \frac{6\lambda_0^2}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m_0}{\Lambda_0} \right], \quad (\text{A.2})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\lambda = \frac{U_{\text{eff}}^{(4)}(0)}{4!} = \lambda_0 + h \left(-\frac{15g_0m_0}{4\pi} + \frac{15g_0\Lambda_0}{2\pi^2} - \frac{9\lambda_0^2}{2\pi m_0} \right) + h^2 \left[-\frac{315\Lambda_0g_0\lambda_0}{4\pi^3m_0} + \left(\frac{315}{8\pi^2} + \frac{315}{\pi^4} - \frac{30A}{\pi^2} \right) g_0\lambda_0 + \frac{30g_0\lambda_0}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m_0}{\Lambda_0} + \frac{27\lambda_0^3\Lambda_0}{2\pi^3m_0^3} + \frac{18\lambda_0^3}{\pi^2m_0^2} \right], \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$g = \frac{U_{\text{eff}}^{(6)}(0)}{6!} = g_0 + h \left(\frac{9\lambda_0^3}{\pi m_0^3} - \frac{45g_0\lambda_0}{2\pi m_0} \right) + h^2 \left(-\frac{675g_0^2\Lambda_0}{4\pi^3m_0} + \frac{675g_0^2}{8\pi^2} + \frac{675g_0^2}{\pi^4} - \frac{75Ag_0^2}{\pi^2} + \frac{75g_0^2}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m_0}{\Lambda_0} + \frac{270g_0\lambda_0^2\Lambda_0}{\pi^3m_0^3} + \frac{225g_0\lambda_0^2}{\pi^2m_0^2} - \frac{81\lambda_0^4\Lambda_0}{\pi^3m_0^5} - \frac{108\lambda_0^4}{\pi^2m_0^4} \right). \quad (\text{A.4})$$

[The symbol $O(h^3)$ that denotes higher order terms is omitted in some expressions, for brevity.]

Solving for m_0 in Eq. (A.2) and substituting in the following two equations:

$$\lambda = \lambda_0 - h \frac{3(5\pi g_0m^2 - 10g_0m\Lambda_0 + 6\pi\lambda_0^2)}{4\pi^2m} + h^2 \left[-\frac{135\Lambda_0g_0\lambda_0}{2\pi^3m} + \left(\frac{135}{4\pi^2} + \frac{315}{\pi^4} - \frac{30A}{\pi^2} \right) g_0\lambda_0 + \frac{30g_0\lambda_0}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m}{\Lambda_0} + \frac{99\lambda_0^3}{4\pi^2m^2} \right] + O(h^3), \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$g = g_0 - h \frac{9(5g_0m^2\lambda_0 - 2\lambda_0^3)}{2\pi m^3} + h^2 \left(-\frac{675g_0^2\Lambda_0}{4\pi^3m} + \frac{675g_0^2}{8\pi^2} + \frac{675g_0^2}{\pi^4} - \frac{75Ag_0^2}{\pi^2} + \frac{75g_0^2}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m}{\Lambda_0} + \frac{405g_0\lambda_0^2\Lambda_0}{2\pi^3m^3} + \frac{1035g_0\lambda_0^2}{4\pi^2m^2} - \frac{297\lambda_0^4}{2\pi^2m^4} \right) + O(h^3). \quad (\text{A.6})$$

Hence, we obtain $g(m, \lambda, g_0)$ as:

$$g = g_0 - h \frac{9(5g_0m^2\lambda - 2\lambda^3)}{2\pi m^3} + h^2 \left(\frac{675g_0^2}{\pi^4} - \frac{75Ag_0^2}{\pi^2} + \frac{75g_0^2}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m}{\Lambda_0} + \frac{1035g_0\lambda^2}{4\pi^2m^2} - \frac{27\lambda^4}{\pi^2m^4} \right) + O(h^3). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

We can also solve for m_0 , λ_0 and g_0 in Eqs. (A.2), (A.3) and (A.4):

$$m_0^2 = m^2 + h \frac{3(\pi m\lambda - 2\lambda\Lambda_0)}{\pi^2} + h^2 \left[\frac{45g\Lambda_0^2}{2\pi^4} - \frac{45gm\Lambda_0}{2\pi^3} - \frac{27\lambda^2\Lambda_0}{\pi^3m} + \left(\frac{27}{2\pi^2} - \frac{36}{\pi^4} + \frac{6A}{\pi^2} \right) \lambda^2 - \frac{6\lambda^2}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m}{\Lambda_0} + \left(\frac{45}{8\pi^2} - \frac{45}{\pi^4} \right) gm^2 \right], \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$\lambda_0 = \lambda + h \frac{3(5\pi gm^2 - 10gm\Lambda_0 + 6\pi\lambda^2)}{4\pi^2m} + h^2 \left(-\frac{675\Lambda_0g\lambda}{4\pi^3m} + \frac{675g\lambda}{8\pi^2} - \frac{315g\lambda}{\pi^4} + \frac{30Ag\lambda}{\pi^2} - \frac{30g\lambda}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m}{\Lambda_0} + \frac{135\Lambda_0\lambda^3}{2\pi^3m^3} - \frac{18\lambda^3}{\pi^2m^2} \right), \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$g_0 = g + h \frac{9(5gm^2\lambda - 2\lambda^3)}{2\pi m^3} + h^2 \left(-\frac{675g^2}{\pi^4} + \frac{75Ag^2}{\pi^2} - \frac{75g^2}{\pi^2} \log \frac{m}{\Lambda_0} + \frac{495g\lambda^2}{2\pi^2 m^2} - \frac{351\lambda^4}{2\pi^2 m^4} \right). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

Replacing these bare constants in U_{clas} and substituting in Eq. (A.1), we can derive the renormalized expansion of U_{eff} to $O(h^2)$, in which the limit $\Lambda_0 \rightarrow \infty$ obtains a universal potential. Eqs. (A.8) and (A.9) are also useful to derive Eqs. (30) and (31), by replacing in Eqs. (A.8) and (A.9) the function $g(m, \lambda, 0)$, as given by Eq. (A.7) [only needed to $O(h)$].

-
- [1] K.G. Wilson and J. Kogut, Phys. Rept. 12C, 75 (1974).
 - [2] F.J. Wegner and A. Houghton, Phys. Rev. A 8, 401 (1973).
 - [3] J. Polchinski, Nucl. Phys. B231, 269 (1984).
 - [4] A. Hasenfratz and P. Hasenfratz, Nucl. Phys. B270, 687 (1986).
 - [5] T. Morris, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A9, 2411 (1994).
 - [6] J. Berges, N. Tetradis, C. Wetterich, Phys. Rep. 363, 223 (2002).
 - [7] O.J. Rosten, Physics Reports 511, 177–272 (2012).
 - [8] C. Itzykson and J.B. Zuber, *Quantum Field Theory*, McGraw-Hill, New York (1980)
 - [9] E.S. Swanson, AIP Conf. Proc. 1296, 1, 75–121 (2010). arXiv:1008.4337.
 - [10] J.F. Nicoll, T.S. Chang, and H.E. Stanley, Phys. Rev. A 13, 1251 (1976).
 - [11] V.I. Tokar, Phys. Lett. A 104, 135 (1984).
 - [12] T.R. Morris, Phys. Lett. B 329, 241 (1994).
 - [13] T.R. Morris, Phys. Lett. B 334, 355 (1994).
 - [14] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, *Statistical Physics, Part 1*, 3rd ed.; Pergamon Press: Oxford, UK (1980).
 - [15] J.R. Shepard, V. Dmitrasinović and J. A. McNeil, Phys. Rev. D 51, 7017 (1995).
 - [16] M.M. Tsypin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 2015 (1994).
 - [17] C. Bagnuls, C. Bervillier, D.I. Meiron and B.G. Nickel, Phys. Rev. B 35, 3585 (1987).
 - [18] E.J. Halfkann and V. Dohm, Z. Phys. B 89, 79 (1992).
 - [19] A.I. Sokolov, V.A. Ul'kov and E.V. Orlov, Journal of Physical Studies 1, 362–365 (1997). cond-mat/9803352.
 - [20] R. Guida, J. Zinn-Justin, Nucl. Phys. B 489 [FS], 626–652 (1997).

- [21] J. Zinn-Justin, *Physics Reports* 344, 159–178 (2001).
- [22] A. Pelissetto and E. Vicari, *Physics Reports* 368, 549–727 (2002).
- [23] A.I. Sokolov, A. Kudlis, M.A. Nikitina, *Nuclear Physics B* 921, 225–235 (2017).
- [24] T.R. Morris, *Nucl. Phys. B* 495, 477–504 (1997).
- [25] P. Pfeuty, G. Toulouse, *Introduction to the renormalization group and critical phenomena*, London: John Wiley & Sons Ltd (1977).
- [26] I.D. Lawrie and S. Sarbach, Theory of Tricritical Points, in *Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena*, vol 9, ed C Domb and J L Lebowitz, New York: Academic Press (1984).
- [27] A. Codello, M. Safari, G.P. Vacca, and O. Zanusso, *Journal of High Energy Physics*, Vol. 2017, Issue 4, article id.127 (2017).
- [28] A. Codello, M. Safari, G.P. Vacca, and O. Zanusso, *Eur. Phys. J. C* 78, 30 (2018).
- [29] J. O’Dwyer and H. Osborn, *Annals of Physics* 323, 1859–1898 (2008).
- [30] M.Q. Huber and J. Braun, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 183, 1290–1320 (2012).
- [31] G. Parisi, *Statistical Field Theory*, Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, (1988).
- [32] J. Zinn-Justin, *Quantum Field Theory and Critical Phenomena*, 4th edition, Clarendon, Oxford (2002).
- [33] D.J. Amit, *Field Theory, the Renormalization Group, and Critical Phenomena*, Second Edition, World Scientific, Singapore (1997).
- [34] M.J. Stephen, E. Abrahams and J.P. Straley, *Phys. Rev.* B12, 256 (1975).
- [35] C.A. Aragão de Carvalho, *Nuclear Physics B* 119, 401–412 (1977).
- [36] A.I. Sokolov, *Sov. Phys. JETP* 50, 802 (1979).
- [37] D.G.C. McKeon and G. Tsoupros, *Phys. Rev.* D46, 1794 (1992). *Erratum:* *Phys. Rev.* D49, 3065 (1994).
- [38] G.J. Huish and D.J. Toms, *Phys. Rev.* D49, 6767 (1994).
- [39] G.J. Huish, *Phys. Rev.* D51, 938 (1995).
- [40] J.S. Hager, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* 35, 2703–2711 (2002).
- [41] J. Honerkamp, *Nucl. Phys. B* 36, 130–140 (1972).