

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION TO JHEP

MARCH 15, 2022

Electroweak renormalization based on gauge-invariant vacuum expectation values of non-linear Higgs representations:

1. Standard Model

Stefan Dittmaier¹, Heidi Rzehak²

¹*Albert-Ludwigs-Universität Freiburg, Physikalisches Institut, 79104 Freiburg, Germany*

²*University of Tübingen, Institute for Theoretical Physics, 72076 Tübingen, Germany*

E-mail: stefan.dittmaier@physik.uni-freiburg.de,
heidi.rzehak@itp.uni-tuebingen.de

ABSTRACT: The renormalization of vacuum expectation value parameters, such as v in the Standard Model (SM), is an important ingredient in electroweak renormalization, where this issue is connected to the treatment of tadpoles. Tadpole counterterms can be generated in two different ways in the Lagrangian: in the course of parameter renormalization, or alternatively via Higgs field redefinitions. The former typically leads to small corrections originating from tadpoles, but in general suffers from gauge dependences if $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization conditions are used for mass parameters. The latter is free from gauge dependences, but is prone to very large corrections in $\overline{\text{MS}}$ schemes, jeopardizing perturbative stability in predictions. In this paper we propose a new scheme for tadpole renormalization, dubbed *Gauge-Invariant Vacuum expectation value Scheme (GIVS)*, which is a hybrid scheme of the two mentioned types, with the benefits of being gauge independent and perturbatively stable. The GIVS is based on the gauge-invariance property of Higgs fields, and the corresponding parameters like v , in non-linear representations of Higgs multiplets. We demonstrate the perturbative stability of the GIVS in the SM by discussing the conversion between on-shell and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalized masses.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Linear and non-linear Higgs representations of the Standard Model	3
2.1	Kinetic Higgs Lagrangian	4
2.2	Higgs potential and tadpoles	7
3	Gauge-invariant vacuum expectation value renormalization	10
3.1	Schemes for tadpole and vacuum expectation value renormalization	10
3.2	Relation between on-shell and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalized masses in the SM	15
4	Conclusions	17
A	The GIVS in the background-field method	19

1 Introduction

After roughly one decade of data taking, very many analyses carried out by the LHC collaborations ATLAS and CMS in fact produce precision measurements of cross sections and model parameters at a level where electroweak (EW) corrections play an important role. In the calculation of EW corrections, the procedure of renormalization is of crucial importance, involving issues like the choice of renormalization scheme and input parameters. Electroweak renormalization was worked out in the 1970–90s in various variants [1–7] and meanwhile is a standard procedure in modern next-to-leading order (NLO) calculations (see, e.g., the review [8] for details and further original references).

In some EW renormalization schemes, details of the parametrizations of vacuum expectation values (vevs) of Higgs fields play a role in higher-order calculations, in others they do not. Technically, these details concern the treatment of tadpole diagrams or sub-diagrams, which have only one external leg and can be interpreted as contributions to vevs of the corresponding external field. In on-shell (OS) renormalization schemes, for instance, all renormalized model parameters are directly related to physical observables, so that in predictions for other observables all tadpole contributions cancel between loop diagrams and counterterms. In renormalization schemes, however, in which not all mass parameters are tied to physical observables, such as in schemes with $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized mass parameters, the treatment of tadpole contributions has an impact on the parametrization of predicted observables in terms of renormalized parameters and on the running behaviour of the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ masses. An analogous statement also applies to models with extended Higgs sectors in which Higgs mixing angles may be renormalized with $\overline{\text{MS}}$ conditions.

In the literature two completely different types of tadpole treatments are in use. Both types fully absorb explicit tadpole diagrams upon introducing a tadpole counterterm $\delta\mathcal{L}_{\delta t} = \delta t h$ in the Lagrangian for each Higgs field component $\phi(x) = v + h(x)$ that might acquire a non-vanishing vev v . This means δt is adjusted in such a way that the vev of h vanishes, $\langle 0|h(x)|0\rangle = 0$. The *explicit* tadpole terms absorbed by δt are redistributed to counterterms of other couplings as *implicit* tadpole contributions. In the two variants for the tadpole treatment, however, the tadpole counterterms $\delta\mathcal{L}_{\delta t}$ are generated in a very different way. One possibility is to include the renormalization constant δt in the parameter renormalization transformation which expresses bare parameters in terms of renormalized parameters, as, e.g., done in Refs. [4, 6]. We call this scheme *Parameter Renormalized Tadpole Scheme (PRTS)* in the following. The renormalized parameter v quantifying the Higgs vev then corresponds to the value of ϕ in the minimum of the renormalized (corrected) Higgs potential. This scheme, however, has the unpleasant feature that δt , which is gauge dependent in general, enters the relations between bare parameters of the Higgs potential, and this results in a potentially gauge-dependent parametrization of predicted observables if $\overline{\text{MS}}$ masses or Higgs mixing angles are used (see discussions in Refs. [9–11]).

The second possibility to introduce $\delta\mathcal{L}_{\delta t}$ is the *Fleischer–Jegerlehner Tadpole Scheme (FJTS)* as introduced in Ref. [12],¹ where the field $h(x)$ is redefined by a transformation $h(x) \rightarrow h(x) + \Delta v$ with a constant Δv in the bare Lagrangian. This transformation is only a change in parametrization of the functional integral of the generating functional of Green functions and does not change any physical prediction. Choosing the constant $\Delta v = -\delta t/M_h^2$, with M_h denoting the mass of the corresponding Higgs boson, implies $\langle 0|h(x)|0\rangle = 0$ as demanded. The FJTS redistributes the tadpole corrections to other counterterms without changing the parametrization of observables at all, i.e. the scheme produces the same result as if just including all explicit tadpole diagrams wherever they appear. In other words, in this scheme the perturbative expansion of $\phi(x)$ proceeds about the bare value of v , which is related to the minimum of the bare Higgs potential, not the corrected one. On the upside, the FJTS does not introduce gauge dependences in the parametrization of predictions, but by experience issues with perturbative stability potentially exist if OS conditions for masses are not used entirely. Comparing corrections to observables calculated within renormalization schemes with $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass parameters that differ only by using the PRTS or FJTS, the differences reflect the additional correction Δv required in the FJTS to shift the expansion point of ϕ to the renormalized value of v . These additional corrections appearing in the FJTS can be very large and jeopardize the perturbative stability of predictions. In the SM, for instance, the differences between OS- and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized masses are unnaturally large [14]. For the top-quark mass this difference is of the order of 10 GeV and thus of similar size as the QCD correction (see Refs. [14–16] and references therein). In models with $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized mixing angles in extended Higgs sectors such as the Two-Higgs Doublet Model, the FJTS is very prone to huge corrections in extreme parameter scenarios, as discussed in Refs. [9–11, 17, 18].

¹This scheme is equivalent to the β_t scheme of Ref. [13].

In this paper, we propose a new tadpole scheme, dubbed *Gauge-Invariant Vacuum expectation value Scheme (GIVS)*, which aims at unifying the good features of the PRTS and FJTS. It is designed to expand Higgs fields about the corrected minimum of the effective Higgs potential, so that no additional corrections arise from correcting the expansion point. We, thus, expect that the GIVS produces only moderate corrections in predictions, very similar to the PRTS and in contrast to the FJTS. This expectation is confirmed in the explicit phenomenological example discussed below. To avoid any gauge dependences in tadpole contributions, the construction of the GIVS makes use of non-linear parametrizations of the Higgs fields [19, 20]. In these non-linear representations CP-even neutral components of Higgs multiplets—and thus also their potential constant contributions—are gauge invariant, and the Higgs potentials are completely free of would-be Goldstone-boson fields, so that tadpole renormalization constants become gauge independent. Simply using these tadpole counterterms in actual calculations based on linear Higgs representations, would not lead to a full compensation of explicit tadpole diagrams. This mismatch can be resolved upon generating a second type of tadpole counterterm by field shifts as in the FJTS, so that all explicit tadpole diagrams are cancelled by the sum of the two types of tadpole counterterms, which renders the GIVS a hybrid scheme. We formulate the GIVS for the SM and demonstrate its perturbative stability by evaluating the differences between OS- and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized masses of SM particles. In a forthcoming publication we will apply the GIVS to non-standard Higgs sectors, e.g., with additional singlet or doublet scalar fields.

The article is organized as follows: In Section 2 we describe the non-linear Higgs representation of the SM in detail, including the calculation of the tadpole constants in the linear and non-linear representations. Moreover, we generally show the gauge independence of tadpoles in the non-linear representation there. The formulation of the GIVS as well as the application to the conversion of masses between OS and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ definitions are presented in Section 3. Our conclusions are given in Section 4, and the appendix briefly describes the application of the GIVS within the background-field method.

2 Linear and non-linear Higgs representations of the Standard Model

In this section, we introduce the linear and non-linear Higgs representations for the SM. All parameters and fields are considered as “bare” in this section, i.e. the renormalization transformation for introducing renormalized quantities and renormalization constants, including the choice of the tadpole scheme, will be the next step after this section. In the formulation of the SM in the linear Higgs representation and the definition of field-theoretical quantities we consistently follow the notation and conventions of Ref. [8]. The transition to the non-linear Higgs representation uses Refs. [19–22] as guideline.

2.1 Kinetic Higgs Lagrangian

Most commonly, the SM Higgs doublet is introduced as a complex two-component field Φ with charge conjugate $\Phi^c = i\sigma_2\Phi^*$, where σ_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) are denoting the Pauli matrices in the following. In the conventions of Ref. [8], Φ and Φ^c are parametrized according to

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + \eta + i\chi) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi^c = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + \eta - i\chi) \\ -\phi^- \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

with the complex would-be Goldstone-boson fields ϕ^+ , $\phi^- = (\phi^+)^*$, the real would-be Goldstone-boson field χ , the physical Higgs field η (called H in Ref. [8]), and the constant v parametrizing the vev of the Higgs doublet. For the transition from the linear to the non-linear Higgs representation it is convenient to first switch to the (2×2) matrix notation for the Higgs doublet

$$\mathbf{\Phi} \equiv (\Phi^c, \Phi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[(v + \eta)\mathbb{1} + 2i\boldsymbol{\phi}], \quad \boldsymbol{\phi} \equiv \frac{\phi_j\sigma_j}{2} = \frac{\vec{\phi} \cdot \vec{\sigma}}{2}, \quad (2.2)$$

with the 2×2 unit matrix $\mathbb{1}$ and ϕ_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) are the three real would-be Goldstone-boson degrees of freedom in a more generic notation. Note that we use summation convention over the Goldstone index j , which is sometimes replaced by a vector-like notation $\vec{\phi} = (\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3)^T$, $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \sigma_3)^T$, etc., and boldface characters like $\boldsymbol{\phi}$ to indicate matrix structures. The new field components ϕ_j can be identified according to

$$\phi^\pm = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\phi_2 \pm i\phi_1), \quad \chi = -\phi_3. \quad (2.3)$$

The complex square $\Phi^\dagger\Phi$ of the Higgs doublet Φ , which is the field combination entering the Higgs potential, translates into the trace of $\mathbf{\Phi}^\dagger\mathbf{\Phi}$,

$$\Phi^\dagger\Phi = \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}[\mathbf{\Phi}^\dagger\mathbf{\Phi}] = \phi^+\phi^- + \frac{1}{2}[(v + \eta)^2 + \chi^2]. \quad (2.4)$$

The matrix field $\mathbf{\Phi}$ can be parametrized in the non-linear form

$$\mathbf{\Phi} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + h)U(\boldsymbol{\zeta}), \quad U(\boldsymbol{\zeta}) \equiv \exp\left(\frac{2i\boldsymbol{\zeta}}{v}\right), \quad \boldsymbol{\zeta} \equiv \frac{\zeta_j\sigma_j}{2}, \quad (2.5)$$

in which h corresponds to the physical Higgs field and $\vec{\zeta} = (\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)^T$ to real would-be Goldstone-boson components. Since the matrix $U(\boldsymbol{\zeta})$ is unitary, the square of the Higgs field does not involve would-be Goldstone-boson fields ζ_j ,

$$\text{tr}[\mathbf{\Phi}^\dagger\mathbf{\Phi}] = (v + h)^2, \quad (2.6)$$

so that the Higgs potential does not involve ζ_j either. Making use of the shorthands

$$s_\zeta \equiv \sin\left(\frac{\zeta}{v}\right), \quad c_\zeta \equiv \cos\left(\frac{\zeta}{v}\right), \quad \zeta \equiv |\vec{\zeta}| = (\vec{\zeta}^2)^{1/2}, \quad (2.7)$$

the relations between the component fields of the two representations are explicitly given by [20]

$$\begin{aligned}\eta &= c_\zeta(v+h) - v = h - \frac{\zeta^2}{2v} \left(1 + \frac{h}{v}\right) + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^4), \\ \vec{\phi} &= \frac{s_\zeta}{\zeta}(v+h)\vec{\zeta} = \left(1 + \frac{h}{v}\right)\vec{\zeta} + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3),\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

where the expansions in the second equalities neglect terms that are of higher order in the Goldstone fields ζ_j . Our conventions are such that $(\eta, \vec{\phi})$ and $(h, \vec{\zeta})$ agree up to higher powers in the Goldstone fields. The Higgs doublet and its charge conjugate carry weak hypercharges $Y_{w,\Phi} = +1$ and $Y_{w,\Phi^c} = -1$, respectively, so that the matrix field Φ transforms under $SU(2)_w \times U(1)_Y$ gauge transformations as [20]

$$\Phi \rightarrow S(\theta) \Phi S_Y(\theta_Y) \tag{2.9}$$

with the transformation matrices

$$S(\theta) = \exp(ig_2\theta), \quad S_Y(\theta_Y) = \exp\left(\frac{i}{2}g_1\theta_Y\sigma_3\right), \quad \theta \equiv \frac{\theta_j\sigma_j}{2}, \tag{2.10}$$

where g_2 and g_1 are the $SU(2)_w$ and the $U(1)_Y$ gauge coupling constants, respectively, and $\vec{\theta} = (\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3)^T$ and θ_Y the corresponding gauge parameters. For the field h and the matrix $U(\zeta)$, Eq. (2.9) implies

$$h \rightarrow h, \quad U(\zeta) \rightarrow S(\theta) U(\zeta) S_Y(\theta_Y). \tag{2.11}$$

Hence, the Higgs field h is invariant under gauge transformations while the fields ζ_j change under gauge transformations in a non-trivial way. Note also that the parameter v , which quantifies the Higgs vev, is directly associated to the gauge-invariant component h , in contrast to the linear parametrization, where the constant v is attributed to the field component η , which is not gauge invariant.

In the non-linear representation the Lagrangian for the kinetic terms of the Higgs and Goldstone fields is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{H,\text{kin}} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left[(D_\mu \Phi)^\dagger (D^\mu \Phi) \right], \tag{2.12}$$

where D_μ is the covariant derivative acting in matrix notation as

$$D^\mu \Phi = \partial^\mu \Phi - ig_2 \mathbf{W}^\mu \Phi - ig_1 \Phi B^\mu \frac{\sigma_3}{2}, \quad \mathbf{W}^\mu \equiv \frac{W_j^\mu \sigma_j}{2}, \tag{2.13}$$

with the matrix-valued $SU(2)_w$ gauge field \mathbf{W}^μ and the $U(1)_Y$ gauge field B^μ . For later purposes, it is very convenient to define the following combination of gauge fields,

$$\mathbf{C}^\mu \equiv \mathbf{W}^\mu + \frac{g_1}{g_2} B^\mu \frac{\sigma_3}{2}, \quad \vec{C}^\mu = \left(W_1^\mu, W_2^\mu, \frac{Z^\mu}{c_w} \right)^T, \tag{2.14}$$

with Z^μ denoting the Z-boson field and $c_w = \cos \theta_w$ the cosine of the weak mixing angle θ_w . Inserting the non-linear representation (2.5) of Φ into $\mathcal{L}_{\text{H,kin}}$, terms with arbitrary powers of Goldstone fields ζ_j emerge. This complicated structure becomes rather transparent after introducing the matrix fields

$$\mathbf{W}_\mu^{(u)} \equiv U(\zeta)^\dagger \mathbf{W}_\mu U(\zeta) + \frac{i}{g_2} U(\zeta)^\dagger \partial_\mu U(\zeta), \quad \mathbf{C}_\mu^{(u)} \equiv \mathbf{W}_\mu^{(u)} + \frac{g_1}{g_2} B_\mu \frac{\sigma_3}{2}, \quad (2.15)$$

which absorb the complete ζ dependence of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{H,kin}}$,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{H,kin}} &= \frac{1}{4} \text{tr} \left[\left(\partial_\mu h + i g_2 \mathbf{C}_\mu^{(u)} (v + h) \right) \left(\partial^\mu h - i g_2 \mathbf{C}^{(u),\mu} (v + h) \right) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (\partial h)^2 + \frac{g_2^2}{8} (v + h)^2 \vec{C}_\mu^{(u)} \cdot \vec{C}^{(u),\mu}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.16)$$

The field $\mathbf{W}_\mu^{(u)}$ is identical with the gauge field \mathbf{W}_μ in the unitary gauge after performing the corresponding field transformation in the full Lagrangian [19, 20]. The full dependence of $\mathcal{L}_{\text{H,kin}}$ on the Goldstone fields can be easily derived from the components of the matrix fields $\mathbf{W}_\mu^{(u)}$ and $\mathbf{C}_\mu^{(u)}$, which are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{W}_\mu^{(u)} &= \vec{W}_\mu + \vec{G}_\mu, \quad \vec{C}_\mu^{(u)} = \vec{C}_\mu + \vec{G}_\mu, \\ \vec{G}_\mu &= -\frac{2s_\zeta c_\zeta}{g_2 \zeta} \partial_\mu \vec{\zeta} + \frac{2}{g_2} \left(\frac{v s_\zeta c_\zeta}{\zeta} - 1 \right) \frac{(\vec{\zeta} \cdot \partial_\mu \vec{\zeta})}{v \zeta} \frac{\vec{\zeta}}{\zeta} - \frac{2s_\zeta^2}{g_2 \zeta^2} \vec{\zeta} \times \partial_\mu \vec{\zeta} \\ &\quad - \frac{2s_\zeta^2}{\zeta^2} \left[\zeta^2 \vec{W}_\mu - (\vec{W}_\mu \cdot \vec{\zeta}) \vec{\zeta} \right] - \frac{2s_\zeta c_\zeta}{\zeta} \vec{W}_\mu \times \vec{\zeta} \\ &= -\frac{2}{g_2 v} \partial_\mu \vec{\zeta} - \frac{2}{g_2 v^2} \vec{\zeta} \times \partial_\mu \vec{\zeta} - \frac{2}{v^2} \left[\zeta^2 \vec{W}_\mu - (\vec{W}_\mu \cdot \vec{\zeta}) \vec{\zeta} \right] - \frac{2}{v} \vec{W}_\mu \times \vec{\zeta} \\ &\quad + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3), \end{aligned} \quad (2.17)$$

where \times denotes the usual cross product of 3-dimensional vectors. Accordingly, an expression for $\vec{C}_\mu^{(u)} \cdot \vec{C}^{(u),\mu}$ in Eq. (2.16) can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{C}_\mu^{(u)} \cdot \vec{C}^{(u),\mu} &= \vec{C}_\mu \cdot \vec{C}^\mu - \frac{4c_\zeta s_\zeta}{g_2 \zeta} (\vec{C}_\mu \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\zeta}) + \frac{4}{g_2} \left(\frac{v c_\zeta s_\zeta}{\zeta} - 1 \right) \frac{(\vec{\zeta} \cdot \vec{C}_\mu)(\vec{\zeta} \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\zeta})}{v \zeta^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{4s_\zeta^2}{g_2 \zeta^2} (\vec{C}_\mu - 2\vec{W}_\mu) \cdot (\vec{\zeta} \times \partial^\mu \vec{\zeta}) \\ &\quad + \frac{4g_1 s_\zeta^2}{g_2 \zeta^2} B_\mu \left[-W_3^\mu \zeta^2 + (\vec{W}^\mu \cdot \vec{\zeta}) \zeta_3 \right] - \frac{4c_\zeta s_\zeta}{\zeta} \vec{C}_\mu \cdot (\vec{W}^\mu \times \vec{\zeta}) \\ &\quad + \frac{4s_\zeta^2}{g_2^2 \zeta^2} (\partial_\mu \vec{\zeta}) \cdot (\partial^\mu \vec{\zeta}) - \frac{4}{g_2^2} \left(\frac{v^2 s_\zeta^2}{\zeta^2} - 1 \right) \frac{(\vec{\zeta} \cdot \partial_\mu \vec{\zeta})(\vec{\zeta} \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\zeta})}{v^2 \zeta^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (2.18)$$

To facilitate the derivation of Feynman rules, it is convenient to insert the expanded version of $\vec{C}_\mu^{(u)}$ into $\mathcal{L}_{\text{H,kin}}$ up to the desired order in ζ_j fields. Up to quadratic order in ζ_j , the Higgs kinetic Lagrangian reads

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{H,kin}} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial h)^2 + \frac{(v + h)^2}{2v^2} \left\{ (\partial_\mu \vec{\zeta}) \cdot (\partial^\mu \vec{\zeta}) + \frac{g_2^2 v^2}{4} \vec{C}_\mu \cdot \vec{C}^\mu \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + g_1 g_2 B_\mu \left[-W_3^\mu \zeta^2 + (\vec{W}^\mu \cdot \vec{\zeta}) \zeta_3 \right] - g_2^2 v \vec{C}_\mu \cdot (\vec{W}^\mu \times \vec{\zeta}) \\
& - g_2 v \vec{C}_\mu \cdot \partial^\mu \vec{\zeta} - g_2 (\vec{C}_\mu - 2\vec{W}_\mu) \cdot (\vec{\zeta} \times \partial^\mu \vec{\zeta}) \Big\} + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^3). \tag{2.19}
\end{aligned}$$

The gauge-fixing Lagrangian for the non-linear representation is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{gf}} = & -\frac{1}{2\xi_A} (\partial_\mu A^\mu)^2 - \frac{1}{2\xi_A} (\partial_\mu Z^\mu + \xi_Z M_Z \zeta_3)^2 \\ & - \frac{1}{\xi_W} (\partial_\mu W^{+\mu} - i\xi_W M_W \zeta^+) (\partial_\mu W^{-\mu} + i\xi_W M_W \zeta^-) \end{aligned} \quad (2.20)$$

with $\zeta^\pm = (\zeta_2 \pm i\zeta_1)/\sqrt{2}$, the fields $W_\mu^\pm = (W_{1,\mu} \mp iW_{2,\mu})/\sqrt{2}$ corresponding to the W^\pm bosons, and A_μ being the photon field. The parameters ξ_a ($a = A, Z, W$) are the usual arbitrary gauge parameters, and M_V ($V=Z, W$) the Z - and W -boson masses.

2.2 Higgs potential and tadpoles

The complex Higgs doublet field Φ undergoes self-interactions as described by the Higgs potential

$$V = -\mu_2^2(\Phi^\dagger\Phi) + \frac{\lambda_2}{4}(\Phi^\dagger\Phi)^2, \quad (2.21)$$

with μ_2^2 and λ_2 being real, positive free parameters.² In the linear Higgs representation, the potential V involves would-be Goldstone-boson fields which is not the case in the non-linear representation, where it reads

$$V = -\frac{\mu_2^2}{2} \text{tr}[\Phi^\dagger \Phi] + \frac{\lambda_2}{16} (\text{tr}[\Phi^\dagger \Phi])^2 = -\frac{\mu_2^2}{2} (v+h)^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{16} (v+h)^4. \quad (2.22)$$

In lowest order, the vev parameter v is chosen such that the field configurations $\eta \equiv 0$ and $h \equiv 0$ correspond to the classical minimum of V , so that no terms linear in η or h remain in V .

Beyond lowest order, however, loop corrections induce non-vanishing contributions T^η and T_{nl}^h to the one-point vertex functions Γ^η and Γ_{nl}^h , known as *tadpole constants*. To prevent any confusion w.r.t. to the two types of Higgs representations, we mark vertex functions Γ^\cdots and tadpole contributions T^\cdots in the non-linear representation by a suffix “nl” throughout. For later purposes, we compute and compare these one-loop tadpole contributions T^η and T_{nl}^h of the physical Higgs fields η and h of the linear and non-linear representations, respectively. In the linear representation Γ^η is given by

[illegible]

²In order to avoid a clash of notation with the reference mass scale μ of dimensional regularization, we denote the parameters in the potential μ_2^2 and λ_2 , with the “2” hinting on the Higgs doublet.

$$+ 2M_W^2 [3A_0(M_W^2) - 2M_W^2] + \frac{1}{2}M_H^2 A_0(\xi_Z M_Z^2) + M_H^2 A_0(\xi_W M_W^2) \Big\}, \quad (2.23)$$

with M_H denoting the Higgs-boson mass and m_f the mass of the fermion f , which has colour multiplicity N_f^c . The field label u generically stands for Faddeev–Popov ghost fields. Here we made use of the scalar one-point one-loop integral in $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$ dimensions,

$$A_0(m^2) = \frac{(2\pi\mu)^{4-D}}{i\pi^2} \int d^D q \frac{1}{q^2 - m^2 + i0} = m^2 \left[\Delta + \ln \left(\frac{\mu^2}{m^2} \right) + 1 \right] + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \quad (2.24)$$

with the arbitrary reference mass μ and the standard UV divergence

$$\Delta = \frac{2}{4-D} + \ln 4\pi - \gamma_E, \quad (2.25)$$

in which γ_E denotes the Euler–Mascheroni constant. In the non-linear representation Γ_{nl}^h is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{nl}^h &= T_{nl}^h = \text{(diagram: dashed line connected to a solid circle)} \\
&= -h \cdot \text{(diagram: dashed loop)} + h \cdot \text{(diagram: circular loop with arrow labeled } f) + h \cdot \text{(diagram: wavy loop labeled } V) + h \cdot \text{(diagram: dashed loop labeled } \zeta) \\
&= \frac{1}{16\pi^2 v} \left\{ \frac{3}{2} M_H^2 A_0(M_H^2) - 4 \sum_f N_f^c m_f^2 A_0(m_f^2) + M_Z^2 [3A_0(M_Z^2) - 2M_Z^2] \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2M_W^2 [3A_0(M_W^2) - 2M_W^2] \right\}.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.26}$$

Note that no ghost loops contribute to the tadpole T_{nl}^h in the non-linear representation, because the field h does not couple to ghost fields, since Goldstone fields ζ_j and the gauge-invariant Higgs field h do not mix under gauge transformations. As already anticipated in the introduction, the gauge invariance of h in the non-linear representation has the consequence that the corresponding tadpole contribution T_{nl}^h is gauge independent, while T^η is not. For later convenience, we introduce the parameter

$$\Delta v_\xi = \frac{T^\eta - T_{\text{nl}}^h}{M_{\text{H}}^2} = \frac{1}{16\pi^2 v} \left\{ \frac{1}{2} A_0(\xi_Z M_Z^2) + A_0(\xi_W M_W^2) \right\}, \quad (2.27)$$

quantifying the gauge-dependent difference between the tadpole parameters in the linear and non-linear Higgs representations. It is interesting to note that Δv_ξ vanishes in the Landau gauge, where all $\xi_a = 0$. This is due to the fact that the Goldstone-boson modes are massless in Landau gauge, so that the corresponding one-loop tadpole diagrams lead to vanishing scaleless integrals in dimensional regularization. We do not necessarily expect that an analogous statement holds beyond the one-loop level.

We conclude this section by considering the gauge dependences of the tadpole functions Γ^η and Γ_{nl}^h from a more general point of view, in particular in order to get an idea about a possible generalization beyond the one-loop level. The gauge-parameter dependences

we can see that Eq. (2.31) is consistent with the ξ dependence of Eq. (2.23). Finally, applying Eq. (2.28) to the tadpole function Γ_{nl}^h of the non-linear Higgs representation, we immediately get the all-order result

$$\partial_{\xi_a} \Gamma_{\text{nl}}^h = 0 \quad (2.34)$$

for all gauge parameters ξ_a , because the BRST variation of the gauge-invariant fields h vanishes. The proven gauge independence of the tadpole function Γ_{nl}^h is a crucial requirement for a possible generalization of the GIVS beyond one loop.

3 Gauge-invariant vacuum expectation value renormalization

3.1 Schemes for tadpole and vacuum expectation value renormalization

Before formulating our new proposal for handling tadpole contributions, the GIVS, we first recapitulate the FJTS and PRTS variants for treating tadpoles in the linear Higgs representation in the SM. The following description of the FJTS and the PRTS is fully equivalent to the one given in Sect. 3.1.6 of Ref. [8], although we have switched to a notation for the renormalization in the Higgs sector that is closer to the treatment of extended Higgs sectors described in Refs. [17, 18], in order to prepare the generalization of the GIVS beyond the SM. All aspects of the renormalization procedure not spelled out explicitly below, are exactly as described in Ref. [8].

We start out by considering the Higgs potential V , as defined in (2.21), and denote bare parameters by subscripts “0” and bare fields by subscripts “B” in the following. The classical ground-state configuration Φ_0 minimizes V , so that

$$\Phi_0^\dagger \Phi_0 = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} [\Phi_0^\dagger \Phi_0] = \frac{2\mu_{2,0}^2}{\lambda_{2,0}}. \quad (3.1)$$

We separate the ground-state configuration $\Phi_0 = (0, v_0/\sqrt{2})^T$ from the bare Higgs doublet Φ_B by introducing a *bare vev parameter* v_0 , the precise definition of which is specific to the chosen tadpole scheme as described below,³

$$\Phi_B = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_B^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_0 + \eta_B + i\chi_B) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.2)$$

Higher-order corrections contain tadpole diagrams, i.e. Feynman diagrams containing subdiagrams of the form given in Eq. (2.23). The vertex functions, defined via a Legendre transformation from the connected Green functions, involve such tadpole contributions if the splitting $v_0 + \eta_B(x)$ of the physical Higgs field does not provide an expansion of the effective Higgs potential about its true minimum (see for instance App. C of Ref. [11]). Technically, it is desirable to organize the perturbative bookkeeping by appropriate parameter and field definitions and renormalization in such a way that the occurrence of tadpole contributions

³The parameter v_0 introduced here plays the same role as the parameter \bar{v} introduced in Sect. 3.1.6 of Ref. [8]. In turn, the parameter v_0 defined in Eq. (122) of Ref. [8] coincides with the parameter v_0 introduced here only in the FJTS, but not in the PRTS.

is widely suppressed. Choosing v_0 such that $v_0^2 = 4\mu_{2,0}^2/\lambda_{2,0}$ at least to leading order avoids tadpole contributions at tree level. We will always assume this in the following. In higher orders, the explicit (unrenormalized) tadpole contribution T^η of (2.23) can be cancelled upon generating a tadpole counterterm $\delta t \eta$ in the counterterm Lagrangian $\delta\mathcal{L}$. This is achieved by a tadpole renormalization condition for the renormalized one-point function Γ_R^η (in momentum space) of the physical Higgs field,

$$\Gamma_R^\eta = T^\eta + \delta t \stackrel{!}{=} 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \delta t = -T^\eta. \quad (3.3)$$

The tadpole counterterm is generated by appropriately choosing v_0 and, if needed, by a further redefinition of the bare Higgs field η_B . Inserting the field decomposition (3.2) into the bare Lagrangian \mathcal{L} , produces a term $t_0 \eta$ in \mathcal{L} with

$$t_0 = \frac{1}{4}v_0 (4\mu_{2,0}^2 - \lambda_{2,0}v_0^2) \quad (3.4)$$

at the one-loop level, where t_0 can be viewed as *bare tadpole constant*. The tadpoles described below impose different conditions on t_0 , partially accompanied by appropriate field redefinitions of η_B , in order to generate the desired tadpole counterterm $\delta t h$ in the counterterm Lagrangian $\delta\mathcal{L}$.

Fleischer–Jegerlehner tadpole scheme (FJTS) [12]:

In the FJTS the bare tadpole constant is consistently set to zero,

$$t_0 = 0, \quad v_0 = 2\sqrt{\frac{\mu_{2,0}^2}{\lambda_{2,0}}}, \quad (3.5)$$

so that no tadpole counterterm is introduced via parameter redefinitions, and the bare Higgs-boson mass is fixed by

$$M_{H,0}^2 = 2\mu_{2,0}^2. \quad (3.6)$$

Instead, the tadpole counterterm is introduced by an additional field redefinition

$$\eta_B \rightarrow \eta_B + \Delta v^{\text{FJTS}} \quad (3.7)$$

in the bare Lagrangian. This substitution leads to the term $-M_{H,0}^2 \Delta v^{\text{FJTS}} h$ in the bare Lagrangian, where $M_{H,0}$ is the bare Higgs-boson mass. Adjusting the constant Δv^{FJTS} according to

$$\Delta v^{\text{FJTS}} = -\frac{\delta t^{\text{FJTS}}}{M_H^2} = \frac{T^\eta}{M_H^2}, \quad (3.8)$$

the explicit one-loop tadpole diagrams quantified by T^η cancel against the tadpole renormalization constant $\delta t^{\text{FJTS}} = -M_H^2 \Delta v^{\text{FJTS}}$, as required in Eq. (3.3). The field shift (3.7) distributes tadpole renormalization constants to many counterterms in $\delta\mathcal{L}$. Each term of \mathcal{L} containing a Higgs field η_B produces such a counterterm upon replacing the η leg in the Feynman rule by a factor Δv^{FJTS} (see, e.g., App. A of Ref. [8]).

Since the field shift (3.7) is a mere reparametrization of the functional integral over the Higgs field, as long as all parameter renormalization constants are kept fixed, this shift does not influence any physical observable, but only redistributes terms in the calculation of observables. Setting $\Delta v^{\text{FJTS}} = 0$ would be possible without changing any prediction; the only difference in this variant is that explicit tadpole diagrams are not cancelled by counterterms and have to be included in the calculation of corrections to observables. This consideration, in particular, makes clear that in the FJTS tadpole contributions correct for the fact that the effective Higgs potential is not expanded about the location of its minimum, but about the minimum of the potential in lowest order, which in the course of renormalization receives further corrections. For this reason, renormalization constants to mass parameters receive tadpole corrections in the FJTS, which are rather large by experience. In OS renormalization schemes these corrections cancel in predictions, because these tadpole corrections systematically cancel between self-energies and mass counterterms, but in other renormalization schemes such as $\overline{\text{MS}}$ schemes this cancellation is only partial, and large corrections typically remain.

On the positive side, the FJTS respects the gauge-invariance requirement mentioned above. To see this, recall that physical observables are always parametrized in a gauge-independent way in terms of the original bare parameters of the theory, i.e. in terms of $\mu_{2,0}^2$ and $\lambda_{2,0}$ in the Higgs sector. This gauge independence is neither disturbed by the gauge-independent reparametrization in terms of the parameters v_0 and $M_{\text{H},0}$ from Eqs. (3.5) and (3.6), nor by any pure field shift such as the one provided by (3.7) even though Δv^{FJTS} is gauge dependent. Finally, the gauge independence of the parametrization of an observable in terms of v_0 and $M_{\text{H},0}$ carries over to the renormalized version of these parameters if the corresponding renormalization constants do not introduce gauge dependences, which is for instance the case in OS and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ schemes in the FJTS.

Parameter-renormalized tadpole scheme (PRTS) [6]:

The idea behind the PRTS is to achieve an expansion of the Higgs field about the true minimum of the renormalized effective Higgs potential (as obtained from the effective action after renormalization) by appropriate relations among the parameters of the theory. To this end, the bare parameter⁴

$$v_0 = v + \delta v \tag{3.9}$$

is renormalized in such a way that the renormalized parameter v is fixed by the renormalized parameters M_{W} and $g_2 = e/s_{\text{w}}$, which are directly related to measured values,

$$v = \frac{2M_{\text{W}}}{g_2} = \frac{2M_{\text{W}}s_{\text{w}}}{e}, \tag{3.10}$$

⁴The parameter v_0 of this paper is identical with the parameters $\bar{v} = v$ introduced in the PRTS formulation of Sect. 3.1.6. (b) of Ref. [8], i.e. the meaning of the parameter v of this paper is different from v in Ref. [8]. In this paper $v = 2M_{\text{W}}s_{\text{w}}/e$ is a shorthand for a combination of measured quantities, while in Sect. 3.1.6. (b) of Ref. [8] v is a gauge-dependent, UV-divergent auxiliary quantity.

where $s_w = \sin \theta_w$ is the sinus of the weak mixing angle θ_w and e the electric unit charge. The corresponding renormalization constant

$$\frac{\delta v}{v} = -\delta Z_e + \frac{\delta s_w}{s_w} + \frac{\delta M_W^2}{2M_W^2}, \quad (3.11)$$

is, thus, directly fixed by the renormalization conditions on e , M_W , and $s_w^2 = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$. In order to guarantee the compensation of all tadpole contributions after renormalization, the bare tadpole constant t_0 given in Eq. (3.4) is split into a renormalized value t^{PRTS} and a corresponding renormalization constant δt^{PRTS} ,

$$t_0 = t^{\text{PRTS}} + \delta t^{\text{PRTS}}, \quad (3.12)$$

and demanding $t^{\text{PRTS}} = 0$. On the l.h.s. of Eq. (3.4), this simply replaces t_0 by δt^{PRTS} , on the r.h.s. the bare parameter v_0 is inserted according to Eq. (3.9); this leads to

$$\delta t^{\text{PRTS}} = v_0 \left(\mu_{2,0}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{2,0} v_0^2 \right) = v \left(\mu_{2,0}^2 - \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{2,0} v^2 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{2,0} v \delta v \right), \quad (3.13)$$

where the second equality holds in one-loop approximation. Since the renormalized parameter v , which is directly fixed by measurements, and the original bare parameters $\mu_{2,0}^2$ and $\lambda_{2,0}$ are gauge independent, the gauge dependence of δt^{PRTS} goes over to δv , where it shows up as gauge dependence in the mass renormalization constant δM_W^2 .

In the renormalization procedure, the two bare parameters $\mu_{2,0}^2$ and $\lambda_{2,0}$ of the Higgs sector are tied to two renormalized parameters, for which we take v as specified above and the Higgs-boson mass M_H . The link to M_H is provided by the squared bare Higgs mass $M_{H,0}^2 = M_H^2 + \delta M_H^2$, where M_H is fixed by experiment and the renormalization constant δM_H^2 by a renormalization condition. The bare Higgs-boson mass $M_{H,0}$ is related to the bare parameters according to

$$M_{H,0}^2 = -\mu_{2,0}^2 + \frac{3}{4} \lambda_{2,0} v_0^2 = -\mu_{2,0}^2 + \frac{3}{4} \lambda_{2,0} v^2 + \frac{3}{2} \lambda_{2,0} v \delta v, \quad (3.14)$$

where again Eq. (3.9) was used in the last equality. From Eqs. (3.13) and (3.14), we see that the PRTS tadpole renormalization constant δt^{PRTS} can also be introduced by the replacements [8, 10]

$$\lambda_{2,0} \rightarrow \lambda_{2,0} + 2 \frac{\delta t^{\text{PRTS}}}{v^3}, \quad \mu_{2,0}^2 \rightarrow \mu_{2,0}^2 + \frac{3}{2} \frac{\delta t^{\text{PRTS}}}{v} \quad (3.15)$$

in the bare Lagrangian with $t_0 = 0$. As a result of the described procedure, some vertex counterterms receive contributions from δt^{PRTS} ; the corresponding counterterm Feynman rules can, e.g., be found in App. A of Ref. [8].

As mentioned before, these gauge dependences of the PRTS fully drop out in predictions based on OS-renormalized parameters. If $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized mass parameters are used as input, the gauge dependence of δt^{PRTS} enters the parametrization of observables in the step where $\mu_{2,0}^2$ and $\lambda_{2,0}$ are traded for v_0 and $M_{H,0}$ via Eqs. (3.13) and (3.14). However, these gauge dependences do not invalidate the applicability of the PRTS. In spite of the gauge

dependences, consistent predictions can either be produced upon fixing a gauge once and for all, or by translating measured input parameters between different gauge choices. By experience, the PRTS has the practical advantage over the FJTS that contributions to mass renormalization constants are much smaller, which, in particular, implies that conversions of renormalized mass parameters between OS and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization schemes are typically much smaller in the PRTS as compared to the FJTS (see also Section 3.2).

Gauge-Invariant Vacuum expectation value Scheme (GIVS):

The aim in the new proposal of this paper is to unify the benefits of the FJTS and the PRTS: the gauge-invariance property of the former and the perturbative stability of the latter. To avoid potentially large corrections induced by tadpole loops as inherent in the FJTS, we tie the vev of the Higgs field to the “true” minimum of the effective Higgs potential, i.e. to the Higgs potential expressed in terms of renormalized parameters, as done in the PRTS. The gauge dependences in the PRTS result from the fact that the location of the minimum of the renormalized effective Higgs potential, quantified by the parameter v , is translated into a condition $v_0 = v + \delta v$ for the non-gauge-invariant component $v_0 + \eta_B(x)$ of the Higgs doublet Φ (2.1) in the linear Higgs representation.

This problem is avoided by switching to the non-linear Higgs representation (2.5) where the condition $v_0 = v + \delta v$ applies to the gauge-invariant component $v_0 + h_B(x)$, a fact that gives the GIVS its name. In detail, we fix the tadpole counterterm by

$$\delta t_{\text{nl}}^{\text{PRTS}} = -T_{\text{nl}}^h, \quad (3.16)$$

where the tadpole contribution T_{nl}^h results from the one-point function of the h field in the non-linear Higgs representation, $\Gamma_{\text{nl}}^h = T_{\text{nl}}^h$. Generating now tadpole counterterms from the bare Lagrangian according to Eq. (3.15) with $\delta t_{\text{nl}}^{\text{PRTS}}$ instead of δt^{PRTS} , this procedure is just the application of the PRTS in the non-linear representation. Note, however, that $\delta t_{\text{nl}}^{\text{PRTS}}$ is a gauge-independent constant, so that the PRTS in the non-linear Higgs representation does not suffer from gauge dependences. This procedure already fully defines the GIVS in the non-linear representation, but almost all explicit calculations of EW corrections are carried out in the linear Higgs representation.

The GIVS is defined in the linear Higgs representation in such a way that the effect of tadpole renormalization is exactly the same as in the non-linear representation. This means that we set

$$\delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}} \equiv \delta t_{\text{nl}}^{\text{PRTS}} = -T_{\text{nl}}^h, \quad (3.17)$$

which is the (gauge-independent) part of the tadpole renormalization that goes into relation (3.13) between bare parameters. The tadpole counterterms proportional to δt_1^{GIVS} are exactly the ones as generated in the PRTS according to Eq. (3.15) with δt^{PRTS} replaced by δt_1^{GIVS} . Since, however, $T_{\text{nl}}^h \neq T^\eta$, these tadpole counterterms are not sufficient to cancel all explicit tadpole diagrams, which go with T^η in the linear representation. We achieve the complete cancellation of explicit tadpole diagrams upon generating additional tadpole

counterterms as in the FJTS by a field shift $\eta_B \rightarrow \eta_B + \Delta v^{\text{GIVS}}$ in the bare Lagrangian with $\delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}} = -M_{\text{H}}^2 \Delta v^{\text{GIVS}}$ and demand

$$\begin{aligned} \delta t^{\text{GIVS}} &= \delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}} + \delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}} \stackrel{!}{=} -T^\eta. \\ \Rightarrow \delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}} &= -M_{\text{H}}^2 \Delta v^{\text{GIVS}} = T_{\text{nl}}^h - T^\eta = -M_{\text{H}}^2 \Delta v_\xi, \quad \text{i.e.} \quad \Delta v^{\text{GIVS}} = \Delta v_\xi, \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

with Δv_ξ representing the gauge-dependent quantity defined in (2.27). The constant δt_2^{GIVS} is gauge dependent, but does not have any effect on physical observables, analogously to its role in the FJTS.

To summarize, the GIVS is a hybrid version of the PRTS and the FJTS with two types of tadpole counterterms: the ones connected to $\delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}} = v_0(\mu_{2,0}^2 - \lambda_{2,0}v_0^2/4)$ as δt^{PRTS} in the PRTS and the ones connected to Δv^{GIVS} in the same way as Δv^{FJTS} in the FJTS. The GIVS tadpole counterterms are generated from the bare Lagrangian with $t_0 = 0$ by the substitutions

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{2,0} &\rightarrow \lambda_{2,0} + \frac{2}{v^3} \delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}}, & \mu_{2,0}^2 &\rightarrow \mu_{2,0}^2 + \frac{3}{2v} \delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}}, \\ \eta_B &\rightarrow \eta_B - \delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}}/M_{\text{H}}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

which combines the substitutions (3.7) and (3.15) of the FJTS and PRTS, respectively. Alternatively, with the tadpole counterterms of the FJTS and the PRTS already generated, the generation of the one-loop GIVS tadpole counterterms is easily accomplished by the substitutions

$$\delta t^{\text{PRTS}} \rightarrow \delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}}, \quad \delta t^{\text{FJTS}} \rightarrow \delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}}. \quad (3.20)$$

These substitutions can, e.g., be directly applied to the SM Feynman rules given in App. A of Ref. [8]. If both δt^{PRTS} and δt^{FJTS} contribute to a counterterm vertex, in which case simply δt is written in those Feynman rules, the full GIVS tadpole constant δt^{GIVS} has to be taken,

$$\delta t \rightarrow \delta t^{\text{GIVS}} = \delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}} + \delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}} = -T^\eta. \quad (3.21)$$

This is, in particular, the case for the counterterm in the Higgs one-point function Γ_{R}^η , which receives the counterterm $\delta t = -T^\eta$ so that $\Gamma_{\text{R}}^\eta = 0$ as demanded.

3.2 Relation between on-shell and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalized masses in the SM

In order to compare the different tadpole renormalization schemes, we consider the relation between $\overline{\text{MS}}$ and OS renormalized masses, \overline{M} and M^{OS} , respectively. The link between \overline{M} and M^{OS} is provided by the bare mass parameter M_0 , which is split into a renormalized mass and a corresponding mass renormalization constant $\delta \overline{M}$ or δM^{OS} in the two schemes,

$$M_0 = M^{\text{OS}} + \delta M^{\text{OS}} = \overline{M} + \delta \overline{M}. \quad (3.22)$$

Taking into account that the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization constant $\delta \overline{M}$ only consists of the UV-divergent contributions proportional to the standard UV divergence Δ defined in Eq. (2.25), the mass difference $\Delta M^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}}$ is given by

$$\Delta M^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}} = \overline{M} - M^{\text{OS}} = \delta M^{\text{OS}} - \delta \overline{M} = \delta M^{\text{OS}}|_{\text{finite}}, \quad (3.23)$$

where the suffix “finite” means that Δ is set to zero. The mass difference, thus, can be calculated from the OS mass renormalization constant δM^{OS} upon setting the UV-divergent constant Δ to zero and specifying a value for the scale μ which now plays the role of a renormalization scale. For expressing the OS constants δM^{OS} in terms of self-energy functions $\Sigma(p^2)$ at on-shell points $p^2 = (M^{\text{OS}})^2$, we follow the notation and conventions of Ref. [8] where self-energies $\Sigma(p^2)$ do not only include the contribution $\Sigma_{\text{1PI}}(p^2)$ from one-particle irreducible (1PI) diagrams, but also all explicit tadpole loops and tadpole counterterms (see Eq. (141) in Ref. [8]). Omitting the superscript “OS” for on-shell masses throughout, we obtain at the one-loop level

$$\Delta m_f^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{Re} \Sigma_{\text{1PI}}^{ff,r}(m_f^2) + \text{Re} \Sigma_{\text{1PI}}^{ff,l}(m_f^2) + m_f \left[\text{Re} \Sigma_{\text{1PI}}^{ff,L}(m_f^2) + \text{Re} \Sigma_{\text{1PI}}^{ff,R}(m_f^2) \right] - 2m_f \frac{\Delta v}{v} \right]_{\text{finite}}, \quad (3.24)$$

$$\Delta M_V^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}} = \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{Re} \Sigma_{\text{T,1PI}}^{VV}(M_V^2)}{M_V} - M_V \frac{\Delta v}{v} \right]_{\text{finite}} \quad V = \text{Z, W}, \quad (3.25)$$

$$\Delta M_{\text{H}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}} = \left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{\text{Re} \Sigma_{\text{1PI}}^{\eta\eta}(M_{\text{H}}^2)}{M_{\text{H}}} - \frac{3}{2} M_{\text{H}} \frac{\Delta v}{v} \right]_{\text{finite}}. \quad (3.26)$$

Explicit expression for self-energy functions can, e.g., be found in Ref. [6].⁵ The sum of all tadpole contributions (explicit loop diagrams and renormalization constants) is contained in the Δv term, which is chosen according to the applied tadpole scheme,

$$\Delta v^{\text{FJTS}} = \frac{T^\eta}{M_{\text{H}}^2}, \quad \Delta v^{\text{PRTS}} = 0, \quad \Delta v^{\text{GIVS}} = \frac{T^\eta - T_{\text{nl}}^h}{M_{\text{H}}^2} = \Delta v_\xi. \quad (3.27)$$

In Tab. 1, we list the numerical values for $\Delta M_{\text{EW}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}}$ according to Eqs. (3.24)–(3.26) for the heaviest particles in the SM, where the subscript “EW” indicates that we only include EW (one-loop) corrections. The masses entering in $\Delta M_{\text{EW}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}}$ are chosen according to the OS mass values given in Tab. 1, and the inverse of the fine-structure constant is chosen as $\alpha_{\text{em}}^{-1} = 137.0359997$. All other masses, i.e. the fermion masses of the first and second generations, are set to zero. The conversion is calculated at the renormalization scale of the corresponding OS mass, $\mu = M^{\text{OS}}$ and for the gauge-dependent PRTS the ‘t Hooft–Feynman gauge ($\xi_a = 1$) is chosen, as mostly done in practice. For the FJTS, we compared to the numerical value of the top-quark mass shift given in Ref. [14] and find agreement. The values obtained in the PRTS and the GIVS are of comparable size while in general the FJTS leads to larger differences between the OS and the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ masses. An exception is the conversion of the Z-boson mass, for which all three tadpole schemes produce mass shifts of the moderate size that is naively expected from EW corrections. As emphasized in the literature [14–16] for the top quark before, the FJTS shift $\Delta m_{t,\text{EW}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}} = 10.75 \text{ GeV}$ in the conversion of fermion masses is much larger than the typical size of EW corrections of the percent level. For the lighter fermions b and τ , the relative corrections $\Delta M_{\text{EW}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}}/M^{\text{OS}}$ are

⁵In Ref. [6] the functions Σ_{1PI} are simply called Σ , the scalar parts of the fermion self-energies are combined to $\Sigma^{ff,S} = \Sigma^{ff,r} + \Sigma^{ff,l}$, and the Higgs self-energy $\Sigma_{\text{1PI}}^{\eta\eta}$ is denoted Σ^{H} .

	$M^{\text{OS}}[\text{GeV}]$	$\Delta M_{\text{EW}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}}[\text{GeV}]$		
		FJTS	PRTS	GIVS
W boson	80.379	-2.22	0.82	0.74
Z boson	91.1876	-0.77	1.25	1.14
Higgs boson	125.1	6.34	3.16	2.80
top quark	172.4	10.75	0.99	0.54
bottom quark	4.93	-1.79	0.10	0.13
τ lepton	1.77686	-0.93	-0.028	-0.015

Table 1: On-shell masses M^{OS} of the heaviest SM particles and differences $\Delta M_{\text{EW}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}}$ between the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass $\overline{M}(\mu = M^{\text{OS}})$ and M^{OS} induced by NLO EW corrections using the FJTS, PRTS, or GIVS.

even larger than for the top quark in the FJTS, reaching up to $\sim 50\%$, while the shifts in the PRTS and GIVS remain all moderate. The large corrections in the FJTS are mostly due to the top-quark loop in $\Delta v^{\text{FJTS}} = T^\eta/M_{\text{H}}^2$. Despite these large corrections, the FJTS often is favoured in the literature in this context, since it leads to a gauge-independent result in contrast to the PRTS. Note, however, that these large EW one-loop corrections entail an enhancement of the theoretical uncertainties due to missing higher-order corrections. The GIVS, on the other hand, provides gauge-independent mass shifts that are moderate and, thus, leads to smaller EW theory uncertainties, when those uncertainties are estimated by the propagation of the known corrections to higher order as typically done.⁶

4 Conclusions

Extensive discussions in the literature have shown that the two mostly used prescriptions for tadpole contributions in EW renormalization lead to unsatisfactory results in predictions based on $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization conditions. The tadpole prescription (called PRTS in this paper) in which relations between parameters are exploited to generate tadpole counterterms show decent perturbative stability, but suffer from gauge dependences; on the other hand, generating tadpole counterterms from Higgs field redefinitions (called FJTS) avoid gauge dependences, but potentially suffers from perturbative instabilities. The difference between the two tadpole schemes can be interpreted as different choices of vevs for the Higgs field at higher orders, i.e. the separation of the physical Higgs field into a constant contribution and field excitation is different in the two schemes. The PRTS expands about the “true” (corrected) vev, while the FJTS leads to potentially large corrections in the renormalization of mass parameters originating from the perturbative shift in the Higgs vev. In the SM, this issue concerns $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized mass parameters, in models with extended Higgs sector this concerns $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized Higgs mixing angles in addition.

⁶There is a large cancellation in the mass shift $\Delta m_{t,\text{EW}}^{\overline{\text{MS}}-\text{OS}}$ between the one-loop QCD and EW corrections in the FJTS scheme, as pointed out in Ref. [14]. Since this cancellation is, however, accidental, it does not lead to a reduction of theoretical uncertainties from missing higher orders.

Motivated by this unsatisfactory situation, we have proposed a hybrid scheme of the PRTS and FJTS variants unifying the strengths and avoiding the weaknesses of the PRTS and FJTS schemes by generating the gauge-dependent part of the tadpole counterterm *à la* FJTS, where it does not enter predictions for observables, and the potentially large gauge-independent part *à la* PRTS, where it is absorbed into parameter relations which in turn protects observables from large corrections. The new scheme is called *Gauge-Invariant Vacuum expectation value Scheme (GIVS)*, because it exploits the fact that parameters v_i determining Higgs vevs like the famous parameter v in the SM, appear as parts of truly gauge-invariant field components of Higgs multiplets Φ_i if these multiplets are represented in an appropriate non-linear fashion. These non-linear Higgs representations factorize the would-be Goldstone-boson parts from the remaining Higgs field components in such a way that gauge-invariant combinations of the fields Φ_i , such as $\Phi_i^\dagger \Phi_j$, do not involve Goldstone fields. Thus, Goldstone fields do not appear in the Higgs potential at all. The condition that determines the v_i by minimizing the effective Higgs potential does not involve Goldstone fields, resulting in gauge-independent tadpole corrections that can be absorbed into parameter relations as in the PRTS. The GIVS, thus, expands Higgs fields about the “true” minimum of the effective Higgs potential, like the PRTS, but in a representation in which the vevs acting as expansion points are gauge invariant. The hybrid character of the GIVS comes into play by fixing tadpole renormalization constants δt_i in the non-linear representation of the Higgs sector and making use of these δt_i in the linear representation where these δt_i are supplemented by FJTS-like contributions to fully cancel all explicit tadpole diagrams. We stress that actual loop calculations in the GIVS can be entirely carried out in the linear Higgs representations like for the PRTS and FJTS, once the simple tadpole constants are known, i.e. calculations in the GIVS are not more complicated than usual.

We have described the GIVS for the SM in such detail that further applications of this scheme at the one-loop level should be simple. Owing to the gauge-invariance property of the Higgs field and its one-point function in the non-linear representation, which follows from a Nielsen identity, we expect that the GIVS can be generalized to higher loop levels without major obstacles. To illustrate the perturbative stability of one-loop results based on $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization with the GIVS tadpole treatment, we have discussed the mass parameter conversion between OS and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -renormalized masses in the SM. As expected, the GIVS leads to small shifts between $\overline{\text{MS}}$ - and OS-renormalized masses, in contrast to the FJTS. In a forthcoming publication, we will apply the GIVS to a scalar singlet extension of the SM and to the Two-Higgs-Doublet Model and investigate the perturbative stability of $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalization of the Higgs mixing angles. We expect that the GIVS outperforms the FJTS in view of stability, very similar to the PRTS, but without the downside of the PRTS of leading to gauge dependences.

Acknowledgements

We thank Ansgar Denner for helpful discussions and for comments on the manuscript. H.R.’s research is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation)—project no. 442089526; 442089660.

Appendix

A The GIVS in the background-field method

In the quantization of gauge fields via the background-field method (BFM) (see, e.g., Refs. [26–28]), each field Ψ of the conventional formalism is split into a *quantum field* Ψ and a *background field* $\hat{\Psi}$. The quantum field represents the integration variable in the functional integral employed for quantization and leads to lines inside loops of Feynman diagrams in perturbative calculations; the background field acts as (classical) source in the effective action and leads to external lines and tree-like propagators in Feynman diagrams. One of the great benefits of the BFM is the gauge invariance of its effective action $\hat{\Gamma}[\hat{\Psi}]$, which is achieved by the independent gauge fixings of the quantum and background parts of the gauge fields. This property leads to QED-like Ward identities for the 1PI Green functions instead of the much more complicated Slavnov–Taylor identities in the conventional quantization formalism. These Ward identities in turn imply simplifications in the renormalization procedure, as for instance discussed in Refs. [7, 8] for the EW part of the SM. In this appendix, we briefly review the formulation of the non-linear Higgs representation in the BFM and show that the implementation of the GIVS in the BFM is fully straightforward, i.e. the benefits of BFM renormalization and the GIVS can be combined easily.

The application of the BFM to the SM in the non-linear Higgs representation is described in Refs. [21, 22]. The splitting of fields into quantum and background parts proceeds according to the usual linear splitting

$$\Psi \rightarrow \tilde{\Psi} = \Psi + \hat{\Psi} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for all fields but the would-be Goldstone-boson fields ζ_j , which are contained in the unitary matrix $U = U(\zeta)$. For these fields, the splitting proceeds multiplicatively for the matrix U according to

$$U \rightarrow \tilde{U} = \hat{U}U, \quad \tilde{U} = U(\tilde{\zeta}), \quad \hat{U} = U(\hat{\zeta}), \quad (\text{A.2})$$

so that $\tilde{\zeta} = \hat{\zeta} + \zeta + \mathcal{O}(\zeta^2)$, where $\mathcal{O}(\zeta^2)$ stands for any field monomials at least bilinear in any combination of quantum or background would-be Goldstone-boson fields. Exploiting the unitarity of \tilde{U} , the kinetic Higgs Lagrangian becomes

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{H,kin}} = \frac{1}{4} (v + \tilde{h})^2 \text{tr} \left[\left(\tilde{D}_\mu \tilde{U} \right)^\dagger \left(\tilde{D}^\mu \tilde{U} \right) \right] + \frac{1}{2} \left(\partial_\mu \tilde{h} \right) \left(\partial^\mu \tilde{h} \right), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

and the Higgs potential is again independent of the would-be Goldstone-boson fields,

$$V = -\frac{\mu_2^2}{2} (v + \tilde{h})^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{16} (v + \tilde{h})^4. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

In order to calculate 1PI Green functions, at least the gauge of the quantum gauge fields has to be fixed. The background gauge-invariance of the effective action requires a special form of the gauge fixing term. Following Refs. [21, 22], we take

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{fix}} = -\frac{1}{\xi_Q} \text{tr} \left[\left(\hat{D}_W^\mu \mathbf{W}_\mu + \frac{1}{2} \xi_Q g_2 v \hat{U} \zeta \hat{U}^\dagger \right)^2 \right] - \frac{1}{2\xi_Q} \left(\partial^\mu B_\mu + \frac{1}{2} \xi_Q g_1 v \zeta_3 \right)^2, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

with the covariant derivative in the adjoint representation defined as

$$\hat{D}_W^\mu \mathbf{X} = \partial^\mu \mathbf{X} - ig_2 [\hat{\mathbf{W}}^\mu, \mathbf{X}], \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where \mathbf{X} stands for any matrix-valued field transforming in the adjoint representation. To be in line with the BFM formulation in the linear Higgs representation [7, 8], we take a common gauge parameter ξ_Q for both the $SU(2)_w$ and $U(1)_Y$ gauge fields, although it would be possible to introduce different gauge parameters for the two group factors. The derivation of the corresponding Faddeev–Popov Lagrangian proceeds as usual, and the result involves neither h nor \hat{h} in the non-linear Higgs representation.

In the BFM, each conventional Feynman rule splits into different versions with different numbers of quantum and background fields; for the linear Higgs representation the Feynman rules are explicitly given in Refs. [7, 8]. For the calculation of 1PI Green functions (vertex functions), only Feynman rules with exactly two quantum fields are needed, corresponding to the fact that exactly two loop lines are attached to each vertex. For the formulation of the GIVS, we only need the Higgs one-point function $\Gamma_{\text{nl}}^{\hat{h}} = T_{\text{nl}}^{\hat{h}}$ in the non-linear Higgs representation, the calculation of which only requires all $\hat{h}\Psi^\dagger\Psi$ terms for the quantum fields Ψ of the Lagrangian at one loop. The intermediate steps of this calculation are straightforward and simple, so that we only quote the result that the tadpole constants in the BFM completely agree with the corresponding tadpoles of the conventional formalism after setting all gauge parameters ξ_a to ξ_Q , although the break-up into bosonic diagrammatic contributions of gauge bosons, would-be Goldstone bosons, and ghost fields is somewhat different,

$$\Gamma^{\hat{h}} = T^{\hat{h}} = T^h|_{\xi_a=\xi_Q}, \quad \Gamma_{\text{nl}}^{\hat{h}} = T_{\text{nl}}^{\hat{h}} = T_{\text{nl}}^h|_{\xi_a=\xi_Q}. \quad (\text{A.7})$$

The implementation of the GIVS in the BFM renormalization procedure works exactly as described in Section 3 for the conventional formalism. The tadpole renormalization constant δt^{GIVS} consists of the same two parts δt_1^{GIVS} and δt_2^{GIVS} as defined in Eq. (3.18). Nominally the tadpole constants $T_{(\text{nl})}^h$ have to be replaced by $T_{(\text{nl})}^{\hat{h}}$, but according to Eq. (A.7) those quantities do not change in the transition to the BFM for $\xi_a = \xi_Q$. The generation of the tadpole counterterms follows the same strategy as in the conventional formalism as well. Making use of the BFM Feynman rules given in App. A of Ref. [8], the GIVS tadpole counterterms are obtained by the substitutions $\delta t^{\text{PRTS}} \rightarrow \delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}}$, $\delta t^{\text{FJTS}} \rightarrow \delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}}$, and $\delta t \rightarrow \delta t_1^{\text{GIVS}} + \delta t_2^{\text{GIVS}}$.

References

- [1] D. A. Ross and J. C. Taylor, *Renormalization of a unified theory of weak and electromagnetic interactions*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B51** (1973) 125–144. [Erratum: *Nucl. Phys.* B58 (1973) 643].
- [2] A. Sirlin, *Radiative Corrections in the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)$ Theory: A Simple Renormalization Framework*, *Phys. Rev.* **D22** (1980) 971–981.
- [3] K.-i. Aoki, Z. Hioki, M. Konuma, R. Kawabe, and T. Muta, *Electroweak Theory: Framework of On-Shell Renormalization and Study of Higher Order Effects*, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **73** (1982) 1–225.

- [4] M. Böhm, H. Spiesberger, and W. Hollik, *On the One-Loop Renormalization of the Electroweak Standard Model and Its Application to Leptonic Processes*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **34** (1986) 687–751.
- [5] F. Jegerlehner, *Renormalizing the standard model*, in *Testing the Standard Model - TASI-90: Theoretical Advanced Study Inst. in Elementary Particle Physics, Boulder, Colorado, June 3-29, 1990*, vol. C900603, pp. 476–590, 1990.
- [6] A. Denner, *Techniques for calculation of electroweak radiative corrections at the one-loop level and results for W physics at LEP-200*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **41** (1993) 307–420, [[arXiv:0709.1075](#)].
- [7] A. Denner, G. Weiglein, and S. Dittmaier, *Application of the background field method to the electroweak standard model*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B440** (1995) 95–128, [[hep-ph/9410338](#)].
- [8] A. Denner and S. Dittmaier, *Electroweak Radiative Corrections for Collider Physics*, *Phys. Rept.* **864** (2020) 1–163, [[arXiv:1912.06823](#)].
- [9] M. Krause, R. Lorenz, M. Mühlleitner, R. Santos, and H. Ziesche, *Gauge-independent Renormalization of the 2-Higgs-Doublet Model*, *JHEP* **09** (2016) 143, [[arXiv:1605.04853](#)].
- [10] A. Denner, L. Jenniches, J.-N. Lang, and C. Sturm, *Gauge-independent \overline{MS} renormalization in the 2HDM*, *JHEP* **09** (2016) 115, [[arXiv:1607.07352](#)].
- [11] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, and J.-N. Lang, *Renormalization of mixing angles*, *JHEP* **11** (2018) 104, [[arXiv:1808.03466](#)].
- [12] J. Fleischer and F. Jegerlehner, *Radiative corrections to Higgs decays in the extended Weinberg-Salam Model*, *Phys. Rev.* **D23** (1981) 2001–2026.
- [13] S. Actis, A. Ferroglia, M. Passera, and G. Passarino, *Two-Loop Renormalization in the Standard Model. Part I: Prolegomena*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **777** (2007) 1–34, [[hep-ph/0612122](#)].
- [14] F. Jegerlehner, M. Y. Kalmykov, and B. A. Kniehl, *On the difference between the pole and the \overline{MS} masses of the top quark at the electroweak scale*, *Phys. Lett. B* **722** (2013) 123–129, [[arXiv:1212.4319](#)].
- [15] B. A. Kniehl, A. F. Pikelner, and O. L. Veretin, *Two-loop electroweak threshold corrections in the Standard Model*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **896** (2015) 19–51, [[arXiv:1503.02138](#)].
- [16] A. L. Kataev and V. S. Molokoedov, *Notes on interplay of the QCD and EW perturbative corrections to the pole-running top-quark mass ratio*, [[arXiv:2201.12073](#)].
- [17] L. Altenkamp, S. Dittmaier, and H. Rzehak, *Renormalization schemes for the Two-Higgs-Doublet Model and applications to $h \rightarrow WW/ZZ \rightarrow 4 \text{ fermions}$* , *JHEP* **09** (2017) 134, [[arXiv:1704.02645](#)].
- [18] L. Altenkamp, S. Dittmaier, and H. Rzehak, *Precision calculations for $h \rightarrow WW/ZZ \rightarrow 4 \text{ fermions}$ in the Two-Higgs-Doublet Model with Prophecy4f*, *JHEP* **03** (2018) 110, [[arXiv:1710.07598](#)].
- [19] B. W. Lee and J. Zinn-Justin, *Spontaneously Broken Gauge Symmetries Part 3: Equivalence*, *Phys. Rev. D* **5** (1972) 3155–3160.
- [20] C. Grosse-Knetter and R. Kögerler, *Unitary gauge, Stueckelberg formalism and gauge invariant models for effective lagrangians*, *Phys. Rev. D* **48** (1993) 2865–2876, [[hep-ph/9212268](#)].

- [21] S. Dittmaier and C. Grosse-Knetter, *Deriving nondecoupling effects of heavy fields from the path integral: A Heavy Higgs field in an $SU(2)$ gauge theory*, *Phys. Rev. D* **52** (1995) 7276–7293, [[hep-ph/9501285](#)].
- [22] S. Dittmaier and C. Grosse-Knetter, *Integrating out the standard Higgs field in the path integral*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **459** (1996) 497–536, [[hep-ph/9505266](#)].
- [23] H. Kluberg-Stern and J. B. Zuber, *Ward Identities and Some Clues to the Renormalization of Gauge Invariant Operators*, *Phys. Rev. D* **12** (1975) 467–481.
- [24] N. K. Nielsen, *On the Gauge Dependence of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking in Gauge Theories*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **101** (1975) 173–188.
- [25] P. Gambino and P. A. Grassi, *The Nielsen identities of the SM and the definition of mass*, *Phys. Rev. D* **62** (2000) 076002, [[hep-ph/9907254](#)].
- [26] S. Weinberg, *The quantum theory of fields. Vol. 2: Modern applications*. Cambridge University Press, 2013.
- [27] M. Böhm, A. Denner, and H. Joos, *Gauge theories of the strong and electroweak interaction*. Teubner, 2001.
- [28] M. D. Schwartz, *Quantum Field Theory and the Standard Model*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2014.