

Scaling solution for field-dependent gauge couplings in quantum gravity

C. Wetterich

*Institut für Theoretische Physik
Universität Heidelberg
Philosophenweg 16, D-69120 Heidelberg*

Quantum gravity can determine the field-dependence of gauge couplings. This prediction is based on the scaling solution of functional flow equations. For momenta below the field-dependent Planck mass the quantum scale invariant standard model emerges as an effective low energy theory. For a small non-zero value of the infrared cutoff scale the fifth-force effects of time-varying couplings or apparent violations of the equivalence principle turn out to be negligibly small for the present cosmological epoch. More sizable effects of quantum scale symmetry violation are expected during nucleosynthesis or before. The scaling solution of metric quantum gravity yields restrictions for model building, as limiting the number of scalars in grand unified theories.

The possible dependence of the electromagnetic fine structure constant on a scalar field χ has been proposed long ago [1–4]. Such a field-dependence induces a fifth force by exchange of the scalar field [5]. If the range of the interaction mediated by the “cosmon” χ is large enough and the atom-cosmon coupling not too small, the scalar-mediated fifth force becomes observable by an apparent violation of the equivalence principle [5]. Furthermore, in realistic cosmologies a change of the value of χ with cosmic time can lead to time-varying fundamental constants [6–8], for a review see ref. [9]. If the cosmon χ is associated with the scalar field responsible for dynamical dark energy or quintessence [10], the amount of time variation of fundamental couplings and the apparent violation of the equivalence principle are related [11]. Both originate from the same atom-cosmon coupling.

In view of the important experimental and observational effects to investigate apparent violations of the equivalence principle, scalar-induced fifth forces and time varying fundamental couplings, a theoretical determination or limitation of the field-dependence of fundamental couplings would be most welcome. In this note we propose that the scaling solution of quantum gravity indeed fixes the field-dependence of the gauge couplings. It fixes similarly the field-dependence of the other dimensionless couplings of the standard model of particle physics, as Yukawa couplings or the quartic Higgs coupling. The present note focuses, however, on the gauge couplings.

Scale invariant standard model

The scaling solution of quantum gravity is closely related to quantum scale symmetry [12] and we address this topic first. Scale symmetry is realized for theories that do not involve any parameters with dimension of mass or length. Scale symmetry of the classical action for the standard model coupled to gravity is achieved by replacing both the Planck mass and the Higgs boson mass by a scalar field χ [13–19],

$$S = \int_x \sqrt{g} \left\{ -\frac{\chi^2}{2} R + \frac{\lambda_H}{2} (h^\dagger h - \varepsilon \chi^2)^2 + \dots \right\}, \quad (1)$$

with h the Higgs-doublet, R the curvature scalar and \sqrt{g} the root of the determinant of the metric. The couplings λ_H and ε are dimensionless. The dots denote kinetic terms and Yukawa interactions that involve the dimensionless gauge- and Yukawa-couplings.

Due to quantum fluctuations the dimensionless couplings become running couplings. The solution of the flow equations for these couplings introduces mass scales as the renormalization scale μ or the confinement scale Λ_{QCD} in quantum chromodynamics (QCD). If these mass scales are intrinsic parameters, the quantum effects violate scale symmetry. An example is the running electromagnetic coupling in quantum electrodynamics (QED) for electrons coupled to photons. The running gauge coupling is reflected in the gauge invariant quantum effective action by a gauge invariant kinetic term

$$\Gamma_F = \frac{1}{4} \int_x \sqrt{g} F_{\mu\nu} Z (-\partial^2) F^{\mu\nu}, \quad F_{\mu\nu} = \partial_\mu A_\nu - \partial_\nu A_\mu, \quad (2)$$

with $\partial^2 = \partial^\mu \partial_\mu$. In one loop order one has the approximate form

$$Z = \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha_0} - \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \ln \left(\frac{-\partial^2 + 4m_e^2}{4m_e^2} \right), \quad (3)$$

with α_0 the fine structure constant as measured with experiments for which the relevant length scales are much larger than m_e^{-1} .

In the presence of scale symmetry the electron mass is field-dependent,

$$m_e = y_e h_0 = y_e \sqrt{\varepsilon} \chi = h_e \chi, \quad (4)$$

with h_0 the expectation value of the neutral component of the Higgs doublet. Inserting eq. (4) into eq. (3) no intrinsic scale appears in Z . The effective action (2) is compatible with quantum scale symmetry.

The running of the gauge coupling appears in the coupling of A_μ to the electrons, which involves the gauge covariant derivative D_μ . Eq. (2) uses a normalization of the gauge field for which the covariant derivative $D_\mu = \partial_\mu - iA_\mu$ does not directly involve the gauge coupling. Rescaling the

gauge field by $A_\mu \rightarrow Z^{-1/2}A_\mu$ shifts the gauge coupling g to the covariant derivative, and one infers a momentum dependent gauge coupling ($-\partial^2 \rightarrow q^2$)

$$g^2(q) = Z^{-1}(q) . \quad (5)$$

For $q^2 \gg 4m_e^2$ it obeys the usual flow equation

$$q^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial q^2} g^2 = -Z^{-2} q^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial q^2} Z = \frac{g^4}{12\pi^2} , \quad (6)$$

while for $q^2 \ll 4m_e^2$ the flow stops. We could also define the gauge coupling at some arbitrary renormalization scale μ , with $g^2(\mu) = \bar{g}^2$ taking a fixed value. Consistency with the scale invariant expression (3,4) requires that μ is proportional to χ .

For QCD we may again define the gauge coupling by $g^2(\mu) = \bar{g}^2$. The quantum scale invariant standard model [10, 20] requires $\mu \sim \chi$. In this case the confinement scale where $g^2(q)$ diverges or turns to non-perturbatively large values is proportional to χ

$$\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = \eta_{\text{QCD}} \chi . \quad (7)$$

With similar procedures for all dimensionless couplings no parameter with dimension of mass or length is present in the quantum effective action. This realizes the quantum scale invariant standard model. All mass scales are dynamical, given by the value of the cosmon field χ .

In turn, the dimensionless couplings have to be field-dependent – g^2 depends both on q^2 and on χ^2 . Being dimensionless, it is a function of the ratio q^2/χ^2 . Only for this specific χ -dependence of the dimensionless couplings quantum scale symmetry becomes an exact global symmetry in the presence of quantum fluctuations. For any non-zero value of χ this global scale symmetry or dilatation symmetry is broken spontaneously. One then predicts an exactly massless Goldstone boson. For couplings depending only on q^2/χ^2 the renormalization flow with momentum (at fixed χ) is directly linked to the field-dependence of the coupling and therefore to possible apparent violations of the equivalence principle or to time-varying fundamental constants.

We observe that quantum scale symmetry does not fix the parameter ε in eq. (1) and therefore is not related to the gauge hierarchy problem. A possible understanding of the naturalness of the tiny value of ε in terms of an additional ‘‘particle scale symmetry’’ at fixed effective Planck mass is proposed in refs. [21–23]. This is not the subject of the present work.

Can one get the scale invariant standard model from some consistent quantum field theory that remains valid up to arbitrarily short distances? It has been proposed to employ χ as an effective ultraviolet cutoff [10, 20, 24]. This is valid as long as $q^2 \ll \chi^2$, and indeed leads to the quantum scale invariant model. A complete quantum field theory has also to cover the range $q^2 > \chi^2$, however, for which the interpretation of χ as an effective ultraviolet cutoff is no longer valid. If the present value of χ is associated to the Planck mass M , this momentum range concerns transplanckian physics. Similarly, one wants to understand the

field-dependence of couplings for the whole range of χ from zero to infinity. This is particularly relevant for crossover cosmologies for which χ starts from zero in the infinite past and reaches infinity in the infinite future [25–27].

Scaling solution in quantum gravity

A direct way of obtaining the quantum scale invariant standard model is the scaling solution of quantum gravity. The formulation of quantum gravity as a consistent quantum field theory, which remains valid for all distance scales, requires the existence of an ultraviolet fixed point. Quantum gravity formulated in terms of the metric can be either asymptotically safe [28–33] or asymptotically free [34–37]. The non-perturbative properties of such a fixed point and the flow towards realistic values can be dealt with by functional renormalization for the effective average action [38]. This approach introduces an infrared cutoff scale k such that only fluctuations with momenta $q^2 > k^2$ are included for the computation of the effective action. Instead of a finite number of couplings one follows the flow of whole functions of fields, which amounts to infinitely many couplings. In particular, the existence of an ultraviolet fixed point requires that the functional flow equations admit a scaling solution for which all dimensionless couplings as the gauge coupling depend only on dimensionless ratios as

$$\tilde{\rho} = \frac{\chi^2}{k^2} , \quad \tilde{q}^2 = \frac{q^2}{\chi^2} , \quad (8)$$

without an additional explicit dependence on k .

If for $k \rightarrow 0$ the gauge coupling $g^2(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{q}^2)$ reaches a fixed function $g_*^2(\tilde{q}^2)$, any dependence on the scale k disappears. This results in dimensionless momentum-dependent and field-dependent couplings, as for eq. (3) for QED,

$$g^{-2}(\tilde{q}^2) = \frac{1}{4\pi\alpha_0} - \frac{1}{12\pi^2} \ln \left(\frac{\tilde{q}^2 + 4h_e^2}{4h_e^2} \right) , \quad (9)$$

or for QCD with $\tilde{g}^2 = g^2(q^2 = \chi^2)$ and N_f flavors of massless quarks

$$g^{-2}(\tilde{q}^2) = \frac{1}{\tilde{g}^2} + \frac{B_F}{2} \ln(\tilde{q}^2) , \quad (10)$$

$$B_F = \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left(33 - \frac{8N_f}{3} \right) .$$

The confinement scale can be identified with the momentum for which the one-loop approximation to the running gauge coupling diverges

$$\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2 = \chi^2 \exp \left(-\frac{2}{B_F \tilde{g}^2} \right) , \quad (11)$$

realizing eq. (7). We conclude that the limit $k \rightarrow 0$ of the scaling solution realizes the quantum scale invariant standard model.

Running couplings

Within functional renormalization the flow equations for the k -dependence of coupling functions $g^2(q^2, \chi^2, k^2)$ are evaluated at fixed q^2 and χ^2

$$\partial_t g^{-2} = k \partial_k g^{-2} \Big|_{\chi^2, \tilde{q}^2} = \beta_{g^{-2}} . \quad (12)$$

For small g^2 and k sufficiently below the Planck mass M the β -function for QED can be approximated by the one-loop expression

$$\beta_{g^{-2}} = B_F l \left(\frac{q^2}{k^2}, \frac{m_e^2}{k^2} \right), \quad B_F = -\frac{1}{6\pi^2}. \quad (13)$$

The ‘‘threshold function’’ l accounts for the stop of the flow for $k^2 \ll q^2$ or $k^2 \ll m_e^2$, since both q^2 and m_e^2 constitute effective infrared cutoffs such that the additional cutoff $\sim k^2$ no longer matters. We may approximate this decoupling of ‘‘heavy modes’’ from the flow by

$$l = \frac{k^2}{k^2 + m_e^2 + q^2/4}. \quad (14)$$

The solution

$$g^{-2} = g_0^{-2} + \frac{B_F}{2} \ln \left(\frac{k^2 + m_e^2 + q^2/4}{m_e^2} \right) \quad (15)$$

recovers eq. (3) for $k \rightarrow 0$. It is one of the advantages of functional renormalization that threshold functions as l are produced automatically and extend directly to χ -dependent masses as $m_e = h_e \chi$.

In the standard model the electron mass cuts the flow of all couplings except for non-renormalizable couplings involving neutrinos. As a result, there is only a negligibly tiny difference between the limit $k \rightarrow 0$ and some small finite value, say $k^2 \approx 10^{-3} \text{eV}$. Rather realistic cosmology for both inflation and dynamical dark energy obtains for a value of k in the 10^{-3}eV range [27]. We will take in the following this finite value. Since k is the only scale appearing in the scaling solution its value is actually arbitrary, defining the mass units. Only the dimensionless ratio $\tilde{\rho} = \chi^2/k^2$ matters. Our units are chosen such that for a present ratio $\tilde{\rho} = 10^{60}$ one has $\chi = 2.44 \cdot 10^{18} \text{GeV}$. In runaway cosmologies with ever increasing $\tilde{\rho}$ the huge value of $\tilde{\rho}$ is simply an effect of the large age of the universe in Planck units.

From the flow equation (12) at fixed χ we can switch to the equivalent equation at fixed $\tilde{\rho}$

$$(\partial_t - 2\tilde{\rho}\partial_{\tilde{\rho}})g^{-2}|_{\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{q}^2} = \beta_{g^{-2}}. \quad (16)$$

The condition for the scaling solution is that the explicit k -dependence at fixed $\tilde{\rho}$ vanishes. In the following we mainly consider the limit $\tilde{q}^2 \rightarrow 0$. The scaling solution for the field-dependent coupling $g^2(\tilde{\rho})$ has therefore to obey the non-linear differential equation

$$\tilde{\rho}\partial_{\tilde{\rho}}g^{-2}(\tilde{\rho}) = -\frac{1}{2}\beta_{g^{-2}}. \quad (17)$$

Similar ‘‘scaling equations’’ have to be obeyed for a large coupled system of coupling functions. As common for such systems of differential equations only few solutions may exist for the whole range $0 \leq \tilde{\rho} < \infty$. Fundamental scale invariance [39] postulates that the world is described precisely by a scaling solution, with all relevant parameters for a flow away from the scaling solution set to zero. The requirement of existence of the scaling solution can make

this concept highly predictive. We may alternatively consider a scenario where the first substantial flow away from the scaling solution would occur at some scale k_0 . There will be not much difference to the exact scaling solution if we set for the latter $k = k_0$.

Time variation of couplings and fifth force

With χ -dependent particle masses as $m_e = h_e \chi$ and a χ -dependent Planck mass $M = \chi$ one may expect the presence of a fifth force mediated by cosmon exchange. The issue for observational consequences is more subtle, however, since the mass ratio $m_e/M = h_e$ is independent of χ . For a discussion of observations it is best to make a Weyl transformation to the Einstein frame. In the Einstein frame the Planck mass $M = \bar{M}$ is a constant which is introduced only by the variable transformation of the metric $g'_{\mu\nu} = (\chi^2/\bar{M}^2)g_{\mu\nu}$. Also the particle masses are constant if the fields for fermions are scaled correspondingly, $m_e = h_e \bar{M}$, $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}} = \eta_{\text{QCD}} \bar{M}$. Dimensionless couplings as h_e or g remain invariant under a Weyl scaling. The ratio \tilde{q}^2 does not change its value and is given in the Einstein frame by $\tilde{q}^2 = q_E^2/\bar{M}^2$. (Note $q_E^2 = q_\mu q_\nu g'^{\mu\nu} = (\bar{M}^2/\chi^2)q^2 = \bar{M}^2 \tilde{q}^2$.) Writing eq. (15) in the form

$$\begin{aligned} g^{-2} &= g_0^{-2} + \frac{B_F}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{1}{h_e^2 \tilde{\rho}} + \frac{\tilde{q}^2}{4h_e^2} \right) \\ &= g_0^{-2} + \frac{B_F}{2} \ln \left(1 + \frac{\bar{M}^2 k^2}{m_e^2 \chi^2} + \frac{q_E^2}{4m_e^2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

a dependence on χ remains only for $k \neq 0$. (The second equation uses the fixed value $m_e = h_e \bar{M}$.) For a present value of χ equal to \bar{M} the cosmon coupling to atoms is suppressed by a tiny factor $k^2/m_e^2 \approx 10^{-17}$. In earlier epochs of cosmology, when $\tilde{\rho}$ assumed smaller values, the time variation of g^2 with varying $\tilde{\rho}$ and the corresponding fifth force are more substantial. This happens for $\tilde{\rho} < h_e^{-2}$ [27].

Ultraviolet completion and quantum gravity

So far we have assumed the existence of the scaling solution for $\tilde{\rho} > \tilde{\rho}_c$, with $\tilde{\rho}_c \gg 1$ such that the metric fluctuations in quantum gravity can be neglected. The question is what happens for $\tilde{\rho} < \tilde{\rho}_c$? The answer needs an extension of the flow equation to quantum gravity. Functional renormalization has found for the flow of the gauge coupling without a scalar field a gravity-induced anomalous dimension B_g [40–48] see also [49–54],

$$\partial_t g^2 = -B_g g^2 - B_F g^4, \quad (19)$$

with

$$B_g = 2C_g \frac{k^2}{M^2(k)} = \frac{C_g}{w}, \quad w = \frac{M^2(k)}{2k^2}. \quad (20)$$

More details will be presented in later parts of this note. For the UV-fixed point w approaches a constant w_* and therefore B_g becomes constant. On the other

hand, the gravitational contribution decreases rapidly for $k^2 \ll M^2(k)$.

The flow equation (19) is easily extended to the presence of a scalar field by having M^2 depending on χ^2 and on k . A typical form of the scaling solution for w is given by [55–57]

$$w = w_0 + \frac{1}{2}\tilde{\rho}, \quad (21)$$

where we have taken a normalization of the scalar field such that for $\chi \rightarrow \infty$ one has $M^2 = \chi^2$. The scaling solution for the gauge coupling has therefore to obey

$$\tilde{\rho}\partial_{\tilde{\rho}}g^2 = \frac{C_g g^2}{2w_0 + \tilde{\rho}} + \frac{B_F g^4}{2}. \quad (22)$$

The UV-limit corresponds to $\tilde{\rho} \rightarrow 0$, or $k \rightarrow \infty$ at fixed χ . For the UV-completion of the scaling solution we therefore need to consider the region where $\tilde{\rho}$ can be neglected in the denominator of the first term in eq. (22). For this regime both $B_g = C_g/w_0$ and B_F are constant. The constant B_F arises from the fluctuations of the gauge bosons and charged particles. It includes contributions from all particles that are effectively massless in the transplanckian regime for $\tilde{\rho} \rightarrow 0$. Typically one expects massless particles beyond the ones present in the standard model as an effective low energy theory.

Depending on the sign of B_g and B_F we distinguish four scenarios:

- (i) $B_g > 0, B_F > 0$: In this case the gauge coupling is asymptotically free. It reaches zero for $\tilde{\rho} \rightarrow 0$. A family of scaling solutions can be characterized by the value

$$g^2(\tilde{\rho}_d) = g_d^2, \quad \tilde{\rho}_d \ll 1. \quad (23)$$

For increasing $\tilde{\rho} > \tilde{\rho}_d$ the gauge coupling increases. For the gauge bosons of the standard model the value of g_d^2 has to be small enough such that at the decoupling of the gravity fluctuations for $\tilde{\rho} \approx 2w_0$ the gauge couplings are not too large. Observation requires $g^2(\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0) \approx 0.3$. If g_d^2 remains below the resulting upper bound, the flow can be continued to large $\tilde{\rho}$, matching the discussion above for $\tilde{\rho} \gg 2w_0$ where only the part $\sim B_F$ contributes to the flow. At this level there are continuous families of scaling solutions parametrized by different values of g_d^2 . Obtaining phenomenologically acceptable values of $g^2(\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0)$ does not require relevant parameters for deviations from the scaling solution. What is not guaranteed, however, is that all members of the family of scaling solutions result in a viable scaling solution for the coupled system of many coupling functions.

- (ii) $B_g > 0, B_F < 0$: In this case the gauge coupling remains asymptotically free. Its flow exhibits now an infrared stable fixed point

$$g_*^2 = -\frac{B_g}{B_F}. \quad (24)$$

For $g_d^2 < g_*^2$ the gauge coupling g^2 increases for increasing $\tilde{\rho}$, approaching rapidly the value g_*^2 . On the other hand, for $g_d^2 > g_*^2$ the gauge coupling decreases towards g_*^2 . For a consistent scaling solution we should be able to choose $\tilde{\rho}_d$ arbitrarily close to zero. This implies a bound

$$0 \leq g^2(\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0) \lesssim g_*^2. \quad (25)$$

For small enough $\tilde{\rho}_d$ arbitrarily large values of g_d^2 are mapped at $\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0$ to the fixed point value $g^2(2w_0) \approx g_*^2$. This follows from the dominance of the term B_F for large g^2 , according to

$$\tilde{\rho}\partial_{\tilde{\rho}}g^{-2} = B_g g^{-2} + B_F. \quad (26)$$

The restricted range (25) is a first example for the predictivity of scaling solutions. The infrared stable fixed point for $B_g > 0, B_F < 0$ has been discussed for abelian gauge theories in ref. [40], and for grand unified theories with sufficiently many scalars in refs. [58, 59].

- (iii) $B_g < 0, B_F > 0$: For this case the fixed point (24) becomes infrared unstable. Unless g_d^2 is chosen very close to g_*^2 the coupling $g^2(\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0)$ is either zero or it diverges before $\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0$ is reached. Both cases are unacceptable. Only the possibility of tuning g_d^2 very close to g_*^2 remains.
- (iv) $B_g < 0, B_F < 0$: For this situation the theory is trivial in the gauge sector. Any positive coupling $g_d^{-2} \geq 0$ at $\tilde{\rho}_d \rightarrow 0$ is mapped to $g^2(\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0) = 0$. This prediction of the scaling solution is not compatible with observation.

Predictivity

From the point of view of consistency the requirement of existence of the scaling solution leads to predictions in two cases: $g^2(2w_0) < g_*^2$ for case (ii), and $g^2(2w_0) = 0$ for case (iv). Further predictivity is gained if we insist on avoiding tuning of parameters. Assume at $\tilde{\rho}_d \ll 1$ some arbitrary value g_d^2 not extremely close to zero and not extremely close to g_*^2 . For a sizable B_g this value changes quickly with $\tilde{\rho}$. For small g^2 it obeys

$$g^2(\tilde{\rho}) = g_d^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}_d} \right)^{B_g/2}, \quad (27)$$

while in the presence of a second fixed point g_*^2 one has for small $g^2 - g_*^2$

$$g^2(\tilde{\rho}) = g_*^2 + (g_d^2 - g_*^2) \left(\frac{\tilde{\rho}}{\tilde{\rho}_d} \right)^{-B_g/2}. \quad (28)$$

Any value of g_d^2 away from the fixed point is driven rapidly towards the infrared stable fixed point, $g_*^2 = -B_g/B_F$ for case (ii) or $g_*^2 = 0$ for the cases (iii) and (iv). For case (i), as well as for the case (iii) with $g_d^2 > g_*^2$, the gauge coupling diverges before $\tilde{\rho}$ reaches the value $2w_0$.

We conclude that a particularly robust situation arises for case (ii) with a predicted value

$$g^2(\tilde{\rho} = 2w_0) = -\frac{B_g}{B_F}. \quad (29)$$

Comparison of this prediction with the value $g^2 \approx 0.3$ compatible with observation requires knowledge of B_g and B_F . The constant B_F can be determined by the usual one-loop formula in the absence of gravity. It involves the number of massless gauge bosons, fermions and scalars for transplanckian physics. If B_g is computed reliably, compatibility with observation restricts the particle content of transplanckian physics.

Previous computations have mainly found positive B_g . The issue of the sign is complex, however, since two diagrams contribute with opposite sign. Typically, one also finds parameter ranges for which B_g is negative. The results obtained so far show substantial differences both for the absolute magnitude of B_g and the boundary in parameter space separating positive and negative B_g . In view of the importance of B_g for restricting the transplanckian particle content we compute this quantity in the next part of this note by employing the gauge invariant formulation of the functional flow equation [60]. This formulation separates clearly between physical fluctuations and gauge fluctuations. Furthermore, the contribution of the gauge fluctuations combined with the regularized Faddeev-Popov determinant or ghost sector yields a universal measure contribution which does not depend on the form of the effective average action Γ_k . A clear separation of the different modes provides for a simple physical picture of the flow and is expected to be particularly robust.

Gauge invariant flow equation

We start with the simplest truncation of the gauge invariant effective average action Γ_k ,

$$\Gamma_k = \int_x \sqrt{g} \left\{ \frac{Z(\chi)}{4} F_{\mu\nu}^z F_z^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} M^2(\chi) R + V(\chi) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}[\chi] \right\}. \quad (30)$$

Here $Z(\chi)$, $M^2(\chi) = 2w(\chi)k^2$ and $V(\chi) = u(\chi)k^4$ depend on the scalar field χ , and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}[\chi]$ is a kinetic term for χ . For a scaling solution the dimensionless functions Z , w and u depend only on the dimensionless ratio $\tilde{\rho} = \chi^2/k^2$. The non-abelian field strength,

$$F_{\mu\nu}^z = \partial_\mu A_\nu^z - \partial_\nu A_\mu^z + f_{uv}^z A_\mu^u A_\nu^v, \quad (31)$$

involves the structure constants f_{uv}^z of the gauge group. Indices are raised with the inverse metric $g^{\mu\nu}$ and $g = \det(g_{\mu\nu})$, such that \sqrt{g} includes a factor i in case of Minkowski signature. We are interested in the flow of the gauge coupling $\alpha = g^2/(4\pi) = (4\pi Z)^{-1}$ with k and possible scaling solutions for which Z depends only on $\tilde{\rho}$. We focus on constant field values χ and do not explicitly compute the effect of scalar fluctuations. Thus $\mathcal{L}_{\text{kin}}[\chi]$ may be neglected.

The exact flow equation[38, 61],

$$k\partial_k \Gamma_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ (\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k)^{-1} k\partial_k R_k \right\} - \delta_k, \quad (32)$$

involves the second functional derivative $\Gamma_k^{(2)}$ of the effective average action, and R_k is a suitable infrared cutoff function. For the gauge invariant formulation of the flow equation [60] the first term in eq. (32) involves only the contributions from the physical fluctuations. The appropriate projection is realized by a particular ‘‘physical gauge fixing’’, and R_k acts only on the physical fluctuations. In this formulation δ_k is a measure contribution with a similar structure as the first term, see below. The flow of Z can be extracted by evaluating $\partial_k \Gamma_k$ for non-zero gauge fields and a flat space metric.

Field-dependent inverse propagator matrix

The flow equation depends on the field-dependent propagator for the physical fluctuations in the presence of the cutoff, $(\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k)^{-1}$. Since it involves the second functional derivative of the effective average action eq. (32) is a functional differential equation. The approximation consists in evaluating $\Gamma_k^{(2)}$ for the particular truncation (30).

For the computation of $\Gamma^{(2)}$ for such field configurations we expand

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}, \quad A_\mu^z = \bar{A}_\mu^z + a_\mu^z. \quad (33)$$

We work in euclidean space, $\eta_{\mu\nu} = \delta_{\mu\nu}$, and may continue analytically to Minkowski space at the end.

We expand the truncation (30) in quadratic order in a_μ^z and $h_{\mu\nu}$

$$\Gamma_{k,2} = \Gamma_a + \Gamma_h + \Gamma_{hg} + \Gamma_{F1} + \Gamma_{F2}. \quad (34)$$

The term quadratic in the gauge field fluctuations

$$\Gamma_a = \int_x \frac{Z}{2} a_\mu^z (\mathcal{D}_T)^{\mu\nu}_{zy} a_\nu^y, \quad (35)$$

involves the operator

$$(\mathcal{D}_T)^{\mu\nu}_{zy} = -(D^\rho D_\rho)_{zy} \eta^{\mu\nu} + (D^\mu D^\nu)_{zy} + 2f^u{}_{zy} F_u^{\mu\nu}, \quad (36)$$

with

$$D_\mu a_\nu^z = \partial_\mu a_\nu^z + f_{uv}^z A_\mu^u a_\nu^v. \quad (37)$$

Here and in the following we omit the bar on the ‘‘background gauge fields’’. For the terms quadratic in the metric fluctuations one has ($h = h_\mu^\mu$, $\partial^2 = \partial^\mu \partial_\mu$)

$$\Gamma_h = \frac{1}{8} \int_x \left\{ -M^2(h^{\mu\nu} \partial^2 h_{\mu\nu} - h \partial^2 h) + V(h^2 - 2h_{\mu\nu} h^{\mu\nu}) \right\}, \quad (38)$$

and

$$\Gamma_{hg} = -\frac{1}{4} \int_x M^2(\partial_\rho h_\nu^\rho - \partial_\nu h) \partial_\mu h^{\mu\nu}. \quad (39)$$

Furthermore, there are contributions $\sim F^2$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{F2} = \int_x \frac{Z}{4} & \left[F_{\mu\nu}^z F_{z\rho\sigma} h^{\mu\rho} h^{\nu\sigma} \right. \\ & + F_{\mu\nu}^z F_{z\rho}{}^\nu (2h_\tau^\mu h^{\tau\rho} - h h^{\mu\rho}) \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{8} F_{\mu\nu}^z F_z^{\mu\nu} (h^2 - 2h_{\rho\tau} h^{\rho\tau}) \right]. \quad (40) \end{aligned}$$

Finally, Γ_{F_1} mixes the gauge field and metric fluctuations

$$\Gamma_{F_1} = \int_x \frac{Z}{4} (D_\mu a_\nu^z - D_\nu a_\mu^z) (h F_z^{\mu\nu} - 4h^{\mu\rho} F_{z\rho}{}^\nu) . \quad (41)$$

We consider a restricted set of ‘‘background field strengths’’ $F_{\mu\nu}$ for which the covariant derivative vanishes

$$D_\rho F_{\mu\nu}^z = 0 . \quad (42)$$

This simplifies the mixing term, using partial integration

$$\Gamma_{F_1} = \int_x Z F_z^{\mu\rho} \left(\partial_\mu h_\rho^\nu - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu h \delta_\rho^\nu \right) a_\nu^z . \quad (43)$$

We will evaluate the flow of the effective action for constant gauge field strength $F_z^{\mu\nu}$.

Physical fluctuations

For the setting of the gauge invariant flow equation [60] we split the metric fluctuations into physical fluctuations and gauge fluctuations [62]

$$h_{\mu\nu} = t_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{3} \tilde{P}_{\mu\nu} \sigma + a_{\mu\nu} . \quad (44)$$

In momentum space the physical graviton fluctuation is traceless and transverse, and the physical scalar fluctuation σ in the metric is multiplied by a projector $\tilde{P}_{\mu\nu}$,

$$q^\nu t_{\mu\nu} = 0 , \quad t_\mu^\mu = 0 , \quad \tilde{P}_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} - \frac{q_\mu q_\nu}{q^2} . \quad (45)$$

The gauge fluctuations of the metric $a_{\mu\nu}$ are treated separately. Their contribution, together with the regularized Faddeev-Popov determinant or associated ghost fluctuations, yields the universal measure contribution in the functional flow equation. The same holds for the longitudinal gauge field fluctuations which correspond to the gauge degrees of freedom. The combined measure contributions are denoted by δ_k in eq (32). In practice, we can impose the ‘‘physical gauge fixing’’

$$\partial^\mu h_{\mu\nu} = 0 , \quad D^\mu a_\mu^z = 0 . \quad (46)$$

In the sector of physical fluctuations we can write the matrix $\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k$ in block form

$$\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k = \begin{pmatrix} P^{(h)} + P^{(h,F)} & P^{(ha)} \\ P^{(ha)\dagger} & P^{(a)} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (47)$$

In momentum space one has for the physical metric fluctuations

$$P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(h)} = \frac{M^2}{4} \left[\left(q^2 - \frac{2V}{M^2} \right) P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} - 2 \left(q^2 - \frac{V}{2M^2} \right) P_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)} + \tilde{R}_{k,\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(h)} \right] , \quad (48)$$

where the projectors on the graviton fluctuations and scalar metric fluctuations read

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} &= \frac{1}{2} (\tilde{P}_{\mu\rho} \tilde{P}_{\nu\sigma} + \tilde{P}_{\mu\sigma} \tilde{P}_{\nu\rho}) - \frac{1}{3} \tilde{P}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{P}_{\rho\sigma} , \\ \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)} &= \frac{1}{3} \tilde{P}_{\mu\nu} \tilde{P}_{\rho\sigma} , \quad \hat{P}^{(t)} \hat{P}^{(\sigma)} = 0 . \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The projector on the physical metric fluctuations reads

$$\hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(f)} = \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} + \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)} . \quad (50)$$

For the transverse gauge boson fluctuation block one has

$$P_{zy}^{(a)\mu\nu} = Z \left\{ (\mathcal{D}_T)_{zy}^{\mu\nu} + \tilde{R}_{k,zy}^{(a)\mu\nu} \right\} . \quad (51)$$

The off-diagonal term is linear in $F_{\mu\nu}$, and reads in momentum space

$$P_z^{(ha)\mu\nu,\rho} = -\frac{i}{2} q_\sigma Z F_z^{\sigma\tau} (\delta_\tau^\mu \eta^{\nu\rho} + \delta_\tau^\nu \eta^{\mu\rho} - \delta_\tau^\rho \eta^{\mu\nu}) . \quad (52)$$

Here we assume that the infrared cutoff R_k is block diagonal. Finally, one has

$$\begin{aligned} P^{(hF)\mu\nu\rho\sigma} &= \frac{Z}{4} \left\{ F_z^{\mu\rho} F^{z\nu\sigma} + F_z^{\mu\sigma} F^{z\nu\rho} \right. \\ &\quad + F_z^\mu{}_\tau F^{z\sigma\tau} \eta^{\nu\rho} + F_z^\nu{}_\tau F^{z\sigma\tau} \eta^{\mu\rho} \\ &\quad + F_z^\mu{}_\tau F^{z\rho\tau} \eta^{\nu\sigma} + F_z^\nu{}_\tau F^{z\rho\tau} \eta^{\mu\sigma} \\ &\quad - F_z^\rho{}_\tau F^{z\sigma\tau} \eta^{\mu\nu} - F_z^\mu{}_\tau F^{z\nu\tau} \eta^{\rho\sigma} \\ &\quad \left. + \frac{1}{4} F_z^{\tau\lambda} F^{z\tau\lambda} (\eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\rho\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\rho} \eta^{\nu\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\sigma} \eta^{\nu\rho}) \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (53)$$

Flow equation for gauge coupling

The flow equation for Z and therefore the gauge coupling $g^2 = Z^{-1}$ can be extracted by evaluating the contribution to the flow equation (32) which is quadratic in $F_{\mu\nu}$. We can therefore expand for small $F_{\mu\nu}$. Since the off-diagonal term $P^{(ha)}$ is proportional to $F_{\mu\nu}$ we can use a matrix expansion of the inverse propagator. Writing

$$(\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k) = D + M , \quad (54)$$

$$D = \begin{pmatrix} P^{(h)} + P^{(h,F)} & 0 \\ 0 & P^{(a)} \end{pmatrix} , \quad M = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P^{(ha)} \\ P^{(ha)\dagger} & 0 \end{pmatrix} ,$$

we need the second order in M

$$(\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k)^{-1} = D^{-1} - D^{-1} M D^{-1} + D^{-1} M D^{-1} M D^{-1} + \dots \quad (55)$$

With block diagonal R_k the term linear in M does not contribute to the trace. The remaining terms are block diagonal and we can invert the inverse propagators for the different blocks separately. The propagators in each block involve the same projections on physical modes as for the inverse propagator.

For block diagonal R_k one concludes, with $\partial_t = k \partial_k$,

$$\pi_k = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ (\Gamma_k^{(2)} + R_k)^{-1} \partial_t R_k \right\} = \pi_k^{(a)} + \pi_k^{(h)} + \pi_k^{(ha)} , \quad (56)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_k^{(a)} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ P^{(a)-1} \partial_t R_k^{(a)} \right\} , \\ \pi_k^{(h)} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ (P^h + P^{(hF)})^{-1} \partial_t R_k^{(h)} \right\} , \\ \pi_k^{(ah)} &= \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ D^{-1} \partial_t R_k D^{-1} M D^{-1} M \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

where $R_k^{(a)} = Z\tilde{R}_z^{(a)}$ and $R_k^{(h)} = (M^2/4)\tilde{R}_k^{(h)}$. We need the expansion of every term in eq. (57) in second order in A_μ or $F_{\mu\nu}$. Since M is linear in $F_{\mu\nu}$ we can evaluate $\pi_k^{(ah)}$ by setting $A_\mu = 0$ for the diagonal matrix D . The graphical representation of $\pi_k^{(ah)}$ is shown in Fig. 1. We have indicated in Fig.1 the factors of Z , inferring $\pi_k^{(ah)} \sim Z$.




Fig. 1. Graphical representation of mixed contribution $\pi_k^{(ah)}$ to the flow of the effective action. Curled lines are gauge boson propagators, and solid lines indicate the propagators for the metric fluctuations. Gauge boson propagators carry a factor Z^{-1} , vertices a factor Z , and $\partial_t R_k^{(a)} \sim Z$.

For the contribution $\pi_k^{(h)}$ we expand

$$\pi_k^{(h)} = \frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ P^{(h)-1} \partial_t R_k^{(h)} \right\} + \pi_k^{(h,F)} + \dots \quad (58)$$

with

$$\pi_k^{(h,F)} = -\frac{1}{2} \text{tr} \left\{ P^{(h)-1} \partial_t R_k^{(h)} P^{(h)-1} P^{(h,F)} \right\}. \quad (59)$$

The first term in eq. (58) yields the well known gravitational contribution to the flow of the scalar potential [63, 64]. The second term gives a contribution $\sim F^2$, as depicted in Fig. 2. It is obvious that $\pi_k^{(h,F)}$ is proportional




Fig. 2. Graviton fluctuation contributing to the flow of Z .

to Z . Finally, $\pi_k^{(a)}$ is the standard contribution from the fluctuations of gauge bosons, as computed in ref. [61, 65]. It is independent of Z . The measure contributions for the graviton fluctuations are independent of the background gauge field and only contribute to the flow of the scalar potential V and M^2 . The measure contributions from the gauge field fluctuations are the ones for Yang-Mills theories in flat space [61, 65].

Summarizing the various contributions yields

$$\partial_t Z = -\eta_F Z = A_g Z + a_4, \quad (60)$$

where the gauge boson contribution a_4 contains a part $\sim \eta_F$ due to the k -derivative of the factor Z in $R_k^{(a)}$,

$$a_4 = b_F + c_F \eta_F. \quad (61)$$

For $SU(N)$ Yang-Mills theories one has

$$b_F = \frac{11N}{24\pi^2}, \quad c_F = -\frac{21N}{96\pi^2}. \quad (62)$$

Similarly, the gravity induced anomalous dimension A_g is given by

$$A_g = b_g + c_g \eta_F, \quad (63)$$

where c_g arises from $\partial_t R_k^{(a)}$ in the first diagram in Fig. 1. The coefficients b_g and c_g have to be computed (see below) from $\pi_k^{(ah)}$ and $\pi_k^{(h,F)}$ in eqs. (57) and (59). For $Z = 1/g^2$ eq. (60) yields for η_F

$$\eta_F = -\frac{b_g + g^2 b_F}{1 + c_g + g^2 c_F}. \quad (64)$$

One infers the flow equation for the gauge coupling

$$\partial_t g^2 = \eta_F g^2 = -\frac{b_g g^2 + b_F g^4}{1 + c_g + c_F g^2}. \quad (65)$$

An expansion in small values of g^2 yields

$$\partial_t g^2 = -B_g g^2 - B_F g^4 + \dots, \quad (66)$$

with

$$B_g = \frac{b_g}{1 + c_g}, \quad B_F = \frac{b_F}{1 + c_g} - \frac{b_g c_F}{(1 + c_g)^2}. \quad (67)$$

In the absence of the metric fluctuations, $b_g = 0$, $B_g = 0$, $B_F = b_F$, the term $\sim g^4$ amounts to the standard one-loop β -function for gauge theories, while the next term $\sim g^6$ accounts for most of the two-loop contribution [61, 65]. For $B_g > 0$ the gauge coupling is asymptotically free. The gravitational contributions dominate for $g^2 \rightarrow 0$.

Universality of gravity induced anomalous dimension

There are two simple properties of the coefficients b_g and c_g that we can extract without detailed calculations. The first observes that b_g is dimensionless. For $V = 0$ the only scales in the truncation (30) of the effective action are M and k . In this limit b_g is a function of k^2/M^2 . The diagrams in Figs. 1, 2 involve the propagator $P^{(h)-1}$ of the metric fluctuations which is $\sim M^{-2}$. With $\partial_t R_k^{(h)} \sim M^2$ one concludes

$$b_g = \tilde{b}_g \frac{k^2}{M^2}, \quad c_g = \tilde{c}_g \frac{k^2}{M^2}. \quad (68)$$

For $V \neq 0$ the coefficients \tilde{b}_g and \tilde{c}_g will depend on the dimensionless combination

$$v = \frac{2V}{k^2 M^2}. \quad (69)$$

Second, the coefficients b_g and c_g are universal in the sense that they do not depend on the particular gauge group. The gravity induced anomalous dimension is the

same for all Yang-Mills theories, being equal to the one for an abelian model as quantum electrodynamics. For the contribution in Fig. 2 this follows directly from the observation that $P^{(hF)}$ only involves the gauge invariant bilinear of the field strength

$$\mathcal{F}^{\mu\rho\nu\sigma} = F_z^{\mu\rho} F^{z\nu\sigma} . \quad (70)$$

It is directly related to

$$F_z^{\mu\nu} F_{\mu\nu}^z = \eta_{\mu\nu} \eta_{\rho\sigma} \mathcal{F}^{\mu\rho\nu\sigma} , \quad (71)$$

without involving any particular relations for the generators of the gauge group.

For the first diagram in fig. 1 we write explicitly $\pi_k^{(ah)} = \pi_{k,1}^{(ah)} + \pi_{k,2}^{(ah)}$, where

$$\pi_{k,1}^{(ah)} = \frac{1}{2} \int_q \left\{ \left(P^{(h)-1} \partial_t R_k^{(h)} P^{(h)-1} \right)_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \right\} \quad (72)$$

with

$$C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} = \left(P^{(ha)} (P^{(a)})^{-1} P^{(ha)\dagger} \right)^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} . \quad (73)$$

The momentum integral stands for $\int_q = \int d^4q / (2\pi)^4$. The gauge boson propagator is given by

$$\left((P^{(a)})^{-1} \right)_{\mu\nu}^{zy} = Z^{-1} (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q))^{-1} \tilde{P}_{\mu\nu} \delta^{zy} , \quad (74)$$

where $\mathcal{R}_k(q)$ is the cutoff function for the transversal gauge boson fluctuations. In analogy to the diagram in Fig. 2 one has

$$\begin{aligned} C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} = & \frac{Z}{4} (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q))^{-1} q_\alpha q_\beta \left\{ \left[\mathcal{F}^{\alpha\rho\beta\mu} \tilde{P}^{\sigma\nu} \right. \right. \\ & - \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{F}^{\alpha\rho\beta\delta} \tilde{P}_\delta^\sigma \eta^{\mu\nu} + \mathcal{F}^{\alpha\delta\beta\mu} \tilde{P}_\delta^\nu \eta^{\rho\sigma}) \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{1}{4} \mathcal{F}^{\alpha\delta\beta\gamma} \tilde{P}_{\delta\gamma} \eta^{\rho\sigma} \eta^{\mu\nu} + (\rho \leftrightarrow \sigma) \right] + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (75)$$

involving only the gauge invariant combination (70). For the second diagram in Fig. 1,

$$\pi_{k,2}^{(ah)} = \frac{1}{2} \int_q \left\{ (P^{(h)})^{-1} \tilde{C}^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \right\} , \quad (76)$$

one obtains $\tilde{C}^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}$ from $C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}$ by replacing $(q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k)^{-1}$ by

$$Z^{-1} \partial_t (Z \mathcal{R}_k) (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k)^{-2} = (\partial_t \mathcal{R}_k - \eta_F \mathcal{R}_k) (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k)^{-2} . \quad (77)$$

The term $\sim \eta_F$ in eq. (77) is responsible for the contribution in eq. (63).

Computation of gravity induced anomalous dimension

The quantitative values of the coefficients b_g, c_g depend on the choice of the infrared cutoff function. We employ for the metric fluctuations the same cutoff function $\mathcal{R}_k(q)$

as for the gauge bosons, with a structure adapted to the form of the inverse propagator

$$(R_k^{(h)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{M^2}{4} \mathcal{R}_k(q) (\hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} - 2\hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)}) . \quad (78)$$

The effect of the term $\mathcal{R}_k^{(h)}$ in eq. (48) is simply a replacement $q^2 \rightarrow q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q)$ in the inverse metric propagator. By virtue of the projector properties the propagator for the physical metric fluctuations reads in presence of the infrared cutoff

$$\begin{aligned} (P^{(h)})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{-1} = & \frac{4}{M^2} \left\{ (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q) - vk^2)^{-1} \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2} (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q) - \frac{vk^2}{4})^{-1} \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)} \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (79)$$

with v given by eq. (69). Correspondingly, one obtains in the sector of physical metric fluctuations

$$\begin{aligned} (P^{(h)-1} \partial_t R_k^{(h)} P^{(h)-1})_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = & \frac{4}{M^2} (\partial_t \mathcal{R}_k(q) + (2 - \eta_g) \mathcal{R}_k(q)) \\ & \times \left[(q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q) - vk^2)^{-2} \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2} (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q) - \frac{vk^2}{4})^{-2} \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)} \right] . \end{aligned} \quad (80)$$

Here

$$\eta_g = -\partial_t \ln \left(\frac{M^2}{k^2} \right) . \quad (81)$$

reflects the possible k -dependence of M^2 in eq. (78).

Taking things together we obtain explicit momentum integrals for the different contributions to the flow generator, as

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_k^{(ah)} = & \frac{2}{M^2} \int_q \left\{ \left[\mathcal{A}^{(t)}(q^2) + \mathcal{B}^{(t)}(q^2) \right] C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2} \left[\mathcal{A}^{(\sigma)}(q^2) + \mathcal{B}^{(\sigma)}(q^2) \right] C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \hat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)} \right\} , \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

where

$$\mathcal{A}^{(t)}(q^2) = (\partial_t \mathcal{R}_k + (2 - \eta_g) \mathcal{R}_k) (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k - vk^2)^{-2} , \quad (83)$$

and

$$\mathcal{B}^{(t)}(q^2) = (\partial_t \mathcal{R}_k - \eta_F \mathcal{R}_k) (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k - vk^2)^{-1} (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k)^{-1} . \quad (84)$$

Here $\mathcal{A}^{(\sigma)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(\sigma)}$ obtain from $\mathcal{A}^{(t)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(t)}$ by replacing $v \rightarrow v/4$. Similarly, one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \pi_k^{(hF)} = & -\frac{2}{M^2} \int_q \left\{ \mathcal{A}^{(t)}(q^2) P^{(hF)\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \hat{P}_{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}^{(t)} \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{A}^{(\sigma)}(q^2) P^{(hF)\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \hat{P}_{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}^{(\sigma)} \right\} . \end{aligned} \quad (85)$$

We observe the opposite signs of the contributions $\pi_k^{(ah)}$ and $\pi_k^{(hF)}$.

For the computation of b_g and c_g we choose a particular configuration of the gauge field

$$A_1^{\bar{z}} = -\frac{F}{2}x_2, \quad A_2^{\bar{z}} = \frac{F}{2}x_1, \quad (86)$$

for an arbitrary direction \bar{z} . The gauge field in all other color-directions vanishes, such that eq. (86) corresponds to an abelian gauge field. For constant F the non-vanishing field strength components read

$$F_{12}^{\bar{z}} = -F_{21}^{\bar{z}} = F, \quad (87)$$

with

$$F^z{}_{\mu\nu}F_z{}^{\mu\nu} = 2F^2. \quad (88)$$

Extracting the term $\sim F^2$ on the r.h.s. of the flow equation

$$\pi_k = \frac{1}{2} \int_x s_F F^2 + \dots, \quad (89)$$

one obtains for the (30)

$$\partial_t Z = s_F. \quad (90)$$

For the configuration (86) one obtains

$$P^{(hF)\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \widehat{P}_{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}^{(t)} = \frac{ZF^2}{24} (20 - 10\Delta), \quad (91)$$

and

$$P^{(hF)\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \widehat{P}_{\rho\sigma\mu\nu}^{(\sigma)} = \frac{ZF^2}{24} (1 - 2\Delta), \quad (92)$$

where

$$\Delta = \frac{q_1^2 + q_2^2 - q_3^2 - q_0^2}{q^2}. \quad (93)$$

Similarly, for the contribution from Fig. 1 one needs

$$C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \widehat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)} = \frac{5Z}{3(q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q))} q_\alpha q_\beta \tilde{P}_{\rho\mu} \mathcal{F}^{\alpha\rho\beta\mu}, \quad (94)$$

and

$$C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \widehat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(\sigma)} = \frac{1}{20} C^{\rho\sigma\mu\nu} \widehat{P}_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^{(t)}. \quad (95)$$

For the configuration (86) we have

$$q_\alpha q_\beta \tilde{P}_{\rho\mu} \mathcal{F}^{\alpha\rho\beta\mu} = (q_1^2 + q_2^2) F^2 = \frac{1}{2} q^2 F^2 (1 + \Delta). \quad (96)$$

Under the momentum integral we can employ

$$\int_q f(q^2) \Delta = 0. \quad (97)$$

The independence of the expressions (91)-(96) from the choice of gauge fields can be checked by assuming the existence of a different choice with

$$\mathcal{F}^{\mu\rho\nu\sigma} = \frac{F^2}{6} (\eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\rho\sigma} - \eta^{\mu\sigma} \eta^{\nu\rho}), \quad (98)$$

where

$$P^{(hF)\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{ZF^2}{24} (2\eta^{\mu\rho} \eta^{\nu\sigma} + 2\eta^{\mu\sigma} \eta^{\nu\rho} - \eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\rho\sigma}), \quad (99)$$

and

$$C^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} = \frac{ZF^2 q^2}{24(q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k)} \left\{ \left([2\eta^{\rho\mu} \tilde{P}^{\sigma\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{P}^{\rho\sigma} \eta^{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{P}^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\rho\sigma} + \frac{3}{4} \eta^{\mu\nu} \eta^{\rho\sigma} - \tilde{P}^{\rho\mu} \tilde{P}^{\sigma\nu}] + (\rho \leftrightarrow \sigma) \right) + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu) \right\}. \quad (100)$$

We can now infer the coefficient A_g in eq. (60),

$$A_g = \frac{10}{3M^2} \int_q \left\{ \frac{q^2}{q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q)} [\mathcal{A}^{(t)} + \mathcal{B}^{(t)} - \frac{1}{40} (\mathcal{A}^{(\sigma)} + \mathcal{B}^{(\sigma)})] - \mathcal{A}^{(t)} + \frac{1}{40} \mathcal{A}^{(\sigma)} \right\}. \quad (101)$$

One observes a marked dominance of the graviton (traceless transverse tensor) fluctuations. The subleading contribution from the scalar metric fluctuation proportional to $\mathcal{A}^{(\sigma)}$ and $\mathcal{B}^{(\sigma)}$ is suppressed for both diagrams by a factor around 1/40, unless v takes large negative values. The graviton contributions are of a similar size for both diagrams, with a positive contribution $\sim \mathcal{A}^{(t)} + \mathcal{B}^{(t)}$ from Fig. 1, and a negative contribution $\sim \mathcal{A}^{(t)}$ from Fig. 2. Writing the graviton contribution in the form

$$A_g^{(t)} = \frac{10}{3M^2} \int_q \left\{ \frac{q^2}{q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q)} \mathcal{B}^{(t)} - \frac{\mathcal{R}_k(q)}{q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q)} \mathcal{A}^{(t)} \right\}, \quad (102)$$

we obtain for $v = 0$, $\eta_g = 0$, $\eta_F = 0$

$$A_g^{(t)} = \frac{10}{3M^2} \int_q (q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k)^{-3} \left[(q^2 - \mathcal{R}_k) \partial_t \mathcal{R}_k - 2\mathcal{R}_k^2 \right]. \quad (103)$$

The sign of $A_g^{(t)}$ will depend on the value of v and the precise shape of the cutoff function $\mathcal{R}_k(q)$.

Numerical values of anomalous dimension

For numerical values of the integrals $\int_q \mathcal{A}^{(t)}$ etc. we need to specify the form of the infrared cutoff function $\mathcal{R}_k(q)$. We choose here the Litim cutoff [66]

$$\mathcal{R}_k(q) = (k^2 - q^2) \theta(k^2 - q^2). \quad (104)$$

This restricts the momentum integral to $q^2 < k^2$, and replaces in this range $q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k(q)$ by k^2 . The simple integration yields

$$\int_q \mathcal{A}^{(t)} = \int_q \frac{2k^2 + (2 - \eta_g)(k^2 - q^2)}{k^4(1 - v)^2} = \frac{(8 - \eta_g)k^2}{96\pi^2(1 - v)^2}, \quad (105)$$

and

$$\int_q \mathcal{B}^{(t)} = \int_q \frac{2k^2 - \eta_F(k^2 - q^2)}{k^4(1 - v)} = \frac{(6 - \eta_F)k^2}{96\pi^2(1 - v)}, \quad (106)$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \int_q \frac{q^2}{q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k} \mathcal{A}^{(t)} &= \frac{(10 - \eta_g)k^2}{192\pi^2(1 - v)^2}, \\ \int_q \frac{q^2}{q^2 + \mathcal{R}_k} \mathcal{B}^{(t)} &= \frac{(8 - \eta_F)k^2}{192\pi^2(1 - v)}. \end{aligned} \quad (107)$$

Similarly, one obtains for c_g in eq. (63)

$$c_g = -\frac{5k^2}{288\pi^2 M^2} \left(\frac{1}{1 - v} - \frac{1}{40} \frac{1}{1 - v/4} \right). \quad (108)$$

This is typically a rather small quantity with only little influence on the running gauge coupling in eq. (67). In a good approximation we can identify $B_g = b_g$, $B_F = b_F$. We extract our value for the gravity induced anomalous dimension

$$\begin{aligned} b_g &= \frac{5k^2}{288\pi^2 M^2} \left[\frac{8}{1 - v} - \frac{6 - \eta_g}{(1 - v)^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{1}{5(1 - v/4)} + \frac{6 - \eta_g}{40(1 - v/4)^2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (109)$$

For $\eta_g = 0$ one finds vanishing b_g for a critical v_c , which can be approximated by neglecting the scalar contribution,

$$\eta_g(v_c) = 0, \quad v_c \approx \frac{1}{4}. \quad (110)$$

For $v < v_c$ the gravity induced anomalous dimension is positive, $b_g > 0$, while for $v > v_c$ one has $b_g < 0$.

The dominant graviton part of our result (109) coincides with the result of ref. [44] up to an overall factor 10/9. Larger differences are found as compared to the values of b_g quoted in refs [45] and [46]. This concerns both the overall size and the structure. Effects of different gauge fixing procedures are not expected to affect the contribution of the transverse traceless graviton fluctuations. They concern the scalar contribution which is found to be very small in our approach. The dominant effect of different choices of infrared cutoff functions can be absorbed by a rescaling of the infrared cutoff scale k .

Fixed points

For a fixed point one has $M^2 \sim k^2$ and $U \sim k^4$,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{M^2}{k^2} &= 2w_*, \quad \eta_g = 0, \\ \frac{V}{k^4} &= u_*, \quad v_* = \frac{u_*}{w_*}. \end{aligned} \quad (111)$$

The gauge invariant flow equation with the same setting and infrared cutoff function yields in the graviton approximation [57]

$$w_* = \frac{1}{192\pi^2} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_M + \frac{25}{128\pi^2(1 - v_*)}, \quad (112)$$

and [63]

$$u_* = \frac{1}{128\pi^2} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_U + \frac{5}{96\pi^2(1 - v_*)}, \quad (113)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_M &= -N_S - N_F + 4N_V + \frac{43}{6}, \\ \tilde{\mathcal{N}}_U &= N_S - 2N_F + 2N_V - \frac{8}{3}, \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

and

$$b_g = \frac{5}{288\pi^2 w_*} \left(\frac{4}{1 - v_*} - \frac{3}{(1 - v_*)^2} \right). \quad (115)$$

With

$$\begin{aligned} v_* = \frac{u_*}{w_*} &= \frac{3\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_U(1 - v_*) + 20}{2\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_M(1 - v_*) + 75} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{4\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_M} \left\{ 2\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_M - 3\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_U - 75 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sqrt{(2\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_M - 3\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_U - 75)^2 + 440\tilde{\mathcal{N}}_M} \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

we obtain b_g as a function of N_S , N_F and N_V . For a given transplanckian particle content the gravity induced anomalous dimension is fixed.

As a first example we take the particle content of the standard model where [57]

$$\begin{aligned} u_* &= -0.0507, \quad w_* = 0.00505, \\ v_* &= -10.05, \end{aligned} \quad (117)$$

and therefore

$$b_g = 0.118. \quad (118)$$

With a positive gravity induced anomalous dimension the gauge couplings are asymptotically free for the standard model coupled to gravity. The values of the gauge couplings cannot be predicted.

For an SO(10) grand unified theory (GUT) with $N_F = 48$, $N_V = 45$ we show the gravity induced anomalous dimension b_g as a function of the number of scalars N_S in Fig. 3. It turns negative for $N_S \gtrsim 30$ as a consequence of




Fig. 3.

v_* becoming larger than 1/4. This is typically the case for

a scalar sector leading to realistic spontaneous symmetry breaking. With

$$B_F = \frac{50 - \tilde{N}_{10}}{16\pi^2}, \quad (119)$$

and \tilde{N}_{10} given by the numbers N_R of R -dimensional scalar-representations as [67]

$$\tilde{N}_{10} = \frac{1}{3}(N_{10} + 4N_{16} + 8N_{45} + 12N_{54} + 28N_{120} + 70N_{126} + 68N_{144} + 56N_{210}), \quad (120)$$

one finds an infrared unstable fixed point as long as $\tilde{N}_{10} < 50$. The gauge coupling is then asymptotically safe instead of asymptotically free. Again, its value cannot be predicted. In contrast, for a large number of scalars $\tilde{N}_{10} > 50$ the gauge coupling becomes ‘‘trivial’’. It is predicted to vanish for $\tilde{\rho} \approx 2w_0$, in contrast to observational requirements. Thus SO(10)-unification coupled to quantum gravity is viable only for $\tilde{N}_{10} < 50$.

Conclusions

We have performed a quantum gravity computation for the dependence of gauge couplings on a scalar field χ . This prediction is based on the scaling solution for functional flow equations. No deviation from the scaling solution is necessary, such that fundamental scale invariance [39] can be realized. In the momentum region below the effective

Planck mass the momentum dependence of the gauge couplings is compatible with the usual perturbative result for running couplings.

In the limit of the infrared regulator scale k going to zero the scaling solution predicts the quantum scale invariant standard model as an ‘‘effective low energy theory’’ for momenta below the Planck mass. A small value of $k \approx 10^{-3}$ eV, as advocated for interesting cosmologies with dynamical dark energy, induces only negligible modifications of the quantum scale invariant standard model, with a possible exception in the neutrino sector. The time variation of fundamental constants is negligibly small for present cosmology unless the neutrino sector yields an additional source. The same holds for apparent violations of the equivalence principle. A more sizable time-variation of ‘‘fundamental couplings’’ occurs in early cosmology when the ratio $\tilde{\rho} = \chi^2/k^2$ has been much smaller than today. This concerns the epoch of nucleosynthesis or before.

Finally, the scaling solution of quantum gravity imposes restrictions for model building. Coupled to a quantum field theory for the metric, grand unified theories based on the gauge groups SO(10) or SO(5) are viable only if the number of scalars is not too large. There is no guarantee, however, that the metric remains the basic degree of freedom for a quantum field theory or gravity. It seems likely to us that some form of gravity-induced anomalous dimension for the running gauge couplings applies to a more general class of theories, coming in pair with possible predictivity for the low energy value of the gauge couplings or the fine structure constant.

-
- [1] Pascual Jordan, ‘‘Die physikalischen weltkonstanten,’’ *Naturwissenschaften* **25**, 513–517 (1937).
- [2] Paul A. M. Dirac, ‘‘The cosmological constants,’’ *Nature* **139**, 323 (1937).
- [3] P Jordan, ‘‘Über die kosmologische konstanz der feinstrukturkonstanten,’’ *Zeitschrift für Physik* **113**, 660–662 (1939).
- [4] P. Jordan, *Schwerkraft und Weltall: Grundlagen der theoretischen Kosmologie*, Die Wissenschaft, Vol. 107 (F. Vieweg, 1955).
- [5] R. D. Peccei, J. Sola, and C. Wetterich, ‘‘Adjusting the cosmological constant dynamically: Cosmons and a new force weaker than gravity,’’ *Phys. Lett. B* **195**, 183–190 (1987).
- [6] C. Wetterich, ‘‘Cosmologies with variable newton’s ‘constant’,’’ *Nucl. Phys. B* **302**, 645–667 (1988).
- [7] T. Damour and Alexander M. Polyakov, ‘‘The string dilaton and a least coupling principle,’’ *Nucl. Phys. B* **423**, 532–558 (1994), arXiv:hep-th/9401069.
- [8] T. Damour, F. Piazza, and G. Veneziano, ‘‘Violations of the equivalence principle in a dilaton runaway scenario,’’ *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 046007 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0205111.
- [9] Jean-Philippe Uzan, ‘‘The fundamental constants and their variation: Observational status and theoretical motivations,’’ *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 403 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0205340.
- [10] C. Wetterich, ‘‘Cosmology and the fate of dilaton symmetry,’’ *Nucl. Phys. B* **302**, 668–696 (1988), arXiv:1711.03844 [hep-th].
- [11] Christof Wetterich, ‘‘Probing quintessence with time variation of couplings,’’ *JCAP* **10**, 002 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0203266.
- [12] C. Wetterich, ‘‘Quantum scale symmetry,’’ (2019), arXiv:1901.04741 [hep-th].
- [13] Y. Fujii, ‘‘Scalar-tensor theory of gravitation and spontaneous breakdown of scale invariance,’’ *Phys. Rev. D* **9**, 874–876 (1974).
- [14] F. Englert, C. Truffin, and R. Gastmans, ‘‘Conformal invariance in quantum gravity,’’ *Nucl. Phys. B* **117**, 407–432 (1976).
- [15] Peter Minkowski, ‘‘On the spontaneous origin of newton’s constant,’’ *Phys. Lett. B* **71**, 419–421 (1977).
- [16] A. Zee, ‘‘A broken symmetric theory of gravity,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **42**, 417 (1979).
- [17] Stephen L. Adler, ‘‘Order r vacuum action functional in scalar free unified theories with spontaneous scale breaking,’’ *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 1567 (1980).
- [18] Lee Smolin, ‘‘Towards a theory of space-time structure at very short distances,’’ *Nucl. Phys. B* **160**, 253–268 (1979).
- [19] Yasunori Fujii, ‘‘Origin of the gravitational constant and particle masses in scale invariant scalar - tensor theory,’’ *Phys. Rev. D* **26**, 2580 (1982).
- [20] Mikhail Shaposhnikov and Daniel Zenhausern, ‘‘Quantum

- scale invariance, cosmological constant and hierarchy problem,” *Phys. Lett. B* **671**, 162–166 (2009), arXiv:0809.3406 [hep-th].
- [21] C. Wetterich, “Fine tuning problem and the renormalization group,” *Phys. Lett. B* **140**, 215–222 (1984).
- [22] C. Wetterich, “The mass of the higgs particle,” in *Search for Scalar Particles: Experimental and Theoretical Aspects, Trieste, Italy, July 23-24, 1987* (1987).
- [23] William A Bardeen, *On naturalness in the standard model*, Tech. Rep. (FERMILAB, Batavia, IL, 1995).
- [24] Mikhail Shaposhnikov and Daniel Zenhausern, “Scale invariance, unimodular gravity and dark energy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **671**, 187–192 (2009), arXiv:0809.3395 [hep-th].
- [25] C. Wetterich, “Variable gravity universe,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 024005 (2014), arXiv:1308.1019 [astro-ph.CO].
- [26] C. Wetterich, “Inflation, quintessence, and the origin of mass,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **897**, 111–178 (2015), arXiv:1408.0156 [hep-th].
- [27] Christof Wetterich, “The quantum gravity connection between inflation and quintessence,” *Galaxies* **10**, 50 (2022), arXiv:2201.12213 [astro-ph.CO].
- [28] S. Weinberg, “Ultraviolet divergences in quantum theories of gravitation,” in *General Relativity: An Einstein Centenary Survey*, edited by S. W. Hawking and W. Israel (Univ. Pr., Cambridge, UK, 1979) pp. 790–831.
- [29] M. Reuter, “Nonperturbative evolution equation for quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57**, 971–985 (1998), arXiv:hep-th/9605030.
- [30] Djamel Dou and Roberto Percacci, “The running gravitational couplings,” *Class. Quant. Grav.* **15**, 3449–3468 (1998), arXiv:hep-th/9707239.
- [31] Wataru Souma, “Nontrivial ultraviolet fixed point in quantum gravity,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **102**, 181–195 (1999), arXiv:hep-th/9907027.
- [32] O. Lauscher and M. Reuter, “Ultraviolet fixed point and generalized flow equation of quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 025013 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0108040.
- [33] M. Reuter and Frank Saueressig, “Renormalization group flow of quantum gravity in the einstein-hilbert truncation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 065016 (2002), arXiv:hep-th/0110054.
- [34] Saswato Sen, Christof Wetterich, and Masatoshi Yamada, “Asymptotic freedom and safety in quantum gravity,” *JHEP* **03**, 130 (2022), arXiv:2111.04696 [hep-th].
- [35] K. S. Stelle, “Renormalization of higher derivative quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 953–969 (1977).
- [36] E. S. Fradkin and G. A. Vilkovisky, “Conformal invariance and asymptotic freedom in quantum gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **77**, 262–266 (1978).
- [37] E. S. Fradkin and Arkady A. Tseytlin, “Renormalizable asymptotically free quantum theory of gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **104**, 377–381 (1981).
- [38] Christof Wetterich, “Exact evolution equation for the effective potential,” *Phys. Lett. B* **301**, 90–94 (1993), arXiv:1710.05815 [hep-th].
- [39] C. Wetterich, “Fundamental scale invariance,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **964**, 115326 (2021), arXiv:2007.08805 [hep-th].
- [40] Jan-Eric Daum, Ulrich Harst, and Martin Reuter, “Running gauge coupling in asymptotically safe quantum gravity,” *JHEP* **01**, 084 (2010), arXiv:0910.4938 [hep-th].
- [41] Sarah Folkerts, Daniel F. Litim, and Jan M. Pawłowski, “Asymptotic freedom of yang-mills theory with gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **709**, 234–241 (2012), arXiv:1101.5552 [hep-th].
- [42] U. Harst and M. Reuter, “Qed coupled to qeg,” *JHEP* **05**, 119 (2011), arXiv:1101.6007 [hep-th].
- [43] Nicolai Christiansen and Astrid Eichhorn, “An asymptotically safe solution to the u(1) triviality problem,” *Phys. Lett. B* **770**, 154–160 (2017), arXiv:1702.07724 [hep-th].
- [44] Nicolai Christiansen, Daniel F. Litim, Jan M. Pawłowski, and Manuel Reichert, “Asymptotic safety of gravity with matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 106012 (2018), arXiv:1710.04669 [hep-th].
- [45] Astrid Eichhorn and Fleur Versteegen, “Upper bound on the abelian gauge coupling from asymptotic safety,” *JHEP* **01**, 030 (2018), arXiv:1709.07252 [hep-th].
- [46] J. E. Daum, U. Harst, and M. Reuter, “Non-perturbative qeg corrections to the yang-mills beta function,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **43**, 2393 (2011), arXiv:1005.1488 [hep-th].
- [47] Gustavo P. de Brito and Astrid Eichhorn, “Nonvanishing gravitational contribution to matter beta functions for vanishing dimensionful regulators,” (2022), arXiv:2201.11402 [hep-th].
- [48] Astrid Eichhorn and Aaron Held, “Dynamically vanishing dirac neutrino mass from quantum scale symmetry,” (2022), arXiv:2204.09008 [hep-ph].
- [49] Sean P. Robinson and Frank Wilczek, “Gravitational correction to running of gauge couplings,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 231601 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0509050.
- [50] Artur R. Pietrykowski, “Gauge dependence of gravitational correction to running of gauge couplings,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 061801 (2007), arXiv:hep-th/0606208.
- [51] David J. Toms, “Quantum gravity and charge renormalization,” *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 045015 (2007), arXiv:0708.2990 [hep-th].
- [52] Dietmar Ebert, Jan Plefka, and Andreas Rodigast, “Absence of gravitational contributions to the running yang-mills coupling,” *Phys. Lett. B* **660**, 579–582 (2008), arXiv:0710.1002 [hep-th].
- [53] Yong Tang and Yue-Liang Wu, “Gravitational contributions to the running of gauge couplings,” *Commun. Theor. Phys.* **54**, 1040–1044 (2010), arXiv:0807.0331 [hep-ph].
- [54] David J. Toms, “Quantum gravitational contributions to quantum electrodynamics,” *Nature* **468**, 56–59 (2010), arXiv:1010.0793 [hep-th].
- [55] Tobias Henz, Jan Martin Pawłowski, Andreas Rodigast, and Christof Wetterich, “Dilaton quantum gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **727**, 298–302 (2013), arXiv:1304.7743 [hep-th].
- [56] Tobias Henz, Jan Martin Pawłowski, and Christof Wetterich, “Scaling solutions for dilaton quantum gravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **769**, 105–110 (2017), arXiv:1605.01858 [hep-th].
- [57] Christof Wetterich and Masatoshi Yamada, “Variable planck mass from the gauge invariant flow equation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 066017 (2019), arXiv:1906.01721 [hep-th].
- [58] Astrid Eichhorn, Aaron Held, and Christof Wetterich, “Predictive power of grand unification from quantum gravity,” *JHEP* **08**, 111 (2020), arXiv:1909.07318 [hep-th].
- [59] Astrid Eichhorn, Aaron Held, and Christof Wetterich, “Quantum-gravity predictions for the fine-structure constant,” *Phys. Lett. B* **782**, 198–201 (2018), arXiv:1711.02949 [hep-th].
- [60] C. Wetterich, “Gauge invariant flow equation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* (2016), 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2018.04.020, arXiv:1607.02989 [hep-th].
- [61] M. Reuter and C. Wetterich, “Effective average action for gauge theories and exact evolution equations,” *Nuclear Physics B* **417**, 181–214 (1994).
- [62] C. Wetterich, “Quantum correlations for the metric,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 123525 (2017), arXiv:1603.06504 [gr-qc].
- [63] Jan M. Pawłowski, Manuel Reichert, Christof Wetterich,

- and Masatoshi Yamada, “Higgs scalar potential in asymptotically safe quantum gravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 086010 (2019), arXiv:1811.11706 [hep-th].
- [64] C. Wetterich, “Effective scalar potential in asymptotically safe quantum gravity,” *Universe* **7**, 45 (2021), arXiv:1911.06100 [hep-th].
- [65] C. Wetterich, “Gauge-invariant fields and flow equations for yang–mills theories,” *Nuclear Physics B* **934**, 265–316 (2018), arXiv:1710.02494 [hep-th].
- [66] Daniel F. Litim, “Optimized renormalization group flows,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 105007 (2001), arXiv:hep-th/0103195.
- [67] R. Slansky, “Group theory for unified model building,” *Phys. Rept.* **79**, 1–128 (1981).