

Thermal fluctuations in pinned elastic systems: field theory of rare events and droplets

Leon Balents

Department of Physics, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93106-4030

Pierre Le Doussal

CNRS-Laboratoire de Physique Theorique de l'Ecole Normale Supérieure, 24 rue Lhomond 75231 Paris France
(dated: March 22, 2002)

Using the functional renormalization group (FRG) we study the thermal fluctuations of elastic objects (displacement field u , internal dimension d) pinned by a random potential at low temperature T , as prototypes for glasses. A challenge is how the field theory can describe both typical (minimum energy $T = 0$) configurations, as well as thermal averages which, at any non-zero T as in the phenomenological droplet picture, are dominated by rare degeneracies between low lying minima. We show that this occurs through an essentially non-perturbative thermal boundary layer (TBL) in the (running) effective action $\Gamma[u]$ at $T > 0$ for which we find a consistent scaling ansatz to all orders. The TBL describes how temperature smoothes the singularities of the $T = 0$ theory and contains the physics of rare thermal excitations (droplets). The formal structure of this TBL, which involves all cumulants of the coarse grained disorder, is first explored around $d = 4$ using a one loop Wilson RG. Next, a more systematic Exact RG (ERG) method is employed, and first tested on $d = 0$ models where it can be pushed quite far. There we obtain precise relations between TBL quantities and droplet probabilities (those are constrained by exact identities which are then checked against recent exact results). Our analysis is then extended to higher d , where we illustrate how the TBL scaling remains consistent to all orders in the ERG and how droplet picture results can be retrieved. Since correlations are determined deep in the TBL (by derivatives of $\Gamma[u]$ at $u = 0$), it remains to be understood (in any d) how they can be retrieved (as $u = 0^+$ limits in the non-analytic $T = 0$ effective action), i.e. how to recover a $T = 0$ critical theory. This formidable "matching problem" is solved in detail for $d = 0, N = 1$ by studying the (partial) TBL structure of higher cumulants when points are brought together. We thereby obtain the β -function at $T = 0$, all ambiguities removed, displayed here up to four loops. A discussion of the $d > 4$ case and an exact solution at large d are also provided.

I. INTRODUCTION

Complex and disordered materials are often dominated, in their static properties, by rare but large fluctuations, and in their dynamics by ultra-slow relaxations. Such behavior occurs in a variety of systems involving many interacting degrees of freedom, from supercooled liquids to spin glasses¹. Understanding the nature of the low lying excitations in these highly complex systems and even more so, obtaining an analytic theory of the low temperature behaviour in realistic dimensions, is a formidable task. A class of problems which shares some of the basic physics and seem more amenable to analytic approaches are elastic manifolds pinned by quenched disorder. They are of interest for numerous experimental systems, such as interfaces in magnets^{2,3}, contact lines of fluids wetting a rough substrate⁴, charge density waves^{5,6} (CDW), Coulomb glasses⁷ and Wigner crystals^{8,9} in heterojunctions and on the surface of helium¹⁰, or vortex lattices in superconductors^{11,12,13}. It seems likely that a broader class of problems, including random field systems, can be understood by similar methods.

In this paper we will thus focus on the low temperature equilibrium behaviour of elastic manifolds pinned by a random potential. Such systems are usually described by a displacement field $u(r)$ which measures deformations away from a reference ordered state in the absence of any thermal, disorder induced, or quantum fluctuations. In

their classical version they are typically described by a model Hamiltonian

$$H[u] = \int d^d r \frac{1}{2} \dot{u}^2 + W(u(r); r); \quad (1)$$

where the random potential $W(u; r)$ can be chosen, for concreteness, Gaussian with zero mean and variance $\overline{W(u; r)W(u'; r')} = R(u - u')^{(d)}(r - r')$. We indicate here and in the following a disorder (ensemble) average by an overline. At equilibrium and low temperature the elastic manifold is usually pinned by disorder into non trivial rough configurations. In these so called glass phases, deformations scale with size L as $u \sim L^\zeta$ with roughness exponent ζ , and are dominated by the competition between elastic and disorder energies. Different physical cases are described by varying longitudinal (i.e. internal) dimensionality (d), transverse (i.e. embedding) dimensionality (N = the number of vector components of u (we focus on $N = 1$ for simplicity here), and $R(u)$. For instance $R(u)$ is a periodic function in the case of CDW or lattices, while in the case of interfaces in a ferromagnet it is short range for random bond disorder, and long range ($R(u) \sim |u|^\alpha$) for random field disorder.

As in other energy dominated glass phases in related systems, in the pinned elastic medium temperature is formally irrelevant in the RG sense as the ratio of typical temperature to energy scales flows to zero as $T_L \sim L^{-\phi}$. Here, the exponent $\phi = d/2 + 2$ (> 0) as a consequence

of the so called statistical tilt symmetry^{14,15} (STS), which expresses that the probability distribution of the disorder is translationally invariant. However, because of the multiplicity of low energy configurations, thermal effects are rather subtle and do in fact dominate the behaviour of some observables at small but non zero temperature. The basic mechanism is that even if local quasidegeneracies of ground states may occur only rarely, they can induce large deformations.

A minimal physical description of such thermal excitations in disordered glasses is provided by the phenomenological droplet picture^{16,17}. In its simplest form, it supposes the existence, at each length scale L , of a small number of excitations of size $u \sim L$ above a ground state, drawn from an energy distribution of width

$E \sim L$ with constant weight near $E = 0$. This means that with probability $T = L$ this excitation can be thermally active with $E \sim T$. The consequence is that static thermal fluctuations at a given scale are dominated by such rare samples/regions with two nearly degenerate minima. For instance, the $(2n)^{\text{th}}$ moment of fluctuations is expected to behave as

$$\overline{(u^2 i - u^2 f)^n} \sim \mathbb{G}_n(T=L) L^{2n} : \quad (2)$$

as a straightforward consequence (angular brackets denote the thermal average with respect to the canonical distribution). This simple picture seems to describe models such as Eq. (1) relatively well, at least in low dimensions,^{18,19,20}. The statistics of low energy excitations has been much studied numerically recently in other systems such as low dimensional spin glasses²¹. The droplet picture has been refined in many ways to account for more complex systems, and it is still controversial if this scenario fully describes systems such as spin glasses. Issues such as the fractal dimension d_f of these droplet excitations ("fat" droplets) and the possible global multiplicity of true ground states are still debated. In any case, it is clear that the basic mechanism of stochastic local ground state quasi-degeneracies must be part of any realistic analytical theory of such systems.

Similar physics occurs in the dynamics of these systems. Although we will not address it in details here, it is useful to study, in parallel to the statics, equilibrium dynamics.²² The Langevin equation of motion is

$$\partial_t u_{rt} = r^2 u_{rt} + F(u_{rt}; r) + \zeta(r; t); \quad (3)$$

with friction γ , thermal noise $\zeta(r; t)$ with $\langle \zeta(r; t) \zeta(r'; t') \rangle = 2 T^d \delta(r - r') \delta(t - t')$, and random force $F(u; r) = -\partial V(u; r) / \partial u$ (noting $u(r; t) = u_t$) with correlator denoted $\langle u \rangle = R^0(u)$. Equilibrium dynamics at non-zero temperature $T > 0$ provides an equivalent way, through the fluctuation dissipation relations, to study the statics. Extension of the droplet picture to the dynamics supposes that equilibrium dynamics in the glass phase is dominated by thermal activation between the thermally active low lying quasidegenerate minima, with typical barriers scaling as

$U_b \sim L$. Little is known about the distribution of these barriers, but there is some evidence²³ that

Despite the wide applicability and extensive theoretical studies of the elastic model, Eqs. (1-3), there are few analytical results for the ground state properties, and even less for thermal excitations. There are exact solutions in the mean-field ($N \rightarrow 1$) limit^{24,25,26,27} and for fully connected models^{28,29} (i.e. the $d \rightarrow 1$ limit). These limits are interesting and probably capture part of the physics but they also have peculiarities which are still not fully understood. In both, thermal activation over divergent barriers ($U_L \sim L$) is not included, and the infinite N limit (or Cayley tree^{30,31}) leads to global state degeneracies (with $E \sim T$) { replica symmetry breaking (RSB)³² { which may, or may not, be lifted at finite N . For finite N or exact results exist only in two cases. There are some exact results for the roughness and the free energy distributions of the $1+1$ dimensional directed polymer problem ($d = 1, N = 1$ case)^{33,34,35,36,37} and the related Burgers turbulence, and KPZ growth or exclusion problems^{38,39,40}. The $d = 0$ limit of a particle in a random potential is simpler but also interesting as in some cases the full structure of the zero temperature fixed point can be solved exactly and many results obtained. This is the case for the $N = 1$ Sinai or so called toy model (i.e. RF) case ($\beta = 2=3$): there the droplet picture is "exact" and the droplet probabilities are exactly known^{41,42}. Other interesting results have been obtained for any N in the marginal case ($\beta = 0$) of a log correlated $R(u)$, where RSB seems to occur⁴³.

A potentially promising method is the field-theoretic Functional Renormalization Group (FRG). It was originally developed at $T = 0$ to lowest order in an expansion in $\epsilon = 4 - d$ (one loop) for the statics⁴ and later for depinning⁴⁵ (around the upper critical dimension $d_{uc} = 4$). It is called "functional" since one must follow the RG flow of the full correlator $R(u)$ which becomes marginal in $d = 4$, as u becomes dimensionless. It is shown that $R(u)$ becomes non-analytic beyond the Larkin length as the random force correlator $\langle u \rangle = R^0(u)$ develops a cusp singularity at $u = 0$. Physically this cusp is associated to the existence of many metastable states and its meaning has been discussed in^{27,44,46}. At the depinning transition it yields a non-zero threshold force as $f_c \sim j^0(0^+)$. Most importantly, the non-analyticity of the effective action seems to allow to evade the so called dimensional reduction phenomenon which renders perturbation theory in an analytic $R(u)$ trivial and yields the incorrect result $\beta = 2$. Instead, in the space of non analytic functions, well behaved fixed points do exist, yielding reasonable values for the exponents ($\beta = 3$ for random field disorder, $\beta = 0.283$ for random bonds⁴⁴ and a logarithmic growth of displacement for CDW and Bragg glass¹²).

An outstanding but crucial question is the inherent consistency of this FRG method given this non-analyticity, a highly anomalous occurrence in conventional field theory. In particular, the occurrence of non-

analyticity in the effective action at finite scale usually does not occur, because fluctuations average out any singularities associated with multiple local minima. Here, the zero temperature field theory contains only disorder (sample to sample) and not thermal fluctuations, and these considerations do not apply. Instead it is tempting to compare the integration over fast modes to some (iterative) minimization procedure, which can then produce non-analytic energy landscape for fast modes ("shocks"). This picture can be made precise in simple single mode $d = 0$ "toy RG" models⁴⁶. The emergence of such shocks is well known in the equivalent Burgers-KPZ system in $d = 1$. In any case, the usual justification of perturbative renormalization group calculations (i.e. expansions) must be re-examined. We will comment further on the physics associated with this structure below.

A sign of the difficulties inherent in justifying the approach occurs already in attempts to extend this FRG method beyond the one loop approximation, and also at non-zero temperature. Formidable difficulties appear already at two loop order for the beta function at $T = 0$ (and even in the one-loop corrections to the two point correlation function). Because the effective action is non-analytic, the renormalized perturbation theory is ambiguous⁴⁷. An exact solution of the FRG at large N to any number of loops shows that special care has to be given to how any specific correlation is precisely defined, i.e. how the system is prepared²⁷. For $N = 1$ quasistatic depinning the ambiguity can be fully lifted, as at any steady state velocity $v > 0$, the elastic manifold always moves forward. The resulting field theory is found renormalizable to two loop⁴⁸, and the predictions fully supported by numerical simulations. A solution of the ambiguity for the statics, based on a requested (and hoped for) renormalizability property, was proposed in⁴⁷. An alternative route, technically more complex but more transparent physically, which we will follow here, is to study the system at non-zero temperature $T > 0$ where the action remains analytic and no such ambiguities appear.

Extensions of the FRG to non-zero temperature have been studied previously to one loop^{49,50,51,52}. Since the renormalized temperature $T_L = L^{-1}$ tends to zero, one expects that the asymptotic fixed point is still the $T = 0$ one. This convergence was found to be highly non-uniform. From the FRG flow equation truncated to follow the second cumulant alone ignoring feedback from higher cumulants, it was found that $\Gamma(u) = R^{(0)}(u)$ indeed remains analytic and differs from the $T = 0$ fixed point function only in a thermal boundary layer $u \sim T_L$ where the cusp singularity is rounded. A highly desirable consequence of this early one loop analysis^{49,50,51} was that the correct scaling for creep barriers $U_b \sim L^{-1}$ was recovered as a consequence of the boundary layer, from the divergence of $R^{(0)}(0) \sim 1/T_L$, the quantity which enters the friction (i.e. the time scale) renormalization. This very same divergence however, is also very troublesome in considering any extension to higher number of loops

(as was found in⁵²) since one easily realizes that adding one loop extracts one power of $1/T_L$, thus adding one new divergence. Until now the status of the boundary layer beyond one loop thus seemed rather unhealthy.

The occurrence of these technical issues is not surprising when one reflects upon the non-trivial physics that the field theory must describe. On the one hand, typical samples and their ground states (which control static correlations at $T = 0$) are critical in a fairly conventional sense. For instance, they are described by scaling exponents (ν ; ν_{eff}) and amplitudes, which apparently (hopefully!) can be computed systematically in an expansion. On the other hand, thermal fluctuations of the manifold are dominated by rare low-lying metastable configurations, which play no role in the $T = 0$ theory. The distribution (over disorder) of the thermally fluctuating part of the correlations (e.g. $\langle h(u) h(u') \rangle$) is thus extremely broad, and must be encoded somehow also in the field theory at $T > 0$. Both types of quantities are formally defined extremely similarly as derivatives of the effective action (e.g. of the renormalized $R(u)$) at $u = 0$. Nevertheless, they scale very differently and represent rather different physics. The coexistence of these two features strongly argues for an unconventional structure of the field theory.

In this paper we solve these issues in $d = 0$ and propose a consistent form for the effective action of the field theory in any dimension to any number of loops. We establish the clear connection between the formal thermal boundary layer and the physical droplet picture in any d (see⁵² for an early calculation). Thus we obtain a "field theory of droplets", i.e. we show that the present extension of the field theoretic FRG captures correctly the basic feature of glasses, rare events due to quasi-ground-state degeneracies. The mechanism is quite non-trivial. A short account of these results has been given in⁵³, together with a discussion of the thermal boundary layer structure which also arises in the dynamics and yields there to fluctuations of barriers, as discussed in detail in²².

First, in Section II, within a Wilson formulation, we derive and carefully analyze the full one loop FRG equations. We discover that the thermal boundary layer extends to all cumulants of the disorder. Thus the truncation to the second cumulant performed in previous studies is not strictly consistent at $T > 0$. It does however give the correct overall scaling, since we find that a consistent ansatz can be found for all cumulants. This results in a hierarchy of FRG equations for the scaling forms of each cumulant or the random potential, with good properties. Unfortunately, there is no longer a small parameter (ϵ has disappeared as a small parameter!) which prevents a perturbative solution. We must thus assume that there exists a global solution, which we call the Thermal Boundary Layer Ansatz (TB LA).

To further explore this novel theory we turn to the Exact RG method (ERG), explained in Section III. The ERG follows the full (non local) effective action func-

tional under coarse graining. To better understand the physics, we start in Section IV with a detailed analysis of the $d = 0$ case, where the effective action becomes a (replica) function rather than a functional, and can be studied without any truncation. There, the droplet picture is exact, and a variety of exact results are available for comparison with the methods developed here. From the TBLA and the ERG, we derive exact relations for droplet probabilities. These are tested on the exact solution of the toy model, and are found to pass this non-trivial check. In Section V, we introduce and discuss the problem of matching the zero temperature and boundary layer regimes. In particular, there are a variety of correlation functions describing the critical (typical) correlations of the ground state, and as such should be determined physically by the $T = 0$ non-analytic field theory. Formally, however, they are obtained as indicated above from derivatives of the effective action at $u = 0$, deep within the TBL. Thus, some information should be transmitted through the TBL. We show how these correlations are indeed determined from particular limits of the (non-analytic) zero temperature "outer" solution. This is accomplished through a careful consideration of the Partial Boundary Layer (PBL) structure that obtains when any two relative replica displacements ($u_a - u_b$) become of order T_L . Thus we will describe the full solution of the ambiguity problem (for $d = 0$ and $N = 1$) in the zero temperature beta function. As an example of the power of this prescription, we calculate the beta function and various correlations as a series in R up to four loop order.

With this physical understanding of the FRG equations in the thermal boundary layer regime in hand, we then turn to $d > 0$ in Section VI. We show that a fully consistent boundary layer ansatz can be found for the whole non-local effective action, and is self-consistent when applied to the ERG equations. This result provides a non-trivial "solution" to the above-mentioned disease of proliferation of $1/T_L$ divergences by resumming them order by order into a finite result. We show explicitly that the results from the droplet picture are recovered. Perturbative control (i.e. the expansion) is naively expected in the outer non-analytic solution. The necessary extension of the matching understood in $d = 0$ to obtain physical quantities (even zero temperature ones) remains a challenge. We discuss this issue and some perspectives on future work at the end of this section. Whether the method could account for other scenarios, more complex than the initial droplet picture, is also addressed.

A panoply of appendices give various technical details and a description of related models. In particular the case $d > 4$ is examined in details: it is shown, through analysis of the one loop FRG, exact solution at large d and qualitative arguments, that a phase with non-analytic effective action exists at $T = 0$ and strong enough disorder, but that the TBL remains of finite width, at variance with $d < 4$.

II. BOUNDARY LAYER WITHIN THE WILSON FRG

In this Section we establish the Wilson one loop FRG equations, which are a convenient starting point for our investigation of the thermal boundary layer. We include from the start all cumulants of the random potential since we do find, a posteriori, that they must all be considered.

A. Model, properties and notations

From now on we consider the equilibrium statics at $T > 0$, defined through the equilibrium Hamiltonian in (1). Formally, all static quantities of interest can be obtained from the replicated generating (partition) function

$$Z[n_a] = \int \prod_{a=1}^n D u_a \exp \left[-\frac{H[u_a]}{T} + \sum_r h_a(r) u_a(r) \right] \quad (4)$$

The number of replicas n can be taken to zero, or kept arbitrary as a bookkeeping device. Since some of our calculations are independent of n , we will explicitly indicate when the limit $n = 0$ is considered.

The connected cumulants of the random potential $W(u; r)$ in Eq. 1 are denoted $(k \text{ points})$:

$$\overline{W(u_1; r_1) \dots W(u_k; r_k)}^c = (k) S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots, u_k; r_1; \dots, r_k) \quad (5)$$

with $S^{(2)}(u; u^0) = R(u - u^0)$. The cumulants higher than second are generated by coarse graining, and are thus included here from the start. We ignore for the moment correlations between different points in internal space: this choice and its extensions are discussed below. The probability distribution of the random potential is chosen translationally invariant, so the cumulants satisfy

$$S^{(k)}(u_1 + \dots; \dots, u_k + \dots; u) = S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots, u_k; u) \quad (6)$$

They are also even so that $S^{(k)}(-u_1; \dots, -u_k; u) = S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots, u_k; u)$, the $S^{(k)}$ being by construction fully symmetric functions of their arguments.

Performing the disorder average one obtains:

$$Z[n] = \int D u \exp \left[-\frac{H[u]}{T} + \sum_r h_a(r) u_a(r) \right] \quad (7)$$

$$S[u] = \int d^d r \left(\frac{1}{2T} \sum_a u_a^2 - V[u] \right) \quad (8)$$

where we denote vectors in replica space as $u = (u_1; \dots, u_n)$, and we define the characteristic function of the pinning disorder

$$V[u] = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{T^k k!} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_k} S^{(k)}[u_{a_1}; \dots, u_{a_k}]; u \quad (9)$$

which is a fully symmetric, translationally-invariant function of the replica vector u . The property (6) results

in STS, e.g. in Fourier space $\ln Z[\tilde{h} = h] = \ln Z[\tilde{h} = 0] - T \ln(q)h(q) = (2\tilde{q})$ resulting in infinite sets of relations between correlation functions and other important consequences^{14,15}, to which we will return later. One consequence is that the "one replica" part of the action in (8) is not corrected by disorder under coarse graining (which is also why one can set the elastic coefficient to unity).

Let us give some useful notations and properties. For notational simplicity we will often write:

$$S^{(k)}(u_{12::k}) = S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots; u_k; u) \quad (10)$$

for any function, and for a function of one argument $R(u_{12}) = R(u_1, u_2)$. Since any function antisymmetric in any two replicas gives zero contribution to the action when summed over replicas, such functions may be added freely to any cumulant without physical consequences. This freedom will be used to simplify some expressions. Usually the cumulants $S^{(k)}$ will be taken fully symmetric in their arguments. It is then useful to define the symmetrization with respect to a given set of arguments:

$$\text{sym}_1 \dots (u_{1::k}) = \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{2 \in P_k} (u_{(1)} \dots u_{(k)}) \quad (11)$$

P_k being the set of permutations of k objects. Next we note two useful properties of the above decomposition of the action in cumulants, i.e. in number of replica sums (9). Translational invariance (6) implies relations between derivatives, e.g.:

$$\sum_{a=1}^k (\partial_a) S^{(k)}[u_1; \dots; u_k] = 0 \quad (12)$$

This implies properties such as:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{sym}_{10::0} S_{10::0}^{(k)}[u_1] &= 0; \\ \text{sym}_{20::0} S_{20::0}^{(k)}[u_1] &= (k-1) \text{sym}_{11::0} S_{11::0}^{(k)}[u_1]; \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where here $\text{sym} = \text{sym}_1$, and we denote everywhere partial derivatives $S_{n_1 n_2 : m_k}^{(k)}$ for n_i derivatives in the i -th argument.

Finally, there is a "gauge invariance" property: the change

$$S^{(k)}[u_1] \rightarrow S^{(k)}[u_1] + \text{sym}_1 \dots (u_1 \dots u_k) \quad (14)$$

yields an extra term in (8) proportional to an explicit n . Thus, if one considers $n = 0$, one can add freely to each k replica term any function of $p < k$ replicas. Physically, this gauge freedom corresponds to the fact that the random potential may be shifted by a u -independent random function of x , changing only the free energy in a trivial way but leaving all displacement correlation functions unchanged. Explicitly, this shift is of the form

$$W(u; x) \rightarrow W(u; x) + w(x); \quad (15)$$

where $w(x)$ can have arbitrary cross-correlations with W , i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} W(u_1; x_1) &= \sum_{x_1} \sum_{p, x} \sum_{(p; k)} W(x_{k+1}) \dots W(x_p) \\ &= \sum_{x_1} \sum_{p, x} \sum_{(p; k)} W(x_k); \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

with arbitrary $(p; k)$.

B. conventional scaling and one loop FRG equations

Let us first summarize the conventional view on the behaviour of the above action (8) under coarse graining and RG as it has emerged from previous works^{44,49,51,52}. In the usual zero-temperature power counting, namely $T \rightarrow bT$, $x \rightarrow bx$, and $u \rightarrow bu$, all the cumulants $S^{(k)}$ for $k > 2$ are irrelevant, and the second cumulant $R(u, u)$ is marginally relevant just below $d = 4$. Similarly, terms describing correlations between different internal space points are strongly irrelevant, which justifies to restrict to (5) with $k = 2$ (in the field theory language the only needed counterterms are for the local part of the second cumulant of the disorder).

More precisely, within the Wilson approach with a running UV momentum cut-off $\Lambda = e^{-l}$, one makes the above action dimensionless $S[u] = A_d \tilde{S}[u]$ as:

$$\tilde{S}[u] = \int d^d x \left(\frac{1}{2T_1} \nabla_x u^a \nabla_x u^a + V[u] \right); \quad (17)$$

with $r = r_1$. We have introduced the ratio of thermal energy T to pinning energy L which defines the running temperature:

$$T_1 = A_d T_1; \quad (18)$$

$$= d - 2 + 2 > 0; \quad (19)$$

The rescaled temperature T_1 flows to zero, indicating the dominance of energy over entropy as appropriate for a pinned glass phase. For later convenience we also introduced $A_d = S_d = (2)^d = 1 = (2^{d-1} d = 2) (d=2)$. The rescaled generating function reads:

$$V[u] = A_d \nabla_1^d \tilde{V}[u_1]; \quad (20)$$

$$\tilde{V}[u] = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{T_1^k k!} \sum_{a_1 \dots a_k} S^{(k)}[u_{a_1}; \dots; u_{a_k}]; \quad (21)$$

and corresponds to the rescaled dimensionless local cumulants:

$$R(u) = A_d^{-1} \nabla_1^d \tilde{R}(u_1); \quad (22)$$

$$S^{(k)}[u_{a_1}; \dots; u_{a_k}] = A_d^{-k} \nabla_1^k S^{(k)}[u_{a_1-1}; \dots; u_{a_k-1}];$$

These equations embody the conventional scaling. Within the Wilson formulation one finds that for $d = 4 - d = 1$ there are well defined fixed point functions

$R(u)$ is also of $O(u)$. One also expects that for $k > 2$ the fixed point value of the functions $S^{(k)}(u)$ (more specifically $S^{(k)}(u)$ for $k > 2$). This smallness has been argued to justify the truncation $S^{(k)} = 0$ for $k > 2$ at one-loop, to leading order in ϵ at $T = 0$. Prior investigations of thermal effects have presumed this truncation remains valid at $T > 0$ ^{49,51,52} also to obtain the leading order in ϵ . We now check this assumption.

To capture this leading-order behavior, we therefore employ a one loop FRG analysis. A general one loop FRG scheme contains in fact much more than the minimal physics needed (in principle) for a consistent $O(\epsilon)$ analysis by the usual power-counting. However, we will pursue it in the general form in order to have a single calculation which encompasses both this simple regime and the thermal boundary layer. We emphasize that at this stage it has mainly a heuristic value, since, as we find later, the restriction to one loop is not necessarily justified within the boundary layer. Similarly, the consideration of non-local terms in internal space for the disorder cumulants will also, in the end, become necessary. We ignore for now all of these further complications, which will be captured by the more rigorous (but heavier) exact RG scheme studied below. The present much simpler

one loop Wilson RG will give us a first good idea of what is happening in this theory.

Expanding the action (8) to quadratic order in the "fast" modes with Fourier component non-zero only in the shell $1 < q < 1 + d/2$ and performing the resulting Gaussian functional integral one obtains the differential flow equation for the function $V(u)$ as:

$$\partial_t V(u) = \frac{1}{2} A_d \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \text{Tr} \ln \left(\frac{T}{2} \partial_a \partial_b V(u) \right) \quad (23)$$

$$= A_d \int \frac{d^d p}{(2\pi)^d} \text{Tr} \left(\frac{T}{2} \partial_a \partial_b V(u) \right) \quad (24)$$

where the Tr denotes a trace in replica space only. For convenience we have introduced the parameters $c_p = 1/(2p)$ since an almost identical equation will be derived below for the exact RG in $d = 0$ (with $c_p = 1$).

We can now use the expansion in (9) and collect terms with a given number of replica sums on either side of (23). The general form of this equation is derived in Appendix A. We give here only the result for the projection of the FRG equation (23) onto two and three replica components:

$$\partial_t R(u) = \left(-4 + u \partial_u R(u) + T_1 R''(u) + S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u) + \frac{1}{2} R''(u)^2 - R''(0) R''(u) \right) \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_t S^{(3)}(u_{123}) = & \left(-2 - 6 + u \partial_u S^{(3)}(u_{123}) + \text{sym} \left[\frac{3T_1}{2} S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{123}) + \frac{3T_1}{2} R''(u_{13}) R''(u_{23}) \right. \right. \\ & + 3 \text{sym} \left[R''(u_{12}) (S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{113}) - S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{123})) \right] + R''(u_{12}) R''(u_{13})^2 - \frac{1}{3} R''(u_{12}) R''(u_{23}) R''(u_{31}) ; \\ & \left. \left. + \frac{3}{2} \text{sym} S_{1100}^{(4)}(u_{1123}) \right] \right) \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

where here $\text{sym} = \text{sym}_{123}$, and $\text{sym} = 1$. Since $R''(0)$ does not feed into higher cumulants (for $n = 0$) we define:

$$R(u) = R'(u) - R''(0)u^2/2 \quad (27)$$

Note that since additive (u -independent) constants in (25) are pure gauge (for $n = 0$ in the sense discussed above) we will in general ignore them below. Equations, with similar structure exist for higher cumulants (see Appendix A for details).

C. analysis within conventional scaling

One first notes that (25, 26) does not close, since there is a feedback of cumulant $k + 1$ in cumulant k , though only in a single term. At zero temperature, in the conventional scaling discussed above this should not be a

problem. Let us first discuss that case and formally set $T_1 = 0$ in (25, 26). We will call the solutions of the resulting equation the "outer" solution. This terminology is motivated by the thermal boundary layer analysis which is performed below.

1. zero temperature

For $T = 0$ the solution $R_1(u)$ of (25) (neglecting the third cumulant term $S^{(3)}$) converges to a zero temperature fixed point function⁴⁴ $R(u)$, with a small set of universality classes^{12,49}. For, e.g. $W(u; x)$ periodic on the interval $0 < u < 1$, one finds $\epsilon = 0$ and the force-force correlator $\tilde{w}(u) = R''(u) = M \ln_{n2Z} \frac{1}{6} [(u - 1/2)^2 - 1/12]$. Its non-analytic behavior at small u ,

$$\tilde{w}(u) \sim \tilde{w}(0) - \frac{1}{2} u^2 + O(u^2); \quad (28)$$

is, however, super-universal, i.e. the same for all disordered elastic models. We denote $\tilde{f}^0(0^+)j = \tilde{\sim}$, where $\tilde{\sim}$ is a $O(1)$ constant whose numerical value depends on the model. The physical significance of this cusp has been discussed by several authors^{27,44,46}. It is related to the existence of multiple metastable minima in the effective potential, since these are implied by the divergence of the mean squared curvature of the pinning potential, $\tilde{\sim}_{T=0}^0(0) = (\partial_u^2 V(u))^2 = +1$. We will see further consequences below. Note that the second derivative of (25) at $u = 0$ yields the fixed point constraint

$$R^0(0) = \tilde{\sim}(0) = \tilde{\sim}^2 = (2): \quad (29)$$

Note that this will be the precise definition of the parameter $\tilde{\sim}$ in the remainder of this paper. The relation between $\tilde{\sim}$ and the first derivative given above then holds only within the one-loop Wilson approximation, and is corrected at higher order.

The neglect of $S^{(3)}$ then appears consistent. Given that the second cumulant flows to a fixed point R then (26) shows that the third cumulant also flows to the fixed point:

$$S^{(3)}(u_{123}) = \frac{3}{2} \text{sym} (R^0(u_{12})R^0(u_{13})^2 - \frac{1}{3}R^0(u_{12})R^0(u_{23})R^0(u_{31})): \quad (30)$$

Thus, at least formally, $S_{T=0}^{(3)} \sim \tilde{\sim}^3$. The other terms, including the fourth cumulant $S_{T=0}^{(4)}$ (and higher which have fixed points⁵² similar to (30)) can be neglected self-consistently in that picture, as well $S^{(3)}$ in the equation for $R(u)$, as they yield only higher-order corrections in $\tilde{\sim}$.

Although this picture is consistent at $T = 0$ to the lowest order in $\tilde{\sim}$, closer examination shows possible ambiguities in the feeding term $S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u)$ in Eq. (25) if one uses (30) which make the next order in $\tilde{\sim}$ more problematic. In particular, differentiating (30) and taking $v = u_1 = u_2$ similarly yields:

$$S_{110}^{(3)}(v;0;u) = R^0(u)(R^0(u)^2 - R^0(v)^2) - \frac{1}{2}R^0(v)R^0(u)^2 - R^0(v)R^0(v)R^0(u): \quad (31)$$

It turns out that in this expression has well defined and coinciding limits as $v \rightarrow 0$. However, in the formal FRG equation (25) $S_{110}^{(3)}(v;0;u)$ is evaluated exactly at $v = 0$ and generally the replacement of that expression by either $\lim_{v \rightarrow 0^+}$ or $\lim_{v \rightarrow 0^-}$ may not be valid in particular renormalisation scheme. More general ambiguities arise at higher orders and cannot be so easily resolved regardless of the scheme. Even in the present Wilsonian formulation, treatment of this term alone is not consistent since other two-loop contributions arise at order $\tilde{\sim}^3$, thus it is not clear that the smoothness of this limit is sufficient to guarantee a well behaved $\tilde{\sim}$ -expansion even to this order. Studies beyond Wilson⁵⁴ are discussed elsewhere⁴⁷ so we will not address them here. Instead,

we follow a different route and focus on $T > 0$, where no ambiguity appears, and first summarize the naive $T > 0$ analysis still to lowest order in $\tilde{\sim}$. A systematic study of the resolution of these ambiguities by connecting zero and non-zero temperature quantities will be performed for the case of $d = 0$ in Section IV.

2. non-zero temperature

Reinstating the T_1 terms in (25,26), the naive $T > 0$ analysis still assumes that $S^{(3)} = R$ and converts (25) into a decoupled flow equation for $R_1(u)$. Since $T_1 = e^{-1}$ flows rapidly to zero, $R_1(u)$ does converge to the $T = 0$ fixed point. However, since at $T > 0$ the function remains analytic around $u = 0$ the convergence to the non-analytic $T = 0$ fixed point function is highly non-uniform. One finds^{49,50} that for $u < T_1 = \tilde{\sim}$ the cusp singularity is rounded in a thermal boundary-layer (TBL). Its detailed solution yields two regimes at large l (precisely $T_1 = \tilde{\sim}^2$):

$$R_1(u) \sim R(u) \quad \text{for } u \ll O(1) \quad T_1 = \tilde{\sim}; \quad (32)$$

$$R_1(u) = \frac{1}{2}R^0(0)u^2 + T_1^3(\tilde{\sim})^2 r(\alpha); \quad \text{for } \alpha = \frac{\tilde{\sim}u}{T_1} \gg O(1); \quad (33)$$

where we introduced the TBL scaling variable α and scaling function $r(\alpha)$. The matching of the thermal boundary layer (33) to the zero temperature behaviour outside (28) requires that:

$$r^0(\alpha) \sim \tilde{\sim}^2 \quad \text{for } \alpha \gg 1: \quad (34)$$

Substituting the TBL form (33) in (25) one finds that (up to additive constants) the leading terms are $O(T_1^2)$ yielding the constraint that

$$(2 - \frac{R^0(0)u^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2}(r^0(\alpha) - R^0(0))^2 + r^0(\alpha)) = 0 \quad (35)$$

is a constant, which must thus equal $r^0(0)$. Note that the $\partial_1 R$ term is $O(T_1^3 = \tilde{\sim}^2)$ and the rescaling term (apart from the one acting on the purely quadratic part of R) is even smaller as $O(T_1^3 = \tilde{\sim}^3)$ so both can be safely neglected at large l such that $T_1 = \tilde{\sim}^2$. Using (29), (35) yields⁵¹

$$r^0(\alpha) - r^0(0) = \frac{1}{1 + \alpha^2} - 1; \quad (36)$$

which is smooth for $\alpha \gg O(1)$ and has the desired matching property (34). Note that the flow of $R_1^0(0)$ is not fully specified by the solution. However the existence of the above single TBL together with the matching implies that the value to which it converges must be equal to the $T = 0$ fixed point value, as can be seen from (35) (a different asymptotic value would require a more complex TBL scenario, not supported here).

Thus the problem of matching is successfully solved within this approach. The convergence to (33) was studied in⁵¹, where it was found that an expansion in higher powers of T_1 could be solved order by order. In⁵² it was found that the form (36) was particular to Wilson, as other one loop schemes (with the same truncation to second cumulant) give other analytical forms. Although $r(u)$ was found non universal, its large u (34) and small u behaviour must be. For instance, the divergence of the mean curvature is constrained to be

$$T_1 R_1^{\text{om}}(0) \propto T_1^{-2}; \quad (37)$$

(i.e. $r^{\text{om}}(0) = 1$). This simple consequence of the TBL was found to yield for susceptibility fluctuations the same scaling as predicted by droplets⁵². Also, since a similar analysis (and truncation) in the dynamics⁵¹ yields that the friction grows as $\partial_1 \ln \tau_1 = R_1^{\text{om}}(0)$ the TBL nicely recovers the scaling of barriers $U_b \propto L$ expected in the creep motion. Thus there must be some truth in this TBL scaling, although this simple analysis is far from being sufficient, as we now show.

Before doing so, we note that above four dimensions, the situation is rather different, and discussed in Appendix H, where this case is analyzed by FRG and large d methods. For a weak random potential with smooth correlations, no cusp arises even at $T = 0$, and there is therefore no TBL. For stronger disorder or a sufficiently non-smooth potential, the zero temperature cusp does arise. In this case, however, the TBL has a width $\propto T$ instead of T_1 , and so does not scale to zero with the infrared cutoff. The physics of this difference (which we believe is associated to the short-scale nature of metastable states for $d > 4$) is discussed in Appendix H.

D. thermal boundary layer: the systematic analysis

We need now to estimate the magnitude of the term $S_{110}^{(3)}$ in the second cumulant equation (25), in the TBL region $u \propto T_1$, which has not been done before. For that we must carefully reexamine the equation for the

third cumulant (26). First one sees that $S^{(3)}(u_{123})$ will also have a TBL form for $u_i \propto T_1$ since the $O[(R^{(0)})^3]$ terms in (26) feed their boundary-layer scaling forms into $S^{(3)}$. Naively balancing these terms with the rescaling part ($S^{(3)} \propto T_1^{-3}$) suggests $S^{(3)} \propto T_1^{-3}$. This is, however, inconsistent, since the remaining terms linear in $S^{(3)}$ would then be $O(T_1^{-2})$. Instead, the only consistent TBL ansatz for the third cumulant is:

$$S^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) = (\sim) T_1^{-4} S^{(3)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_2; \alpha_3) \quad (38)$$

The second derivative term feeding into Eq. (25) then reads:

$$S_{110}^{(3)}(0; 0; u) = T_1^{-2} S_{110}^{(3)}(0; 0; \alpha) \quad \text{for } \alpha \propto 0(1) \quad (39)$$

and is thus of the same order $O(T_1^{-2})$ than the other surviving terms in the boundary layer for $R(u)$. Thus the above described result for $r(\alpha)$ appears as an (uncontrolled) approximation, since we now have two coupled equations for the TBL scaling functions r and $s^{(3)}$. The equation (25) now leads to:

$$0 = \frac{\alpha^2}{2} + \frac{1}{2} (r^{\text{om}}(\alpha) - r^{\text{om}}(0))^2 + r^{\text{om}}(\alpha) - r^{\text{om}}(0) + S_{110}^{(3)}(0; 0; \alpha); \quad (40)$$

while $s^{(3)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_2; \alpha_3)$ satisfies a TBL equation simply obtained from (26) by setting $S^{(3)} \propto s^{(3)}$, $R \propto r$, $u_i \propto \alpha_i$, $T_1 \propto 1$, suppressing the linear rescaling term and setting the l.h.s. to zero.

Of course we must now worry about the fourth cumulant term $S_{1100}^{(4)}$ in the equation for $S^{(3)}$, so in fact there is an infinite set of coupled equations and the scaling forms in (33-38) must be extended to all cumulants. We will now establish the consistent form of all cumulants and derive the TBL equation for all of them. There are a few subtleties in that construction.

Let us first write the one loop FRG equation for the k -th cumulant in a very schematic form:

$$\partial_1 S^{(k)} = O S^{(k)} + S^{(k+1)\text{om}} + T_1 S^{(k)\text{om}} + \sum_{m=2}^k \sum_{k_1=k-m+1}^k P_m^{(k)} S^{(k_1)\text{om}} S^{(k-m)\text{om}} + T_1 \sum_{m=2}^{k-1} \sum_{k_1=k-m+1}^{k-1} P_m^{(k-1)} S^{(k_1)\text{om}} S^{(k-m)\text{om}} \quad (41)$$

where O denotes the rescaling linear operator, the two next terms are tadpoles, and each of the last two terms is a loop with $m \geq 2$ disorder vertices. The counting of T factors results from there being m propagators per loop, hence a factor T^m , and a factor T^{-k_1} associated to each k_1 -replica vertex $S^{(k_1)}$. One easily sees that only

these terms can appear. This property and their detailed structure is worked out in Appendix A, but is irrelevant for the present discussion. Among them there is a feeding term of $O[(R^{(0)})^k]$.

A look at (41) suggests that the natural generalization

of (33-38), namely

$$S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots; u_k) \sim T_1^{k+1} S^{(k)}(\alpha_1; \dots; \alpha_k) \quad (42)$$

should produce a consistent TBL equation with all terms in (41) of order $O(T_1^k)$, except the rescaling and left hand side which are $O(T_1^{k+1})$ and thus disappear from the TBL equation as T_1^{-2} . This is essentially correct, apart from one simple, but important, modification. In the TBL equation for r (35, 40) one term survives in the rescaling part, coming from the quadratic part of $R(u)$, and this is because this term scales naturally as $R^{(0)}(0)u^2 \sim T_1^2$ (while all other even monomials scale as larger, hence subdominant, powers of T_1). One can then ask whether one should consider similar terms in the TBL equation for $s^{(k)}$, which is $O(T_1^k)$. The construction of the k -replica term is detailed in Appendix B. One easily sees that for $k = 2p$ even, the monomial of lowest degree one can construct which is a genuine k -replica term is indeed of order u^k and thus scales as T_1^k . It reads:

$$Q_{2p} u_1 u_2 \dots u_{2p}; \quad (43)$$

where $Q_{2p} = S_{11 \dots 1}^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0)$, and is fully symmetric, even, and translationally invariant (see Appendix B). A k -replica monomial must contain at least

one of each replica, i.e. the product (43), otherwise it is a pure gauge. No such term exists for $k = 2p+1$ odd, and one shows that the term of smallest order in that case is of order u^{k+3} . For instance for the third cumulant, one checks that the term of order u^4 , namely

$$\text{sym}_{123} u_1^2 u_2 u_3 \quad (44)$$

is forbidden by translational invariance (see Appendix B). Thus the third cumulant starts at higher order $S^{(3)} \sim u^6$. The conclusion is thus that the TBL form (42) is correct for odd cumulants but for even cumulants it should be replaced by the correct TBL form:

$$S^{(2p)}(u_1 \dots u_k) = u Q_{2p} u_1 u_2 \dots u_{2p} + (\sim) T_1^{2p+1} S^{(2p)}(\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{2p}); \quad (45)$$

Having determined the scaling for all cumulants within the TBL, we briefly return to the third cumulant TBL equation. Using (46), we can express the feeding terms from the fourth cumulant in their appropriate TBL form. Remarkably, as for the second cumulant, a formal analytic solution for $s^{(3)}$ is possible (and this appears to generalize to all cumulants). Using the gauge freedom and STS relations (13) one directly rearranges the third cumulant equation into the form

$$\begin{aligned} s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{123}) - s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{113}) &= \frac{1}{1 + r^{(0)}(\alpha_{12})} G(\alpha_{123}) + a(\alpha_{13}) + a(\alpha_{23}) + \text{sym}_{123} \frac{h_1}{2} r^{(0)}(\alpha_{13}) r^{(0)}(\alpha_{23}) \\ &+ r^{(0)}(\alpha_{12}) r^{(0)}(\alpha_{13})^2 - \frac{1}{3} r^{(0)}(\alpha_{12}) r^{(0)}(\alpha_{23}) r^{(0)}(\alpha_{13}) + \frac{1}{2} s_{1100}^{(4)}(\alpha_{1123}) \quad ; \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where $G(\alpha_{123}) = G^{(1)}(\alpha_{123}) + G^{(2)}(\alpha_{123})$, where $G^{(1)}, G^{(2)}$ are translationally invariant functions symmetric in 1 & 2 and respectively antisymmetric in 1 & 3, 2 & 3, and $a(\alpha)$ is an even function. These are constrained by the requirement that $s^{(3)}$, or equivalently $s_{111}^{(3)}$ is a symmetric function, and in the latter case, fully gauge invariant. Although this has been written as a formal solution for $s^{(3)}$, it clearly involves the fourth cumulant quantity $s_{1100}^{(4)}(\alpha_{1123})$. Thus "solutions" of this form do not close, and form a coupled hierarchy. Indeed, it is equally valid to view (46) as expressing the fourth cumulant feeding term in terms of lower cumulants. This and other similar relations are used later in the paper to simplify some expressions.

Let us write the TBL scaling form in a more compact way in terms of the rescaled characteristic function defined in (21). It takes the form:

$$V_1(u) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_{2p}} f_{2p} \alpha_{a_1} \dots \alpha_{a_{2p}} \frac{T_1}{(\sim)^2} v(\tilde{\alpha});$$

$$\quad (47)$$

where we have defined the boundary-layer replica vector, and scaling function:

$$\tilde{\alpha} = \sim u T_1 \quad (48)$$

$$v(\tilde{\alpha}) = \sum_{k=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{a_1 \dots a_k} S^{(k)}[\alpha_{a_1}; \dots; \alpha_{a_k}]; \quad (49)$$

Note that all dependence in T_1 , which has been made apparent in (47), factors in front of all cumulants and that the TBL characteristic function $v(\tilde{\alpha})$ approaches a fixed point form at large l . Below we will discuss the physical meaning of the set of (l -dependent) constants,

$$f_{2p} = S_{11 \dots 1}^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0) \quad (50)$$

with $f_2 = R^{(0)}(0) = (\sim)^2$ (remember that $u_a u_b \sim \frac{1}{2}(u_a - u_b)^2$ up to gauge term s).

Inserting the l -dependent form (47) into (23), taking into account all l -dependent rescaling factors, and discarding terms small as T_1^{-2} , one gets the TBL-FRG

equations which must be satisfied by the constants f_{2p} and the function v at their fixed point. The Trln term in (23) takes the form :

$$\text{Trln} \sum_{a,b} M_{ab} \sum_i \partial_a \partial_b v(\vec{x}) ; \quad (51)$$

$$M_{ab} = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} f_{2p} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_{2p}} \alpha_{a_1} \dots \alpha_{a_{2p}} \quad (52)$$

with $\alpha_a = (\vec{f})_a = T_1$, and $\partial_a = \partial/\partial x_a$ here.

However we see that because the monomials associated to each f_{2p} is such that one replica appears only once, the matrix M_{ab} is independent of replica a and b . Thus in the expansion of (51) to any order in M , any power of M or any product of the form :

$$\sum_b M_{ab} \partial_b \partial_c v(\vec{x}) = \sum_b M_{ab} \partial_b \partial_c v(\vec{x}) = 0 \quad (53)$$

vanishes when traced, because of translational invariance (12). Thus M can be set to zero (for $n = 0$) in (51) and

we finally obtain the non-trivial one loop Wilson fixed point TBL equation in a very compact form :

$$\sum_{p=1}^{\infty} x_{2p} f_{2p} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_{2p}} \alpha_{a_1} \dots \alpha_{a_{2p}} \frac{1}{2} \text{Trln} \sum_{a,b} \partial_a \partial_b v(\vec{x}) = 0; \quad (54)$$

where all l dependence has disappeared, the trace being over replica indices. The first term is, as discussed above, the only one surviving from the rescaling part and contains the scaling eigenvalues:

$$x_2 = \frac{2}{d} = 0 \quad (55)$$

$$x_{2p} = d - 2p \quad (56)$$

(54) is a highly compact form which, expanded in the number of replica sums, yields coupled boundary layer equations for r and $s^{(3)}$, and all higher cumulants. It is useful for later purpose to also give the schematic structure of these TBL equation for the coupled function $s^{(k)}(u_1; \dots; u_k)$:

$$0 = \sum_{k \text{ even}} x_k f_k \alpha_1 \dots \alpha_k + \sum_{m=2}^{\infty} s^{(k+1)} + s^{(k)} + \sum_{k_1=k+m}^{\infty} s^{(k_1)} s^{(k-m)} + \sum_{k_1=k-1+m}^{\infty} s^{(k_1)} s^{(k-m)} \quad (57)$$

for any $k \geq 2$, where, as in (41) all coefficients and detailed structure has been suppressed (they are identical to the one in (41) and given in Appendix A). Note that the coefficients f_k appear only in the first term and have no feedback in the others. Similarly, the naively first non-gauge term in $s^{(2p)}$ proportional to $\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{2p}$ (subdominant to f_{2p}) drops out of the equation completely. Thus this term can be taken as zero, and $s^{(2p)}$ thus is chosen to start as α^{2p+2} .

E. physical consequences, correlations, droplets

Let us now pause and analyze what has been achieved. We have derived, within the one loop Wilson FRG, coupled flow equations for all cumulants of the disorder. We have found a scaling form for its solution at large l (i.e. small T_1) which exhibits a thermal boundary layer, consistent for all cumulants. It is expressed in terms of an infinite set of unknown parameters f_{2p} and functions $s^{(p)}$. These encode for the probability distribution of the coarse grained disorder, and obey the reduced fixed point equations (54, 57).

The first observation is that there is no remaining small parameter in Eqs. (54,57). It is clear in the Trln term. For the other terms it also holds if conventional (zero temperature) scaling holds. Indeed although

$f_2 = 1$, the product $x f_2 = 1$, and in the conventional zero T scaling $S_{11;l}^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0) \sim 0^{2p}$, thus $x_{2p} f_{2p} \sim 0(1)$. The problem has thus become fully non-perturbative and one is thus in the uncomfortable situation where a full solution of this fixed point equation (54, 57) is required simultaneously for all cumulants of the disorder distribution, an infinite number of functions. Although some formal algebraic relations between cumulants can be obtained in the TBL, as discussed above for $s^{(3)}$, no general solution of the full hierarchy appears possible. Thus at this stage we have no choice but to assume the existence of a global, well behaved solution to the TBL-FRG equation and explore some of the consequences of this thermal boundary layer ansatz (TBLa). As we show below, it implies that a smooth zero temperature limit exists for displacement correlations determined by the f_{2k} coefficients, i.e. a well defined limit exists as the bare temperature $T \rightarrow 0^{+64}$. The above definition of the f_{2k} further implies that conventional scaling holds for all $T = 0$ correlations, i.e. $u_{T=0}^{2k} \sim 2k$ for $k > 1$, as we now show.

1. zero temperature limit: evading dimensional reduction

Let us explore this further, one of the aims being to obtain zero temperature correlation functions (as well as $T > 0$ ones). The coefficients f_{2p} (50) have an interest-

ing physical meaning, linked to the so called "dimensional reduction" (DR) property. They are the rescaled cumulants of the so called random force, precisely:

$$\overline{F(0; r_1) \cdots F(0; r_k)} = S_{11 \dots 1l}^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0); \quad (58)$$

The model (1), as other disordered systems such as random field spin models, has the amazing DR exact property that if one computes any observable (e.g. correlation functions) at $T = 0$ in perturbation theory in analytic disorder cumulants, the result is equal to all orders in perturbation theory to the result in the simple model with only a random force, introduced by Larkin to model physics at short scales:

$$H_{\text{eff}}[u] = \int d^d r \frac{1}{2} \nabla u^2 + \int d^d r F(0; r) u(r) \quad (59)$$

which is simply, of course (in Fourier)

$$u(q) = F(0; q) = q^2 \quad (60)$$

we will see that the f_{2p} do indeed determine the correlations at $T = 0$ (connected with respect to disorder), simply as expected from (60):

$$\overline{u(q_1) \cdots u(q_p)}^C \Big|_{T=0} = (2^{-d})^d \int \prod_{i=1}^p d^d q_i C_{T=0}(q_i; \dots; 0); \quad (61)$$

$$C_{T=0}(q_1; \dots; 0) = q_1^{2p} S_{11 \dots 1l}^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0);$$

except that from the TBLA these cumulants are independent and flow under RG, yielding a non trivial result, different from the "naive DR estimate" which assumes them constant and is incorrect. Thus the structure (47) has nice properties: it does obey correctly the DR property, since setting naively $T = 0$ by simply removing the term proportional to T_1 in (47) does indeed leave us only with a random force. At the same time, though, the TBL provides a novel and non-trivial mechanism to evade the "naive DR estimate" since it gives a non-trivial renormalization of the random force cumulants. It is particularly interesting since only two other mechanisms have been proposed previously to evade DR, namely (i) replica symmetry breaking, only convincingly demonstrated in mean field models (ii) the cusp and non analyticity of the disorder cumulants in the FRG, demonstrated in the statics only to one loop (although up to two loops at depinning). Here we have constructed another one, as apparent from the structure (47).

Specifically the zero temperature correlations can be computed by restoring the l dependence, using from (22) that $S_{11 \dots 1l}^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0) = A_d^{2p} \frac{d+2p+2p}{l} S_{11 \dots 1l}^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0)$ and the TBLA property (50) that $S_{11 \dots 1l}^{(2p); 1l}(0; \dots; 0)$ converges to its fixed point value $2p \sim 2p f_{2p}$. We can then simply estimate the correlation when e.g. all momenta have similar magnitude $q_i^2 = q^2$. Setting $l = \ln(q/q_0)$, one finds from (61):

$$C_{T=0}(q_1; \dots; 0) \sim q^{2p} f_{2p} q^{2p(d-1+)}; \quad (62)$$

with $b_p = A_d^{1/2p} \sim 2p$. Taking into account the Fourier transform, this is the form expected from the scaling $u \sim L^{-1}$, i.e. real space correlations $\overline{u(r_1) \cdots u(r_{2p})}^{T=0} \sim L^{2p}$ (L the common scale). The prefactors of the correlations however, and thus the full probability distribution, are determined by the constants f_{2p} . It is thus likely (but at this stage not established) that they should be universal (for long range and periodic disorder, and up to a common non universal scale for short range disorder). Similar correlations were computed recently for depinning⁵⁵. It is worth noting that, as was the case for $R^{(0)}(0)$, the terms involving the higher cumulants of the random force f_{2p} do not feed back into the renormalization of the nonlinear part of pinning force (and thus do not appear in the \ln), as was the case for $R^{(0)}(0)$. This is also to be expected on physical grounds, since they only result in the shift (59) and can thus be eliminated by a translation.

2. non-zero T , droplets

In addition to the terms containing f_{2p} which describe the zero temperature limit, (47) also contains a term proportional to T_1 which describes the first correction proportional to T in the correlation functions. Remarkably, its content is precisely the one of the droplet picture. Let us indicate here how it works, remaining very schematic for now. A more precise and detailed formulation will be given in Section IV.

Let us consider an arbitrary correlation amongst replicas (connected with respect to disorder). Since same replicas correspond to same thermal average, it corresponds to some disorder average of some product of thermal averages (itself connected⁶⁰), and we write schematically:

$$\overline{u_{q_1}^{a_1} \cdots u_{q_p}^{a_{2p}}}^C = (2^{-d})^d \int \prod_{i=1}^p d^d q_i C_{q_1 \dots q_p}^{a_1 \dots a_{2p}} \quad (63)$$

$$= \overline{u_{q_1} u_{q_1} \cdots u_{q_p} u_{q_p}} \quad (64)$$

Lowest order perturbation theory gives

$$C_{q_1 \dots q_p}^{a_1 \dots a_{2p}} = \frac{T^{2p}}{q_1^2 \cdots q_p^2} V^{(2p)}(0); \quad (65)$$

where here $V^{(2p)}(0)$ denotes a $2p$ -th derivative at $u = 0$, the exact replica index structure of which we ignore here. Substituting the rescaled form for the characteristic function yields $V_1^{(2p)}(0) = A_d^{d+2p} V_1^{(2p)}(0)$. Inserting now the TBLA (47) gives

$$C_{q_1 \dots q_p}^{a_1 \dots a_{2p}} = b_p^{2p} \frac{1}{q_1^2 \cdots q_p^2} (f_{2p} + \frac{T_1}{(q \sim f)} V^{(2p)}(0)) \quad (66)$$

Thus we find that at $T \neq 0$, as expected:

$$\overline{u_{q_1} u_{q_1} \cdots u_{q_p} u_{q_p}}^C \Big|_{T=0} \quad (67)$$

obtained above (61,62) (since at $T = 0$ the correlations become independent of the replica index $\{$ in the absence of RSB). The contribution of thermal excitations, to lowest order takes the form

$$C_{T=0} = (Tq)^{2p-2} q^{2p(d-1)} b_p^0 v^{(2p)}(0); \quad (68)$$

with $b_p^0 = A_d^{1-2p} \sim 2p^{-2}$. This is exactly the scaling expected from the droplet picture at low temperature. In real space:

$$C_{T=0} \sim L^{-2p} \quad (69)$$

with $C = \overline{h_{r_1} \dots h_{r_{2p}}}$. The complicated set of TBL fixed point coefficients thus encode for the distribution of low energy excitation. This equivalence will be further explored below.

Another question is what fixes the coefficients f_{2p} ? Let us examine the FRG equation (A15) for the fourth cumulant (see Appendix A). We need to take four derivatives at zero. Since $R^{(0)}(u)$ starts at u^2 , $S_{110}^{(3)}$ as u^4 , $S_{110}^{(5)}$ as u^6 , only one term in addition to the rescaling term contributes. The analysis is identical for any $2p$ -th cumulant and one finds

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 S_{1::1}^{(2p)}(0;::0) &= (d-2p) S_{1::1}^{(2p)}(0;::0) \\ &+ p T_1 S_{311::1}^{(2p)}(0;::0); \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

a simple generalization of the relation (37) for the second cumulant. Thus the f_{2p} are determined from the hierarchy, and from the function v itself.

A further hypothesis is that these f_{2p} match the behavior of the outer solution, in particular,

$$f_{2p} \stackrel{?}{=} \lim_{u \downarrow 0} \lim_{T_1 \downarrow 0} S_{11::1}^{(2p)}(u_1; \dots; u_{2p}; u_{11::1}^{(2p)}(0^+; \dots; 0^+); 0 \quad (71)$$

Here we have introduced the notation 0^+ for the small argument limit of the outer solution. Given the existence of the TBL, this is not a trivial statement. It is a particular case of a more general question of how (and which) zero temperature quantities match to $T \rightarrow 0$ objects within the TBL. The appealing result of the above postulate is that the f_{2p} coefficients are truly properties of the system at zero temperature, despite being defined from (50) deep inside the TBL region ($u = 0$ rather than $u = 0^+$). This is, however, only an hypothesis. The structure and consistency of matching is explored and verified in some detail in $d = 0$ in Section V.

If one attempts to generalize the TBLA to match further and further (nonanalytic) derivatives of the outer solution, it seems natural to expect that:

$$V_1(\mathfrak{x}) = V_1^{T=0}(\mathfrak{x}) + \frac{T_1}{(\sim \tilde{f})} v(\mathfrak{x}) + \frac{T_1}{(\sim \tilde{f})} v_2(\mathfrak{x}) + \dots \quad (72)$$

Another consequence of the TBL ansatz is that the scaling of moments of the pinning force derivatives $(S_{n_1 \dots n_{2k}}^{(2k)}(0; \dots; 0))$ for $k = 1; 2; \dots$ is not modified from the naive results of Refs. 49,51. Thus, in particular, the interpretation of the boundary layer as representing thermal activation, and moreover the equality of the barrier exponent with β remains unchanged. It is somewhat less clear, but we think likely, that the general form of the velocity-force characteristic^{49,51} (in the low velocity limit) should be unmodified, as this relies only on the scaling assumption. We leave this question open to future analysis (see also the parallel work on the dynamics in^{22,53}).

However, although the scaling of moments is preserved, the prefactors are certainly modified by inclusion of higher cumulants. Indeed, we have shown that the $S^{(3)}(0;0;u)$ term in (25) modifies $R^{(4)}(0)$ (and all higher derivatives) if the full hierarchy is solved self-consistently. This value appears explicitly in calculations of susceptibility fluctuations⁵² and in the velocity-force characteristic⁵¹, so these results may be modified by the non-Gaussian distribution encoded in the higher-replica terms. Note however that s in (40) starts as u^6 and thus it cannot change the result $r^{(0)}(0) = 1$, thus (37) remains true. It would obviously be desirable to solve the hierarchy encoded in (54) to obtain these and other physical quantities. This is an important open problem.

III. EXACT RG AND GENERAL IDENTITIES IN ANY DIMENSION

The Wilson one loop approach was helpful in exploring the new physics of the thermal boundary layer. Since the non perturbative nature of the problem has been unveiled, the validity of the approximations implicit in the one loop Wilson scheme, which is known to work in perturbative situations, are here difficult to assess. In particular the assumption of uncorrelated space points does not remain correct, and a more controlled and general technique is required to perform a detailed analysis. We therefore turn now to a more powerful Exact RG (ERG) method. Within the ERG, we will still not obtain a complete solution of the TBL hierarchy, but we will obtain some concrete results. For instance, in $d = 0$, up to a change in some coefficients (c_p defined above) the one loop FRG equations are exact. This is very interesting both as a new way to study $d = 0$ but even more so as a way to confirm the structure found here in an exactly solvable case, since in some cases exact solutions exist in $d = 0$. This paves the way for future ERG studies in $d > 0$, as discussed in Section VI.

In this section we review the ERG method, and obtain useful exact identities valid in any dimension. We will turn to its specific application in $d = 0$ in the following section. As a general method, the ERG was introduced long ago^{58,59} and much studied since, but not so often for perturbative calculations, and rarely in the context of

disordered systems. In recent studies however a systematic multiloop expansion scheme was developed^{52,56} and applied to perturbative study of pinned systems and the FRG. We will find useful the version developed directly on the effective action functional⁵⁶, and will borrow from it. In parallel, we will also derive simpler, but powerful, exact relations, directly for correlation functions using from scale invariance and STS. These will teach us much about the physics associated with the thermal boundary layer.

A. Effective action

We are interested in calculating correlation functions in the replica theory, typically:

$$\langle u_x^a u_y^b \rangle; \langle u_x^a u_y^b u_z^c u_t^d \rangle; \dots \quad (73)$$

as we recall correlations with an odd number of fields vanish. A useful object in doing so is the effective action functional $[u]$. We recall its definition as a Legendre transform:

$$[u] = \int_r h_r^a u_r^a - W[h] \quad (74)$$

$$\partial_{h_r^a} W[h] = u_r^a \quad (75)$$

$$W[h] = \ln Z[h] \quad (76)$$

where $Z[h]$ was defined in (8). It thus has a physical interpretation in terms of a free energy with imposed expectation values for the fields (e.g. probability distribution of the order parameter).

Let us consider the perturbation theory of the replicated problem defined by $Z[0]$ in (8), the free propagator being:

$$\langle u_q^a u_{-q}^b \rangle_0 = \frac{T}{q^2 + m^2} \delta_{ab} \quad (77)$$

and the interaction vertices come from the disorder cumulants. We have added a small mass which confines the manifold in a finite region in u , and provides an infrared cutoff. Other IR cutoff, such as finite size L , or momentum IR cutoff⁵⁰ can also be considered (the UV cutoff is still denoted Λ).

We recall that $W[h]$ is the generating function of connected correlations, noted $h \cdot i_c$, which are sums of connected graphs. $[u]$ is the generating function of one particle irreducible (1PI) graphs (which cannot be disconnected by cutting one propagator) and thus contain loops. The interest of the effective action functional is that since it resums the loops, correlations are simply obtained from it as sums of tree diagrams.

There are two useful expansions of the functional $[u]$, the polynomial expansion, schematically:

$$[u] = [0] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{ab} \sum_{r,r^0}^X \sum_{r;r^0}^{(2)ab} u_r^a u_{r^0}^b + \frac{1}{4!} \sum^{(4)} u u u u + \dots$$

where the "proper vertices" $\sum_{q_1, \dots, q_{2p}}^{(2p)a_1 \dots a_{2p}}$ are the $2p$ -th functional derivative of $[u]$ in $u = 0$ and are the sums of all 1PI graphs with $2p$ external legs (note here $2p$ does not refer to the number of replicas, but to the number of external legs). A different expansion is the multiloop expansion:

$$[u] = [0] + \frac{1}{2T} \sum_q (q^2 + m^2) u_q^a u_{-q}^a - V[u]; \quad (78)$$

$$V[u] = \sum_r V(u_r) + \sum_{r;r^0} V^{(2)}(u_r; u_{r^0}; r - r^0) + \dots \quad (79)$$

with $[0] = \frac{1}{2} n L^d \int_q \ln(q^2 + m^2)$, where we have decomposed the interaction part, noted $-V[u]$, into a local part defined by the function $V(u)$ of a replica vector, a bilocal part $V^{(2)}(u_r; u_{r^0}; r - r^0)$ defined as a function of two replica vectors and one space argument, with by definition $\sum_r V^{(2)}(u; v; r) = 0$, trilocal etc.. Each of these terms can then also be expanded in sums over different numbers of replicas, as was done in (9). Because of STS, $V, V^{(2)}, \dots$ contain only sums over $k \geq 2$ replicas (the single replica part is not corrected) and thus represent the "renormalized disorder" (V encodes all cumulants of the "renormalized random potential" at the same space points, $V^{(2)}$ at two different space points, etc.).

From this Section on, we will make a convenient change of notation. We will denote the original action (i.e. the bare model) studied here as:

$$S[u] = \frac{1}{2T} \sum_q (q^2 + m^2) u_q^a u_{-q}^a - \sum_r V_0(u_r); \quad (80)$$

where the index 0 denotes the bare model. The function $V(u)$ thus defines the "renormalized disorder" and is expanded as in (9) in terms of the "renormalized cumulants" $R, S^{(k)}$ while $V_0(u)$ represent the bare disorder, and bare cumulants $R_0, S_0^{(k)}$. A similar expansion for the bilocal terms, and higher, will be considered below.

B. Exact RG

The aim is to compute $[u]$, e.g. the renormalized cumulants, as a function of the IR cutoff since some kind of fixed point behaviour with universality and scaling is expected in that limit. Remarkably, the effective action satisfies the exact functional equation:

$$m \partial_m V[u] = m^2 \sum_a^X \left[G_{xa,xa}^{-1} - (r_x^2 + m^2)_{xx}^{-1} \right];$$

$$G_{xa,yb} = (r_x^2 + m^2)_{ab \ xy} - T \frac{\partial^2 V[u]}{\partial u_x^a \partial u_y^b} \quad (81)$$

where the inversion is both in replica and in internal space. This equation is supplemented by an initial condition, namely in the absence of any fluctuation (with

all bops suppressed) the action and effective action are equal. For instance, if one takes $m = 1$, or $0 =$, in that case:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{Z} \\ [\mathbf{u}] = S[\mathbf{u}] ; \quad V[\mathbf{u}] = \sum_r V_0[\mathbf{u}_r]; \end{aligned} \quad (82)$$

i.e. the renormalized disorder is equal to the bare one ($V = V_0, V^{(2)} = 0, \dots$). Thus solving the Exact RG equation (81) from the initial condition (82) allows, in principle to compute $[\mathbf{u}]$ in the small m limit.

C. correlations from the effective action

Once the effective action functional $[\mathbf{u}]$ is known, any connected correlation function can be computed, since it is the sum of all connected tree diagrams made with the proper vertices. This means that it can be computed from expanding

$$h_{\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2 : \mathbf{u}_{2p} \mathbf{i}_c} = h_{\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2 : \mathbf{u}_{2p} \mathbf{e}} [\mathbf{u}]_{\mathbf{i}_c}^{\text{tree}} \quad (83)$$

(indices here mean both space and replicas) and using Wick's theorem, but (as indicated by the "tree" superscript) keeping only the connected tree diagrams. The two point function is thus:

$$h_{\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}} h_{\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}} \mathbf{i}_c = h_{\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}} h_{\mathbf{q}}^{\mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}} \mathbf{i}_c = {}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q})_{\mathbf{a} \mathbf{b}}^{-1} \quad (84)$$

$$= T \frac{1}{q^2 + m^2} \mathbf{a} \mathbf{b} + \frac{1}{(q^2 + m^2)^2} {}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q}); \quad (85)$$

where ${}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q})$ is the off-diagonal disorder at finite momentum. At zero momentum it is exactly given by the local part V of the renormalized disorder

$${}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q} = 0) = R^0(0) \quad (86)$$

as one easily sees that only two legs entering the $S^{(k)}$ vertex leaves $k - 2$ free replica sums, i.e. a factor k^2 . However ${}^{(2)}(\mathbf{q} = 0) = {}^{(2)}(0)$ at finite momentum is given by the two replica part of the bilocal part $V^{(2)}$ and higher. These can be computed order by order in the local part (useful if this one is of order ϵ). In perturbation theory it contains all 1PI graphs with a flowing momentum. It is thus in general simpler to compute only correlations at $q = 0$ in presence of a mass since then one needs only the effective action at $q = 0$, i.e. the local part of the renormalized disorder.

The higher correlations can be computed in a similar way. For instance, schematically one has for a four point function:

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{u}_3 \mathbf{u}_4 \mathbf{i}} &= (h_{\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{i}} h_{\mathbf{u}_3 \mathbf{u}_4 \mathbf{i}} + 2 \text{perm}) \\ &= h_{\mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{u}_1 \mathbf{i}} h_{\mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{u}_2 \mathbf{i}} h_{\mathbf{u}_3 \mathbf{u}_3 \mathbf{i}} h_{\mathbf{u}_4 \mathbf{u}_4 \mathbf{i}} \\ &\quad + 10; 2^0; 3^0; 4^0 \\ &\quad + {}^{(4)} \\ &\quad + 10; 2^0; 3^0; 4^0; \end{aligned} \quad (87)$$

More generally in expanding (83) there is thus a $({}^{(2)})^1$ on each line of these tree diagrams and the vertices can be only ${}^{(4)}; {}^{(6)}; \dots$

Analyzing (and even more so, solving) the ERG equation is not a trivial task since one has to deal with a functional. One way to analyze it in $d > 0$ is the multiloop expansion scheme (79), which we will explore in Section VI. We first study it in $d = 0$ since there it reduces to a flow equation for a function. Interestingly this flow equation is very similar to the Wilson FRG equation studied in the previous Section. We emphasize though, that the relation between the cumulants $R, S^{(k)}$ (i.e. the local part of the effective action) and the correlation functions at zero momentum are identical in any dimension. It is thus particularly interesting to study them together with a mass, i.e. a confining well for the interface, and study the correlations of its center of mass u_{cdm} since many of the $d = 0$ formulae then apply. These exhibit scaling with m and amplitudes which have good limits as $d \rightarrow 0$ (this is particularly interesting for the random field interface).

D. identities from exact RG and STS

Before we do so we first establish directly on the correlation functions two sets of simple and general identities.

The first is an exact RG identity. The exact RG can indeed also be formulated directly on correlation functions. Usually it leads to complicated hierarchies whose meaning is unclear. Here it yields interesting constraints on the structure of the low energy excitations. Let us consider the average of any observable $O[\mathbf{u}]$ which does not contain the mass m explicitly:

$$hO[\mathbf{u}] = \frac{R Q_n}{R Q_n} \frac{D u^a O[\mathbf{u}] e^{-S[\mathbf{u}]}}{D u^a e^{-S[\mathbf{u}]}} \quad (88)$$

where $S[\mathbf{u}]$ defined in (80) has a simple explicit m dependence. Taking a derivative yields:

$$m Q_n hO[\mathbf{u}] = \frac{m^2}{T} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_f \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{\mathbf{x}}^f} (hO[\mathbf{u}] u_{\mathbf{x}}^f u_{\mathbf{x}}^f \mathbf{i}) \quad (89)$$

$$= \frac{m^2}{T} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} \sum_f \frac{\partial}{\partial u_{\mathbf{x}}^f} hO[\mathbf{u}] u_{\mathbf{x}}^f u_{\mathbf{x}}^f \mathbf{i} \quad (90)$$

where the last equality holds for $n = 0$. This identity can be used, e.g. to generate relations between correlation with $2p$ and $2p + 2$ fields.

The second is the consequence of STS. Let us consider again (88) and in the numerator let us shift integration by $u_{\mathbf{x}}^a \rightarrow u_{\mathbf{x}}^a + v_{\mathbf{x}}$, this yields:

$$hO[\mathbf{u}] = hO[\mathbf{u} + \mathbf{v}] e^{\frac{1}{T} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} v_{\mathbf{x}} (m^2 - r_{\mathbf{x}}^2)} e^{\frac{1}{2T} \sum_{\mathbf{x}} (r_{\mathbf{x}} v_{\mathbf{x}})^2 + m^2 v_{\mathbf{x}}^2} \quad (91)$$

To linear order this gives:

$$Th_{\mathbf{u}_{\mathbf{x}}^c} O[\mathbf{u}] = m^2 hO[\mathbf{u}] \sum_{\mathbf{f}} u_{\mathbf{x}}^{\mathbf{f}} \mathbf{i}$$

Following the analysis of Section II, we also consider the TBL form for the rescaled solution of the ERG equation:

$$V_1(\tilde{u}) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} f_{2p} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_{2p}} \tilde{u}_{a_1} \dots \tilde{u}_{a_{2p}} \frac{T_1}{2} v(\tilde{u}) + O(T_1^2) \quad (103)$$

$$\tilde{u} = u = T_1$$

with the same definition (50) for the f_{2p} and for the TBL cumulants. The only difference is that here we define $(\tilde{u})^2 = \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_2} (2 - R^{(0)}(0))$. We expect a fixed point value for $R_1^{(0)}(0)$ but here, in $d = 0$, $\epsilon = 4$ is not a small parameter anymore and there is no longer an obvious relation between $R^{(0)}(0)$ and the $R^{(0)}(0^+)$ in the $T = 0$ non-analytic theory. In fact in (25) we expect the term proportional to $S^{(3)}$ to be important everywhere (while it could be neglected $O^{(3)}$ outside of the TBL). The exact TBL equations in $d = 0$ read:

$$\sum_{p=1}^{\infty} x_{2p} f_{2p} \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_{2p}} \tilde{u}_{a_1} \dots \tilde{u}_{a_{2p}} + \tilde{u} r^{ab} \frac{1}{2} \partial_a \partial_b v(\tilde{u}) = 0; \quad (104)$$

with $x_2 f_2 = 1$, $x_{2p} = 2p(\dots)$ for $p > 1$.

So we now explore the consequences of the ERG equation on the correlation functions in $d = 0$

B. comparison with droplet predictions

In order to compare with the droplet theory we first discuss briefly how to calculate physical quantities in a low temperature expansion. One assumes that the behaviour up to order T can be obtained by considering no more than two quasidegenerate minima in the rescaled landscape separated by a distance $x = \text{um}$ $O(1)$.

We first introduce, in terms of the rescaled variables, the probability distribution $P(x_1)$ of the position x_1 of the absolute minimum, normalized as $\int dx_1 P(x_1) = 1$. The probability density (conditional on the global minimum being x_1) that the secondary minimum is located at position x_2 with rescaled energy above the ground state $= E_m$, is denoted $P(x_1; x_2; \dots)$. Thus one has

$$\int_{x_2} \int_{x_1} dx_2 \int_{x_1} dP(x_1; x_2; \dots) = P(x_1); \quad (105)$$

We define the "droplet probability density"

$$D(x_1; x_2) = P(x_1; x_2; \dots = 0); \quad (106)$$

Note the symmetry $D(x_1; x_2) = D(x_2; x_1)$. This is the probability density that the absolute minimum is (almost) degenerate, and does not obey a normalization condition. In the droplet picture it is finite and non-zero⁶¹ Let us illustrate the way to construct the low temperature expansion (see e.g.⁴² for systematics in the toy model). Let us consider a generic disorder average of product of thermal averages of any observables of the rescaled position. One starts with restricting to two wells (more generally N):

$$\overline{hO_i(x)}_i = \int_0^{Z+1} dE \int_{x_1}^{x_2} dx_1 dx_2 P(x_1; x_2; \dots) \quad (107)$$

$$= \int_i^Y (pO_i(x_1) + (1-p)Q_i(x_2)) \quad (108)$$

$$p = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-m/T}} \quad (109)$$

p and $1-p$ being the (Gibbs) thermal occupation probabilities of the two wells. Then one adds and subtracts the $T = 0$ part, and introduces $w = m/T$:

$$\overline{hO_i(x)}_i = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} dx_1 P(x_1) O_i(x_1) \quad (110)$$

$$+ Tm \int_0^{Z+1} dw \int_{x_1}^{x_2} dx_1 dx_2 P(x_1; x_2; Tm/w) (pO_i(x_1) + (1-p)Q_i(x_2)) O_i(x_1) + O(T^2 m^2); \quad (111)$$

$$p = \frac{1}{1 + e^{-w}}; \quad (112)$$

We have assumed that the restriction to two wells is valid, that the thermal width of the packet in each well is small compared to the distance between the wells. This width

results in subleading corrections⁶⁵.

For small m one gets the lowest order droplet result:

$$\overline{hO(x)}_i = \int_{x_1}^{x_2} dx_1 P(x_1) O_i(x_1) \quad (112)$$

$$+ T m \int_0^Z dw \int dx_1 dx_2 D(x_1; x_2) \left(\int_i^Y (p O_i(x_1) + (1-p) Q_i(x_2)) \int_i^Y O_i(x_1) \right) + O(T^2 m^2) \quad (113)$$

provided the integral converges, but it usually does since the one well part has been subtracted. Generalization to N wells is studied in⁴².

A first interesting constraint on these droplet functions is obtained from STS. The identity from Section III specialized to $d=0$ gives in replicas

$$\lim_{c \rightarrow 0} \langle \theta_u O[u] \rangle = m^2 \lim_{f \rightarrow 0} \langle h[u] u^f \rangle \quad (114)$$

where $O(u)$ is any odd function. For the particular case where $O(u_a)$ is a function of a single replica, one directly obtains (for $n=0$)

$$\overline{h[u] O[u]} = m^2 \overline{h[u] u} - \overline{h[u] h[u]} : \quad (115)$$

To $O(T)$, the expectation value on the left hand side can be evaluated directly at $T=0$, while the right hand side is determined from averaging with respect to $D(x_1; x_2)$. This gives in rescaled variables

$$\int_0^Z dx_1 O^0(x_1) P(x_1) = \int_0^Z 2p(1-p) \int dx_1 dx_2 (x_1 - x_2) D(x_1; x_2) O(x_1); \quad (116)$$

for any odd $O(x_1)$. Thus one finds the implication of STS within the droplet picture:

$$P^0(x_1) = \int_0^Z dx_2 (x_1 - x_2) D(x_1; x_2); \quad (117)$$

As discussed in the Appendix, this is the most general relation between droplet probabilities that one can extract from STS. Upon multiplication by odd functions (e.g. powers) of x_1 and integration it generates an infinite series of identities between zero temperature observables and finite temperature ones.

One may also obtain an RG equation for the droplet probabilities. One considers the energy difference

$$E = \frac{m^2}{2} (u_2^2 - u_1^2) + V(u_2) - V(u_1) \quad (118)$$

between the two minima. Upon an infinitesimal variation of m , the total derivative comes only from the explicit dependence on m , since the contribution from the implicit variation of u_1, u_2 with m vanishes using the minimization condition. Thus, assuming no creation or annihilation of additional minima, one obtains taking into account rescaling

$$m \langle \theta_m P(x_1; x_2; \cdot) \rangle = 2 + \int_0^Z dx_{x_1} + \int_0^Z dx_{x_2} \langle (x_1^2 - x_2^2) \theta P(x_1; x_2; \cdot) \rangle : \quad (119)$$

for $\beta > 0$.⁶¹ Integrating this relation over x_2 , and assuming $m \langle \theta_m P(x_1) \rangle = 0$ gives

$$\langle P(x) + x_1 P^0(x_1) \rangle = \int_0^Z dx_2 (x_1^2 - x_2^2) D(x_1; x_2); \quad (120)$$

This relation (120) obtained within the droplet picture from the above RG equation, can also be obtained by a similar method to that used above for STS, from the more general ERG relation (not itself assuming droplets)

$$m \langle \theta_m h[u] \rangle = \frac{m^2}{T} \lim_{f \rightarrow 0} \langle h[u] u^f u^f \rangle; \quad (121)$$

a particular case of the ERG equations, written directly on the correlation functions given in Section III. It also generates another infinite set of identities between zero temperature observables and finite temperature ones, also discussed in the Appendix.

We now compare the droplet predictions for the correlation functions to that of the ERG. We begin with those

of the droplet model.

1. correlation functions from the droplet theory

At zero temperature we are concerned with the simplest to sample fluctuations of the location of the global minimum. The simplest such quantity is the variance:

$$\overline{u^2}_{T=0} = m^2 \langle x_1^2 \rangle_P; \quad (122)$$

where we defined the average

$$\langle h(x_1) \rangle_P = \int_0^Z dx_1 P(x_1) O(x_1); \quad (123)$$

The non-Gaussian nature of the distribution $P(x_1)$ is probed by the four-point correlator

$$\overline{u^4} - 3\overline{u^2}^2 = m^4 \langle (x_1^4)_P - 3x_1^2 x_1^2 \rangle_P; \quad (124)$$

Other correlation functions probe the thermal fluctuations of the particle. In particular one can define the

sample dependent susceptibility $\chi_s = \overline{h u^2 i} - \overline{h u i}^2$ and its moments. Although it is negligible in a typical disorder configuration, it becomes large when there are two quasi-degenerate minima with $\chi_s = m^{-2} p(1-p)(x_1 - x_2)^2$. Its disorder average is the second cumulant of thermal fluctuations

$$\overline{h u^2 i - h u i^2} = \frac{T}{2} m^{-2} \int dx_1 dx_2 (x_1 - x_2)^2 D(x_1; x_2) = T m^{-2} \quad (125)$$

We used (109) and $p(1-p) = \frac{1}{2}$ (see Appendix D). The symbol $'$ (here and throughout this section) indicates that the first term on the right hand side of the first line is intended to give correctly the amplitude of the T-linear term. In fact, as is well known, this correlator is fully constrained by STS to give exactly the free propagator result. Within the droplet calculation this can be obtained from (117) upon multiplication by x_1 and integration. For the present model (confining by a harmonic well) it is exact at any T (i.e. all higher order corrections cancel).

At quartic order one may define several thermal correlation functions. One of them is the second moment of:

$$\overline{(h u^2 i - h u i^2)^2} = \frac{T}{12} m^{-4} \int dx_1 dx_2 (x_1 - x_2)^4 D(x_1; x_2)$$

(see Appendix D for details). There is one other combination

$$\overline{h(u - h u i^2) i} = \frac{T}{4} m^{-4} \int dx_1 dx_2 (x_1 - x_2)^4 D(x_1; x_2)$$

from the droplet calculation. These two combinations are however, related by STS which implies that:

$$\overline{h(u - h u i^2) i} = 3 \overline{(h u^2 i - h u i^2)^2} \quad (126)$$

which again is an exact relation valid for all T (see Appendix D and⁴²). Although it cannot be derived from (117), the droplet theory is clearly compatible with it. It in fact entails a property⁶⁶ of the various moments of ϕ .

Remarkably the RG, combined with STS, allows to relate these quartic $T > 0$ observables to quadratic ones at $T = 0$. Here we can see it from the droplet theory. Indeed multiplying (117) by $8x_1^3$, (120) by $6x_1^2$ and subtracting we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{12} \int dx_1 dx_2 (x_1 - x_2)^4 D(x_1; x_2) = \frac{2}{2} \overline{h x_1^2 i} \quad (127)$$

A fixed point has been assumed. Similar relations exist at the fixed point between $2n$ and $2n - 2$ observables for any $n \geq 2$.

Finally, it is interesting to look for a combination which should have contributions only from three wells. Within the droplet theory the coefficient of T should vanish and

thus this correlation can be used to test droplet theory. The simplest one occurs at sixth order and reads:

$$D_3 = \frac{1}{6} \overline{h(u_a - u_b)^2 (u_b - u_c)^2 (u_c - u_a)^2 i} \quad (128) \\ = \frac{1}{6} \overline{h u^3 i h u^2 i h u i} - \overline{h u^2 i^3} + \overline{h u^4 i (h u^2 i - h u i^2)} - \overline{h u^3 i^2}$$

this is the lowest order necessary to see 3 well physics, since the combination $\overline{h(u_a - u_b)^2 (u_a - u_c) (u_b - u_c) i}$ is zero by symmetrization (here a;b;c denote any triplet of distinct replicas). Thus the prediction of the droplet theory is that:

$$D_3 \propto O(m^2 T^2) \quad (129)$$

C. correlation functions from the ERG

In this section we give the relation between a set of correlation functions of u and the m -dependent cumulants $R, S^{(k)}$, using the properties of the effective action summarized above in Section III. Details can be found in the Appendix C. We stress, as discussed above, that the relations given here between the $R, S^{(k)}$ and the correlations are exact, not only in $d = 0$, but in any dimension (if one considers zero momentum $u \neq u_q = 0$, i.e. center of mass). The rescaling and, of course, the fixed point values, does however depend on d (see Sections II and VI). Next, we insert the expected asymptotic flow of the cumulant for $m \rightarrow 0$ using the TBL ansatz and discuss consequences. The resulting relations are then also expected to be "exact" but with the following disclaimers (i) they are subjected to the TBL assumptions and (ii) there are accurate up to subleading corrections in m . For them we will use the symbol $'$ and will, here, reserve the symbol $=$ for relations which are exact by construction

1. two point function

We start with the two point function:

$$\overline{h u^a u^b i} = T \frac{1}{m^2} \delta_{ab} + \frac{1}{m^4} R^{(0)}(0) \quad (130)$$

which contains a zero temperature part, and a thermal connected part which form is dictated by STS. Higher correlations will have similar properties and we will explicitly write them up to six-th order. To classify them it is convenient, from now on in this Section, to use the convention that different replica indices mean non equal replicas. Then one has

$$\overline{h u_a^2 i} = \overline{h u^2 i} = T \frac{1}{m^2} + \frac{1}{m^4} R^{(0)}(0) \quad (131)$$

$$\overline{h u_a u_b i} = \overline{h u i^2} = \frac{1}{m^4} R^{(0)}(0) \quad (132)$$

The disorder cancels between the two lines and the second cumulant of thermal fluctuations is thus exactly given by (125) above.

The TBLA gives, using Eq. (101),

$$\overline{h u i^2} = \frac{1}{4} m^{-2} R^{(0)}(0); \quad (133)$$

This gives the second moment of the position of the absolute minimum.

2. four point function

The calculation of the four point function requires only one (4) vertex. Since $S^{(3)}$ starts as u^6 only R and $S^{(4)}$ can give a contribution. The calculation is performed in Appendix C. There are five possible replica monomials. Their connected expectation values read:

$$h u_a^4 i_c = \frac{T^2}{m^8} R^{(4)}(0) + \frac{F_4}{m^8} \quad (134)$$

$$h u_a^3 u_b i_c = \frac{T^2}{m^8} R^{(4)}(0) + \frac{F_4}{m^8} \quad (135)$$

$$h u_a^2 u_b^2 i_c = \frac{T^2}{m^8} R^{(4)}(0) + \frac{F_4}{m^8} \quad (136)$$

$$h u_a^2 u_b u_c i_c = \frac{F_4}{m^8} \quad (137)$$

$$h u_a u_b u_c u_d i_c = \frac{F_4}{m^8} \quad (138)$$

we denote the fourth cumulant of the random force $F_4 = S_{1111}^{(4)}(0;0;0;0)$. To obtain their full expectation values $h u i = h u i_c + h u i_{disc}$ one must add their disconnected parts, given in (C2) in terms of the two points averages (132), and which contain only T and $R^{(0)}$.

One sees that these five connected correlations depend only on two independent quantities F_4 and $R^{(0)}$. The first one measures the fourth order cumulant of the displacement at zero temperature. Since in that limit all replica averages in (134) (and in (C2)) coincide

$$\overline{u^4} = \overline{3u^2}^2, \quad T=0 \quad m^{-4} S_{1111}^{(4)}(0;0;0;0) \quad (139)$$

in terms of the rescaled quantities, assuming a fixed point. Comparing with (124) and generalizing, one finds that the full distribution $P(x)$ of the position of the absolute minimum, is retrieved from the ERG fixed point from its cumulants:

$$h x^{2p} i_p^c = \frac{1}{2^p} S_1^{(2p)}(0; \dots; 0) \quad (140)$$

At $T > 0$ from (134) there is only one independent additional observable (as discussed in the Appendix C this can be equivalently seen from the STS-ERG relations). One finds:

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{\frac{1}{2}} &= \overline{(h u^2 i - h u i^2)^2} = \frac{1}{2} h (u_a - u_b)^2 (u_c - u_d)^2 i \\ &= h u_a^2 u_b^2 - 2 u_a^2 u_b u_c + u_a u_b u_c u_d i \\ &= \frac{T^2}{m^4} + \frac{T^2}{m^8} R^{(4)}(0) \end{aligned} \quad (141)$$

The fourth cumulant F_4 cancels in this combination and $R^{(0)}(0)$ also cancels in the disconnected part (see Appendix C). In terms of the rescaled disorder the variance of the susceptibility fluctuations becomes:

$$\overline{\frac{1}{s}} - \overline{\frac{1}{s}}^2 = \frac{T^2}{m^8} R^{(4)}(0) = \frac{T^2}{m^4} \frac{1}{4} R^{(4)}(0); \quad (142)$$

At this stage assuming a fixed point for $R^{(4)}(0)$ would imply conventional thermal scaling for the fluctuations $\frac{1}{s} = O(T)$. The TBLA allows to evade that, as $R^{(4)}(0)$ blows up as m^{-1} with $R^{(4)}(0) = T^2 R^{(0)}(0) = T$ with $T = 2Tm$, which leads instead to much larger fluctuations:

$$\overline{\frac{1}{s}} - \overline{\frac{1}{s}}^2 = \frac{1}{8} (2 - R^{(0)}(0)) (Tm)^{-4}; \quad (143)$$

using the exact result $R^{(0)}(0) = 1$. The scaling coincides with the result above, and the amplitude too, given the relation (127) which exists at the fixed point

$$\overline{\frac{1}{s}} - \overline{\frac{1}{s}}^2 = T \frac{2}{m^2} \overline{h u^2 i} m^{-2} \quad (144)$$

It should be stressed that this relation originates from the exact ERG identity:

$$m \partial_m R^{(0)}(0) = (2 - R^{(0)}(0) + T R^{(0)}(0)) \quad (145)$$

assuming that $R^{(0)}(0)$ reaches a limit. Both droplets and the TBLA are consistent with this exact relation. Note that similar identities for the $2p$ -th cumulant where shown from the ERG (70) and result in relations similar to (145) for higher order observables (see Appendix C).

To check further consistency between the TBL and droplets, we now compute the three well quantity D_3 defined in (128) above. The calculation of the six point functions is performed in the Appendix C. We find:

$$\begin{aligned} D_3 &= \frac{1}{32} m^{-6} T^3 (6 R^{(4)}(0) + 2 T R^{(6)}(0) \\ &+ S_{222}^{(3)}(0;0;0) + 3 R^{(4)}(0)^2) \end{aligned} \quad (146)$$

in rescaled variables. We note that from the TBLA $T R^{(6)}(0) = 1 - T^2$ as are all last three terms, so naively $D_3 = T$. However this is not so, as we find that these three terms actually cancel to leading order when using the ERG equation. Indeed using the fourth derivative in zero of the FRG equation (25) for R , it simplifies to:

$$D_3 = \frac{1}{32} m^{-6} T^3 (2 R^{(4)}(0) - m \partial_m R^{(4)}(0)) \quad (147)$$

$$= \frac{1}{32} (4 - 2) (R^{(0)}(0)) m^{-6} T^2 \quad (148)$$

which is indeed $O(T^2)$. It is likely that obtaining the correct prefactor here requires considering the next order correction to the TBL. But clearly the TBL solution of the ERG knows that D_3 is a three well quantity. Finally, the third cumulant of the susceptibility is also considered in the Appendix and shown to relate to the third cumulant TBL function $S_{222}^{(3)}(0;0;0)$.

D. comparison with the solution of the toy model

It is interesting that one case of the model studied here, the so-called toy model, has been exactly solved. In that case:

$$u_m^{4=3} x^{4=3} \quad (149)$$

$$V(u) u^{1=2} u = \quad (150)$$

$$= 4=3 ; \quad = 2=3 \quad (151)$$

Correlations and probability distributions are known, or accessible, and one can infer from them some characteristics of the fixed point, e.g. the (universal) numerical value of $R^{(0)}(0)$ (see below) etc..

We can in particular verify that the solution of the toy model obtained in Ref.⁴¹ obeys the exact relations from STS and ERG obtained here. Let us start with the simple relation between fourth and second moments. With the choice $K(u) = 2$ just at large u in (94), with $\beta = 1$, one has at $T = 0$ in the limit $m \rightarrow 0$:

$$\overline{hu^2 i} = \frac{R^{(0)}(0)}{m^4} = c_2 m^{8=3} \quad (152)$$

$$c_2 = \frac{2^{4=3}}{Z^{4=3}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{du}{du} \frac{A i^0(iu)^2}{A i(iu)^4} \quad (153)$$

$$= \frac{2^{4=3}}{3} \frac{Z^{4=3}}{1} \frac{du}{2} \frac{iu}{A i(iu)^2} = 1.05423856519 \quad (154)$$

This implies:

$$R^{(0)}(0) = 4c_2 \quad (155)$$

On the other hand one has⁴¹:

$$\overline{(u - hu i)^4} = 3 \overline{(hu^2 i - hu i^2)^2} \quad (156)$$

$$= \frac{T}{2} 4m^{14=3} \quad (157)$$

$$4 = \frac{2^{7=3}}{1} \frac{Z^{4=3}}{2} \frac{du}{2} \frac{1}{A i(iu)^2} \left(\frac{A i^0(iu)}{A i(iu)} \right)''' \quad (158)$$

The above relation (142) between this quantity and $R^{(4)}(0)$ implies that one must have:

$$R^{(4)}(0) = \frac{4}{3} \frac{1}{T} \quad (159)$$

where $T = 2Tm$. This is clearly consistent with the TBL ansatz. Thus for the above prefactor to be correct one needs the non trivial relation:

$$4 = 4c_2 \quad (160)$$

which we have confirmed numerically.

One can go further, since the full distribution $P(x_1)$ and the droplet distribution $D(x_1; x_2)$ were obtained for the toy model. First one notes that if $\hat{P}(x_1)$ and $\hat{D}(x_1; x_2)$ are solution of (117) and (120) then:

$$P(x_1) = \hat{P}(x_1) \quad (161)$$

$$D(x_1; x_2) = \hat{D}(x_1; x_2) \quad (162)$$

are also solutions (they correspond to different choices for β and the rescaling factor of u). One member of this family (corresponding to the choice $\beta = 1$) is:

$$P(x_1) = g(x_1)g(-x_1) \quad (163)$$

$$D(x_1; x_2) = \hat{D}(x_1; x_2) (x_2 - x_1) \quad (164)$$

$$+ \hat{D}(x_2; x_1) (x_1 - x_2) \quad (165)$$

$$\hat{D}(x_1; x_1 + y) = 2g(-x_1)d(y)g(x_1 + y) \quad (166)$$

with the specific forms:

$$g(x) = \frac{Z^{4=3}}{1} \frac{d}{2} e^{-i x} \frac{1}{A i(i)} \quad (167)$$

$$d(y) = \frac{Z^{4=3}}{1} \frac{d}{2} e^{i y} \frac{A i^0(i)}{A i(i)} = \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} e^{-\beta_s y} \quad (168)$$

in terms of the zeroes β_s of the Airy function. Comparing with⁴¹ one further sees that the choice considered above corresponds to $\beta = 2^{2=3}$.

We check in Appendix D that these functions indeed satisfy the relations (117) and (120). An outstanding question is whether these relations could allow some analytical progress in the other cases.

To conclude this Section we have established a precise mapping in $d = 0$ between droplet probabilities and some thermodynamic quantities. Questions which deserve further investigation are: (i) how much constraints the FRG-STS equations give on the set of all thermodynamic boundary layer functions (associated to all disorder cumulants) (ii) whether $D(x_1; x_2)$ may contain all the information encoded in this set (iii) what part of these functions is universal. Answers to these questions in $d = 0$ would certainly be very helpful to understand the general case. Before discussing $d > 0$, we turn to the question of how the $T = 0$ information, namely $P(x_1)$, can be retrieved from the TBL study. This necessitates considering the so-called matching problem.

V. MATCHING

In this section, we use the ERG method for $d = 0$ developed in the previous section to consider the matching problem in some detail. As discussed in the previous section, most physical quantities are formally determined by derivatives of coupling functions in the effective action evaluated at zero argument. As such, they are defined deep within the TBL. Physically, however, one can divide these quantities into those describing zero temperature (sample-averaged ground state) properties and alternatively thermal ($T > 0$) fluctuations. While it is natural that the latter are determined by the TBL, which, as we have discussed, is an encapsulation of droplet physics, it is surprising for the former zero temperature quantities to require a TBL analysis. Thus one is led to expect some sort of matching of certain derivatives of coupling

functions at strictly zero argument (and $T \rightarrow 0^+$) to corresponding limits as $u_{ab} \rightarrow 0^+$ of $T = 0$ functions. The subtlety in the latter definition is the order in which the limit of coinciding points should be taken. It will naturally emerge from a careful study of the matching.

Unlike for $R(u)$, all higher cumulants are described by functions of more than two separate points. As the outer solution for such cumulants is non-analytic whenever any two points are brought nearby, each such non-analyticity must be resolved by some boundary layer structure. Therefore for each cumulant we will introduce a set of Partial Boundary Layers (PBLs), one for each distinct way of bringing subset(s) of points together. We will adopt a transparent notation to specify the distinct PBLs. Each PBL consists of a set of q groups, all n_i points within group i having been brought together. Thus for a given k -th cumulant there is one PBL for each integer partition of k , $\sum_{i=1}^q n_i = k$. We label the corresponding PBL functions by the integers n_i in decreasing order. For instance $s^{(3)}$ is the full TBL introduced previously and $s^{(21)}$ is the only PBL associated with the third cumulant, and we will denote simply the outer solution $s^{(111)} = S^{(3)}$.

We will illustrate this procedure explicitly for the third and fourth cumulants, making a full consistency check for the third and a partial check on the fourth. In the end this construction enables and justifies an expansion in powers of R of the fixed point equation for the function $R(u)$, i.e. the beta function of the model. For comparison with the expansion, we will keep $d = 4$ and $d = 4$ factors unsimplified.

A. analysis of third cumulant

The necessity of understanding matching in some detail is evident from inspection of the equation (25) for $R(u)$. We have already noted the feedback of the third cumulant in this equation, but have not emphasized that even for u of $O(1)$, this feedback term $S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u)$ is required for two arguments coincident with one another. Since the outer solution is non-analytic whenever pairs of arguments coincide, we should expect some kind of boundary layer softening of this singularity to render $S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u)$ well defined. Because, however, u remains of $O(1)$, this requires a new Partial Boundary Layer (PBL) treatment. The tantalizing question is how such a PBL analysis can recover a sensible zero temperature limit, in which naively $S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u)$ above is replaced by some quantity defined entirely outside all BLS.

We investigate the PBL for the third cumulant through its ERG equation (26). The PBL will be taken to correspond to $u_{12} = u_{13} = T_1 = O(1)$, $u_{13} = O(1)$, and T_1^2 as usual. We would like to constrain the PBL behavior by assuming that $S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u)$ is $O(T^0)$ (and $O(T^3)$ hopefully in the expansion), and moreover is quadratic in u at small argument. It clearly should be, so as to

correct the fixed point value of $R^{(0)}(0)$ compared to a lowest order truncation. A naive scaling ansatz would then be $S^{(3)}(u^{123}) = T_1^2 s^{(21)}(u_{12};u_{13})$. However, it is readily seen that this is inconsistent in the above equation, because then the thermal term would be much larger than all others (i.e. $O(T_1)$ as compared to $O(T_1^2)$). Instead, the only way to consistently obtain the proper behavior of $S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u)$ is to postulate a purely quadratic in u_{12} term with the aforementioned T_1^2 scaling, a fully complex PBL term appearing only at $O(T_1^3)$, i.e.

$$S^{(3)}(u_1;u_2;u_3) = T_1^2 \hat{s}^2(u_{12}) + T_1^3 s^{(21)}(u_{12};u_{13}) + O(T_1^4); \quad u_{12} = O(1); \quad u_{13} = O(1); \quad (169)$$

where \hat{s} and \hat{s}^2 are order $O(1)$ and even functions. The function \hat{s} so defined is particularly significant because it gives the feedback of the third cumulant into the second:

$$S_{110}^{(3)}(0;0;u) = 2^{-3} \hat{s}(u); \quad (170)$$

Note that while \hat{s} does not depend on the choice of parameterizing using $u_{12};u_{13}$ rather than $u_{12};u_{32}$, the function $s^{(21)}(u_{12};u_{13})$ depends on this choice (as well as $\hat{s}(u)$ defined below).

In terms of the function $\hat{s}(u)$ the outer equation for the second cumulant thus reads:

$$\partial_1 R(u) = 0 = (-4 + u \partial_u) R(u) + \frac{1}{2} R^{(0)}(u)^2 - R^{(0)}(0) R^{(0)}(u) - 2^{-3} \hat{s}(u); \quad (171)$$

Expanded to $O(u^2)$ it yields the exact relation:

$$R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 = -2(1 + 2^{-3} R^{(0)}(0^+)); \quad (172)$$

Here and below we will omit the \hat{s} to denote fixed point quantities.

If one considers the large u_{12} limit, one may expect to match to the outer solution. In particular, taking the small u_{12} limit of the outer solution, we expect (by a choice of gauge, see Appendix E):

$$S^{(3)}(u_{123}) = 3u_{12}^2 \hat{s}(u_{13}) + 3u_{12} \hat{s}^2(u_{13}) + O(u_{12}^4); \quad u_{12} = O(1); \quad u_{13} = O(1); \quad (173)$$

Matching the two forms is an extremely strong constraint, and completely determines $\hat{s}(u)$ from the outer solution (outside all BLS) { for this reason we have used the same function $\hat{s}(u)$ in Eqs. (169,173). This fact explains the conceptual dilemma mentioned above: although $\hat{s}(u)$ is a quantity defined inside the PBL, it is wholly determined by the zero temperature solution. Thus the zero temperature limit of Eq. (25) is well defined. As a check on this matching requirement, we will verify that the equation for $\hat{s}(u)$ obtained by analysis entirely with the PBL is equivalent to the equation for $\hat{s}(u)$ obtained from the small u_{12} limit of the outer solution.

Note that all terms in the series in Eq. (173) are powers of j_{12} , since any odd power of u_{12} can be converted to a higher even power by symmetrization. Thinking further about this, there should be a hierarchy of such terms, since the term can only capture the $O(u_{12}^2)$ coefficient of the small u_{12} limit of the outer solution, the $s^{(21)}$ term only the $O(j_{12}^3)$ etc. In general the coefficient of $O(j_{12}^j)$ in the outer solution is matched by the large α_{12} (α_{12}^j) of a generalization of \hat{S} at order T_1^n in the PBL expansion (169). In particular one must have:

$$s^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) = j_{12}^3 (u_{13}); \quad \alpha_{12} \rightarrow 1 \quad (174)$$

In both regimes (inner PBL and outer small u_{12} limits),

the higher and higher terms are progressively smaller, so we may hope to truncate this successfully. Unlike at $O(u_{12}^2)$ for (u) , at $O(u_{12}^3)$, matching to the outer solution (i.e. (u_{13})) only determines the large α_{12} limiting behavior of $s^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13})$, which has the full PBL complexity otherwise.

We first consider the PBL constraints implied by the $S^{(3)}$ equation. One finds, applying the ansatz of Eq. (169), that all terms are $O(T^2)$ or smaller (we do not, as appropriate to $d = 0$, assume $\epsilon = 1$ for the moment). Keeping only these terms, and for simplicity dropping the feeding term from the fourth cumulant, one has

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & \partial_1 S^{(3)}(u_{123}) = T_1^2 \alpha_{12}^2 (2 - 2 - 4) (u) + u_{13}^0 (u_{13}) \\ & \frac{R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13})}{R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13})^2} + u_{13}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) + 3 u_{13}^0 (u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) \\ & + T_1^2 R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12}) + (r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12}))^2 + s_{110}^{(3)}(0; 0; \alpha_{12}) \\ & + T_1^2 s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) - s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{13}) r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12}) + s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) \\ & + T_1^2 \alpha_{12}^2 s_{12}^{(31)0}(u_{13}) - \frac{1}{2} s_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; 0; u_{13}) + s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{112}; u_{13}) + O(T_1^3): \end{aligned} \quad (175)$$

To obtain this equation we have performed an expansion in small u_{12} discarding some "gauge terms" as detailed in the Appendix. Note that the dangerous term, the contribution from $T_1 S_{200}^{(3)}$ vanishes being a pure gauge. For completeness we have included the feedback from the PBL31 and the PBL22 of the fourth cumulant (last line) which will be discussed in the next Section, but is not crucial for the following discussion. In the third line of Eq. 175, we have grouped a contribution arising from the $T_1 R^{\text{oo}^2}$, $R^{\text{oo}} S_{110}$, and R^{oo^3} terms in Eq. (26). This is simplified by eliminating $s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_1; \alpha_2)$ using the full BL equation for the second cumulant:

$$s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_1; \alpha_2) = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12}^2 - \frac{1}{2} r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12})^2 - r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12}) \quad (176)$$

The resulting equation can be studied at large α_{12} , using the matching constraints Eq. (174) and $r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12}) = r_1^{\text{oo}} j_{12}$ and the corresponding limit of the fourth cumulant quantities (discussed below):

$$\text{sym}_{12} s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{112}; u_{13}) = 2 \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{13}) \quad (177)$$

$$\text{sym}_{12} s_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; 0; u_{13}) = 2 \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}) \quad (178)$$

Collecting all $O(\alpha_{12}^2)$ terms (the dominant ones in this limit), one finds

$$\begin{aligned} (2 - 2 - 4) (u) + u^0(u) + \frac{R^{\text{oo}}(u)}{R^{\text{oo}}(u)^2} \left(\frac{1}{2} + \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) (r_1^{\text{oo}})^2 - \frac{R^{\text{oo}}(u)}{R^{\text{oo}}(u)^2} \right) \\ + u^{\text{oo}}(u) R^{\text{oo}}(u) + 3 u^0(u) R^{\text{oo}}(u) + 6 r_1^{\text{oo}}(u) \\ (g^{(31)0}(u) + 2g^{(31)}(u) + g^{(22)}(u)) = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (179)$$

This equation allows to compute (u) in an expansion in powers of R as we will explicitly show below.

Conceptually, one should regard (u) and (u) as determined by the underlying zero temperature fixed point,

since although they obtain in the PBL, they are entirely constrained by matching. Thus (u) should be obtain-

able by considering the outer equation for $S^{(3)}$:

$$0 = (2 \quad 2 \quad 6 + i \partial_{u_1}) S^{(3)}(u_{123}) + 3 \text{sym} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{12}) (2^3 (u_{13}) S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{123})) \quad (180)$$

$$+ R^{\text{oo}}(u_{12}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13})^2 - \frac{1}{3} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{12}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{23}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) - 3^4 \text{sym}^{(211)}(u_{12}; u_{13})$$

where the last term arises from the PBL211 of the fourth cumulant. Eq. (179) should match the small u_{12} limit of the outer equation. Inserting the expansion of Eq. (173),

together with fourth cumulant matching conditions (see below) and keeping terms to $O(u_{12}^2)$. One finds

$$(2 \quad 2 \quad 4) (u) + \frac{1}{u} (u) + \frac{R^{\text{oo}}(u)}{R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^2} \frac{R^{\text{oo}}(u)}{R^{\text{oo}}(u)}^2 \quad (181)$$

$$+ (R^{\text{oo}}(u) - R^{\text{oo}}(0)) R^{\text{oo}}(u) + 3^0 (u) R^{\text{oo}}(u) + 6 R^{\text{oo}}(0^+) (u)$$

$$+ \tilde{r}^{(31)0}(u) + 2g^{(31)}(u) + g^{(22)}(u) = 0$$

Note that these equations are similar but not identical, and in the derivation of Eq. (181) we used neither the term α_{12} in Eq. (26) nor the BL equation for $r(\alpha_{12})$. Nevertheless, they are equivalent as can be seen by using (172) in Eq. (181) and the matching requirement $R^{\text{oo}}(0^+) = r_1^{\text{oo}}$, one directly obtains Eq. (179). We have also used (F 45, F 46) relating the tilde quantities to un-

tilde ones in the fourth cumulant matching. Note that (u) starts as u^2 (see below). The corresponding term $\alpha_{12} u_{13}^2$ is allowed in the PBL, while in the full BL it is not (the third cumulant starts as α^6).

The first true PBL quantity which is not fully determined by matching is $s^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13})$. Using Eq. (181) to simplify Eq. (175), one finds

$$0 = s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) - s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{13}) r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12}) + s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) - 6 r_1^{\text{oo}} \alpha_{12}^2 (u_{13}) \quad (182)$$

$$\frac{R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13})}{2} \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) (r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha_{12})^2 - (r_1^{\text{oo}})^2 \alpha_{12}^2)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} s_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; 0; u_{13}) + \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}) + s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{112}; u_{13}) + 2 \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{13})$$

supplemented by the boundary condition (174). We note that this equation can be formally but explicitly solved

for $s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha; u)$. One finds

$$s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha; u) - s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u) = \frac{1}{1 + r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha)} a(u) + b(\alpha) + 6 \alpha^2 r_1^{\text{oo}}(u) - \left(\frac{1}{2} \right) \frac{R^{\text{oo}}(u)}{2} (r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha)^2 - (r_1^{\text{oo}})^2 \alpha^2) \quad (183)$$

$$+ \frac{1}{2} s_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha; 0; u) - \alpha^2 g^{(22)}(u) - s_{1100}^{(31)}(0; 0; \alpha; u) - 2 \alpha^2 g^{(31)}(u) \quad (184)$$

where a and b are arbitrary gauge functions. This solubil-

ity is similar to the algebraic solution for $r^{\text{oo}}(\alpha)$ possible

in the full BL for the second cumulant.

We have thus solved the matching problem up to the third cumulant. It is interesting to organise the resulting implicit solution for $\psi(u)$ as an expansion in powers of R . To lowest order $O(R^3)$, Eq. (181) becomes:

$$(2 - 2 - 4) \psi(u) + \psi(u) + \frac{R^{\text{odd}}(u)}{R^{\text{odd}}(0^+)^2} - \frac{R^{\text{odd}}(u)}{R^{\text{odd}}(u)^2} = 0: \quad (186)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 R(u) = 0 &= (4 + u) \partial_1 R(u) + \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{odd}}(u)^2 - R^{\text{odd}}(0) R^{\text{odd}}(u) + \frac{1}{2} R_1^{\text{odd}} \frac{dx}{x} R^{\text{odd}}(ux) - R^{\text{odd}}(0) (R^{\text{odd}}(ux)^2 - R^{\text{odd}}(0^+)^2) + O(R^4) > 0 \\ &= \frac{2 - 2 - 4}{1} R_1^{\text{odd}} \frac{dx}{x} R^{\text{odd}}(ux) - R^{\text{odd}}(0) (R^{\text{odd}}(ux)^2 - R^{\text{odd}}(0^+)^2) + O(R^4) < 0 \end{aligned} \quad (187)$$

Both formula match up to a constant when $u = 0$. Setting $\psi = 4$, $\psi = 3=4$, $\psi = 2 - 3 = \frac{4(1)}{2+}$, the above result gives the exact beta function in $d = 0$ to order $O(R^3)$. Higher powers can be obtained by studying (179) or (181) to next order in the expansion in power of R , and considering the feedback from the fourth cumulant which is of the same order. Note that at this order, obtained here rigorously, this result coincide with the naive zero temperature procedure. This procedure consists in first solving the S equation (26) for arbitrary ψ by dropping terms containing temperature and neglecting the $R^{\text{odd}}S$, and fourth cumulant term, then evaluating the feedback term from S in the R equation (26) which at this order has an unambiguous limit (see discussion near Eq. 31). It is unlikely at this stage that the absence of ambiguity will exist at higher order. Note furthermore that in the limit $\psi \rightarrow 0$ and $\psi \rightarrow 0$ the convolution operator in (187) becomes local, e.g. $R_1^{\text{odd}} \frac{dx}{x} f(x) \rightarrow f(1) =$, and we recover the result of Ref.⁴⁷, (Eq. 3.43) with $X = 2$. Thus the Wilson value $\psi = 1$ seems to reproduce, up to a factor of 2, the result $X = 1$ obtained in the ψ -expansion to two loop in Ref.⁴⁷. This is not so bad, since this $d = 0$ calculation does not involve any spatial integration. It raises the hope that a lot of the structure of the putative ψ -function in a true ψ -expansion may already be contained in this $d = 0$ model.

To close the study of the third cumulant we examine the matching of the full BL to the partial one. This is complicated by the fact that in the full BL regime the rescaling term is negligible, while in fact it is not in the partial BL and the outer region. Thus as one leaves the full BL region, presumably the rescaling term becoming important tends to suppress ψ . We find that to match we must have, coming from the full BL:

$$S^{(3)}(\alpha_{123}) - \alpha_{13} \psi_{12}^2 - c_1 \alpha_{13}^2 \alpha_{12}^2$$

Solving this linear equation and inserting feedback (170) from S in the R equation we obtain the "beta-function" to the same order, i.e. the condition for the fixed point in the asymptotic limit $\psi \rightarrow 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} &+ \alpha_{13} \psi(u_{12}) + \psi_{13} \psi(u_{12}) + O(1) \\ \alpha_{123} &= O(1): \end{aligned} \quad (189)$$

while the small argument behaviour from the partial BL side should be:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S}^{(3)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) &= u_{13} \psi(u_{12}) + \psi_{13} \psi(u_{12}) + O(u_{13}) \\ &= u_{13} \psi(u_{12}) + c_1 u_{13}^2 + O(u_{13}^3) \\ \alpha_{12} &= O(1); \quad u_{13} = O(1); \end{aligned} \quad (190)$$

with $c_1 = \frac{1}{2} \psi(0)$.

B. analysis of fourth cumulant

We now turn to the structure of matching for the fourth cumulant. This is of interest for a variety of physical quantities. First, the fourth cumulant of u at zero temperature, (139) can be rewritten as:

$$\overline{u^4} - 3(\overline{u^2})^2 = \frac{1}{16} m^4 f_4 \quad (191)$$

and is the lowest order quantity expressing the deviation of the distribution of u from a Gaussian. Second, the beta function to next order (R^4) requires the fourth cumulant feedback into the third. More generally, the fourth cumulant is illustrative of the nested structure of higher cumulant PBLs. Unlike for lower cumulants there is more than one path of successive matchings connecting the outer solution to the full TBL.

Using the notations defined at the beginning of this Section, we need to discuss the PBLs: $S^{(4)}; S^{(31)}; S^{(22)}; S^{(211)}; S^{(1111)} = S^{(4)}$ for the full, various partial BL, and finally, the outer solution. Each of these

has its zero T piece and their finite T parts. Let us enumerate the various boundary layers. One has to first

non-trivial order in temperature, in each case:

$$\begin{aligned}
 S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) &= f_4 T_1^4 \alpha_1 \alpha_2 \alpha_3 \alpha_4 + T_1^5 s^{(4)}(\alpha_{1234}); & \alpha_{1234} = O(1) & \quad (\text{fullBL}) \\
 S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) &= T_1^3 \text{sym}_{123}(\alpha_{12} \alpha_{23}^{(31)}(u_{34})) + T_1^4 s^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34}); & \alpha_{123}; u_{34} = O(1) & \quad (\text{PBL 31}) \\
 S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) &= T_1^4 s^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}); & \alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13} = O(1) & \quad (\text{PBL 22}) \\
 S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) &= T_1^2 \alpha_{12}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) + T_1^3 s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}); & \alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}; u_{34} = O(1) & \quad (\text{PBL 211})
 \end{aligned}$$

(192)

where $s^{(211)}$, $s^{(211)}$, $s^{(31)}$ and $s^{(31)}$ are order $O(1)$ functions. The first terms in the fullBL, PBL31 and PBL211 are zero temperature components and are anomalously large (have a lower power of temperature) compared to their associated s functions. These terms are necessary for a zero temperature limit to exist. Their form is constrained by the requirements of permutation symmetry in each group of boundary layer variables. They have the additional crucial property that each contributes to its PBL equation at the same order in temperature as the corresponding s term, despite the lower power of temperature in its definition. This is because when two derivatives act on α BL variables in these terms it produces only gauge. The $s^{(211)}$ function is a simple generalisation of the function introduced in PBL21 for the third cumulant. In the PBL31 we have omitted the quadratic term $(\alpha_{12}^2 + \alpha_{13}^2 + \alpha_{23}^2)^{(31)}(u_{34})$ since the latter two terms in parenthesis are pure gauge and the first can be rewritten up to gauge in the form above using that $u_{13} = T_1$ (see Appendix E). Finally, in PBL22 symmetry in both 1 & 2 and 3 & 4 forbids zero temperature quadratic and cubic terms, while the naive quartic one has been subsumed into $s^{(22)}$. Additional more detailed properties of these functions are summarized in the Appendix F




FIG. 1: Nested partial boundary layer structure for the fourth cumulant. The limit of two points in a given PBL coinciding takes one along the direction of the an arrow in the diagram.

Particular pairs (inner and outer) of these PBLs are connected by taking a single argument (pair of points) in the outer PBL small (points close) and reciprocally in the inner PBL large (points far). This is illustrated in Fig. 1. The conditions for such asymptotic matching sequentially going inwards from the outer solution are considered in detail in Appendix F. This determines the form of various small and large argument limits of the PBL functions defined above:

$$\begin{aligned}
S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) &= u_{12}^2 \text{ }^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) + j_{12} j^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) & u_{12} ! 0 \\
s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) &= j_{12} j^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) & \alpha_{12} ! 1 \\
s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) &= u_{13} \text{ }^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{14}) + j_{13} j^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{14}) & u_{13} ! 0 \\
s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) &= j_{34} j^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) & u_{34} ! 0 \\
\text{ }^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) &= \text{ }^{(211)}(0; u_{34}) \quad u_{13} \text{ }^{(31)}(u_{34}) + u_{13}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{34}) + u_{13}^2 \text{sgn}(u_{13}) h^{(31)}(u_{34}) & u_{13} ! 0 \\
\text{ }^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) &= u_{34}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}) & u_{34} ! 0 \\
s^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) &= \alpha_{34}^2 \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}) + j_{34} j^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) & \alpha_{34} ! 1 ; \alpha_{12} \text{ xed} \\
s^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) &= \alpha_{12}^2 \alpha_{34}^2 \frac{1}{4} s_{220}^{(22)}(0; 0; 0) + u_{13} \text{ }^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}) + j_{13} j^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}) & u_{13} ! 0 \\
\text{ }^{(31)}(u_{34}) &= u_{34} \text{ }^{(31)0}(0) + \frac{1}{2} u_{34}^2 \text{sgn}(u_{34}) \text{ }^{(31)00}(0^+) & u_{34} ! 0 \\
s^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34}) &= \alpha_{13}^2 \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{34}) + \alpha_{13}^2 \text{sgn}(\alpha_{13}) \alpha_{12}^2 h^{(31)}(u_{34}) + \alpha_{13} \alpha_{12}^2 \text{ }^{(31)}(u_{34}) + j_{13} j_{12}^2 \text{ }^{(31)}(u_{34}) & \alpha_{13} ! 1 \\
s^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34}) &= \text{ }^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) u_{34} + \text{ }^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) j_{34} j & u_{34} ! 0 ; \alpha_{123} \text{ xed} \\
s^{(4)}(u_{1234}) &= \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{34}^2 \text{sgn}(u_{34}) \alpha_{12}^2 \text{ }^{(31)00}(0^+) + \alpha_{34} \text{ }^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) + j_{34} j^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) & \alpha_{34} ! 1 ; \alpha_{123} \text{ xed} \\
s^{(4)}(u_{1234}) &= \alpha_{13} \text{ }^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}) + j_{13} j^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}) & \alpha_{13} ! 1 ; \alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34} \text{ xed} \\
\end{aligned} \tag{193}$$

The matching analysis results in some additional conditions not already implicit above. These are

$$\text{ }^{(31)}(u) = \text{ }^{(31)}(u) + \text{ }_{01}^{(211)}(0; u); \tag{194}$$

$$g^{(31)}(u_{34}) = g^{(31)}(u_{34}) - \frac{1}{2} \text{ }_{02}^{(211)}(0; u_{34}); \tag{195}$$

The various zero temperature terms can be determined sequentially by matching from the outer solution. In particular, the small argument behavior of $S^{(4)}$ yields $\text{ }^{(211)}$, which in turn yields $\text{ }^{(31)}$; $g^{(31)}$ and $g^{(22)}$, which finally determine f_4 . This Larkin term thus matches all the way through to give

$$f_4 = 2 \text{ }^{(31)0}(0) = 2 \text{ }_{11}^{(211)}(0; 0); \tag{196}$$

$$f_4 = s_{220}^{(22)}(0; 0; 0) = 4 g^{(22)}(0) = 2 \text{ }_{11}^{(211)}(0; 0) \tag{197}$$

As discussed in Appendix F, these derivatives are unambiguous, and determined by a definite procedure discussed therein.

Unlike these zero temperature quantities, the PBL functions themselves are not determined by matching alone. Instead, they obey PBL equations derived from the basic ERG fourth cumulant equation (given in (A15)) and the PBL forms in (192). The PBL211, PBL22, and PBL31 equations are given and analyzed in Appendix F.

C. expansion in powers of R

The PBL analysis of the fourth cumulant enables the calculation of the beta function to $O(R^4)$. To do so, we require $\text{ }^{(4)}(u)$ which feeds in (171). To obtain it, we must solve (181) perturbatively in R (equivalently). We write:

$$\text{ }^{(4)}(u) = \text{ }_0^{(4)}(u) + \text{ }_1^{(4)}(u) + \dots \tag{198}$$

The zeroth order solution $\text{ }_0^{(4)}(u)$ obeys (185), the solution of which is implicit in (187). The next order satisfies

$$(\text{d}^3 + 2 \text{ }_1)(u) + u \text{ }_1^0(u) = \text{ }_1^{(4)}(0) \text{ }_0^{(4)}(u) R^0(u) - 3 \text{ }_0^{(4)}(u) R^0(u) - 6 R^0(0^+) \text{ }_0^{(4)}(u) + \text{ }_0^{(4)}(u); \tag{199}$$

where $\text{ }_0^{(4)}(u) = \text{ }_0^{(31)0}(u) + 2 g_0^{(31)}(u) + g_0^{(22)}(u)$ represents the feeding from the fourth cumulant.

To determine $\text{ }_0^{(4)}(u)$ we use the expansion of the outer equation for $S^{(3)}$ to cubic non-analytic order (see Ap-

pendix E) and keep only the feeding ($O(R^3)$) term:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\text{d}^3 + 3 \text{ }_0)(u) + u \text{ }_0^0(u) & \\
= \text{ }_3^{(4)} \frac{1}{2} R^0(0^+) \text{ }_0^{(4)}(u) + R^0(u) R^0(0^+) R^0(0^+) & \tag{200}
\end{aligned}$$

Note that the r.h.s starts as β_j at small u . The function $\beta_0(u)$ is determined from the appropriate expansions of

the (2^{11}) equation as detailed in Appendix F. It satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} & (d-4+\frac{4}{3})\beta_0(u) + u\beta_0'(u) \\ &= \frac{h_7}{2}(\beta_0''(u)^2 - \beta_0''(0^+)^2) + 12\beta_0'(u)(\beta_0''(u)^2 - \beta_0''(0^+)^2) + \beta_0''(0^+)^2\beta_0'''(0^+) + \beta_0''(u)^2\beta_0'''(u)^2 : \end{aligned} \quad (201)$$

It is straightforward to solve the linear equations (200,201) for β_0 ; β_0 , and substitute them into (199) which in turn is easily solved. For arbitrary β the resulting beta function to this order now involves double convolutions, generalizing the single one obtained in (187). Thus, for

simplicity of presentation we give the result explicitly for the particular case $\beta = 0$. This choice is of formal interest for comparison with β -expansion calculations. One obtains then

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_1 R(u) = 0 = & (d-4+\frac{4}{3})\beta_1 R(u) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}R''(u)^2 - R''(0)R''(u) + 2\beta_1 R''(u) - R''(0)(R''(u)^2 - R''(0^+)^2) \\ & + \frac{2}{3}R''(u)[20R''(u)^2 - R''(0^+)^2R''(0^+)] + 2R''(u)(R''(u)^2 - R''(0^+)^2) \\ & + 6(R''(u)^2 - R''(0^+)^2)^2 + 4R''(u)^2(R''(u)^2 + R''(u)R^{(5)}(u)) \\ & + \frac{h_7}{2}\beta_1 R''(u)^2 - R''(0^+)^2 + 24R''(u)(R''(u)^2 - R''(0^+)^2R''(0^+)) + 2R''(u)^2R''(u)^2 : \end{aligned} \quad (202)$$

where here $\beta_1 = 1/(2-2)$ and $\beta_2 = 1/(4-3)$ (respectively β_3, β_4 and β_5 in the notations introduced below).

This result is also of interest if one performs the R -expansion in another consistent way, closer to the β -expansion, by expanding simultaneously in β taking $\beta = O(R)$. In that case, and to this order, there is only one additional $O(R^3)$ term appearing in (202), $2\beta_1^3(2\beta_0(u) + u\beta_0'(u))$ with β_0 given by (185) setting $\beta = 0$.

A remarkable property of the above β -function is that, apart from an immaterial constant, its Taylor expansion in β does not contain a $O(\beta)$ but starts as $u^2 + \beta^3 + \dots$. It thus satisfies the physical requirement of the absence of "supercusp" (as discussed in^{47,48} in the dynamical version this can be traced to a requirement about potentiality of the model). It implies some non trivial identities between the zero temperature functions introduced here. Examination of the various terms on the right hand side of (181) shows that a sufficient condition for the coefficient of β to vanish is:

$$\beta_0''(0^+) + 2\beta_0''(0^+) = 0 \quad (203)$$

$$\beta_0''(0^+) = 0 \quad (204)$$

One easily checks that these identities are indeed verified to lowest order in R , i.e. by the functions β_0 , β_1 and β_2 (note that β_0 is a linear combination of functions which do start as β so cancellations occur). A quite non trivial property is that these hold actually to all orders. From the exact equation (171), it is again a sufficient condition for the absence of supercusp. Although we hold no general proof we have checked that it holds on some higher order terms. It seems to work term by term in the FRG equation with cancellations reminiscent of those occurring in properties such as dimensional reduction.

We give here the correction to the second derivative, the u^2 term in the β -function, for any β . One notes indeed that one can obtain relations between derivatives valid for arbitrary β . We define $x_{m,n} = 1/x_{m,n}$ where the $x_{m,n} = d-m+n = (2m-4)(m-1) + (2m-n)$ are the naive bare eigenvalues (rescaling factor) of a n -th derivative of a m -th cumulant at zero. These generalize the one defined above in (104), $x_{m,n} = x_m$. Computing $\beta_0''(0)$ with the above method, one finds:

$$0 = (d-2)\beta_0''(0) + R''(0^+)^2 + 8\beta_1 R''(0^+)^2 R''(0^+) + 48\beta_1\beta_2(\beta_1\beta_5 + \beta_2\beta_4)\beta_0''(0)^3 R''(0) \quad (205)$$

$$+ 12\beta_1\beta_4((2\beta_1\beta_4 + 4\beta_1\beta_5) + 13\beta_2\beta_4)\beta_0''(0^+)^2 R''(0^+)^2 + O(R^5) \quad (206)$$

this can be equivalently obtained by taking two derivative at zero of the beta function for arbitrary d , not shown here.

We now compute the Larkin term to leading order in R . It can be expressed by taking the derivative at zero of the equation for $\beta^{(31)}$ which, to lowest order reads (see Appendix F):

$$\begin{aligned} & (d-4+3)_0^{(31)}(u) + u_0^{(31)0}(u) \\ & = 3_0^{(4)} R^{\text{00}}(u) R^{\text{00}}(u)^3 \end{aligned} \quad (207)$$

Using Eq. (196) yields, for arbitrary d one finds:

$$f_4 = \frac{6}{d-4+4} {}_0^{(4)} R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^4 + O(R^5) \quad (208)$$

that gives:

$$f_4 = \frac{\overline{u^4}}{(\overline{u^2})^2} \quad 3 = \frac{6(\frac{2}{2})}{2} {}_0^{(4)} + O(R) \quad (209)$$

given that the exact value in $d=0$ for the case $d=4=3$, $d=2=3$ is $f_4^{\text{ex}} = 0.16173$: it clearly appears that the R expansion should also be performed as an expansion in small d and u . For the (relevant) random field case $d=3$ one finds:

$$f_4 = \frac{1}{12} {}_2^{(2)} + O(R^3) \quad (210)$$

thus values of order the exact result in $d=0$ are already reached for $d=1$.

To obtain a reasonable estimate directly in $d=0$ (within a fixed dimension expansion) one should clearly pursue the expansion to large order, i.e. compute the $f_4(R)$ "function" up to values of R (i.e. its anomalous derivatives) where it changes sign. R is presumably not small in that regime. In fact we now the exact value of $R^{\text{00}}(0) = 4C_2 = 4/2$ at the fixed point.

Let us now reflect on what has been accomplished. We have shown explicitly on the third cumulant, and to some degree of detail on the fourth one that in $d=0$ matching through the various PBL was possible from the outer solution all the way down to the full BL where the true derivatives are defined. Since there is little doubt that this extends to any cumulant in $d=0$ a consequence is that one should be able to compute directly, e.g. the beta function, from the outer equation, performing a non-analytic expansion of $R(u)$ and taking the proper derivatives at the limit of coinciding points, in a manner free of ambiguities.

This is what we have performed, using mathematica, up to four loops (order R^5). The three loop result (order R^4) reproduces exactly (202) above and the four loop result is detailed in the Appendix G

Let us summarize the procedure here. We use schematic notations, parenthesis means a symmetrized expression, square bracket means taking the limit of two coinciding points and symmetrizing the result. We indicate schematically the derivatives. Here subscripts do

not indicate derivatives but the order in the expansion. The iteration reads as follows. The lowest (two loop, R^3) order reads as:

$$S_0^{(3)} = {}_S (R^{\text{00}} R^{\text{00}} R^{\text{00}}) \quad (211)$$

$${}_0 = [S_0^{(3)0}] \quad (212)$$

the three loop order reads:

$$S_0^{(4)} = {}_Q {}_0^{(4)} (R^{\text{00}} R^{\text{00}} R^{\text{00}} R^{\text{00}}) \quad (213)$$

$$S_1^{(3)} = {}_S (R^{\text{00}} S_0^{(3)0}) + [S_0^{(4)0}] \quad (214)$$

$${}_1 = [S_1^{(3)0}] \quad (215)$$

We have explicitly checked that the evaluation of the limits at coinciding arguments $[::]$ never contain sign ambiguities. This is the case also for the direct evaluation of

$$\lim_{u_i \rightarrow 0} \frac{Y^4}{i!} ({}_{u_i} S_0^{(4)}(u_{1234})) = {}_Q {}_0^{(4)} R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^4 \quad (216)$$

Upon taking the four derivatives, a choice of ordering of the arguments can be made. The limit it can then be taken, and, since the expression is permutation invariant in 1;2;3;4, is found to be independent of the choice. Thus the function can be defined by continuity at zero. That this is also equal to the true derivative at zero, which requires some knowledge of the full TBL is of course the non trivial property. We have demonstrated in some detail here how it arises.

VI. DISCUSSION AND PROSPECTS

We have shown that the naive thermal boundary layer structure found in previous one loop studies of the FRG is really only the tip of the iceberg. In fact the TBL is, as we have shown, a truly non-perturbative feature of the field theory which extends to all cumulants. For the special case $d = 0$ and $N = 1$ we have explored the structure in some detail and unveiled the connection of the TBL to droplet physics. Also for this case, we have also been able to describe in detail the matching between the TBL and the zero temperature outer solution. This matching solves the ambiguity problem and explains how correlation functions calculated in the field theory have their expected zero temperature limits. It enables a systematic evaluation of the $T = 0$ beta function in powers of the renormalized disorder $R(u)$, given explicitly here up to four loops.

The detailed understanding of the thermal boundary layer described here in $d = 0$ is clearly a necessary first step towards progress in higher dimensions. The ultimate goal of such a program is a first principles derivation of

the ϵ -expansion, of matching, and a test of the droplet picture (or its extensions) in $d > 0$. The ERG described in Section III appears as a promising technique to approach the problem. We now indicate some first steps in this program.

We employ the multiloop expansion of the full effective action functional discussed already in (79):

$$V[u] = \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \int_{r_1}^{\infty} V_1^{(j)}(u_{r_1}, \dots, u_{r_j}; m_{r_j}) \quad (217)$$

in terms of translationally-invariant functions (j -local term^s) of j u_i and r_i variables, with $V_1^{(1)}(u) = V(u)$ in previous notations (and here $l = \ln(l=m)$). The ERG equation (81) can itself be expanded in locality^{52,56} yielding a set of FRG flow equations for the functions $V_1^{(j)}$ and more conveniently for the rescaled functions $V_1^{(j)}(u_1, \dots, u_j; r_1, \dots, r_j) = m^{jd} V_1^{(j)}(u_1/m, \dots, u_j/m; x_1, \dots, x_j)$ with $x = m r$. By similar considerations as in Section we obtain a generalization of the TBLA

$$V_1^{(j)}(u_1, \dots, u_j; x_1, \dots, x_j) = \sum_{p=1}^{\infty} f_{j;2p}(x_1, \dots, x_{2p}) \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_{2p}}^{\infty} u_1^{a_1} \dots u_{2p}^{a_{2p}} + \frac{T_1}{2} V^{(j)}(u_1, \dots, u_j; x_1, \dots, x_j) \quad (218)$$

with $\tilde{u} = u/T_1$ and $T = m/T$. The $f_{j;2p}(x_1, \dots, x_{2p})$ are the multiloop extension of the random force terms and are proportional to the j point, k -th cumulant of the random force (with $f_{1,2} = R^{(0)}(0) = \langle \tilde{f}^2 \rangle$). The TBLA is applied by first separating the ERG equations into coupled sets by a cumulant expansion (i.e. by number of replicas), and then applying the ansatz. Each q^{th} cumulant equation is satisfied by the ansatz to the leading $O(T_1^q)$ order for $\tilde{u} \rightarrow 0$ ($l \rightarrow 1$). As in $d = 0$ and in the one loop Wilson calculation, in this balance the random force terms contribute only through rescaling terms while the $v^{(j)}$ functions survive in the remaining terms, the flow $(-m \partial_{m_i})$ term being subdominant. Thus one obtains a set of coupled fixed point equations for a set of appropriately defined j -local k^{th} cumulant boundary layer functions $s^{(j;k)}$. These equations are regular, thereby solving the $l=T_1$ divergence problem mentioned in the Introduction.

The apparently self-consistency of this generalized TBLA is encouraging. Furthermore, it embodies the lowest-order droplet scaling as we now describe. Indeed, since the ERG gives the exact effective action $[u]$, the above scaling form is a very strong statement with implications for all correlations. As in $d = 0$, these are obtained exactly by their tree level calculation from $[u]$. For instance, for the center of mass fluctuations

$$(u_0 = L^{-d} \int_r u_r), \quad \frac{(\int_0^1 u_0^2 - \int_0^1 u_0^2)^n}{(m/L)^{d(2n-1)}} m^{2n} \sum_{n_v} \mathcal{G}_{\alpha}^{2n+2n_i} [v^{(0)}(\alpha)]^{n_v} \Big|_{\alpha=0}; \quad (219)$$

where the sum is over the number n_v of vertices, $\mathcal{G}_{\alpha}^{2n+2n_i} [v^{(0)}(\alpha)]^{n_v} \Big|_{\alpha=0}$ indicates schematically a combination of derivatives of the local replica TBL function $v^{(0)}(u)$, with $2(n+n_i)^{\text{th}}$ total derivatives spread over n_v^{th} factors. The number n_i is the number of internal lines, and for tree diagrams $n_i = n_v - 1$. Remarkably this precisely reproduces the droplet behavior of thermal fluctuations, (2), with an amplitude determined from the local TBL functions. Of course, the full TBLA for the effective action determines all correlation functions at low temperature, including those at non-zero wavevector, which will have scaling dependent upon q in the manner expected from droplets.

While these successes are encouraging, the further steps of matching and connecting to the outer solution (hopefully describable in an ϵ -expansion) remain a formidable task ahead. In Appendix I, we sketch some of the problems encountered in approaching these goals. Another intriguing question is the extension of the present methods to $N > 1$ in $d = 0$. There too, a preliminary study indicates that the $N = 1$ mechanism for

the resolution of zero temperature ambiguities is in some way modified. A better understanding of the mechanism of the (super-cusp) cancellations, which appear to occur term by term for $N = 1$, is necessary. Of course, despite the progress made in this paper, we should not be surprised that some formidable challenges remain in the glass problem. We look forward to successful application and extension of the ideas elaborated herein.

Acknowledgments

L.B. was supported by NSF grant DMR-9985255, and the Packard foundation. Both L.B. and P.L.D. were supported by the NSF-CNRS program through NSF grant INT-0089835, and CNRS Project 10674.

APPENDIX A: GENERAL STRUCTURE OF THE FRG EQUATION

In this Appendix we study the equation (24), in terms of the rescaled function $\tilde{V}(u)$ defined in (21), namely:

$$\partial_1 \tilde{V}(u) = O \tilde{V}(u) + \sum_{p=1}^X c_p \text{Tr}(\tilde{V}^{(0)p}) \quad (\text{A } 1)$$

where O is the rescaling operator, for an arbitrary set of coefficients c_p . We expand the trace and project onto k replica terms. We want to evaluate:

$$\text{Tr}(\tilde{V}^{(0)p}) \quad (\text{A } 2)$$

we decompose the matrix $V^{(0)} = A + B$ as:

$$V_{ab}^{(0)} = \delta_{ab} V_{aa}^{(0)} + (1 - \delta_{ab}) V_{ab}^{(0)} \quad (\text{A } 3)$$

We can use the matrix identity:

$$\text{Tr}(A + B)^p = \text{Tr}(A^p) + \sum_{v=1}^{X^p} \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_v} \sum_{0 \leq v+m \leq p} \text{Tr}(A^{m_1} B A^{m_2} \dots B A^{m_v}) \quad (\text{A } 4)$$

$$= \text{Tr}(A^p) + \sum_{v=1}^{X^p} \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_v} \sum_{0 \leq v+m \leq p} (m_v + 1) \text{Tr}(B A^{m_1} B A^{m_2} \dots B A^{m_v}) \quad (\text{A } 5)$$

as can be easily checked by multiplying with z^p and summing over p . Thus we obtain the convenient representation:

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}(\tilde{V}^{(0)p}) &= \sum_a^X (V_{aa}^{(0)})^m \\ &+ \sum_{v=1}^{X^p} \sum_{m_1, \dots, m_v} \sum_{0 \leq v+m \leq p} (m_v + 1) \sum_{a_1, \dots, a_v}^X (V_{a_v a_1}^{(0)})^{m_1} V_{a_1 a_2}^{(0)} (V_{a_2 a_2}^{(0)})^{m_2} \dots V_{a_{v-1} a_v}^{(0)} (V_{a_v a_v}^{(0)})^{m_v} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6)$$

Using the definition of V in terms of the cumulants, we can now obtain the full form of the flow of the rescaled q replica term.

To express it we define the following sets of constraints, $C_0(q)$ as:

$$1 \leq m \leq q-1; f_0 = 0; \sum_{i=1}^m p_i = q-1-m \quad (\text{A } 7)$$

the set $C_1(q)$ as:

$$1 \leq v \leq q; f_0 = 0; \sum_{i=1}^v q_i = q-v; 1 \leq p = v + \sum_{i=1}^{X^v} m_i \leq q \quad (\text{A } 8)$$

and $C_2(q; v; m; f; m_i; g; p)$ as:

$$f p_{i0}; p_{i1}; \dots; p_{im_i} g_{i=1, \dots, v}; p_{ij} = 0; \sum_{i=1}^{X^v} (p_{i0} + p_{i1} + \dots + p_{im_i}) = q-p \quad (\text{A } 9)$$

The FRG equations for the rescaled cumulants (in the Wilson approach) read:

$$\begin{aligned}
 @S^q(u) = & (d_q + u @u_i) S^q(u) \\
 & + T_1 \sum_{m; f p_i g_i = 1; \dots; m} 2 C_0(q) \frac{C_m q!}{(1+p_1)! \dots (1+p_m)!} \text{sym} [S_{200::0}^{2+p_1}(u_1; u_{i_1}) S_{200::0}^{2+p_2}(u_1; u_{i_2}) \dots S_{200::0}^{2+p_m}(u_1; u_{i_m})] \\
 & + \sum_{v; f m_i g_i p_i 2 C_1(q)} \sum_{f p_{i0} p_{i1} \dots p_{im_i} g_i = 1; \dots; v} 2 C_2(q; v; f m_i g_i p_i) \prod_{i=1}^v \frac{1}{p_{i0}! (1+p_{i1})! \dots (1+p_{im_i})!} \\
 & \text{sym} [S_{110::0}^{2+p_{i0}}(u_v; u_1; u_{i_{10}}) \prod_{k_1=1}^{p_{i1}} S_{200::0}^{2+p_{i k_1}}(u_1; u_{i_{1 k_1}}) \dots \prod_{k_2=1}^{p_{i2}} S_{200::0}^{2+p_{i k_2}}(u_2; u_{i_{2 k_2}}) \dots S_{110::0}^{2+p_{i v_0}}(u_{v-1}; u_v; u_{i_{v_0}}) \prod_{k_v=1}^{p_{i v}} S_{200::0}^{2+p_{i k_v}}(u_v; u_{i_{v k_v}})]
 \end{aligned} \tag{A 10}$$

where the first sym is symmetrization with respect to the union of sets $u_1; \dots; u_m; u_{i_1}; \dots; u_{i_m}$, with $\text{card}(u_{i_1}) = p_i + 1$ and the second sym is symmetrization with respect to the union of sets $u_1; \dots; u_v; u_{i_{10}}; \dots; u_{i_{1 m_1}}; \dots; u_{i_{v_0}}; \dots; u_{i_{v m_v}}$, with $\text{card}(u_{i_{10}}) = p_{i0}$ and $\text{card}(u_{i_{k_1}}) = p_{i k_1} + 1$ for $1 \leq k_1 \leq m_1$.

Let us now derive the flow equations for the second, third and fourth cumulant. The definitions of the rescaled quantities are the Wilson ones, Eq. (22), only at the end we give the equations for the ERG definitions (102).

For $q = 2$, the possibilities for C_0, C_1, C_2 are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m = 1; p_1 = 0 \\
 v = 1; m_1 = 0; p = 1; p_{10} = 1 \\
 v = 1; m_1 = 1; p = 2; p_{10} = p_{11} = 0 \\
 v = 2; m_1 = m_2 = 0; p = 2; p_{10} = p_{20} = 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{A 11}$$

which yield the following terms, in the same order:

$$@_1 R(u) = (d_2 + u @R(u) + 2 C_1 T_1 R^{(0)}(u) + 2 C_1 S_{110}^{(3)}(0; 0; u) - 4 @R^{(0)}(0) R^{(0)}(u) + 2 C_2 R^{(0)}(u)^2 \tag{A 12}$$

For $q = 3$, one gets:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m = 1; p_1 = 1 \\
 m = 2; p_1 = p_2 = 0 \\
 v = 1; m_1 = 0; p = 1; p_{10} = 2 \\
 v = 1; m_1 = 1; p = 2; p_{10} = 1; p_{11} = 0 \\
 v = 1; m_1 = 1; p = 2; p_{10} = 0; p_{11} = 1 \\
 v = 1; m_1 = 2; p = 3; p_{10} = p_{11} = p_{12} = 0 \\
 v = 2; m_1 = m_2 = 0; p = 2; p_{10} + p_{20} = 1 \\
 v = 2; m_1 = 1; m_2 = 0; p = 3; p_{10} = p_{11} = p_{20} = 0 \\
 v = 2; m_1 = 0; m_2 = 1; p = 3; p_{10} = p_{20} = p_{21} = 0 \\
 v = 3; m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 0; p = 3; p_{10} = p_{20} = p_{30} = 0
 \end{aligned} \tag{A 13}$$

These yields, in the order in which they appear (denoting $u_{ij} = u_i u_j$):

$$\begin{aligned}
 @_1 S^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) = & (d_3 + 2 d_2 + u_i @u_i) S^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) + \text{sym} [3 C_1 T_1 S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) + 6 C_2 T_1 R^{(0)}(u_{12}) R^{(0)}(u_{13}) \\
 & + 3 C_1 S_{1100}^{(4)}(u_1; u_1; u_2; u_3) + 12 C_2 S_{110}^{(3)}(u_1; u_1; u_2) R^{(0)}(u_{13}) - 6 @R^{(0)}(0) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) \\
 & 18 @R^{(0)}(0) R^{(0)}(u_{12}) R^{(0)}(u_{13}) - 12 @S_{110}^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) R^{(0)}(u_{12}) + 6 C_3 R^{(0)}(u_{21}) R^{(0)}(u_{13}) R^{(0)}(u_{12}) \\
 & + 12 C_3 R^{(0)}(u_{21}) R^{(0)}(u_{12}) R^{(0)}(u_{23}) - 6 @R^{(0)}(u_{31}) R^{(0)}(u_{12}) R^{(0)}(u_{23})]
 \end{aligned} \tag{A 14}$$

This is rearranged by redefining $R^{(0)}(u) = R^{(0)}(u) - R^{(0)}(0)$, using the gauge invariance (terms which depend on less than q replicas can be erased in a q -rep term) as well as identities from translational invariance (STS) such as

$\text{sym } S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) = 2 \text{sym } S_{110}^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3)$. Finally setting $c_p = 1/(2p)$ one obtains the one loop Wilson FRG equations for $q = 2, 3$.

The same is applied to $q = 4$. One checks that the change $R^{\text{00}}(u) \rightarrow R^{\text{00}}(0) + R^{\text{00}}(u)$ produces terms proportional to $R^{\text{00}}(0)$ which cancel or are only gauge terms. It thus simplifies into:

$$\begin{aligned}
 @_1 S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) = & (d - 4 + \frac{1}{2} @_{u_1}) S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) + \text{sym } @ S_{11000}^{(5)}(u_{11234}) + 2 T_1 S_{2000}^{(4)}(u_{1234}) \\
 & + 3 T_1 S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{123}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + 4 T_1 R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) \\
 & + 6 R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) (S_{1100}^{(4)}(u_{1134}) - S_{1100}^{(4)}(u_{1234})) + 6 (S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{112}) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{134}) + S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{123}) S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{124})) \\
 & + 12 S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{112}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{123}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) (2 R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{24})) + \frac{1}{2} S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{123}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14})^2 \\
 & + 6 R^{\text{00}}(u_{12})^2 R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) (2 R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{24})) - 2 R^{\text{00}}(u_{31}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{23}) + \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{41}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{23}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})]
 \end{aligned} \tag{A 15}$$

with $\epsilon = 0 = 1$ for Wilson and $\epsilon = 3=4$, $\epsilon = 1=2$ for ERG in $d = 0$.

APPENDIX B : STRUCTURE OF CUMULANTS

We discuss the structure for $n = 0$. The disorder cumulant $S^{(k)}(u_1; :u_k)$ is a sum of (symmetrized) monomials of even degree N , $u_1^{p_1} u_2^{p_2} :u_k^{p_k}$ with $1 \leq p_i \leq k$ and $\sum_{i=1}^k p_i = N$. Symmetrization is implicit below so we do not always write the sym symbols. The number of possible such terms of same degree N is $A(N; k)$. These however must come in a smaller number of independent linear combinations (of same N) satisfying translational invariance. We denote it $B(N; k)$. Shifting $u_i \rightarrow u_i + \epsilon$ each monomial yields:

$$u_1^{p_1} u_2^{p_2} :u_k^{p_k} \rightarrow u_1^{p_1} u_2^{p_2} :u_k^{p_k} + \sum_{i=1}^k \epsilon \frac{\partial}{\partial u_i} u_1^{p_1} u_2^{p_2} :u_k^{p_k} + O(\epsilon^2) \quad (B1)$$

imposing that combinations give zero - up to terms which can be gauge with respect to k -th cumulant, allows to find them. It is sufficient to impose the condition on the $O(\epsilon)$ term, i.e. focus on infinitesimal translations. Also each replica must appear at least once (otherwise it is a gauge term). Let us determine the lowest possible value of N for a given k and the structure of the lowest terms. We must distinguish k even or odd.

For k even the lowest possible term is simple and unique and has $N = k$ (i.e. $A(k; k) = B(N; k) = 1$):

$$S^{(k)}(u_1; :u_k) = S_{11::1}^{(k)}(0; :0) u_1 u_2 : : : u_k \quad (B2)$$

which is by itself symmetric and translationally invariant since the translation (B1) produces only $k-1$ -rep terms (pure gauge). One can determine easily the next term $N = k + 2$. Let us do it first on the fourth cumulant. There are two choices, which give under translation (terms proportional to ϵ):

$$u_1^3 u_2 u_3 u_4 \rightarrow 3u_1^2 u_2 u_3 u_4 \quad (B3)$$

$$u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3 u_4 \rightarrow 4u_1^2 u_2 u_3 u_4 \quad (B4)$$

using symmetrization, so the translationally invariant combination is $\text{sym} [\frac{1}{3} u_1^3 u_2 u_3 u_4 - \frac{1}{4} u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3 u_4]$. The result for the k -th cumulant is the obvious generalization:

$$S^{(k)}(u_1; :u_k) = \frac{1}{2} k S_{31::1}^{(k)}(0; :0) \text{sym} [\frac{1}{3} u_1^3 u_2 u_3 :u_k - \frac{1}{4} u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3 :u_k] \quad (B5)$$

. There is thus a single term for $N = k + 2$, i.e. $A(k + 2; k) = 2$, $B(k + 2; k) = 1$. In particular one can parameterize the fourth cumulant up to $O(u^8)$ as:

$$S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) = q_4 u_1 u_2 u_3 u_4 + \frac{1}{4} q_5 u_1 u_2 u_3 u_4 (2u_1^2 + 2u_2^2 + 2u_3^2 + 2u_4^2 - u_1 u_2 - u_1 u_3 - u_1 u_4 - u_2 u_3 - u_2 u_4 - u_3 u_4)$$

with $q_4 = S_{1111}^{(4)}(0; 0; 0; 0)$ and $q_5 = S_{2211}^{(4)}(0; 0; 0; 0)$.

For odd k it is more subtle. The naive choice $N = k + 1$ yields again a single term :

$$S^{(k)}(u_1; :u_k) = \frac{1}{2} S_{21::1}^{(k)}(0; :0) \text{sym} u_1^2 u_2 : : : u_k \quad (B6)$$

but, it is in fact forbidden. Indeed, the translation produces $u_1 u_2 : : : u_k$, a variation which cannot be cancelled, since there is only one term. One then has to try $N = k + 3$. To find the possible combinations let us discuss first the three replica term $k = 3$. There are three monomials at order u^6 :

$$u_1^4 u_2 u_3 \rightarrow 4u_1^3 u_2 u_3 \quad (B7)$$

$$u_1^3 u_2^2 u_3 \rightarrow 3u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3 + 2u_1^3 u_2 u_3 \quad (B8)$$

$$u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3^2 \rightarrow 6u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3 \quad (B9)$$

since there are two constraints, there is only one possible combination $u_1^4 u_2 u_3 - 2u_1^3 u_2^2 u_3 + u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3^2$. A gain, this extends easily to any k odd, the lowest N is thus $N = k + 3$ with a single term :

$$S^{(k)}(u_1; :u_k) = \frac{1}{4!} k S_{41::1}^{(k)}(0; :0) \text{sym} (u_1^4 u_2 u_3 - 2u_1^3 u_2^2 u_3 + u_1^2 u_2^2 u_3^2) u_4 : : : u_k \quad (B10)$$

It is interesting to note that for the third cumulant complex analysis can be used. Indeed $S^{(3)}(u_{123})$ can be expressed as a function of $z = u_1 + j u_2 + j^2 u_3$ and its complex conjugate \bar{z} (j is the third root of unity satisfying $j^3 = 1$). That automatically enforces translational invariance. Since the permutation group is generated by $z \rightarrow jz$ and $z \rightarrow \bar{z}$ it is easy to express symmetrization. One drawback of this representation however is that gauge freedom is not immediately apparent, so we have not explored further this method.

APPENDIX C : CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

We give here some details of the calculation of correlations from the effective action. We compute all four and six point correlations in terms of the disorder cumulants. In each case we also give the STS and ERG identities which relate these correlations.

The calculation was outlined in Section III. Correlations are obtained from tree diagrams using the exact two point function and the proper vertices $^{(4)}$, $^{(6)}$, .. with 4, 6 external legs etc. These are then separated in number of replicas. The exact two point function is given in (130).

1. four point functions

The calculation of the four point function requires only one $^{(4)}$ vertex. Since $S^{(3)}$ starts as u^6 only R and $S^{(4)}$ can give a contribution. One simplification in the calculation is that dressing the external lines with a $R^{(0)}(0)$ gives zero, so any propagator from an external point to a vertex can be replaced by the free propagator $T_{ab} = m^{-2}$. This is because if one contracts first these terms one has, for instance:

$$R^{(0)}(0) \begin{array}{c} \text{X} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{f} \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \text{X} \\ \text{---} \\ \text{egh} \end{array} S(u_e; u_g; u_h) = 0 \quad (C1)$$

from translational invariance. Next, a limited range of q -replica interactions can contribute to a given average. At linear order in one finds that for a given correlation with p distinct replicas, interactions with $q < p$ cannot contribute (since one can equivalently use "excluded vertices" where replica are constrained to be distinct). For a given correlation which is a monomial of order m , interactions with $q > m$ cannot contribute (using un-excluded vertices, there remain free replica sums). This is why an observable such as $h_{a_i} u_{b_i} u_{c_i} u_{d_i}$ with four distinct replicas gives zero when contracted to linear order with R and $S^{(3)}$, and cannot involve fifth and higher cumulants either.

The result for the connected averages (graphs where all proper vertices are connected) for the few possible monomials at order u^4 is given in the text in (134). In each (except the last) a term proportional to $S^{112}(0;0;0) + S^{121}(0;0;0) + S^{211}(0;0;0)$ naively arises but vanishes by translational invariance. Here we give the disconnected parts:

$$h_{a_i}^4 i_{disc} = 3h_{a_i}^2 i^2 \quad (C2)$$

$$h_{a_i}^3 u_{b_i} i_{disc} = 3h_{a_i}^2 i h_{a_i} u_{b_i} \quad (C3)$$

$$h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i}^2 i_{disc} = h_{a_i}^2 i^2 + 2h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i^2 \quad (C4)$$

$$h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i} u_{c_i} i_{disc} = h_{a_i}^2 i h_{a_i} u_{b_i} + 2h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i^2 \quad (C5)$$

$$h_{a_i} u_{b_i} u_{c_i} u_{d_i} i_{disc} = 3h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i^2 \quad (C6)$$

These can be used to check that the part involving $R^{(0)}(0)$ cancels in the calculation of the second moment of the sample dependent susceptibility $= h_{a_i}^2 i - h_{a_i}^2 i$. In the disconnected part:

$$h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i}^2 - 2h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i} u_{c_i} + u_{a_i} u_{b_i} u_{c_i} u_{d_i} i_{disc} = (h_{a_i}^2 i - h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i)^2 = T^2 \frac{1}{m^4} \quad (C7)$$

Let us now give the STS and ERG identities from (114) and (121). We find the relations between the two two-point functions and the few four-point functions. The ERG relations read:

$$\begin{aligned} 2 T h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i' - T m \mathbb{Q}_m h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i &= 2 m^{-2} (h_{a_i}^3 u_{b_i} - h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i} u_{c_i}) \\ 2 T h_{a_i}^2 i' - T m \mathbb{Q}_m h_{a_i}^2 i &= m^{-2} (h_{a_i}^4 i - h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i}^2 i) \end{aligned} \quad (C8)$$

where we recall $a; b; c$ are all distinct replicas, and one must distinguish several cases in the sum over f in (121). Choosing respectively $0 = u_a^3$, $0 = u_a^2 u_b$ and $0 = u_a u_b u_c$, one finds three STS relations:

$$3 \frac{T}{m^2} h_{a_i}^2 i = h_{a_i}^4 i - h_{a_i}^3 u_{b_i} i \quad (C9)$$

$$\frac{T}{m^2} (2h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i + h_{a_i}^2 i) = h_{a_i}^3 u_{b_i} i + h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i}^2 i - 2h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i} u_{c_i} i \quad (C10)$$

$$3 \frac{T}{m^2} h_{a_i} u_{b_i} i = 3 (h_{a_i}^2 u_{b_i} u_{c_i} - h_{a_i} u_{b_i} u_{c_i} u_{d_i})$$

These few equations are not independent, otherwise all four point correlations would be determined from the two point ones. The difference of the two ERG equations is equivalent to the difference between the two first STS ones.

Thus only four are independent and we have the fourth order correlations. Generally at order n one will have N_n n -th order correlations, $N_n - 2$ RG equations and $N_n - 1$ STS equations. N_n can be obtained from the boson partition sum $\sum_{k=1}^n \frac{1}{z^k} = \sum_n N_n z^n$ (with $N_4 = 5, N_6 = 11, N_8 = 22, N_{10} = 42, \dots$).

Note that the relation (126) is obtained by forming the linear combination of the three STS relations (with coefficients 1; -3; 2 for the three successive lines, respectively).

If we now compute all above averages using the droplet theory, one finds that the above equations reduce to only two:

$$3h x_1^2 i_b = h x_1^4 i_b - h x_1^2 x_2 i_b \quad (C 11)$$

$$2 h x_1^2 i_b = h x_1^4 i_b - h x_1^2 x_2^2 i_b \quad (C 12)$$

where $h O(x_1; x_2) i_b = \int dx_1 dx_2 O(x_1; x_2) D(x_1; x_2)$. The three STS equations yield a single equivalent one and the two RG equations a single one. Since there are three fourth order unknown we are left with e.g. $h x_1^4 i_b$ undetermined.

2. six point functions

The calculation of the six point connected function requires either one $^{(6)}$ vertex or two $^{(4)}$ vertices. It can require a priori up to the sixth cumulant. However, terms of order $(S^{(6)})^2$ and higher contain too many replica sums to match the incoming ones. In both vertices $S^{(5)}$ can be dropped as it starts as u^8 . The $^{(4)}$ vertices involve four derivatives in zero and thus can only involve R or $S^{(4)}$. Thus to obtain e.g. $h u_a^6 i_c$, we need to contract u_a^6 with

$$\sum_{ef} \frac{1}{2T^2} R_{ef} + \sum_{efg} \frac{1}{6T^3} S_{efg}^{(3)} + \sum_{efgh} \frac{1}{24T^4} S_{efgh}^{(4)} + \sum_{efghij} \frac{1}{6!T^6} S_{efghij}^{(6)} \quad (C 13)$$

$$+ \sum_{efg} \frac{1}{2(2T^2)^2} (4T) R_{ef}^0 R_{eg}^0 + \sum_{efghi} \frac{1}{2(2T^2)(24T^4)} (16T) R_{ef}^0 (S^{(4)})_{eghi}^{(1;0;0;0)} \quad (C 14)$$

where in this equation only derivatives are indicated by superscript and schematic notations are used. We find the following result for the eleven distinct connected sixth point functions:

$$h u_a^6 i_c = 15q_4 T - 15q_4 T^2 - 15T^3 R^{(4)}(0) - T^4 R^{(6)}(0) + m_6 \quad (C 15)$$

$$h u_a^5 u_b i_c = 10q_4 T - 15q_4 T^2 - 10T^3 R^{(4)}(0) - T^4 R^{(6)}(0) + m_6 \quad (C 16)$$

$$h u_a^4 u_b^2 i_c = 7q_4 T - 3q_4 T^2 + 2s_6 T^3 + 5T^3 R^{(4)}(0) + T^4 R^{(6)}(0) + 12T^3 R^{(4)}(0)^2 + m_6 \quad (C 17)$$

$$h u_a^3 u_b^3 i_c = 6q_4 T + 3q_6 T^2 - 3s_6 T^3 - 6T^3 R^{(4)}(0) - T^4 R^{(6)}(0) - 18T^3 R^{(4)}(0)^2 + m_6 \quad (C 18)$$

$$h u_a^4 u_b u_c i_c = 6q_4 T - 9q_4 T^2 + s_6 T^3 + 6T^3 R^{(4)}(0)^2 + m_6 \quad (C 19)$$

$$h u_a^3 u_b^2 u_c i_c = 4q_4 T - \frac{1}{2} s_6 T^3 - T^3 R^{(4)}(0) - 3T^3 R^{(4)}(0)^2 + m_6 \quad (C 20)$$

$$h u_a^3 u_b u_c u_d i_c = 3q_4 T - 3q_4 T^2 + m_6 \quad (C 21)$$

$$h u_a^2 u_b^2 u_c^2 i_c = 3q_4 T + 3q_6 T^2 + s_6 T^3 + 3T^3 R^{(4)}(0) + 6T^3 R^{(4)}(0)^2 + m_6 \quad (C 22)$$

$$h u_a^2 u_b^2 u_c u_d i_c = 2q_4 T + q_6 T^2 + m_6 \quad (C 23)$$

$$h u_a^2 u_b u_c u_d u_e i_c = q_4 T + m_6 \quad (C 24)$$

$$h u_a u_b u_c u_d u_e u_f i_c = m_6 \quad (C 25)$$

Here for simplicity the mass m has been set to unity, but is easy to restore. We have denoted $s_6 = S_{222}^{(3)}(0;0;0)$, $q_4 = S_{1111}^{(4)}(0;0;0;0)$, $q_6 = S_{2211}^{(4)}(0;0;0;0)$ and $m_6 = S_{111111}^{(6)}(0;0;0;0;0;0)$.

We now list the ERG and STS identities to sixth order. Choosing the observable O in (114) successively as $O = u_a^5, O = u_a^4 u_b, O = u_a^3 u_b^2, O = u_a^3 u_b u_c, O = u_a^2 u_b^2 u_c, O = u_a^2 u_b u_c u_d, O = u_a u_b u_c u_d u_e$ one finds seven STS identities:

$$\frac{T}{m^2} 5h u_a^4 i = h u_a^6 i - h u_a^5 u_b i \quad (C 26)$$

$$\frac{T}{m^2} (4h u_a^3 u_b i + h u_a^4 i) = h u_a^5 u_b i + h u_a^4 u_b^2 i - 2h u_a^4 u_b u_c i \quad (C 27)$$

$$\frac{T}{m^2} (3h u_a^2 u_b^2 i + 2h u_a^3 u_b i) = h u_a^4 u_b^2 i + h u_a^3 u_b^3 i - 2h u_a^3 u_b^2 u_c i \quad (C 28)$$

$$\frac{T}{m^2} (3h_a^2 u_b u_c i + 2h_a^3 u_b i) = h_a^4 u_b u_c i + 2h_a^3 u_b^2 u_c i - 3h_a^3 u_b u_c u_d i \quad (C 29)$$

$$\frac{T}{m^2} (4h_a^2 u_b u_c i + h_a^2 u_b^2 i) = 2h_a^3 u_b^2 u_c i + h_a^2 u_b^2 c^2 i - 3h_a^2 u_b^2 u_c u_d i \quad (C 30)$$

$$\frac{T}{m^2} (2h_a u_b u_c u_d i + 3h_a^2 u_b u_c i) = h_a^3 u_b u_c u_d i + 3h_a^2 u_b^2 u_c u_d i - 4h_a^2 u_b u_c u_d u_e i \quad (C 31)$$

$$\frac{T}{m^2} 5h_a u_b u_c u_d i = 5h_a^2 u_b u_c u_d u_e i - 5h_a u_b u_c u_d u_e u_f i \quad (C 32)$$

There are also the ERG relations:

$$m \langle h_a^4 i \rangle = m^2 (h_a^6 i - h_a^4 u_b^2 i) \quad (C 33)$$

$$m \langle h_a^3 u_b i \rangle = m^2 (h_a^5 u_b i + h_a^3 u_b^3 i - 2h_a^3 u_b^2 u_c i) \quad (C 34)$$

$$m \langle h_a^2 u_b u_c i \rangle = m^2 (h_a^4 u_b u_c i + 2h_a^3 u_b^2 u_c i - 3h_a^2 u_b^2 u_c u_d i) \quad (C 35)$$

$$m \langle h_a^2 u_b^2 i \rangle = m^2 (2h_a^4 u_b^2 i - 2h_a^2 u_b^2 u_c^2 i) \quad (C 36)$$

$$m \langle h_a u_b u_c u_d i \rangle = m^2 (4h_a^3 u_b u_c u_d i - 4h_a^2 u_b u_c u_d u_e i) \quad (C 37)$$

If one now estimates the above correlations using the droplet theory, these twelve relations (seven STS and three ERG), to lowest order in Tm , reduce again to two! They read:

$$5Tm \langle h_a^4 i \rangle = h_a^6 i - h_a^4 x_2 i \quad (C 38)$$

$$Tm \langle h_a^3 u_b i \rangle = h_a^5 i - h_a^4 x_2^2 i \quad (C 39)$$

for STS and ERG respectively.

Finally, let us indicate the calculation of D_3 . One has:

$$D_3 = h_a^2 a^3 u_b^2 c - a^2 u_b^2 c^2 - a^4 bc + a^4 u_b^2 - a^3 u_b^3 i_c \quad (C 40)$$

$$= 6 \frac{T^3}{m^{10}} R^{(4)}(0) + 2 \frac{T^4}{m^{12}} R^{(6)}(0) + 2s_6 \frac{T^3}{m^{12}} + 12 \frac{T^3}{m^{14}} R^{(4)}(0)^2$$

with $s_6 = S_{222}^{(3)}(0;0;0)$. Upon rescaling this yields the expression in the text.

Finally, the third cumulant of the susceptibility reads:

$$\overline{(s - \overline{s})^3} = \overline{(h_a^2 i - h_a^2 i)^3} \quad (C 41)$$

$$= \frac{1}{8} h_a (u_a - u_b)^2 (u_c - u_d)^2 (u_e - u_f)^2 i \quad (C 42)$$

$$= h_a^2 u_b^2 u_c^2 - 3u_a^2 u_b^2 u_c u_d + 3u_a^2 u_b u_c u_d u_e - u_a u_b u_c u_d u_e u_f i_c \quad (C 43)$$

$$= s_6 \frac{T^3}{m^{12}} + 6 \frac{T^3}{m^{14}} R^{(4)}(0)^2 \quad (C 44)$$

It is of order Tm as here no cancellation occurs. It directly gives a physical interpretation to the sixth cumulant TBL function (since we have already related $R^{(4)}(0)$ to the variance of s).

APPENDIX D: DETAILS ON DROPLET CALCULATIONS

1. some thermodynamic quantities

Let us compute some thermodynamic quantities predicted by the two well droplets. We use the rescaled variables $u = x/m$. Denoting $y = x_1 - x_2$, one has:

$$h(x - h_x i)^m i = (p(1 - p)^m + (1 - p)^m (1 - p)p^m) y^m \quad (D 1)$$

for any power m . One can define the general correlations:

$$D_{m_1 m_2 \dots m_q} = \overline{Y^q} \quad (D 2)$$

with $m_1 = m_2 = \dots = m_q = 2$ and $\sum_{i=1}^p m_i$ is even. Defining:

$$D(y) = \int_0^Z dx_1 D(x_1; x_1 + y) \quad (D3)$$

One then obtains:

$$D_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_q} = C_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_q} T \int_0^Z y^{m_1 + \dots + m_q} D(y) \quad (D4)$$

$$C_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_q} = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^Z \frac{dz}{z} \frac{y^q}{z} \frac{(z + (-z)^{m_i})}{(1+z)^{m_i+1}} \quad (D5)$$

The symmetry $z \rightarrow 1/z$ can be used. One finds for example for m even:

$$C_m = \frac{1}{m} \quad (D6)$$

$$C_{m, m} = \frac{1}{2m + 4m^2} + \frac{4^{-m} P_{-}[1+m]}{2 \left[\frac{3}{2} + m \right]} \quad (D7)$$

$$C_{m, m, m} = \frac{2}{6m + 27m^2 + 27m^3} + \frac{3 \left[\frac{2}{3} + m \right] \left[1 + 2m \right]}{\left[\frac{3}{2} + 3m \right]} \quad (D8)$$

There are three such quantities for the sixth cumulants:

$$D_6 = \overline{h(x - hx) i^6} = T \int_0^Z \frac{1}{6} y^6 D(y) \quad (D9)$$

$$D_{33} = \overline{h(x - hx) i^3 i^3} = T \int_0^Z \frac{1}{60} y^6 D(y) \quad (D10)$$

$$D_{222} = \overline{h(x - hx) i^2 i^2 i^2} = T \int_0^Z \frac{1}{60} y^6 D(y) \quad (D11)$$

2. Check that the solution of toy model satisfies the ERG-STSE equations

We will need:

$$g^0(x) = \int_0^Z \frac{d}{2} e^{-i \times \frac{i}{A i(i)}} \quad (D12)$$

$$xg(x) = \int_0^Z \frac{d}{2} e^{-i \times \frac{A i^0(i)}{A i(i)^2}} \quad (D13)$$

$$x^2 g(x) = \int_0^Z \frac{d}{2} e^{-i \times \left(\frac{i}{A i(i)} + 2 \frac{A i^0(i)^2}{A i(i)^3} \right)} \quad (D14)$$

$$g(x) + xg^0(x) = \int_0^Z \frac{d}{2} e^{-i \times \frac{i A i^0(i)}{A i(i)^2}} \quad (D15)$$

$$g(x) + x^3 g(x) = \int_0^Z \frac{d}{2} e^{-i \times \left(5 \frac{i A i^0(i)}{A i(i)^2} - \frac{A i^0(i)^3}{A i(i)^4} \right)} \quad (D16)$$

obtained taking successive derivatives. The STS equation reads, plugging in (166):

$$P^0(x_1) = g^0(x_1)g(-x_1) + g^0(-x_1)g(x_1) = 2 \int_0^Z dy y d(y) [g(-x)g(x_1 + y) + g(x_1)g(-x_1 + y)] \quad (D17)$$

It can be satisfied if:

$$2 \int_0^{Z+1} dy d(y) g(x_1 + y) = g^0(x_1) + h(x_1^2) g(x_1) \quad (D 18)$$

One has:

$$2 \int_0^{Z+1} dy d(y) g(x_1 + y) = \int_0^{Z+1} \frac{d_1}{2} \frac{A i^0(i_1)}{A i(i_1)} \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} \frac{1}{A i(i_2)} \int_0^{Z+1} dy e^{i_1 y} e^{-i_2(x_1+y)} \quad (D 19)$$

$$= \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} \frac{1}{A i(i_2)} e^{-i_2 x_1} \int_{i_1}^{Z+1+i_1} \frac{dz_1}{2i} \frac{A i^0(z_1)}{A i(z_1)} \frac{1}{(z_1 - i_2)^2} \quad (D 20)$$

$$= \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} e^{-i_2 x_1} \frac{1}{A i(i_2)} \left(\frac{A i^0}{A i} \right)^0(i_2) \quad (D 21)$$

$$= \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} e^{-i_2 x_1} \left(\frac{i_2}{A i(i_2)} - \frac{A i^0(i_2)^2}{A i(i_2)^3} \right) \quad (D 22)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} g^0(x_1) + \frac{1}{2} x_1^2 g(x_1) \quad (D 23)$$

It works, with $h(x_1^2) = x_1^2$. Similarly the FRG equation reads:

$$(P(x_1) + x_1 P^0(x_1)) = 2 \int_0^{Z+1} dy d(y) [(2x_1 y + y^2) g(-x_1) g(x_1 + y) + (-2x_1 y + y^2) g(x_1) g(-x_1 + y)] \quad (D 24)$$

$$= 2x_1 P^0(x_1) + 2 \int_0^{Z+1} dy d(y) y^2 [g(-x_1) g(x_1 + y) + g(x_1) g(-x_1 + y)] \quad (D 25)$$

if we use the STS equation. Thus we need to check that:

$$P(x_1) - (2x_1) P^0(x_1) = 2 \int_0^{Z+1} dy d(y) y^2 [g(-x_1) g(x_1 + y) + g(x_1) g(-x_1 + y)] \quad (D 26)$$

Now we have again:

$$2 \int_0^{Z+1} dy d(y) g(x_1 + y) = \int_0^{Z+1} \frac{d_1}{2} \frac{A i^0(i_1)}{A i(i_1)} \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} \frac{1}{A i(i_2)} \int_0^{Z+1} dy y^2 e^{i_1 y} e^{-i_2(x_1+y)} \quad (D 27)$$

$$= \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} \frac{1}{A i(i_2)} e^{-i_2 x_1} \int_{i_1}^{Z+1+i_1} \frac{dz_1}{2i} \frac{A i^0(z_1)}{A i(z_1)} \frac{2}{(z_1 - i_2)^3} \quad (D 28)$$

$$= \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} e^{-i_2 x_1} \frac{1}{A i(i_2)} \left(\frac{A i^0}{A i} \right)^0(i_2) \quad (D 29)$$

$$= \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d_2}{2} e^{-i_2 x_1} \left(\frac{1}{A i(i_2)} - 2 \frac{i_2 A i^0(i_2)}{A i(i_2)^2} + 2 \frac{A i^0(i_2)^3}{A i(i_2)^4} \right) \quad (D 30)$$

$$= g(x_1) - \frac{1}{3} (g(x_1) + x_1 g^0(x_1)) - \frac{1}{3} (g(x_1) + x_1^3 g(x_1)) = \frac{1}{3} g(x_1) - \frac{1}{3} x_1 g^0(x_1) - \frac{1}{3} x_1^3 g(x_1) \quad (D 31)$$

which we have also checked numerically. One has thus:

$$2 \int_0^{Z+1} dy d(y) y^2 [g(x_1) g(-x_1 - y) + g(-x_1) g(x_1 - y)] = \frac{4}{3} g(x_1) g(-x_1) - \frac{2}{3} x_1 g^0(x_1) g(-x_1) + \frac{2}{3} x_1 g^0(-x_1) g(x_1) \\ = P(x_1) - (2x_1) P^0(x_1) \quad (D 32)$$

and the ERG equation is also satisfied.

Let us close by noting that under the rescaling (162) the function defined in (D 3) transforms as:

$$D(y) = \hat{D}^3(-y) \quad (D 33)$$

with:

$$\hat{D}(y) = 2d(y) \int_1^{Z+1} dx_1 g(-x_1) g(x_1 + y) = 2d(y) \int_1^{Z+1} \frac{d}{2} \frac{e^{-i y}}{A i(i)^2} \quad (D 34)$$

One can check that the cumulants computed in⁴¹ are recovered with the choice $\beta = 2^{-2/3}$.

APPENDIX E: SYMMETRIZED TAYLOR EXPANSION OF CUMULANTS

The matching calculations in the main text extensively involve Taylor expansions of cumulants. This procedure exhibits some subtleties since the cumulants themselves are defined only up to the gauge transformation:

$$S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots; u_k) \rightarrow S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots; u_k) + \text{sym}_k(f(u_1; \dots; u_k)) \quad (\text{E } 1)$$

with arbitrary f . Thus in general since the specific function $S^{(k)}$ is not defined without specifying a gauge the results of the Taylor expansion may themselves not be gauge invariant.

In particular when two arguments u_1 and u_2 of $S^{(k)}(u_1; \dots; u_k)$ are brought close together it is desirable to avoid odd terms in $u_1 - u_2$. One may for instance expand around the midpoint $(u_1 + u_2)/2$, or perform the half sum of two expansions around each point respectively using the permutation symmetry of $S^{(k)}$. For instance:

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) &= S^{(3)}\left(\frac{u_1 + u_2}{2}; \frac{u_1 + u_2}{2}; u_3\right) + \frac{1}{4}(u_1 - u_2)^2 S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_1; u_3) - S_{110}^{(3)}(u_1; u_1; u_3) + O((u_1 - u_2)^3) \\ S^{(3)}(u_1; u_2; u_3) &= \frac{1}{2} S^{(3)}(u_1; u_1; u_3) + S^{(3)}(u_2; u_2; u_3) - \frac{1}{2}(u_1 - u_2)^2 S_{110}^{(3)}(u_1; u_1; u_3) + O((u_1 - u_2)^3) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E } 2)$$

Note that the zero-th order term in the first case is not gauge-invariant, while it is in the second. We will thus use the second method to perform short distance expansions. Note that taking the derivative $\partial_1 \partial_2 \partial_3$ on both sides recovers a gauge invariant quantities identical in both cases.

Let us illustrate the procedure to higher orders. Let us consider for simplicity an analytic and symmetric function $f(x; y) = f(y; x)$. The result is:

$$f[u_{13}; u_{23}] = f[u_{13}; u_{13}] + \frac{1}{2} u_{12}^2 f_{11}[u_{13}; u_{13}] + \frac{1}{4!} u_{12}^4 (2f_{13}[u_{13}; u_{13}] + 3f_{22}[u_{13}; u_{13}]) + O(u_{12}^6) \quad (\text{E } 3)$$

This is performed iteratively. When the lowest order term is even one extracts it from the sum and keeps iterating the rest. When it is odd, one first symmetrizes the full expression in $1; 2$ then writes $u_{23} = u_{13} - u_{12}$ and finally Taylor expand again in u_{12} . What is actually done is to use the freedom:

$$f[u_{13}; u_{23}] \rightarrow f[u_{13}; u_{23}] + g[u_{13}; u_{23}] \quad (\text{E } 4)$$

where g is antisymmetric in its two arguments. Then g is determined order by order so that all odd terms are made to vanish. One can formalize this procedure as follows. If one assumes the result to be:

$$f[x; x - y] + g[x; x - y] = \sum_n^X y^{2n} c_{2n}(x) \quad (\text{E } 5)$$

then one has

$$\begin{aligned} f(x; y) = f(y; x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_n^X (x - y)^{2n} (c_{2n}(x) + c_{2n}(y)) \\ g(x; y) = -g(y; x) &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_n^X (x - y)^{2n} (c_{2n}(x) - c_{2n}(y)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{E } 6)$$

One can show that any symmetric and globally even function can indeed be decomposed as (E 6).

Using the gauge freedom, one can also make to vanish any particular Taylor coefficient. Note the following property of the Taylor expansion upon a gauge transformation. Consider:

$$S^{(3)}(u_{123}) \rightarrow S^{(3)}(u_{123}) + h(u_{23}) \quad (\text{E } 7)$$

Consider the expansion:

$$S^{(3)}(u_{123}) = \sum_n^X u_{12}^n c_n(u_{13}) \quad (\text{E } 8)$$

writing $h(u_{23}) = h(u_{13} - u_{12})$ and expanding in u_{12} one sees that the gauge transformation becomes:

$$c_n(u_{13}) \rightarrow c_n(u_{13}) + (-1)^n \frac{1}{n!} h^{(n)}(u_{13}) \quad (\text{E } 9)$$

Note that each term in that expansion is not gauge invariant, it is only when the series is resummed to all orders that gauge invariance becomes manifest. This helps to clarify the proper definition of the function $\mathcal{U}(u)$ in the PBL21. First let us note that the feedback from third to second cumulant involves the combination $2\mathcal{U}_2(u) + \mathcal{U}_1^0(u)$ which is indeed invariant upon the above gauge transformation, as physically expected. Although one could have in general a non vanishing $\mathcal{U}_1(u)$ it can be set to zero by the above gauge transformation. The small argument expansion and the definition of $\mathcal{U}(u)$ given in the text thus corresponds to a choice of gauge, and thus with this definition $\mathcal{U}(u)$ is gauge invariant (up to a constant).

Let us illustrate the symmetrized expansion in the calculation of the feeding terms for the third cumulant functions $\mathcal{U}(u)$ and $\mathcal{U}_1(u)$. Consider the R^3 feeding term of the outer S equation. It can be rewritten, up to gauge:

$$-\frac{1}{2}R^0(u_{12})(R^0(u_{13}) - R^0(u_{23}))^2 + \frac{1}{2}R^0(u_{12})^2(R^0(u_{13}) + R^0(u_{23})) + \frac{1}{6}(R^0(u_{13}) + R^0(u_{23}))^3 \quad (\text{E } 10)$$

The first term gives $\frac{1}{2}R^0(0^+)R^0(u_{13})^2j_{12}^3 + O(u_{12}^4)$, the second gives:

$$-\frac{1}{2}R^0(0^+)^2u_{12}^2(2R^0(u_{13}) - R^0(u_{13})u_{12}) + R^0(0^+)R^0(0^+)R^0(u_{13})j_{12}^3 + O(u_{12}^4) \quad (\text{E } 11)$$

The cubic analytic odd term is eliminated when performing the symmetrized expansion explained in the Appendix, which we also use to perform the expansion of the last term. The latter is analytic and gives $u_{12}^2R^0(u_{13})R^0(u_{13})^2 + O(u_{12}^4)$. Putting everything together we find

$$[R^0(0^+)^2 - R^0(u_{13})^2]R^0(u_{13})u_{12}^2 + \frac{1}{2}R^0(0^+)R^0(u_{13})^2 + R^0(0^+)R^0(0^+)R^0(u_{13})j_{12}^3 + O(u_{12}^4) \quad (\text{E } 12)$$

yielding the feeding terms given in the text.

APPENDIX F: FOURTH CUMULANT MATCHING

In this Appendix we give details about the matching procedure explained in the text. We first derive general relations between asymptotic behaviors of the various functions which parameterize successive partial boundary layers, based on consistency requirements that the TBL scaling holds. Then we derive exact fixed point equations for these functions, for which, in some cases formal solutions can be given. The general matching relations can then in turn be checked.

1. general analysis of the matching

The possible forms of the full BL, PBL211, PBL31, PBL22 and outer solution, and their functions, are defined in (193). Let us first give some useful properties of these functions. We can assume permutation symmetry in the α variables inside each TBL function, e.g. that $s^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34})$ is symmetric in α_{123} independently of the variable u_{34} since it is true up to corrections that are higher order in T_1 . The other symmetries are the following: $s^{(31)}$ is odd, $s^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) = s^{(22)}(\alpha_{34}; \alpha_{12}; u_{13}) = s^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; -u_{13})$, $s^{(211)}$ and $s^{(211)}$ are symmetric in the two last arguments (exchange of 3 and 4). Note a quartic polynomial can be incorporated in $s^{(31)}$ and thus one need to consider only degree two and three polynomial. Degree one polynomial produce gauge terms. Other possible cubic combinations vanish, $\text{sym}_{123}(\alpha_{12}\alpha_{23}\alpha_{21}) = 0$, $\text{sym}_{123}(\alpha_{12}^3) = 0$. All quadratic combinations are equivalent up to gauge terms. Finally, note that only $s_{11}^{(211)}$ and $s^{(31)0}$ are gauge invariant.

One might alternatively choose to express the form in the PBL31 in terms of functions of u_{14} rather than u_{34} , i.e.

$$S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) = T_1^3 \text{sym}_{123}(\alpha_{12}\alpha_{23})^{\wedge(31)}(u_{14}) + T_1^4 s^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{14}) ; \quad \alpha_{123}; u_{34} = O(1) \quad (\text{PBL31}): \quad (\text{F } 1)$$

Clearly since u_3 and u_1 are completely equivalent in the PBL31, $\wedge^{(31)} = s^{(31)}$; $s^{(31)} = s^{(31)}$. However, the expression in terms of u_{14} is more awkward when taking the necessary limit of large $\alpha_{13}; \alpha_{23}$, since this form singles out u_1 over u_2 , artificially breaking the symmetry $u_1 \leftrightarrow u_2$, which is preserved by this limit.

First consider matching of the outer solution with the PBL211. One can expand the outer solution at small u_{12} . We can always choose this expansion to be even in u_{12} (see Appendix E) and the zero-th order term vanishes being pure gauge. Hence we expect:

$$S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) \sim u_{12}^2 \sim^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) + u_{12}^4 j_{12}^3 \sim^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) + O(u_{12}^4) \\ u_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}; u_{34} = O(1): \quad (\text{F } 2)$$

As already discussed for the third cumulant, for the TBL scaling to hold, the first non-analyticity must arise at order j_{12}^3 . This should be compared to the large α_{12} limit of PBL211. This implies:

$$s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) \sim \alpha_{12}^{-1} j_{12}^3 s^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}); \quad (F 3)$$

which defines $\tilde{s}^{(211)}$. To match, one has then $\tilde{s}^{(211)} = s^{(211)}$; $\tilde{h}^{(211)} = h^{(211)}$.

Next consider matching PBL211 to PBL31. From PBL211, we must take the limit of small u_{13} :

$$s^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) = s^{(211)}(0; u_{34}) + u_{13} \tilde{s}^{(31)}(u_{34}) + u_{13}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{34}) + u_{13}^2 \text{sgn}(u_{13}) \tilde{h}^{(31)}(u_{34}) + O(u_{13}^3); \quad (F 4)$$

$$s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) = s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; 0; u_{34}) + u_{13} \tilde{s}^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) + j_{13} j^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) + O(u_{13}^2); \quad (F 5)$$

We have omitted a naively possible j_{13} term in the expansion of $s^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})$ which again is forbidden by matching and TBL scaling. As discussed in Section V such a term would give rise to a supercusp.

It is useful to note at this stage that $s^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})$ has some gauge redundancy. In particular, one may transform $s^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) \rightarrow s^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) + f(u_{13}) + f(u_{14})$ changing $S^{(4)}$ by gauge terms. The implications for the expansion coefficients in (F 4) are straightforward to determine. In particular, the transformation by $f(u_{13})$ leads to independent constant shifts in $\tilde{s}^{(31)}$, $g^{(31)}$, $\tilde{h}^{(31)}$ and all higher functions. The transformation by $f(u_{14})$ leads to

$$s^{(211)}(0; u_{34}) \rightarrow s^{(211)}(0; u_{34}) + f(u_{34}); \quad (F 6)$$

$$\tilde{s}^{(31)}(u_{34}) \rightarrow \tilde{s}^{(31)}(u_{34}) + f'(u_{34}); \quad (F 7)$$

$$g^{(31)}(u_{34}) \rightarrow g^{(31)}(u_{34}) + \frac{1}{2} f''(u_{34}); \quad (F 8)$$

Non-analytic coefficients such as $\tilde{h}^{(31)}(u_{34})$ are invariant under the latter transformation.

We should compare to the large α_{13} limit of PBL31. This requires some care due to the cubic invariant. It is useful to rewrite

$$\text{sym}_{123}(\alpha_{12} \alpha_{23}^2) = \frac{1}{6}(\alpha_{13}^3 + \alpha_{23}^3) + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12}^3 - \alpha_{13} \alpha_{12}^2; \quad (F 9)$$

When multiplied by $j^{(31)}(u_{34})$, the first two terms are gauge, and the second term is both antisymmetric (hence higher order in T) and does not grow at large α_{13} , hence is subdominant to the dominant α_{13} term. Hence

$$T_1^3 \text{sym}_{123}(\alpha_{12} \alpha_{23}^2) j^{(31)}(u_{34}) = T_1^2 \alpha_{12}^2 u_{13} j^{(31)}(u_{34}) + O(T_1^4) \quad (F 10)$$

in this limit. Next consider the large α_{13} behaviour of $s^{(31)}$:

$$s^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34}) = \alpha_{13}^2 g^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) + \alpha_{13}^2 \text{sgn}(\alpha_{13}) \tilde{h}^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) + \alpha_{13} j^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) + j_{13} j^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) + O(1);$$

It cannot grow faster because it must match PBL 211 which is no larger than T^2 . Comparing the two limits, we find:

$$j^{(31)}(u) = \tilde{s}^{(31)}(u) + \frac{(211)}{01}(0; u); \quad (F 11)$$

$$g^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) = \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{34}) = \alpha_{12}^2 (g^{(31)}(u_{34}) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(211)}{02}(0; u_{34})); \quad (F 12)$$

$$h^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) = \alpha_{12}^2 \tilde{h}^{(31)}(u_{34}); \quad (F 13)$$

$$\tilde{s}^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) = \alpha_{12}^2 \tilde{s}^{(31)}(u_{34}); \quad (F 14)$$

$$j^{(31)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) = \alpha_{12}^2 j^{(31)}(u_{34}); \quad (F 15)$$

To obtain the dependence on $s^{(211)}$ in the first two lines above, one must take some care with the $O(u_{13}^0)$ term in (F 4):

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{12}^2 s^{(211)}(0; u_{34}) &= \alpha_{12}^2 s^{(211)}(0; u_{14} - u_{13}) \\ &= \alpha_{12}^2 s^{(211)}(0; u_{14}) - u_{13} \alpha_{12}^2 \frac{(211)}{01}(0; u_{14}) + \frac{1}{2} u_{13}^2 \alpha_{12}^2 \frac{(211)}{02}(0; u_{14}) + \end{aligned} \quad (F 16)$$

The first term above is gauge and can be dropped. After dropping this, we can express the result back in terms of u_{13} and u_{34} by writing $u_{14} = u_{34} + u_{13}$ and expanding in u_{13} . Because a gauge term has been discarded at the intermediate stage, one does not arrive back at the starting expression! Indeed,

$$\alpha_{12}^2 s^{(211)}(0; u_{34}) = -u_{13} \alpha_{12}^2 \frac{(211)}{01}(0; u_{34}) - \frac{1}{2} u_{13}^2 \alpha_{12}^2 \frac{(211)}{02}(0; u_{34}) + \quad (F 17)$$

This leads directly to (F11,F12). Such symmetrization procedure is also discussed in Appendix E. It is useful for calculations to note the alternative expansion:

$$^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{14}) = ^{(211)}(0;u_{14}) - u_{13} ^{(31)}(u_{14}) + u_{13}^2 (g^{(31)}(u_{14}) + ^{(31)0}(u_{14})) + u_{13}^2 \text{sgn}(u_{13}) f^{(31)}(u_{14}) + O(u_{13}^3) \quad (\text{F18})$$

which defines the partial derivatives. Finally note that $^{(31)}$ (up to a constant) and $g^{(31)}$ are gauge invariant.

Next we match PBL211 to PBL22. This requires the (different from above) small u_{34} limit of the PBL211:

$$^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{14}) = j_{34} \tilde{j}^{(22)}(u_{13}) + u_{34}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}) + O(j_{34}^3); \quad (\text{F19})$$

$$s^{(211)}(\alpha_{12};u_{13};u_{14}) = j_{34} \tilde{j}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12};u_{13}) + O(j_{34}^2); \quad (\text{F20})$$

In the large α_{34} limit of PBL22, one has generally

$$s^{(22)}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34};u_{13}) = \alpha_{34}^2 g^{(22)}(\alpha_{12};u_{13}) + j_{34} \tilde{j}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12};u_{13}); \quad (\text{F21})$$

up to gauge terms independent of α_{34} , and we used the fact that $s^{(22)}$ is even in α_{34} . Matching gives then $\tilde{j}^{(22)} = \tilde{j}^{(22)}$, and

$$g^{(22)}(\alpha_{12};u_{13}) = \alpha_{12}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}); \quad (\text{F22})$$

$$\tilde{j}^{(22)} = 0; \quad (\text{F23})$$

Next we match PBL31 to BL4. The small u_{34} expansion of PBL31 can be written as:

$$^{(31)}(u_{34}) = u_{34} ^{(31)0}(0) + \frac{1}{2} u_{34}^2 \text{sgn}(u_{34}) ^{(31)00}(0^+) + \dots \quad (\text{F24})$$

$$s^{(31)}(\alpha_{123};u_{34}) = \tilde{j}^{(4)}(\alpha_{123})u_{34} + \tilde{j}^{(4)}(\alpha_{123})j_{34} + O(u_{34}^2) \quad (\text{F25})$$

where $\tilde{j}^{(4)}$ is odd and $\tilde{j}^{(4)}$ is even. We have used that $\tilde{j}^{(4)}$ is odd. On the other hand the large argument limit of PB4, taking point 4 away from 1;2;3 (i.e. large α_{34}), reads:

$$s^{(4)}(u_{1234}) = (\alpha_{34})^2 g^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) + (\alpha_{34})^2 \text{sgn}(u_{34}) h^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) + \alpha_{34} f^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) + j_{34} \tilde{j}^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) + \text{cst} \quad (\text{F26})$$

where the matching implies:

$$\tilde{j}^{(4)} = \tilde{j}^{(4)}; \quad f^{(4)} = \tilde{j}^{(4)} \quad (\text{F27})$$

$$h^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12}^2 ^{(31)00}(0^+) \quad (\text{F28})$$

$$g^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) = 0 \quad (\text{F29})$$

and $g^{(4)}(\alpha_{123}) = 0$ because $^{(31)}$ is odd. Note that by adding gauge terms the quadratic functions $h^{(4)}$ and $f^{(4)}$ can be made symmetric in 123. Finally, the matching of the Larkin term in BL4 and the small argument behaviour of the PBL31 yields:

$$f_4 = 2 ^{(31)0}(0) \quad (\text{F30})$$

(as we find below, these derivatives exist and are non-ambiguous).

Finally, we match PBL22 to BL4. The small u_{13} expansion of PBL22 can be written as:

$$s^{(22)}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34};u_{13}) = \alpha_{12}^2 \alpha_{34}^2 \frac{1}{4} s_{220}^{(22)}(0;0;0) + u_{13} \tilde{j}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34}) + j_{13} \tilde{j}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34}) \quad (\text{F31})$$

On the other hand we must consider the limit of PB4 when taking both points 34 far from 12, i.e. the large u_{13} limit with α_{12} and α_{34} fixed:

$$s^{(4)}(u_{1234}) = \alpha_{13} \tilde{j}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34}) + j_{13} \tilde{j}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34}) + \text{cst} \quad (\text{F32})$$

One sees however that one must have $\tilde{j} = 0$ because $\tilde{j}(u;v) = \tilde{j}(u;v)$, $\tilde{j}(u;-v) = \tilde{j}(u;v)$ thus $\tilde{j}(u;-v) = \tilde{j}(u;v)$, but \tilde{j} must be odd. Thus the matching implies $\tilde{j} = 0$ and

$$\tilde{j}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34}) = \tilde{j}(\alpha_{12};\alpha_{34}) \quad (\text{F33})$$

Finally we can combine the various matching stages to obtain expressions for the Larkin term f_4 . This is an important test since one may approach the full BL from either the PBL22 or PBL31. These two approaches give

$$f_4 = 2 \quad {}^{(31)0}(0); \quad (F 34)$$

$$f_4 = s_{220}^{(22)}(0;0;0) = 4g^{(22)}(0); \quad (F 35)$$

Consider first the approach from PBL211. We require $\sim^{(31)}$ which is obtained using ${}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{14}) = {}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{34} + u_{13})$:

$$\sim^{(31)}(u_{34}) = \quad {}_{01}^{(211)}(0;u_{34}) \quad {}_{10}^{(211)}(0;u_{34}); \quad (F 36)$$

Thus using (F 11)

$${}^{(31)}(u_{34}) = \quad {}_{10}^{(211)}(0;u_{34}); \quad (F 37)$$

We also require $g^{(22)}(u_{13})$. From the PBL211, taking small u_{34} , one writes

$${}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13} + u_{34}) = {}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13}) + \quad {}_{01}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13})u_{34} + \frac{1}{2} \quad {}_{02}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13})u_{34}^2 + \quad (F 38)$$

The first term is gauge and can be dropped. The second is usefully rewritten by symmetrizing in 34 (allowed in PBL211).

$$\begin{aligned} {}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{14}) &= \frac{1}{2} (\quad {}_{01}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13}) \quad {}_{01}^{(211)}(u_{14};u_{14})) u_{34} + \frac{1}{2} \quad {}_{02}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13})u_{34}^2 + \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \quad {}_{11}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13})u_{34}^2 + \end{aligned} \quad (F 39)$$

We therefore read o

$$g^{(22)}(u_{13}) = \quad \frac{1}{2} \quad {}_{11}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13}); \quad (F 40)$$

Note that first derivatives at the point $(u;u)$ such as ${}_{10}^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{13})$ is changed upon adding a gauge term f , and can thus be set to zero upon choice of gauge.

Finally (F 37) and (F 40) can be applied to equations (F 34) and (F 35) respectively to obtain the Larkin term. Both happily agree, and give

$$f_4 = \quad 2 \quad {}_{11}^{(211)}(0;0); \quad (F 41)$$

the derivative being unambiguous thanks to the TBLA. Note that ${}^{(211)}$ has unambiguous first derivatives at the points $(u;0)$ and $(u;u)$. It has also unambiguous second crossed derivatives 11 at these points $(u;u)$. There are ambiguities however in the second derivatives 20 at point $(u;0)$ (because of the \tilde{h} term) and one should be careful there.

Let us note the useful properties:

$$s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{112};u_{13})', \quad 2\alpha_{12}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{13}) \quad (F 42)$$

$$s_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12};0;u_{13})', \quad 2\alpha_{12}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}) \quad (F 43)$$

$$\quad {}_{11}^{(211)}(0;u) + \frac{1}{2} \quad {}_{11}^{(211)}(u;u) \quad {}_{20}^{(211)}(0;u) = \quad \tilde{c}^{(31)0}(u) + 2g^{(31)}(u) + g^{(22)}(u) \quad (F 44)$$

which is consistent with the equation from the PBL21 above since:

$$\sim^{(31)0}(u) + 2g^{(31)}(u) = \quad {}^{(31)0}(u) + 2g^{(31)}(u) \quad (F 45)$$

$$g^{(22)}(u) = g^{(22)}(u) \quad (F 46)$$

2. Outer equation

Having made precise the various limiting behaviors of the PBL functions we now derive the FRG equations that they obey.

We start by writing the fourth cumulant equation (A 15) in the outer region where all $u_{ij} \rightarrow 0$ (1). Neglecting feedback from fifth cumulant it reads:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) = 0 = & (d - 4 + u_{u_i}) S^{(4)}(u_{1234}) + \text{sym} [6R^{\text{00}}(u_{12})(-2^4)^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) S_{1100}^{(4)}(u_{1234})] \\ & + 6(-2^3)(u_{12}) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{134}) + S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{123}) S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{124}) \\ & + 12(-2^3)(u_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + S_{110}^{(3)}(u_{123}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) (-2R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{24})) + \frac{1}{2} S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{123}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14})^2 \\ & + 6^0 R^{\text{00}}(u_{12})^2 R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) (2R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{24})) - 2R^{\text{00}}(u_{31}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{23}) + \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{41}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{23}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F } 47)$$

We are now going to study the small u_{12} limit of this equation. Before doing so, it is instructive to give the detailed result for the various small argument expansions defined in the previous Section of the R^4 feeding term. These will feed in the various RG equations for their corresponding functions. We denote these feeding terms by the subscript R^4 but one should not forget that they are only feeding terms, not the true function to this order. Symmetrized Taylor expansion to order u_{12}^2 yields:

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 S_{R^4}^{(4)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) &= \frac{(211)}{R^4} (u_{13}; u_{14}) = \text{sym}_{34} [3R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(0^+)^2 - 2R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 \\ & R^{\text{00}}(u_{14})^2 R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 - 4R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 + 2R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 - R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})^2 R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 \\ & R^{\text{00}}(u_{13})^2 R^{(3)}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) - R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) \\ & + 2R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) - \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})^2 R^{(3)}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{14})] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F } 48)$$

We now expand this in u_{13} at fixed u_{34} . One finds

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(211)}{R^4} (0^+; u_{34}) &= \frac{5}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})^2 R^{(3)}(u_{34})^2 \\ \sim_{R^4}^{(31)}(u_{34}) &= 2R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{34})^3 + 5R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})^2 R^{(3)}(u_{34}) R^{(4)}(u_{34}) \\ \frac{(31)}{R^4}(u_{34}) &= 3R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{34})^3 \\ \mathfrak{G}_{R^4}^{(31)}(u_{34}) &= 2R^{(3)}(0^+)^2 R^{(3)}(u_{34})^2 - 6R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(0^+)^2 R^{(4)}(0^+) - 5R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{34})^2 R^{(4)}(u_{34}) \\ & \quad - \frac{5}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})^2 R^{(4)}(u_{34})^2 + R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})^2 R^{(3)}(u_{34}) R^{(5)}(u_{34})] \\ \mathfrak{G}_{R^4}^{(31)}(u_{12}; u_{34}) &= u_{12}^2 - 2R^{(3)}(0^+)^2 R^{(3)}(u_{34})^2 + \frac{5}{2} R^{(3)}(u_{34})^4 \\ & \quad - 6R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(0^+)^2 R^{(4)}(0) + \frac{15}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{34})^2 R^{(4)}(u_{34}) \\ \mathfrak{H}_{R^4}^{(31)}(u_{34}) &= \frac{3}{2} R^{(3)}(0^+)^3 R^{(3)}(u_{34}) - \frac{3}{2} R^{(3)}(0^+) R^{(3)}(u_{34})^3 \end{aligned}$$

We next expand instead the (211) feeding term in u_{34} at fixed u_{13} , discarding the zeroth order gauge piece (and symmetrizing this by averaging with the same expansion at fixed u_{14}). This confirms that $\sim^{(22)}(u_{13}) = 0$ and gives

$$\mathfrak{G}_{R^4}^{(22)}(u_{13}) = 3R^{(3)}(0^+)^2 R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 + \frac{3}{2} R^{(3)}(u_{13})^4 + 6R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 R^{(4)}(u_{13}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{13})^2 R^{(4)}(u_{13})^2:$$

The small argument behaviours are:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{(211)}{R^4} (0^+; u_{34}) &= \frac{5}{2} R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^4 u^2 - \frac{15}{2} R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{00}}(0^+) u^2 + O(u^4) \\ \sim_{R^4}^{(31)}(u) &= 2R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^4 u + 12R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{00}}(0^+) u^2 \text{sgn}(u) + O(u^3) \\ \frac{(31)}{R^4}(u) &= 3R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^4 u - \frac{21}{2} R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{00}}(0^+) u^2 \text{sgn}(u) + O(u^3) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{R^4}^{(31)}(u) &= 2R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^4 - 15R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{ooo}}(0^+) j_1 j_2 + O(u^2) \\
g_{R^4}^{(31)}(u) &= \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^4 + \frac{15}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{ooo}}(0^+) j_1 j_2 + O(u^2) \\
h_{R^4}^{(31)}(u) &= 3R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{ooo}}(0^+) u + O(u^2 \text{sgn}(u)) \\
g_{R^4}^{(22)}(u) &= \frac{3}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^4 + 6R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{ooo}}(0^+) j_1 j_2 + O(u^2)
\end{aligned}$$

Similarly, the Taylor expansion to order j_{12}^2 yields the feeding R^4 term for $\sim^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})$. It reads:

$$\begin{aligned}
{R^4}^{(211)}(u{13}; u_{14}) &= 2\text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13})^2 R^{(3)}(0^+) + \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34})^2 R^{(3)}(0^+) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 \\
&+ R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(0^+) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) - \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(0^+) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) + \frac{3}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(0^+) R^{(4)}(0^+) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14})
\end{aligned}$$

with the following small argument behaviour:

$$\begin{aligned}
{R^4}^{(211)}(u{13}; u_{14}) &= _{R^4}^{(211)}(0; u_{14}) + u_{13} \left(\frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^3 R^{\text{ooo}}(u_{14}) - \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(0^+) R^{\text{ooo}}(u_{14})^3 \right) \\
&+ 2j_{13} j_2 R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^2 (R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14})^2 + 3R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{\text{ooo}}(0^+))
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{F } 49)$$

We can now perform Taylor expansion to $O(u_{12}^2)$ of the complete outer equation (F 47). One finds:

$$0 = {}^4u_{12}^2 [(d^4 + 2 + 13\mathcal{E}_{u_{13}} + u_{14}\mathcal{E}_{u_{14}}) {}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})] \quad (\text{F } 50)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ 6R^{\text{oo}}[0^+] \sim^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) + 2\text{sym}_{34} ({}^{(31)0}(u_{14}) + 2g^{(31)}(u_{14})) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) + {}^{(31)}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) - g^{(22)}(u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) \\
&+ 2R^{(3)}(u_{14}) {}_{01}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) + R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) {}_{02}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) - R^{(3)}(u_{13}) {}_{10}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{34}) \\
&+ R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) {}_{11}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) - \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) {}_{11}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{F } 51)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ 2 {}^2u_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34} {}^4(18 {}^{(0)}(u_{13}) {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) + 3 {}^{(0)}(u_{13}) {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) - {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) {}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) - {}^{(0)}(u_{34}) {}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13})) \\
&{}^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) S_{101}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) - \frac{1}{2} {}^{\text{oo}}(0) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) + {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) S_{102}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4)
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{F } 52)$$

$$\frac{S_{111}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4)}{4^2} - 2 {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) S_{201}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \quad (\text{F } 53)$$

$$+ 2 {}^2u_{12}^2 {}^3\text{sym}_{34} {}_{12} {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{ooo}}(0^+) + R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) ({}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) - {}^{\text{oo}}(0)) \quad (\text{F } 54)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&+ \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14})^2 {}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) + R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) {}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) - R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) {}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) \\
&+ \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34})^2 {}^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) + 2 {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) + 2 {}^{(0)}(u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) + 2 {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})
\end{aligned}$$

$$+ 4 {}^{(0)}(u_{13}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) - 2 {}^{(0)}(u_{14}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) + (u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 + (u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2$$

$$+ 2 {}^2u_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34} \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{oo}}(0^+)^2 S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) + R^{(3)}(u_{14})^2 S_{101}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) - R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) S_{102}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) S_{111}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) + R^{\text{oo}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) S_{111}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) + R^{\text{oo}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) S_{201}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
&+ {}^0u_{12}^2 {}_{R^4}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{F } 55)$$

where $_{R^4}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})$ as defined in (F 48) above and we have used extensively all the already derived relations between partial derivatives of $^{(211)}$. Note that we have performed an expansion symmetric in 1,2 as explained in the Appendix. Thus terms such as $u_{12}^2 \text{sgn} u_{12} \tilde{h}(u_{14}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{13})$ which do appear, e.g., in expanding $^{(211)}(u_{21}; u_{24}) R^{\text{oo}}(u_{23})$ are in fact of higher order j_{12}^2 .

Next, the resulting equation for $^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14})$ can be further expanded for small u_{13} (one uses ${}^{(0)}(0) = 0$, ${}^{(0)}(0) = 0$), to obtain an equation for $^{(31)}$. In principle we should be able to obtain it by taking the first derivative with respect to u_{13} at fixed u_{14} . It indeed works for the R^4 feeding term, but for the other terms it produces a non analytic piece $j_{13} j_2$ i.e. the above equation expands as (schematically):

$$0 = u_{12}^2 (u_{13} H(u_{14}) + j_{13} \tilde{H}(u_{14}) + O(u_{13}^2)) \quad (\text{F } 56)$$

Let us give each piece separately. The H equation gives:

$$0 = (d_4 + 3 + u_9^{(31)}(u) - 6R^{(0+)} \sim_{10}^{(211)}(0;u)) \quad (F 57)$$

$$+ R^{(0+)}(u) (g^{(22)}(0) - 3g^{(22)}(u) - (31)^0(0) + 3(31)^0(u)) + R^{(0+)}(u) (31)^0(u) - 2R^{(0+)}(u) h^{(31)}(u) \quad (F 58)$$

$$+ 2(15^0(0) - 9^0(u)) \quad (F 59)$$

$$+ 3^0(3^0(u)R^{(0+)}(u)^2 + 6^0(u)R^{(0+)}(u)R^{(0+)}(u) + 9^0(u)R^{(0+)}(u)^2) \quad (F 59)$$

$$3^0 - 4R^{(0+)}(u)R^{(0+)}(u)^3 \quad (F 60)$$

note that we write the term $\sim_{10}^{(211)}(0;u)$ in both equations since it has an analytic piece and a non-analytic one (subscript NA) as one sees from (F 49) above. The H equation gives:

$$0 = R^{(0+)}(u) (g^{(22)}(0^+) + 2g^{(31)}(0^+) + (31)^0(0^+)) - R^{(0+)}(u) (6g^{(31)}(u) + 5(31)^0(u)) \quad (F 61)$$

$$6R^{(0+)} \sim_{10}^{(211)}(0;u)_{NA} - 18^2(0^+) + 2^0(0^+) \quad (F 61)$$

$$6^{-1} [0^+ + 2^0(0^+)] R^{(0+)}(u) R^{(0+)}(u) \quad (F 62)$$

This should vanish identically, in the same way that a $u_{12}^2 j_{13} j$ term does not appear in the third cumulant, which would produce $(u) j_{1j}$ and the infamous supercusp!

One easily checks that to lowest order in R the various combinations in this equation do actually vanish. First the combination $0^+ + 2^0(0^+)$ vanishes. Next to lowest order, one has (from above):

$$R^{(0+)}(u) (6g^{(31)}(u) + 5(31)^0(u)) = 12R^{(0+)}(u)^3 (R^{(0+)}(u)^2 + 3R^{(0+)}(u)R^{(0+)}(u)^2) \quad (F 63)$$

$$6R^{(0+)} \sim_{10}^{(211)}(0;u)_{NA} = 12R^{(0+)}(u)^3 (R^{(0+)}(u)^2 + 3R^{(0+)}(u)R^{(0+)}(u)^2) \quad (F 64)$$

so that the non-analytic piece of these two terms in the $RS^{(4)}$ term also cancel. Finally we note that the feeding terms to order $O(R^4)$ displayed above:

$$g_{R^4}^{(22)0}(0^+) + 2g_{R^4}^{(31)0}(0^+) + \frac{(31)^0}{R^4}(0^+) = 0 \quad (F 65)$$

also exactly cancel.

When the feedback from fifth cumulant is also included, these cancellations should keep occurring order by order. We have checked on the equation for that $0^+ + 2^0(0^+)$ also vanishes to next order from the RS term in the equation for S^3 . There seems to be additional exact relations to higher orders, we find:

$$0^+ + 2^0(0^+) = 0 \quad (F 66)$$

$$24^0(0^+) + 14^0(0^+) + 4^0(0^+) = 0 \quad (F 67)$$

this seems to work in some algebraic way, term by term, reminiscent of dimensional reduction type cancellations, according to a mechanism which remains to be understood to all orders.

3. Equation for PBL 211

We now proceed as in the study of the third cumulant matching in the text, where we derived two equations obeyed by (u) (then shown to be consistent). We have derived above the equation for $^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{14})$ as a small argument limit of the outer solution. We now derive the equation for $^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{14})$ directly in the PBL211, by examining (A 15) in the regime where $\alpha_{12} = O(1)$, all other u_{ij} being of order one. We use the various PBL functions defined in 193. Grouping all terms of lowest order $O(\Gamma_1^{-2})$ we obtain:

$$0 = 2^2 \alpha_{12}^2 [d + 2^4 + (u_3 @_{u_{13}} + u_{14} @_{u_{14}})]^{(211)}(u_{13};u_{14}) + 3^3 s_{200}^{(211)}(\alpha_{12};u_{13};u_{14}) \quad (F 68)$$

$$+ 2^2 \alpha_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34}^{(31)0}(u_{14}) R^{(0+)}(u_{13}) + (31)^0(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) \quad (F 69)$$

$$+ 2R^{(3)}(u_{14}) \frac{(211)}{01}(u_{13};u_{14}) + R^{(0+)}(u_{14}) \frac{(211)}{02}(u_{13};u_{14}) - R^{(3)}(u_{13}) \frac{(211)}{10}(u_{13};u_{14})$$

$$+ R^{(0+)}(u_{13}) \frac{(211)}{11}(u_{13};u_{14}) - \frac{1}{2} R^{(0+)}(u_{34}) \frac{(211)}{11}(u_{13};u_{14})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + {}^2\text{sym}_{34} r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) s_{200}^{(211)}(0; u_{13}; u_{14}) + r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) s_{200}^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) \\
& R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) s_{200}^{(22)}(0; \alpha_{12}; u_{13}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_1; \alpha_2; u_{13}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_2; \alpha_2; \alpha_1; u_{13}) \\
& + {}^2\text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) + \frac{1}{2} r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{134}) \\
& + 2\alpha_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34} {}^4(3 {}^0(u_{13}) {}^0(u_{14}) (u_{14})^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) (u_{14})^{\text{00}}(u_{13})) \\
& {}^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) S_{101}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) + {}^0(u_{14}) S_{102}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \frac{S_{111}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4)^2}{4^2} {}^2 {}^0(u_{14}) S_{201}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
& + \text{sym}_{34} {}^2 {}^4 s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{13}) s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{14}) + {}^4 s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{14}) + s_{011}^{(3)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_2; \alpha_2) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
& + 2 \alpha_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) {}^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) + \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{14})^2 {}^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) {}^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) {}^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) \\
& + \frac{1}{2} R^{\text{00}}(u_{34})^2 {}^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) + 2 {}^0(u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) + 2 {}^0(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) + 2 {}^0(u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) \\
& + 4 {}^0(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) {}^2 {}^0(u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) + (u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 + (u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13})^2 \\
& + 2 \alpha_{12}^2 {}^2\text{sym}_{34} R^{(3)}(u_{14})^2 S_{101}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) S_{102}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
& R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) S_{111}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) R^{(3)}(u_{13}) S_{111}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(u_{14}) S_{201}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
& + 2 \text{sym}_{34} {}^2 {}^2 r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{13}) + 2 {}^2 r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) \\
& + R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_1; \alpha_2) + \frac{1}{2} r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12})^2 S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
& + (2 r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) + 3 {}^0 r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12})^2) R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + {}^0 {}^2 \alpha_{12}^2 ({}^{(211)}_{R^4}(u_{13}; u_{14}) - 3 R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) R^{(3)}(0^+)^2)
\end{aligned}$$

we recall $= 3=4$ and ${}^0 = 1=2$ for ERG.

Taking the large α_{12}^2 limit one checks that one recovers the previous sm all u_{12}^2 limit of the outer equation for S^4 . The non trivial term which grow as α_{12}^2 give respectively:

$$T_1^2 {}^3\text{sym}_{34} r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) s_{200}^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) ! {}^6 {}^4 u_{12}^2 R^{\text{00}}(0^+) {}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) \quad (\text{F } 70)$$

$$T_1^2 {}^2\text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{34}) s_{200}^{(22)}(0; \alpha_{12}; u_{13}) ! {}^2 {}^4 u_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{34}) g^{(22)}(u_{13}) \quad (\text{F } 71)$$

$$2T_1^2 {}^2\text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{14}) s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{112}; u_{13}) ! {}^4 {}^4 u_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{14}) g^{(31)}(u_{13}) \quad (\text{F } 72)$$

$$(\text{F } 73)$$

Using the full BL of R , $s_{011}^{(3)}(\alpha_{122}) = \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12}^2 - \frac{1}{2} r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12})^2 - r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) + \frac{1}{2} \alpha_{12}^2 (1 - (r^{\text{00}})^2)$ and that $(r_1^{\text{00}})^2 = 1 + 2 {}^{\text{00}}(0)$ yields:

$$T_1^2 \text{sym}_{34} s_{011}^{(3)}(\alpha_{122}) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{134}) ! {}^3 u_{12}^2 {}^{\text{00}}(0) S_{200}^{(3)}(u_{134}) \quad (\text{F } 74)$$

and similarly:

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2T_1^2 \text{sym}_{34} {}^2 {}^2 r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) + R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_1; \alpha_1; \alpha_2) + \frac{1}{2} r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12})^2 S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
& + u_{12}^2 \text{sym}_{34} {}^2 {}^4 {}^3 (u_{14}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(0^+) - {}^2 {}^3 {}^{\text{00}}(0) R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^2 S_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4)
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{F } 75)$$

the non trivial term in the R^4 feeding term is:

$$3 {}^0 T_1^2 r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12})^2 R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) + 3 {}^0 u_{12}^2 R^{\text{00}}(0^+)^2 R^{\text{00}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{00}}(u_{14}) \quad (\text{F } 76)$$

Let us write the resulting equation obtained from PBL211 when the leading order equation is used. One gets:

$$\begin{aligned}
0 = & {}^3 s_{200}^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) + {}^3 r^{\text{00}}(\alpha_{12}) (s_{200}^{(211)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}; u_{14}) - s_{200}^{(211)}(0; u_{13}; u_{14})) - {}^6 {}^3 \alpha_{12}^2 r_1^{\text{00}} {}^{(211)}(u_{13}; u_{14}) \\
& {}^2\text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{00}}(u_{34}) (s_{200}^{(22)}(0; \alpha_{12}; u_{13}) - 2\alpha_{12}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}))
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2 \text{ }^2\text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{}}(u_{14}) (s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{112}; u_{13}) + 2\alpha_{12}^2 g^{(31)}(u_{13})) \\
& + \text{ }^4(s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{14}) - s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{14})) (s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) - s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{13})) - 36 \text{ }^4\alpha_{12}^2 (u_{13}) (u_{14}) \\
& + 4 \text{ }^2\text{sym}_{34} R^{\text{}}(u_{14}) [r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) (s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) - s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{13})) + \frac{1}{4} s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) - 6\alpha_{12}^{\text{}}\alpha_{12}^2 (u_{13})] \\
& + [\frac{1}{2} r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) + s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{112}) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(r_1^{\text{}})^2}{2} \alpha_{12}^2 + (r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}))^2 - (r_1^{\text{}})^2 \alpha_{12}^2)] s_{200}^{(3)}(u_1; u_3; u_4) \\
& + [2 (s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{112}) - \frac{1}{2} \frac{(r_1^{\text{}})^2}{2} \alpha_{12}^2) + 2 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) + 3 \text{ }^0(r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}))^2 - (r_1^{\text{}})^2 \alpha_{12}^2)] R^{\text{}}(u_{13}) R^{\text{}}(u_{14}) \tag{F 77}
\end{aligned}$$

It can be simplified slightly by using the full BL of R . Note that it is a linear equation for $s^{(211)}$, the homogeneous part has the same structure as found in the third cumulant matching in the text, for $s^{(21)}$ above and $s^{(3)}$. Thus it can be similarly solved, formally, in terms of the (more complicated) homogeneous part.

4. PBL 31

Considering the ERG equation (A 15) for $S^{(4)}$ in the regime where u_1, u_2 and u_3 are close together, and inserting the various PBL forms from (193) as appropriate, we end at leading order $O(T_1^3)$:

The equation is of order $O(T_1^3)$. One finds:

$$0 = \text{sym}_{123} [\alpha_{12}^2 \alpha_{13}] (d + 3 \text{ }^4 + (u_{34})^{(31)}(u_{34}) + \frac{3}{2} \text{ }^2\text{sym}_{123} [s_{2000}^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34})]) \tag{F 78}$$

$$+ \frac{3}{2} \alpha_{13} R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) s_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; 0; u_{34}) + 3 \text{ }^2 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) (s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{113}; u_{34}) - s_{1100}^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34})) \tag{F 79}$$

$$+ 3 R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) s_{1001}^{(31)}(\alpha_{123}; u_{34})) + \frac{3}{2} R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) s_{1100}^{(4)}(\alpha_{1123}) \tag{F 80}$$

$$- 5 \text{ }^2\alpha_{12}^2 r^{\text{}}(u_{13}) \text{ }^{(31)0}(u_{34}) - \alpha_{12}^2 \alpha_{13} (\text{ }^{(31)0}(u_{34}) R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) + 3 \text{ }^{(31)0}(u_{34}) R^{\text{}}(u_{34})) \tag{F 81}$$

$$+ \frac{3}{2} \text{ }^2 \text{ }^0(u_{34}) \alpha_{13} r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) + \frac{3}{4} R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) s_{200}^{(3)}(\alpha_{123}) + \frac{5}{4} \text{ }^2 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) s_{(20)}^{(21)}(\alpha_{13}; u_{34}) \tag{F 82}$$

$$+ 9 \text{ }^3\alpha_{12}^2 \alpha_{13} \text{ }^0(u_{34}) R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) + 3 \text{ }^2\alpha_{13} s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{112}) \text{ }^0(u_{34}) \tag{F 83}$$

$$- \frac{3}{2} \text{ }^2 s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{34}) s_{200}^{(3)}(\alpha_{123}) - 3 \text{ }^2 s_{20}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) (s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{123}) - s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{113})) \tag{F 84}$$

$$+ (3 \text{ }^2\alpha_{13} r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12})^2 \text{ }^0(u_{34}) + \alpha_{12} \alpha_{23} (- 12 R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) \text{ }^0(u_{34}) - 18 (R^{\text{}}(u_{34}))^2 \text{ }^0(u_{34})) \tag{F 85}$$

$$- 3 \text{ }^2 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{13}) s_{20}^{(21)}(0; u_{34}) + 3 \text{ }^2 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{13})^2 s_{(20)}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) \tag{F 86}$$

$$+ 3 \text{ }^2 (2 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{13}) - r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{13}) r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{23})) s_{(20)}^{(21)}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34}) \tag{F 87}$$

$$+ 6 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) (s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{113}) - s_{110}^{(3)}(\alpha_{123})) + 3 \text{sym} [r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{13}) R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) \tag{F 88}$$

$$+ \text{ }^0 9 \text{sym} [(r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}))^2 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{13})] R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) - 3 r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12}) r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{13}) r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{23}) R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) \tag{F 89}$$

$$+ \text{sym} (\alpha_{13} \alpha_{12} r^{\text{}}(\alpha_{12})) \frac{R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) (R^{\text{}}(u_{34}))^2}{2} - 3 \text{sym} [\alpha_{12} \alpha_{23}] \frac{R^{\text{}}(u_{34}) (R^{\text{}}(u_{34}))^3}{3} : \tag{F 90}$$

Upon taking the limit α_{13} large the whole equation should grow linearly in α_{13} and we should obtain an equation of the form :

$$\alpha_{13} [\alpha_{12}^2 f(u_{34}) + g(\alpha_{12}; u_{34})] + \alpha_{13} [\alpha_{12}^2 \bar{f}(u_{34}) + \bar{g}(\alpha_{12}; u_{34})] = 0 \tag{F 91}$$

The parts f and \bar{f} must match the small u_{13} limit of the outer equation discussed previously (and the corresponding non analytic piece should vanish). The parts g and \bar{g} should match the small α_{13} limit of PBL211. All the obtained equations should be independent. We will not present these equations in detail here.

One notes that again the equation for $s^{(31)}$ is linear. It has a slightly different structure from the previous PBL ones, there being an additional first derivative term w.r.t. the TBL variables. This should not prevent it being formally solvable. The inhomogeneous piece can be simplified using the equations discussed above, the one obtained derived above for $s^{(31)}$, and various other BL equations. We will not give further details here.

5. PBL 22

Considering the ERG equation (A 15) for $S^{(4)}$ in the regime where u_1 is close to u_2 and u_3 close to u_4 and inserting the various PBL forms from (193) as appropriate, we find at leading order $O(T_1^3)$:

$$0 = r^0(\alpha_{34}) (S_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) - S_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; 0; u_{13})) + r^0(\alpha_{12}) (S_{200}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) - S_{200}^{(22)}(0; \alpha_{34}; u_{13})) \quad (F 92)$$

$$+ S_{020}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) + S_{200}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13})] \quad (F 93)$$

The result is rather simple as many terms do not contribute to this order. The rescaling term gives zero to order T^3 because there is no cubic polynomial allowed by symmetry. The feeding TRRR and RRRR term also yields zero to this order. For the TRRR term one checks that the $r^0(\alpha_{12})r^0(\alpha_{34})$ term cannot appear and for the RRRR term one checks that although it appears there are powerful cancellations between the various resulting terms. The other terms result from Taylor expansions in α_{12} and α_{34} not to high enough order to produce anything not antisymmetric (one needs at least $\alpha_{12}^2\alpha_{34}^2$ but this is higher order in T).

We can solve this generally, remembering that the l.h.s. can be gauge, suppressing the dependence on u_{13} (which acts only as a parameter). The left hand side can be taken as an arbitrary function of α_{12} plus the same function of α_{34} (since the right hand side is symmetric in the two variables). Doing this, one finds the general solution

$$S_{02}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) - S_{02}^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; 0; u_{13}) = \frac{g(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34})}{1 + r^0(\alpha_{34})} + \frac{a(\alpha_{12}) + a(\alpha_{34})}{1 + r^0(\alpha_{34})}; \quad (F 94)$$

where $a(x)$ is arbitrary and $g(x; y) = -g(y; x)$ is antisymmetric but otherwise arbitrary. The most trivial but likely physical solution corresponds to $a(x) = g(x; y) = 0$:

$$S^{(22)}(\alpha_{12}; \alpha_{34}; u_{13}) = \alpha_{12}^2 \alpha_{34}^2 g^{(22)}(u_{13}); \quad (F 95)$$

This matches properly provided that $\sim(\alpha_{12}; u_{13}) = 0$, i.e. that s^{211} is sufficiently smooth. We have not checked whether the (here neglected) fifth cumulant will produce some additional non trivial feeding term to $s^{(22)}$. This does not however modify the conclusion that $s^{(22)}$ can be obtained formally in terms of higher PLB cumulant functions.

APPENDIX G: BETA FUNCTION TO HIGHER ORDERS IN R

The iteration to four loop order reads:

$$S_0^{(5)} = -P_5(R^0 R^0 R^0 R^0 R^0) \quad (G 1)$$

$$S_1^{(4)} = -Q_4((R^0 S_1^{(4)0}) + (R^0 R^0 S_1^{(3)0}) + [S_0^{(5)0}]) \quad (G 2)$$

$$S_2^{(3)} = -S_3((R^0 S_1^{(3)0}) + [S_1^{(4)0}]) \quad (G 3)$$

$$_2 = [S_2^{(3)0}] \quad (G 4)$$

The only term needed not yet determined is the R^5 feeding term into the fifth cumulant. The general expression for the feeding term of the p -th cumulant is⁵²:

$$c_p^0 P!(T r W^p) \sum_{aa_1 : : a_p} R_{aa_1}^0 : R_{aa_p}^0 \quad (G 5)$$

$$W_{ab} = \sum_{ab} \sum_c R_{ac}^0 R_{ab}^0 \quad (G 6)$$

where $R_{ab} = R(u_{ab})$, the last term being the $p+1$ -th replica term which appear in the trace and must thus be subtracted. Here $c_p^0 = c_p = 1 = (2p)$ for Wilson and $c_p^0 = 1 = 2^p$ which comes from rescaling for the ERG. As can also be extracted from Appendix A, the feeding term into the fifth cumulant equation (not written) reads:

$$12 S_{5\text{sym}} 5R^0(u_{12})R^0(u_{13})R^0(u_{14})(R^0(u_{12}) - R^0(u_{23}))(R^0(u_{15}) + R^0(u_{25})) \\ + (5R^0(u_{14}) - R^0(u_{45}))R^0(u_{15})R^0(u_{12})R^0(u_{23})R^0(u_{34}) \quad (G 7)$$

with $\gamma_5 = 1$ for Wilson and $\gamma_5 = 5=16$ for the ERG.

At each step of the calculation, upon applying the $[\cdot]_{12}$ we check carefully that no ambiguity arises. In general, upon inserting the non-analytic expansion for $R^{(0)}(u_1 - u_2)$ in powers of $|u_1 - u_2|$, a very large number of terms proportional to $\text{sgn}(u_1 - u_2)$ arise. They however amazingly cancel when the limit $u_2 \rightarrow u_1$ is taken. In fact this serves as a useful and non-trivial check at each stage of the calculation.

The final result for the four-loop beta function $\beta_4 R = \beta(R)$ is:

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_4 R = & \quad (G 8) \\ & c_{10} R^{(0)}(u)^4 R^{(0)}(u) + c_{11} R^{(0)}(0^+)^4 R^{(0)}(u) + (c_{11} - c_{10}) R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(0^+) - (c_{10} + c_{11}) R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(u) \\ & c_{20} R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(u)^2 + c_{21} R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 + c_{22} R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 R^{(0)}(0^+) R^{(0)}(u) \\ & (c_{20} + c_{21} + c_{22}) R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 R^{(0)}(u)^2 \\ & + c_{30} R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(u)^3 R^{(0)}(u) + c_{31} R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(u) - (c_{30} + c_{31}) R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(0^+)^3 R^{(0)}(0^+) \\ & + c_{40} R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(u)^3 + c_{50} R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(u) + c_{60} R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(u) + c_{61} R^{(0)}(u)^2 R^{(0)}(0^+)^2 R^{(0)}(u) \\ & + c_{70} R^{(0)}(u)^3 R^{(0)}(u)^2 + c_{80} R^{(0)}(u)^3 R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(u) + c_{90} R^{(0)}(u)^3 R^{(0)}(u) R^{(0)}(u) \end{aligned}$$

The various terms have been grouped together with their associated anomalous ("counter") terms. The coefficients c_{ij} are found to satisfy the constraint that the superscusp vanishes for each group i , i.e. the associated anomalous terms successfully subtract the j th piece of the main term (indexed $j = 0$). Terms with even powers of $R^{(0)}(u)$ do not need anomalous term, nevertheless one notes the existence of the c_{61} term. The table of coefficients c_{ij} is found to be:

$$c_{10} = 372 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} \frac{q}{d} s + 354 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 248 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 156 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 138 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 9)$$

$$c_{11} = 12 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} \frac{q}{d} s + 18 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 8 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 6 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 12 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 10)$$

$$c_{20} = 672 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} \frac{q}{d} s + 664 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 488 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 364 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 346 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 11)$$

$$c_{21} = 624 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} \frac{q}{d} s + 588 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 432 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 300 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 264 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 12)$$

$$c_{22} = 24 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 24 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 32 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 13)$$

$$c_{30} = 192 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} \frac{q}{d} s + 220 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 192 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 148 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 166 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 14)$$

$$c_{31} = 28 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 32 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 28 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 46 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 15)$$

$$c_{40} = 48 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} \frac{q}{d} s + 64 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 48 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 52 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 52 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 16)$$

$$c_{50} = 96 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} \frac{q}{d} s + 184 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 144 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 172 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 224 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 17)$$

$$c_{60} = 24 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 32 \frac{2}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 24 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 50 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 18)$$

$$c_{61} = 2 \frac{3}{d} s \quad (G 19)$$

$$c_{70} = 4 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 4 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 12 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 20)$$

$$c_{80} = 4 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q^2}{d} s + 4 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} s^2 + 16 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 21)$$

$$c_{90} = 4 \frac{1}{d} s^3 \quad (G 22)$$

We have also computed the correction to the fourth cumulant, yielding:

$$f_4 = \frac{6}{d} \frac{4}{d} \frac{4}{d} + 4 \frac{4}{d} R^{(0)}(0^+)^4 \left(\frac{0}{d} + 28 \frac{0}{d} \frac{q}{d} R^{(0)}(0^+) + 16 \left(2 \frac{5}{d} \frac{p}{d} + \frac{2}{d} s \right) R^{(0)}(0^+) \right) \quad (G 23)$$

up to $O(R^6)$ terms (strictly for $d = 0$).

APPENDIX H: ABOVE FOUR DIMENSIONS

In this section we consider the behavior for $d > 4$, and in particular the fate of the TBL in this case. Four dimensions plays to a certain extent the role of an upper critical dimension. In particular, for $d > 4$ and a weak and smooth pinning potential, the Larkin approximation (of Taylor expanding the pinning potential to obtain a random force) is self-consistent in the sense that the deformations $h(u(r) - u(0))$ remain bounded and small. The self-consistency of this argument suggests that under these conditions there is an (almost) unique local minimum energy conformation of the elastic medium, and consequently no glassy behavior. (We include the proviso "almost" here to indicate that the self-consistent Larkin argument, which considers only the variance of the manifold displacement, may incorrectly miss rare samples/regions with anomalously strong pinning, arising from the tails of the disorder

distribution.) Nevertheless, clearly for strong enough pinning (or a weak but non-smooth pinning potential) there must be multiple metastable states for the manifold.

To analyze the nature of these low-energy states and their consequences for the boundary layer, we consider both the FRG and a complementary ϵ -expansion approach, both of which support the same qualitative behavior. For a weak, smooth pinning potential, both approaches indicate that the effective action remains analytic at $T = 0$, and consequently that the TBL is absent. Since this implies the variance of the curvature of the effective potential, $\langle V''(u) \rangle^2$ is bounded (and indeed small (see below)), this indicates the absence of metastability. For stronger disorder, the effective potential does become non-analytic at $T = 0$, and there is thus a boundary layer for $T > 0$. Unlike for $d < 4$, however, the width of this boundary layer is $O(T)$ rather than $O(T=L)$. Our interpretation of this result is that the metastable states for $d > 4$ occur at small scales, and hence between states with bounded energy differences from the ground state. Physically, even for strong disorder the manifold remains asymptotically flat on large scales (with a bounded displacement larger than the transverse correlation length of the pinning potential), because it is too costly in elastic energy to distort the manifold over large distances. The metastable states thus correspond to small local distortions of the manifold atop this generally flat background.

1. FRG for $d > 4$

We consider the Wilson FRG. First, note that the distinction between strong and weak pinning can be observed from very simple considerations at $T = 0$. In particular, from (25), and ignoring higher cumulants (e.g. $S^{(3)}$) for the moment, one finds by differentiating:

$$\partial_1 R^{(4)}(0) = R^{(4)}(0) + 3 R^{(4)}(0) \frac{i_2}{i_1} + T_1 R^{(6)}(0): \quad (\text{H } 1)$$

For $d > 4$, $i_2 < 0$, and for $R^{(4)}(0) < j \neq 3$ (at low T) it flows to zero, as do all higher derivatives and cumulants. Taking $i_1 = -2 (< 0)$, only the quadratic Gaussian Larkin force term survives under renormalization. This is the weak pinning state. From (H 1), however, for stronger disorder (and low T), one moves outside the domain of stability, and the disorder correlator becomes non-analytic (at $T = 0$) at some finite scale $l = l_1$ as for $d < 4$.

In this case for $l > l_1$ we must return to general functional analysis. The detailed behavior of the FRG for scales of order l_1 is quite complex, both inside and outside the boundary layer. However, considering the behavior outside the boundary layer (i.e. at $T_1 = 0$), it is clear from (25) that the full force-force correlator $\tilde{\gamma}_1(u)$ does not have a stable fixed point, and that ultimately the flow of $\tilde{\gamma}_1$ will be toward zero. Higher cumulants also flow toward zero, and moreover do so more rapidly with scale than does the second cumulant. Hence there will be another scale $l_2 > l_1$, beyond which the entire function $\tilde{R}(u)$ will become small, so that the $O(R^2)$ terms can be neglected. Once this occurs, there is no longer any feedback to continue to narrow the boundary layer, which will have some width set by its narrowness at $l = l_2$, presumably of $O(T_{l_2})$. In particular, in the linearized FRG equation for $\tilde{\gamma}_1$, the $T_1 \tilde{\gamma}_1^{(0)}$ term can then be neglected (presuming as usual $T_1 \ll 1$), and one has

$$\tilde{\gamma}_1(u) = e^{-j \int \tilde{V}(u)} \quad \text{for } l > l_2: \quad (\text{H } 2)$$

Here to avoid confusion we have not made any rescaling, i.e. used $i_1 = 0$. In the same scheme it is appropriate to take $i_2 = d - 2$. This behavior obtains hence uniformly for all u , indicating that indeed there is no further sharpening of the boundary layer. The physical interpretation is that the important metastable states occur at finite scales $L \sim l_2^{-1} e^{l_2}$, with consequent finite energy separations.

2. Large dimension limit

Next we consider the large dimension limit $d \rightarrow \infty$. The FRG analysis sketched above suggests that the qualitative physics is independent of dimension for $d > 4$, so we may expect the large d approach to recover similar behavior. The results to leading order are identical to those for a fully-connected "mean-field" model, so we will present the two in tandem. For the large dimension analysis, it is convenient to consider the model on a d -dimensional hypercubic lattice.

$$H[u_i] = \frac{K}{2d} \sum_{i,j} (u_i - u_j)^2 + \sum_i V_i(u_i); \quad (\text{H } 3)$$

where $K = K = T$ and $V_i(u_i) = V_i(u_i) = T$. We consider in particular the free energy (effective action) $\Phi_0[u_0]$ for the uniform (zero) mode of the displacement field u_0 , in a given disorder realization, defined according to

$$\Phi_0[u_0; \lambda] = \int^Z \ln \int^P [du_i] e^{-H[u_i; g] + \lambda \int^P (u_i - u_0)}; \quad (H 4)$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \lambda} \Phi_0[u_0; \lambda] = 0; \quad (H 5)$$

Here λ is a Lagrange multiplier used to define $\Phi_0[u_0] = \Phi_0[u_0; (u_0)]$ in the usual way via the condition in (H 5). One may also readily calculate a variety of other similar quantities at large d , e.g. the full effective action for all coordinates in a particular disorder realization, or the effective action for the replicated model. The present choice seems simplest and the most physically transparent.

The large- d limit of $\Phi_0[u_0]$ can be calculated using the efficient method of Georges and Yedidia,⁶² which gives the result, to leading (zeroth) order in $1=d$,

$$\Phi_0[u_0] = \sum_i (g_i(\cdot) + u_0) - \frac{K}{d} \sum_{i,j} g_i^0(\cdot) g_j^0(\cdot); \quad (H 6)$$

where (u_0) is determined by the condition $\sum_i (g_i^0(\cdot) + u_0) = 0$ and

$$g_i(x) = \int^Z \ln \int^P du e^{-K u^2 - V_i(u) + x u}; \quad (H 7)$$

is proportional to the free energy of the "toy model" with potential $V_i(u)$. To leading order in $1=d$ the last term in (H 6) can be simplified to $\frac{1}{d} \sum_{i,j} g_i^0(\cdot) g_j^0(\cdot) = N u_0^2$, where N is the number of sites. With this replacement, the result is identical to the exact effective action for the fully connected mean-field model,

$$H[u_i; g] = \frac{K}{2N} \sum_{i,j} (u_i - u_j)^2 + \sum_i V_i(u_i); \quad (H 8)$$

The effective action for this model is easily and exactly obtained by mean-field theory. One finds

$$\Phi_{FC;0}[u_0] = \Phi_0[u_0] = \sum_i g_i(\cdot) + N u_0 - N K u_0^2; \quad (H 9)$$

with the same condition (H 5) determining λ as above. Using the fully-connected form in (H 9), one can then generally show that the renormalized random force obeys

$$\frac{\Phi_{FC;0}'(u_0)}{N K} = \sim -2u_0; \quad (H 10)$$

where $\sim = -K$.

We now use this result to evaluate the two-point function of the "renormalized pinning potential" defined by $\Phi_0[u_0]$ (note that because we consider the uniform mode, there is no mean elastic contribution to the energy for a displacement u_0). For concreteness, we focus on the periodic CDW case, and take $V_i(u_i) = V(u_i - u_i) = T$, with u_i uniformly distributed between 0 and 2π .

a. Renormalized disorder correlator for weak pinning

Consider first the case of a weak and smooth potential, (e.g. $V(u) = a \cos u$ for $a \ll K$) with $\tilde{V}(u) \equiv \tilde{V}^0(u) \equiv K$. In this case, we expect from the FRG analysis, that the renormalized disorder will remain analytic at $T = 0$, and hence that there will be no TBL. Thus we concentrate on zero temperature, for which

$$g_i(\cdot) = \min_u [K u^2 + V_i(u)] = u : \quad (H 11)$$

This can be evaluated perturbatively in $V_i(u)$ to give

$$g_i(\cdot) = K \frac{\sim^2}{4} + V_i(\frac{\sim}{2}) - \frac{(\tilde{V}_i^0(\frac{\sim}{2}))^2}{4K^2} + O(\tilde{V}_i^3); \quad (H 12)$$

Then (H 10) gives perturbatively

$$\sim 2u_0 + \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \frac{1}{K} \nabla_i^0(u_0) - \frac{1}{N} \sum_i \frac{1}{K^2} \nabla_i^0(u_0) \nabla_i^0(u_0) + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{ij} \frac{1}{2K^2} \nabla_i^0(u_0) \nabla_j^0(u_0) + O(V^3=K^3): \quad (H 13)$$

It is straightforward to obtain the force-force correlator by directly averaging using Eqs. (H 10,H 13). One finds

$$\overline{(\nabla_0^0(u_0) - \nabla_0^0(u_0^0))^2} = N K^{-2} \left(\nabla_1^0(u_0) - \nabla_1^0(u_0^0) \right)^2 + \nabla_2^0(u_0) - \nabla_2^0(u_0^0) + O(V^4=K^2); \quad (H 14)$$

with

$$\nabla_1^0(u_0) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d u_0} \frac{V^0(u_0) V^0(u_0 + \frac{1}{K})}{K^2}; \quad (H 15)$$

$$\nabla_2^0(u_0) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{d}{d u_0} \frac{[V^0(u_0)]^2 V^0(u_0 + \frac{1}{K}) + V^0(u_0) [V^0(u_0 + \frac{1}{K})]^2}{K^3}; \quad (H 16)$$

Provided the potential $V(u_0)$ is smooth (the existence of all derivatives is a sufficient condition), the force-force correlator in (H 14) is analytic at zero temperature to all orders in $V=K^{-1}$. Since it is analytic at zero temperature, there is a smooth limit as $T \rightarrow 0$, without any boundary layer. This can also be explicitly verified by a direct calculation of $g_i(\tilde{r})$ perturbatively in V from (H 7). This describes the weak-disorder behavior in large d .

b. Renormalized disorder correlator for strong pinning

For stronger disorder, or for a non-smooth pinning potential, the above analysis does not obtain. We now consider the behavior explicitly for such a case, taking for concreteness the Villain potential:

$$e^{-\nabla_i(u)} = \sum_n e^{-\frac{a}{2}(u - \frac{1}{K} + 2n)^2}; \quad (H 17)$$

with u uniformly distributed between $0 < u < 2$. In the low temperature limit with $a = aK$ fixed as $T \rightarrow 0$, the single site "free energy" is then given approximately by

$$e^{-g_i(\tilde{r})} = \sum_n e^{-K g_n(\tilde{r}; \tilde{r})}; \quad (H 18)$$

$$g_n(\tilde{r}; \tilde{r}) = \frac{a}{2} (\tilde{r} + 2n)^2 - \frac{1}{2(a+2)} (\tilde{r} + a(\tilde{r} + 2n))^2; \quad (H 19)$$

Consider first the zero temperature limit, for which this simplifies to

$$g_i(\tilde{r}) = \min_n g_n(\tilde{r}; \tilde{r}); \quad (H 20)$$

The minimum occurs for a given n when $\tilde{r}_{n-1,m} < \tilde{r} < \tilde{r}_{n,m+1}$, where

$$\tilde{r}_{n,m+1} = 2 + (2n+1)2 \quad (H 21)$$

which is the point where $g_n = g_{n+1}$. The derivative of g has a jump at these values with:

$$g_i^0(\tilde{r}; T=0) = \sum_n \frac{1}{a+2} (\tilde{r} + a(\tilde{r} + 2n)) (2\tilde{r} + (2n-1)2 < \tilde{r} < 2\tilde{r} + (2n+1)2); \quad (H 22)$$

Hence g_i^0 at $T=0$ consists of alternating linear segments with slope $-1/(a+2)$, and jumps of magnitude $g'(\tilde{r}_{n,m+1} - \tilde{r}) - g'(\tilde{r}_{n,m} - \tilde{r}) = 2/a = (a+2)$. At low but non-zero temperature, the jumps in $g_i^0(\tilde{r})$ are rounded over a region of width $K^{-1} = T=K$.

To obtain the second cumulant of the effective potential we use that $\nabla_0^0(u_0) = \nabla_0^0(u_0^0)$ which gives:

$$\overline{(\nabla_0^0(u_0) - \nabla_0^0(u_0^0))^2} = N^2 K^{-2} \overline{(\tilde{r}(\tilde{r}) - \tilde{r}(\tilde{r}^0) - 2(u_0 - u_0^0))^2}; \quad (H 23)$$




FIG. 2: The function $U(\lambda)$ defined in the text for the N -site $d = 1$ Villain model for the simplest limit $a = 1$. At zero temperature, it consists of N "shocks" (step discontinuities) in each 4 interval of λ , each of magnitude $2/N$. At $T > 0$, these steps are smoothed by an amount $K^{-1} = T/K$.

where as usual λ is determined from

$$u_0 = U(\lambda) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i g_i^0(\lambda); \quad (\text{H 24})$$

For simplicity (though it is not essential), we now study the limit $a = 1$ where $g_i^0(\lambda)$ is flat and jumps exactly by 2 at each shock. Note that the infinite limit amounts to making the model discrete, since each coordinate u_i is then constrained to sit exactly at one of the minima of the Villain potential, $u_i = \lambda_i + 2n_i$. This model is still non-trivial since K is still necessary to hold all particles near to one another (i.e. to keep $n_i - n_{i_0}$ small). The function $U(\lambda)$ for this case is shown schematically in Fig. 2. Graphically the solution to (H 24) is obtained by intersecting a horizontal line with the function $u_0(\lambda)$ for a given disorder realization. We consider first the behavior at $T = 0$ and show that it indeed exhibits the expected absolute value cusp in the force-force correlation function. From the figure it is clear that (at $T = 0$) the solution to (H 24) is always such that λ is equal to one of the shock values $\lambda_i = \lambda_{i_0} + (2n_i + 1)2$, with n_i an integer. Let us, for a fixed N , order the shocks by increasing values of λ , i.e. $\lambda_m < \lambda_{m'}$ for $m < m'$.

To obtain the two point statistics of the (u_0) random function we intersect with two lines $U(\lambda) = u_0$ and $U(\lambda) = u_0^0$. For given values of u_0 and u_0^0 and a given configuration of disorder, the solution is $U(\lambda_m) = u_0$ and $U(\lambda_{m'}) = u_0^0$ with the above-mentioned ordering. Clearly from the figure one has, since $U(0) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i g_i^0(0)$,

$$\lambda_m - \lambda_{m'} = n = \frac{N u_0}{2} - \frac{N u_0^0}{2}; \quad (\text{H 25})$$

where $[x]$ indicates the greatest integer less than or equal to x . This involves the "center of mass" of the g_i^0 variables. On the other hand we know that the λ_m are of the form $\lambda_{i_0} + (2n_i + 1)2$ for some i ; n_i but the differences $\lambda_m - \lambda_{m'} = 2\lambda_{i_0} - 2\lambda_{i'_0}$ depend only on the differences $\lambda_i - \lambda_{i'}$. Thus we can use that the differences are statistically uncorrelated with the center of mass. This is true because the distribution of the g_i^0 is uniform. Thus we may consider for fixed $n = \lambda_m - \lambda_{m'}$ the distribution over the differences.

This problem is formulated as follows. One chooses N independent variables $g_i = 2\lambda_i$ on the interval $[0, 4]$ with uniform distribution. Since the quantities of interest depend only upon the differences, we may arbitrarily fix the first one at zero, and order them as $g_0 = 0 < g_1 < g_2 < \dots < g_{N-1} < g_N = 4$. The distribution of $g_n - g_0$ is the object of interest. Switching to difference variables $\lambda_k = g_k - g_{k-1}$, $k = 1 :: N$, this probability reads

$$P_N(\lambda) = Z_N \prod_{i=1}^N \delta(\lambda_i - 4) \prod_{i=1}^N \delta(\lambda_i); \quad (\text{H 26})$$

where Z_N is a normalization constant. The first delta function here expresses the constraint that the sum of the difference variables gives $\lambda_N - \lambda_0 = 4$. Standard techniques (using a Fourier representation of the delta functions) give the normalized result

$$P_N(\lambda) = \frac{1}{(4)^{N-1}} \frac{(N)}{(n)(N-n)} \lambda^{n-1} (4-\lambda)^{N-n-1} \quad (\text{H 27})$$

Thus, finally, the probability distribution of $\lambda_m - \lambda_{m'}$ is obtained by the sum

$$P(\lambda_0, \lambda_0^0) = \sum_n P_N(\lambda) \text{Prob} \left[\frac{N u_0}{2} - \frac{N u_0^0}{2} = n \right]; \quad (\text{H 28})$$

Clearly the fluctuations of n are $O(1)$, while n itself is $O(N)$. Hence, in the large system limit $N \rightarrow \infty$ the center of mass disorder is negligible and we can take

$$x = n/N = (u_0 - u_b)/2 \quad (H 29)$$

Then, using the Sterling formula, one has

$$P(x) = \exp(2N(u_b \ln(\frac{u_b}{2u_0}) + (2 - u_b) \ln(\frac{4}{2(2 - u_b)}))) \quad (H 30)$$

where the denominators have been chosen so that it is approximately normalized, and we have taken $u_0^0 = 0$ without loss of generality since P is translationally invariant. Due to N in the exponential, it is strongly peaked. We write $x = 2u_0 + f$ to bring out the physical f , representing the fluctuation of the force difference per site (in units of K). Then

$$P_n(x) = \exp(2N(u_0 \ln(1 + \frac{f}{2u_0}) + (2 - u_b) \ln(1 - \frac{f}{2(2 - u_b)}))) \quad (H 31)$$

$$\exp(-N(\frac{f^2}{2D} + Af^3)) \quad ; \quad (H 32)$$

$$D(u_0) = \frac{1}{2}u_0(2 - u_b); \quad (H 33)$$

$$A(u_0) = \frac{1}{3} \frac{u_b}{u_0^2(2 - u_b)^2}; \quad (H 34)$$

The force correlator is finally obtained as:

$$\overline{(x_0(u_0) - x_0(u_0^0))^2} = N^2 K^{-2} (\overline{(u_0 - u_b - 2(u_b - u_b^0))^2}) = K^{-2} N u_0 (2 - u_b) = \frac{1}{2}: \quad (H 35)$$

Indeed, as expected, this form has the linear cusp at small u_0 . Higher cumulants are readily extracted by further expansion around the saddle point $f = 0$, e.g.

$$\overline{(x_0(u_0) - x_0(u_0^0))^3} = -24NK^3 A(u_0) D(u_0)^3: \quad (H 36)$$

This also exhibits the non-analytic behavior expected at $T = 0$.

Turning finally to $T > 0$, we note that shock contributing to $U(x)$ in Fig. 2 is smoothed on the scale $\ell = T/K$. For large N $\ell = T/K$ each shock will overlap many others over this range. Therefore the $T > 0$ solution is expected to be fully analytic in u_0 , and rounded over a scale $\ell = T/K$. Thus one finds agreement with the naive FRG treatment for $d > 4$ of Sec. H 1: the thermal boundary layer width does not diverge with scale (in this case N since we consider the center of mass) but remains finite.

APPENDIX I: ISSUES IN EXTENSIONS TO $N > 1$ OR $d > 0$

1. more than one component

In this Appendix we attempt the calculation of the two loop β -function for $d = 0$ and $N > 1$, by the direct method of expansion in powers of R of Section V C and show that it fails.

In the N component model the zero temperature exact RG equations truncated to order R^3 read:

$$m \mathcal{G}_m \tilde{R}(u) = (-4 + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}_{u^4}) \tilde{R}(u) + \frac{1}{2} R_{ij}^{00}(u)^2 + \mathcal{G}_{u^4} \mathcal{G}_{u^2} S(u_1; u_2; 0) \delta_{u_1=u_2=u} \quad (I1)$$

$$m \mathcal{G}_m S(u_1; u_2; u_3) = (-2 + 2 \mathcal{G}_{u^4} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{G}_{u^4}) S(u_1; u_2; u_3) \quad (I2)$$

$$+ 3 \text{sym} [R_{ij}^{00}(u_{12}) R_{jk}^{00}(u_{12}) R_{ki}^{00}(u_{13})] - R_{ij}^{00}(u_{12}) R_{jk}^{00}(u_{23}) R_{ki}^{00}(u_{31}) \quad (I3)$$

where summation over repeated indices is implicit, arguments are now N components vectors u^i , $i = 1; \dots; N$. Considering the model with $O(N)$ symmetry, we define the functions:

$$\tilde{R}(u) = N b(u^2/N) \quad (I4)$$

$$h(x) = b(x^2) \quad (I5)$$

for any N . To compute the beta function by the direct method requires the calculation of the feedback of S into R , denoted as:

$$2\text{loop} = -S [\text{Tr}(R^{\text{tr}} R^{\text{tr}} R^{\text{tr}})] \quad (\text{I6})$$

where we use the schematic notations defined in Section V C and the Tr denote the trace to be performed in $O(N)$ space (and ϵ is set to zero for now).

Performing the necessary contractions, and assuming that $h(x)$ has a well-defined Taylor expansion near zero with $h^0(x) = 0$ we find the fixed point equation for h :

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & h + \frac{1}{2N} h^{\text{tr}}(x)^2 + \frac{N}{2N} \frac{1 h^0(x)^2}{x^2} \\ & + 4 \left[\frac{1}{2N^2} h^{\text{tr}}(x)^2 (h^{\text{tr}}(x)^2 - h^{\text{tr}}(0)^2) + \frac{(N-1)}{N^2} \left[\frac{h^0(x)^3}{x^5} - \frac{3 h^0(x)^2 h^0(x)}{2 x^4} + \frac{1 h^0(x)^3}{2 x^2} \right] \right. \\ & \left. - \frac{(N-1)}{8N^2} h^{\text{tr}}(0)^2 \left[(N+3) \frac{h^0(x)}{x} + h^{\text{tr}}(x) \right] \right] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I7})$$

where $h^0(x) = h^0(x) - h^0(0)x$. The first line contains the rescaling term and the one loop $O(h^2)$ terms, while the second and third line is the result of the calculation to $O(h^3)$ of the above-mentioned feedback. Extension for finite using convolutions as in (I87) is straightforward. The non-anomalous terms, present in an analytic theory, have the same structure as obtained in previous similar field theory calculations. The anomalous terms all contain $h^{\text{tr}}(0)$ which plays the role of $R^{\text{tr}}(0)$ for $N = 1$. In fact, for $N = 1$, $h(x)$ identifies to $R(x)$ and one recovers the beta function obtained in (I87). One nice feature of the calculation leading to the above is that when taking vectors u_1 and u_2 close one can check explicitly that terms containing $(u_{12} - \delta)^2$ vanish, thus the result does not depend on how the points are brought together, i.e. it is unambiguous.

However, the above is not an acceptable β -function. Indeed one finds that the behaviour at small argument of the r.h.s. of (I7) is:

$$-\frac{N^2}{4} \frac{1}{N^2} h^{\text{tr}}(0)^3 x + O(x^2) \quad (\text{I8})$$

This singularity (supercusp) occurring in the feeding term at two loop is inconsistent with the working hypothesis (that the behavior be similar to the one loop result which starts as u^2), necessary for this direct R expansion method to work. Thus, for $N > 1$ one of the assumptions leading to this expansion must break down.

One also notes that a two loop term survives for $N = 1$, which is surprising in view of the results found in (). It reads: $-\frac{1}{2} h^{\text{tr}}(0)^2 \frac{h^0(x)}{x} = -h^{\text{tr}}(0)^2 b^0(x^2)$. It is easy to trace it to the expansion of the leading order term:

$$S = 4 S_N b^0 \left(\frac{u_{ab}^2}{N} \right) b^0 \left(\frac{u_{ab}^2}{N} \right) b^0 \left(\frac{u_{ac}^2}{N} \right) + b^0 \left(\frac{u_{bc}^2}{N} \right) + O(1) \quad (\text{I9})$$

expanded to order u_{ab}^2 keeping only the leading order in N .

The fact that the most naive extension of the non-analytic expansion in power of R fails here signals that the matching problem must be reexamined for $N > 1$. Work is in progress in that direction.

2. higher dimensions

It is instructive to consider how the naive one loop zero temperature FRG is encapsulated in the ERG. Since it requires keeping only terms up to second order in $R(u)$, it is straightforward to write the corresponding multilocal terms used in this formalism. We require up to bilocal order for the second cumulant, which is a term in the effective action of the form

$$V_1^{(2)} = \frac{1}{2T^2} \sum_{x_1, x_2} \sum_{ab} R(u_{x_1}^{ab}; u_{x_2}^{ab}; x_{12}): \quad (\text{II0})$$

Naively truncating to this order, the rescaled local and bilocal disorder correlators obey the equations

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_1 R(u) = & (d-2 + u \partial_u) R(u) \\ & + T \partial_g(x=0) R^{\text{tr}}(u) + 2T \sum_x \partial_g(x) R_{11}(u; u; x) + \frac{1}{2} \sum_x (\partial_g(x) g(x)) (R^{\text{tr}}(u)^2 - R^{\text{tr}}(0) R^{\text{tr}}(u)) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II1})$$

and

$$\partial_1 \tilde{R}(u_1; u_2; x) = (2d - 2 + \frac{1}{x} \partial_{u_1} + x_1 \partial_{x_1}) \tilde{R}(u_1; u_2; x) + F(u_1; u_2; x) \frac{d}{dx} F(u_1; u_2; x) \quad (\Pi 2)$$

$$F(u_1; u_2; x) = T \partial_g(x=0) (\tilde{R}_{20}(u_1; u_2; x) + \tilde{R}_{02}(u_1; u_2; x)) + 2T \partial_g(x) \tilde{R}_{11}(u_1; u_2; x) + \frac{1}{2} \partial_g(x) g(x) R^{(0)}(u_1) R^{(0)}(u_2); \quad (\Pi 3)$$

We use the same rescaling factor $l=4$ as in the text for second cumulant (and an extra m^d for the bilocal term). The projector in $\Pi 2$ extracts the purely local part. Here the Fourier transforms of $g(x); \partial_g(x)$ are $g(p) = \frac{1}{p^2+1}$, $\partial_g(p) = \frac{1}{(p^2+1)^2}$. Note that if T is taken to zero in $(\Pi 1)$, it becomes exactly the naive one loop FRG equation of the Wilson approach for $\tilde{R}(u)$, with $\frac{1}{x} \partial_g(x) g(x) = 1 = (32^{-2})$ in $d=4$ (yielding the usual universal number appearing at one loop). From $\tilde{R}(u)$ one obtains, at least naively, the $q=0$ correlations to lowest order in ϵ .

Attempts to "improve" on this calculation however lead to difficulties. These occur already in considering the two point correlation function at non-zero momentum, which is determined from $\tilde{R}_{11}(0;0;q)$. Naively solving $(\Pi 2)$ in the zero temperature limit gives the outer solution:

$$\tilde{R}_{\text{outer}}(u_1; u_2; q) = (q) R^{(0)}(u_1) R^{(0)}(u_2); \quad (\Pi 4)$$

which, we know from considerations in the present paper can at best hold only for $u_i \rightarrow 0$ (l). The momentum integral is found to be:

$$(q) = \int_0^{\frac{1}{2}} dl e^{-l} (h(q e^{-l}) - h(0)); \quad (\Pi 5)$$

and $h(q) = \frac{1}{2} \int_k \frac{1}{(k^2+1)^2} \frac{1}{(k+q)^2+1}$.

Taking two derivatives gives $\tilde{R}_{11}(u_1; u_2; q) = (q) R^{(0)}(u_1) R^{(0)}(u_2)$. Unlike similar local $(R^{(0)}(u))^2$ terms, this does not have an unambiguous limit for small $u_1; u_2$. This is indeed a sign of difficulty for the matching. In particular, the naive Larkin term in the bilocal TBL, $\tilde{R}_{\text{TBL}}(u_1; u_2; q) = T_{11}^2 f_{2,2}(q) u_1 u_2$, does not match the non-analytic outer solution at small argument $\tilde{R}_{\text{outer}}(u_1; u_2; q) = (q) (R^{(0)}(0))^2 u_1 u_2$. Thus the matching problem is more complex in this case and requires further analysis. Without such a prescription, the zero temperature beta function becomes itself ambiguous at $O(R^3)$, since at this order there is a feeding term in the local equation of the form $R^{(0)}(u) \tilde{R}_{11}(u; u; \epsilon)$, an expression which naively starts as u^2 at small u , which seems problematic. Work is in progress to tackle these issues.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| <p>¹ J.P. Bouchaud et al. Spin glasses and random fields Ed. A. P. Young, World Scientific, Singapore, 1998.</p> <p>² T. Nattermann Spin glasses and random fields Ed. A. P. Young, World Scientific, Singapore, 1998.</p> <p>³ S. Lemerle et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 849.</p> <p>⁴ S. Moulinet, C. Guthmann and E. Rolley, Eur. Phys. J. A 8 (2002) 437{43.</p> <p>⁵ G. G. Guner, Rev. Mod. Phys. 60, 1129 (1988).</p> <p>⁶ Thomas Nattermann, Thierry Giamarchi, Pierre Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 056603 (2003).</p> <p>⁷ M. Ben Chorin et al. Phys. Rev. B 48 15025 (1993), A. Vaknin et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. 81 669 (1998), Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 3402 (2000), Phys. Rev. B 65 134208 (2002). V. Orlyanchik and Z. O. vadyahu, Rev. Lett. 92 066801 (2004).</p> <p>⁸ E. Y. Andrei and al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 2765 (1988).</p> <p>⁹ see e.g. R. Chitra, T. Giamarchi, P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. B 65, 035312 (2002) and Ref. therein.</p> <p>¹⁰ F. J. B. Williams Helv. Phys. Acta 65 297 (1992).</p> <p>¹¹ G. B. Latter, M. V. Feigel'man, V. B. Geshkenbein, A. I.</p> | <p>Larkin and V. M. Vinokur, Review of Modern Physics 66 1125 1994.</p> <p>¹² T. Giamarchi and P. Le Doussal, Phys. Rev. B 52 1242 (1995), cond-mat/9705096, in A. P. Young, editor, Spin glasses and random fields, World Scientific, Singapore, 1997.</p> <p>¹³ T. Nattermann and S. Scheidl, Advances in Physics 49 (2000) 607{704.</p> <p>¹⁴ U. Schulz, J. Villain, E. Brezin and H. Orland, J. Stat. Phys. 51 (1988) 1{27.</p> <p>¹⁵ T. Hwa and D. S. Fisher, Phys. Rev. B 49 (1994) 3136{54.</p> <p>¹⁶ W. L. McMillan J. Phys. C 17 3179 (1984), A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore J. Phys. C 17 L463 (1984), A. J. Bray and M. A. Moore in "Heidelberg Colloquium on Glassy Dynamics and Optimization" ed. van Hemmen and I. Morgenstern (Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg 1986).</p> <p>¹⁷ D. S. Fisher, D. A. Huse Phys. Rev. B 38 373 and 386 (1988).</p> <p>¹⁸ M. Mezard J. Phys. France 51 1831 (1990).</p> |
|--------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|

- ¹⁹ D.S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* 43 10728 (1991).
- ²⁰ See, e.g. A.A. Middleton, *Phys. Rev. B* 63 60202 (2001); T. Hwa and D.S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* 49, 3136 (1994).
- ²¹ J. Houdayer, F. K. Zakala, O.C. Martin, *Eur. Phys. J. B* 18, 467 (2000); F. K. Zakala, O.C. Martin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85, 3013 (2000); M. Palassini and A.P. Young, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85, 3017 (2000) J. Lamarcq, J.-P. Bouchaud, O.C. Martin, M. Mezard, *Europhys. Lett.* 58, 321 (2002); J. Lamarcq, J.-P. Bouchaud, O.C. Martin, *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 012404 (2003); M. Picco, F. Ritort, M. Sales, *cond-mat/0106592*, *cond-mat/0106554*, *Phys. Rev. B* 67 (2003) 184421; M. Palassini, F. Liers, M. Juenger, A.P. Young, *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 064413 (2003).
- ²² L. Balents and P. Le Doussal *cond-mat/0312338*, *Phys. Rev. E* 69, 061107 (2004).
- ²³ B.D.rossel and M. Kardar, *Phys. Rev. E* 52, 4841 (1995). L.V.M. Ikheev, B.D.rossel, and M. Kardar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75, 1170 (1995). B.D.rossel, *J. Stat. Phys.* 82, 431 (1996).
- ²⁴ M. Mezard, G. Parisi *J. Phys. I (France)* 1 809 (1991).
- ²⁵ L. Cugliandolo, P. Le Doussal, *cond-mat/9505112*, *Phys. Rev. E* 53 1525 (1996).
- ²⁶ L. Cugliandolo, J. Kurchan, P. Le Doussal, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 76 2390 (1996).
- ²⁷ P. Le Doussal, K.J. Wiese, *cond-mat/0109204*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89, 125702 (2002), *cond-mat/0305634*, *Phys. Rev. B* 68, 174202 (2003), *cond-mat/0406297*.
- ²⁸ D.S. Fisher *Phys. Rev. B* 31 1396 (1985)
- ²⁹ J. Vannimenus, B. Derrida *J. Stat. Phys.* 105 1 (2001).
- ³⁰ B. Derrida *Physica D* 107 186 (1997).
- ³¹ B. Derrida and H. Spohn *J. Stat. Phys.* 51 817 1988
- ³² M. Mezard, G. Parisi, M. V. Vrasoro "Spin glass theory and beyond" World Scientific Singapore (1987).
- ³³ D.A. Huse, C.L. Henley and D.S. Fisher *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56 899 (1986).
- ³⁴ M. Kardar, *Nucl. Phys. B* 290 582 (1987), L. Balents and M. Kardar, *Phys. Rev. B* 49, 13030 (1994). T. Emig and M. Kardar *cond-mat/0101247*.
- ³⁵ J.Z. Imbrie and T. Spencer, *J. Stat. Phys.* 52 609 1988
- ³⁶ E. Brunet and B. Derrida, *cond-mat/0005352* *Phys. Rev. E* 61 (2000) 67891801, *cond-mat/0005355* *Physica A* 279 (2000) 398{407}.
- ³⁷ K. Johansson, *math.PR/9910146*, *math.CO/9903134*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* 209, 437–476 (2000), Jinho Baik, Percy Deift, Kurt Johansson, *math.CO/9810105* *J. Amer. Math. Soc.* 12 (1999), no. 4, 1119{1178
- ³⁸ M. Kardar G. Parisi and Y.C. Zhang *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56 889 (1986).
- ³⁹ B. Derrida, J.L. Lebowitz, E.R. Speer, *cond-mat/0205353*
- ⁴⁰ P.L. Ferrari, M. Prahofer, H. Spohn, *cond-mat/0303162*, M. Prahofer, H. Spohn, *cond-mat/0212519*, *J. Stat. Phys.* 115 (1-2), 255-279 (2004), *math.PR/0105240*, *J. Stat. Phys.* 108 (5-6) 1071-1106 (2002), *cond-mat/0101200*, *cond-mat/9912264*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84, 4882 (2000), *cond-mat/9910273*, *Physica A* 279, 342 (2000), *cond-mat/9612209*, *Stat. Phys.* 88, 999 (1997).
- ⁴¹ P. Le Doussal and C. Monthus, *cond-mat/0204168*, *Physica A* 317 140 (2003).
- ⁴² C. Monthus and P. Le Doussal, *cond-mat/04xxxxx* and in preparation.
- ⁴³ D. Carpentier and P. Le Doussal, *cond-mat/0003281* *Physical Review E* 63 026110 (2001), H. Castillo and P. Le Doussal, *cond-mat/0006373*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86 4859 (2001).
- ⁴⁴ D.S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 56, 1964 (1986), L. Balents, D.S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* 48, 5959 (1993).
- ⁴⁵ T. Nattermann et al. *J. Phys. (Paris)* 2, 1483 (1992). O. Narayan, D.S. Fisher, *Phys. Rev. B* 46, 11520 (1992). H. Leschhorn, T. Nattermann, S. Stepanow, and L.H. Tang, *Annalen der Physik* 6, 1 (1997).
- ⁴⁶ L. Balents, J.P. Bouchaud, and M. Mezard, *J. de Phys. I* 6, 1007 (1996).
- ⁴⁷ P. Chauve, P. Le Doussal and K.J. Wiese, *cond-mat/0006056* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86 (2001) 1785, P. Le Doussal, K.J. Wiese and P. Chauve *cond-mat/0304614*, *Phys. Rev. E* 69 (2) 026112 Part 2 (2004).
- ⁴⁸ P. Le Doussal, K.J. Wiese and P. Chauve *cond-mat/0205108*, *Phys. Rev. B* 66, 174201 (2002)
- ⁴⁹ L. Balents, *Europhys. Lett.* 24, 489 (1993).
- ⁵⁰ Pascal Chauve, Thierry Giamarchi and Pierre Le Doussal, *cond-mat/9804190*, *Europhys. Lett.* 44 110 (1998).
- ⁵¹ P. Chauve, Thierry Giamarchi and Pierre Le Doussal *cond-mat/0002299*, *Phys. Rev. B* 62 (2000) 6241.
- ⁵² P. Chauve and P. Le Doussal *Phys. Rev. E* 64, 051102 (2001).
- ⁵³ L. Balents and P. Le Doussal, *cond-mat/0205358*, *Europhys. Lett.* 65, 685 (2004).
- ⁵⁴ H. Bucheli et al., *Phys. Rev. B* 57, 7642 (1998).
- ⁵⁵ P. Le Doussal, K.J. Wiese, *cond-mat/0301465*, *Phys. Rev. E* 68, 046118 (2003).
- ⁵⁶ G. Schehr, P. Le Doussal *cond-mat/0304486*, *Phys. Rev. E* 68, 046101 (2003).
- ⁵⁷ P. Le Doussal, C. Monthus, D.S. Fisher *cond-mat/9811300*, *Phys. Rev. E*, 59 4795 (1999).
- ⁵⁸ K.G. Wilson and J. Kogut, *Phys. Rep.* 12 75 (1974).
- ⁵⁹ J. Polchinski, *Nucl. Phys. B* 231 269 (1984).
- ⁶⁰ the way it is connected is itself defined by the connected replica average. We do not need to specify it here, and detailed examples are studied in Section.
- ⁶¹ it is also useful to define a more symmetric probability distribution $\hat{P}(x_1; x_2; \dots)$ that the two lowest minima are located at x_1, x_2 with energy difference of arbitrary sign, with $\hat{P}(x_1; x_2; \dots) = (P(x; x_2; \dots) + (P(x; x_1; \dots))$ being normalized to 2. The RG equation (119) is established, strictly, for \hat{P} for any d , but clearly also applies to P for any $d > 0$. The symmetry of $D(x_1; x_2) = P(x_1; x_2; \dots = 0)$ then follows if \hat{P} is continuous (which is implied by the RG equation for $x_1 \notin x_2$).
- ⁶² A. Georges and J.S. Yedidia, *J. Phys. A* 24 2173 (1991). See also A. Hazareesing, J.P. Bouchaud *cond-mat/9904172*.
- ⁶³ the condition exactly for $d = 4$ becomes $T_1 = T^2$ and all other considerations are very similar
- ⁶⁴ Although as an extra precaution one may want to distinguish $T \neq 0^+$ (studied here, $\lim_{T \rightarrow 0} \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty}$) and $T = 0$ (absolute minimum of the energy $\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \lim_{T \rightarrow 0}$), we will denote $T = 0$ everywhere below for simplicity (also, at this stage we do not see any reason why the two should differ).
- ⁶⁵ in the simplest version of the droplet theory one assumes that p is uncorrelated from $x_1; x_2$. This restriction can be lifted although it would change the amplitudes
- ⁶⁶ that $6p^2(1-p)^2 = p(1-p)$