



UNIVERSITÀ DEGLI STUDI DI ROMA
LA SAPIENZA

FACOLTÀ DI SCIENZE MATEMATICHE, FISICHE E NATURALI

PhD thesis in Physics
A.Y. 2003/2004

Universality and non{universality
in the Ashkin-Teller model

Advisors:

Prof. Giovanni Gallavotti

Prof. Vieri Mastropietro

Author:

Alessandro Giuliani

Index :

1. Introduction	7
1.1. The Ashkin-Teller model	9
1.2. Results	11
1.3. Outline of the proof	14
1.4. Summary	16
2. The Ising model exact solution	18
2.1. The multipolygon representation	18
2.2. The Grassmann integration rules	18
2.3. The Grassmann representation of the 2D Ising model with open boundary conditions	19
2.4. The Grassmann representation of the 2D Ising model with periodic boundary conditions	27
2.5. The Ising model's free energy	28
3. The Grassmann formulation of Ashkin-Teller	30
3.1. The Grassmann representation for a pair of Ising models with multispin interactions	30
3.2. The Grassmann representation for the Ashkin-Teller model	33
4. The ultraviolet integration	37
4.1. The effective interaction on scale 1	37
4.2. The integration of the fields	38
4.3. Symmetry properties	43
5. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The anomalous regime	48
5.1. Multiscale analysis	48
5.2. The localization operator	49
5.3. Renormalization	51
5.4. Analyticity of the effective potential	53
5.4. Proof of Theorem 5.1	54
6. The flow of the running coupling constants	61
6.1. The flow equations	61
6.2. Proof of Theorem 6.1	61
6.2. The flow of the renormalization constants	64
6.4. The scale h_1	65
7. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The non anomalous regime	67
7.1. Integration of the ⁽¹⁾ field	67
7.2. The localization operator	68
7.3. Renormalization for h_1	69
7.4. The integration of the scales h_2	70
7.5. Keeping h_2 finite	71
7.6. The critical points	71
7.7. Computation of h_2	72
8. The specific heat	74
9. Conclusions and open problems	78
Appendix A 1. Grassmann integration. Truncated expectations	79
A 1.1 Truncated expectations and some more rules	79
A 1.2 Graphical representation for truncated expectations	81

Appendix A 2. The Pfaffian expansion	83
Appendix A 3. Gram {Hadamard inequality}	90
Appendix A 4. Proof of Lemma 5.3	94
Appendix A 5. Proof of (5.42)	95
Appendix A 6. Vanishing of the Beta function	96
A 6.1. The reference model	96
A 6.2. The Dyson equation	97
A 6.3. Ward identities and the first addend of (A 6.8)	99
A 6.4. The first correction identity	102
A 6.5. Ward identities and the second addend in (A 6.8)	108
A 6.6. Proof of (A 6.95)	112
Appendix A 7. The properties of $D_1(p)^{-1}C_1(k;k-p)$	127
Appendix A 8. Proof of Lemma 7.3	129
Appendix A 9. Independence from boundary conditions	131
Acknowledgments	132
References	133

1. Introduction.

Two dimensional classical spin systems play a very special role in statistical mechanics, in providing the simplest non trivial examples of systems undergoing a phase transition.

The first of these models to be extensively studied was the Ising model, [Pe] [D] [Ka49] [KO] [Ya] whose importance relies in the fact that it first gave firm and quantitative indications that a microscopic short range interaction can produce phase transitions which deeply differ from that described by mean field approximation.

In the Ising model many detailed informations about the microscopic structure of the phases in the low or high temperature regime can be obtained by perturbative techniques (cluster expansion [Ru63] [GM 68] [D] [Ru69]), by correlation inequalities [Gr] [FKG] [Le74] and by probabilistic methods (e.g. the "infinite cluster" method [Ru79] [A] [80] [Hil]) and some of the critical properties can be deduced by combination of the previous techniques together with the use of "infrared bounds" [Fr] [A] [82]. However, most of the results about the behaviour of thermodynamic functions near the critical temperature rely on the exact solution, first obtained by Onsager and after him reproduced in many different independent ways [KO] [KWa] [SML] [H] [S].

The Ising model in zero magnetic field is solvable in a very strong sense: it can be exactly mapped into a system of free fermions [SML] [H] [S] and, as a consequence, not only one can calculate the free energy and the magnetization, but exact formulae for many important spin correlation functions can be derived, and the asymptotic behaviour for large distances of some of them can be exactly computed¹. For instance the energy (energy correlation functions can be computed, as well as the asymptotic behaviour of the spin-spin correlation function [MPW] [BMW] [TM] [WMTB] [MW] and of some multi-spin correlation functions, when we let the relative distances of the positions of the spins diverge in some special way and directions (e.g. along the same horizontal line [Ka69]).

These results allow to calculate the critical exponents, as defined in the usual scaling theory of critical phenomena, and to verify that, even if the scaling laws are all satisfied, as expected, the 2D Ising model exponents are different from those expected from Curie-Weiss theory: one says that the Ising model belongs to a different universality class.

The development of Renormalization Group [Ka66] [DJC] [Sy] [W 1] [W 2] [WF], starting from the end of the 60's, clarified the concept of universality class, and gave a fundamental explanation to the phenomenological expectation that different models, even describing completely different physical situations, could show the same critical behaviour, in the sense that their critical exponents are the same (if one suitably identifies the corresponding thermodynamic functions in the two systems). In the context of statistical mechanics, it became clear that two systems, with the same symmetries and with interactions differing only by irrelevant terms have correlation functions that, at the critical point, show the same asymptotic behaviour in the limit of large distances; that is the two systems have the same critical exponents.

Independently from Renormalization Group, and approximately at the same time, a new important branch of statistical mechanics arose, that of exactly solvable models, for a review see [Ba82]. In this context, and more specially in that of 2D spin systems, many explicit examples were constructed of new and unexpected universality classes, different from Ising's. We refer in particular to two dimensional 6 vertex

¹ It must be stressed that these informations cannot be trivially derived from the exact expression of the free energy, and hard work together with amazing algebraic cancellations are needed for the computation of the asymptotics of correlation functions, even for the "simple" spin-spin correlation function along the same horizontal line, see [MW].

8 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

(6V) and 8 vertex (8V) models². The class of 6V models includes the ice model, first solved by Lieb [L1], the F model and the KDP model, solved in rapid succession after the ice model exact solution [L2][L3][Su]; see [LW] for a review on the 6V models. The Lieb's solution was a breakthrough in statistical mechanics, both because it first showed the existence of exactly solvable models other than Ising itself, and because concretely showed the existence of many new universality classes different from Ising's in the context of 2D spin systems. The latter point was of great importance for the development of the theory of critical phenomena: in fact at the time of the solution of the ice model the universality theory of critical point singularity was not yet developed in its final form. So, when Renormalization Group approach arose around 1969, the 6V models appeared as a counterexample to the universality that Renormalization Group was supposed to predict: depending on the specific choices of the energies assigned to the different vertex configurations one could find different values for the critical exponents.

This fact, not well understood at the beginning by a fundamental point of view, was dismissed by the theoretical physics community on the grounds that the 6V models are spin model "with constraints" (see footnote 2), that is too pathological to be well described by the universality theory of critical phenomena.

However the deep meaning of Lieb's counterexamples was made clear by Baxter's exact solution of the 8V model, contained in a series of papers from 1971 to 1977 [Ba]³: it made clear to everybody that the 6V models could not be considered as pathological counterexamples. As remarked in footnote 2, 8V models are genuine short range Ising models with finite interaction and one can for instance consider a path in the parameters space continuously linking two 6V models defined by different choices of the energies associated with the vertex configurations. The remarkable result following by the 8V solution is that along this path the 8V critical exponents change continuously, and continuously connect those of the two different 6V models.

This observation was crucial and led to a much better understanding of the theories that were put forward to explain critical phenomena, first among all Renormalization Group itself. In modern language the solution of the above "paradoxes" relies on the fact that the 6V and 8V models with different choices of parameters differ by marginal terms: however this fact is not apparent in the original spin variable, and in order to realize this one has to reformulate all these models as suitable field theory models (that is not an easy task).

Even if many important informations about the thermodynamics of vertex models can be found from their exact solution, these models are exactly solvable in a sense much weaker than that of Ising.

The 6V models are solvable by Bethe ansatz, that is by assuming that the eigenvector of the transfer matrix with largest eigenvalue is a linear combination of plane waves; and calculating the coefficients of the linear combination by solving a (complicated) integral equation. This allows to find an exact expression for the free energy $f(\beta; E)$, as a function of the temperature β^{-1} and of an external electric field E (so that by computing the derivatives of f w.r.t. E one can study the critical behaviour of the electric response function); but nothing can be said about more complicated correlation functions, it is not even possible to write formal expression for them.

The solution of the 8V model is even more involved and sophisticated and is based on a reformulation of the problem of calculating the free energy into the problem of solving a set of coupled elliptic integral equations (the so called Yang{Baxter triangle{star equations). Also in this case it is not possible to find

² The vertex models are defined by associating a direction to each of the bonds linking the sites of a 2D lattice; and by allowing only a few configurations of the arrows entering or exiting a lattice site. In the 6V (8V) models only 6 (8) different configurations are allowed at each site, and different energies are assigned to each allowed configuration. The 8V model can be easily mapped into 2D spin models, described by two Ising layers, coupled by a 4 spin interaction. The 6V models can be obtained from the spin description of 8V by letting the coupling constants tending to infinity in some specific way (they can be considered as Ising models "with constraints").

³ Baxter's solution represents one of the major achievements of mathematical physics in the 1970's: it introduced for the first time in theoretical physics the use of triangle{star equations and of corner transfer matrix, which are nowadays fundamental tools for the study of quantum groups and integrable systems.

(even formal) expressions for generic correlation functions, but only the free energy as a function of some thermodynamic parameters can be calculated, so that only informations about special low order correlation functions can be obtained.

Relying the solutions of 6V and 8V on the explicit analytic solution of special integralequations, it is not surprising that even small and apparently harmless modifications (from the Renormalization Group point of view) of these models completely destroy their integrability. Also, the exact solutions do not give any information about the thermodynamic behaviour of systems obtained as small perturbations of 6V and 8V.

On the other hand one can hope that many relevant properties of the integrable models are quite robust under perturbations. Indeed, on the basis of operator algebra and scaling theory, it was conjectured since a long time that a universality property holds for Ising, in the sense that by adding to it, for instance, a next to nearest neighbor interaction, the critical indexes remain unchanged. A similar universality property was conjectured for the 8V model. By scaling theory arguments, Kadano [Ka77] found evidence that 8V is in the same class of universality of the Ashkin-Teller model⁴, in the sense that the critical exponents are the same, if one suitably identifies the coupling constants. Further evidence for this conclusion was given in [PB], by second order Renormalization Group, and in [LPJN], by a heuristic mapping of both the 8V and the Ashkin-Teller models into the massive Luttinger model, a not integrable model describing massive interacting fermions on the continuum in 1+1 dimensions.

As suggested by the previous discussion, the natural method to relate non-integrable models to integrable ones is given by Renormalization Group (RG). This was realized long ago, but the main open problem in this context was to implement RG in a rigorous way; and, even at a heuristic level, to understand in a detailed and quantitative way from the RG point of view how the crossovers between the different universality classes are realized, when one let continuously vary the strength of the coupling constants defining the interaction among spins.

In this dissertation we want to describe a constructive method for studying thermodynamic and correlation functions at the critical point for a wide class of two dimensional classical spin systems, obtained as perturbations of the Ising model, including the next to nearest neighbor Ising, the 8V model and Ashkin-Teller. The method was first introduced in [PS] and [M] and is based on an exact mapping of the spin model into a model of interacting spinless fermions in 1+1 dimensions and on the implementation of constructive fermionic Renormalization Group methods for the construction of the effective potential and of the correlation functions. The constructive fermionic Renormalization Group methods we apply were developed by the Roma's school in the last decade [BG1][BGPS][BOM][GS][BM] and are technically based on the so-called functional renormalization group, developed in the 1980's starting from [Po][GN], see [G1][BG] for reviews.

We will apply the method to the analysis of the critical behaviour of the specific heat C_v in the Ashkin-Teller model and we will rigorously prove an old conjecture by Baxter and Kadano about the critical behaviour of Ashkin-Teller (AT), in correspondence of different choices of the parameters defining the model (the interlayer interaction and the anisotropy $J^{(1)} - J^{(2)}$, see (1.1)). We shall study in detail how the crossover between the different universality classes is realized when we let $J^{(1)} - J^{(2)} \rightarrow 0$ and how the location of the critical points is renormalized by the interaction ϕ , in the region of small ϕ .

1.1. The Ashkin-Teller model.

The Ashkin-Teller model [AT] was introduced as a generalization of the Ising model to a four component system; in each site of a bidimensional lattice there is a spin which can take four values, and only nearest neighbor spins interact. The model can be also considered a generalization of the four state Potts model to which it reduces for a suitable choice of the parameters.

⁴ Ashkin-Teller (AT) is defined as a pair of Ising layers coupled via a four spin plaquette interaction, different from that of 8V; AT is not integrable and, in correspondence of some special choices of its parameters, it reduces to Ising and to the 4 states Potts model.

10 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

A very convenient representation of the Ashkin-Teller model is in terms of Ising spins [F]: given a square sublattice $M \subset \mathbb{Z}^2$ of side M , one associates at each site $x \in M$ two kinds of Ising spins, $\sigma_x^{(1)}, \sigma_x^{(2)}$, assuming two possible values ± 1 . The AT Hamiltonian is assumed to be:

$$H_M^{AT} = \sum_{\langle x,y \rangle \in M} \left[J^{(1)} \sigma_x^{(1)} \sigma_y^{(1)} + J^{(2)} \sigma_x^{(2)} \sigma_y^{(2)} + \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{x \in M} K_i \sigma_x^{(i)} \right] \quad (1.1)$$

where x,y are nearest neighbor sites and the last identity is a definition for H_M^{AT} . Periodic boundary conditions will be assumed throughout the work.

The case in which the two Ising subsystems are identical $J^{(1)} = J^{(2)}$ is called isotropic, the opposite case anisotropic.

When the coupling $K_i = 0$, Ashkin-Teller (AT) reduces to two independent Ising models and it has of course two critical temperatures if $J^{(1)} \neq J^{(2)}$.

When $J^{(1)} = J^{(2)} = J$, AT reduces to the four states Potts model.

We shall study the case $J^{(i)} > 0, i = 1, 2$, that is the case in which the two Ising subsystems are ferromagnetic.

AT is a model for a number of 2d magnetic compounds: for instance layers of atoms and molecules adsorbed on clean surfaces, like selenium on nickel, molecular oxygen on graphite, atomic oxygen on tungsten; and layers of oxygen atoms in the basal CuO plane of some cuprates, like $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_x$, are believed to constitute physical realizations of the AT model [DR][Bak][Bar]. Theoretical results on AT can give detailed informations on the critical behaviour and the phase diagrams of such systems, which can be experimentally measured by means of electron diffraction techniques.

Also, as explained in previous section, the importance of AT is in providing a conceptual laboratory in which the highly non trivial phenomenon of phase transitions can be understood quantitatively in a relatively manageable model; in particular it has attracted great theoretical interest because is a simple and non trivial generalization of the Ising and four-state Potts models, showing a rich variety of critical behaviours, depending on the choices of the parameters $J^{(i)}$ and K_i in (1.1). AT is not exactly solvable, except in the trivial $K_i = 0$ case, and it has great theoretical interest to develop techniques that, without any use of exact solutions, could allow to understand the AT critical behaviour. In fact exact solutions are quite rare and generally peculiar of low dimensions, while RG methods are expected to work in much more general situations: then it is important to refine RG techniques in a simple but non trivial playground, as that offered by AT.

The thermodynamic behaviour of the anisotropic AT model is not well understood even at a heuristic level. What is "known" is mainly based on conjectures, suggested by scaling theory, and on numerics.

A first conjecture, proposed by Wu and Lin [WL], concerns the critical points: from the symmetries of the model, it is expected that AT, even in the interacting case (i.e. $K_i \neq 0$), has two critical temperatures for $J^{(1)} \neq J^{(2)}$ which coincide at the isotropic point $J^{(1)} = J^{(2)}$. However nothing has been proposed about the location of the critical points, even at a conjectural level.

Kadano [Ka77] and Baxter [Ba82] conjectured that the critical properties in the anisotropic and in the isotropic case are completely different; in the first case the critical behaviour should be described in terms of universal critical indices (identical to those of the 2D Ising model) while in the isotropic case the critical behaviour should be nonuniversal and described in terms of indexes which are non trivial functions of J . In other words, the AT model should exhibit a universal/nonuniversal crossover when the isotropic point is reached.

The general anisotropic case was studied numerically by Migdal [Kadano Renormalization Group [DR], Mean Field Approximation and Monte Carlo [Be], real space Renormalization Group [Bez] Transfer Matrix Finite Size Scaling [Bad]; such results give evidence of the fact that, far away from the isotropic point, AT has two critical points and belongs to the same universality class of the Ising model but give essentially no informations on the critical behaviour when the anisotropy is small. The problem of how the crossover from

universal to nonuniversal behaviour is realized in the isotropic limit remained for years completely unsolved, even at a heuristic level.

1.2. Results.

Our main results concern the analytical properties of the free energy in an interval of temperatures around the critical temperatures; and the critical behaviour of the specific heat. These thermodynamic quantities are defined in the usual way: if β is the inverse temperature, the partition function at finite volume is:

$$Z_M \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{\{s_M^{(1)}, s_M^{(2)}\}} e^{-\beta H_M^{\text{AT}}}; \quad (1.2)$$

where $f_M^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2^M} \sum_{s_M^{(i)}} g$; correspondingly, the free energy and the specific heat are defined as:

$$f = -\frac{1}{M} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M} \log Z_M; \quad C_V = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{x,y \in M} \langle H_x^{\text{AT}} H_y^{\text{AT}} \rangle_{M,T}; \quad (1.3)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_{M,T}$ denotes the truncated expectation w.r.t. the Gibbs distribution with Hamiltonian (1.1).

We find convenient to introduce the variables

$$t = \frac{t^{(1)} + t^{(2)}}{2}; \quad u = \frac{t^{(1)} - t^{(2)}}{2} \quad (1.4)$$

with $t^{(j)} = \tanh J^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2$. The parameter t has the role of a reduced temperature and u measures the anisotropy of the system. We shall consider the free energy or the specific heat as functions of $t; u$. When $u = 0$ the model (1.1) reduces to a pair of decoupled Ising models and the specific heat C_V can be immediately computed from the Ising model exact solution; the system admits two critical points, defined by

$$\tanh J^{(i)} = \frac{p-1}{2}; \quad i = 1, 2; \quad (1.5)$$

or, in terms of the parameters $t; u$ defined in (1.4):

$$t_c = \frac{p-1}{2} \pm |u|; \quad (1.6)$$

As it is well known from Ising's exact solution, near the two critical temperatures the specific heat shows a logarithmic divergence: $C_V \sim C \log |t - t_c|$, where $C > 0$.

Consider now the $\epsilon \neq 0$ case. If the anisotropy is strong the two Ising subsystems have very different critical temperatures: so, if the temperature of the coupled system is near to the critical temperature of one of the Ising subsystems, one can expect that AT is essentially equivalent to a single critical Ising model, perturbed by a small "random noise", produced by the non-critical fluctuations of the second Ising subsystem; in such a case one expects that the effect of the coupling is at most that of changing the value of the critical temperatures [PS]⁵. On the other hand if the anisotropy is small the two systems will become critical almost at the same temperature and the properties of the system could change drastically.

⁵ Note that, because of the structure of the Hamiltonian (1.1) (in which the interaction has the form of a product of bond interactions), this heuristic picture applies both to the case the non-critical Ising model is well inside the paramagnetic phase and to the case it is well inside the magnetized phase: in both cases, if the system 2 is the system far from criticality, we can rewrite $s_x^{(2)}$ as $s_x^{(2)} = m_2 + \tilde{s}_x^{(2)}$, where m_2 is the (unperturbed) magnetization of system 2, and $\tilde{s}_x^{(2)}$ is the field associated with the non-critical fluctuations of $s_x^{(2)}$ around its average value; one can then expect that the effect of the interaction of system 1 with system 2 is just that of changing the coupling $J^{(1)}$ into an effective coupling $J^{(1)} + (m_2)^2 + \tilde{J}$, where \tilde{J} is a small random noise, generated by the non-critical fluctuations of $\tilde{s}_x^{(2)}$ around its average value. Since we shall assume $J^{(1)}$ to be $O(1)$, it makes no qualitative difference whether m_2 is vanishing or not.

12 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

With the notations introduced above and calling D a sufficiently small $O(1)$ interval (i.e. with amplitude independent of ϵ) centered around $\frac{p-2}{2} - 1$, we can express our main result as follows [GM 1][GM 2].

Theorem. There exists $\epsilon > 0$ such that, if $|j| \leq \epsilon$ and $t \in D$, the AT model admits two critical points of the form :

$$t_c(\epsilon; u) = \frac{p-2}{2} - 1 + \epsilon \left(\frac{|j|}{j} \right)^{1+} (1 + O(\epsilon; u)) : \quad (1.7)$$

Here ϵ and ϵ are $O(\epsilon)$ corrections and $\epsilon = \epsilon(\epsilon) = b + O(\epsilon^2)$, $b > 0$, is an analytic function of ϵ . If $|j| \leq \epsilon$, $t \in D$ and $t \notin t_c$, the free energy and the specific heat of the model are analytic in $\epsilon; t; u$; in the same region of parameters, the specific heat C_v can be written as:

$$C_v = F_1 - 2\epsilon \log \frac{|t - t_c|}{2} + F_2 \frac{1}{\epsilon} + F_3 ; \quad (1.8)$$

where: $2\epsilon^2 = (t - t_c)^2 + (t - t_c^+)^2$; $\epsilon = a + O(\epsilon^2)$, $a \neq 0$; and F_1, F_2, F_3 are functions of $t; u$, bounded above and below by $O(1)$ constants.

A first interesting result that can be read from the Theorem is that the location of the critical points is dramatically changed by the interaction, see (1.7). The difference of the interacting critical temperatures normalized with the free one $G(\epsilon; u) = \frac{t_c^+(\epsilon; u) - t_c(\epsilon; u)}{t_c^+(0; u) - t_c(0; u)}$ rescales with the anisotropy parameter as a power law $|j|$, and in the limit $u \rightarrow 0$ it vanishes or diverges, depending on the sign of ϵ (this is because $\epsilon = b + O(\epsilon^2)$, with $b > 0$). In Fig. 1 we plot the qualitative behaviour of $G(\epsilon; u)$ as a function of u , for two different values of ϵ (i.e. we plot the function u^ϵ , with $\epsilon = 0.3; -0.3$ respectively).




Fig. 2. The behaviour of the difference G between the interacting critical temperatures normalized to the free one, for two different values of ϵ ; depending on the sign of the interaction, it diverges or vanishes in the isotropic limit.

As far as we know, the existence of the critical index $\epsilon(\epsilon)$ was not known in the literature, even at a heuristic level.

From (1.8) it follows that there is universality for the specific heat, in the sense that it diverges logarithmically at the critical points, as in the Ising model. However the coefficient of the log is anomalous: in fact if t is near to one of the critical temperatures $t_{c\pm} = \frac{1}{2}j^{\pm 1}$ so that the coefficient in front of the logarithm behaves like $j^{\frac{1}{2}(1+\epsilon)}$, with ϵ a new anomalous exponent $O(1)$; in particular it is vanishing or diverging as $u \rightarrow 0$ depending on the sign of ϵ . We can say that the system shows an anomalous universality which is a sort of new paradigmatic behaviour: the singularity at the critical points is described in terms of universal critical indexes and nevertheless, in the isotropic limit $u \rightarrow 0$, some quantities, like the difference of the critical temperatures and the constant in front of the logarithm in the specific heat, scale with anomalous critical indexes, and they vanish or diverge, depending on the sign of ϵ .

Eq (1.8) clarifies how the universality/nonuniversality crossover is realized as $u \rightarrow 0$. When $u \neq 0$ only the first term in eq (1.8) can be $\log\{\}$ singular in correspondence of the two critical points; however the logarithmic term dominates on the second one only if t varies inside an extremely small region $O(j^{\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon} e^{-c/j})$ around the critical points (here c is a positive $O(1)$ constant). Outside such region the power law behaviour corresponding to the second addend dominates. When $u \rightarrow 0$ one recovers the power law decay first found by Mastropietro [M] in the isotropic case:

$$C_v \sim F_2 \frac{1-t-t_c}{c} \quad (1.9)$$

In Fig. 2 we plot the qualitative behaviour of C_v as a function of t . The three graphs are plots of eq (1.8), with $F_1 = F_2 = 1, F_3 = 0, u = 0.01, \epsilon = 0.1; 0; -0.1$ respectively; the central curve corresponds to the case $\epsilon = 0$, the upper one to $\epsilon < 0$ and the lower to $\epsilon > 0$.




Fig. 2. The behaviour of the specific heat C_v for three different values of ϵ , showing the $\log\{\}$ singularities at the critical points; in the isotropic limit the two critical points tend to coincide, the lower curve becomes continuous while the upper develops a power law divergence.

It now worths to make some technical remarks about the Theorem above.

The first is about the range of parameters where the Theorem holds. The key hypothesis for the validity of the Theorem is the smallness of u . When $u = 0$ the critical points correspond to $t_{c\pm} = \frac{1}{2}$; hence for simplicity we restrict t in a sufficiently small $O(1)$ interval around $\frac{1}{2}$. A possible explicit choice for D , convenient for our proof, could be $D = [\frac{3(\frac{1}{2}-1)}{4}; \frac{5(\frac{1}{2}-1)}{4}]$. We expect that our technique would allow us to prove the above theorem, at the cost of a lengthier discussion, for any $t^{(1)}, t^{(2)} > 0$: of course in that

14 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin-Teller model

case we should distinguish different regions of parameters and treat in a different way the cases of low or high temperature or the case of big anisotropy (i.e. the cases $t < t_c$ or $t > t_c$ or $|J| > 1$).

The second remark is about the analyticity of the specific heat. It is claimed that C_v is analytic in $t; u$ outside the critical line. However, this is not apparent from (1.8), because β is non analytic in u at $u = 0$ (of course the bounded functions F_j are non analytic in u also, in a suitable way compensating the non analyticity of β). We get to (1.8) by interpolating two different asymptotic behaviours of C_v in the regions $|t - \bar{t}_c| < 2|J|^{1/2}$ and $|t - \bar{t}_c| > 2|J|^{1/2}$, where \bar{t}_c is the average point between t_c^+ and t_c^- ; then, the non analyticity of β is introduced "by hands" by our estimates and it is not intrinsic for C_v . (1.8) is simply a convenient way to describe the crossover between different critical behaviours of C_v .

Finally, it must be stressed that we do not study the free energy directly at $t = t_c(u)$, therefore in order to show that $t = t_c(u)$ is a critical point we must study some thermodynamic property like the specific heat by evaluating it at $t \neq t_c(u)$ and $M = 1$ and then verify that it has a singular behavior as $t \rightarrow t_c$. The case t precisely equal to t_c cannot be discussed at the moment with our techniques, in spite of the uniformity of our bounds as $t \rightarrow t_c$. The reason is that we write the AT partition function as a sum of 16 different partition functions, differing for boundary terms. Our estimates on each single term are uniform up to the critical point; however, in order to show that the free energy computed with one of the 16 terms is the same as the complete free energy, we need to stay at $t \neq t_c$: in this case boundary terms are suppressed as $e^{-M|t - t_c|} \rightarrow 0$, as $M \rightarrow 1$. If we stay exactly at the critical point cancellations between the 16 terms can be present (as it is well known already from the Ising model exact solution [MW]) and we do not have control on the behaviour of the free energy, as the infinite volume limit is approached. We believe that this is a purely technical difficulty and that it could be solved by a more detailed analysis of the cancellations among the different terms appearing in the Ising's partition function. Another possibility to study AT directly at the critical point would be to adapt our method to the case of open boundary conditions (where even in the fermionic representation the free energy can be written as the logarithm of a single partition function). The interest of studying the model directly at criticality is linked to the possibility of explicitly studying the finite size corrections to the correlation functions and the approach to their conformal limit.

1.3. Outline of the proof.

The proof of the Theorem above is based on a multiscale analysis of the free energy and of the generating function of the energy-energy correlation functions.

The first step to set up the Renormalization Group machinery is finding a convenient field theory which gives an equivalent description of our spin system. We give a fermionic representation of the theory, following the same strategy of [PSM]. We start from the well known representation of the Ising model free energy in terms of a sum of Pfaffians [MW] which can be equivalently written (see Ref. [DJ]) as Grassmann functional integrals, formally describing massive non interacting Majorana fermions $\psi, \bar{\psi}$ on a lattice with action

$$S = \sum_x \frac{t}{4} (\partial_1 \psi_x - i \partial_0 \bar{\psi}_x) (\partial_1 \bar{\psi}_x + i \partial_0 \psi_x) - 2i \sum_x (\partial_1 + \partial_0) \psi_x + i \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1 \right) t \sum_x \bar{\psi}_x \psi_x; \quad (1.10)$$

where ∂_j are discrete derivatives; criticality corresponds to the massless case. If $t = 0$ the free energy and specific heat of the AT model can be written as sum of Grassmann integrals describing two kinds of Majorana fields, with masses $m^{(1)} = t^{(1)} \frac{p}{2} + 1$ and $m^{(2)} = t^{(2)} \frac{p}{2} + 1$.

If $t \neq 0$ again the free energy and the specific heat can be written as Grassmann integrals, but the Majorana fields are interacting with a short range potential. By performing a suitable change of variables [DJPSM] and integrating out the ultraviolet degrees of freedom, the effective action can be written as

$$Z_1 = \int \prod_x d\psi_x d\bar{\psi}_x \exp \left[\sum_x \frac{t}{4} (\partial_1 \psi_x - i \partial_0 \bar{\psi}_x) (\partial_1 \bar{\psi}_x + i \partial_0 \psi_x) - 2i \sum_x (\partial_1 + \partial_0) \psi_x + i \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1 \right) t \sum_x \bar{\psi}_x \psi_x + W_1 \right] \quad (1.11)$$

where ψ^\dagger is a creation (annihilation) index and i is a quasi-particle index. ψ and ψ^\dagger have the role of two masses and it holds $\psi = O(t^{-\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon}) + O(\epsilon)$, $\psi^\dagger = O(u)$. W_1 is a sum of monomials of arbitrary order, with kernels which are analytic functions of ψ ; analyticity is a very nontrivial property obtained exploiting anticommutativity properties of Grassmann variables via Gram inequality for determinants [Le] [GPS]. The ψ are Dirac fields, which are combinations of the Majorana variables $\psi^{(j)}$; $\bar{\psi}^{(j)}$, $j = 1, 2$, associated with the two Ising subsystems.

One can compute the partition function by expanding the exponential of the action in Taylor series in ψ and naively integrating term by term the Grassmann monomials, using the Wick rule; however such a procedure gives poor bounds for the coefficients of this series that, in the thermodynamic limit, can converge only far from the critical points.

In order to study the critical behaviour of the system we perform a multiscale analysis involving non trivial resummations of the perturbative series. The first step is to decompose the propagator $\hat{g}(k)$ as a sum of propagators more and more singular in the infrared region, labeled by an integer $h \geq 1$, so that $\hat{g}(k) = \sum_{h=1}^{\infty} \hat{g}^{(h)}(k)$, $\hat{g}^{(h)}(k) \sim k^{-h}$. We compute the Grassmann integrals defining the partition function by iteratively integrating the propagators $\hat{g}^{(1)}; \hat{g}^{(0)}; \dots$. After each integration step we rewrite the partition function in a way similar to the last equation, with $Z_h; \psi_h; \bar{\psi}_h; W_h$ replacing $Z_1; \psi_1; \bar{\psi}_1; W_1$, in particular the masses m_h and the wave function renormalization Z_h are modified through the iterative scheme; the structure of the action is preserved because of symmetry properties; moreover W_h is shown to be a sum of monomials of arbitrary order, with kernels decaying in real space on scale k^{-h} , which are analytic functions of ψ_h ; if k are small enough, $k \ll m_h$, and $j_k j^{-k}; j_k j^{-k} \ll 1$; again analyticity follows from Gram (Hadamard) type of bounds.

All the above construction is based on the crucial property that the effective interaction at each scale does not increase: $j_h j^{-2} \leq j_j$. This property is highly non trivial and at a first naive analysis it even seems false. In fact the effective coupling constants j_h obey a complicated set of recursive equations, whose right hand side is called, as usual, the Beta function. The Beta function can be written as sum of two terms; the first term is common to a wide class of models, including the Luttinger model, the Thirring model, the Holstein-Hubbard model for spinless fermions, the Heisenberg XYZ spin chain, the 8 vertex model; the other term is model dependent. The first term is dimensionally marginal, that is it tends to let the effective coupling constants grow logarithmically. But, if one could show that it is exactly vanishing, then the flow of the running coupling constants in all the above models could be controlled just by dimensional bounds, and the expansion would be convergent; the observables would then be expressed by explicit convergent series from which all the physical information can be extracted.

In the years two different strategies have been followed to prove the vanishing of the Beta function in the above sense. The first one, proposed by Benfatto and Gallavotti [BG1] and proved in [BoM] [BM2], consists of an indirect argument, based on the fact that the first term of the Beta function (the one that is common to the class of models listed above) is the same as that one obtained from a multiscale analysis of the Luttinger model, that is an exactly solvable model [ML]; by contradiction, one shows that the Beta function must be vanishing, otherwise the correlation functions obtained by the multiscale integration would not coincide with the correlations which can be exactly computed from Luttinger's exact solution.

Very recently Benfatto and Mastropietro [BM1] proposed a new proof of the vanishing of the Beta function, completely independent from any exact solution and based on a rigorous implementation of Ward identities. Ward identities play a crucial role in Quantum Field Theory and Statistical Mechanics, as they allow to prove cancellations in a non perturbative way. The advantage of reducing the analysis of Ashkin-Teller to a fermionic model like that in (1.11) is that such model can be written as the sum of a term formally verifying many symmetries which were not verified by AT, e.g. total gauge invariance symmetry $\psi_x; \bar{\psi}_x; e^{i\phi} \psi_x; \bar{\psi}_x$ and chiral gauge invariance $\psi_x; \bar{\psi}_x; e^{i\phi} \psi_x; \bar{\psi}_x$; plus mass terms and higher order corrections which are weighted by small constants. The first term has an associated beta function that is vanishing, as it can be

16 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin-Teller model

proved through Ward identities following from its gauge invariance⁶; the second term produces summable corrections to the Beta functions, which are specific of Ashkin-Teller. One says that the symmetries used to prove the vanishing of the Beta function are hidden in the spin models, as they are not verified even at a formal level; however they are exactly realized by a model that is "close", in an RG sense, to Ashkin-Teller.

So, we use the argument of [BM 1] together with a detailed analysis of the structure of the perturbative expansion to prove that ϕ_h stays small under the multiscale integration. Once this is established, we show that $\phi_h; \psi_h; Z_h$, under the iterations, evolve as: $\phi_h' = 1 - b_2 \phi_h$, $\psi_h' = 1 - b_2 \psi_h$, $Z_h' = b_1^{-2} \phi_h$, with b_1, b_2 explicitly computable in terms of a convergent power series.

We then perform the iterative integration described above up to a scale h_1 such that $(j_{h_1} + j_{h_1}) \phi_{h_1} = O(1)$. For scales lower than h_1 we return to the description in terms of the original Majorana fermions $(\psi^{(1)}; \psi^{(2)})$ associated with the two Ising subsystems. One of the two fields (say $\psi^{(1)}$) is massive on scale h_1 (so that the Ising subsystem with $j = 1$ is "far from criticality" on the same scale); then we can integrate the massive Majorana field $\psi^{(1)}$ without any further multiscale analysis, obtaining an effective theory of a single Majorana field with mass $j_{h_1} - j_{h_1}$ which can be arbitrarily small; this is equivalent to say that on scale h_1 we have an effective description of the system as a single perturbed Ising model with anomalous parameters near criticality. The integration of the scales h_1 is performed again by a multiscale decomposition similar to the one just described; an important feature is however that there are no more quartic marginal terms, because the anticommutativity of Grassmann variables forbids local quartic monomials of a single Majorana fermion. This greatly simplifies the analysis of the flow of the effective coupling constants, which is convergent, as it follows just by dimensional estimates. Criticality is found when the effective mass on scale 1 is vanishing; the values of $t; u$ for which this happens are found by solving a non trivial implicit function problem.

Technically it is an interesting feature of this problem that there are two regimes in which the system must be described in terms of different fields: a first one in which the natural variables are Dirac Grassmann variables, and a second one in which they are Majorana; the scale h_1 separating the two regimes is dynamically generated by the iterations. In the first regime the two entangled Ising subsystems are undistinguishable, the natural description is in terms of Dirac variables and the effective interaction is marginal; in the integration of such scales nonuniversal indexes appear and hidden Ward identities must be used to control the flow of the effective coupling constants. In the second region the two Ising subsystems really look different, one appears to be (almost) at criticality and the other far from criticality on the same scale; the parameters of the two subsystems are deeply changed (in an anomalous way) by the previous integration; in this region the effective interaction is irrelevant.

1.4. Summary.

In Chap 2 we get the exact solution of Ising by rewriting the partition function as a Grassmann functional integral. This will be the starting point for the subsequent perturbative construction.

In Chap 3 we describe the Grassmann formulation of a class of interacting Ising models in two dimensions, to which the multiscale method we will subsequently describe applies. This class includes the Ashkin-Teller model and the 8V model (and models obtained as perturbations of both). The general Grassmann formulation we describe is studied in detail for the Ashkin-Teller model and for the latter we also give an

⁶ At the formal level the proof of the vanishing of the Beta function through Ward identities is well known since the 1970's [DL][DM]. However the original proof of this statement discarded in the analysis the presence of cut-offs, which necessarily break exact gauge invariance; the problem of establishing whether gauge invariance and formal Ward identities were recovered in the limit of cut-off removal was not considered by the authors of the original proof. In [BM 1] the authors first considered this problem and they proved that actually the Ward identities found after the removal of the cut-off are different from the formal ones: this is the phenomenon of chiral anomaly, well known in the context of similar models used in Relativistic Quantum Field Theory, e.g. the Schwinger model [ZJ].

alternative Grassmann formulation that will be convenient in the following.

In Chap.4 we describe how to integrate out the ultraviolet degrees of freedom and we compute the effective action for the infrared part of the problem. We also study in detail the symmetry properties of our model, and we classify the terms that can possibly appear in the theory by symmetry reasons.

In Chap.5 we describe the multiscale analysis in the first regime of scales, where the system is described in terms of Dirac fields. In particular, this Chapter includes the definition of localization and a detailed analysis of the dimensional improvements that must be used to control the size of some contributions that, even if apparently marginal, can be shown to be effectively irrelevant.

In Chap.6 we study the flow of the running coupling constants, using the bounds previously derived in Chap. 5 and the vanishing of the Beta function.

In Chap.7 we describe the multiscale analysis in the second regime of scales, where the system is described in terms of a single Majorana field. We solve the equation for the scale h_1 dividing the first and the second regime and the equation for the critical temperatures.

In Chap.8 we describe the expansion for the energy {energy correlation functions and we complete the proof of the main Theorem.

In the remaining Appendices we collect a number of technical lemmas needed for the proof of the main Theorem. In particular in Appendix A 6 we reproduce the proof of the vanishing of the Beta function, following [BM 1].

So, let's start.

2. The Ising model exact solution.

In this section we want to describe the Ising model exact solution, in a way that will be convenient for the subsequent perturbative analysis of the Ashkin-Teller model. We shall mainly follow the work of Samuel [5].

The Ising model partition function on a square lattice $M = Z^2$, where M is the side of the square, is defined as:

$$Z_I = \sum_{\{s_i\}} e^{J \sum_{\langle i,j \rangle} s_i s_j} \quad (2.1)$$

where $\langle i,j \rangle$ are nearest neighbor sites and J is the inverse temperature. We first consider open boundary conditions and, after that, the more complicated case of periodic boundary conditions.

2.1. The multipolygon representation.

It is well known that the partition function (2.1) is equivalent to the partition function of a gas of multipolygons with hard core. This representation was originally introduced to study the geometry of the microscopic configurations in the hot phase, and can be obtained as follows.

One first rewrites the sum appearing at the exponent in (2.1) as $\sum_b \tilde{s}_b$, where \tilde{s}_b is the sum over the bonds linking nearest neighbor sites of M and \tilde{s}_b is the product of the spin variables over the two extremes of b . If we expand the exponential in power series we find:

$$Z_I = \sum_{\{s_i\}} \sum_b (\cosh J + \tilde{s}_b \sinh J) = (\cosh J)^B \sum_{\{s_i\}} \sum_b (1 + \tilde{s}_b \tanh J) \quad (2.2)$$

where B is the number of bonds of M . Developing the product, we are led to a sum of terms of the type:

$$(\tanh J)^k \tilde{s}_{b_1} \dots \tilde{s}_{b_k} \quad (2.3)$$

and we can conveniently describe them through the geometric set of lines b_1, \dots, b_k . If we perform the summation over the configurations $\{s_i\}$, many terms of the form (2.3) give vanishing contribution. The only terms which survive are those in which the vertices of the geometric figure $b_1 \cup b_2 \cup \dots \cup b_k$ belong to an even number of b_j 's. These terms are those such that $\tilde{s}_{b_1} \dots \tilde{s}_{b_k} \sim 1$ and we shall call these geometric figures multipolygons. Let $P_k(M)$ be the number of multipolygons with k sides on the sublattice M . Then the partition function (2.1) is easily rewritten as:

$$Z_I = (\cosh J)^B 2^{M^2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} P_k(M) (\tanh J)^k \quad (2.4)$$

If open boundary conditions are assumed, only multipolygons not winding up the lattice are allowed. In the case of periodic boundary conditions the representation is the same, but the polygons are allowed to wind up the lattice.

2.2. The Grassmann integration rules.

In this section we introduce some basic definitions about Grassmann integration. We will need them to reinterpret (2.4) as a Grassmann functional integral.

Let us consider a finite dimensional Grassmann algebra, which is a set of anticommuting Grassmann variables $f^+; g$, with an index belonging to some finite set A . This means that

$$f^+ f^+ = 0; \quad g g = 0; \quad f^+ g + g f^+ = 0; \quad f^+ f^+ = 0; \quad g g = 0; \quad f^+ g + g f^+ = 0; \quad f^+ f^+ = 0; \quad g g = 0; \quad f^+ g + g f^+ = 0; \quad (2.5)$$

2. The Ising model exact solution. 19

in particular $(\sigma_i^z)^2 = 0.8 - 2A$ and $8 = \dots$.

Let us introduce another set of Grassmann variables $d_i^{\pm}; d_i^{\pm} \in \mathbb{R}, 2A$, anticommuting with $\sigma_i^{\pm}; \sigma_i^{\pm} \in \mathbb{R}$, and an operation (Grassmann integration) defined by

$$\int d_i^{\pm} = 1; \quad \int d_i^{\pm} = 0; \quad \int d_i^2 A; \quad \int 1 = 1: \quad (2.6)$$

If $F(\sigma_i^{\pm})$ is a polynomial in $\sigma_i^{\pm}; \sigma_i^{\pm} \in \mathbb{R}, 2A$, the operation

$$\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} F(\sigma_i^{\pm}) \quad (2.7)$$

is simply defined by iteratively applying (2.6) and taking into account the anticommutation rules (2.5). It is easy to check that for all $2A$ and $C \in \mathbb{C}$

$$\frac{\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+C} d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm}}{\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+C}} = C^{-1}; \quad (2.8)$$

in fact $e^{+C} = 1 + C$ and by (2.6)

$$\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+C} = C; \quad (2.9)$$

while

$$\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+C} = 1: \quad (2.10)$$

If one considers Grassmann variables whose quadratic action is not diagonal, one finds the generalizations of the above formulas, e.g.

$$\frac{\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+M_{ij} \sigma_i^{\pm} \sigma_j^{\pm}}}{\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+M_{ij} \sigma_i^{\pm} \sigma_j^{\pm}}} = [M^{-1}]_{00}; \quad (2.11)$$

with M an $N \times N$ complex matrix. Again (2.11) can be easily verified by using (2.6) and the anticommutation rules (2.5), which also allow us to write

$$\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+M_{ij} \sigma_i^{\pm} \sigma_j^{\pm}} = \det M \quad (2.12)$$

and

$$\int d_i^{\pm} d_i^{\pm} e^{+M_{ij} \sigma_i^{\pm} \sigma_j^{\pm}} = M_{00}^{-1}; \quad (2.13)$$

if M_{00}^{-1} is the minor complementary to the entry M_{00} .

The above formulas closely remind us the Gaussian integrals: note however that there is no need that M is real or positive defined (but of course they have to be invertible).

For the moment this is all we need for the Grassmann formulation of the Ising model. More algebraic properties of the Grassmann integration can be found in Appendix A1.

2.3. The Grassmann representation of the 2d Ising model with open boundary conditions.

In order to represent the sum over multipolygons in (2.4) as a Grassmann integral, we first associate to each site $x \in \mathbb{Z}^2_M$, a set of four Grassmann variables, $\overline{H}_x; H_x; \overline{V}_x; V_x$, that must be thought as associated to four

Fig. 3. The four Grassmann fields associated to the sites x and y .

new sites drawn very near to x and to its right, left, up side, down side respectively, see Fig 3. We shall denote these sites by $R_x; L_x; U_x; D_x$ respectively.

If $t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \tanh J$, we consider the action

$$S(t) = t \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \left(\bar{H}_x H_{x+\hat{e}_1} + \bar{V}_x V_{x+\hat{e}_0} \right) + \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \left(\bar{H}_x H_x + \bar{V}_x V_x + \bar{V}_x \bar{H}_x + V_x \bar{H}_x + H_x \bar{V}_x + V_x H_x \right); \quad (2.14)$$

where $\hat{e}_1; \hat{e}_0$ are the coordinate versors in the horizontal and vertical directions, respectively. Open boundary conditions are assumed. We claim that the following identity holds:

$$\frac{I}{2^{M^2} (\cosh J)^B} = \left(\frac{1}{2} \right)^{M^2} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \sum_{y \in \Lambda} \int d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x e^{S(t)} \quad (2.15)$$

where I in the l.h.s. is calculated using open boundary conditions. The proof of (2.15) will occupy the rest of this section.

In order to prove (2.15) we expand the exponential in the r.h.s., we integrate term by term the Grassmann variables, and we get a summation over terms that we want to put in correspondence with the terms in the summation over multipolygons of (2.4). We can do as follows. We represent every quadratic term in (2.14) with a line connecting the two sites corresponding to the two Grassmann fields. Correspondingly, we represent every term obtained by the contraction of the Grassmann variables (that is the contraction of a suitable product of the quadratic terms appearing in $S(t)$) with the union of the lines representing the contracted monomials. The figure one obtains (call it a dimer) resembles a multipolygon, and exactly coincide with a multipolygon if one shrinks the sites $R_x; L_x; U_x; D_x$ to let them coincide with x .

This graphical construction allows to put in correspondence each dimer with a unique multipolygon. We then have to show that the total weight of the dimer corresponding to the same multipolygon is exactly $(\frac{1}{2})^{M^2} t^j$, where $(\frac{1}{2})^{M^2}$ is the same factor appearing in the r.h.s. of (2.15) (note that M^2 is the number of sites of Λ) and, if j is the length of γ , t^j is the weight (2.4) assigns to γ .

We first note that the correspondence between dimers and multipolygons is not one to one, because an empty site x in the multipolygon representation corresponds to three different contractions of Grassmann fields, that is either to $\int d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x \bar{H}_x H_x \bar{V}_x V_x$, or to $\int d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x V_x \bar{H}_x H_x \bar{V}_x$, or to $\int d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x V_x H_x \bar{V}_x \bar{H}_x$. The total contribution of these three contractions is:

$$\sum_{x \in \Lambda} \int d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x (\bar{H}_x H_x \bar{V}_x V_x + V_x \bar{H}_x H_x \bar{V}_x + V_x H_x \bar{V}_x \bar{H}_x) = 1 - 1 - 1 = -1; \quad (2.16)$$

as wanted.

It is easy to realize that, unless for the above ambiguity, the correspondence between dimers and multipolygons is unique. And, since each side of a dimer is weighted by a factor t and each empty site is weighted

2. The Ising model exact solution. 21

by (1), the weights of the corresponding figures are the same, at least in absolute value. From now on we shall extract from the weight of the contribution of the empty sites together with the trivial factor t^{j_j} (that is we redefine the weight of by dividing it by $(-1)^{M^2 - n} t^{j_j}$, where n is the number of sites belonging to , possibly different from j_j if has self intersections).

We are then left with proving that the weight of a dimer (as just redefined) is exactly $(-1)^n$; in this way the sign of every configuration of dimers together with the minus signs of the empty sites, (2.16), would reproduce exactly the factor $(-1)^{M^2}$ in (2.15).

We start with considering the simplest dimer, that is the square with unit side. Let us denote its corner sites with $(0;0) = x_1, (1;0) = x_2, (1;1) = x_3, (0;1) = x_4$ and let us prove that its weight is $(-1)^4 = 1$. The explicit expression of its weight in terms of Grassmann integrals, as generated by the expansion of the exponent in (2.15) is:

$$\int \prod_{i=1}^4 d\bar{H}_{x_i} dH_{x_i} d\bar{V}_{x_i} dV_{x_i} \prod_{i=1}^4 \left(\bar{H}_{x_1} H_{x_2} - \bar{V}_{x_2} V_{x_3} - \bar{V}_{x_3} H_{x_4} - \bar{H}_{x_4} H_{x_1} \right) \quad (2.17)$$

In the previous equation, we wrote the different binomials corresponding to the segments of the dimer following the anticlockwise order, starting from \bar{H}_{x_1} . We associated a sign to each binomial, + if its fields are written in the same order as they appear in (2.14), and otherwise.

By collecting the minus signs and by permutating the position of \bar{H}_{x_1} from the first to the last position, we find that (2.17) is equal to

$$\int \prod_{i=1}^4 d\bar{H}_{x_i} dH_{x_i} d\bar{V}_{x_i} dV_{x_i} \prod_{i=1}^4 \left(H_{x_2} V_{x_2} \bar{H}_{x_2} \bar{V}_{x_2} - \bar{V}_{x_3} \bar{V}_{x_3} \bar{H}_{x_3} H_{x_3} - \bar{H}_{x_4} H_{x_4} \bar{V}_{x_4} V_{x_4} - \bar{V}_{x_1} V_{x_1} H_{x_1} \bar{H}_{x_1} \right) \quad (2.18)$$

where now we wrote separated from a dot the contributions corresponding to the same site. The explicit computation of (2.18) gives $[(-1)(-1)(+1)(-1)] = +1$, as desired.

Let us now consider a generic dimer not winding up the lattice and without self intersections, and let us prove by induction that its weight is $(-1)^n$. We will then assume that the dimers with number of sites $k < n$ have weights $(-1)^k$. The first step from which the induction starts is the case $k = 4$, that we have just considered.

Let us consider the smallest rectangle R containing . Necessarily, each side of R has non empty intersection with . Let us enumerate the corners of which are also extremes of straight segments belonging to the sides of R , starting from the leftmost among the lowest of these points (possibly coinciding with the lower left corner of R) and proceeding in anticlockwise order; call x_j the site with label j . Note that two consecutive indices $j, j+1$ could represent the same site $x_j = x_{j+1} \in M$; in that case x would be a corner of R . Call $2N$ the cardinality of the set of the enumerated points (it is even by construction) and let us identify the label $2N+1$ with the label 1.

Let us denote with the symbol $(2j-1! 2j)$, $j = 1; \dots; N$, the product of Grassmann fields corresponding to the straight line connecting the point $2j-1$ with $2j$ (not including the fields located in $2j-1$ and in $2j$), written in the anticlockwise order and with the sign induced by the expansion of the exponential in (2.15). That is, if the two fields belonging to a binomial appearing in (2.14), written following the anticlockwise order, are in the same order as they appear in (2.14), we will assign a + sign to the second of those two fields (of course, second w.r.t. the anticlockwise order); otherwise a - sign. As an example, if $2j-1$ and $2j$ are two points on the upper horizontal side of R , $(2j-1! 2j)$ would be equal to

$$(-\bar{H}_{x_{2j-1}} \bar{e}_1) \bar{V}_{x_{2j-1}} e_1 V_{x_{2j-1}} e_1 H_{x_{2j-1}} e_1 \bar{H}_{x_{2j}} (e_1 \bar{H}) \bar{V}_{x_{2j}+e_1} V_{x_{2j}+e_1} H_{x_{2j}+e_1} \quad (2.19)$$

With a small abuse of notation, in the following we shall also denote with the symbol $(2j-1! 2j)$ the straight line connecting $2j-1$ with $2j$ on the polygon (i.e. the geometric object, not only the algebraic one).

22 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

Moreover, let us denote with the symbol $[2j ! 2j + 1]$, $j = 1; :::; N$, the product of Grassmann elds corresponding to the non straight line connecting the point $2j$ with $2j + 1$ (including the elds located in $2j$ and in $2j + 1$) in the order induced by the choice of proceeding in anticlockwise order and with the sign induced by the expansion of the exponential in (2.15). With a small abuse of notation we shall also denote with the same symbol $[2j ! 2j + 1]$ the corresponding line connecting $2j$ with $2j + 1$ on the polygon . The sites $2j$ and $2j + 1$ could either coincide (in that case $2j$ is a corner of R) or, if they do not, they could belong to the same side of R or to different adjacent sides of R . Let us denote with γ_j the union of $[2j ! 2j + 1]$ with the shortest path on R connecting $2j$ with $2j + 1$. The key remark is that $n_{\gamma_j} < n$ so that, by the inductive hypothesis, the weight of γ_j is $(-1)^{n_{\gamma_j}}$.

With these notations and remarks, let us calculate the weight of . We write the weight in terms of a Grassmann integral as follows:

$$\int \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x (-1)^{[2] [3] \dots [2N-1] [2N]} \quad (2.20)$$

The minus sign in front of the integral, appearing for the same reason why it appears in (2.18), is due to the permutation of the eld \bar{H}_{x_1} from the first position (that is the one one gets by expanding the exponential in (2.15), writing the Grassmann binomials starting from site 1 and proceeding in anticlockwise order) to the last one (that is the position it appears into the product $[2N ! 1]$).

By a simple explicit calculation, it is straightforward to verify that the integral of the "straight line" $(2j-1 ! 2j)$ gives a contribution $(-1)^{l_{2j-1}}$, where l_{2j-1} is the length of the segment $(2j-1 ! 2j)$ (note that $l_{2j-1}-1$ is the number of sites belonging to $(2j-1 ! 2j)$, excluding the extremities). We are left with computing the integral of the "non straight line" $[2j ! 2j+1]$. We must distinguish 12 different cases, which we shall now study in detail.

1) j and $j+1$ are distinct and they belong to the low side of R . In this case

$$[j ! j+1] = \int \prod_{x_j} d\bar{H}_{x_j} dH_{x_j} d\bar{V}_{x_j} dV_{x_j} (-1)^{[x_j V_1]} \int \prod_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{H}_{x_{j+1}} dH_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{V}_{x_{j+1}} dV_{x_{j+1}} ; \quad (2.21)$$

as it follows from the rules explained above. We did not explicitly write neither the integration elements (those appearing in the r.h.s. of (2.15)) nor the elds corresponding to the sites between the site x_j and the site x_{j+1} ; note however that the number of elds between braces is necessarily even. In order to compute (2.21) we use the inductive hypothesis, telling us that the weight of γ_j is $(-1)^{n_{\gamma_j}}$, that is, explicitly:

$$(-1)^{D_j + d_j} = \int \prod_{x_j} d\bar{H}_{x_j} dH_{x_j} d\bar{V}_{x_j} dV_{x_j} (-1)^{[x_j V_1]} \int \prod_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{H}_{x_{j+1}} dH_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{V}_{x_{j+1}} dV_{x_{j+1}}$$

In the last equation we called D_j the length of the non straight line $[j ! j+1]$ (note that D_j+1 is the number of sites belonging to $[j ! j+1]$, including both extremities), we denoted by the symbol $(j ! j+1)$ the product of Grassmannian elds corresponding to the straight line on R connecting x_j with x_{j+1} and by d_j its length (note that d_j-1 is the number of sites belonging to $(j ! j+1)$, excluding both extremities). By performing the integration over the elds in $(j ! j+1)$, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{D_j + 1} &= \int \prod_{x_j} d\bar{H}_{x_j} dH_{x_j} d\bar{V}_{x_j} dV_{x_j} (-1)^{[x_j V_1]} \int \prod_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{H}_{x_{j+1}} dH_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{V}_{x_{j+1}} dV_{x_{j+1}} \\ &= \int \prod_{x_j} d\bar{H}_{x_j} dH_{x_j} d\bar{V}_{x_j} dV_{x_j} (-1)^{[x_j V_1]} \int \prod_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{H}_{x_{j+1}} dH_{x_{j+1}} d\bar{V}_{x_{j+1}} dV_{x_{j+1}} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.21).

2) j and $j+1$ coincide with the low right corner of R . In this case

$$[j ! j+1] = \int \prod_{x_j} d\bar{H}_{x_j} dH_{x_j} d\bar{V}_{x_j} dV_{x_j} = 1 : \quad (2.22)$$

2. The Ising model exact solution. 23

3) j and $j+1$ are distinct and they belong to the low and the right sides of R , respectively. In this case

$$[j! j+1] = \int^Z H_{x_j} \overline{V_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} \overline{V_{x_j}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{j+1}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} : \quad (2.23)$$

Calling 0 the lower right corner of R , the inductive hypothesis tells us that:

$$(1)^{D_{j+d_j}} = \int^Z V_{x_j} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} (j! 0) H_0 \overline{V_0} \overline{H_0} \overline{V_0} (0! j+1) V_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{x_j}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} : \quad (2.24)$$

In the last equation we called d_j the length of the shortest path on R connecting j with $j+1$ that is the sum of the lengths of $(j! 0)$ and $(0! j+1)$. By performing the integration over the elds in $(j! 0)$, in 0 and in $(0! j+1)$ we nd:

$$\begin{aligned} (1)^{D_{j+d_j}} &= \int^Z V_{x_j} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} V_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{x_j}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} = \\ &= \int^Z V_{x_j} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} \overline{V_{x_j}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} V_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.23).

4) j and $j+1$ are distinct and they belong to the right side of R . In this case

$$[j! j+1] = \int^Z V_{x_j} \overline{V_{x_j}} \overline{H_{x_j}} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{j+1}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} : \quad (2.24)$$

The inductive hypothesis tells us that:

$$(1)^{D_{j+d_j}} = \int^Z V_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} \overline{V_{x_j}} (j! j+1) V_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} : \quad (2.25)$$

By performing the integration over the elds in $(j! j+1)$ we nd:

$$\begin{aligned} (1)^{D_{j+d_j}} &= \int^Z V_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} \overline{V_{x_j}} V_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} = \\ &= \int^Z V_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} \overline{V_{x_j}} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} V_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.24).

5) j and $j+1$ coincide with the upper right corner of R . In this case

$$[j! j+1] = \int^Z V_{x_j} \overline{V_{x_j}} \overline{H_{x_j}} H_{x_j} = 1 : \quad (2.25)$$

6) j and $j+1$ are distinct and they belong to the right and upper sides of R , respectively. In this case

$$[j! j+1] = \int^Z V_{x_j} \overline{V_{x_j}} \overline{H_{x_j}} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} H_{x_{j+1}} : \quad (2.26)$$

Calling 0 the upper right corner of R , the inductive hypothesis tells us that:

$$(1)^{D_{j+d_j}} = \int^Z V_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_j}} \overline{V_{x_j}} (j! 0) V_0 \overline{V_0} \overline{H_0} H_0 (0! j+1) (\overline{H_{x_{j+1}}}) H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V_{x_{j+1}}} H_{x_j} \overline{H_{x_{j+1}}} : \quad (2.27)$$

24 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

By perform ing the integration over the elds in $(j ! 0)$, in 0 and in $(0 ! j + 1)$ we nd:

$$\begin{aligned} (1)^{D_{j+1}} &= \int V_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} \overline{V}_{x_j} (\overline{H}_{x_{j+1}}) H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} H_{x_j} V_{x_{j+1}} = \\ &= \int V_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} \overline{V}_{x_j} H_{x_j} V_{x_{j+1}} (\overline{H}_{x_{j+1}}) H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.26).

7) j and $j + 1$ are distinct and they belong to the upper side of R . In this case

$$[j ! j + 1] = \int (\overline{H}_{x_j}) H_{x_j} \overline{V}_{x_j} V_{x_j} V_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} \overline{H}_{x_{j+1}} H_{x_{j+1}} : \quad (2.27)$$

The inductive hypothesis tells us that:

$$(1)^{D_{j+d_j}} = \int \overline{V}_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} H_{x_j} (j ! j + 1) (\overline{H}_{x_{j+1}}) H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} V_{x_j} V_{x_{j+1}} :$$

By perform ing the integration over the elds in $(j ! j + 1)$ we nd:

$$\begin{aligned} (1)^{D_{j+1}} &= \int \overline{V}_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} H_{x_j} (\overline{H}_{x_{j+1}}) H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} V_{x_j} V_{x_{j+1}} = \\ &= \int \overline{V}_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} H_{x_j} V_{x_j} V_{x_{j+1}} (\overline{H}_{x_{j+1}}) H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.27).

8) j and $j + 1$ coincide with the upper left corner of R . In this case

$$[j ! j + 1] = \int (\overline{H}_{x_j}) H_{x_j} \overline{V}_{x_j} V_{x_j} = 1 : \quad (2.28)$$

9) j and $j + 1$ are distinct and they belong to the upper and left sides of R , respectively. In this case

$$[j ! j + 1] = \int (\overline{H}_{x_j}) H_{x_j} \overline{V}_{x_j} V_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1} H_1)} H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} V_{x_{j+1}} : \quad (2.29)$$

Calling 0 the upper left corner of R , the inductive hypothesis tells us that:

$$(1)^{D_{j+d_j}} = \int \overline{V}_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} H_{x_j} (j ! 0) (\overline{H}_0) H_0 \overline{V}_0 V_0 (0 ! j + 1) (\overline{V}_{x_{j+1}}) V_{x_{j+1}} H_{x_{j+1}} V_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1} H_1)} :$$

By perform ing the integration over the elds in $(j ! 0)$, in 0 and in $(0 ! j + 1)$ we nd:

$$\begin{aligned} (1)^{D_{j+1}} &= \int \overline{V}_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} H_{x_j} (\overline{V}_{x_{j+1}}) V_{x_{j+1}} H_{x_{j+1}} V_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1} H_1)} = \\ &= \int \overline{V}_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} H_{x_j} V_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1} H_1)} (\overline{V}_{x_{j+1}}) V_{x_{j+1}} H_{x_{j+1}} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.29).

10) j and $j + 1$ are distinct and they belong to the left side of R . In this case

$$[j ! j + 1] = \int (\overline{V}_{x_j}) V_j H_{x_j} \overline{H}_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1} H_1)} H_{x_{j+1}} \overline{V}_{x_{j+1}} V_{x_{j+1}} : \quad (2.30)$$

The inductive hypothesis tells us that:

$$(-1)^{D_j + d_j} = \int_{x_j} \bar{V}_{x_j} \prod_{j \leq j+1} (\bar{V}_{x_{j+1}}) \prod_{j+1} H_{x_{j+1}} \bar{H}_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1})} :$$

By performing the integration over the fields in $(j \leq j+1)$ we find:

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{D_{j+1}} &= \int_{x_j} \bar{V}_{x_j} V_{x_j} (\bar{V}_{x_{j+1}}) V_{x_{j+1}} H_{x_{j+1}} \bar{H}_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1})} = \\ &= \int_{x_j} \bar{V}_{x_j} V_{x_j} \bar{H}_{x_j} \overline{(x_{j+1})} (\bar{V}_{x_{j+1}}) V_{x_{j+1}} H_{x_{j+1}} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.30).

11) j and $j+1$ coincide with the lower left corner of R . In this case it is necessarily $j = 2N$ and $j+1 = 1$ and we have:

$$[2N \rightarrow 1] = \int_{x_1} (\bar{V}_{x_1}) \prod_1 H_{x_1} \bar{H}_{x_1} = +1 : \quad (2.31)$$

Note that this time the result is $+1$. This "wrong" sign exactly compensates the minus sign appearing in the r.h.s. of (2.20).

12) j and $j+1$ are distinct and they belong to the left and lower sides of R , respectively. In this case it is necessarily $j = 2N$ and $j+1 = 1$ and we have

$$[2N \rightarrow 1] = \int_{x_{2N}} (\bar{V}_{x_{2N}}) \prod_{x_{2N}} H_{x_{2N}} \bar{H}_{x_{2N}} \overline{(x_1)} \prod_1 H_{x_1} \bar{H}_{x_1} : \quad (2.32)$$

Calling 0 the lower left corner of R , the inductive hypothesis tells us that:

$$(-1)^{D_N + d_N} = \int_{x_{2N}} \bar{V}_{x_{2N}} \prod_{x_{2N}} (2N \rightarrow 0) (\bar{V}_0) \prod_{H_0} H_0 \bar{H}_0 (0 \rightarrow 1) H_{x_1} \prod_1 \bar{H}_{x_1} \bar{H}_{x_{2N}} \overline{(x_1)} :$$

By performing the integration over the fields in $(2N \rightarrow 0)$, in 0 and in $(0 \rightarrow 1)$ we find:

$$\begin{aligned} (-1)^{D_N} &= \int_{x_{2N}} \bar{V}_{x_{2N}} V_{x_{2N}} H_{x_1} V_{x_1} \bar{H}_{x_1} \bar{H}_{x_{2N}} \overline{(x_1)} = \\ &= \int_{x_{2N}} \bar{V}_{x_{2N}} V_{x_{2N}} \bar{H}_{x_{2N}} \overline{(x_1)} H_{x_1} V_{x_1} \bar{H}_{x_1} \end{aligned}$$

and the last line is clearly equal to the r.h.s. of (2.29). It follows that $[2N \rightarrow 1] = (-1)^{D_N + 1}$, consistently with the result in item (11) above. Also in this case, the apparently "wrong" sign exactly compensates the minus sign appearing in the r.h.s. of (2.20).

Combining the results of previous items, we can simply say that the integration of $(2j-1 \rightarrow 2j)$ contributes to the weight of ω with $(-1)^{2j-1}$; the integration of $[2j \rightarrow 2j+1]$, with $j < N$, contributes with $(-1)^{L_{2j}+1}$ (here we defined L_{2j} to be the length of $[2j \rightarrow 2j+1]$), while $[2N \rightarrow 1]$ with $(-1)^{L_{2N}}$. Substituting these results into (2.20), we find that the weight of ω is equal to $(-1)^n$, as desired.

The above discussion concludes the proof in the case of polygons without self intersections. Let us call simple a polygon without self intersections. If ω is not simple, calling s the number of its self intersections, we can easily prove that its weight is equal to $(-1)^s$ times the product of the weights of a number of simple polygons, defined as follows. We draw ω with two colors, white and black, both the disconnected interiors




Fig. 4. The two elementary operations of disconnecting an intersection. The labels W and B mean that the corresponding regions must be coloured white and black respectively. Note that the operation of disconnecting an intersection involves the doubling of the site 0 at the center of the intersection: in the figure we call 0 and 0_1 its two copies after the disconnection.

of the polygon and its exterior, call them A_1, \dots, A_n and A_0 respectively. The drawing is done in such a way that A_0 is white and two adjacent sets A_i and A_j , $0 \leq i < j \leq n$, have different colors (we call A_i and A_j adjacent if their boundaries have a common side). Then we consider the set P of simple polygons obtained as the boundaries of the black sets, thought as completely disconnected one from the other. The "disconnection" of the boundaries of the black regions (which originally could touch each other through the corners) is realized by the elementary disconnection of the intersection elements described in Fig. 4.

We claim that the weight of Q is $(-1)^{|P|} (-1)^{n-1}$, which is the desired result (recall that P is the set of polygons obtained as boundaries of the black sets, after the disconnection described in Fig. 4). Note that the factor $(-1)^{|P|}$ in front of the product of the weights of the disconnected simple polygons is due to the doubling of the centers of the intersections, implied by our definition of disconnection, see footnote to Fig. 4.

In order to prove the claim we explicitly write the contribution from the intersection in both cases (a) and (b) of Fig. 4, and we show that it is equal to the contribution of the two corner elements on the r.h.s. of Fig. 4, unless for a minus sign, to be associated to the new site 0_1 .

The contribution of the left hand side of case (a) in Fig. 4 is:

$$\prod_{x_0} \overline{dH_{x_0}} dH_{x_0} \overline{dV_{x_0}} dV_{x_0} \prod_{x_1} \overline{H_{x_1}} H_{x_0} \prod_{x_3} \overline{H_{x_0}} H_{x_3} \prod_{x_2} \overline{V_{x_0}} V_{x_0} \prod_{x_4} \overline{V_{x_0}} V_{x_4} : \quad (2.33)$$

Multiplying (2.33) by

$$\prod_{x_1} \overline{dH_{x_0_1}} dH_{x_0_1} \overline{dV_{x_0_1}} dV_{x_0_1} \prod_{x_0_1} \overline{V_{x_0_1}} H_{x_0_1} = +1; \quad (2.34)$$

we see that it can be equivalently rewritten as

$$Z = \int \prod_{x_0} d\bar{H}_{x_0} dH_{x_0} d\bar{V}_{x_0} dV_{x_0} \prod_{x_{01}} d\bar{H}_{x_{01}} dH_{x_{01}} d\bar{V}_{x_{01}} dV_{x_{01}} \prod_{x_3} d\bar{H}_{x_3} dH_{x_3} \prod_{x_{01}} d\bar{V}_{x_{01}} dV_{x_{01}} \prod_{x_4} d\bar{V}_{x_4} dV_{x_4} : \quad (2.35)$$

Exchanging the names of the fields $\bar{V}_{x_0} \leftrightarrow \bar{V}_{x_{01}}$ and $\bar{H}_{x_0} \leftrightarrow \bar{H}_{x_{01}}$, we easily recognize that (2.35) is equal to (-1) times the contribution of the r.h.s. of case (a) in Fig. 4. The minus sign compensates the fact that after the doubling the new polygon has a site more than the original one.

The argument can be repeated in case (b), so that the proof of the claim is complete.

This concludes the proof of (2.15) in the case of open boundary conditions (i.e. in the case where polygons winding up over the lattice are not allowed).

2.4. The Grassmann representation of the 2d Ising model with periodic boundary conditions. In the case periodic boundary conditions are assumed, the representation in terms of multipolygons is the same, except for the fact that also polygons winding up over the lattice are allowed. In order to construct a Grassmann representation for the multipolygon expansion of Ising with p.b.c., let us start with considering the following expression:

$$Z = \int \prod_{x \in \Lambda} d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x e^{S_{*,*0}(t)} ; \quad (2.36)$$

where $*,*0 =$ and $S_{*,*0}(t)$ is defined by (2.14), but with different boundary conditions, i.e.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}_{x+M e_0} &= \bar{H}_x ; & \bar{H}_{x+M e_1} &= \bar{H}_x \\ H_{x+M e_0} &= H_x ; & H_{x+M e_1} &= H_x \end{aligned} ; \quad *,*0 = ; \quad (2.37)$$

where we recall that M is the side of the lattice Λ . Identical definitions are set for the variables V, \bar{V} . We shall say that $\bar{H}; H; \bar{V}; V$ satisfy $*,*0$ (periodic $*,*0$ (periodic) boundary conditions in vertical (horizontal) direction. Note that, unless for a sign and for the replacement $S(t) \leftrightarrow S_{*,*0}(t)$, (2.36) is the same as the r.h.s. of (2.15).

Clearly, by expanding the exponential in (2.36) and by integrating the Grassmann fields as described in previous section, we get a summation over dimers very similar to the one seen above. In particular the weights assigned to the closed polygons not winding up the lattice are exactly the same as those calculated in previous section. In this case, however, also Grassmann polygons winding up the lattice are allowed. Let us calculate the weight that (2.36) assigns to these polygons (as above we define the weight by discarding the "trivial" factors $t^{j,j}$ and $(-1)^{M^2 - n}$).

As an example, let us first calculate the contribution from the simplest polygon winding up the lattice, the horizontal straight line winding once in horizontal direction. Its weight is given by:

$$Z = \int \bar{V}_0 V_0 \bar{H}_0 H_{e_1} \bar{V}_{e_1} V_{e_1} \bar{H}_{e_1} H_{2e_1} \dots \bar{H}_{(M-1)e_1} H_{M e_1} ; \quad (2.38)$$

Now, using (2.37) we can rewrite $\bar{H}_{M e_1}$ as \bar{H}_0 . Also, permutating the field H_0 from the last position to the third one, we see that (2.38) is equal to:

$$\begin{aligned} & (-1)^0 \int \bar{V}_0 V_0 H_0 \bar{H}_0 \bar{V}_{e_1} V_{e_1} H_{e_1} \bar{H}_{e_1} \dots \bar{V}_{(M-1)e_1} V_{(M-1)e_1} H_{(M-1)e_1} \bar{H}_{(M-1)e_1} = \\ & = (-1)^0 (-1)^M = (-1)^0 (-1)^n ; \end{aligned} \quad (2.39)$$

where, in the last identity, we used that the length of the straight polygon is exactly M . Repeating the lengthy construction of previous section, it can be (straightforwardly) proven that a generic polygon winding up once in horizontal direction has a weight (as assigned by (2.36)) equal to $(\mu^0)(1)^n$. Analogously a polygon winding up once in vertical direction has a weight (as assigned by (2.36)) equal to $(\nu)(1)^n$.

Let us now consider the simplest polygon winding up h times in horizontal direction and v times in vertical direction, that is the union of h distinct horizontal lines and v distinct vertical lines each of them winding once over the lattice in horizontal or vertical direction, respectively. Repeating the same simple calculation of (2.38)-(2.39), we easily see that the weight assigned by (2.36) to is $(\mu^0)^h(\nu)^v(1)^{M(h+v)}$. Note that has $(1)^{h+v}$ self intersections, so that $n = M(h+v) - h - v$ and the weight can be rewritten as $(\mu^0)^h(\nu)^v(1)^{h-v}(1)^n$. Again, repeating the lengthy construction of previous section, it can be (straightforwardly) proven that a generic polygon winding up h times in horizontal direction and v times in vertical direction has a weight (as assigned by (2.36)) equal to $(\mu^0)^h(\nu)^v(1)^{h-v}(1)^n$.

Since the weight assigned to a generic polygon is the one just computed, which is in general different from $(1)^n$, it is clear that there exists no choice of $\mu^0 = 1$ such that (2.36) is equal to $(1)^{M^2} (2 \cosh^2 J)^{M^2}$ times \mathcal{I} , where now \mathcal{I} is the Ising model partition function in the volume M with periodic boundary conditions. However it is easy to realize that $(1)^{M^2} \mathcal{I} (2 \cosh^2 J)^{M^2}$ is equal to a suitable linear combination of the expressions in (2.36), with different choices of $\mu^0 = 1$: it holds that

$$(1)^{M^2} \frac{\mathcal{I}}{(2 \cosh^2 J)^{M^2}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu^0=1}^X \sum_{\nu=1}^Y d\bar{H}_x dH_x d\bar{V}_x dV_x (1)^{(\mu^0, \nu)} e^{S_{\mu^0, \nu}(t)}; \quad (2.40)$$

where $+, =, +, =$; $= 0$ and $+, + = 1$. In order to verify the last identity it is sufficient to verify that the weight assigned from the r.h.s. of (2.40) to each polygon is exactly $(1)^n$. If winds up the lattice h times in horizontal direction and v times in vertical direction, from the calculation above it follows that the weight assigned to by the r.h.s. of (2.40) is:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\mu^0=1}^X (1)^{(\mu^0, \nu)} (\mu^0)^h (\nu)^v (1)^{h-v} (1)^n = \\ & = \frac{1}{2} (1)^n [(1)^{h+v+hv+} + (1)^{h+v+hv+} + (1)^{h+v+hv+} + (1)^{h+v+hv+}] \end{aligned} \quad (2.41)$$

The expression between square brackets on the last line is equal to $(1)^{h+v} [(1)^{h+v} + (1)^v + (1)^h + 1]$. Now, if h and v are both even, this is equal to $(+1)[1+1+1+1] = 2$; if h is even and v is odd (or viceversa), it is equal to $(+1)[1-1+1+1] = 2$; if they are both odd, it is equal to $(-1)[1-1-1+1] = 2$. That is, (2.41) is identically equal to $(1)^n$, as wanted, and (2.40) is proven.

2.5. The Ising model's free energy

From the Grassmann representation of the Ising model partition function, it is easy to derive the well known expression for the Ising's free energy. Even if in the following we won't need it, we reproduce here the calculation, for completeness.

The unitary transformation of the Grassmann fields diagonalizing the action $S_{\mu^0, \nu}(t)$ is the following:

$$\begin{aligned} H_x &= \frac{1}{j_M} \sum_{j=2}^X \hat{H}_k e^{ikx}; & \bar{H}_x &= \frac{1}{j_M} \sum_{j=2}^X \hat{\bar{H}}_k e^{ikx}; \\ V_x &= \frac{1}{j_M} \sum_{j=2}^X \hat{V}_k e^{ikx}; & \bar{V}_x &= \frac{1}{j_M} \sum_{j=2}^X \hat{\bar{V}}_k e^{ikx}; \end{aligned} \quad (2.42)$$

where $k = (k; k_0)$ and $D_{\mu^0, \nu}$ is the set of k 's such that

$$k = \frac{2}{M} n_1 + \frac{(\mu^0 - 1)}{M} \quad k_0 = \frac{2}{M} n_0 + \frac{(\nu - 1)}{M} \quad (2.43)$$

with $M=2$, $n_0 = [(M-1)=2]$, $M=2$, $n_1 = [(M-1)=2]$, $n_0, n_1 \in \mathbb{Z}$. In terms of the new fields $\hat{H}_k; \hat{\bar{H}}_k; \hat{V}_k; \hat{\bar{V}}_k$, the action $S_{n,n_0}(t)$ can be written as:

$$S_{n,n_0}(t) = \sum_{k \in 2D_{n,n_0}} \int \hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k e^{ik} + t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k e^{ik_0} + \hat{H}_k \hat{H}_k + \hat{V}_k \hat{V}_k + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \hat{V}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{\bar{V}}_k + \hat{V}_k \hat{H}_k \quad (2.44)$$

Let us say that $k > 0$ if its first component k_0 is > 0 . Then we can rewrite (2.44) as:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k > 0} \int & \hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k e^{ik} + \hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k e^{-ik} + t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k e^{ik_0} + t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k e^{-ik_0} + \hat{H}_k \hat{H}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \\ & + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{V}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{\bar{V}}_k + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{H}_k + \hat{V}_k \hat{H}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{V}_k \\ & \sum_{k > 0} \int \hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k e^{ik} + \hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k e^{-ik} + t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k e^{ik_0} + t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k e^{-ik_0} + \hat{H}_k \hat{H}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \\ & + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{\bar{H}}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{V}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{\bar{V}}_k + \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{H}_k + \hat{V}_k \hat{H}_k + \hat{H}_k \hat{V}_k \end{aligned} \quad (2.45)$$

where $\hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k e^{ik} + \hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k e^{-ik} + t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k e^{ik_0} + t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k e^{-ik_0}$ and the matrix M_k is defined as:

$$M_k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 + te^{ik} & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ (1 + te^{-ik}) & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 + te^{ik_0} & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & (1 + te^{-ik_0}) & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.46)$$

Then, unless for a sign,

$$\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d} \int \hat{\bar{H}}_x \hat{H}_x d\hat{\bar{V}}_x d\hat{V}_x e^{S_{n,n_0}(t)} = \sum_{k > 0} \int \hat{\bar{H}}_k \hat{H}_k d\hat{\bar{H}}_k d\hat{H}_k d\hat{\bar{V}}_k d\hat{V}_k e^{t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k} e^{t \hat{\bar{V}}_k \hat{V}_k} \quad (2.47)$$

and, using (2.12), we see that the r.h.s. of (2.47) is equal $\sum_{k > 0} \det M_k$. The explicit computation of $\det M_k$ leads to:

$$\begin{aligned} \det M_k &= (1 + t^2 + 2t \cos k) (1 + t^2 + 2t \cos k_0) - 4t (\cos k + \cos k_0) - 4t^2 \cos k \cos k_0 = \\ &= (1 + t^2)^2 - 2t(1 - t^2) (\cos k + \cos k_0) : \end{aligned} \quad (2.48)$$

Now, using (2.40), we find that

$$\begin{aligned} f_{\text{Ising}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M^2} \log \int = \\ &= \log(2 \cosh^2 J) + \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dk}{2} \log f(1 + t^2)^2 - 2t(1 - t^2) (\cos k + \cos k_0) g = \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dk}{2} \log 4 \cosh^2 2J - \sinh 2J (\cos k + \cos k_0) \quad (2.49) \end{aligned}$$

that is the celebrated Onsager's result. Note that the argument of the logarithm in the last expression is always > 0 and it vanishes if $\sinh 2J = 1$, that is the equation for the critical temperature. In the following we shall also write this condition in the equivalent form $\tanh J = \frac{1}{2}$.

3. The Grassmann formulation of Ashkin-Teller.

In this section, using the Grassmann representation of the Ising model, derived in previous Chapter, we will derive the Grassmann representation for a class of interacting spin models, defined as a pair of Ising models coupled by suitable multi-spin interactions.

We will first derive the general representation for a wide class of models, to be defined in next section, including the Ashkin-Teller model defined in (1.1), the four states Potts model, the 8V model and the next to nearest neighbor Ising model. Then we will focus on AT, and we will perform more algebraic manipulations to get to a final representation that will be convenient for the following multiscale integration, necessary to construct a convergent expansion for some correlation functions, as explained in the Introduction.

The reason why we choose to focus on AT is for definiteness and for avoiding too cumbersome abstract expressions, that necessarily would turn out in trying to describe our method in a too general setting. However it will be clear that the same method we will apply to the study of the AT model could equally well be applied to 8V (in a suitable range of parameters), to Ising perturbed with a small non nearest neighbor interaction or to linear combinations of the above models. Note that, even if the four states Potts model can be represented by a Grassmann functional integral as proved below, the subsequent multiscale analysis we will apply to AT would not work for Potts. This is because Potts is equivalent to a system of strongly interacting fermions, while our perturbative methods are applicable only in the range of weak coupling.

3.1. The Grassmann representation for a pair of Ising models with multi spin interactions.

Let us start with considering a pair of nearest neighbor Ising models with periodic boundary conditions, labeled by $j = 1, 2$, with couplings allowed to depend on the bonds $b \in \mathcal{B}_M$ (here \mathcal{B}_M is the dual of \mathcal{M} , that is the set of bonds linking the nearest neighbor sites of \mathcal{M}):

$$H_I^{(j)} f J_b^{(j)} g = \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}_M} J_b^{(j)} \tilde{\sim}_b^{(j)}; \quad (3.1)$$

where the bond spin $\tilde{\sim}_b^{(j)}$ was defined in 2.1 above. Repeating the construction of previous Chapter, one finds that the partition function of the model (3.1) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_I^{(j)} &= \sum_{\mathcal{M}} e^{-H_I^{(j)} f J_b^{(j)} g} \\ &= (-1)^{M^2} 2^{M^2} \sum_{b \in \mathcal{B}_M} \cosh J_b^{(j)} \frac{1}{2} \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \sum_{y \in \mathcal{M}} dH_x^{(j)} d\bar{H}_x^{(j)} dV_x^{(j)} d\bar{V}_x^{(j)} (-1) e^{S^{(j)} f t_b^{(j)} g}; \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{M}; \mathcal{M}^0)$ labels the boundary conditions of the Grassmann fields, \mathcal{M}^0 was defined after (2.40) and

$$\begin{aligned} S^{(j)} f t_b^{(j)} g &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \cosh J_{x, x+\hat{e}_1}^{(j)} \bar{H}_x^{(j)} H_{x+\hat{e}_1}^{(j)} + \cosh J_{x, x+\hat{e}_0}^{(j)} \bar{V}_x^{(j)} V_{x+\hat{e}_0}^{(j)} + \\ &+ \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \cosh \bar{H}_x^{(j)} H_x^{(j)} + \bar{V}_x^{(j)} V_x^{(j)} + \bar{V}_x^{(j)} \bar{H}_x^{(j)} + V_x^{(j)} \bar{H}_x^{(j)} + H_x^{(j)} \bar{V}_x^{(j)} + V_x^{(j)} H_x^{(j)} : \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

Let us now consider a multi spin interaction $V^{(1); (2)}$ between the two layers, linear combination of interactions of the form :

$$\begin{aligned} V_I &= \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \left(\binom{(i_1)}{x+z_1} \binom{(i_1)}{x+z_1+\hat{e}_{j_1}} \right) \left(\binom{(i_2)}{x+z_2} \binom{(i_2)}{x+z_2+\hat{e}_{j_2}} \right) \dots \left(\binom{(i_k)}{x+z_k} \binom{(i_k)}{x+z_k+\hat{e}_{j_k}} \right) \\ &\quad \sum_{x \in \mathcal{M}} \cosh \tilde{\sim}_{b+x}^{(i)}; \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

32 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

Using (3.9) we see that (3.8) can be rewritten as:

$$\prod_{b \in \mathbb{Z}} \cosh J_b^{(j)} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} dH_x^{(j)} d\overline{H}_x^{(j)} dV_x^{(j)} d\overline{V}_x^{(j)} e^{S^{(1)} f t_b^{(1)} g + S^{(2)} f t_b^{(2)} g} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \prod_{q=1}^n \left(1 + \bigwedge_q t_{b+x}^{(j)} + s_{b+x}^{(j)} D_{b+x}^{(j)} \right)^i : \quad (3.10)$$

Let us denote with i the elements of I_q . and, if $i = (b; j)$, define $x(i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} s_{b+x}^{(j)} = t_{b+x}^{(j)}$ and $D_x(i) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D_{b+x}^{(j)}$. Let us also assign an ordering to the elements of I and let us write $i_1 < i_2$ if i_1 precedes i_2 w.r.t. this ordering. With these definitions we can rewrite the last product in (3.10) as:

$$\prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \prod_{q=1}^n \left(1 + \bigwedge_q \prod_{(b;j) \in I_q} t_{b+x}^{(j)} \prod_{i_1 \in I_q} \left(1 + \bigwedge_{i_1 < i_2} x(i_1) D_x(i_1) + \prod_{i_1 < i_2} x(i_1) D_x(i_1) x(i_2) D_x(i_2) + \dots \right) \right) \quad (3.11)$$

and, calling $T_x(I_q) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigwedge_q \prod_{(b;j) \in I_q} t_{b+x}^{(j)}$ we still can rewrite the last expression as:

$$\prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \prod_{q=1}^n \left(1 + \bigwedge_q \prod_{(b;j) \in I_q} t_{b+x}^{(j)} \prod_{i_1 \in I_q} \left(T_x(I_q) x(i_1) D_x(i_1) + \dots \right) \right) = \prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \prod_{q=1}^n \left(1 + \bigwedge_q \prod_{(b;j) \in I_q} t_{b+x}^{(j)} \exp \left(\sum_{i_1 \in I_q} \tilde{x}^{(q)}(i_1) D_x(i_1) + \dots \right) \right) \quad (3.12)$$

In the last expression $\tilde{x}^{(q)}(i_1) = T_x(I_q) x(i_1)$ and the couplings $\tilde{x}^{(q)}(i_1; \dots; i_k)$, $2 \leq k \leq |I_q|$ are defined by the following recursive relations:

$$T_x(I_q) x(i_1) \dots x(i_k) = \prod_{p=1}^k \tilde{x}^{(q)}(J_1) \dots \tilde{x}^{(q)}(J_p); \quad (3.13)$$

where $J_r = (j_1^{(r)}; \dots; j_{|J_r|}^{(r)})$ are ordered (i.e. $j_1^{(r)} < \dots < j_{|J_r|}^{(r)}$) subsets of $(i_1; \dots; i_k)$, such that $|J_1| + \dots + |J_p| = k$.

Substituting (3.12) into (3.10) we finally find:

$$\prod_{b \in \mathbb{Z}} \cosh J_b^{(j)} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} dH_x^{(j)} d\overline{H}_x^{(j)} dV_x^{(j)} d\overline{V}_x^{(j)} e^{S^{(1)} f t_b^{(1)} g + S^{(2)} f t_b^{(2)} g + V} \prod_{x \in \mathbb{Z}} \prod_{q=1}^n \left(1 + \bigwedge_q \prod_{(b;j) \in I_q} t_{b+x}^{(j)} \prod_{i_1 \in I_q} \left(\tilde{x}^{(q)}(i_1; \dots; i_k) D_x(i_1) \dots D_x(i_k) \right) \right) : \quad (3.14)$$

This concludes the derivation of the Grassmann representation for pairs of Ising models coupled by an interaction $V(t^{(1)}; t^{(2)})$, linear combination of interactions of the form (3.4).

3.2. The Grassmann representation for the Ashkin-Teller model.

We now specialize to the case of the Ashkin-Teller model. We first write the explicit form of V in (3.14) for AT. As already discussed in previous section, the AT model corresponds to an interaction of the form $V_{I_1} + V_{I_2}$, with $I_1 = f(b_0; 1); (b_0; 2)g$ and $I_2 = f(b_1; 1); (b_1; 2)g$, b_0 being the bond connecting $(0; 0)$ with $(0; 1)$ and b_1 the one connecting $(0; 0)$ with $(1; 0)$. We shall assume the sets I_q , $q = 1, 2$, ordered so that $(b_{q-1}; 1) < (b_{q-1}; 2)$. We are interested in writing the explicit expressions in the case $t_b^{(j)} = t^{(j)}$ and $s_b^{(j)} = s^{(j)}$ independent of b (but in general depending on the lattice $j = 1, 2$).

The definitions of t_x , T_x and s_x introduced in last section become in this case:

$$t_1 = t_2 = \tanh t; \quad T_x(I_q) = \frac{t^{(1)}t^{(2)}}{1 + t^{(1)}t^{(2)}}; \quad s_x(b_{q-1}; j) = \frac{s^{(j)}}{t^{(j)}}; \quad (3.15)$$

Then (3.13) can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{t^{(1)}t^{(2)}}{1 + t^{(1)}t^{(2)}} s_x(b_{q-1}; 1) s_x(b_{q-1}; 2) &= \tilde{s}_x^{(q)}(b_{q-1}; 1); (b_{q-1}; 2) + \tilde{s}_x(b_{q-1}; 1) \tilde{s}_x(b_{q-1}; 2); \\ \tilde{s}_x(b_{q-1}; j) &= \frac{t^{(1)}t^{(2)}}{1 + t^{(1)}t^{(2)}} \frac{s^{(j)}}{t^{(j)}}; \end{aligned} \quad (3.16)$$

implying:

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{s}_x(b_{q-1}; 1) &= \frac{t^{(1)}t^{(2)}}{1 + t^{(1)}t^{(2)}} t^{(1)}; \quad \tilde{s}_x(b_{q-1}; 2) = \frac{s^{(2)}t^{(1)}}{1 + t^{(1)}t^{(2)}} t^{(2)}; \\ \tilde{s}_x^{(q)}(b_{q-1}; 1); (b_{q-1}; 2) &= \frac{s^{(1)}s^{(2)}}{1 + t^{(1)}t^{(2)}} e; \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

With these definitions V in (3.14) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} V = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} & \left(h \left(\overline{H}_x^{(1)} \overline{H}_{x+e_1}^{(1)} + \overline{H}_x^{(2)} \overline{H}_{x+e_1}^{(2)} + e \overline{H}_x^{(1)} \overline{H}_{x+e_1}^{(1)} \overline{H}_x^{(2)} \overline{H}_{x+e_1}^{(2)} + \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + h \left(\overline{V}_x^{(1)} \overline{V}_{x+e_0}^{(1)} + \overline{V}_x^{(2)} \overline{V}_{x+e_0}^{(2)} + e \overline{V}_x^{(1)} \overline{V}_{x+e_0}^{(1)} \overline{V}_x^{(2)} \overline{V}_{x+e_0}^{(2)} \right) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

and the first of (3.14) becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{A T} &= \frac{h}{(1 + t^{(1)}t^{(2)})} \cosh J^{(1)} \cosh J^{(2)} i_{2M^2} \\ &= \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \sum_{j=1}^2 h \int \overline{H}_x^{(j)} \overline{H}_x^{(j)} dV_x^{(j)} d\overline{V}_x^{(j)} e^{S^{(1)}(t^{(1)}) + S^{(2)}(t^{(2)}) + \tilde{V}}; \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

where $S^{(j)}(t)$ was defined in previous Chapter, see (2.36); moreover $t^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t^{(j)} + t^{(j)}$ and

$$V = \sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \left(\overline{H}_x^{(1)} \overline{H}_{x+e_1}^{(1)} \overline{H}_x^{(2)} \overline{H}_{x+e_1}^{(2)} + \overline{V}_x^{(1)} \overline{V}_{x+e_0}^{(1)} \overline{V}_x^{(2)} \overline{V}_{x+e_0}^{(2)} \right); \quad (3.20)$$

3.3. Starting from (3.19) we will now make more algebraic manipulations by introducing new Grassmann fields, linear combinations of the fields $\overline{H}; \overline{H}; \overline{V}; \overline{V}$. This will be convenient in order to set up the Renormalization Group scheme we will use to study in detail the specific heat of AT. The aim is to rewrite the formal

34 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

action appearing at the exponent in (3.19) as the formal action of a perturbed massive Luttinger model, the latter being a model for which Renormalization Group technique is already well developed [BM][GM].

We shall consider for simplicity the partition function $Z_{AT} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_{AT}(\beta; u; v)$, i.e. the partition function in which all Grassmannian variables verify antiperiodic boundary conditions. The other free partition functions in the analogue of (3.7) admit similar expressions. In fact we shall see in Chap. 7 and Appendix A 9 that, if $(\beta; u; v)$ does not belong to the critical surface¹ the partition function $Z_{AT}^{1/2}$ divided by $Z_I^{(1)/2} Z_I^{(2)/2}$ is exponentially insensitive to boundary conditions as $M \rightarrow 1$.

It is convenient to perform the following change of variables [D], $j = 1, 2$

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{H}_{jx}^{(j)} + iH_{jx}^{(j)} &= e^{i\bar{\theta}_x^{(j)}} e^{i\theta_x^{(j)}} \bar{H}_{jx}^{(j)} - iH_{jx}^{(j)} = e^{-i\bar{\theta}_x^{(j)}} e^{-i\theta_x^{(j)}} \\ \bar{V}_{jx}^{(j)} + iV_{jx}^{(j)} &= \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} + \psi_x^{(j)} \quad \bar{V}_{jx}^{(j)} - iV_{jx}^{(j)} = \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} - \psi_x^{(j)} : \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

The effect of this change of variables is the following one. If $S_x^{(j)}(t^{(j)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_x S_x^{(j)}$, after the change of variables (2.21) we get:

$$S_x^{(j)} = S_x^{(j;-)} + S_x^{(j;+)} + Q_x^{(j)} \quad (3.22)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} S_x^{(j;-)} &= \frac{t^{(j)} h}{4} \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 - i\theta_0) \psi_x^{(j)} + \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 + i\theta_0) \psi_x^{(j)} + \\ &+ \frac{t^{(j)} h}{4} \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + i \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + i \frac{p}{2} - 1 - t^{(j)} \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} \psi_x^{(j)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

with

$$\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} = \psi_{x+\theta_1}^{(j)} \quad \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)} = \psi_{x+\theta_0}^{(j)} : \quad (3.24)$$

Moreover

$$\begin{aligned} S_x^{(j;+)} &= \frac{t^{(j)} h}{4} \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 - i\theta_0) \psi_x^{(j)} + \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 + i\theta_0) \psi_x^{(j)} + \\ &+ \frac{t^{(j)} h}{4} \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + i \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + i \frac{p}{2} + 1 + t^{(j)} \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} \psi_x^{(j)} \end{aligned} \quad (3.25)$$

and finally

$$\begin{aligned} Q_x^{(j)} &= \frac{t^{(j)} h}{4} \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + i\theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) - \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} - i\theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) \\ &+ \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + i\theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) - \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} - i\theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + i \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} - \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + \\ &+ i \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + i \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} - \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) + i \bar{\psi}_x^{(j)} (\theta_1 \psi_x^{(j)} + \theta_0 \psi_x^{(j)}) : \end{aligned} \quad (3.26)$$

Formally $S_x^{j;-}$ and $S_x^{j;+}$ are the actions of a pair of Majorana $d = 2$ fermions on a lattice with masses $\frac{p}{2} - 1 - t^{(j)}$, and $\frac{p}{2} + 1 + t^{(j)}$, respectively; note that, since $c_j \leq t^{(j)} - 1 + c_j$, for some $c > 0$, the mass of the ψ field is always $O(1)$. On the contrary the mass of the $\bar{\psi}$ field can be arbitrarily small; in the free case ($\beta = 0$) the condition for the theory to be massless is equivalent to the condition $t = \frac{p}{2} - 1$, that

¹ The critical surface is a suitable 2-dimensional subset of $[\beta; u; v] \in [\frac{p}{2}; \frac{p}{2}]$, that is of the 3-set in the parameters space where we are interested to study the AT model, see the assumptions in the main Theorem in the Introduction; we will explicitly determine the critical surface in Chap. 7 below and we will prove that it can be parametrized as $(\beta; t_c(\beta; u); u)$, with $t_c(\beta; u)$ given by (1.7).

is the Ising's criticality condition (see the end of Chap.3); this is consistent with the well known property that the Ising's correlation functions decay as power laws if and only if we are at criticality.

It is convenient to pass from Majorana to Dirac fermions via the change of variables

$$\psi_{1;x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_x^{(1)} & i \psi_x^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}; \quad \psi_{1;x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\psi}_x^{(1)} & -i \bar{\psi}_x^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}; \quad (3.27)$$

$$\psi_{1;x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \psi_x^{(1)} & i \psi_x^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}; \quad \psi_{1;x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\psi}_x^{(1)} & -i \bar{\psi}_x^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} \quad (3.28)$$

and, if $\psi = \psi, \bar{\psi} = \bar{\psi}$, we define $\hat{\psi}_{1;k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \psi_x e^{i k x}$, with ψ denoting either ψ or $\bar{\psi}$.

Let us introduce some more definitions. Let

$$t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{t^{(1)} + t^{(2)}}{2}; \quad u \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{t^{(1)} - t^{(2)}}{2} \quad (3.29)$$

and note that t, u as functions of t, u are given by

$$t = t \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - (t^2 - u^2)}}{1 + \sqrt{t^2 - u^2}}; \quad u = u \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - (t^2 - u^2)}}{1 + \sqrt{t^2 - u^2}}; \quad (3.30)$$

Furthermore, let

$$Q(\psi; \bar{\psi}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x,j} Q_x^{(j)} \psi_x \bar{\psi}_j; \quad V(\psi; \bar{\psi}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} V; \quad (3.31)$$

where $Q(\psi; \bar{\psi})$ and $V(\psi; \bar{\psi})$ must be thought as functions of ψ and $\bar{\psi}$. With the above definitions and using (2.13), (2.28) it is straightforward algebra to verify that Z_{AT} can be rewritten as:

$$Z_{AT} = e^{EM^2} \int \prod (d\psi) (d\bar{\psi}) e^{Q(\psi; \bar{\psi}) + \tilde{V}(\psi; \bar{\psi})}; \quad (3.32)$$

where E is a suitable constant (we won't need its explicit value) and $P(d\psi, d\bar{\psi})$ is:

$$P(d\psi) = N^{-1} \prod_{k \in 2D, k \neq 0} d\psi_k^+ d\psi_k \exp \left[\frac{t}{4M^2} \sum_{k \in 2D, k \neq 0} \psi_k^+ A(k) \psi_k \right];$$

$$A(k) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} i \sin k + \sin k_0 & i(k) & \frac{1}{2} (i \sin k + \sin k_0) & i(k) \\ i(k) & i \sin k - \sin k_0 & i(k) & \frac{1}{2} (i \sin k - \sin k_0) \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{A};$$

$$i(k) = \frac{1}{2} (i \sin k + \sin k_0) \quad i(k) = \frac{1}{2} (i \sin k - \sin k_0) \quad i(k) = i \sin k + \sin k_0 \quad i(k) = i \sin k - \sin k_0 \quad (3.33)$$

where

$$\psi_k^+ = (\psi_{1;k}^+; \psi_{1;k}^+; \psi_{1;k}^+; \psi_{1;k}^+); \quad \psi_k = (\psi_{1;k}; \psi_{1;k}; \psi_{1;k}; \psi_{1;k}); \quad (3.34)$$

N is chosen in such a way that $\int P(d\psi) = 1$ and

$$t(k) = 2 \left(1 + \frac{P}{2+1} \right) + \cos k_0 + \cos k \quad 2; \quad u(k) = (u=t) (\cos k + \cos k_0); \quad (3.35)$$

In the first of (2.37) the $(+)$ sign corresponds to $\psi = \psi$ ($\bar{\psi} = \bar{\psi}$). The parameter P in (3.33) is given by $P \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (0)$.

36 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

It is convenient to split the $P_{\frac{1}{2}, 1}$ appearing in the definition of $\chi(k)$ as:

$$P_{\frac{1}{2}, 1} = (P_{\frac{1}{2}, 1} + \frac{1}{2}) - \frac{1}{2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} t - \frac{1}{2}; \quad (3.36)$$

where t is a parameter to be properly chosen later as a function of β , in such a way that the average location of the critical points will be given by $t = t_c$; in other words t has the role of a counterterm fixing the middle point of the critical temperatures. The splitting (3.36) induces the following splitting of $P(d)$:

$$P(d) = P(d) e^{-F(d)}; \quad F(d) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{2M^2} \sum_{k \neq 0} (i!)^+ \hat{\mu}_k^+ \hat{\mu}_k^-; \quad (3.37)$$

where $P(d)$ is given by (2.29) with $\beta = 1$ and $\frac{1}{2} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2(1 - t - t_c)$ replacing $\beta(0)$.

The final expression we found will be the starting point for the multiscale analysis of the partition function and of the correlation function, which will occupy us in the following Chapters.

4. The ultraviolet integration.

Starting from this Chapter and up to Chapter 7, we will construct the expansion for the free energy f of the Ashkin-Teller model, see (1.3), and we will prove that f is well defined and analytic in $t; u$ for any $t \in t_c$, see (1.7).

It will soon be clear that a naive perturbative expansion in e of the Grassmann functional integral in (3.32) would give us poor bounds for the partition function. This is because the propagator of the elds introduced in last Chapter has a mass that is vanishing at $t = \frac{p}{2} - 1 + \frac{p}{2} u$, that is in correspondence of the "bare" critical points. This produces infrared divergences in the integrals defining the n th order contribution to the free energy, as obtained by this naive perturbative expansion. It is then necessary to find out an iterative resummation rule, giving sense to the perturbation series. The iterative construction we will develop is inspired to the multiscale analysis of Grassmann functional integrals similar to (3.32), as those appearing in the context of non relativistic spinless fermions in $1+1$ dimensions or of 1d quantum spin chains [GPS][GM][BM]; in all these problems the partition function can be written as the integral of an exponential of a fermionic action, of the form of a Luttinger model action plus a perturbation, containing both a quadratic and a quartic term. In our case, looking at (3.32) and (3.33), the Luttinger model part of the action corresponds to the diagonal elements of $A(k)$ plus the local part of \tilde{V} ; the quadratic corrections to the non diagonal terms of $A(k)$; the quartic corrections to the non local part of \tilde{V} . The difference between our problem and those already studied in the literature consists in the form of this perturbation; more precisely, in the form of the quadratic corrections, which can be relevant or marginal in a Renormalization Group sense, see next Chapter. These terms generate new effective coupling constants, whose size must be controlled throughout the Renormalization Group iterations. Moreover, our problem, formulated as a problem of 1d fermions, does not have many natural symmetries that usually are present in a fermionic theory, such as gauge symmetry, conservation of the particle number and of the quasi-particle number. A priori, this could be a reason why other relevant or marginal terms, not originally present in the action (3.32), could be generated by the iterative construction. We will use a number of hidden symmetries, induced by the symmetries of the original spin model, to guarantee that these terms are not generated; by "hidden" here we mean that these symmetries, very natural in the original spin language, are not apparent in the fermionic one.

In this Chapter we describe the integration of the ultraviolet degrees of freedom, that is of the massive elds in (3.32) (i.e. the elds). This will be the first step of our iterative construction. The subsequent steps will be for various aspects technically very similar to the ultraviolet one, which we will now present in all details. We will introduce and describe many of the technical tools we will use throughout the work, such as the Pfaffian expansion, the Gram-Hadamard bounds and the symmetry relations for the fermionic elds.

4.1. The effective interaction on scale 1.

The propagators $\langle x; i \mid y; i \rangle_0$ of the fermionic integration $P(d)$, defined in (3.33), verify the following bound, for some $\epsilon_A; \epsilon > 0$:

$$j \langle x; i \mid y; i \rangle_0 \leq j A e^{-m |x-y|}; \quad (4.1)$$

where m is the minimum between $j^{(1)}$ and $j^{(2)}$ and

$$m^{(1)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2(t^{(1)} - t) = t; \quad m^{(2)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 2(t^{(1)} - t) = t; \quad (4.2)$$

where $\beta = \beta(\epsilon)$; t was defined in (3.36) and $t \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{P}{2} - 1$. Note that both $m^{(1)}$ and $m^{(2)}$ are $O(1)$. This suggests to integrate first the ϕ variables.

Aim of the present and of the subsequent sections is to perform the integration of the ϕ variables and, after that, to rewrite (3.32) in the form

$$Z_{A,T} = e^{M^2 E_1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} P_{Z_1; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}; C_1}(\mathbf{d}) e^{V^{(1)}(\frac{P}{2} \mathbf{z}_1)}; \quad V^{(1)}(0) = 0; \quad (4.3)$$

where $C_1(k) \leq 1$, $Z_1 = t$, $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{R}^{2D}$ and $P_{Z_1; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}; C_1}(\mathbf{d})$ is the exponential of a quadratic form:

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Z_1; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}; C_1}(\mathbf{d}) &= N_1^{-1} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} d^+ d^- \exp \left[\frac{1}{4M^2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^2} Z_1 C_1(k) d_k^+ A^{(1)}(k) d_k^- \right]; \\ A^{(1)}(k) &= \begin{pmatrix} M^{(1)}(k) & N^{(1)}(k) \\ N^{(1)}(k) & M^{(1)}(k) \end{pmatrix} \\ M^{(1)}(k) &= \frac{i \sin k + \sin k_0 + a_1^+(k)}{i(\mathbf{1} + c_1(k))} \frac{i(\mathbf{1} + c_1(k))}{i \sin k - \sin k_0 + a_1(k)} \\ N^{(1)}(k) &= \frac{b_1^+(k)}{i(\mathbf{1} + d_1(k))} \frac{i(\mathbf{1} + d_1(k))}{b_1(k)}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

where N_1 is chosen in such a way that $\int_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} P_{Z_1; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}; C_1}(\mathbf{d}) = 1$. We shall call $V^{(1)}$ the effective interaction on scale 1; it can be expressed as a sum of monomials in ϕ of arbitrary order:

$$V^{(1)}(\phi) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_{2n} \in \mathbb{Z}^2} \sum_{\mathbf{i} \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}} \hat{\mathbb{W}}_{2n; \mathbf{i}; \mathbf{1}}^{(1)}(k_1, \dots, k_{2n}) \left(\prod_{i=1}^{2n} \phi_{k_i} \right) \quad (4.5)$$

where $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}$, $\mathbf{i} = (i_1, \dots, i_{2n}) \in \mathbb{N}^{2n}$, $i_i = 1$ and $\hat{\mathbb{W}}_{2n; \mathbf{i}; \mathbf{1}}^{(1)}(k) = \frac{P}{n 2^{2n} k^{2n}}$. The constant E_1 in (4.3), the functions a_1, b_1, c_1, d_1 in (4.4) and the kernels $\hat{\mathbb{W}}_{2n; \mathbf{i}; \mathbf{1}}^{(1)}$ in (4.5) satisfy natural dimensional bounds and a number of symmetry relations, which will be described and proved below, where we will also show in detail how to get to (4.3). At the end of the Chapter we will collect the results in Theorem 4.1.

Note that from now on we will consider all functions appearing in the theory as functions of $\phi; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}$ (of course t and u can be analytically and elementarily expressed in terms of $\phi; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}$). We shall also assume $\|\phi\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}}$ bounded by some $O(1)$ constant. Note that if ϕ belong to a sufficiently small interval D centered around $\frac{P}{2} - 1$, as assumed in the hypothesis of the Main Theorem in the Introduction, then of course $\|\phi\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} \leq c_1$ for a suitable constant c_1 (for instance, if $D = [\frac{3(P/2 - 1)}{4}, \frac{5(P/2 - 1)}{4}]$, that is a possible choice for the interval D , we find $\|\phi\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} \leq 1 + O(\epsilon)$ and $\|\phi\|_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} \leq 2 + O(\epsilon)$).

4.2. The integration of the ϕ fields.

We start with considering (3.32), with $P(\mathbf{d})$ rewritten as in (3.37), and we define:

$$e^{E_1 M^2 Q^{(1)}(\phi)} V^{(1)}(\phi) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} P(\mathbf{d}) e^{Q(\phi; \mathbf{1})} F(\phi) \sim V(\phi; \mathbf{1}); \quad (4.6)$$

where E_1 is a constant, $Q^{(1)}$ is quadratic in ϕ and $O(1)$ w.r.t. $\phi; \mathbf{1}$ and $V^{(1)}$ is at least quadratic in ϕ and $O(\phi; \mathbf{1})$. $Q^{(1)}$ will contribute to the free measure $P_{Z_1; \mathbf{1}; \mathbf{1}; C_1}$.

We calculate $V^{(1)}$ in terms of truncated expectations (see Appendix A1), defined as:

$$E^T(X; n) = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial^n} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^{2D}} P(\mathbf{d}) e^{X(\phi; \mathbf{1})} d\mathbf{d}; \quad (4.7)$$

where $P(d)$ is defined in (3.33) and the associated propagator is given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_{(\cdot;!) ; (+; !)}(x-y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle x; ! \quad y; ! \rangle = g_{!}^{(1)}(x-y) + g_{!}^{(2)}(x-y) \\ g_{(\cdot;!) ; (+; \cdot !)}(x-y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle x; ! \quad y; \cdot ! \rangle = g_{!; \cdot !}^{(1)}(x-y) + g_{!; \cdot !}^{(2)}(x-y) \\ g_{(\cdot;!) ; (\cdot; \cdot !)}(x-y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle x; ! \quad y; \cdot ! \rangle = g_{!; \cdot !}^{(1)}(x-y) - g_{!; \cdot !}^{(2)}(x-y) \\ g_{(\cdot;!) ; (\cdot; !)}(x-y) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle x; ! \quad y; ! \rangle = g_{!}^{(1)}(x-y) - g_{!}^{(2)}(x-y); \end{aligned} \quad (4:8)$$

where, for $j = 1, 2$,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{!}^{(j)}(x-y) &= \frac{2}{t} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k e^{ik(x-y)} \frac{j! (-i \sin k + i \sin k_0)}{\sum_j \sin^2 k + \sin^2 k_0 + (m_{jk}^{(j)})^2} \\ g_{!; \cdot !}^{(j)}(x-y) &= \frac{2}{t} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k e^{ik(x-y)} \frac{i! m_{jk}^{(j)}}{\sum_j \sin^2 k + \sin^2 k_0 + (m_{jk}^{(j)})^2}; \end{aligned} \quad (4:9)$$

with $m_{jk}^{(j)} = (k) + (-1)^j (k)$ and $j = 1 + (-1)^j (=2)$. Calling $m^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m_{\cdot 0}^{(j)}$ one can easily verify that $m^{(j)}$ is given by (4.2) and the propagators are bounded as in (4.1), for some $\epsilon > 0$. The similar equations and bounds for the propagators are proven in the same way.

Calling

$$\bar{V}(\cdot; \cdot) = Q(\cdot; \cdot) - F(\cdot) + \tilde{V}(\cdot; \cdot); \quad (4:10)$$

and using the rules in Appendix A1, we obtain

$$M^{-2} \mathbb{E}_1 + Q^{(1)}(\cdot) + V^{(1)}(\cdot) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \log P(d) e^{\bar{V}(\cdot; \cdot)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{n+1}}{n!} E^T(\bar{V}; n); \quad (4:11)$$

We label each one of the monomials in \bar{V} by an index v_i , so that each monomial in \bar{V} can be written as

$$\sum_{x_{v_i}} K_{v_i}(x_{v_i}) \prod_{f \in P_{v_i}}^{(f)} \prod_{f \in P_{v_i}}^{(f)} \prod_{f \in P_{v_i}}^{(f)}; \quad (4:12)$$

where x_{v_i} is the total set of coordinates associated to v_i , $K_{v_i}(x_{v_i})$ is a bounded compact support function and P_{v_i} and \mathbb{P}_{v_i} are the set of indices labelling the or - elds in the monomial v_i ; the labels $(f); ! (f); x(f)$ assume values in the sets $f; f; l; g$ and M respectively. We can write

$$\begin{aligned} V^{(1)}(\cdot) &= \sum_{P_{v_0} \neq 0} V^{(1)}(\mathbb{P}_{v_0}) ; \quad V^{(1)}(\mathbb{P}_{v_0}) = \sum_{x_{v_0}} \prod_{f \in P_{v_0}}^{(f)} \prod_{f \in P_{v_0}}^{(f)} K_{P_{v_0}}(x_{v_0}) \\ K_{P_{v_0}}(x_{v_0}) &= \sum_{s=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{s!} \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_s} E^T(e(P_{v_1}); \dots; e(P_{v_s})) \prod_{i=1}^s K_{v_i}(x_{v_i}); \end{aligned} \quad (4:13)$$

where $e(P_{v_i}) = \prod_{f \in P_{v_i}}^{(f)} x(f); ! (f)$ and the \prod on the sum means that we are excluding the case $v; \dots; v_s$ all come from $Q(\cdot; \cdot)$ (such terms will contribute, by definition, to $Q^{(1)}(\cdot)$). Furthermore $\prod_{i_1, \dots, i_s} c^s$, for some constant c , $\mathbb{P}_{v_0} = \prod_{i \in P_{v_0}} \mathbb{P}_{v_i}$ and $x_{v_0} = \prod_{i \in P_{v_0}} x_{v_i}$.

We use now a generalization of a well known expression for E^T [Le], proven in Appendix A2:

$$E^T(e(P_{v_1}); \dots; e(P_{v_n})) = \sum_T \prod_{i \in T} g(f_i^1; f_i^2) \int dP_T(t) P f G^T(t) \quad (4:14)$$

40 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin-Teller model

where:

- a) T is a set of lines forming an anchored tree between the cluster of points $P_{v_1}; \dots; P_{v_s}$ i.e. T is a set of lines which becomes a tree if one identifies all the points in the same clusters;
 b) T is a sign (irrelevant for the subsequent bounds);
 c) given $\gamma \in T$, let f^1, f^2 the field labels associated to the points connected by γ ; $g(f^1, f^2)$ is defined as:

$$g(f^1, f^2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g_{\underline{a}(f^1), \underline{a}(f^2)}(x(f^1) - x(f^2)) \quad ; \quad \underline{a}(f) = (f); ! (f) \quad ; \quad (4.15)$$

- d) $t = ft_{i,j^0} \in [0,1]; 1 \leq i, j^0 \leq s$, $dP_T(t)$ is a probability measure with support on a set of t such that $t_{i,j^0} = u_i \cdot \psi$ for some family of vectors $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$ of unit norm;
 e) if $2n = \sum_{i=1}^s \mathcal{P}_{v_i}$ then $G^T(t)$ is a $(2n - 2s + 2) \times (2n - 2s + 2)$ antisymmetric matrix, whose elements are given by $G_{f,f^0}^T = t_{i(f),j(f^0)} g(f, f^0)$, where: $f, f^0 \in F_T$ and $F_T \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [\gamma \in T : f, f^0 \in \gamma; i(f)$ is s.t. $f \in P_{i(f)}$;
 f) $P f G^T$ is the Pfaffian of G^T ; given an antisymmetric matrix $A_{ij} = -A_{ji}$, $i, j = 1; \dots; 2k$, its Pfaffian is defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Pf} A &= \frac{1}{2^k k!} \sum_{\pi \in S_{2k}} \text{sgn}(\pi) A_{(1)\pi(1)} A_{(2)\pi(2)} \dots A_{(k)\pi(k)} \\ &= \sum_{\pi \in S_{2k}} \text{sgn}(\pi) \prod_{i=1}^k A_{i, \pi(i)} \quad ; \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where in the first line π is a permutation of $1; \dots; 2k$ and $\text{sgn}(\pi)$ is its parity while, in the second line, $i_1; \dots; i_{2k}$ are Grassmannian variables. A well known property is that $(\text{Pf} A)^2 = \det A$.

If $s = 1$ the sum over T is empty, but we can still use the above equation by interpreting the r.h.s. as 1 if P_{v_1} is empty, and $\text{Pf} G^T(P_{v_1})$ otherwise.

In order to bound $\text{Pf} G^T$ we first use $\text{Pf} G^T = \sum_{\pi \in S_{2k}} \text{sgn}(\pi) \prod_{i=1}^k G_{i, \pi(i)}$ and then, in order to bound the determinant, the Gram-Hadamard inequality, proven in Appendix A.3, stating that, if M is a square matrix with elements M_{ij} of the form $M_{ij} = \langle A_i, B_j \rangle$, where A_i, B_j are vectors in a Hilbert space with scalar product $\langle \cdot, \cdot \rangle$, then

$$|\det M| \leq \prod_{i=1}^Y \|A_i\| \|B_i\| \quad (4.17)$$

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

Let $H = \mathbb{R}^n \otimes H_0$, where H_0 is the Hilbert space of complex four dimensional vectors $F(k) = (F_1(k); \dots; F_4(k))$, $F_i(k)$ being a function on the set D_M , with scalar product

$$\langle F, G \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{X^4} \frac{1}{M^2} F_i(k) G_i(k) \quad ; \quad (4.18)$$

It is easy to verify that

$$G_{f,f^0} = t_{i(f),j(f^0)} g(f, f^0) = \langle u_{i(f)}, A_f; u_{j(f^0)}, B_{f^0} \rangle \quad ; \quad (4.19)$$

where $u_i \in \mathbb{R}^n$, $i = 1; \dots; n$, are vectors such that $t_{i,j^0} = u_i \cdot \psi$, and, if $\hat{g}_{\underline{a},j^0}(k)$ is the Fourier transform of $g_{\underline{a},j^0}(x - y)$, $A_f(k)$ and $B_{f^0}(k)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} A_f(k) &= e^{ik \cdot x(f)} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f);(-;1)}(k) \\ \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f);(+;1)}(k) \\ \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f);(+;-1)}(k) \\ \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f);(-;-1)}(k) \end{pmatrix} \\ B_{f^0}(k) &= e^{ik \cdot x(f^0)} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f^0);(-;1)}(k) \\ \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f^0);(+;1)}(k) \\ \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f^0);(+;-1)}(k) \\ \hat{g}_{\underline{a}(f^0);(-;-1)}(k) \end{pmatrix} \quad ; \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

42 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

with

$$\overline{P}^{(j)}(d^{(j)}; d^{(j)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{N^{(j)}} \prod_x d_x^{(j)} d_x^{-(j)} d_x^{(j)} d_x^{-(j)} e^{-\sum_x [S_x^{(j)} + S_x^{(j)} + Q_x^{(j)}]} ; \quad (4.29)$$

with $j = 1, 2$, $S_x^{(j)}$, $Q_x^{(j)}$ defined as in (3.25), (3.26) and

$$S_x^{(j)} = S_x^{(j)} + i(t - \frac{P}{2} - 1) \frac{-(j)}{x} \frac{(j)}{x} ; \quad (4.30)$$

where $S_x^{(j)}$ is defined as in (3.23). Substituting these expressions in (4.29), we find that, if $\frac{(j)}{k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(j)}{k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(j)}{k} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{(j)}{k}$,

$$\overline{P}^{(j)}(d^{(j)}; d^{(j)}) = \frac{1}{N^{(j)}} \exp \left\{ \frac{t^{(j)}}{4M^2} \sum_k \frac{(j)}{k} C_k^{(j)} \frac{(j)}{k} g \right\} \quad (4.31)$$

$$C_k^{(j)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} i \sin k & \sin k_0 & i \cos k & \cos k_0 & i(\cos k - \cos k_0) \\ i \sin k & \sin k_0 & i(\cos k - \cos k_0) & i \sin k & \sin k_0 \\ i \sin k & \sin k_0 & i(\cos k - \cos k_0) & i \sin k & \sin k_0 \\ i(\cos k - \cos k_0) & i \sin k & \sin k_0 & i \cos k & \cos k_0 \\ i(\cos k - \cos k_0) & i \sin k & \sin k_0 & i \cos k & \cos k_0 \end{pmatrix} :$$

A lengthy but straightforward calculation shows that the determinant $B^{(j)}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \det C_k^{(j)}$ is equal to

$$B^{(j)}(k) = \frac{16}{(t^{(j)})^4} [1 - (t^{(j)})^2] (2 \cos k - \cos k_0) + (t^{(j)} - t)^2 (t^{(j)} - t)^2 \quad (4.32)$$

Using, for $l, m = 1, \dots, 4$, the algebraic identity

$$\frac{1}{N^{(j)}} \prod_{k \neq l} (d_k^{(j)})_l (d_k^{(j)})_l (d_k^{(j)})_m \exp \left\{ \frac{t^{(j)}}{4M^2} \sum_k \frac{(j)}{k} C_k^{(j)} \frac{(j)}{k} g \right\} = \frac{4M^2}{t^{(j)}} (C_k^{(j)})_{lm}^{-1} ; \quad (4.33)$$

we find:

$$\langle \frac{(j)}{k} \frac{(j)}{k} \rangle_1 = \frac{4M^2}{t^{(j)}} \frac{C_{1,1}^{(j)}(k)}{B^{(j)}(k)} ; \quad \langle -\frac{(j)}{k} \frac{(j)}{k} \rangle_1 = \frac{4M^2}{t^{(j)}} \frac{C_{1,1}^{(j)}(k)}{B^{(j)}(k)} ; \quad (4.34)$$

$$\langle -\frac{(j)}{k} -\frac{(j)}{k} \rangle_1 = \frac{4M^2}{t^{(j)}} \frac{C_{1,1}^{(j)}(k)}{B^{(j)}(k)} ;$$

where, if $l = 1$, recalling that $t = \frac{P}{2} - 1 + \epsilon = 2$ and $t = \frac{P}{2} - 1$,

$$c_{1,1}^{(j)}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{4}{(t^{(j)})^2} [2t^{(j)}t - (i \sin k \cos k_0 + i \sin k_0 \cos k) + [(t^{(j)})^2 + t^2] (i \sin k - i \sin k_0)]$$

$$c_{1,1}^{(j)}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} i! \frac{4}{(t^{(j)})^2} [t^{(j)} (3t + t) \cos k \cos k_0 + [(t^{(j)})^2 + 2t t + t^2] (\cos k + \cos k_0)] \quad (4.35)$$

$$t^{(j)} (t + t) + 2 \frac{t t^2}{t^{(j)}} :$$

$P_{Z_1; 1; 1; C_1}(d)$ can now be written in terms of these correlations, as

$$P_{Z_1; 1; 1; C_1}(d) = P^{(1)}(d^{(1)}) P^{(2)}(d^{(2)}) ; \quad (4.36)$$

4. The ultraviolet integration. 43

with

$$P^{(j)}(d^{(j)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{N_j} \sum_k d_k^{(j)} \bar{d}_k^{(j)} \exp \frac{t^{(j)} B^{(j)}(k)}{4M^2 \det c_k^{(j)}} \left(\frac{c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k)}{c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k)} \frac{c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k)}{c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k)} \frac{c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k)}{c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k)} \right)^{\frac{1}{2}} ; \quad (4.37)$$

where $\det c_k^{(j)} = c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k) c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k) - c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k) c_{1;1}^{(j)}(k)$. If we now use the identity $t^{(j)} = t(2 + (-1)^j) = 2$ and rewrite the measure $P^{(1)}(d^{(1)}) P^{(2)}(d^{(2)})$ in terms of d_k we find:

$$P_{Z_1; 1; 1; 1; c_1}(d) = \frac{1}{N^{(1)}} \sum_k d_k^+ d_k^- \exp \left[\frac{Z_1 C_1(k)}{4M^2} + i^T A^{(1)}_k g \right]; \quad (4.38)$$

with $C_1(k)$, Z_1 , $\frac{1}{N^{(1)}}$ and $A^{(1)}(k)$ defined as after (4.3), and $A^{(1)}(k)$ as in (4.4), with

$$M^{(1)}(k) = \frac{2}{2} \frac{c_{1;1}^+(k)}{c_{1;1}^+(k)} \frac{c_{1;1}^+(k)}{c_{1;1}^+(k)}; \quad N^{(1)}(k) = \frac{2}{2} \frac{c_{1;1}(k)}{c_{1;1}(k)} \frac{c_{1;1}(k)}{c_{1;1}(k)}; \quad (4.39)$$

where $c_{1;1;1;2}^{(j)}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} [(1 - 2)B^{(1)}(k)c_{1;1;1;2}^{(1)}(k) = \det c_k^{(1)} + (1 + 2)B^{(2)}(k)c_{1;1;1;2}^{(2)}(k) = \det c_k^{(2)}] = 2$. It is easy to verify that $A^{(1)}(k)$ can be written in the same form as (4.4). In fact, computing the functions in (4.39), one finds that, for $k, \frac{1}{N^{(1)}}$ and $\frac{1}{N^{(2)}}$ small,

$$\begin{aligned} M^{(1)}(k) &= \frac{(i \sin k + \sin k_0) \frac{1}{N^{(1)}} + O(k^3)}{i \frac{1}{N^{(1)}} + O(k^2)} \frac{i \frac{1}{N^{(1)}} + O(k^2)}{(i \sin k - \sin k_0) \frac{1}{N^{(1)}} + O(k^3)} \\ N^{(1)}(k) &= \frac{(i \sin k + \sin k_0) O(\frac{1}{N^{(1)}}) + O(k^3)}{i \frac{1}{N^{(1)}} + O(\frac{1}{N^{(1)}} k^2)} \frac{i \frac{1}{N^{(1)}} + O(\frac{1}{N^{(1)}} k^2)}{(i \sin k - \sin k_0) O(\frac{1}{N^{(1)}}) + O(k^3)}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.40)$$

where the higher order terms in $k, \frac{1}{N^{(1)}}$ and $\frac{1}{N^{(2)}}$ contribute to the corrections $a_1(k), b_1(k), c_1(k)$ and $d_1(k)$.

4.3. Symmetry properties.

In this section we identify some symmetries of model (3.19) and, using these symmetry properties, we prove that the quadratic and quartic terms in $V^{(1)}$ and the corrections $a_1(k), b_1(k), c_1(k)$ and $d_1(k)$ appearing in (4.4) have a special structure, described in Theorem 4.1 below.

We start with noting that the form algebra appearing in (3.19) (see also (2.14), (2.36) and (3.20) for an explicit form of the different contributions appearing in (3.19)) is invariant under the following transformations.

1) Parity:

$$H_x^{(j)} \rightarrow \bar{H}_x^{(j)}; \quad \bar{H}_x^{(j)} \rightarrow H_x^{(j)}; \quad V_x^{(j)} \rightarrow \bar{V}_x^{(j)}; \quad \bar{V}_x^{(j)} \rightarrow V_x^{(j)}; \quad (4.41)$$

In terms of the variables $\hat{d}_{1;k}$, this transformation is equivalent to $\hat{d}_{1;k} \rightarrow i \hat{d}_{1;k}$ (the same for \bar{d}) and we shall call it parity.

2) Complex conjugation:

$$\hat{d}_x^{(j)} \rightarrow \bar{\hat{d}}_x^{(j)}; \quad \bar{\hat{d}}_x^{(j)} \rightarrow \hat{d}_x^{(j)}; \quad \hat{c}_x^{(j)} \rightarrow \bar{\hat{c}}_x^{(j)}; \quad \bar{\hat{c}}_x^{(j)} \rightarrow \hat{c}_x^{(j)}; \quad c \rightarrow \bar{c}; \quad (4.42)$$

where c is a generic constant appearing in the form algebra and \bar{c} is its complex conjugate. In terms of the variables $\hat{d}_{1;k}$, this transformation is equivalent to $\hat{d}_{1;k} \rightarrow \bar{\hat{d}}_{1;k}$ (the same for \bar{d}), $c \rightarrow \bar{c}$ and we shall call

4.4 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin-Teller model

it complex conjugation.

3) Hole-particle:

$$\begin{aligned} H_x^{(j)} &\rightarrow (1)^{j+1} H_x^{(j)}; & \overline{H}_x^{(j)} &\rightarrow (1)^{j+1} \overline{H}_x^{(j)}; \\ V_x^{(j)} &\rightarrow (1)^{j+1} V_x^{(j)}; & \overline{V}_x^{(j)} &\rightarrow (1)^{j+1} \overline{V}_x^{(j)}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.43)$$

This transformation is equivalent to $\hat{h}_{jk} \rightarrow \hat{h}_{jk}^\dagger$ (the same for \bar{h}) and we shall call it hole-particle.

4) Rotation:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i \overline{V}_{x_0;x}^{(j)}; & \overline{H}_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i V_{x_0;x}^{(j)}; \\ V_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i \overline{H}_{x_0;x}^{(j)}; & \overline{V}_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i H_{x_0;x}^{(j)}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.44)$$

This transformation is equivalent to

$$\hat{h}_{(k;k_0)} \rightarrow e^{i\pi/4} \hat{h}_{(k_0;k)}; \quad \hat{h}_{(k;k_0)}^\dagger \rightarrow e^{i\pi/4} \hat{h}_{(k_0;k)}^\dagger \quad (4.45)$$

and we shall call it rotation.

5) Reflection:

$$\begin{aligned} H_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i \overline{H}_{x;x_0}^{(j)}; & \overline{H}_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i H_{x;x_0}^{(j)}; \\ V_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i \overline{V}_{x;x_0}^{(j)}; & \overline{V}_{x;x_0}^{(j)} &\rightarrow i V_{x;x_0}^{(j)}; \end{aligned} \quad (4.46)$$

This transformation is equivalent to $\hat{h}_{(k;k_0)} \rightarrow i \hat{h}_{(k;k_0)}^\dagger$ (the same for \bar{h}) and we shall call it reflection.

6) The (1) ↔ (2) symmetry.

$$\begin{aligned} H_x^{(1)} &\rightarrow H_x^{(2)}; & \overline{H}_x^{(1)} &\rightarrow \overline{H}_x^{(2)}; \\ V_x^{(1)} &\rightarrow V_x^{(2)}; & \overline{V}_x^{(1)} &\rightarrow \overline{V}_x^{(2)}; \end{aligned} \quad u \rightarrow u; \quad (4.47)$$

This transformation is equivalent to $\hat{h}_{jk} \rightarrow i \hat{h}_{jk}^\dagger$ (the same for \bar{h}) together with $u \rightarrow u$ and we shall call it (1) ↔ (2) symmetry.

It is easy to verify that the quadratic forms $P(d)$, $P(\bar{d})$ and $P_{Z_1; 1; 1; 1; C_1}(d)$ are separately invariant under the symmetries above. Then the effective action $V^{(1)}(\cdot)$ is still invariant under the same symmetries. Using the invariance of $V^{(1)}$ under transformations (1)–(6), we now study in detail the structure of its quadratic and quartic terms.

Quartic term. Let us consider in (4.5) the term with $2n_P = 4$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = +$, $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = \beta_3 = \beta_4 = 1$; for simplicity of notation, let us denote it with $\sum_{k_1} W_P(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) \hat{h}_{1;k_1}^{++} \hat{h}_{1;k_2}^{++} \hat{h}_{1;k_3}^{++} \hat{h}_{1;k_4}^{++} (k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4)$. Under complex conjugation it becomes equal to $\sum_{k_1} W_P(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) \hat{h}_{1;k_1}^{--} \hat{h}_{1;k_2}^{--} \hat{h}_{1;k_3}^{--} \hat{h}_{1;k_4}^{--} (k_3 + k_4 - k_1 - k_2)$, so that $W(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = W(k_3; k_4; k_1; k_2)$.

Then, defining $L_1 = W(k_{++}; k_{++}; k_{++}; k_{++})$, where $k_{++} = (\pi/2; \pi/2)$, and $\bar{L}_1 = P_0 L_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_1|_{\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = \alpha_4 = 0}$, we see that L_1 and \bar{L}_1 are real. From the explicit computation of the lower order term we find $\bar{L}_1 = e Z_1^2 + O(\epsilon^2)$.

Quadratic terms. We distinguish 4 cases (items (a)–(d) below).

a) Let us consider in (4.5) the term with $2n = 2$, $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = +$ and $\beta_1 = \beta_2 = 1$; let us denote it with

$P_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}$. Under parity it becomes

$$\sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) (i!) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk} = \sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}; \quad (4:48)$$

so that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is even in k .

Under complex conjugation it becomes

$$\sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk} = \sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}; \quad (4:49)$$

so that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is purely imaginary.

Under hole-particle it becomes

$$\sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk} = \sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}; \quad (4:50)$$

so that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is odd in $!$.

Under (1) \rightarrow (2) it becomes:

$$\sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) (i!) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk} = \sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}; \quad (4:51)$$

so that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is even in $!$. Let us define $S_1 = i! = 2^P \sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1)$, where $k_0 = (-M; 0, M)$, and $n_1 = P_0 S_1$, $s_1 = P_1 S_1 = \frac{1}{2} S_1 + \frac{1}{2} S_1 = 0 + \frac{1}{2} S_1 = \frac{1}{2} S_1$. From the previous discussion we see that S_1, s_1 and n_1 are real and s_1 is independent of $!$. From the computation of the lower order terms we find $s_1 = O(1)$ and $n_1 = -Z_1 + c_1 + O(2)$, for some constant c_1 independent of $!$. Note that, since $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is even in k (so that in particular no linear terms in k appear) in real space no terms of the form $\hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}$ can appear.

b) Let us consider in (4.5) the term with $2n = 2$, $!_1 = !_2 = !$ and let us denote it with $\sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}$. We proceed as in item (a) and, by using parity, we see that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is even in k and odd in $!$.

By using complex conjugation, we see that $W_{!}(k; 1) = W_{!}(k; 1)$.

By using hole-particle, we see that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is even in $!$ and $W_{!}(k; 1) = W_{!}(k; 1)$ implies that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is purely imaginary.

By using (1) \rightarrow (2) we see that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is odd in $!$.

If we define $M_1 = i! = 2^P \sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1)$ and $m_1 = P_1 M_1$, from the previous properties follows that M_1 and m_1 are real, m_1 is independent of $!$ and, from the computation of its lower order, $m_1 = O(1)$. Note that, since $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is even in k (so that in particular no linear terms in k appear) in real space no terms of the form $\hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}$ can appear.

c) Let us consider in (4.5) the term with $2n = 2$, $!_1 = !_2 = +$, $!_1 = !_2 = !$ and let us denote it with $\sum_{!jk} W_{!}(k; 1) \hat{!jk}^+ \hat{!jk}$. By using parity we see that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is odd in k .

By using reflection we see that $W_{!}(k; k_0; 1) = W_{!}(k; -k_0; 1)$.

By using complex conjugation we see that $W_{!}(k; k_0; 1) = W_{!}(k; k_0; 1)$.

By using rotation we find $W_{!}(k; k_0; 1) = i! W_{!}(k_0; k; 1)$.

By using (1) \rightarrow (2) we see that $W_{!}(k; 1)$ is even in $!$.

46 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

We now define

$$G_1(k) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\vec{k}} W_1(k; \vec{k}) \left(\frac{\sin k}{\sin \frac{\pi}{M}} + \frac{\sin k_0}{\sin \frac{\pi}{M}} \right);$$

We can rewrite $G_1(k) = a_1 \sin k + b_1 \sin k_0$, with

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= \frac{1}{2 \sin \frac{\pi}{M}} \sum_{\vec{k}} W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) + W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) \\ b_1 &= \frac{1}{2 \sin \frac{\pi}{M}} \sum_{\vec{k}} W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) - W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.52)$$

From the properties of $W_1(k; \vec{k})$ discussed above, we get:

$$\begin{aligned} W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) &= W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) = W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) = i! W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) \\ W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) &= W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) = W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) = i! W_1\left(\frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{\pi}{M}; 1\right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.53)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 &= a_1 = a_1 = i! b_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} ia \\ b_1 &= b_1 = b_1 = i! a_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} !b = i! ia \end{aligned} \quad (4.54)$$

with $a = b$ real and independent of i . As a consequence, $G_1(k) = G_1(i \sin k + i \sin k_0)$ for some real constant G_1 . If $z_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_0 G_1$ and we compute the lowest order contribution to z_1 , we find $z_1 = O(k^2)$.

d) Let us consider in (4.5) the term with $2n = 2$, $\vec{k}_1 = \vec{k}_2 = \vec{k}$, $k_1 = k_2 = k$ and let us denote it with $\hat{W}_1(k; \vec{k})$. Repeating the proof in item c) we see that $W_1(k; \vec{k})$ is odd in k and in k_1 and, if we define

$$F_1(k) = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{\vec{k}} W_1(k; \vec{k}) \left(\frac{\sin k}{\sin \frac{\pi}{M}} + \frac{\sin k_0}{\sin \frac{\pi}{M}} \right);$$

we can rewrite $F_1(k) = F_1(i \sin k + i \sin k_0)$. Since $W_1(k; \vec{k})$ is odd in k_1 , we find $F_1 = O(k^3)$.

This concludes the study of the properties of the kernels of $V^{(1)}$ we shall need in the following. Repeating the proof above it can also be seen that the corrections $a_1(k)$, $b_1(k)$, appearing in (4.4), are analytic odd functions of k , while $c_1(k)$ and $d_1(k)$ are real and even; the explicit computation of the lower order terms in the Taylor expansion in k shows that, in a neighborhood of $k = 0$, $a_1(k) = O(k) + O(k^3)$, $b_1(k) = O(k) + O(k^3)$, $c_1(k) = O(k^2)$ and $d_1(k) = O(k^2)$.

The result of the previous discussion can be collected in the following Theorem.

Theorem 4.1 Assume that $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{2n} \leq c_1$ for some constant $c_1 > 0$. There exist a constant ϵ such that, if $j_1, j_2, \dots, j_{2n} \leq \epsilon$, then A_T can be written as in (4.3), (4.4), (4.5), where:

- 1) E_1 is an $O(1)$ constant;
- 2) $a_1(k); b_1(k)$ are analytic odd functions of k and $c_1(k); d_1(k)$ real analytic even functions of k ; in a neighborhood of $k = 0$, $a_1(k) = O(k) + O(k^3)$, $b_1(k) = O(k) + O(k^3)$, $c_1(k) = O(k^2)$ and $d_1(k) = O(k^2)$;
- 3) the determinant $\det A^{(1)}(k)$ can be bounded above and below by two positive constants times $(1 - \epsilon)^2 + j(k)j(1 + \epsilon)^2 + j(k)j$ and $c(k) = \cos k_0 + \cos k - 2$;
- 4) $\hat{W}_{2n, i, \vec{k}_i}^{(1)}$ are analytic functions of k_i ; $i = 1, \dots, 2n$ and, for some constant C ,

$$\hat{W}_{2n, i, \vec{k}_i}^{(1)}(k_1, \dots, k_{2n-1}) \leq M^{2Cn} j^{n \text{ axf1}; n=2g}; \quad (4.55)$$

4(a) the terms in (4.5) with $n = 2$ can be written as

$$L_1 \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_4}^X \hat{+}_{1;k_1} \hat{+}_{1;k_2} \hat{+}_{1;k_3} \hat{+}_{1;k_4} (k_1 + k_2 + k_3 + k_4) + \\ + \sum_{k_1, \dots, k_4}^X \sum_{i=1}^4 \bar{W}_{4; i; \underline{1}}(k_1; k_2; k_3) \hat{+}_{1;k_1}^1 \hat{+}_{2;k_2}^2 \hat{+}_{3;k_3}^3 \hat{+}_{4;k_4}^4 \left(\sum_{i=1}^4 k_i \right); \quad (4.56)$$

where L_1 is real and $\bar{W}_{4; i; \underline{1}}(k_1; k_2; k_3)$ vanishes at $k_1 = k_2 = k_3 = \frac{1}{M}; \frac{1}{M}$;

4(b) the term in (4.5) with $n = 1$ can be written as:

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{k}^X \sum_{h}^X S_1(i!) \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ + M_1(i!) \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ + F_1(i \sin k + i \sin k_0) \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ + \\ + G_1(i \sin k + i \sin k_0) \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ + \sum_{k}^X \sum_{i=1}^4 \bar{W}_{2; i; \underline{1}}(k) \hat{+}_{1;k}^1 \hat{+}_{2;k}^2 + \dots \quad (4.57)$$

where: $\bar{W}_{2; i; \underline{1}}(k)$ is $O(k^2)$ in a neighborhood of $k = 0$; $S_1; M_1; F_1; G_1$ are real analytic functions of $i; 1; 1$; s.t. $F_1 = O(1)$ and

$$L_1 = l_1 + O(1) + O(1); \quad S_1 = s_1 + n_1 + O(1) + O(1) \\ M_1 = m_1 + O(1) + O(1); \quad G_1 = z_1 + O(1) + O(1) \quad (4.58)$$

with $s_1 = f_1$, $m_1 = f_2$ and $l_1; n_1; f_1; f_2; z_1$ independent of $1; 1$; moreover $l_1 = e = z_1^2 + O(1)$, $f_1; f_2 = O(1)$, $n_1 = -z_1 + c_1 + O(1)$, for some c_1 independent of 1 , and $z_1 = O(1)$.

Remark. The meaning of Theorem 2.1 is that after the integration of the fields we are left with a fermionic integration similar to (3.33) up to corrections which are at least $O(k^2)$, and an effective interaction containing terms with any number of fields. A priori many bilinear terms with kernel $O(1)$ or $O(k)$ with respect to k near $k = 0$ could be generated by the integration besides the ones originally present in (2.29); however symmetry considerations restrict drastically the number of possible bilinear terms $O(1)$ or $O(k)$. Only one new term of the form $\sum_k (i \sin k + i \sin k_0) \hat{+}_{1;k}^+ \hat{+}_{1;k}^+$ appears, which is "dimensionally" marginal in a RG sense; however it is weighted by a constant $O(1)$ and this will improve its "dimension", so that it will result to be irrelevant, see next Chapter.

5. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The anomalous regime.

In this Chapter we begin to describe the iterative integration scheme we shall follow in order to compute the Grassmann functional integral in (4.3). Each step of the iteration will resemble for many technical aspects the ultraviolet step described in the previous Chapter. We first split the light field in a sum of independent Grassmann fields ψ_h with masses smaller and smaller, labeled by a scale index $h = 1$. Then we begin to integrate step by step each of them, starting from that with the biggest mass. After each integration step we rewrite the partition function in a way similar to the r.h.s. of (4.3), with new effective parameters $Z_h; g_h$ and a new effective interaction $V^{(h)}$ replacing $Z_h; g_h$ and $V^{(h)}$ respectively. As a consequence, a new fundamental problem must be faced: the size of these parameters and of the new effective interaction must be controlled, and in particular it must be proven that the weight of the local quartic term in $V^{(h)}$ remains small under the iterations. This is not trivial at all, and in fact one of the major difficulties of the problem is in finding a suitable definition of the new parameters after each integration step. It will in fact become clear that there is some arbitrariness in their definition and the choice must be done with care, so that the flow of the effective coupling constants can be controlled.

In the present Chapter we will first describe the iterative procedure, including the definition of localization, crucial for the definition of the effective coupling constants. In the present Chapter we shall describe only the regime in which the effective parameters g_h are small; we shall call this regime the anomalous one, because g_h grow exponentially in this regime, with an exponent that is a non trivial function of β . We then describe the result of the iteration in this regime, that is the bounds the kernels of the effective interaction satisfy at each step, under the assumption that the size of the effective local quartic term remain small. This key property (also called vanishing of the Beta function, for reasons that will become clear later) will be proven in next Chapter. The subsequent regime (in which g_h are of the same order of the mass of the field) must be studied with a different iterative procedure, and will be done in Chapter 8.

5.1. Multiscale analysis.

From the bound on $\det A^{(1)}(k)$ described in Theorem 4.1, we see that the fields have a mass given by $m \inf_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |j| + |j|$, which can be arbitrarily small; their integration in the infrared region (small k) needs a multiscale analysis. We introduce a scaling parameter $\ell > 1$ which will be used to define a geometrically growing sequence of length scales $1; \ell; \ell^2; \dots$, i.e. of geometrically decreasing momentum scales $h; h = 0; 1; 2; \dots$. Correspondingly we introduce C^1 compact support functions $f_h(k)$ $h = 1$, with the following properties: if $k_j = \frac{\ell^h}{2} \sin^2 k + \sin^2 k_0$, when $h = 0$, $f_h(k) = 0$ for $|k_j| < \frac{\ell^h}{2}$ or $|k_j| > \frac{\ell^h}{2}$, and $f_h(k) = 1$, if $|k_j| = \frac{\ell^h}{2}$; $f_1(k) = 0$ for $|k_j| < \frac{\ell}{2}$ and $f_1(k) = 1$ for $|k_j| > \frac{\ell}{2}$; furthermore:

$$1 = \sum_{h=h_M}^{X^1} f_h(k) \quad ; \quad \text{where:} \quad h_M = m \inf_{j \in \mathbb{Z}} |j| > \frac{\ell}{2} \sin \frac{\ell}{M} g; \quad (5.1)$$

and $\frac{\ell}{2} \sin \frac{\ell}{M}$ is the smallest momentum allowed by the antiperiodic boundary conditions, i.e. it is equal to $\min_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} |k|$.

The purpose is to perform the integration of (2.41) over the fermion fields in an iterative way. After each iteration we shall be left with a "simpler" Grassmannian integration to perform: if $h = 1; 0; 1; \dots; h_M$, we shall write

$$Z_{AT} = \int P_{Z_h; g_h; C_h} (d\psi^{(h)}) e^{V^{(h)}(\psi^{(h)})} \frac{\ell^{E_h}}{2} ; \quad V^{(h)}(0) = 0; \quad (5.2)$$

where the quantities $Z_h, g_h, C_h, P_{Z_h; g_h; C_h} (d\psi^{(h)})$, $V^{(h)}$ and E_h have to be defined recursively and the result of the last iteration will be $Z_{AT} = e^{M^2 E_{1+h_M}}$, i.e. the value of the partition function.

$$\begin{aligned} L_0 \bar{\mathcal{W}}_{2; -\frac{1}{2}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}; -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{k}) &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=0}^X \bar{\mathcal{W}}_{2; -\frac{1}{2}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}) \\ L_1 \bar{\mathcal{W}}_{2; -\frac{1}{2}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}; -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{k}) &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{j=0}^X \bar{\mathcal{W}}_{2; -\frac{1}{2}}^{(n)}(\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}, -\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{k}-\mathbf{j}) \frac{\sin k}{\sin \frac{M}{2}} + \frac{\sin k_0}{\sin \frac{M}{2}} ; \end{aligned} \quad (5.6)$$

50 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

where $k_0 = \frac{\pi}{M}; \frac{0}{M}$ are the smallest momenta allowed by the antiperiodic boundary conditions.

2) If $n = 2$, $L_1 \mathbb{W}_{4i;\underline{i};\underline{i}}^{(h)} = 0$ and

$$L_0 \mathbb{W}_{4i;\underline{i};\underline{i}}^{(h)}(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{W}_{4i;\underline{i};\underline{i}}^{(h)}(k_{++}; k_{++}; k_{++}; k_{++}) : \quad (5:7)$$

3) If $n > 2$, $L_0 \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}} = L_1 \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}} = 0$.

The action of P_j , $j = 0; 1$, on the kernels $\mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}}$, thought as functionals of the sequence $_{h}(k); \text{ } _{h}(k); \dots; \text{ } _{1}; \text{ } _{1}$ is defined as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}} \text{ } _{(h)} = \text{ } _{(h)} = 0 \\ P_1 \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}} &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k \text{ } _{h}; k} \text{ } _{k}(k) \frac{\partial \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}}}{\partial \text{ } _{k}(k)} \text{ } _{(h)} = \text{ } _{(h)} = 0 + \sum_{k \text{ } _{k}} \text{ } _{k}(k) \frac{\partial \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}}}{\partial \text{ } _{k}(k)} \text{ } _{(h)} = \text{ } _{(h)} = 0 : \end{aligned} \quad (5:8)$$

Given $L_j; P_j$, $j = 0; 1$ as above, we define the action of L on the kernels $\mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}}$ as follows.

1) If $n = 1$, then

$$L \mathbb{W}_{2i;\underline{i};\underline{i}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \sum_{i=1}^8 L_0 (P_0 + P_1) \mathbb{W}_{2i;\underline{i};\underline{i}} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 = 0 \text{ and } \text{ } _1 + \text{ } _2 = 0, \\ L_0 P_1 \mathbb{W}_{2i;\underline{i};\underline{i}} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 = 0 \text{ and } \text{ } _1 + \text{ } _2 \notin 0, \\ L_1 P_0 \mathbb{W}_{2i;\underline{i};\underline{i}} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 \notin 0 \text{ and } \text{ } _1 + \text{ } _2 = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 \notin 0 \text{ and } \text{ } _1 + \text{ } _2 \notin 0. \end{cases}$$

2) If $n = 2$, then $L \mathbb{W}_{4i;\underline{i};\underline{i}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} L_0 P_0 \mathbb{W}_{4i;\underline{i};\underline{i}}$.

3) If $n > 2$, then $L \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}} = 0$.

Finally, the effect of L on $V^{(h)}$ is, by definition, to replace on the r.h.s. of (4.8) $\mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}}$ with $L \mathbb{W}_{2n;\underline{i};\underline{i}}$. Note that $L^2 V^{(h)} = L V^{(h)}$.

Using the previous definitions we get the following result. We use the notation $\text{ } _{(h)} = f \text{ } _{k}(k) g_{k2D}^{k=h; \dots; 1}$ and $\text{ } _{(h)} = f \text{ } _{k}(k) g_{k2D}^{k=h; \dots; 1}$.

Lemma 5.1. Let the action of L on $V^{(h)}$ be defined as above. Then

$$L V^{(h)}(\text{ } _{(h)}) = (s_h + \text{ } _h n_h) F^{(h)} + m_h F^{(h)} + l_h F^{(h)} + z_h F^{(h)}; \quad (5:9)$$

where $s_h; n_h; m_h; l_h$ and z_h are real constants and: s_h is linear in $\text{ } _{(h)}$ and independent of $\text{ } _{(h)}$; m_h is linear in $\text{ } _{(h)}$ and independent of $\text{ } _{(h)}$; $n_h; l_h; z_h$ are independent of $\text{ } _{(h)}$; moreover, if $D_h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} D$; $\backslash f k : C_h^{-1}(k) > 0g$,

$$\begin{aligned} F^{(h)}(\text{ } _{(h)}) &= \frac{1}{2M^2} \sum_{k2D_h \text{ } != 1}^X \sum_{i=1}^X (i!) b_{!;k}^{+(h)} b_{!;k}^{(h)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{k2D_h}^X \mathbb{P}^{(h)}(k); \\ F^{(h)}(\text{ } _{(h)}) &= \frac{1}{4M^2} \sum_{k2D_h \text{ } != 1}^X \sum_{i=1}^X i! b_{!;k}^{(h)} b_{!;k}^{(h)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{k2D_h}^X \mathbb{P}^{(h)}(k); \\ F^{(h)}(\text{ } _{(h)}) &= \frac{1}{M^8} \sum_{k_1; \dots; k_4 2D_h}^X b_{1;k_1}^{+(h)} b_{1;k_2}^{+(h)} b_{1;k_3}^{(h)} b_{1;k_4}^{(h)} (k_1 + k_2 - k_3 - k_4) \\ F^{(h)}(\text{ } _{(h)}) &= \frac{1}{2M^2} \sum_{k2D_h \text{ } != 1}^X \sum_{i=1}^X (i \sin k + ! \sin k_0) b_{!;k}^{+(h)} b_{!;k}^{(h)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{k2D_h}^X \mathbb{P}^{(h)}(k); \end{aligned} \quad (5:10)$$

5. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The anomalous regime. 51

where $\Gamma(k) = M^2 \frac{P}{n^2 z^2 - k^2/2 - n}$.

Remark. The application of L to the kernels of the effective potential generates the sum in (5.9), i.e. a linear combination of the Grassmannian monomials in (5.10) which, in the renormalization group language, are called "relevant" (the first two) or "marginal" operators (the two others).

Proof of Lemma 5.1 Lemma 5.1 can be proven repeating the discussion in x4.3 above. Note in fact that the result of x4.3, as presented in Theorem 4.1, can be reformulated by saying that

$$LV^{(1)}(\cdot) = (s_1 + n_1)F^{(-1)} + m_1 F^{(-1)} + l_1 F^{(-1)} + z_1 F^{(-1)}; \quad (5.11)$$

where s_1, n_1, m_1, l_1 and z_1 are real constants and: s_1 is linear in ϵ_1 and independent of ϵ_1 ; m_1 is linear in ϵ_1 and independent of ϵ_1 ; n_1, l_1, z_1 are independent of ϵ_1 .

It is now sufficient to note that the symmetries (1)-(6) discussed in x4.3 are preserved by the iterative integration procedure: in fact it is easy to verify that $LV^{(h)}$, $RV^{(h)}$ and $P_{Z_h - 1; h - 1; h - 1; \epsilon_h}^{(h)}(d^{(h)})$ are, step by step, separately invariant under the transformations (1)-(6). Then the same proof leading to (5.11) leads to (5.9) (it is sufficient to replace any scale label = 1 with h).

We now consider the operator $R \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} 1 - L$. The following result holds. We use the notation $R_1 = 1 - L_0$, $R_2 = 1 - L_0 - L_1$, $S_1 = 1 - P_0$, $S_2 = 1 - P_0 - P_1$.

Lemma 5.2. The action of R on $\mathbb{W}_{2n; i; j}$ for $n = 1; 2$ is the following.

1) If $n = 1$, then

$$R \mathbb{W}_{2; i; j} = \begin{cases} S_2 + R_2(P_0 + P_1) \mathbb{W}_{2; i; j} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 = 0, \\ R_1 S_1 + R_2 P_0 \mathbb{W}_{2; i; j} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 \notin 0 \text{ and } \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 = 0, \\ R_1 S_1 \mathbb{W}_{2; i; j} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 \notin 0 \text{ and } \epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 \notin 0, \end{cases}$$

2) If $n = 2$, then $R \mathbb{W}_{4; i; j} = S_1 + R_1 P_0 \mathbb{W}_{4; i; j}$.

Remark. The effect of R_j , $j = 1; 2$ on $\mathbb{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h)}$ consists in extracting the rest of a Taylor series in k of order j . The effect of S_j , $j = 1; 2$ on $\mathbb{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h)}$ consists in extracting the rest of a power series in $(\epsilon^{(h)}; \epsilon^{(h)})$ of order j . The definitions are given in such a way that $R \mathbb{W}_{2n; i; j}$ is at least quadratic in $k; \epsilon^{(h)}; \epsilon^{(h)}$ if $n = 1$ and at least linear in $k; \epsilon^{(h)}; \epsilon^{(h)}$ when $n = 2$. This will give dimensional gain factors in the bounds for $R \mathbb{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h)}$ w.r.t. the bounds for $\mathbb{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h)}$, $n = 1; 2$, as we shall see in details in x5.5.

Proof of Lemma 5.2 It is sufficient to note that the symmetry properties discussed in x4.3 imply that: $L_1 \mathbb{W}_{2; i; j} = 0$ if $!_1 + !_2 = 0$; $L_0 \mathbb{W}_{2; i; j} = 0$ if $!_1 + !_2 \notin 0$; $P_0 \mathbb{W}_{2; i; j} = 0$ if $\epsilon_1 + \epsilon_2 \notin 0$; and use the definitions of R_i, S_i , $i = 1; 2$.

5.3 Renormalization.

Once that the above definitions are given we can describe our integration procedure for $h \geq 0$. We start from (5.2) and we rewrite it as

$$\int_Z P_{Z_h; h; h; h; \epsilon_h} (d^{(h)}) e^{LV^{(h)}} \overline{P_{Z_h}^{(-h)}} RV^{(h)} \overline{P_{Z_h}^{(-h)}} M^2 E_h; \quad (5.12)$$

with $LV^{(h)}$ as in (5.9). Then we include the quadratic part of $LV^{(h)}$ (except the term proportional to n_h) in the fermionic integration, so obtaining

$$\int_Z P_{Z_h - 1; h - 1; h - 1; \epsilon_h} (d^{(h)}) e^{l_h F} \overline{P_{Z_h}^{(-h)}} - n_h F \overline{P_{Z_h}^{(-h)}} RV^{(h)} \overline{P_{Z_h}^{(-h)}} M^2 E_h; \quad (5.13)$$

52 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

where $\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_h(1 + z_h C_{h-1}(k))$ and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_h}{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)} (\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k) + s_h C_{h-1}(k)) \quad ; \quad \mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_h}{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)} (\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k) + m_h C_{h-1}(k)) \\ a_{h-1}^i(k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_h}{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)} a_h^i(k) \quad ; \quad b_{h-1}^i(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_h}{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)} b_h^i(k) \\ c_{h-1}(k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_h}{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)} c_h(k) \quad ; \quad d_{h-1}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_h}{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)} d_h(k) : \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

The integration in (5.13) differs from the one in (5.2) and (5.12): $P_{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; c_h}$ is defined by (5.3) with Z_h and $A^{(h)}$ replaced by $\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)$ and $A^{(h-1)}$.

Now we can perform the integration of the (h) eld. It is convenient to rescale the elds:

$$\mathcal{V}^{(h)} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{P}{hF} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h)} + \frac{h}{hF} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h)} + R V^{(h)} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h)} ; \quad (5.15)$$

where

$$h = \frac{Z_h}{Z_{h-1}}^2 \mathbf{1}_h ; \quad h = \frac{Z_h}{Z_{h-1}} n_h ; \quad (5.16)$$

and $R V^{(h)} = (1 - L) V^{(h)}$ is the irrelevant part of $V^{(h)}$, and rewrite (5.13) as

$$e^{M^2(t_h + E_h)} \int_{P_{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; c_h}} (d^{(h-1)}) \int_{P_{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; c_h}} e^{i(d^{(h)})} e^{\mathcal{V}^{(h)} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h)}} \quad (5.17)$$

where we used the decomposition $(h) = (h-1) + (h)$ (and $(h-1); (h)$ are independent) and $f_h(k)$ is defined by the relation $C_{h-1}(k) \mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k) = C_{h-1}(k) Z_{h-1} + f_h(k) Z_{h-1}$, namely:

$$f_h(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_{h-1} \frac{h C_{h-1}(k)}{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)} - \frac{C_{h-1}(k)}{Z_{h-1}} = f_h(k) \mathbf{1} + \frac{z_h f_{h+1}(k)}{1 + z_h f_h(k)} ; \quad (5.18)$$

Note that $f_h(k)$ has the same support as $f_h(k)$. Moreover $P_{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; c_h} (d^{(h)})$ is defined in the same way as $P_{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; c_h} (d^{(h-1)})$, with $\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}(k)$ resp. C_h replaced by Z_{h-1} resp. f_h^1 . The single scale propagator is

$$P_{\mathcal{Z}_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; c_h} (d^{(h)}) \quad x; i! \quad y; i!^0 = \frac{1}{Z_{h-1}} g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}(x - y) \quad ; \quad \underline{a} = (; !) \quad ; \quad \underline{a}^0 = (^0 ; !^0) ; \quad (5.19)$$

where

$$g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}(x - y) = \frac{1}{2M^2} \sum_k e^{i \cdot^0 k(x - y)} f_h(k) [A^{(h-1)}(k)]_{j(\underline{a}); j^0(\underline{a}^0)}^{-1} \quad (5.20)$$

with $j(; 1) = j^0(+ ; 1) = 1$, $j(; -1) = j^0(+ ; -1) = 2$, $j(+ ; 1) = j^0(; 1) = 3$ and $j(+ ; -1) = j^0(; -1) = 4$. One finds that $g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}(x) = g_{i; i!^0}^{(1; h)}(x) - g_{i; i!^0}^{(2; h)}(x)$, where $g_{i; i!^0}^{(j; h)}(x)$, $j = 1; 2$ are defined in Appendix A.4.

The long distance behaviour of the propagator is given by the following Lemma, proved in Appendix A.4.

Lemma 5.3. Let $\mathcal{Z}_h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}_h(0)$ and $\mathcal{Z}_h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{Z}_h(0)$ and assume $j \leq \epsilon_1$ for a small constant ϵ_1 . Suppose that for $h > h$

$$\mathcal{Z}_h \leq \frac{1}{2} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{Z}_h \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{Z}_h \quad ; \quad \mathcal{Z}_h \leq \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{Z}_h ; \quad (5.21)$$

that there exists c s.t.

$$e^{-c j} \leq \frac{h}{h-1} e^{-c j} \quad ; \quad e^{-c j} \leq \frac{h}{h-1} e^{-c j} \quad ; \quad e^{-c j} \leq \frac{Z_h}{Z_{h-1}} e^{-c j} ; \quad (5.22)$$

and that, for some constant C_1 ,

$$\frac{j_h j}{h} \leq C_1; \quad \frac{j_h j}{h} \leq C_1; \quad (5.23)$$

then, for all $h \leq h_0$, given the positive integers N, n_0, n_1 and putting $n = n_0 + n_1$, there exists a constant $C_{N,n}$ s.t.

$$|g_{x_0}^{n_0} g_x^{n_1} g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}(x-y)| \leq C_{N,n} \frac{(1+n)h}{1 + (h^{-1}j)(x-y)j^N}; \quad \text{where } d(x) = \frac{M}{h} \sin \frac{x}{M}; \sin \frac{x_0}{M}; \quad (5.24)$$

Furthermore, if P_0, P_1 are defined as in (5.8) and S_1, S_2 are defined as in Lemma 5.2, we have that $P_j g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}$, $j = 0, 1$ and $S_j g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}$, $j = 1, 2$, satisfy the same bound (5.24), times a factor $\frac{j_h j + j_h j}{h}$. The bounds for $P_0 g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}$ and $P_1 g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}$ hold even without hypothesis (5.23).

After the integration of the field on scale h we are left with an integral involving the fields $\psi^{(h-1)}$ and the new effective interaction $V^{(h-1)}$, defined as

$$e^{V^{(h-1)}} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h-1)} E_h M^2 = \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P_{Z_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; \infty} (d^{(h)}) e^{V^{(h)}} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h)}; \quad (5.25)$$

It is easy to see that $V^{(h-1)}$ is of the form (5.5) and that $E_{h-1} = E_h + t_h + \tilde{E}_h$. It is sufficient to use the well known identity

$$M^2 \tilde{E}_h + V^{(h-1)} \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h-1)} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} (1)^{n+1} E_h^T \left(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}} \right)^{(h)}; (n); \quad (5.26)$$

where $E_h^T(X^{(h)}; n)$ is the truncated expectation of order n w.r.t. the propagator $Z_{h-1}^{-1} g_{\underline{a}; \underline{a}^0}^{(h)}$, defined as

$$E_h^T(X^{(h)}; n) = \frac{\partial}{\partial^n} \log \int_{\mathbb{R}^d} P_{Z_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; \infty} (d^{(h)}) e^{X^{(h)}} = 0; \quad (5.27)$$

Note that the above procedure allows us to write the running coupling constants $\mathbf{v}_{h-1} = (\mathbf{v}_{h-1}; \mathbf{v}_{h-1})$, $h \geq 1$, in terms of \mathbf{v}_k , $h \geq k \geq 1$, namely

$$\mathbf{v}_{h-1} = \beta_h(\mathbf{v}_h; \dots; \mathbf{v}_1); \quad (5.28)$$

where β_h is the so called Beta function.

5.4 Analyticity of the effective potential

We have expressed the effective potential $V^{(h)}$ in terms of the running coupling constants \mathbf{v}_k ; \mathbf{v}_k , $k \leq h$, and of the renormalization constants Z_k ; $\gamma_k(k)$; $\gamma_k(k)$, $k \leq h$.

In next section we will prove the following result.

Theorem 5.1. Let $\mathbf{v}_h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{v}_h(0)$ and $\mathbf{v}_h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathbf{v}_h(0)$ and assume $\|\mathbf{v}_h\| \leq \epsilon_1$ for a small constant ϵ_1 . Suppose that for $h > h_0$ the hypothesis (5.21), (5.22) and (5.23) hold. If, for some constant c ,

$$\max_{h > h_0} |j_h j| \leq c j; \quad (5.29)$$

then there exists $C > 0$ s.t. the kernels in (5.5) satisfy

$$\int_{\mathbb{R}^d} dx_1 \dots dx_{2n} |K_{2n; j_1, \dots, j_{2n}}^{(h)}(x_1, \dots, x_{2n})| \leq M^{-2} h^{D_k(n)} (C j)^{\max(1, m-1)} \quad (5.30)$$

54 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

where $D_k(n) = 2 + n + k$ and $k = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} i$.

Moreover $\tilde{F}_{h+1}^j + \tilde{J}_{h+1}^j \leq c j^{2h}$ and the kernels of $LV^{(h)}$ satisfy

$$\tilde{F}_h^j \leq C j \tilde{J}_h^j ; \quad \tilde{J}_h^j \leq C j \tilde{J}_h^j \quad (5.31)$$

and

$$\tilde{J}_h^j \leq C j j ; \quad \tilde{F}_h^j \leq C j j^2 ; \quad \tilde{J}_h^j \leq C j j^2 : \quad (5.32)$$

The bounds (5.31) holds even if (5.23) does not hold. The bounds (5.32) holds even if (5.23) and the first two of (5.22) do not hold.

Remarks.

- 1) The above result immediately implies analyticity of the effective potential of scale h in the running coupling constants $k; k, k \leq h$, under the assumptions (5.21), (5.22), (5.23) and (5.29).
- 2) The assumptions (5.22) and (5.29) will be proved in next Chapter, solving the flow equations for $\mathbf{v}_h = (v_h; v_h)$ and $Z_h; v_h; v_h$, given by $\mathbf{v}_{h-1} = v_h(v_h; \dots; v_1)$, $Z_{h-1} = Z_h(1 + v_h)$ and (5.14). They will be proved to be true up to $h = 1$.

5.5 Proof of Theorem 5.1.

It is possible to write $V^{(h)}$ (5.5) in terms of Gallavotti{Nicol{ trees. The detailed derivation of this representation can be found in the review papers [G1][GM] and in my diploma thesis [G]. We do not repeat here the details, we only give the basic definitions, in order to make the subsequent discussion self consistent.




Fig. 5. A tree with its scale labels.

Let us introduce the following definitions and notations.

- 1) Let us consider the family of all trees which can be constructed by joining a point r , the root, with an ordered set of $n - 1$ points, the endpoints of the unlabeled tree, so that r is not a branching point. n will be called the order of the unlabeled tree and the branching points will be called the non trivial vertices. Two unlabeled trees are identified if they can be superposed by a suitable continuous deformation, so that the endpoints with the same index coincide. Then the number of unlabeled trees with n end-points is bounded by 4^n .

- 2) We associate a label $h \geq 0$ with the root and we denote $T_{h,n}$ the corresponding set of labeled trees with n endpoints. Moreover, we introduce a family of vertical lines, labeled by an integer taking values in $[h; 2]$,

and we represent any tree $\in T_{h,n}$ so that, if v is an endpoint or a non trivial vertex, it is contained in a vertical line with index $h_v > h$, to be called the scale of v , while the root is on the line with index h . There is the constraint that, if v is an endpoint, $h_v > h + 1$; if there is only one end-point its scale must be equal to $h + 2$, for $h = 0$. Moreover, there is only one vertex immediately following the root, which will be denoted v_0 and can not be an endpoint; its scale is $h + 1$.

3) With each endpoint v of scale $h_v = h + 2$ we associate one of the contributions to $V^{(1)}$ given by (4.5); with each endpoint v of scale $h_v = h + 1$ one of the terms in $LV^{(h_v-1)}$ defined in (5.9). Moreover, we impose the constraint that, if v is an endpoint and $h_v = h + 1$, $h_v = h_{v^0} + 1$, if v^0 is the non trivial vertex immediately preceding v .

4) We introduce a field label f to distinguish the field variables appearing in the terms associated with the endpoints as in item 3); the set of field labels associated with the endpoint v will be called I_v . Analogously, if v is not an endpoint, we shall call I_v the set of field labels associated with the endpoints following the vertex v ; $x(f)$, $\langle f \rangle$ and $! (f)$ will denote the space-time point, the index and the ! index, respectively, of the field variable with label f .

5) We associate with any vertex v of the tree a subset P_v of I_v , the external fields of v . These subsets must satisfy various constraints. First of all, if v is not an endpoint and $v_1; \dots; v_{s_v}$ are the s_v vertices immediately following it, then $P_v = \bigcup_i P_{v_i}$; if v is an endpoint, $P_v = I_v$. We shall denote Q_{v_i} the intersection of P_v and P_{v_i} ; this definition implies that $P_v = \bigcup_i Q_{v_i}$. The subsets $P_{v_i} \cap Q_{v_i}$, whose union will be made, by definition, of the internal fields of v , have to be non empty, if $s_v > 1$, that is if v is a non trivial vertex. Given $\in T_{h,n}$, there are many possible choices of the subsets P_v , $v \in T_{h,n}$, compatible with the previous constraints; let us call P one of this choices. Given P , we consider the family G_P of all connected Feynman graphs, such that, for any $v \in T_{h,n}$, the internal fields of v are paired by propagators of scale h_v , so that the following condition is satisfied: for any $v \in T_{h,n}$, the subgraph built by the propagators associated with all vertices $v^0 \dots v$ is connected. The sets P_v have, in this picture, the role of the external legs of the subgraph associated with v . The graphs belonging to G_P will be called compatible with P and we shall denote P the family of all choices of P such that G_P is not empty.

6) we associate with any vertex v an index $\nu_v \in \mathbb{N}$ and correspondingly an operator R_{ν_v} , where R_s or R_p are defined as

$$R_s \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} S_2 & \text{if } n = 1 \text{ and } !_1 + !_2 = 0, \\ R_1 S_1 & \text{if } n = 1 \text{ and } !_1 + !_2 \neq 0, \\ S_1 & \text{if } n = 2, \\ 1 & \text{if } n > 2; \end{cases} \quad (5.33)$$

and

$$R_p \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} R_2 (P_0 + P_1) & \text{if } n = 1 \text{ and } !_1 + !_2 = 0, \\ R_2 P_0 & \text{if } n = 1, !_1 + !_2 \neq 0 \text{ and } \nu_1 + \nu_2 = 0, \\ 0 & \text{if } n = 1, !_1 + !_2 \neq 0 \text{ and } \nu_1 + \nu_2 \neq 0, \\ R_1 P_0 & \text{if } n = 2, \\ 0 & \text{if } n > 2. \end{cases} \quad (5.34)$$

Note that $R_s + R_p = R$, see Lemma 5.2.

The effective potential can be written in the following way:

$$V^{(h)} \left(\frac{p}{Z_h} \right)^{(h)} + M^2 E_{h+1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{T_{h,n}} V^{(h)} \left(\frac{p}{Z_h} \right)^{(h)}; \quad (5.35)$$

where, if v_0 is the first vertex of $T_{h,n}$ and $s_1; \dots; s_n$ are the subtrees of $T_{h,n}$ with root v_0 , $V^{(h)} \left(\frac{p}{Z_h} \right)^{(h)}$ is defined inductively by the relation

$$V^{(h)} \left(\frac{p}{Z_h} \right)^{(h)} = \frac{(1)^{s+1}}{s!} E_{h+1}^T [V^{(h+1)} \left(\frac{p}{Z_h} \right)^{(h+1)}; \dots; V^{(h+1)} \left(\frac{p}{Z_h} \right)^{(h+1)}]; \quad (5.36)$$

5.6 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

and $V^{(h+1)}(i; \frac{P}{Z_h} \overline{\psi}^{(h+1)})$:

- is equal to $R_{v_i} \psi^{(h+1)}(i; \frac{P}{Z_h} \overline{\psi}^{(h+1)})$ if the subtree i with root vertex v_i is not trivial (see (5.15) for the definition of $\psi^{(h)}$);
- if i is trivial and $h \geq 1$, it is equal to one of the terms in $L\psi^{(h+1)}$, see (5.15), or, if $h = 0$, to one of the terms contributing to $\psi^{(1)}(\frac{P}{Z_1} \overline{\psi}^{(1)})$.

5.6. The explicit expression for the kernels of $V^{(h)}$ can be found from (5.35) and (5.36) by writing the truncated expectations of monomials of fields using the analogue of (4.14): if $e(P_{v_i}) = \frac{Q}{f^{2P_{v_i}} x(f); !^{(f)}(f)}$, the following identity holds:

$$E_{h_v}^T(e(P_{v_1}); \dots; e(P_{v_s})) = \frac{1}{Z_{h_v-1}} \sum_{T_v} \prod_{T_v} g^{(h_v)}(f_1^1; f_1^2) \int dP_{T_v}(t) P f G^{T_v}(t) \quad (5.37)$$

where $g^{(h)}(f; f^0) = g_{\underline{a}(f); \underline{a}(f^0)}(x(f) - x(f^0))$ and the other symbols in (5.37) have the same meaning as those in (4.14).

Using iteratively (5.37) we can express the kernels of $V^{(h)}$ as sums of products of propagators of the fields (the ones associated to the anchored trees T_v) and Pfaffians of matrices G^{T_v} .

5.7. If the R operator were not applied to the vertices $v \in \mathcal{V}_2$ then the result of the iteration would lead to the following relation:

$$V_h(i; \frac{P}{Z_h} \overline{\psi}^{(h)}) = \frac{P}{Z_h} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \int dx_{v_0} W_{P;T}(x_{v_0}) \prod_{f \in \mathcal{P}_{v_0}} \frac{(f)^{(h)}(f)}{x(f); !^{(f)}(f)}; \quad (5.38)$$

where x_{v_0} is the set of integration variables associated to v_0 and $T = \sum_v T_v$; $W_{P;T}$ is given by

$$W_{P;T}(x_{v_0}) = \sum_{v \text{ not ep.}} \prod_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \frac{Z_{h_v}}{Z_{h_v-1}} \frac{\frac{P_{v,j}}{2} i h_Y}{i o} \prod_{i=1}^n K_{v_i}^{h_i}(x_{v_i}) \prod_{v \text{ not ep.}} \frac{1}{s_v!} \int dP_{T_v}(t_v) \prod_{T_v} g^{(h_v)}(f_1^1; f_1^2); \quad (5.39)$$

where: ep. is an abbreviation of "end points"; $v_1; \dots; v_n$ are the endpoints of γ , $h_i = h_{v_i}$ and $K_{v_i}^{h_i}(x_{v_i})$ are the corresponding kernels (equal to $h_{v_i-1}(x_{v_i})$ or $h_{v_i-1}(x_{v_i})$ if v is an endpoint of type γ or δ on scale $h_{v_i}-1$; or equal to one of the kernels of $V^{(1)}$ if $h_{v_i} = 2$).

Bounding (5.39) using (5.24) and the Gram-Hadamard inequality, see Appendix A.3, we would find:

$$\int dx_{v_0} W_{P;T}(x_{v_0}) \leq C^{n_M} \sum_{j=1}^n \prod_{h \in \mathcal{H}} \left(\frac{1}{s_v!} \frac{Z_{h_v}}{Z_{h_v-1}} \frac{\frac{P_{v,j}}{2}}{[2 + \frac{P_{v,j}}{2}]^{D_v}} \right); \quad (5.40)$$

We call $D_v = 2 + \frac{P_{v,j}}{2}$ the dimension of v , depending on the number of the external fields of v . If $D_v < 0$ for any v one can sum over $P;T$ obtaining convergence for n small enough; however $D_v \geq 0$ when there are two or four external lines. We will take now into account the effect of the R operator and we will see how the bound (5.40) is improved.

5.8. The effect of application of P_j and S_j is to replace a kernel $W_{2n_i, j_i, i_i}^{(h)}$ with $P_j W_{2n_i, j_i, i_i}^{(h)}$ and $S_j W_{2n_i, j_i, i_i}^{(h)}$. If inductively, starting from the endpoints, we write the kernels $W_{2n_i, j_i, i_i}^{(h)}$ in a form similar to (5.39), we easily realize that, eventually, P_j or S_j will act on some propagator of an anchored tree or on

5. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The anomalous regime. 57

some Pfaffian PfG^{T_v} , for some v . It is easy to realize that P_j and S_j , when applied to Pfaffians, do not break the Pfaffian structure. In fact the effect of P_j on the Pfaffian of an antisymmetric matrix G with elements $G_{f;f^0}, f;f^0 \in J, j \in 2k$, is the following (the proof is trivial):

$$P_0 P f G = P f G^0; \quad P_1 P f G = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{f_1, f_2 \in J} P_1 G_{f_1, f_2} (-1)^{j_1} P f G_1^0; \quad (5.41)$$

where G^0 is the matrix with elements $P_0 G_{f;f^0}, f;f^0 \in J$; G_1^0 is the matrix with elements $P_0 G_{f;f^0}, f;f^0 \in J_1 = J \setminus f_1$; $f_2 \in J_2$ and $(-1)^{j_1}$ is the sign of the permutation leading from the ordering J of the labels f in the l.h.s. to the ordering $f_1; f_2; J_1$ in the r.h.s. The effect of S_j is the following, see Appendix A.5 for a proof:

$$S_1 P f G = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{f_1, f_2 \in J} \frac{1}{k!} S_1 G_{f_1, f_2} \sum_{J_1 \sqcup J_2 = J \setminus \{f_1\}} (-1)^{k_1+k_2} P f G_1^0 P f G_2; \quad (5.42)$$

where: the sum means that $J \setminus J_2 = \{f_1\}; j \in 2k_i, i = 1, 2; (-1)^{k_1+k_2}$ is the sign of the permutation leading from the ordering J of the labels on the l.h.s. to the ordering $f_1; f_2; J_1; J_2$ on the r.h.s.; G_1^0 is the matrix with elements $P_0 G_{f;f^0}, f;f^0 \in J_1$; G_2 is the matrix with elements $G_{f;f^0}, f;f^0 \in J_2$. The effect of S_2 on $P f G^T$ is given by a formula similar to (5.42). Note that the number of terms in the sums appearing in (5.41), (5.42) (and in the analogous equation for $S_2 P f G^T$), is bounded by c^k for some constant c .

5.9. It is possible to show that the R_j operators produce derivatives applied to the propagators of the anchored trees and on the elements of G^{T_v} ; and a product of "zeros" of the form $d_j^b(x(f^1) - x(f^2)), j = 0, 1, b = 0, 1, 2$, associated to the lines $\in J_2$. This is a well known result, and a very detailed discussion can be found in [3] of [BM]. By such analysis, and using (5.41), (5.42), we get the following expression for $R V^{(h)}(\frac{P}{Z_h}(\frac{1}{Z_h}(\frac{1}{Z_h})))$:

$$R V^{(h)}(\frac{P}{Z_h}(\frac{1}{Z_h}(\frac{1}{Z_h}))) = \frac{P}{Z_h} \sum_{P \sqcup T \sqcup B_T} \sum_{T \sqcup T} \sum_{B_T} \int dx_{v_0} W_{P;T}(x_{v_0}) \sum_{f \in P_{v_0}} \sum_{j \in J} \hat{\partial}_j^{q(f)} \frac{(f)(h)}{x(f)! (f)!} O; \quad (5.43)$$

where: B_T is a set of indexes which allows to distinguish the different terms produced by the non trivial R operations; $x(f)$ is a coordinate obtained by interpolating two points in x_{v_0} , in a suitable way depending on j ; $q(f)$ is a nonnegative integer ≥ 2 ; $j(f) = 0, 1$ and $\hat{\partial}_j^{q(f)}$ is a suitable differential operator, dimensionally equivalent to $\partial_j^{q(f)}$ (see [BM] for a precise definition); $W_{P;T}$ is given by:

$$W_{P;T}(x_{v_0}) = \sum_{v \in P} \sum_{Y} \frac{Z_{h_v}}{Z_{h_v-1}} \sum_{i=1}^{\frac{P_{v,j}}{2} i h_Y} d_{j(v)}^{b(v)}(x^i; y^i) P_{I(v)}^C(v_i) S_{i(v)}^c(v_i) K_{v_i}^{h_i}(x_{v_i})^i \\ \sum_{v \in P} \sum_{Y} \frac{1}{S_v!} \int dP_{T_v}(t_v) P_{I(v)}^C(v) S_{i(v)}^c(v) P f G^{h_v; T_v}(t_v) \\ \sum_{v \in P} \sum_{Y} \hat{\partial}_j^{q(f_1^1)} \hat{\partial}_j^{q(f_1^2)} [d_{j(l)}^{b(l)}(x_1; y_1) P_{I(l)}^C(l) S_{i(l)}^c(l) g^{(h_v)}(f_1^1; f_1^2)]^{i_0}; \quad (5.44)$$

where: v_1, \dots, v_n are the endpoints of j ; $b(v), b(l), q(f_1^1)$ and $q(f_1^2)$ are nonnegative integers ≥ 2 ; $j(v), j(f_1^1), j(f_1^2)$ and $j(l)$ can be 0 or 1; $i(v)$ and $i(l)$ can be 1 or 2; $I(v)$ and $I(l)$ can be 0 or 1; $C(v), c(v), C(l)$ and $c(l)$ can be 0, 1 and $\max\{C(v) + c(v), C(l) + c(l)\} = 1$; $G^{h_v; T_v}(t_v)$ is obtained from $G^{h_v; T_v}(t_v)$ by substituting the element $t_{i(f), i(f^0)} g^{(h_v)}(f; f^0)$ with $t_{i(f), i(f^0)} \hat{\partial}_j^{q(f)} \hat{\partial}_j^{q(f^0)} g^{(h_v)}(f; f^0)$.

58 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

It would be very difficult to give a precise description of the various contributions of the sum over B_T , but fortunately we only need to know some very general properties, which easily follows from the construction in §5.1.

1) There is a constant C such that, $\delta T \leq T$, $\beta_T \leq C^n$; for any $\gamma \in B_T$, the following inequality is satisfied

$$h_Y \prod_{f \in \gamma} \frac{h(f)}{h(f)q(f)} \leq \prod_{l \in \gamma} \frac{h(l)}{h(l)b(l)} \leq \prod_{v \in \gamma} z(P_v); \quad (5.45)$$

where: $h(f) = h_{v_0} + 1$ if $f \in P_{v_0}$, otherwise it is the scale of the vertex where the field with label f is contracted; $h(l) = h_v$, if $l \in T_v$ and

$$z(P_v) = \begin{cases} 8 & \text{if } \beta_v = 4 \text{ and } v = p; \\ 2 & \text{if } \beta_v = 2 \text{ and } v = p; \\ 1 & \text{if } \beta_v = 2, v = s \text{ and } \prod_{f \in P_v} (f) \neq 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.46)$$

2) If we define

$$Y_h \prod_{v \in \gamma} \frac{j_{h_v} + j_{h_v}}{h_v} \leq \prod_{v \in \gamma} \frac{j_{h_v} + j_{h_v}}{h_v} \leq \prod_{v \in \gamma} \frac{j_{h_v} + j_{h_v}}{h_v} \leq \prod_{v \in \gamma} \frac{j_{h_v} + j_{h_v}}{h_v}; \quad (5.47)$$

the indices $i(v; \gamma)$ satisfy, for any B_T , the following property:

$$\sum_{v \in \gamma} i(v; \gamma) \leq z^0(P_v); \quad (5.48)$$

where

$$z^0(P_v) = \begin{cases} 8 & \text{if } \beta_v = 4 \text{ and } v = s; \\ 2 & \text{if } \beta_v = 2 \text{ and } v = s \text{ and } \prod_{f \in P_v} (f) = 0; \\ 1 & \text{if } \beta_v = 2, v = s \text{ and } \prod_{f \in P_v} (f) \neq 0; \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (5.49)$$

5.10. We can bound any $\beta_{I(v)}^C S_{I(v)}^C P f G^{h_v; T_v} j$ in (5.44), with $C(v) + c(v) = 0; 1$, by using (5.41), (5.42) and Gram inequality, as illustrated in previous Chapter for the case of the integration of the fields. Using that the elements of G are all propagators on scale h_v , dimensionally bounded as in Lemma 5.3, we find:

$$\beta_{I(v)}^C S_{I(v)}^C P f G^{h_v; T_v} j \leq C^{s_v} \beta_{v_1} j \beta_{v_2} j \leq \prod_{f \in J_v} \frac{j_{h_v} + j_{h_v}}{h_v} \leq \prod_{f \in J_v} \frac{j_{h_v} + j_{h_v}}{h_v}; \quad (5.50)$$

where $J_v = \{ \beta_{v_1} P_{v_1} \cup \beta_{v_2} Q_{v_2} \}$. We will bound the factors $\prod_{f \in J_v} \frac{j_{h_v} + j_{h_v}}{h_v} \leq C^{s_v} \beta_{v_1} j \beta_{v_2} j$ using (5.23) times a constant.

If we call

$$J_{\beta; T; } = \int_{v_0}^{Z} dx_{v_0}^{h_Y} d_{j(v_1)}^b(x^1; Y^1) P_{I(v_1)}^C S_{I(v_1)}^C K_{v_1}^{h_1}(x_{v_1}^1) \prod_{v \in \gamma} \frac{1}{s_v!} \prod_{l \in T_v} h_Y \left[\hat{e}_j^{q(f_1^1)} \hat{e}_j^{q(f_1^2)} d_{j(l)}^b(x_1; Y_1) P_{I(l)}^C S_{I(l)}^C g^{(h_v)}(f_1^1; f_1^2) \right]^{i_0}; \quad (5.51)$$

we have, under the hypothesis (5.29),

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P}; T; \\ n \in \mathbb{N}}} C^{nM} 2^j \int \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{j_{h_i} j + j_{h_i} j}{h_i} c^{(v_i)} i^{(v_i)} i \\ & \quad \times \frac{1}{s_v!} C^{2(s_v-1) h_v n(v)} h_v^{P_{12T_v} b(l)} h_v^{P_{n=1} b(v_i)} h_v^{(s_v-1)} \\ & \quad \times \prod_{h_v \in T_v} [f_1^1 + q(f_1^2)]^{oh_Y} \frac{j_{h_v} j + j_{h_v} j}{h_v} c^{(v)} i^{(v)} i; \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

where $n(v)$ is the number of vertices of type v with scale $h_v + 1$.

Now, substituting (5.50), (5.52) into (5.44), using (5.45), we find that:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P}; T; \\ n \in \mathbb{N}}} dx_{v_0} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{j_{h_i} j + j_{h_i} j}{h_i} c^{(v_i)} i^{(v_i)} i \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{1}{s_v!} C^{P_{s_v=1} P_{v_i} j} P_{v_j} \frac{Z_{h_v}}{Z_{h_v-1}} \frac{P_{v_j}}{2} [2 + \frac{P_{v_j}}{2} + z(P_v)] \right); \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

where, if $k = \sum_{f \in P_{v_0}} q(f)$, $D_k(p) = 2 + p + k$ and we have used (5.47). Note that, given $v \in 2T_{h,m}$ and using (5.23) together with the first two of (5.22),

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{j_{h_v} j}{h_v} &= \frac{j_h j}{h} \frac{j_{h_v} j}{j_h j} h_{h_v} \frac{j_h j}{h} (h_{h_v} - 1) c_j j = C_1 (h_{h_v} - 1) c_j j \\ \frac{j_{h_v} j}{h_v} &= \frac{j_h j}{h} \frac{j_{h_v} j}{j_h j} h_{h_v} \frac{j_h j}{h} (h_{h_v} - 1) c_j j = C_1 (h_{h_v} - 1) c_j j \end{aligned} \quad (5.54)$$

Moreover the indexes $i(v; \cdot)$ satisfy, for any B_T , (5.49) so that, using (5.54) and (5.48), we find

$$\sum_{v \in 2V} \frac{j_{h_v} j + j_{h_v} j}{h_v} c^{(v)} i^{(v)} i = C_1^n \sum_{v \in \text{not ep.}} (1 - c_j j) z^0(P_v); \quad (5.55)$$

Substituting (5.54) into (5.53) and using (5.48), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\substack{P \in \mathcal{P}; T; \\ n \in \mathbb{N}}} dx_{v_0} \prod_{i=1}^n \frac{j_{h_i} j + j_{h_i} j}{h_i} c^{(v_i)} i^{(v_i)} i \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{1}{s_v!} C^{P_{s_v=1} P_{v_i} j} P_{v_j} \frac{Z_{h_v}}{Z_{h_v-1}} \frac{P_{v_j}}{2} [2 + \frac{P_{v_j}}{2} + z(P_v) + (1 - c_j j) z^0(P_v)] \right); \end{aligned} \quad (5.56)$$

and it holds:

$$2 + \frac{P_{v_j}}{2} + z(P_v) + (1 - c_j j) z^0(P_v) \leq \frac{P_{v_j}}{6}; \quad (5.57)$$

Then (5.30) in Theorem 5.1 follows from the previous bounds and the remark that

$$\sum_{2T_{h,m}} \sum_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}} \sum_{B_T} \sum_v \frac{1}{s_v!} \frac{P_{v_j}}{6} c^n; \quad (5.58)$$

for some constant c , see [BM] [GM] or [G] for further details.

The bound on E_h, t_h , (5.31) and (5.32) follow from a similar analysis. The remarks following (5.31) and (5.32) follow from noticing that in the expansion for $LV^{(h)}$ appear only propagators of type $P_0 g_{\underline{a}, \underline{a}^0}^{(h_v)}$ or $P_1 g_{\underline{a}, \underline{a}^0}^{(h_v)}$ (in order to bound these propagators we do not need (5.23), see the last statement in Lemma 5.3). Furthermore, by construction l_h, n_h and z_h are independent of k ; k , so that, in order to prove (5.32) we do not even need the first two inequalities in (5.22). ■

5.11. The sum over all the trees with root scale h and with at least a v with $h_v = k$ is $O(j^{j-\frac{1}{2}(h-k)})$; this follows from the fact that the bound (5.58) holds, for some $c = O(1)$, even if $\mathcal{P}_v j^6$ is replaced by $\mathcal{P}_v j$, for any constant $c > 0$ independent of j ; and that D_v , instead of using (5.57), can also be bounded as $D_v \leq 1 + \mathcal{P}_v j^2$. This property is called short memory property.

6. The flow of the running coupling constants.

The convergence of the expansion for the effective potential is proved by Theorem 5.1 under the hypothesis that the running coupling constants are small, see (5.29), and that the bounds (5.21), (5.22) and (5.23) are satisfied. We now want to show that, choosing ϵ small enough and μ as a suitable function of ϵ , such hypothesis are indeed verified. In the present Chapter, we will prove these hypotheses under the assumption that the Luttinger model Beta function is vanishing; we will do more, and we will find an explicit solution for the flow equation of $Z_h; g_h; m_h$, satisfying in particular the bounds (5.21), (5.22) and satisfying (5.23) for any scale $h \leq h_1$, where h_1 is a scale we will explicitly choose in the present Chapter (it is the scale dividing the anomalous regime from the non anomalous one). The proof of the vanishing of the Beta function will be done in Appendix A6, following the recent work [BM1]. The proof of Appendix A6 will be based on the implementation in our constructive formalism of some non perturbative identities between Schwinger functions, that is of two different approximate Ward identities for the two and four legs Schwinger functions respectively, of the Dyson equation, and of some correction identities, expressing the corrections to the formal Ward identities in terms of two or four legs Schwinger functions. It worths to stress that these non perturbative identities are derived by making use of (chiral) gauge invariance, that is not satisfied by the Ashkin-Teller model. However, since there is a model near to AT in a Renormalization Group sense (we shall call it the reference model) satisfying these symmetries, the cancellations appearing in the perturbation theory of the reference model also imply cancellations for AT itself. We can say that some hidden symmetries of Ashkin-Teller allow us to control the flow of its running coupling constants. Note that here the word "hidden" has a different (and much deeper) meaning than in the introduction of Chapter 4.

6.1. The flow equations

We will first solve the flow equations for the renormalization constants (following from (5.14) and preceding line):

$$\frac{Z_{h-1}}{Z_h} = 1 + z_h \quad ; \quad \frac{g_{h-1}}{g_h} = 1 + \frac{S_h - g_h}{1 + z_h} \quad ; \quad \frac{m_{h-1}}{m_h} = 1 + \frac{m_h - g_h}{1 + z_h} \quad ; \quad (6.1)$$

together with those for the running coupling constants (5.28):

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{g}_h &= g_h + \beta^g(h; g_h; \dots; g_1; 1) \\ \dot{z}_h &= z_h + \beta^z(h; g_h; \dots; g_1; 1) : \end{aligned} \quad (6.2)$$

The functions $\beta^g; \beta^z$ are called the g and z components of the Beta function, see the comment after (5.27), and, by construction, are independent of $k; k$, so that their convergence follow just from (5.29) and the last of (5.22), i.e. without assuming (5.23), see Theorem 5.1. While for a general kernel we will apply Theorem 5.1 just up to a finite scale h_1 (in order to insure the validity of (5.23) with $h = h_1$), we will inductively study the flow generated by (6.2) up to scale 1 , and we shall prove that it is bounded for all scales. The main result on the flows of g_h and z_h , proven in next section, is the following.

Theorem 6.1. If ϵ is small enough, there exists an analytic function $\mu(\epsilon)$ independent of $t; u$ such that the running coupling constants $f_h; g_h; m_h$ with $g_1 = \mu(\epsilon)$ verify $|j_h j| \leq c |j|^{(\#-2)h}$ and $|j_h j| \leq c |j|$. Moreover the kernels $z_h; s_h$ and m_h satisfy (5.21) and the solutions of the flow equations (6.1) satisfy (5.22).

6.2. Proof of Theorem 6.1.

We consider the space $M_\#$ of sequences $\underline{g} = f_h g_h$ such that $|j_h j| \leq c |j|^{(\#-2)h}$; we shall think $M_\#$ as a Banach space with norm $\|\underline{g}\|_\#$, where $\|\underline{g}\|_\# \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{k \geq 1} |j_k j|^{(\#-2)k}$. We will proceed as follows: we first

62 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

show that, for any sequence $\underline{c} \in M_\#$, the low equation for χ_h , the hypothesis (5.21), (5.22) and the property $j_h(\underline{c}) \leq c_j$ are verified, uniformly in \underline{c} . Then we $\chi_{\underline{c}} \in M_\#$ via an exponentially convergent iterative procedure, in such a way that the low equation for χ_h is satisfied.

Given $\underline{c} \in M_\#$, let us suppose inductively that (5.21), (5.22) and that, for $k > h + 1$,

$$j_{k-1}(\underline{c}) \leq c_k j_{\emptyset}^2 \quad (\# = 2)^k; \quad (6.3)$$

for some $c_0 > 0$. Note that (6.3) is certainly true for $h = 1$ (in that case the r.h.s. of (6.3) is just the bound on j^1). Note also that (6.3) implies that $j_k \leq c_j$ for any $k > h$.

Using (5.31), the second of (5.32) and (6.1) we find that (5.21), (5.22) are true with h replaced by $h - 1$.

We now consider the equation $\chi_{h-1} = \chi_h + \chi^h(h; h; \dots; 1; 1)$, $h > h$. The function χ^h can be expressed as a convergent sum over tree diagrams s , as described in 5.5; note that it depends on $(h; h; \dots; 1; 1)$ directly through the end{points of the trees and indirectly through the factors $Z_h = Z_{h-1}$.

We can write $P_0 g_{(+; !); (-; !)}^{(h)}(x, y) = g_{L; !}^{(h)}(x, y) + r_{!}^{(h)}(x, y)$, where

$$g_{L; !}^{(h)}(x, y) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{4}{M^2} \sum_k e^{ik(x-y)} f_h(k) \frac{1}{ik + !k_0} \quad (6.4)$$

and $r_{!}^{(h)}$ is the rest, satisfying the same bound as $g_{(+; !); (-; !)}^{(h)}$, times a factor χ^h . This decomposition induces the following decomposition for χ^h :

$$\begin{aligned} \chi^h(h; h; \dots; 1; 1) &= \\ &= \chi_{L; !}^h(h; \dots; h) + \sum_{k=h+1}^X D^{h,k} + \chi^h(h; \dots; 1) + \sum_{k=h}^X k^{-h,k} (k; k; \dots; 1; 1); \end{aligned} \quad (6.5)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} j_{L; !}^h j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^h; \quad D^{h,k} j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(h-k)} j_k \quad h j; \\ j^h j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(2)h}; \quad k^{-h,k} j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(h-k)}; \end{aligned} \quad (6.6)$$

The first two terms in (6.5) $\chi_{L; !}^h$ collect the contributions obtained by posing $r_{!}^{(k)} = 0$, $k > h$ and substituting the discrete function defined after (5.10) with $M^2_{k,0}$. The rest of (6.6) is called the vanishing of the Luttinger model Beta function property, and it is a crucial and non trivial property of interacting fermionic systems in $d = 1$. It will be proved in Appendix A 6.

Using the decomposition (6.5) and the bounds (6.6) we prove the following bounds for $\chi_h(\underline{c})$, $\underline{c} \in M_\#$:

$$j_h(\underline{c}) \leq c_1 j_{\emptyset}^2; \quad j_h(\underline{c}) \leq c_{h+1} j_{\emptyset}^2 \quad (\# = 2)^h; \quad (6.7)$$

for some $c_0 > 0$. Moreover, given $\underline{c} \in M_\#$, we show that:

$$j_h(\underline{c}) \leq c_h j_{\emptyset}^0 \quad (6.8)$$

where $j_{\emptyset}^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_{h \geq 1} j_h \leq j_{\emptyset}^0$.

Proof of (6.7). We decompose $\chi_h = \chi_{h+1} + \chi^h$ as in (6.5). Using the bounds (6.6) and the inductive hypothesis (6.3), we find:

$$\begin{aligned} j_h(\underline{c}) \leq c_{h+1} j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(h+1)} + \sum_{k=h+2}^X c_j j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(h+1-k)} X^k c_0 j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(2)k^0} + \\ + c_j j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(2)(h+1)} + \sum_{k=h+1}^{k=h+2} X^{k^0=h+2} c^2 j_{\emptyset}^2 \#^{(2)k - \#(h+1-k)}; \end{aligned} \quad (6.9)$$

6. The flow of the running coupling constants. 63

which, for c_0 big enough, immediately implies the second of (6.7) with $h \leq h-1$; from this bound and the hypothesis (6.3) follows the first of (6.7). ■

Proof of (6.8). If we take two sequences $\underline{\lambda}; \underline{\lambda}^0 \in M_{\#}$, we easily find that the beta function for $j_h(\underline{\lambda}) = j_h(\underline{\lambda}^0)$ can be represented by a tree expansion similar to the one for j^h , with the property that the trees giving a non vanishing contribution have necessarily one end point on scale $k \leq h$ associated to a coupling constant $j_k(\underline{\lambda}) = j_k(\underline{\lambda}^0)$ or j_k^0 . Then we find:

$$j_h(\underline{\lambda}) = j_h(\underline{\lambda}^0) = j_1(\underline{\lambda}) = j_1(\underline{\lambda}^0) + \sum_{h+1 \leq k \leq 1} [j_k(\underline{\lambda}); k; \dots; 1; 1) = j_k(\underline{\lambda}^0); k^0; \dots; 1; 1^0] : \quad (6.10)$$

Note that $j_1(\underline{\lambda}) = j_1(\underline{\lambda}^0) + c_0 j_1^0$ because $j_1 = -Z_1^2 + O(Z_1^4)$ and $Z_1 = \frac{p}{2} j_1 + j_1^0 = 2$. If we inductively suppose that, for any $k > h$, $j_k(\underline{\lambda}) = j_k(\underline{\lambda}^0) + 2c_0 j_k^0$, we find, by using the decomposition (6.5):

$$j_h(\underline{\lambda}) = j_h(\underline{\lambda}^0) + c_0 j_1^0 + \sum_{k=h+1}^{\infty} j_k^{\#(2)k} = \sum_{k^0 \leq k} j_k^{\#(k-k^0)} 2c_0 j_k^0 + j_k^i : \quad (6.11)$$

Choosing c_0 big enough, (6.8) follows. ■

We are now left with fixing the sequence $\underline{\lambda}$ in such a way that the flow equation for j_1 is satisfied. Since we want to fix $\underline{\lambda}$ in such a way that $j_1 = 0$, we must have:

$$j_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} j_k^2 = j_k^2(k; k; \dots; 1; 1) : \quad (6.12)$$

If we manage to fix j_1 as in (6.12), we also get:

$$j_h = \sum_{k=h}^{\infty} j_k^{h-1} = j_k^{h-1}(k; k; \dots; 1; 1) : \quad (6.13)$$

We look for a fixed point of the operator $T : M_{\#} \rightarrow M_{\#}$ defined as:

$$(T\underline{\lambda})_h = \sum_{k=h}^{\infty} j_k^{h-1}(k(\underline{\lambda}); k; \dots; 1; 1) : \quad (6.14)$$

where $j_k(\underline{\lambda})$ is the solution of the first line of (6.2), obtained as a function of the parameter $\underline{\lambda}$, as described above.

If we find a fixed point $\underline{\lambda}$ of (6.14), the first two lines in (6.2) will be simultaneously solved by $\underline{\lambda}(\underline{\lambda})$ and $\underline{\lambda}$ respectively, and the solution will have the desired smallness properties for j_h and j^h .

First note that, if j_j is sufficiently small, then T leaves $M_{\#}$ invariant: in fact, as a consequence of parity cancellations, the β component of the Beta function satisfies:

$$j^h(h; h; \dots; 1; 1) = j_{,1}^h(h; \dots; 1) + \sum_k j_k^{\sim h,k}(h; h; \dots; 1; 1) \quad (6.15)$$

where, if c_1, c_2 are suitable constants

$$j_{,1}^h j^h = c_1 j^{\#h} + j^{\sim h,k} j^{\#(h-k)} : \quad (6.16)$$

6.4 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

by using (6.15) and choosing $c = 2c_1$ we obtain

$$j(T_h)_j = \sum_{k=h}^X 2c_1 j^{(\# = 2)k-k-h} c j^{(\# = 2)h}; \quad (6.17)$$

Furthermore, using (6.15) and (6.8), we find that T is a contraction on $M_\#$:

$$\begin{aligned} j(T_h)_j &= (T_h^0)_j \sum_{k=h}^X k^{h-1} j^k (k; k; \dots; 1; 1) = k(k^0; k^0; \dots; 1; 1) j \\ &= \sum_{k=h}^X k^{h-1} \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} j^{k^0} (k^0) + \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} \#(k-k^0) j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} \\ &= \sum_{k=h}^X k^{h-1} \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} + \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} \#(k-k^0) j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} \\ &= \sum_{k=h}^X k^{h-1} \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} + \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} \#(k-k^0) j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} \\ &= \sum_{k=h}^X k^{h-1} \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} + \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} \#(k-k^0) j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} \end{aligned} \quad (6.18)$$

hence $j(T_h)_j = (T_h^0)_j \sum_{k=h}^X k^{h-1} j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} + \sum_{k^0=k}^{X^1} \#(k-k^0) j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0}$. Then, a unique fixed point u for T exists on $M_\#$. Proof of Theorem 6.1 is concluded by noticing that T is analytic (in fact h and u are analytic in u in the domain $M_\#$) ■

6.3 The flow of the renormalization constants.

Once that u_1 is conveniently chosen as in Theorem 6.1, one can study in more detail the flows of the renormalization constants. We will now prove the following.

Lemma 6.1. If u is small enough and u_1 is chosen as in Theorem 6.1, the solution of (6.1) can be written as:

$$Z_h = z^{(h-1)+F^h}; \quad h = 1 \quad (h-1)+F^h; \quad h = 1 \quad (h-1)+F^h \quad (6.19)$$

where $z; u; z$ and $F^h; F^h; F^h$ are $O(u)$ functions, independent of $u_1; u_1$.

Moreover $u = b + O(u^2), b > 0$.

Proof of Lemma 6.1 From now on we shall think h and h fixed, with u_1 conveniently chosen as above ($u_1 = u_1(u)$). Then we have $j_h j = c j j$ and $j_h j = c j j^{(\# = 2)h}$, for some $c; \# > 0$. Having fixed u_1 as a convenient function of u , we can also think h and h as functions of u .

The flow of Z_h . The flow of Z_h is given by the first of (6.1) with z_h independent of $k; k, k-h$. By Theorem 3.1 we have that $j_h j = c j j^2$, uniformly in h . Again, as for h and h , we can formally study this equation up to $h = 1$. We define $z \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{h \rightarrow 1} \frac{1}{h-1} \log Z_h$, so that

$$\log Z_h = \sum_{k=h+1}^X \log(1+z_k) = z(h-1) + \sum_{k=h+1}^X r^k; \quad r^k \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \log \frac{1+z_k}{1+z_1}; \quad (6.20)$$

Using the fact that $z_{k-1} - z_k$ is necessarily proportional to $\frac{1}{k-1} - \frac{1}{k}$ or to $\frac{1}{k-1} - \frac{1}{k}$ and that $\frac{1}{k-1} - \frac{1}{k}$ is bounded as in (6.3), we easily find: $j^k j = c^{k-k^0} j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0} = c^{k-k^0} j^{k^0} j^{k-k^0}^{(\# = 2)k}$. So, if $F^h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k=h+1}^P r^k$ and $F^1 = 0$, then $F^h = O(u)$ and $Z_h = z^{(h-1)+F^h}$. Clearly, by definition, z and F^h only depend on $k, k, k-1$, so they are independent of t and u .

The flow of h . The flow of h is given by the last of (6.1). One can easily show inductively that $k(k) = h, k-h$, is independent of u_1 , so that one can think that $h_{u_1} = h$ is just a function of h, h . Then, again we

6. The flow of the running coupling constants. 65

can study the flow equation for h up to $h \rightarrow 1$. We define $\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{h \rightarrow 1} (1 + (m_h = h - z_h)) = (1 + z_h)$, so that, proceeding as for Z_h , we see that

$$h = 1 + (h-1)F^h; \quad (6.21)$$

for a suitable $F^h = O(\epsilon)$. Of course ϵ and F^h are independent of t and u .

The flow of h . The flow of h can be studied as the one of h . If we define $\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{h \rightarrow 1} (1 + (s_h = h - z_h)) = (1 + z_h)$, we find that

$$h = 1 + (h-1)F^h; \quad (6.22)$$

for a suitable $F^h = O(\epsilon)$. Again, ϵ and F^h are independent of t and u .

We are left with proving that $\epsilon \neq 0$. It is sufficient to note that, by direct computation of the lowest order terms, for some $\epsilon > 0$, (6.1) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} z_h &= b_1 h^2 + O(h^2 \epsilon^h) + O(h^2 \epsilon^2); \quad b_1 > 0 \\ s_h = h &= b_2 h + O(h \epsilon^h) + O(h^2 \epsilon^2); \quad b_2 > 0 \\ m_h = h &= b_2 h + O(h \epsilon^h) + O(h^2 \epsilon^2); \quad b_2 > 0; \end{aligned} \quad (6.23)$$

where b_1, b_2 are constants independent of ϵ and h . Using (6.23) and the definitions of ϵ and ϵ we find:
 $\epsilon = (2b_2 \log \epsilon) + O(\epsilon^2)$ ■

6.4. The scale h_1

The integration described in Chapter 5 is iterated until a scale h_1 defined in the following way:

$$h_1 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} \min(1; \log j_1 j_1^{-1}) & \text{if } j_1 j_1^{-1} > 2j_1 j_1^{-1}, \\ \min(1; \log j_1 j_1^{-1}) & \text{if } j_1 j_1^{-1} \leq 2j_1 j_1^{-1}. \end{cases} \quad (6.24)$$

From (6.24) it follows that

$$C_2 h_1 = j_{h_1} j + j_{h_1} j = C_1 h_1; \quad (6.25)$$

with C_1, C_2 independent of ϵ ; j_1, j_1 .

This is obvious in the case $h_1 = 1$. If $h_1 < 1$ and $j_1 j_1^{-1} > 2j_1 j_1^{-1}$, then $h_1^{-1} = c j_1 j_1^{-1}$, with $1 - c < \epsilon$, so that, using the third of (6.19), we see that $C_2 h_1 = j_{h_1} j = C_1^0 h_1$, for some C_1^0 ; $C_2 = O(1)$. Furthermore, using also the second of (6.19), we find

$$\frac{j_{h_1} j}{j_{h_1} j} = c \quad j_1 j_1 j_1^{-1} F^{h_1} F^{h_1} < 1 \quad (6.26)$$

and (6.25) follows.

If $h_1 < 1$ and $j_1 j_1^{-1} \leq 2j_1 j_1^{-1}$, then $h_1^{-1} = c_u j_1 j_1^{-1}$, with $1 - c < \epsilon$, so that, using the second of (6.19) and $j_1 j = O(j_1 j)$, we see that $C_2 h_1 = j_{h_1} j = C_1^0 h_1$. Furthermore, using the third (6.19), we find

$$\frac{j_{h_1} j}{j_{h_1} j} = c_u \quad j_1 j_1 j_1^{-1} F^{h_1} F^{h_1} < C_1^0; \quad (6.27)$$

for some $C_1^0 = O(1)$, and (6.25) again follows.

Remark. The specific value of h_1 is not crucial: if we change h_1 in $h_1 + n$, $n \in \mathbb{Z}$, the constants C_1, C_2

66 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin{Teller model

in (6.25) are replaced by different $O(1)$ constants and the estimates below are not qualitatively modified. Of course, the specific values of $C_1; C_2$ (then, the specific value of h_1) can affect the convergence radius of the perturbative series in ϵ . The optimal value of h_1 should be chosen by maximizing the corresponding convergence radius. Since here we are not interested in optimal estimates, we find the choice in (6.24) convenient.

Note also that h_1 is a non analytic function of $(\beta; t; u)$ (in particular for small u we have $h_1 = \mu j^{\frac{1}{2} + O(\epsilon)}$). As a consequence, the asymptotic expression for the specific heat near the critical points (that we shall obtain in next section) will contain non analytic functions of u (in fact it will contain terms depending on h_1). However, as remarked after the Main Theorem in Chapter 1, this does not imply that C_v is non analytic: it is clear that in this case the non analyticity is introduced "by hands" by our specific choice of h_1 .

From the results of Theorem 6.1 and Lemma 6.1, together with (6.24) and (6.25), it follows that the assumptions of Theorem 5.1 are satisfied for any $h = h_1$. The integration of the scales h_1 must be performed in a different way, as will be discussed in next Chapter.

7. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The non anomalous regime.

In the preceding Chapters, we have explained how to integrate the fields up to the scale h_1 , defined in the last section of previous Chapter. We managed to prove that, up to that scale, the running coupling constants can be bounded as in (5.22), (5.23) and (5.29), so that the iterative construction is inductively well defined, and the kernels of the effective potentials can be bounded, step by step, as stated by Theorem 5.1. Once we reach the scale h_1 , the bound (5.23) stops to be true and the bounds leading to Theorem 5.1 fail. In particular the crucial bound (5.54) stops to be true. As a consequence, from this scale on, we have to proceed via a different iterative procedure. The idea is to use conditions (5.29), which hold with an equal sign on scale $h = h_1$, to prove that the (h_1) field can be written, by a rotation which is essentially the inverse of (2.13), as a sum of two fields $(1; h_1)$, $(2; h_1)$, one of whom is massive on scale h_1 (i.e. with mass $O(h_1)$). It is then easy to show that one can integrate in one step (i.e. without any further multiscale integration) the massive field, so that one is left with an effective theory involving only the (nearly) massless field.

The two fields correspond to the variables associated to the two original Ising layers. We can then say that on scale h_1 the theory is effectively described by a theory of two interacting Ising layers, with (anomalously) renormalized parameters. On scale h_1 one of the two layers (the one corresponding to the massive field) is well far from criticality and the corresponding variables can be easily integrated out; we are left with the theory of a single perturbed Ising model with renormalized parameters. The multiscale integration for the latter will be much easier than that described above, and in particular it will not involve any anomalous flow of the effective renormalization constants.

In the present Chapter we will first describe the integration of the massive field and the iterative integration of left over massless field. A corollary of the construction will be the analyticity of the free energy for temperatures different from the critical ones. Finally we will derive and solve the equation for the critical temperatures, leading to (1.7).

7.1. Integration of the (1) fields

If h_1 is fixed as in §6.4, we can use Theorem 5.1 up to the scale $h = h_1 + 1$.

Once that all the scales $> h_1$ are integrated out, it is more convenient to describe the system in terms of the fields $\phi_{1;k}^{(1)}$; $\phi_{1;k}^{(2)}$, $k = 1, 2$, defined through the following change of variables:

$$\phi_{1;k}^{(h_1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\phi_{1;k}^{(1; h_1)} + i \phi_{1;k}^{(2; h_1)}); \quad \phi_{1;k}^{(j)} = \frac{1}{M^{1/2}} \sum_k e^{ikx} \phi_{1;k}^{(j)}; \quad (7.1)$$

If we perform this change of variables, we find $P_{Z_{h_1}; \phi_{1;h_1}; \phi_{1;h_1}} = \prod_{j=1}^2 P_{Z_{h_1}; \phi_{1;h_1}^{(j)}}^{(j)}$ where, if we define

$$\phi_{1;k}^{(j; h_1); T} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (\phi_{1;k}^{(j; h_1)}; \phi_{1;k}^{(j; h_1)}),$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_{Z_{h_1}; \phi_{1;h_1}^{(j)}}^{(j)} & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} (d \phi_{1;k}^{(j; h_1)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \\ & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{1}{N_{h_1}^{(j)}} \sum_{k; l} d \phi_{1;k}^{(j; h_1)} \exp \left[- \frac{Z_{h_1}}{4M^{1/2}} \sum_{k \in D_{h_1}} C_{h_1}(k) \phi_{1;k}^{(j; h_1); T} A_j^{(h_1)}(k) \phi_{1;k}^{(j; h_1); O} \right] \\ A_j^{(h_1)}(k) & \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{pmatrix} i \sin k_0 + a_{h_1}^{(j)}(k) & i m_{h_1}^{(j)}(k) + c_{h_1}^{(j)}(k) \\ i m_{h_1}^{(j)}(k) + c_{h_1}^{(j)}(k) & (-i \sin k + \sin k_0) + a_{h_1}^{(j)}(k) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (7.2)$$

and $a_{h_1}^{(j)}$, $m_{h_1}^{(j)}$, $c_{h_1}^{(j)}$ are given by (A.4.2) with $h = h_1 + 1$.

The propagators $g_{1;2}^{(j; h_1)}$ associated with the fermionic integration (7.2) are given by (A.4.1) with $h = h_1 + 1$. Note that, by (6.25), $\max_{h_1} j_1 j_2 = j_{h_1} j + j_{h_1} j = O(h_1)$ (see (A.4.2) for the definition of $m_{h_1}^{(1)}$, $m_{h_1}^{(2)}$). From now on, for definiteness we shall suppose that $\max_{h_1} j_1 j_2 \leq j_{h_1}^{(1)}$. Then, it is easy to realize that the propagator $g_{1;2}^{(1; h_1)}$ is bounded as follows.

$$|g_{x_0}^{n_0} g_x^{n_1} g_{1;2}^{(1; h_1)}(x)| \leq C_N m \frac{(1+n)_{h_1}}{1 + (h_1) \bar{g}(x)^N} ; \quad n = n_0 + n_1 ; \quad (7.3)$$

namely $g_{1;2}^{(1; h_1)}$ satisfies the same bound as the single scale propagator on scale $h = h_1$. This suggests to integrate out $(1; h_1)$, without any other scale decomposition. We end the following result.

Lemma 7.1 If $j_1, j_2, j_1 j_2 \leq c_1$ (c_1 being the same as in Theorem 4.1) and β_1 is fixed as in Theorem 6.1, we can rewrite the partition function as

$$Z_{AT} = \int_{Z_{h_1}} \int_{\mathbb{M}_{h_1}^{(2)}} \int_{\mathbb{C}_{h_1}} (d^{(2; h_1)}) e^{-\bar{V}^{(h_1)}(\bar{Z}_{h_1}^{(2; h_1)}) - M^2 \bar{E}_{h_1}} ; \quad (7.4)$$

where: $\mathbb{M}_{h_1}^{(2)}(k) = m_{h_1}^{(2)}(k) - h_1 - h_1 C_{h_1}^{-1}(k)$, with h_1 a free parameter, s.t. $j_{h_1} j_2 \leq c_1$, $\bar{E}_{h_1} = E_{h_1} j_2$, $c_j j^{2h_1}$; and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{V}^{(h_1)}(^{(2)}) &= h_1 - h_1 F^{(2; h_1)}(^{(2; h_1)}) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \bar{V}_{2n; i; j}^{(2)} \bar{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h_1)}(k_1; \dots; k_{2n-1}) (k_i) = \\ &= \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{\infty} \sum_{j=1}^{\infty} \bar{g}_{j; i}^{(2)} \bar{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h_1)}(x_1; \dots; x_{2n}) ; \end{aligned} \quad (7.5)$$

with $F^{(2; h)}$ given by the r.h.s. of (5.10) with $\bar{V}_{2n; i; j}^{(2; h)}$ replacing $\bar{V}_{2n; i; j}^{(2; h)}$; and $\bar{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h_1)}$ satisfying the same bound (5.30) as $\bar{W}_{2n; i; j}^{(h)}$ with $h = h_1$.

In order to prove the Lemma it is sufficient to consider (5.2) with $h = h_1$ and rewrite $P_{Z_{h_1}; \mathbb{M}_{h_1}^{(2)}; \mathbb{C}_{h_1}}$ as the product $\prod_{j=1}^2 P_{Z_{h_1}; \mathbb{M}_{h_1}^{(j)}; \mathbb{C}_{h_1}}$. Then the integration over the $(1; h_1)$ field is done as the integration of the ϕ 's in Chapter 4, recalling the bound (7.3).

Finally we rewrite $m_{h_1}^{(2)}(k)$ as $\mathbb{M}_{h_1}^{(2)}(k) + h_1 - h_1 C_{h_1}^{-1}(k)$, where h_1 is a parameter to be suitably fixed below as a function of j_1, j_2 .

7.2. The localization operator

The integration of the r.h.s. of (7.4) is done in an iterative way similar to the one described in Chapter 5. If $h = h_1, h_1 - 1, \dots$, we shall write:

$$Z_{AT} = \int_{Z_h} \int_{\mathbb{M}_h^{(2)}} \int_{\mathbb{C}_h} (d^{(2; h)}) e^{-\bar{V}^{(h)}(\bar{Z}_h^{(2; h)}) - M^2 E_h} ; \quad (7.6)$$

where $\bar{V}^{(h)}$ is given by an expansion similar to (5.39), with h replacing h_1 and $Z_h, \mathbb{M}_h^{(2)}$ are defined recursively in the following way. We first introduce a localization operator L . As in 5.2, we define L as a combination of four operators L_j and \bar{P}_j , $j = 0, 1$. L_j are defined as in (5.6) and (5.7), while \bar{P}_0 and \bar{P}_1 , in analogy

7. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The non anomalous regime. 69

with (5.8), are defined as the operators extracting from a functional of $\mathfrak{M}_h^{(2)}(k)$, $h = h_1$, the contributions independent and linear in $\mathfrak{M}_h^{(2)}(k)$. Note that inductively the kernels $\overline{W}_{2n; \underline{l}}^{(h)}$ can be thought as functionals of $\mathfrak{M}_k(k)$, $h = k = h_1$. Given $L_j; \overline{P}_j$, $j = 0; 1$ as above, we define the action of L on the kernels $\overline{W}_{2n; \underline{l}}^{(h)}$ as follows.

1) If $n = 1$, then

$$L \overline{W}_{2; \underline{l}}^{(h)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \begin{cases} L_0 (\overline{P}_0 + \overline{P}_1) \overline{W}_{2; \underline{l}}^{(h)} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 = 0, \\ L_1 \overline{P}_0 \overline{W}_{2; \underline{l}}^{(h)} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 \neq 0. \end{cases}$$

2) If $n > 2$, then $L \overline{W}_{2n; \underline{l}}^{(h)} = 0$.

It is easy to prove the analogue of Lemma 5.1:

$$L \overline{V}^{(h)} = (s_h + h p_h) F^{(2; h)} + z_h F^{(2; h)}; \quad (7.7)$$

where s_h, p_h and z_h are real constants and: s_h is linear in $\mathfrak{M}_k^{(2)}(k)$, $h = k = h_1$; p_h and z_h are independent of $\mathfrak{M}_k^{(2)}(k)$. Furthermore $F^{(2; h)}$ and $F^{(2; h)}$ are given by the first and the last of (5.10) with $\hat{!}_{jk}^{(2; h)} \hat{!}_{!k}^{(2; h)}$ replacing $\hat{!}_{!k}^{(h)} \hat{!}_{!k}^{(h)}$.

Remark. Note that the action of L on the quartic terms is trivial. The reason of such a choice is that in the present case no quartic local term can appear, because of Pauli principle: $\frac{(2; h)}{1; x} \frac{(2; h)}{1; x} \frac{(2; h)}{1; x} \frac{(2; h)}{1; x} = 0$, so that $L_0 \overline{W}_{4; \underline{l}} = 0$.

Using the symmetry properties exposed in 4.3, we can prove the analogue of Lemma 5.2: if $n = 1$, then

$$R \overline{W}_{2; \underline{l}} = \begin{cases} \overline{S}_2 + R_2 (\overline{P}_0 + \overline{P}_1) \overline{W}_{2; \underline{l}} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 = 0, \\ R_1 \overline{S}_1 + R_2 \overline{P}_0 \overline{W}_{2; \underline{l}} & \text{if } !_1 + !_2 \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (7.8)$$

where $\overline{S}_1 = 1 - \overline{P}_0$ and $\overline{S}_2 = 1 - \overline{P}_0 - \overline{P}_1$; if $n = 2$, then $\overline{W}_{4; \underline{l}} = R_1 \overline{W}_{4; \underline{l}}$.

7.3 Renormalization for $h = h_1$

If L and $R = 1 - L$ are defined as in previous subsection, we can rewrite (7.6) as:

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{M}_h^{(2)}; \mathfrak{C}_h}^Z P_{Z_h}^{(2)} (d^{(2; h)}) e^{L \overline{V}^{(h)} (\overline{P}_{Z_h}^{(2; h)})} R \overline{V}^{(h)} (\overline{P}_{Z_h}^{(2; h)}) M^2 E_h; \quad (7.9)$$

Furthermore, using (7.7) and defining:

$$\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} Z_h (1 + C_{h-1}(k) z_h); \quad \mathfrak{M}_{h-1}^{(2)}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \frac{Z_h}{\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}(k)} \mathfrak{M}_h^{(2)}(k) + C_{h-1}(k) s_h; \quad (7.10)$$

we see that (7.9) is equal to

$$\sum_{\mathfrak{M}_{h-1}^{(2)}; \mathfrak{C}_h}^Z P_{\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}}^{(2)} (d^{(2; h)}) e^{h p_h F^{(2; h)} (\overline{P}_{\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}}^{(2; h)})} R \overline{V}^h (\overline{P}_{\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}}^{(2; h)}) M^2 (E_h + t_h) \quad (7.11)$$

Again, we rescale the potential:

$$\mathfrak{V}^{(h)} (\overline{P}_{\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}}^{(h)}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} h F^{(2; h)} (\overline{P}_{\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}}^{(2; h)}) + R \overline{V}^h (\overline{P}_{\mathfrak{Z}_{h-1}}^{(2; h)}); \quad (7.12)$$

70 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

where $Z_{h-1} = \mathbb{Z}_{h-1}(0)$ and $\mathbb{P}_h = (Z_h = Z_{h-1})\mathbb{P}_h$; we define $\mathbb{E}_h^{(1)}$ as in (5.18), we perform the single scale integration and we define the new effective potential as

$$e^{-\bar{V}^{(h-1)}(\frac{P}{Z_{h-1}}(2; h-1))} M^2 E_h^{\text{def}} \stackrel{Z}{=} P_{Z_{h-1}}^{(2)} \mathbb{D}_{h-1}^{(2)} \mathbb{E}_h^{(1)}(d^{(2;h)}) e^{-\mathbb{E}_h^{(1)}(\frac{P}{Z_h}(2; h))} : \quad (7.13)$$

Finally we pose $E_{h-1} = E_h + t_h + \tilde{E}_h$. Note that the above procedure allows us to write the \mathbb{P}_h in terms of $k, h-k-h_1$, namely $\mathbb{P}_{h-1} = \mathbb{P}_h + \mathbb{P}_h(h; ::; h_1)$, where \mathbb{P}_h is the Beta function.

Proceeding as in x4 we can inductively show that $\bar{V}^{(h)}$ has the structure of (7.5), with h replacing h_1 and that the kernels of $\bar{V}^{(h)}$ are bounded as follows.

Lemma 7.2. Let the hypothesis of Lemma 5.1 be satisfied and suppose that, for $h < h_1$ and some constants $c, \# > 0$

$$e^{c|j|} \frac{\mathbb{D}_h^{(2)}}{\mathbb{D}_{h-1}^{(2)}} e^{c|j|} ; e^{c|j|^2} \frac{Z_h}{Z_{h-1}} e^{c|j|^2} ; |j_h| c|j| ; \mathbb{D}_h^{(2)} j^{h-1} : \quad (7.14)$$

Then the partition function can be rewritten as in (7.6) and there exists $C > 0$ s.t. the kernels of $\bar{V}^{(h)}$ satisfy:

$$\int dx_1 \dots dx_{2n} \bar{V}^{(h)}(x_1; ::; x_{2n}) j^{M^2 - h D_k(n)} (c|j|)^{\max(1, n-1)} \quad (7.15)$$

where $D_k(n) = 2 + n + k$ and $k = \sum_{i=1}^n 2n_i$. Finally $\mathbb{E}_{h+1} j + \mathbb{E}_{h+1} j c|j|^{2h}$.

The proof of Lemma 7.2 is essentially identical to the proof of Theorem 5.1 and we do not repeat it here.

It is possible to choose h_1 so that the first three assumptions in (7.14) are valid for any $h < h_1$. More precisely, the following result holds, see Appendix A.8 for the proof.

Lemma 7.3. If $|j| \leq 1, |j_1|, |j_1| \leq c_1$ and c_1 is fixed as in Theorem 4.1, there exists $h_1(1; 1; 1)$ such that, if we choose $h_1 = h_1(1; 1; 1)$, for $h < h_1$ we have:

$$|j_h| c|j|^{(\#=2)(h-h_1)} ; \mathbb{D}_h^{(2)} = \mathbb{D}_{h_1}^{(2)} F_m^h ; Z_h = Z_{h_1} \bar{F}^h ; \quad (7.16)$$

where F_m^h and \bar{F}^h are $O(\cdot)$. Moreover:

$$h_1(1; 1; 1) \leq h_1(1; 0; 0) c|j|^{(1)h_1} j_1 \leq \frac{0}{1} j + (1)h_1 j_1 \leq \frac{0}{1} j : \quad (7.17)$$

7.4. The integration of the scales h_2

In order to insure that the last assumption in (7.14) holds, we iterate the preceding construction up to the scale h_2 defined as the scale s.t. $\mathbb{D}_k^{(2)} j^{k-1}$ for any $h_2 \leq k < h_1$ and $\mathbb{D}_{h_2-1}^{(2)} j > h_2 - 2$.

Once we have integrated all the fields $(\geq h_2)$, we can integrate $(2; h_2)$ without any further multiscale decomposition. Note in fact that by definition the propagator satisfies the same bound (7.3) with h_2 replacing h_1 . Then, if we define

$$e^{M^2 E_{h_2}^{\text{def}}} \stackrel{Z}{=} P_{Z_{h_2-1}} \mathbb{D}_{h_2-1}^{(2)} \mathbb{E}_{h_2} e^{\mathbb{E}_{h_2}^{(1)}(\frac{P}{Z_{h_2-1}}(2; h_2))} ; \quad (7.18)$$

7. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The non anomalous regime. 71

we find that $\tilde{E}_{h_2} \leq c j^{2h_2}$ (the proof is a repetition of the estimates on the single scale integration).

Combining this bound with the results of Theorem 5.1, Lemma 7.1, Lemma 7.2 and Lemma 7.3, together with the results of Chapter 5, we finally find that the free energy associated to α_T is given by the following finite sum, uniformly convergent with the size of M :

$$\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M^2} \log \alpha_T = E_{h_2} + \sum_{h=h_2+1}^{\infty} (E_{h_1} - E_{h_1}) + \sum_{h=h_2+1}^{\infty} (E_h + t_h); \quad (7.19)$$

where $E_{h_2} = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \tilde{E}_{h_2}$ and it is easy to see that E_{h_2} , for any finite h_2 , exists and satisfies the same bound of \tilde{E}_{h_2} .

7.5 Keeping h_2 finite.

From the discussion of previous subsection, it follows that, for any finite h_2 , (7.19) is an analytic function of $(t; u)$, for j sufficiently small, uniformly in h_2 (this is an elementary consequence of Vitali's convergence theorem). Moreover, in Appendix A.9 it is proved that, for any $h_2 > 0$, the limit (7.19) coincides with $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M^2} \log \alpha_T^{(1;2)}$ for any choice $(1; 2)$ of boundary conditions; hence this limit coincides with $2 \log(2 \cosh \dots)$ plus the free energy in (1.3). We can state the result as follows.

Lemma 7.4. There exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ such that, if $j \leq \epsilon_1$ and $t \in D$ (the same as in the Main Theorem in Chapter 1), the free energy f defined in (1.3) is real analytic in $(t; u)$, except possibly for the choices of $(t; u)$ such that $h_2 = 0$.

We shall see in next Chapter that the specific heat is logarithmically divergent as $h_2 \rightarrow 0$. So the critical point is really given by the condition $h_2 = 0$. We shall explicitly solve the equation for the critical point in next subsection.

7.6 The critical points.

In the present subsection we check that, if $t \in D$, D being a suitable interval centered around $\frac{p-1}{2}$, see Main Theorem in Chapter 1, there are precisely two critical points, of the form (1.7). More precisely, keeping in mind that the equation for the critical point is simply $h_2 = 0$ (see the end of previous subsection), we prove the following.

Lemma 7.5. Let $j \leq \epsilon_1$, $t \in D$ and h_1 be fixed as in Lemma 7.3. Then $h_2 = 0$ only if $(t; u) = (t_c(u); u)$, where $t_c(u)$ is given by (1.7).

Proof. From the definition of h_2 given above, see 7.4, it follows that h_2 satisfies the following equation:

$$h_2 - 1 = c_m F_m^{h_2} j_{h_1} j_{h_1} j_{h_1}^{h_1 - h_1}; \quad (7.20)$$

for some $1 - c_m < \dots$ and $\dots = \text{sign } 1$. Then, the equation $h_2 = 0$ can be rewritten as:

$$j_{h_1} j_{h_1} j_{h_1}^{h_1 - h_1} = 0; \quad (7.21)$$

First note that the result of Lemma 7.5 is trivial when $h_1 = 1$. If $h_1 < 1$, (7.21) cannot be solved when $j_{1j}^{1+} > 2j_{1j}^{1+}$. In fact,

$$\begin{aligned} j_{1j}^{(h_1-1)+F^{h_1}} j_{1j}^{(h_1-1)+F^{h_1}} j_{1j}^{h_1 - h_1} &= \\ = j_{1j}^{1+} c_1 j_{1j}^{1+} j_{1j}^{1+} j_{1j}^{1+} c_1^{h_1 - h_1} \frac{h_1 - 1}{3}; \end{aligned} \quad (7.22)$$

7. Renormalization Group for light fermions. The non anomalous regime. 73

where $C^0 = C^0(\cdot; t; u)$ and $C^\infty = C^\infty(\cdot; t; u)$ are bounded above and below by $O(1)$ constants.

In the opposite case $(j_1 j^{(1-s)} > 2 j_1 j^{(1-)})$, we use $h_1 - 1 = c j_1 j^{(1-)}$ and, from the first row of (7.27), we find $\Gamma = C(1 - j_1 j j_1 j^{1=(1+)}_{h_1}) = C$, where C and C are bounded above and below by $O(1)$ constants. Since in this region of parameters $j - t_c j^{-1}$ is also bounded above and below by $O(1)$ constants, we can in both cases write

$$\Gamma = C_\infty(\cdot; t; u) \frac{j - t_c j - j - t_j}{2} ; \quad C_1, \Gamma = C_\infty(\cdot; t; u) - C_2, \Gamma \quad (7.30)$$

and $C_j, \Gamma, j = 1, 2$, are suitable positive $O(1)$ constants.

8. The specific heat.

In this Chapter we describe the expansion for the energy{energy correlation functions, from which we can derive a convergent expansion for the specific heat of the Ashkin{Teller model. We then compute the leading order contributing to the specific heat, we derive the expression (1.8), so concluding the proof of the Main Theorem in the Introduction.

Consider the specific heat defined in (1.3). The correlation function $\langle H_x^{AT} H_y^{AT} \rangle_{M;T}$ can be conveniently written as

$$\langle H_x^{AT} H_y^{AT} \rangle_{M;T} = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \log \mathcal{Z}_{AT}(\cdot)_{=0} ; \quad \mathcal{Z}_{AT}(\cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{(1); (2)}^X e^{\sum_{x \in \Lambda} (1+x) H_x^{AT}} \quad (8.1)$$

where x is a real commuting auxiliary field (with periodic boundary conditions).

Repeating the construction of Chapter 3, we see that $\mathcal{Z}_{AT}(\cdot)$ admit a Grassmannian representation similar to the one of \mathcal{Z}_{AT} , and in particular, if $x \notin y$:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \log \mathcal{Z}_{AT}(\cdot)_{=0} &= \frac{\partial^2}{\partial x \partial y} \log \sum_{(1); (2)}^X (1)^{1+2} b_{AT}^{1;2}(\cdot)_{=0} \\ b_{AT}^{1;2}(\cdot) &= \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \int_{\mathbb{Y}^{1;2}} dH_x^{(j)} d\overline{H}_x^{(j)} dV_x^{(j)} d\overline{V}_x^{(j)} e^{S_1^{(1)}(t^{(1)}) + S_2^{(2)}(t^{(2)}) + V + B(\cdot)} \end{aligned} \quad (8.2)$$

where \cdot , $S^{(j)}(t^{(j)})$ and V where defined in Chapter 3, the apex $1; 2$ attached to b_{AT} refers to the boundary conditions assigned to the Grassmannian fields and finally $B(\cdot)$ is defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} B(\cdot) &= \sum_{x \in \Lambda} a^{(1)} \overline{H}_x^{(1)} H_{x+\hat{e}_1}^{(1)} + \overline{V}_x^{(1)} V_{x+\hat{e}_0}^{(1)} + a^{(2)} \overline{H}_x^{(2)} H_{x+\hat{e}_1}^{(2)} + \overline{V}_x^{(2)} V_{x+\hat{e}_0}^{(2)} + \\ &+ a \overline{H}_x^{(1)} H_{x+\hat{e}_1}^{(1)} \overline{H}_x^{(2)} H_{x+\hat{e}_1}^{(2)} + \overline{V}_x^{(1)} V_{x+\hat{e}_0}^{(1)} \overline{V}_x^{(2)} V_{x+\hat{e}_0}^{(2)} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} A_x ; \end{aligned} \quad (8.3)$$

where $a^{(1)}$, $a^{(2)}$ and a are $O(1)$ constants, with $a^{(1)} = a^{(2)} = O(u)$. Using (8.2) and (8.3) we can rewrite:

$$\langle H_x^{AT} H_y^{AT} \rangle_{M;T} = \frac{1}{4} (\cosh J)^{2M/2} \sum_{(1); (2)}^X (1)^{1+2} \frac{b_{AT}^{1;2}}{A_T} \langle A_x A_y \rangle_{M;T}^{1;2} ; \quad (8.4)$$

where $\langle \cdot \rangle_{M;T}^{1;2}$ is the average w.r.t. the boundary conditions $1; 2$. Proceeding as in Appendix A9 one can show that, if $h_2 > 0$, $\langle A_x A_y \rangle_{M;T}^{1;2}$ is exponentially insensitive to boundary conditions and $\sum_{(1); (2)}^X (1)^{1+2} \frac{b_{AT}^{1;2}}{A_T} = A_T$ is an $O(1)$ constant. Then from now on we will study only $\mathcal{Z}_{AT}(\cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} b_{AT}^{(i); (j)}(\cdot)$ and $\langle A_x A_y \rangle_{M;T}^{(i); (j)}$.

Proceeding as in Chapter 4 we integrate out the fields and we find:

$$\mathcal{Z}_{AT}(\cdot) = \int_{\mathbb{Z}^{1;2}} P_{Z;1;1;1}(\mathbf{d}) e^{V^{(1)} + B^{(1)}} ; \quad (8.5)$$

where

$$B^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}') = \sum_{m,n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2}^{\infty} B_{m;2n;\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_2}^{(1)}(\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_m; \mathbf{y}_1; \dots; \mathbf{y}_{2n}) \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{h^{\mathbf{r}_i}}{x_i} \prod_{i=1}^{2n} \frac{ih^{\mathbf{r}_i}}{y_i} : \quad (8:6)$$

We proceed as for the partition function, namely as described in Chapter 5 above. We introduce the scale decomposition described in Chapter 5 and we perform iteratively the integration of the single scale fields, starting from the field of scale 1. After the integration of the fields $\phi^{(1)}; \dots; \phi^{(h+1)}$, $h_1 < h$, we are left with

$$A_T(\mathbf{r}) = e^{M^2 E_h + S^{(h+1)}(\mathbf{r})} \int \mathcal{P}_{Z_h; \mathbf{r}; h; h; C_h}(\mathbf{d}^{(h)}) e^{V^{(h)}(\mathbf{r})} \left(\overline{Z_h}^{-(h)} \right) + B^{(h)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}'); \quad (8:7)$$

where $\mathcal{P}_{Z_h; \mathbf{r}; h; h; C_h}(\mathbf{d}^{(h)})$ and $V^{(h)}$ are the same as in Chapter 5, $S^{(h+1)}(\mathbf{r})$ denotes the sum of the contributions dependent on \mathbf{r} but independent of \mathbf{r}' , and finally $B^{(h)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}')$ denotes the sum over all terms containing at least one field and two fields. $S^{(h+1)}$ and $B^{(h)}$ can be represented as

$$S^{(h+1)}(\mathbf{r}) = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_m}^{\infty} S_m^{(h+1)}(\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_m) \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{h^{\mathbf{r}_i}}{x_i}$$

$$B^{(h)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}') = \sum_{m,n=1}^{\infty} \sum_{\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2}^{\infty} B_{m;2n;\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_2}^{(h)}(\mathbf{x}_1; \dots; \mathbf{x}_m; \mathbf{y}_1; \dots; \mathbf{y}_{2n}) \prod_{i=1}^m \frac{h^{\mathbf{r}_i}}{x_i} \prod_{i=1}^{2n} \frac{ih^{\mathbf{r}_i}}{y_i} : \quad (8:8)$$

Since the field is equivalent, as regarding dimensional bounds, to two fields (see Theorem 8.1 below for a more precise statement), the only terms in the expansion for $B^{(h)}$ which are not irrelevant are those with $m = n = 1$, $\mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{r}_2 = 0$ and they are marginal. Hence we extend the definition of the localization operator L , so that its action on $B^{(h)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}')$ is defined by its action on the kernels $B_{m;2n;\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_2}^{(h)}(\mathbf{q}_1; \dots; \mathbf{q}_m; \mathbf{k}_1; \dots; \mathbf{k}_{2n})$:

1) if $m = n = 1$ and $\mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2 = \mathbf{r}_1 + \mathbf{r}_2 = 0$, then $L B_{1;2;\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_2}^{(h)}(\mathbf{q}_1; \mathbf{k}_1; \mathbf{k}_2) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_0 B_{1;2;\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_2}^{(h)}(\mathbf{k}_+; \mathbf{k}_+; \mathbf{k}_+)$, where P_0 is defined as in (5.8);

2) in all other cases $L B_{m;2n;\mathbf{r}_1;\mathbf{r}_2}^{(h)} = 0$.

Using the symmetry considerations of 4.3 together with the remark that x is invariant under Complex conjugation, Hole{particle and (1) ! (2), while under Parity $x \rightarrow x^*$ and under Rotation $(x; x_0) \rightarrow (x; x_0)$, we easily realize that $LB^{(h)}$ has necessarily the following form :

$$LB^{(h)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}') = \frac{\overline{Z_h}}{Z_h} \sum_{\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{x}'} \frac{(\mathbf{r}!)}{2} \frac{(\mathbf{r}!)}{x!} \frac{(\mathbf{r}!)}{x'!} ; \quad (8:9)$$

where $\overline{Z_h}$ is real and $\overline{Z_1} = a^{(1)} \mathbf{j} = 0$, $a^{(2)} \mathbf{j} = 0$.

Note that apriori a term $\frac{(\mathbf{r}!)}{x!} \frac{(\mathbf{r}!)}{x'!} \frac{(\mathbf{r}!)}{x''!}$ is allowed by symmetry but, using (1) ! (2) symmetry, one sees that its kernel is proportional to $\mathbf{k}_x, \mathbf{k}_{x'}$. So, with our definition of localization, such term contributes to $RB^{(h)}$.

Now that the action of L on B is defined, we can describe the single scale integration, for $h > h_1$. The integral in the r.h.s. of (8.7) can be rewritten as:

$$e^{M^2 t_h} \int \mathcal{P}_{Z_h; \mathbf{r}; h-1; h-1; C_{h-1}}(\mathbf{d}^{(h-1)}) \int \mathcal{P}_{Z_h; \mathbf{r}; h-1; h-1; C_{h-1}}(\mathbf{d}^{(h-1)}) e^{V^{(h)}(\mathbf{r})} \left(\overline{Z_{h-1}}^{-(h-1)} \right) + B^{(h)}(\mathbf{r}; \mathbf{r}'); \quad (8:10)$$

where $\mathcal{B}^{(h)}$ was defined in (5.15) and

$$\mathcal{B}^{(h)}\left(\overline{Z}_{h-1}^{(-h)}; \cdot\right) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{B}^{(h)}\left(\overline{Z}_h^{(-h)}; \cdot\right): \quad (8.11)$$

Finally we define

$$\begin{aligned} E_h &= E_h^{M^2 + \mathcal{E}^{(h)}(\cdot)} V^{(h-1)}\left(\overline{Z}_{h-1}^{(-h-1)}\right) + \mathcal{B}^{(h-1)}\left(\overline{Z}_{h-1}^{(-h-1)}; \cdot\right) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \\ &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{P}_{Z_{h-1}; h-1; h-1; \mathcal{E}_h^{(1)}}^{(d^{(h)})} e^{\mathcal{B}^{(h)}\left(\overline{Z}_{h-1}^{(-h)}\right) + \mathcal{B}^{(h)}\left(\overline{Z}_{h-1}^{(-h)}; \cdot\right)}; \end{aligned} \quad (8.12)$$

and

$$E_{h-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} E_h + t_h + \mathcal{E}_h^{(1)}; \quad S^{(h)}(\cdot) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} S^{(h+1)}(\cdot) + \mathcal{E}^{(h)}(\cdot): \quad (8.13)$$

With the definitions above, it is easy to verify that \overline{Z}_{h-1} satisfies the equation $\overline{Z}_{h-1} = \overline{Z}_h(1 + \overline{z}_h)$, where $\overline{z}_h = \overline{b}_h + O(\epsilon^2)$, for some $\overline{b}_h \neq 0$. Then, for some $c > 0$, $\overline{Z}_1 e^{c\mathcal{J}^h} \leq \overline{Z}_h \leq \overline{Z}_1 e^{c\mathcal{J}^h}$. The analogous of Theorem 5.1 for the kernels of $\mathcal{B}^{(h)}$ holds:

Theorem 8.1. Suppose that the hypothesis of Lemma 7.1 are satisfied. Then, for $h_1 \leq h \leq 1$ and a suitable constant C , the kernels of $\mathcal{B}^{(h)}$ satisfy

$$\int \prod_{i=1}^{2n} dx_i \mathcal{B}_{2n;m}^{(h)}(x_1, \dots, x_m; y_1, \dots, y_{2n}) \leq M^{2-h(D_k(n)+m)} (C \mathcal{J})^{m \max(1, m-1)}; \quad (8.14)$$

where $D_k(n) = 2 + n + k$ and $k = \sum_{i=1}^{2n} i$.

Note that, consistently with our definition of localization, the dimension of $\mathcal{B}_{2;1;(0;0);(+);(-);(-);(-)}^{(h)}$ is $D_0(1) + 1 = 0$.

Again, proceeding as in Chapter 6, we can study the flow of \overline{Z}_h up to $h = 1$ and prove that $\overline{Z}_h = \overline{Z}_1 \overline{\omega}^{(h-1)+F_z^h}$, where $\overline{\omega}$ is a non trivial analytic function of (\cdot) (its linear part is non vanishing) and F_z^h is a suitable $O(\epsilon)$ function (independent of $\epsilon_1; \epsilon_1$). We recall that $\overline{Z}_1 = O(1)$.

We proceed as above up to the scale h_1 . Once that the scale h_1 is reached we pass to the $(1); (2)$ variables, we integrate out (say) the (1) fields and we get

$$\int \mathcal{P}_{Z_{h_1}}^{(2)} \mathcal{B}_{h_1}^{(2)}(d^{(2)}(\cdot, h_1)) e^{\overline{V}^{(h_1)}\left(\overline{Z}_{h_1}^{(2; h_1)}\right) + \mathcal{B}^{(h_1)}\left(\overline{Z}_{h_1}^{(2; h_1)}; \cdot\right)}; \quad (8.15)$$

with $\overline{L}^{h_1}\left(\overline{Z}_{h_1}^{(2; h_1)}\right) = \overline{Z}_{h_1} \prod_{x \in \Lambda} \frac{\overline{Z}_{h_1}^{(2; h_1)}(x)}{1+x} \frac{\overline{Z}_{h_1}^{(2; h_1)}(x)}{1+x}$.

The scales $h_2 \leq h \leq h_1$ are integrated as in Chapter 7 and one finds that the flow of \overline{Z}_h in this regime is trivial, i.e. if $h_2 \leq h \leq h_1$, $\overline{Z}_h = \overline{Z}_{h_1} F_z^h$, with $F_z^h = O(\epsilon)$.

The result is that the correlation function $\langle H_x^{AT} H_y^{AT} \rangle_{M,T}$ is given by a convergent power series in ϵ , uniformly in M . Then, the leading behaviour of the specific heat is given by the sum over x and y of the lowest order contributions to $\langle H_x^{AT} H_y^{AT} \rangle_{M,T}$, namely by the diagrams in Fig.6. Absolute convergence of the power series of $\langle H_x^{AT} H_y^{AT} \rangle_{M,T}$ implies that the rest is a small correction.

The conclusion is that C_v , for small and $\mathcal{J} \overline{Z} + 1 \ll \mathcal{J} \mathcal{J} \overline{Z}^{-1} = 4$, is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} C_v &= \frac{2}{\mathcal{J}} \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} \frac{X^m}{m!} \frac{X^m}{m!} \frac{X^m}{m!} \frac{(Z_{h-h_0}^{(1)})^2}{Z_{h-1} Z_{h_0-1}} G_{(+;!_1);(+;!_2)}^{(h)}(x, y) G_{(-;!_2);(-;!_1)}^{(h_0)}(y, x) + \\ &+ G_{(+;!_1);(-;!_2)}^{(h)}(x, y) G_{(-;!_1);(+;!_2)}^{(h_0)}(x, y) + \frac{1}{\mathcal{J}} \sum_{x,y \in \Lambda} \sum_{m=h_2}^{\infty} \frac{X^m}{m!} \frac{X^m}{m!} \frac{\overline{Z}_h^{-2}}{Z_h} \mathcal{E}_m^{(h)}(x, y); \end{aligned} \quad (8.16)$$




Fig. 6. The lowest order diagrams contributing to $\langle H_x^A H_y^A \rangle_{M,T}$. The wavy lines ending in the points labeled x and y represent the fields ϕ_x and ϕ_y respectively. The solid lines labeled by h and going from x to y represent the propagators $g^{(h)}(x-y)$. The sums are over the scale indices and, even if not explicitly written, over the indexes i, j (and the propagators depend on these indexes).

where $h_{-h}^0 = \max_{x,y} h; h^0 g^{(h)}_{(-1;1);(-2;2)}(x)$ must be interpreted as

$$G^{(h)}_{(-1;1);(-2;2)}(x) = \begin{cases} g^{(h)}_{(-1;1);(-2;2)}(x) & \text{if } h > h_1, \\ g^{(1;h_1)}_{(-1;1);(-2;2)}(x) + g^{(2;h_1)}_{(-1;1);(-2;2)}(x) & \text{if } h = h_1, \\ g^{(2;h)}_{(-1;1);(-2;2)}(x) & \text{if } h_2 < h < h_1, \\ g^{(2;h_2)}_{(-1;1);(-2;2)}(x) & \text{if } h = h_2. \end{cases}$$

Moreover, if $N; n_0; n_1 \geq 0$ and $n = n_0 + n_1$, $\int_{x_0}^{x_0} \phi_{x_0}^{n_0} \phi_{x_0}^{n_1}(x) dx = C_N n \int \frac{(2+n)h}{1 + (h - \phi(x))^N} dx$. Now, calling c the exponent associated to $\bar{Z}_h = Z_h$, from (8.16) we find:

$$C_v = C_1^{-2c} h_1 \log h_1 h_2 + \frac{(1)}{h_1 h_2} + C_2 \frac{1 - 2c(h_1 - 1)}{2c} + \frac{(2)}{h_1} + \dots; \quad (8.17)$$

where $j_{h_1, h_2}^{(1)}(\cdot) j_{h_1}^{(2)}(\cdot) = c j$ for some c , and $C_1; C_2$ are functions of $\tau; u$, bounded above and below by $O(1)$ constants. Note that, defining as in the line following (1.8), $(1 - h_1)^{-1}$ is bounded above and below by $O(1)$ constants. Then, using (7.30), (1.8) follows.

9. Conclusions and open problems.

In the previous Chapters we described a constructive approach to the study of the thermodynamic properties of weakly interacting spin systems in two dimensions, arbitrarily near to the critical temperature(s).

The approach was based on an exact mapping of the interacting spin system into an interacting system of $1 + 1/\dim$ non relativistic fermions. It applies to a wide class of perturbations of Ising, including the Ashkin{Teller model, the 8 vertex model, the next to nearest neighbor Ising model and linear combinations of these models.

As an application of the method, we studied the free energy and the specific heat for the anisotropic Ashkin{Teller model, which is a well{known model of statistical mechanics, widely studied with a number of different theoretical and empirical techniques. However exact results were lacking since long time: in the 1970's Baxter, Kadano and others conjectured that (1) anisotropic AT has in general two different critical temperatures (whose location was unknown) and (2) AT belongs to the same universality class of Ising except at the isotropic point.

Our calculation of the free energy and of the specific heat allowed to (rigorously) prove for the first time the two conjectures above in the regime of weak coupling and to derive detailed asymptotic expressions for the specific heat itself and for the shape of the critical surface (i.e. for the critical temperatures as functions of the anisotropy parameter and of the coupling). The latter calculation revealed the existence of a previously unknown critical exponent, describing how the difference of the critical temperatures rescale, when we let the anisotropy go to 0.

Important open problems are the following.

1) The study of the free energy and of the correlation functions directly at the critical point, where it is expected that the correlation functions are, in the thermodynamic limit, homogeneous functions of the coordinates and, moreover, conformal invariant. Even for the Ising model this is widely expected by still unproved conjecture. Technically we have to face the difficulty of dealing with a linear combination of 16 Grassmann partition functions, differing for the boundary conditions; up to now we are able to control this combination only outside the critical point (but arbitrarily near to it).

2) The study of more complicated correlation functions, such as the spin{spin correlation functions $\langle \sigma_0 \sigma_x \rangle$. These are difficult to study in the Grassmann formulation, because they correspond to the average of an exponential of a relevant non translationally invariant operator in the Grassmann fields. Such operator is concentrated along a path connecting the two points $0; x$ and, moreover, is weighted by an order 1 constant! Note that even in the free case (Ising) the calculation of the spin{spin correlation functions is very non trivial and is based on the analysis of a Toeplitz determinant, in the limit in which the size of the Toeplitz matrix diverging to infinity, through an application of Szego's Theorem.

A first step towards the understanding of such objects would be the calculation of averages of exponentials of simpler relevant non translational invariant operators, such as those appearing in the study of large deviations for the magnetization or the particle number in a bounded region of \mathbb{Z}^2 .

Appendix A1. Grassmann integration. Truncated expectations.

In the present Appendix we list some more properties of Grassmann integration (the basic ones were introduced in §2.2). In particular we introduce the definition of truncated expectation, and we describe a possible graphical interpretation for the truncated expectations, the so-called Feynman diagrams.

A1.1. Truncated expectations and some more rules.

Pursuing further the analogy with Gaussian integrals stressed in §2.2, we can consider a "measure" (a similar expression is found replacing g with a matrix, see (A1.17) below)

$$P(d) = \int_{2A} d^+ d^- g e^{2A d^+ d^- + g^{-1}}; \quad (A1.1)$$

by construction one has

$$\int P(d) = 1; \quad \int P(d) d^+ = 0; \quad g^{-1} = 0; \quad g : \quad (A1.2)$$

In general $P(d)$ will be called a Gaussian fermionic integration measure (or Grassmann integration measure or, as we shall do in the following, integration tout court) with covariance g : for any analytic function F defined on the Grassmann algebra we can write

$$\int P(d) F(d) = E(F); \quad (A1.3)$$

However note that $P(d)$ is not at all a real measure, as it does not satisfy the necessary positivity conditions, so that the terminology is only formal and the use of the symbol E (which stands for expectation value) is meant only by analogy.

Given p functions X_1, \dots, X_p defined on the Grassmann algebra and p positive integer numbers n_1, \dots, n_p , the truncated expectation is defined as

$$E^T(X_1, \dots, X_p; n_1, \dots, n_p) = \frac{\partial^{n_1 + \dots + n_p}}{\partial d_1^{n_1} \dots \partial d_p^{n_p}} \log \int P(d) e^{iX_1(d) + \dots + iX_p(d)}; \quad (A1.4)$$

where $\partial = \partial / \partial d_1, \dots, \partial / \partial d_p$. It is easy to check that E^T is a linear operation, that is, formally,

$$E^T(c_1 X_1 + \dots + c_p X_p; n) = \sum_{n_1 + \dots + n_p = n} \frac{n!}{n_1! \dots n_p!} c_1^{n_1} \dots c_p^{n_p} E^T(X_1, \dots, X_p; n_1, \dots, n_p); \quad (A1.5)$$

so that the following relations immediately follow:

$$\begin{aligned} (1) \quad E^T(X; 1) &= E(X); \\ (2) \quad E^T(X; 0) &= 0; \\ (3) \quad E^T(X; \dots; X; n_1, \dots, n_p) &= E^T(X; n_1 + \dots + n_p); \end{aligned} \quad (A1.6)$$

Moreover one has

$$E^T(X_1, \dots, X_1, \dots, X_p, \dots, X_p; 1, \dots, 1, \dots, 1, \dots, 1) = E^T(X_1, \dots, X_p; n_1, \dots, n_p); \quad (A1.7)$$

80 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

where, for any $j = 1, \dots, p$, in the l.h.s. the function X_j is repeated n_j times and 1 is repeated $n_1 + \dots + n_p$ times.

We define also

$$E^T(X_1; \dots; X_p) = E^T(X_1; \dots; X_p; 1; \dots; 1) : \quad (A1.8)$$

By (A1.7) we see that all truncated expectations can be expressed in terms of (A1.8); it is easy to see that (A1.8) is vanishing if $X_j = 0$ for at least one j .

The truncated expectation appears naturally considering the integration of an exponential; in fact as a particular case of (A1.4) one has

$$E^T(X; n) = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial^n} \log \int P(d) e^{X(d)} ; \quad (A1.9)$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} \log \int P(d) e^{X(d)} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{\partial^n}{\partial^n} \log \int P(d) e^{X(d)} \\ &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} E^T(X; n) : \end{aligned} \quad (A1.10)$$

The following properties, immediate consequence of (2.6) and very similar to the properties of Gaussian integrations, follow.

(1) Wick rule. Given two sets of labels f_1, \dots, f_n and f_1, \dots, f_m in A , one has

$$\int P(d) f_1 \dots f_n f_1 \dots f_m = \sum_{\pi \in \mathcal{P}_{n+m}} (1)^p \prod_{i=1}^n g_{f_i}; \quad (A1.11)$$

where the sum is over all the permutations $\pi = f_1(1); \dots; f_n(n)g$ of the indices f_1, \dots, f_n with parity p with respect to the fundamental permutation.

(2) Addition principle. Given two integrations $\int P(d_1)$ and $\int P(d_2)$, with covariance g_1 and g_2 respectively, then, for any function F which can be written as sum over monomials of Grassmann variables, i.e. $F = F(\phi)$, with $\phi = \phi_1 + \phi_2$, one has

$$\int P(d_1) \int P(d_2) F(\phi_1 + \phi_2) = \int P(d) F(\phi); \quad (A1.12)$$

where $\int P(d)$ has covariance $g = g_1 + g_2$. It is sufficient to prove it for $F(\phi) = \phi^+$, then one uses the anticommutation rules (2.5). One has

$$\begin{aligned} \int P(d_1) \int P(d_2) \phi_1 + \phi_2 &= \int P(d_1) \int P(d_2) \phi_1 + \int P(d_1) \int P(d_2) \phi_2 \\ &= \int P(d_1) \phi_1 + \int P(d_2) \phi_2 = g_1 + g_2 : \end{aligned} \quad (A1.13)$$

where (A1.2) has been used.

(3) Invariance of exponentials. From the definition of truncated expectations, it follows that, if ϕ is an "external field", i.e. a not integrated field, then

$$\int P(d) e^{X(\phi) + \phi} = \exp \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} E^T(X(\phi) + \phi; n) e^{X(\phi)} ; \quad (A1.14)$$

which is a main technical point: (A1.14) says that integrating an exponential one still gets an exponential, whose argument is expressed by the sum of truncated expectations.

(4) Change of integration. If $P_g(d)$ denotes the integration with covariance g , then, for any analytic function $F(\cdot)$, one has

$$\frac{1}{N} \int P_g(d) e^{-\frac{1}{2} d^T d} F(d) = \int P_{g^{-1}}(d) F(d); \quad g^{-1} = g^{-1} + N^{-1}; \quad (A1.15)$$

where

$$N^{-1} = \frac{g^{-1} + N^{-1}}{g^{-1}} = 1 + g^{-1} = \int P_g(d) e^{-\frac{1}{2} d^T d}; \quad (A1.16)$$

The proof is very easy from the definitions. More generally one has that, if A is a set of labels for the Grassmann fields, if M is an invertible $A \times A$ matrix and $P_M(d)$ is given by

$$P_M(d) = \int \prod_{i,j \in A} d_i d_j \det M e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in A} d_i M_{ij}^{-1} d_j}; \quad (A1.17)$$

then

$$\frac{1}{N_N} \int P_M(d) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in A} d_i N_{ij}^{-1} d_j} F(d) = \int P_{M^{-1}}(d) F(d); \quad (A1.18)$$

where

$$M^{-1} = M^{-1} + N^{-1} \quad (A1.19)$$

and

$$N_N = \det \mathbb{1} + N^{-1} M^{-1} = \frac{\det M^{-1} + N^{-1}}{\det M^{-1}} = \int P_M(d) e^{-\frac{1}{2} \sum_{i,j \in A} d_i N_{ij}^{-1} d_j}; \quad (A1.20)$$

A1.2. Graphical representation for truncated expectations.

Given a Grassmann algebra as in (2.5) and an integration measure like (A1.1) we define the simple expectation as in (A1.3). Then

$$g = E(\cdot^+): \quad (A1.21)$$

Given a monomial

$$X(\cdot) \sim_B = \int \prod_{i \in B} d_i; \quad (A1.22)$$

where B is a subset of A and $\cdot \in \mathcal{F}_g$, the expectation $E(\cdot \sim_B)$ can be graphically represented in the following way.

Represent the indices $\cdot \in B$ as points on the plane. With each $\cdot^+ \in B$, we associate a line exiting from \cdot , while with each $\cdot \in B$, we associate a line entering \cdot . Let T be the set of graphs obtained by contracting such lines in all possible ways so that only lines with opposite \cdot are contracted: given $\cdot \in B$, denote by (\cdot) the line joining \cdot and \cdot and by \cdot an element of T , i.e. a graph in T .

Then we can easily verify that

$$E(\cdot \sim_B) = \sum_{T \in \mathcal{T}(\cdot)} \text{sgn}(T) g(\cdot); \quad (A1.23)$$

which is the Wick rule stated in xA1.1: here $\text{sgn}(T)$ is a sign which depends on the graph (see (A1.11)).

Then define the truncated expectation

$$E^T(\cdot \sim_{B_1}; \dots; \cdot \sim_{B_p}; n_1; \dots; n_p); \quad (A1.24)$$

82 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin-Teller model

with $B_j \subset A$ for any j , as in (A1.4).

One easily checks that, if X_j are analytic functions of the Grassmann variables (each depending on an even number of variables, for simplicity, so that no change of sign intervenes in permuting the order of the X_j), then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (1) \quad E^T(X_1; X_2) &= E(X_1 X_2) = E(X_1)E(X_2) = E(X_1 X_2) = E^T(X_1)E^T(X_2); \\
 (2) \quad E^T(X_1; X_2; X_3) &= E(X_1 X_2 X_3) = E(X_1 X_2)E(X_3) = E(X_1 X_3)E(X_2) \\
 &\quad E(X_2 X_3)E(X_1) + 2E(X_1)E(X_2)E(X_3) = E(X_1 X_2 X_3) \\
 &\quad E^T(X_1 X_2)E^T(X_3) = E^T(X_1 X_3)E^T(X_2) = E^T(X_2 X_3)E^T(X_1); \\
 (3) \quad E^T(X_1; X_2; X_3; X_4) &= E(X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4) = E(X_1 X_2 X_3)E(X_4) = E(X_1 X_2 X_4)E(X_3) \\
 &\quad E(X_1 X_3 X_4)E(X_2) = E(X_2 X_3 X_4)E(X_1) \\
 &\quad E(X_1 X_2)E(X_3 X_4) = E(X_1 X_3)E(X_2 X_4) = E(X_1 X_4)E(X_2 X_3) \\
 &\quad + 2E(X_1 X_2)E(X_3)E(X_4) + 2E(X_1 X_3)E(X_2)E(X_4) + 2E(X_1 X_4)E(X_2)E(X_3) \\
 &\quad + 2E(X_2 X_3)E(X_1)E(X_4) + 2E(X_2 X_4)E(X_1)E(X_3) + 2E(X_3 X_4)E(X_1)E(X_2) \\
 &\quad 6E(X_1)E(X_2)E(X_3)E(X_4) = E(X_1 X_2 X_3 X_4) = E^T(X_1 X_2 X_3)E^T(X_4) \\
 &\quad E^T(X_1 X_2 X_4)E^T(X_3) = E^T(X_1 X_3 X_4)E^T(X_2) = E^T(X_2 X_3 X_4)E^T(X_1) \\
 &\quad E^T(X_1 X_2)E^T(X_3 X_4) = E^T(X_1 X_3)E^T(X_2 X_4) = E^T(X_1 X_4)E^T(X_2 X_3);
 \end{aligned} \tag{A1.25}$$

and so on. One can always write the truncated expectations in terms of simple expectations and viceversa: it is easy to check that in general one has

$$E(X_1 \dots X_s) = \sum_{p=1}^s \sum_{Y_1, \dots, Y_p} E^T(X_{i_1(1)}; \dots; X_{i_{j_{1j}(1)}}) \dots E^T(X_{i_1(p)}; \dots; X_{i_{j_{pj}(p)}}); \tag{A1.26}$$

where:

- (1) the sum is over all the possible sets Y_i ; $i = 1; \dots; p$, which are unions of j_{ij} sets X_j , such that $\bigcup_{j=1}^s X_j = \bigcup_{k=1}^p Y_k$;
 - (2) $i_1(1); \dots; i_{j_{1j}(1)}; i_1(2); \dots; i_{j_{1j}(2)}; \dots; i_{j_{pj}(p)}$ is a permutation of $1; \dots; s$.
- (A1.26) can be verified by induction, see Appendix A4 in [G].

We can now describe the rules to graphically represent the truncated expectations $E^T(\tilde{B}_1; \dots; \tilde{B}_p)$ in (A1.24). Draw in the plane p boxes $G_1; \dots; G_p$, such that G_i contains all points representing the indices belonging to B_i ; from each of the points $x \in G_i$ draw the line corresponding to the field ϕ_x contained in the monomial \tilde{B}_i , with the direction consistent with ϕ_x (the line enters or exists depending if ϕ_x is $+$ or $-$). We call clusters such boxes. Then consider all possible graphs obtained by contracting as before all the lines emerging from the points in such a way that no line is left uncontracted and with the property that if the clusters were considered as points then the graph would be connected. If we denote the lines as before we have

$$E^T(\tilde{B}_1; \dots; \tilde{B}_p; n_1; \dots; n_p) = \sum_{T \in T_0} \prod_{i=1}^p (g_i)^{n_i}; \tag{A1.27}$$

where T_0 denotes the set of all graphs obtained following the just given prescription; again g_i is a sign depending on ϕ_i .

The reason why we have to sum only over the connected graphs follows from (A1.26), as it can be easily verified by induction.

Appendix A 2. The Pfaffian expansion.

In this Appendix we prove (4.14).

Given a set of indices $P_1; \dots; P_s$, consider the quantity $E^T(\sim(P_1); \dots; \sim(P_s))$, with $\sim(P_i) = \bigcup_{f \in P_i} x(f);!$ and $\sim(P_i) = \bigcup_{f \in P_i} x(f);!$.

Define

$$D = \prod_{j=1}^s \prod_{f \in P_j} d_{x(f);!}^{(f)}(f) \quad (; G) = \prod_{f; f^0 \in P_i} \prod_{x(f);!}^{(f)} G_{f; f^0} \prod_{x(f^0);!}^{(f^0)} \quad (\text{A 2:1})$$

where, if $2n = \sum_{j=1}^s |P_j|$ then G is the $2n \times 2n$ antisymmetric matrix with entries

$$G_{f; f^0} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \langle \prod_{x(f);!}^{(f)} \prod_{x(f^0);!}^{(f^0)} \rangle \quad (\text{A 2:2})$$

Then one has

$$E^T(\sim(P_1); \dots; \sim(P_s)) = \text{Pf} G = \int D \exp \frac{1}{2} (; G) \quad (\text{A 2:3})$$

Setting $X = f_1; \dots; f_s$ and

$$\overline{V}_{jj^0} = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{f \in P_j} \prod_{f^0 \in P_{j^0}} \prod_{x(f);!}^{(f)} G_{f; f^0} \prod_{x(f^0);!}^{(f^0)} \quad (\text{A 2:4})$$

we write

$$V(X) = \prod_{j; j^0 \in X} \overline{V}_{jj^0} = \prod_{j, j^0} V_{jj^0} \quad (\text{A 2:5})$$

so defining the quantity V_{jj^0} as

$$V_{jj^0} = \begin{cases} \overline{V}_{jj^0} & \text{if } j = j^0; \\ \overline{V}_{jj^0} + \overline{V}_{j^0j} & \text{if } j < j^0; \end{cases} \quad (\text{A 2:6})$$

Then (A 2.3) can be written, by the definition of G as random variables, as

$$E^T(\sim(P_1); \dots; \sim(P_s)) = \int D e^{V(X)} \quad (\text{A 2:7})$$

We now want to express the last expression in terms of the functions W_X , defined as follows:

$$W_X(X_1; \dots; X_r; t_1; \dots; t_r) = \prod_{k=1}^r \sum_{\gamma} t_k^{|\gamma|} V_{\gamma} \quad (\text{A 2:8})$$

where:

(1) X_k are subsets of X with $|X_k| = k$, inductively defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= f_1 g; \\ X_{k+1} &= X_k; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 2:9})$$




Fig. A 2.1. Graphical representation of the sets X_k , $k=1,2,3$. In the example $X_1 = \{1\}$, $X_2 = \{1,2\}$ and $X_3 = \{1,2,3\}$. The $\gamma = (1,3)$ intersects the boundaries of X_1 and of X_2 .

- (2) $\gamma = (jj^0)$ is a pair of elements $j, j^0 \in X$ and the sum in (A 2.8) is over all the possible pairs (jj^0) ,
 (3) the functions $t_k(\gamma)$ are defined as follows:

$$t_k(\gamma) = \begin{cases} t_k & \text{if } \gamma \in X_k; \\ 1 & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A 2.10})$$

where $\gamma \in X_k$ means that $\gamma = (jj^0)$ "intersects the boundary" of X_k , i.e. connects a point in P_j , $j \in X_k$, to a point in P_{j^0} , $j^0 \notin X_k$. See Fig. A 2.1.

From definition (A 2.8) it follows:

$$W_X(X_1; t_1) = \sum_{j=2}^{X^S} t_1 V_{1j} + V_{11} + \sum_{1 < j^0 < j}^X V_{j^0 j} = (1 - t_1) [V(X_1) + V(X \setminus X_1)] + t_1 V(X) \quad (\text{A 2.11})$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned} e^{V(X)} &= \int_0^1 dt_1 \frac{\partial}{\partial t_1} e^{W_X(X_1; t_1)} + e^{W_X(X_1; 0)} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma_1 \in X_1} V_{\gamma_1} \int_0^1 dt_1 e^{W_X(X_1; t_1)} + e^{W_X(X_1; 0)}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 2.12})$$

Again by definition we have:

$$\begin{aligned} W_X(X_1; X_2; t_1; t_2) &= \\ &= V_{11} + t_1 V_{12} + t_1 t_2 \sum_{j=3}^{X^S} V_{1j} + V_{22} + t_2 \sum_{j=3}^{X^S} V_{2j} + \sum_{2 < j^0 < j}^X V_{j^0 j} = \\ &= t_1 t_2 \sum_{j=2}^{X^S} V_{1j} + t_2 V_{11} + t_2 \sum_{1 < j^0 < j}^X V_{j^0 j} + (1 - t_2)^4 V_{11} + t_1 V_{12} + V_{22} + \sum_{2 < j^0 < j}^X V_{j^0 j} = \\ &= t_2 W_X(X_1; t_1) + (1 - t_2) [W_{X_2}(X_1; t_1) + V(X \setminus X_2)] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 2.13})$$

If we define $X_2 \setminus X_1 \in \gamma_1$, i.e. $X_2 = \{1\}$; point connected by γ_1 with 1g, then:

$$\begin{aligned} e^{W_X(X_1; t_1)} &= \int_0^1 dt_2 \frac{\partial}{\partial t_2} e^{W_X(X_1; X_2; t_1; t_2)} + e^{W_X(X_1; X_2; t_1; 0)} \\ &= \sum_{\gamma_2 \in X_2} V_{\gamma_2} \int_0^1 dt_2 t_1(\gamma_2) e^{W_X(X_1; X_2; t_1; t_2)} + e^{W_X(X_1; X_2; t_1; 0)}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 2.14})$$

Substituting (A 2.14) in (A 2.12) we get:

$$e^{V(X)} = \int_{X_1 \in X_1} \int_{X_2 \in X_2} \int_{Z_1} \int_{Z_2} dt_1 dt_2 (1)^2 V_{X_1} V_{X_2} t_1 (t_2) e^{W_{X_1}(X_1; X_2, t_1, t_2)} + \int_{X_1 \in X_1} dt_1 (1) V_{X_1} e^{W_{X_1}(X_1; X_2, t_1; 0)} + e^{W_{X_1}(X_1; 0)} : \quad (A2.15)$$

A relation generalizing (A 2.13) holds:

$$\begin{aligned} W_X(X_1, \dots, X_{p+1}; t_1, \dots, t_{p+1}) &= t_{p+1} W_X(X_1, \dots, X_p; t_1, \dots, t_p) + \\ (1 - t_{p+1}) W_{X_{p+1}}(X_1, \dots, X_p; t_1, \dots, t_p) &+ V(X, n, X_{p+1}) \end{aligned} \quad (A.2.16)$$

where $p < s$. In fact in the sum over λ in (A 2.8) we can distinguish two cases: either $\lambda = X_{p+1}$ or $\lambda \in X_{p+1}$. In the former case V_λ is necessarily multiplied by t_{p+1} and, if $\lambda = (j^0 j)$, $j^0 \leq p+1$; $j > p+1$; in the latter case V_λ is not multiplied by t_{p+1} and either $j^0 \leq p+1$ or $j^0 \leq p+1$. Then, clearly:

$$\begin{aligned} W_X(X_1; \dots; X_{p+1}; t_1; \dots; t_{p+1}) &= \\ &= t_{p+1} W_X(X_1; \dots; X_p; t_1; \dots; t_p) - W_{X_{p+1}}(X_1; \dots; X_p; t_1; \dots; t_p) - W_{X \times X_{p+1}}(X_1; \dots; X_p; t_1; \dots; t_p) + \\ &+ W_{X_{p+1}}(X_1; \dots; X_p; t_1; \dots; t_p) + W_{X \times X_{p+1}}(X_1; \dots; X_p; t_1; \dots; t_p) \end{aligned} \quad (A.2.17)$$

that is equivalent to (A.2.16). We can iterate the procedure followed to get (A.2.12) and (A.2.15). In the general case we find:

$$e^{V(X)} = \frac{X^1 \cdots X^Z}{r=0 \quad \vdots \quad dt_1 \cdots dt_r (1)^r V_1 \cdots V_r} \frac{Z^1 \cdots Z^Z}{0 \quad \vdots \quad 0} \frac{1}{Y^1 \cdots Y^Z} \prod_{k=1}^Z t_k (Y_{k+1}) \cdots t_k (Y_{k+1}) e^{W_X(X_1, \dots, X_{r+1}; t_1, \dots, t_r, 0)}; \quad (A2:18)$$

where the meaningless factors must be replaced by 1. Moreover, from (A 2.16) we soon realize that

$$\begin{aligned} W_X(X_1, \dots, X_s; t_1, \dots, t_{s-1}; 0) &= W_X(X_1, \dots, X_{s-1}; t_1, \dots, t_{s-1}) \\ W_X(X_1, \dots, X_r; t_1, \dots, t_{r-1}; 0) &= W_{X_r}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1}; t_1, \dots, t_{r-1}) + V(X_n X_r) \end{aligned} \quad (A.2.19)$$

The last equation holds for $r > 1$. If $r = 1$:

$$W_X(X_1; 0) = V(X_1) + V(X_n X_1) \quad (A2.20)$$

Let T be a tree graph connecting X_1, \dots, X_r , such that:

- (1) for all $k = 1, \dots, r$, T is "anchored" to some point $(j; i)$, i.e. T contains a line incident with $(j; i)$, where $j \in X_k$ and $i \in \mathbb{P}_j$,
- (2) each line $\ell \in T$ intersects at least one boundary ∂X_k ,
- (3) the lines ℓ_1, ℓ_2, \dots are ordered in such a way that $\ell_1 \cap \partial X_1, \ell_2 \cap \partial X_2, \dots$,
- (4) for each $\ell \in T$ there exist two indexes $n(\ell)$ and $n^0(\ell)$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} n^*(\gamma) &= \max_{k \in K} f_k : \gamma \in \bigcap_{k \in K} X_k; \\ n^0(\gamma) &= \min_{k \in K} f_k : \gamma \in \bigcap_{k \in K} X_k; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2.21})$$

We shall say that T is an anchored tree.

86 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

Using the definitions above, we can rewrite (A 2.18) as:

$$e^{-V(X)} = \sum_{\substack{r=1 \\ Z_1}}^{X_1} \sum_{\substack{X_2 \\ Z_1}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{X_{r-1} \\ Z_1}} \sum_{\substack{T \text{ on } X_r \\ Z_1}} \sum_{\substack{Y \\ Z_1}} \frac{Q_{r-1}!}{t_n(\cdot)} e^{-W_{X_r}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1}, t_1, \dots, t_{r-1})} e^{-V(X \setminus X_r)} \quad (\text{A 2.22})$$

where " T on X_r " means that T is an anchored tree for the clusters P_j with $j \geq X_r$.

Let us define

$$K(X_r) = \sum_{\substack{X_2 \\ Z_1}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{X_{r-1} \\ Z_1}} \sum_{\substack{T \text{ on } X_r \\ Z_1}} \sum_{\substack{Y \\ Z_1}} \frac{Q_{r-1}!}{t_n(\cdot)} e^{-W_{X_r}(X_1, \dots, X_{r-1}, t_1, \dots, t_{r-1})} ; \quad (\text{A 2.23})$$

so that (A 2.22) can be rewritten as

$$e^{-V(X)} = \sum_{\substack{Y \\ Y \neq X}} \sum_{\substack{X \\ Y \neq X}} (1)^{j-1} K(Y) e^{-V(X \setminus Y)} ; \quad (\text{A 2.24})$$

and, iterating,

$$e^{-V(X)} = \sum_{Q_1, \dots, Q_m} (1)^{j-1} (1)^m \sum_{q=1}^m K(Q_q) ; \quad (\text{A 2.25})$$

The sets Q_1, \dots, Q_m in (A 2.25) are disjoint subsets of X , such that $\bigcup_{i=1}^m Q_i = X$.

Substituting (A 2.25) in (A 2.7), we find

$$\sum_{j=1}^0 \sum_{Y^s} \sim (P_j) A = \sum_{D} \sum_{(Q_1, \dots, Q_m)} (1)^{s+m} \sum_{q=1}^m K(Q_q) ; \quad (\text{A 2.26})$$

where the sum is over the partitions (Q_1, \dots, Q_m) of X . It is easy to realize that in the last equation $K(Q_q)$ (already defined in (A 2.23)) can be rewritten as

$$K(Q) = \sum_{\substack{T \text{ on } Q \\ \text{fixed } T}} \sum_{\substack{X_2 \\ Z_1}} \cdots \sum_{\substack{X_{j-1} \\ Z_1}} \sum_{\substack{Y \\ Z_1}} \frac{Q_{j-1}!}{t_n(\cdot)} e^{-W_Q(X_2, \dots, X_{j-1}, t_1, \dots, t_{j-1})} e^{-V(X \setminus Q)} \quad (\text{A 2.27})$$

Moreover, we can also rewrite (A 2.26) as:

$$\sum_{j=1}^0 \sum_{Y^s} \sim (P_j) A = \sum_{(Q_1, \dots, Q_m)} (1)^{s+m} \sum_{q=1}^m D_{Q_q} K(Q_q) ; \quad (\text{A 2.28})$$

where $D_{Q_q} = \sum_{j \geq 2} \sum_{P_j} d_{X \setminus Q_q}^{(f)} \frac{(f)!}{(f)!}$ and (-1) is the sign of the permutation leading from the ordering of the fields in D_{Q_q} to the ones in $D_{Q_q}^{(f)}$.

Let us now consider the well known relation:

$$E^T \left(\sum_{j=1}^s \sim(P_j) A \right) = \sum_{(Q_1, \dots, Q_m)}^X (1)^{s+1} E^T \left(\sim(P_{j_1}) \dots \sim(P_{j_{s+1}}) \right) \dots E^T \left(\sim(P_{j_m}) \dots \sim(P_{j_{2m}}) \right); \quad (A.2.29)$$

where the sum is over the partitions of f_1, \dots, f_s , $Q_q = f_{j_1} \dots f_{j_q}$ and $(1)^{s+1}$ is the parity of the permutation leading to the ordering on the r.h.s. from the one on the l.h.s. (note that $(1)^{s+1}$ is the same as in (A.2.28)). Comparing (A.2.29) with (A.2.28) we get:

$$E^T \left(\sim(P_1) \dots \sim(P_s) \right) = (1)^{s+1} \sum_{T \text{ on } X}^X \sum_{V \text{ on } T}^Y dP_T(t) e^{V(t)}; \quad (A.2.30)$$

where we defined:

$$dP_T(t) = \sum_{\substack{X_2, \dots, X_{s+1} \\ \text{fixed } T}}^X \sum_{q=1}^Y t_{n^0(\cdot)} \dots t_{n^q(\cdot)} dt_q \quad (A.2.31)$$

and

$$V(t) = \sum_{X \text{ on } T}^X t_{n^0(\cdot)} \dots t_{n^q(\cdot)} V; \quad (A.2.32)$$

If in (A.2.30) we integrate the Grassmann fields appearing in the product

$$V = \sum_{(jj^0) \in T} \overline{V}_{jj^0} + \overline{V}_{jj^0}; \quad (A.2.33)$$

we obtain

$$E^T \left(\sim(P_1) \dots \sim(P_s) \right) = (1)^{s+1} \sum_{T \text{ on } P}^X \sum_{V \text{ on } T}^Y G_{f^1, f^2} \sum_{D \text{ on } T}^Z dP_T(t) e^{V(t)}; \quad (A.2.34)$$

where $P = [P_i]$, the sum $\sum_{T \text{ on } P}$ denotes the sum over the graphs whose elements are lines connecting pairs of distinct points $x(f)$, $f \in P$ such that, if we identify all the points in the clusters P_j , $j = 1, \dots, s$, then T is a tree graph on X ; moreover $\sum_{T \text{ on } P}$ is a suitable sign and

$$D(d) = \sum_{\substack{f \in P \\ f \in T}}^Y d_{x(f), f}^{(f)}; \quad V(t) = \sum_{V \text{ on } T}^X t_{n^0(\cdot)} \dots t_{n^q(\cdot)} V; \quad (A.2.35)$$

The term

$$\sum_{D \text{ on } T}^Z dP_T(t) e^{V(t)} \quad (A.2.36)$$

in (A.2.34) is the Pfaffian of a suitable matrix $G^T(t)$, with elements

$$G_{f, f^0}^T(t) = t_{n^0(\cdot)} \dots t_{n^q(\cdot)} G_{f, f^0}; \quad (A.2.37)$$

where $f^0 = (j(f)j^0)$, $j(f) \in X$ is s.t. $f \in P_{j(f)}$ and G_{f, f^0} was defined in (A.2.2). So (4.14) is proven, with $t_{j, j^0} = t_{n^0(jj^0)} \dots t_{n^q(jj^0)}$.

In order to complete the proof of the claims following (4.14) we must prove that $dP_T(t)$ is a normalized, positive and additive measure, so it can be interpreted as a probability measure in $t = (t_1, \dots, t_{s+1})$; and that, moreover, we can find a family of vectors $u_j \in \mathbb{R}^s$ such that $t_{j, j^0} = u_j \cdot \psi^0$.

So, let us conclude this Appendix by proving the following Lemma.

88 Universality and non{universality in the Ashkin-Teller model

Lemma A.2.1 $dP_T(t)$ is a normalized, positive and σ -additive measure on the natural σ -algebra of $[0;1]^{s-1}$. Moreover there exists a set of unit vectors $u_j \in \mathbb{R}^s$, $j = 1, \dots, s$, such that $t_{j,j^0} = u_j \cdot y^0$.

Proof – Let us denote by b_k the number of lines $\ell \in T$ exiting from the points $x(j;i)$, $j \in X_k$, such that $\ell \cap X_k \neq \emptyset$. Let us consider the integral

$$\int_{\substack{X_2, \dots, X_{s-1} \\ T \text{ fissato}}} \int_0^1 dt_1 \cdots \int_0^1 dt_{s-1} \int_{\ell \in T} t_{n^0(\ell)} \cdots t_{n^1(\ell)-1} = 1; \quad (\text{A.2.38})$$

and note that, by construction, the parameter t_k inside the integral in the l.h.s. appears at the power $b_k - 1$. In fact any line intersecting ∂X_k contributes by a factor t_k , except for the line connecting X_k with the point in $X_{k+1} \cap X_k$. See Fig. A.2.2.




Fig. A.2.1. The sets X_1, \dots, X_6 , the anchored tree T and the lines ℓ_1, \dots, ℓ_5 belonging to T . In the example, the coefficients b_1, \dots, b_5 are respectively equal to: 2;1;3;2;1.

Then

$$\int_{\ell \in T} t_{n^0(\ell)} \cdots t_{n^1(\ell)-1} = \prod_{k=1}^{s-1} t_k^{b_k-1}; \quad (\text{A.2.39})$$

and in (A.2.38) the $s-1$ integrations are independent. It holds:

$$\int_0^1 dt_1 \cdots \int_0^1 dt_{s-1} \int_{\ell \in T} t_{n^0(\ell)} \cdots t_{n^1(\ell)-1} = \prod_{k=1}^{s-1} \int_0^1 dt_k t_k^{b_k-1} = \prod_{k=1}^{s-1} \frac{1}{b_k}; \quad (\text{A.2.40})$$

that is well defined, since $b_k \geq 1$, $k = 1, \dots, m-2$. Moreover we can write:

$$\int_{\substack{X_2, \dots, X_{s-1} \\ T \text{ fissato}}} \int_{\substack{X_2 \\ T; X_1 \text{ fissato}}} \int_{\substack{X_3 \\ T; X_1; X_2 \text{ fissato}}} \cdots \int_{\substack{X_{s-1} \\ T; X_1, \dots, X_{s-2} \text{ fissato}}} = 1; \quad (\text{A.2.41})$$

where the number of possible choices in summing over X_k , once that T and the sets $X_1; \dots; X_{k-1}$ are fixed, is exactly b_{k-1} . In fact, if from X_{k-1} there are b_{k-1} exiting lines, then X_k is obtained by adding to X_{k-1} one of the b_{k-1} points connected to X_{k-1} through the tree lines. Then:

$$\sum_{\substack{X_2, \dots, X_{s-1} \\ T \text{ fissato}}} X = b_1 \dots b_{s-2}; \quad (\text{A } 2.42)$$

and, recalling that $b_{s-1} = 1$,

$$\sum_{\substack{X_2, \dots, X_{s-1} \\ T \text{ fissato}}} \int_0^{Z_1} \dots \int_0^{Z_{s-1}} \prod_{i=1}^s dt_i \dots dt_{s-1} \prod_{j=1}^{2T} t_{n^0(j)} \dots t_{n^1(j)-1} = \prod_{k=1}^{s-2} \frac{b_k}{b_k}; \quad (\text{A } 2.43)$$

yielding to $\int dP_T(t) = 1$. The positivity and additivity of $dP_T(t)$ is obvious by definition.

We are left with proving that we can find unit vectors $u_j \in \mathbb{R}^s$ such that $t_{j,j^0} = u_j \cdot y^0$.

For this aim, let us introduce a family of unit vectors in \mathbb{R}^s defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= v_1; \\ u_j &= t_{j-1} u_{j-1} + v_{j-1} \sqrt{1 - t_{j-1}^2}; \quad j = 2, \dots, s; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 2.44)$$

where $\{v_i\}_{i=1}^s$ is an orthonormal basis. Let us rename the sets P_i ; $i = 1, \dots, s$ in such a way that $X_1 = f_1 g$, $X_2 = f_1 g_2, \dots, X_{s-1} = f_1 \dots g_{s-1} g$. Then, for a given line (jj^0) , we have:

$$t_{j,j^0} = t_{n^0(jj^0)} \dots t_{n^1(jj^0)} = t_j \dots t_{j^0-1} \quad (\text{A } 2.45)$$

From (A 2.44) it follows

$$u_j \cdot y^0 = t_j \dots t_{j^0-1} \quad (\text{A } 2.46)$$

as wanted ■

Appendix A 3. Gram {Hadamard inequality.

In this Appendix we prove Gram {Hadamard inequality, that is the bound (4.17).

Let x_1, \dots, x_m be m vectors of a Hilbert space H and let E be their span. We define the Gram determinant as

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) \det = \det \begin{pmatrix} (x_1, x_1) & \dots & (x_1, x_m) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x_m, x_1) & \dots & (x_m, x_m) \end{pmatrix} \quad (A 3.1)$$

where (\cdot, \cdot) denotes the inner product in H . The following results hold.

Lemma A 3.1. Given a Hilbert space H and m vectors x_1, \dots, x_m in H , the Gram determinant (A 3.1) satisfies

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) = 0; \quad (A 3.2)$$

if and only if the vectors x_1, \dots, x_m are linearly dependent. If the vectors x_1, \dots, x_m are linearly independent then one has

$$(x_1, \dots, x_m) > 0; \quad (A 3.3)$$

Proof - If the vectors x_1, \dots, x_m are linearly dependent then there exist m coefficients c_1, \dots, c_m not all vanishing such that the vector $\sum_{j=1}^m c_j x_j$ is vanishing. By considering its inner product with the vectors x_1, \dots, x_m , we obtain the system

$$\begin{aligned} c_1 (x_1, x_1) + \dots + c_m (x_1, x_m) &= 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \vdots \vdots \\ c_1 (x_m, x_1) + \dots + c_m (x_m, x_m) &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (A 3.4)$$

which is an homogeneous system admitting a nontrivial solution: therefore the determinant of the matrix of the coefficients is zero, so implying (A 3.2).

Vice versa if (A 3.2) holds the system (A 3.4) admits a nontrivial solution. If we multiply the m equations defining the system by c_1, \dots, c_m , respectively, then we sum them, we obtain

$$\| \sum_{j=1}^m c_j x_j \|^2 = 0; \quad (A 3.5)$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ is the norm induced by the inner product (\cdot, \cdot) . Therefore the vector $\sum_{j=1}^m c_j x_j$ has to be identically vanishing: as the coefficients c_1, \dots, c_m are not all vanishing, then the vectors x_1, \dots, x_m have to be linearly dependent.

To prove (A 3.3) consider a non trivial subset $S \subset E$, where E is the span of x_1, \dots, x_m , and set, for any $x \in E$, $x = x_S + x_N$, where $x_S \in S$ and x_N belonging to the orthogonal complement to S . We can write x_N as $x_N = c_1 x_1 + \dots + c_p x_p$, where $p < m$ and $p = m - \dim(S)$ (now we are assuming that the vectors x_1, \dots, x_m are linearly independent). The vector

$$\det \begin{pmatrix} (x_1, x_1) & \dots & (x_1, x_p) & x_1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ (x_p, x_1) & \dots & (x_p, x_p) & x_p \\ (x, x_1) & \dots & (x, x_p) & x_N \end{pmatrix} \quad (A 3.6)$$

is identically vanishing. In particular it follows that

$$x_N = \frac{1}{\det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & \dots & x_p \\ (x; x_1) & \dots & (x; x_p) & 0 \end{pmatrix}} \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & \dots & x_p \\ (x; x_1) & \dots & (x; x_p) & 0 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad (A 3.7)$$

and, analogously,

$$x_S = \frac{1}{\det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & \dots & x_p \\ (x; x_1) & \dots & (x; x_p) & x \end{pmatrix}} \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & \dots & x_p \\ (x; x_1) & \dots & (x; x_p) & x \end{pmatrix} ; \quad (A 3.8)$$

so that

$$0 \leq h^2(x_S; x) = \frac{1}{\det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & \dots & x_p \\ (x; x_1) & \dots & (x; x_p) & x \end{pmatrix}} \det \begin{pmatrix} 0 & x_1 & \dots & x_p \\ (x; x_1) & \dots & (x; x_p) & x \end{pmatrix} = \frac{(x_1; \dots; x_p; x)}{(x_1; \dots; x_p)} ; \quad (A 3.9)$$

By setting $x = x_{p+1}$ and $h^2 = h_p^2$, we can write (A 3.9) as

$$\frac{(x_1; \dots; x_p; x_{p+1})}{(x_1; \dots; x_p)} = h_p^2 \geq 0 ; \quad (A 3.10)$$

where $x_1; \dots; x_p$ are p linearly independent vectors and x_{p+1} is arbitrary. The sign $=$ in (A 3.10) holds if and only if x_{p+1} is a linear combination of the vectors $x_1; \dots; x_p$ so that if $x_1; \dots; x_p; x_{p+1}$ are linearly independent, then (A 3.10) holds with the strict sign, i.e.

$$\frac{(x_1; \dots; x_p; x_{p+1})}{(x_1; \dots; x_p)} = h_p^2 > 0 ; \quad (A 3.11)$$

As $(x_1) = (x_1; x_1) = \|x_1\|^2 > 0$ for $x_1 \neq 0$, (A 3.11) implies (A 3.3). ■

Lemma A 3.2 (Hadamard inequality). The Gram determinant satisfies the inequality

$$(x_1; \dots; x_m) \leq (x_1) \dots (x_m) ; \quad (A 3.12)$$

where the sign $=$ holds if and only if the vectors are orthogonal to each other.

Proof. By (A 3.11) and by using that $(x_S; x_S) = (x; x)$, we have

$$(x_1; \dots; x_m; x) \leq (x_1; \dots; x_m) (x) ; \quad (A 3.13)$$

for any vectors $x_1; \dots; x_m; x \in E$. By iterating and recalling the arguments above (A 3.12) follows. ■

Let $x_1; \dots; x_m$ be m linearly independent vectors in H and E their span. Let f_j^m an orthonormal basis

92 Universality and nonuniversality in the Ashkin-Teller model

in E : set $x_{jk} = (\underline{u}_j; x_k)$, so that $x_k = \sum_{j=1}^m x_{jk} \underline{u}_j$, $k = 1, \dots, m$. Then

$$\begin{aligned}
 (x_1; \dots; x_m) &= \det \begin{pmatrix} (x_1; x_1) & \dots & (x_1; x_m) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ (x_m; x_1) & \dots & (x_m; x_m) \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \sum_{i,j} \bar{x}_{i1} x_{j1} (\underline{u}_i; \underline{u}_j) & \dots & \sum_{i,j} \bar{x}_{i1} x_{jm} (\underline{u}_i; \underline{u}_j) \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \sum_{i,j} \bar{x}_{im} x_{j1} (\underline{u}_i; \underline{u}_j) & \dots & \sum_{i,j} \bar{x}_{im} x_{jm} (\underline{u}_i; \underline{u}_j) \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}_{11} x_{11} & \dots & \bar{x}_{11} x_{1m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \bar{x}_{1m} x_{11} & \dots & \bar{x}_{1m} x_{1m} \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \det \begin{pmatrix} \bar{x}_{11} & \dots & \bar{x}_{1m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \bar{x}_{m1} & \dots & \bar{x}_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & \dots & x_{1m} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{m1} & \dots & x_{mm} \end{pmatrix} \\
 &= \det \bar{X}^T \det X = |\det X|^2;
 \end{aligned} \tag{A 3.14}$$

where the matrix X is defined as

$$X = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & \dots & x_{1m} \\ x_{21} & x_{22} & \dots & x_{2m} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ x_{m1} & x_{m2} & \dots & x_{mm} \end{pmatrix} : \tag{A 3.15}$$

This yields that the Gram determinant (A 3.12) can be written as

$$(x_1; \dots; x_m) = |\det X|^2; \tag{A 3.16}$$

so that from the lemma above the following result follows immediately.

Lemma A 3.3. Given m linearly independent vectors of an Hilbert space H and an orthonormal basis $f_{j=1}^m, g_{j=1}^m$ on their span, and defining the matrix X through (A 3.14), one has

$$|\det X|^2 = |\det (\underline{u}_i; x_j)|^2 = \sum_{j=1}^m \|x_j\|^2; \tag{A 3.17}$$

where $(\underline{u}_i; x_j)$ stands for the matrix with entries $X_{ij} = (\underline{u}_i; x_j)$.

The lemma above is simply a reformulation of the preceding Lemma: it implies the following inequality.

Theorem A 3.1 (Gram-Hadamard inequality). Let $f_{j=1}^m$ and $g_{j=1}^m$ two families of m linearly independent vectors in an Euclidean space E , and let $(\cdot; \cdot)$ an inner product in E and $\|\cdot\|$ the norm induced by that inner product. Then

$$|\det (f_i; g_j)| \leq \prod_{j=1}^m \|f_j\| \|g_j\|; \tag{A 3.18}$$

where $(f_i; g_j)$ stands for the $m \times m$ matrix with entries $(f_i; g_j)$.

Proof - If $g_{j=1}^m$ is an orthogonal basis in E (so that $f_{j=1}^m$, with $\underline{u}_j = \|g_j\|^{-1} g_j$, is an orthonormal basis) then (A 3.17) gives

$$|\det (g_i; x_j)| = |\det (\underline{u}_i; x_j)| \prod_{j=1}^m \|g_j\| = \prod_{j=1}^m \|g_j\| \|x_j\|; \tag{A 3.19}$$

Now consider the case in which the only conditions on the vectors $fg_j g_{j=1}^m$ is that they are linearly independent. Set $g_j = kg_j k^{-1} g_j$, so that $kg_j k^2 = 1$, and define inductively the family of vectors

$$\begin{aligned} u_1 &= g_1 ; \\ u_2 &= \frac{g_2 - (g_2; g_1) g_1}{1 - (g_2; g_1)^2} ; \end{aligned} \quad (A.3.20)$$

and so on, in such a way that one has $(u_i; u_j) = \delta_{ij}$. The basis $f_{u_1}; \dots; u_m$ g , with $u_j = u_j$ $\delta j = 1; \dots; m$ is by construction an orthonormal basis.

If $c_2 = 1 - (g_2; g_1)^2$, with $0 < c_2 < 1$, one has

$$g_2 = c_2 u_2 + c_2 (g_2; g_1) g_1 ; \quad (A.3.21)$$

i.e. $g_2 = c_2 u_2$, if by we mean that, by computing $\det(g_i; f_j)$, no difference is made by the fact that one has the vector g_2 instead of $c_2 u_2$: in fact the contributions arising from the remaining part in (A.3.19) sum up to zero.

We can reason analogously for the terms with $j = 3; \dots; m$, and we find $g_j = c_j u_j$, where c_j is meant as above and the coefficients c_j are such that $0 < c_j < 1$ $\delta j = 1; \dots; m$. In conclusion:

$$\begin{aligned} \prod_{j=1}^m \det(g_i; f_j) &= \prod_{j=1}^m \det(g_i; f_j) \prod_{j=1}^m kg_j k = \prod_{j=1}^m \det(u_i; f_j) \prod_{j=1}^m c_j kg_j k \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^m c_j kg_j k kf_j k \prod_{j=1}^m kg_j k kf_j k ; \end{aligned} \quad (A.3.22)$$

so that (A.3.18) follows. ■

Appendix A 4. Proof of Lemma 5.3.

The propagators $g_{\frac{a}{2}, \frac{a}{2}}^{(h)}(x)$ can be written in terms of the propagators $g_{l, l_0}^{(jh)}(x)$, $j = 1, 2$, see (5.20) and following lines; $g_{l, l_0}^{(jh)}(x)$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} g_{l, l_0}^{(jh)}(x-y) &= \\ &= \frac{2}{M^2} \sum_k e^{ik(x-y)} f_h(k) \frac{i \sin k + i \sin k_0 + a_{h-1}^{(j)}(k)}{\sin^2 k + \sin^2 k_0 + \overline{m}_{h-1}^{(j)}(k)^2 + B_{h-1}^{(j)}(k)} \\ g_{l, l_0}^{(jh)}(x-y) &= \\ &= \frac{2}{M^2} \sum_k e^{ik(x-y)} f_h(k) \frac{i \overline{m}_{h-1}^{(j)}(k)}{\sin^2 k + \sin^2 k_0 + \overline{m}_{h-1}^{(j)}(k)^2 + B_{h-1}^{(j)}(k)} ; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 4.1})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} a_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} a_{h-1}^l(k) + (-1)^j b_{h-1}^l(k) ; \quad c_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} c_{h-1}(k) + (-1)^j d_{h-1}(k) \\ m_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m_{h-1}(k) + (-1)^j j_{h-1}(k) ; \quad \overline{m}_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} m_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) + c^{(j)}(k) \\ B_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) &\stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_l a_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) (i \sin k - i \sin k_0) + a_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) a_{h-1}^{(j)}(k) = 2 : \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 4.2})$$

In order to bound the propagators defined above, we need estimates on $f_h(k)$; $b_h(k)$ and on the "corrections" $a_{h-1}^l(k)$, $b_{h-1}^l(k)$, $c_{h-1}(k)$, $d_{h-1}(k)$. As regarding $f_h(k)$ and $b_h(k)$, it is easy to realize that, on the support of $f_h(k)$, for some c , $c^{-1} j_{h,j} - j_{h-1}(k) j - c j_{h,j}$ and $c^{-1} j_{h,j} - j_{h-1}(k) j - c j_{h,j}$ see Proof of Lemma 2.6 in [BM]. Note also that, if $h \geq h_0$, using the first two of (5.22), we have $\frac{j_{h,j} + j_{h,j}}{h} \leq 2C_1$. As regarding the corrections, using their iterative definition (5.14), the asymptotic estimates near $k = 0$ of the corrections on scale $h = 1$ (see item (2) in Theorem 4.1) and the hypothesis (5.22), we easily find that, on the support of $f_h(k)$:

$$\begin{aligned} a_{h-1}^l(k) &= O(h^{-(1-2cj)h}) + O(h^{-(3-cj)h}) ; \quad b_{h-1}^l(k) = O(h^{-(1-2cj)h}) + O(h^{-(3-cj)h}) ; \\ c_h(k) &= O(h^{-(2-cj)h}) ; \quad d_h(k) = O(h^{-(2-2cj)h}) : \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 4.3})$$

The bounds on the propagators follow from the remark that, as a consequence of the estimates discussed above, the denominators in (A 4.1) are $O(h^{-2h})$ on the support of f_h .

Appendix A 5. Proof of (5.42).

We have, by definition $P f G = (2^k k!)^{-1} \sum_p (-1)^p G_{p(1)p(2) \dots p(2k-1)p(2k)}$, where $p = (p(1); \dots; p(j))$ is a permutation of the indices $f \in J$ (we suppose $j = 2k$) and $(-1)^p$ its sign.

If we apply $S_1 = 1 - P_0$ to $P f G$ and we call $G_{f;f^0}^0 \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} P_0 G_{f;f^0}$, we find that $S_1 P f G$ is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{2^k k!} \sum_p (-1)^p G_{p(1)p(2) \dots p(2k-1)p(2k)}^0 &= \frac{1}{2^k k!} \sum_p (-1)^p \sum_{j=1}^k X^k \\ &G_{p(1)p(2) \dots p(2j-3)p(2j-2)}^0 S_1 G_{p(2j-1)p(2j)} G_{p(2j+1)p(2j+2) \dots p(2k-1)p(2k)}^0; \end{aligned} \quad (A 5.1)$$

where in the last sum the meaningless factors must be put equal to 1. We rewrite the two sums over p and j in the following way:

$$\sum_p \sum_{j=1}^k X^k = \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ f_1 \in f_2}}^{f_1; f_2 \in J} \sum_{J_1; J_2} X^k; \quad (A 5.2)$$

where: the $\sum_{f_1; f_2 \in J}$ on the second sum means that the sets J_1 and J_2 are s.t. $(f_1; f_2; J_1; J_2)$ is a partition of J ; the $\sum_{J_1; J_2}$ on the second sum means that $p(1); \dots; p(2j-2)$ belong to J_1 , $(p(2j-1); p(2j)) = (f_1; f_2)$ and $p(2j+1); \dots; p(2k)$ belong to J_2 . Using (A 5.2) we can rewrite (A 5.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 P f G &= \frac{1}{2^k k!} \sum_{\substack{j=1 \\ f_1 \in f_2}}^{f_1; f_2 \in J} \sum_{J_1; J_2} (-1)^{p_1} S_1 G_{f_1; f_2}^0 \\ &\sum_{p_1; p_2} (-1)^{p_1 + p_2} G_{p_1(1)p_1(2) \dots p_1(2k_1-1)p_1(2k_1)}^0 G_{p_2(1)p_2(2) \dots p_2(2k_2-1)p_2(2k_2)}^0; \end{aligned} \quad (A 5.3)$$

where: $(-1)^{p_1}$ is the sign of the permutation leading from the ordering J to the ordering $(f_1; f_2; J_1; J_2)$; p_i , $i = 1, 2$ is a permutation of the labels in J_i (we suppose $j_i = 2k_i$) and $(-1)^{p_i}$ is its sign. It is clear that (A 5.3) is equivalent to (5.44).

Appendix A 6. Vanishing of the Beta function.

In this Appendix we want to prove the first bound in (6.6), also called the vanishing of the Luttinger model Beta function; we reproduce the proof proposed in [BM 1].

We will consider the reference model for our system, that is a model with propagator given by (6.4), a local quartic interaction and with both ultraviolet and infrared cut-offs. The model is similar (but not the same) to the Luttinger model, but it is not exactly solvable. However its Beta function, coinciding with the first term in the r.h.s. of (6.5), also coincide with the infrared part of the Luttinger model Beta function.

The reference model formally satisfies chiral gauge invariance, in the sense that, neglecting the UV and IR cut-offs, it is invariant under the transformations

$$\psi_j \rightarrow e^{i\alpha_j} \psi_j; \quad (\phi_0 + i\phi_1) \rightarrow (\phi_0 + i\phi_1) + i(\phi_0 + i\phi_1) \alpha_j; \quad (A 6.1)$$

Using the invariance of the Schwinger functions generating functional under these transformations, one gets a hierarchy of Ward identities, which differ from the formal ones by terms which formally vanish when the cut-offs are removed. However these terms could give no trivial contributions to the correlation functions, because they must be included in the multiscale integration and the cut-offs must be removed after the integration procedure is finished. This is in fact the case, and the result can be expressed in terms of some correction identities, relating the corrections to the formal Ward identities to the 2 or 4 legs Schwinger functions. The exact Ward identities differ from the formal ones, even when the UV and IR cut-offs are removed. This is called breaking of chiral symmetry.

The Ward identities together with the so called Dyson equation, allow to express ϕ_h in terms of ψ and of Schwinger functions satisfying the "right" dimensional bounds. The conclusion will be that, keeping the UV cut-off fixed at scale 0, $\phi_h = O(h^{-2})$, uniformly in $h < 0$. This implies that the IR cut-off can be removed and that the infrared part of the Beta function satisfies the first of (6.6). The bound (6.6) is an easy consequence of the bound $\phi_h = O(h^{-2})$, and the proof of this will be presented below for completeness, see (A 6.97) (A 6.101).

A 6.1. The reference model

The reference model is defined by the interaction

$$V(\phi) = \int dx \sum_{x,j} \phi_{x,j}^+ \phi_{x,j}^+ \phi_{x,j}^- \phi_{x,j}^- \quad (A 6.1)$$

where $\int dx$ is a shorthand for $\sum_{x \in \mathbb{Z}^d}$, and by the free measure

$$P(d\phi) = N^{-1} \int \prod_{x,j} d\phi_{x,j} \exp \left(- \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} C_{h,0}(k) (\phi_{k,0} + i\phi_{k,1})^2 \right) \quad (A 6.2)$$

where the summation over k is over the momenta allowed by the antiperiodic boundary conditions, $N = \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}^d} [(L)^{-2} (k_0^2 - k^2) C_{h,0}(k)^2]$ and $[C_{h,0}(k)]^{-1} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sum_{k=h}^0 f_h(k) = C_{h,0}(k)$. We read the presence of $C_{h,0}(k)$ by saying that an ultraviolet cut-off on scale 0 and an infrared cut-off on scale h are imposed. We introduce the generating functional

$$W(\phi; J) = \log \int P(d\phi) e^{V(\phi) + \sum_{x,j} J_{x,j} \phi_{x,j}} \quad (A 6.3)$$


 Fig. 1. Graphical representation of the interaction V and the density $\psi^\dagger \psi$

The interaction V and the density operators appearing at the exponent of (A 6.3) can be represented as in Fig 1.


The Schwinger functions can be obtained by functional derivatives of (A 6.3); for instance

$$G_{!}^{2;1}(x;y;z) = \frac{\partial}{\partial J_{x!}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi_y^+ \partial \psi_z^+} W(\psi; J) \Big|_{J=0} ; \quad (\text{A 6:4})$$

$$G_{!}^{4;1}(x;x_1;x_2;x_3;x_4) = \frac{\partial}{\partial J_{x!}} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi_{x_1!}^+ \partial \psi_{x_2!}^+} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi_{x_3!}^+ \partial \psi_{x_4!}^+} W(\psi; J) \Big|_{J=0} ; \quad (\text{A 6:5})$$

$$G_{!}^4(x_1;x_2;x_3;x_4) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi_{x_1!}^+ \partial \psi_{x_2!}^+} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi_{x_3!}^+ \partial \psi_{x_4!}^+} W(\psi; J) \Big|_{J=0} ; \quad (\text{A 6:6})$$

$$G_{!}^2(y;z) = \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \psi_y^+ \partial \psi_z^+} W(\psi; J) \Big|_{J=0} ; \quad (\text{A 6:7})$$


 Fig. 2. Graphical representation of the Schwinger functions $G_{!}^{2;1}, G_{!}^{4;1}, G_{!}^4, G_{!}^2$.

The generating functional and the Schwinger functions introduced above can be studied by a multiscale analysis similar to that described in Chapter 5, with some complications, due to the presence of the density fields J , and, from the other side, with some simplifications, due to the absence of mass terms in our action (it can be easily seen by symmetry that mass terms analogue of F or F cannot even be generated by the multiscale expansion). We will sketch the expansion below.

A 6.2. The Dyson equation.

Let us consider the four legs Schwinger function $G_{!}^4$ in (A 6.6), computed at a momentum scale $= \hbar$, which

is proportional to \hbar , as it is easy to realize. Since we want to connect \hbar with the "bare coupling", it is natural to write a Dyson equation for \hat{G}^4 :

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = & \hat{g}(k_4) \hat{G}_+^2(k_3) \hat{G}_+^{2;1}(k_1, k_2; k_1; k_2) + \\ & + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p); \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6.8)$$

relating the correlations in (A 6.4), (A 6.5), (A 6.6), (A 6.7); see Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. Graphical representation of the Dyson equation (A 6.8); the dotted line represents the "bare" propagator $g(k_4)$

The Dyson equation can be derived as follows.

We define

$$G_+^{4;1}(z; x_1; x_2; x_3; x_4) = \langle z; !; x_1; +; x_2; +; x_3; +; x_4; + \rangle^T; \quad (\text{A } 6.9)$$

$$G_+^4(x_1; x_2; x_3; x_4) = \langle x_1; +; x_2; +; x_3; +; x_4; + \rangle^T; \quad (\text{A } 6.10)$$

where

$$x_i! = x_i!; x_i!; \quad (\text{A } 6.11)$$

Moreover, we shall denote by $\hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ and $\hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ the corresponding Fourier transforms, deprived of the momentum conservation delta. Note that, if the "+" momenta are interpreted as "incoming momenta" in the usual graph pictures, then the "-" momenta are "outgoing momenta"; our definition of Fourier transform is such that even p , the momentum associated with the field, is an incoming momentum. Hence, the momentum conservation implies that $k_1 + k_3 = k_2 + k_4 + p$, in the case of $\hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ and $k_1 + k_3 = k_2 + k_4$ in the case of $\hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$.

If $Z = \int P(d) \exp f V(\cdot) g$ and $\langle \cdot \rangle$ denotes the expectation with respect to $Z^{-1} \int P(d) \exp f V(\cdot) g$, by the definition of truncated expectation it follows:

$$G_+^4(x_1; x_2; x_3; x_4) = \langle x_1; +; x_2; +; x_3; +; x_4; + \rangle = G_+^2(x_1; x_2) G_+^2(x_3; x_4); \quad (\text{A } 6.12)$$

where we used the fact that $\langle x_i!; y_j! \rangle = 0$.

Let $g_1(x)$ be the free propagator, whose Fourier transform is $g_1(k) = \hbar; 0(k) = (-ik_0 + !k)$. Then, we can write the last equation as

$$\begin{aligned} G_+^4(x_1; x_2; x_3; x_4) = & \int dz g(z, x_4) \langle x_1; +; x_2; +; x_3; +; z; +; z; +; z; + \rangle + \\ & + \int dz g(z, x_4) \langle x_3; +; z; +; z; +; z; + \rangle = \\ = & \int dz g_1(z, x_4) \langle [x_1; +; x_2; +]; [x_3; +; z; +; z; +] \rangle^T; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6.13)$$

Again, by definition of truncated expectations, we have:

$$\langle \begin{matrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ z \end{matrix} \rangle^+ = \langle \begin{matrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ z \end{matrix} \rangle \langle \begin{matrix} x_1 \\ x_2 \\ z \end{matrix} \rangle^+ \quad (A.6.14)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle z_1^+; x_1^+; x_2^+; x_3; z; \rangle^T &= \langle z_1^+ x_1^+ x_2^+ x_3; z; \rangle \\
&= \langle z_1^+ x_1^+ x_2^+ \rangle \langle x_3; z; \rangle \langle z_1^+ \rangle \langle x_1^+ x_2^+ x_3; z; \rangle \\
&= \langle x_1^+ x_2^+ \rangle \langle z_1^+ x_3; z; \rangle + 2 \langle z_1^+ \rangle \langle x_1^+ x_2^+ \rangle \langle x_3; z; \rangle :
\end{aligned}
\tag{A 6:15}$$

Using the last two equations, together with (A.6.12), we can rewrite (A.6.13) as:

$$\begin{aligned}
G_+^4(\mathbf{x}_1; \mathbf{x}_2; \mathbf{x}_3; \mathbf{x}_4) = & \int_Z dzg(z, \mathbf{x}_4) \langle \mathbf{x}_1; +; \mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{x}_2; +; \mathbf{i} \mid z; + \rangle^T \langle \mathbf{x}_3; +; \mathbf{i} \mid z; + \rangle + \\
& + \int_Z dzg(z, \mathbf{x}_4) \langle z; +; \mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{x}_1; +; \mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{x}_2; +; \mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{x}_3; +; \mathbf{i} \mid z; + \rangle^T + \\
& + \int_Z dzg(z, \mathbf{x}_4) \langle \mathbf{x}_1; +; \mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{x}_2; +; \mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{x}_3; +; \mathbf{i} \mid z; + \rangle^T \langle z; +; \mathbf{i} \mid \mathbf{x}_4; +; \mathbf{i} \rangle :
\end{aligned}
\tag{A.6.16}$$

The last addend is vanishing, since $\langle z_i! \rangle = 0$ by the propagator parity properties. In terms of Fourier transform s , we get the Dyson equation (A.6.8).

The l.h.s. of the Dyson equation computed at the cutoff scale is indeed proportional to the effective interaction Γ_h (see (A.6.34) below), while the r.h.s. is proportional to Γ_h . If one does not take into account cancellations in (A.6.8), this equation only allows us to prove that $\|\Gamma_h\| \leq C_h \|\Gamma_{h-1}\|$ with C_h diverging as $h \rightarrow 1$. However, inspired by the analysis in the physical literature, see [DLJS04], we can try to express $\hat{G}_1^{2,1}$ and $\hat{G}_1^{4,1}$, in the r.h.s. of (A.6.8), in terms of \hat{G}_1^2 and \hat{G}_1^4 by suitable Ward identities and correction identities.

A 6.3.W and identities and the first addend of (A 6.8)

To begin with, we consider the first addend in the r.h.s. of the Dyson equation (A.6.3). A remarkable identity relating \hat{G}_+^{2+1} to \hat{G}_+^2 can be obtained by the chiral gauge transformation $x_{i+} \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} x_{i+}$, $x_i \rightarrow x_i$ in the generating functional (A.6.3); one obtains the following identity, represented pictorially in Fig. 4, with $D_+(p) = ip_0 + \not{p}$:

$$D_+(p)G_+^{2;1}(p;k) = G_+^2(q) - G_+^2(k) + G_+^{2;1}(p;k); \quad (A.6.17)$$

with $\hat{+}^{2;1}$ the Fourier transform of $_{+}^{2;1}(x;y;z)$:

$$Z_{+}^{2,1}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z}) = \frac{1}{M^4} \sum_{\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{p}} e^{i\mathbf{p} \cdot \mathbf{x} - i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{y} + i(\mathbf{k} - \mathbf{p}) \cdot \mathbf{z}} \hat{Z}_{+}^{2,1}(\mathbf{p}; \mathbf{k}) = \langle T_{\mathbf{y};+}^{\dagger}; T_{\mathbf{z};+}^{\dagger}; T_{\mathbf{x};+} \rangle^T \quad (\text{A } 6.18)$$

and

$$T_{x;l} = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_{k_+, k_-} e^{i(k_+ - k_-)x} C_l(k_+, k_-) \hat{a}_{k_+;l}^+ \hat{a}_{k_-;l} \quad (A.6:19)$$

$$C_{\pm}(k^+; k) = [C_{h;0}(k) - 1]D_{\pm}(k) - [C_{h;0}(k^+) - 1]D_{\pm}(k^+):$$

The above W and identity can be derived as follows. Consider the chiral gauge transformation

$$x_{j+1}! e^{i x_{j+1}} x_{j+1}! x_j! x_j! \quad (A.6.20)$$

and notice that $W(\cdot; J)$, as defined by (A.6.3), is invariant under this change of variables. Then we can rewrite

$$W(\cdot; J) = \log P(d) \exp \int_{\mathbb{Z}} dx \frac{+}{x; +} e^{i \times D_+ [n; 0]} e^{-i \times D_+ [n; 0]} x; +^{\circ}$$
$$\exp V(\cdot) + \int_{\mathbb{Z}} dX \frac{!}{J_{x; !}} \frac{+}{x; !} x; ! + e^{-i \times \frac{+}{x; +}} x; + + e^{i \times \frac{+}{x; +}} x; + + \frac{+}{x; } x; + \frac{+}{x; } x; :^{\# \circ}$$

(A.6.21)




Fig. 4. Graphical representation of the Ward identity (A 6.17); the small circle in $\hat{A}_{+}^{2;1}$ represents the function C_{+} of (A 6.19).

where $D^{[h;0]}$, $! =$, is the pseudo differential operator defined by

$$D_{\{k\}}^{[h;0]} = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k e^{i k x} (i k_0 - k) \hat{\pi}_k; \quad D_{\{k\}}^{[h;0]} = 0; \quad (A.6.22)$$

As we have just remarked, the l.h.s. of (A 6.21) is independent of x . Then, by differentiating both sides w.r.t. x and posing $x = 0$, we find:

$$0 = \langle D_+ (\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x_{j+1} \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x_{j+1} \end{smallmatrix}) \begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x_{j+1} \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x_{j+1} \end{smallmatrix} + \begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x_{j+1} \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x_{j+1} \end{smallmatrix} \rangle_{\mathcal{H}} ; \quad (A.6.23)$$

where

$$\langle \cdot \rangle_{\mathcal{J}} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} e^{\mathbf{W}(\cdot; \mathcal{J})} \int_{\mathcal{P}(\mathbf{d})} e^{\mathbf{V}(\cdot) + \sum_{i=1}^R dx_i [\mathbf{x}_i! + \mathbf{x}_i! + \mathbf{x}_i! + \mathbf{x}_i! + \mathbf{x}_i! + \mathbf{x}_i!]} ; \quad (\text{A.6.24})$$

D_1 is defined as the Fourier transform of $D_1(p)$:

$$D! \left(\begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x; ! \end{smallmatrix} \begin{smallmatrix} + \\ x; ! \end{smallmatrix} \right) = \frac{1}{M^4} \sum_{p:k} D! (p) e^{-ipx} \hat{a}_{k; !}^+ \hat{a}_{p; !}^- ; \quad (A.6.25)$$

and the corrections $T_{x,+}$ and $C_1(k_+, k_-)$ were defined by (A.6.19).

Now, differentiating (A.6.23) w.r.t. $\frac{+}{v;+}$ and $\frac{+}{z;+}$ and setting $\frac{+}{v;+} = J = 0$, we find:

$$D_+ G_+^{2;1}(x; y; z) = (x - y) G_+^2(x; z) - (x - z) G_+^2(y; x; x) + G_+^{2;1}(x; y; z); \quad (A.6.26)$$

whose Fourier transform gives (A 6.17).

The use of W and identities is to provide relations between Schwinger functions, but the correction terms (due to the cut-offs) substantially affect the W and identities and apparently spoil them of their utility. However there are other remarkable relations connecting the correction terms to the Schwinger functions; such correction identities can be proved by performing a careful analysis of the renormalized expansion for the correction terms, and come out of the peculiar properties of the function $C_+(k; k_p)$, see next section. The correction identity for $\hat{C}_{+;1}^{2;1}$ is the following, see Fig.5.

$$\hat{G}_+^{2;1}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{k}) = D_+^h(\mathbf{p}) + \hat{G}_+^{2;1}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{k}) + \frac{D_+(\mathbf{p})}{D_+(\mathbf{p})} \hat{G}_+^{2;1}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{k}) + \hat{H}_+^{2;1}(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{k}) \quad (\text{A } 627)$$

where γ_j are $O(h)$ and weakly dependent on h , once we prove that γ_j is small enough for $j \leq h$, and $\hat{H}_{+}^{2,1}(p; k; q)$ can be obtained through the analogue of (A.6.4), with $W(\gamma_j; J)$ replaced by

$$W(\mathbf{J}) = \log \prod_{d \in \mathcal{D}} P(d) e^{\sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} J_{xi} + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} J_{xij} + \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{I}} \sum_{j \in \mathcal{J}} \sum_{k \in \mathcal{K}} J_{xijk}}; \quad (\text{A.6.28})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} T_x &= \frac{1}{M^4} \sum_{k_+ \in k}^X e^{i(k_+ - k_-)x} \frac{C_+(k_+; k_-)}{D_+(k_+ - k_-)} \hat{x}_+^+ \hat{x}_+^-; \\ T_{x;!} &= \frac{1}{M^4} \sum_{k_+ \in k}^X e^{i(k_+ - k_-)x} \frac{D_!(k_+ - k_-)}{D_+(k_+ - k_-)} \hat{x}_+^+ \hat{x}_+^-; \end{aligned} \quad (A.629)$$




Fig. 5. Graphical representation of the correction identity (A.6.27); the filled point in the last term represents $J_{x;+}(T_{x;-}, \dots, T_{x;+})$.

The crucial point is that if α and β are suitably chosen, \hat{H}_+^{2j1} , when computed from momenta at the cut-off scale, is $O(\Lambda^{-\beta})$ smaller, with $0 < \beta < 1$ a positive constant, with respect to the first two addends of the r.h.s. of (A.6.27). In other words the correction identity (A.6.27) says that the correction term \hat{H}_+^{2j1} , which is usually neglected in the physical literature, can be written in terms of the Schwinger functions G_+^{2j1} and \bar{G}_+^{2j1} up to the exponentially smaller term \hat{H}_+^{2j1} .

Inserting the correction identity (A 6.27) in the Ward identity (A 6.17), we obtain the new identity

$$(1 + p)D_+(p)\hat{G}_+^{2;1}(p;k;q) - D_-(p)\hat{G}_+^{2;1}(p;k;q) = \hat{G}_+^2(q) - \hat{G}_+^2(k) + \hat{H}_+^{2;1}(p;k;q) : \quad (A.6.30)$$

In the same way one can show that the formal Ward identity $D(p)\hat{G}^{2,1}(p;k;q) = \hat{G}^2(q) - \hat{G}^2(k)$ becomes, if the cut-offs are taken into account:

$$(1 - \epsilon) D_+ (p) \hat{G}^{2;1}_+(p; k; q) = \hat{H}^{2;1}_+(p; k; q); \quad (\text{A } 6.31)$$

where, again $\phi^0 = 0$ and $H^{2,1}$ satisfies a bound similar to that of $H_+^{2,1}$, when computed for momenta at the cutoff scale.

The identities (A.6.30) and (A.6.31) allow us to write $G_+^{\hat{2};1}$ in terms of $G^{\hat{2}}$ and $H^{\hat{2};1}$; one finds:

$$D_+(p)\hat{G}^{2;1}_+(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{k}) = \frac{h}{1} + \frac{0}{1} \frac{i}{1} \frac{n}{1} \hat{G}^{2}_+(q) \hat{G}^{2}_+(\mathbf{k}) + \frac{0}{1} \hat{H}^{2;1}_+(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{k}) + \hat{H}^{2;1}_+(\mathbf{p};\mathbf{k})^0; \quad (A.6.32)$$

In order to bound $\hat{G}^{2;1}$, we can use the dimensional bounds for the two and four legs Schwinger functions, easily proved by repeating for $W(\cdot; J)$ an iterative construction similar to that exposed in Chapter 5 and

performing the bounds as explained in §5.5. The expansion involves the definition of a more involved localization operator, also acting on the kernels of the monomials involving the external fields and can be found in many review papers [GPS][GM][BM]; it is very similar (and even simpler) to the expansion for $W(\cdot; J)$, that will be described in next section.

The result we need is the following.

Theorem A.6.1 There exists ϵ_0 such that, if $\epsilon_h \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \max_{k \geq h} |j_k| \leq \epsilon_0$ and $|j_k| \leq \epsilon_h$, then

$$\hat{G}_+^{2;1}(2k; k) = \frac{\epsilon_h^{2;1}}{Z_h D_+(k)^2} [1 + O(\epsilon_h^2)]; \quad (\text{A.6.33})$$

where $\epsilon_h^{2;1}(\cdot)$ is an exponent $O(\cdot)$ and

$$\hat{G}_+^2(k) = \frac{1}{Z_h D_+(k)} [1 + O(\epsilon_h^2)]; \quad \hat{G}_+^4(k; k; k) = Z_h^{-2} |j_k|^4 [1 + O(\epsilon_h^2)]; \quad (\text{A.6.34})$$

Remarks

1 - The proof of Theorem A.6.1 follows by a repetition of the estimates of Chapter 5. For some references: (A.6.33) follows by the analysis in [BM2]; the first of (A.6.34) can be proven as explained in [GPS][GM]; the second (A.6.34) follows as a combination of the first of (A.6.34) and of the results in Chapter 5.

2 - A posteriori, it will result that $\epsilon_h^{2;1}(\cdot) = 0$. For the moment we just need (A.6.33) to bound $\hat{J}_+^{2;1}$ with a constant times $\epsilon_h^{\#}$ times the r.h.s. of (A.6.33), as explained above, that is

$$|\hat{J}_+^{2;1}(2k; k)| \leq C \epsilon_h^{\#} \frac{\epsilon_h^{2;1}}{Z_h D_+(k)^2} \leq C (\epsilon_h^{\#} = 2) \epsilon_h^{2h} \quad (\text{A.6.35})$$

Substituting the preceding bounds into (A.6.32), we soon find that $\hat{G}^{2;1}(p; k)$, with $|p| = |k| = \epsilon_h$, can be bounded as

$$|\hat{G}_+^{2;1}(p; k)| \leq C \frac{\epsilon_h^{2h}}{Z_h}; \quad (\text{A.6.36})$$

where, as in Theorem A.6.1, we assumed $\epsilon_h \leq \epsilon_0$.

Substituting the last bound into the first addend of (A.6.8), with the arguments set on scale ϵ_h , we soon find

$$\hat{G}(k_4) \hat{G}^2(k_3) \hat{G}_+^{2;1}(k_1 - k_2; k_1; k_2) \leq C |j| \epsilon_h^h \frac{\epsilon_h^{2h}}{Z_h^2}; \quad (\text{A.6.37})$$

that is the "right" dimensional bound. In fact the l.h.s. of (A.6.8) can be bounded as in (A.6.34) so that, if we could neglect the second term in the r.h.s. (A.6.8), we would soon find $|j_h| \leq C |j|$.

Aim of the next sections will be first to prove the correction identity (A.6.27); then to describe a strategy which will allow us to find a "right" dimensional bound also for the second term in the r.h.s. (A.6.8).

A.6.4. The first correction identity

We start from the generating function (A.6.28) and we perform iteratively the integration of the variables, to be defined iteratively in the following way. After the fields $\phi^{(0)}$; $\phi^{(j)}$ have been integrated, we can write

$$e^{W(\cdot; J)} = e^{M^2 E_j} \int_{Z_j; C_{h,j}} P_{Z_j; C_{h,j}}(d\phi^{[j]}) e^{V^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j} \phi^{[j]} + K^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j} \phi^{[j]}; J)); \quad (\text{A.6.38})$$

with $V^{(j)}(0) = 0$, $Z_j = \max_k Z_j(k)$,

1) $P_{Z_j, C_{h;j}}(d^{[h;j]})$ is the effective Grassmannian measure at scale j , equal to

$$P_{Z_j, C_{h;j}}(d^{[h;j]}) = \sum_{k \in C_{h;j}} \frac{d^{[h;j]+} d^{[h;j]}}{N_j(k)} \exp \left(\frac{1}{L} \sum_k C_{h;j}(k) Z_j(k)^{[h;j]+} D_!(k)^{[h;j]} \right); \quad (A\ 6.39)$$

$$N_j(k) = (L)^{-1} C_{h;j}(k) Z_j(k) [k_0^2 - k^2]^{1=2}; \quad (A\ 6.40)$$

$$C_{h;j}(k)^{-1} = \sum_{r=h}^X f_r(k) \quad h;j(k); \quad D_!(k) = ik_0 + !k; \quad (A\ 6.41)$$

2) the effective potential on scale j , $V^{(j)}(\cdot)$, is a sum of monomial of Grassmannian variables multiplied by suitable kernels, as in (5.5). The localization operator acts on the kernels of $V^{(j)}(\cdot)$ as described in x5.2. Note however that in the present case (i.e. for the reference model) the terms proportional to F^- and F^+ are automatically vanishing, by symmetry: only the terms proportional to F^- and F^+ survive.

3) the effective source term at scale j , $K^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}; \cdot; J)$, is a sum of monomials of Grassmannian variables and $\cdot; J$ eld, with at least one \cdot or one J eld; we shall write it in the form

$$K^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}; \cdot; J) = B^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}) + K_J^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}) + W_R^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}; \cdot; J); \quad (A\ 6.42)$$

where $B^{(j)}(\cdot)$ and $K_J^{(j)}(\cdot)$ denote the sums over the terms containing only one \cdot or J eld, respectively.

Of course (A 6.38) is true for $j = 0$, with

$$\begin{aligned} Z_0(k) &= 1; \quad E_0 = 0; \quad V^{(0)}(\cdot) = V(\cdot); \quad W_R^{(0)} = 0; \\ B^{(0)}(\cdot) &= \sum_x dx [\frac{+}{x;!} \frac{+}{x;!} + \frac{+}{x;!} \frac{+}{x;!}]; \quad K_J^{(0)}(\cdot) = \sum_x dx J_{x;+} T_x \quad \sum_x ! T_{x;!} : \end{aligned} \quad (A\ 6.43)$$

Let us now assume that (A 6.38) is satisfied for a certain $j \geq 0$ and let us show that it holds also with $j+1$ in place of j .

In order to perform the integration corresponding to $^{(j)}$, we write the effective potential and the effective source as sum of two terms, according to the following rules.

We split the effective potential $V^{(j)}$ as $LV^{(j)} + RV^{(j)}$, with L acting on $V^{(j)}$ as explained in x5.2.

Analogously we write $K^{(j)} = LK^{(j)} + RK^{(j)}$, $R = 1 - L$, according to the following definition. First of all, we put $LW_R^{(j)} = W_R^{(j)}$.

Let us consider now $B^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j})$; we want to show that, by a suitable choice of the localization procedure, if $j \geq 1$, it can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} B^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}) &= \sum_{i=j+1}^X \sum_{x,y} dx dy \\ &+ \sum_{x;!} \frac{+}{x;!} g_i^{Q;(i)}(x-y) \frac{\partial}{\partial y^+} V^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}) + \frac{\partial}{\partial y^+} V^{(j)}(\frac{P}{Z_j}) g_i^{Q;(i)}(y-x) \frac{+}{x;!} + \\ &+ \sum_{x;!} \sum_{y;!} \frac{dk}{(2)^2} h^{[h;j]+} \hat{Q}_!^{(j+1)}(k) \hat{+}_{k;!} + \hat{+}_{k;!} \hat{Q}_!^{(j+1)}(k) \hat{+}_{k;!} \frac{i}{k;!}; \end{aligned} \quad (A\ 6.44)$$

where $g_i^{Q;(i)}(k) = g_i^{(i)}(k) \hat{Q}_!^{(i)}(k)$, with

$$g_i^{(j)}(k) = \frac{1}{Z_{j-1} D_!(k)} \tilde{f}_j(k); \quad (A\ 6.45)$$

$f_j(k) = f_j(k) Z_{j-1} [\bar{Z}_{j-1}(k)]^{-1}$ and $Q_i^{(j)}(k)$ defined inductively by the relations

$$\hat{Q}_i^{(j)}(k) = \hat{Q}_i^{(j+1)}(k) - z_j Z_j D_i(k) \sum_{i=j+1}^{X^0} \hat{Q}_i^{(j+1)}(k); \quad \hat{Q}_i^{(0)}(k) = 1: \quad (\text{A } 6:46)$$

Note that $\hat{Q}_i^{(j)}(k)$ does not depend on the infrared cutoff for $j > h$ and that (even for $j = h$) $\hat{Q}_i^{(j)}(k)$ is of size $Z_{j-1}^{-1} j$, see discussion in §3 of [BM 3], after eq. (60). Moreover the propagator $\hat{Q}_i^{(j+1)}(k)$ is equivalent to $\hat{Q}_i^{(j)}(k)$, as concerns the dimensional bounds.

The L operation for $B^{(j)}$ is defined by decomposing $V^{(j)}$ in the r.h.s. of (A 6:44) as $LV^{(j)} + RV^{(j)}$.

Finally we have to define L for $K_J^{(j)}(\frac{p}{Z_j})$. It is easy to see that the field J is equivalent, from the point of view of dimensional considerations, to two fields. Hence, the only terms which need to be renormalized are those of second order in ϵ , which are indeed marginal; let us denote their sum with $K_J^{(j,2)}$. Let us start with defining the L operation on $K_J^{(0)}$ as the identity. Let us now analyze the structure of $K_J^{(1,2)}(\frac{p}{Z_{j-1}^{h+1}})$, as it appears after integrating the (0) field and rescaling $[h; 1]$. We have

$$K_J^{(1,2)}(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{Z_{j-1}^2} \int dx J_{x,+} T_x + \int dy dz F_{2,+}^{(1)}(x; y; z) + F_{1,+}^{(1)}(x; y; z) + \dots \quad (\text{A } 6:47)$$

$F_{2,+}^{(1)}$ denotes the sum of all Feynman diagrams containing a $T_{x,+}$ vertex or those obtained by contracting both fields of a T_x vertex (the index $+$ refers to the $+$ index of the two left external fields). $F_{1,+}^{(1)}$ represents the sum over the diagrams built by leaving external one of these fields of T_x .

Now, if $S_i^{(0)}$ is defined as in Appendix A 7, it is easy to see that the Fourier transform of $F_{2,+}^{(1)}$ can be written as

$$\hat{F}_{2,+}^{(1)}(k_+; k) = \frac{p}{D_+(p)} \int d\bar{k}_+ S_+^{(0)}(\bar{k}_+; \bar{k}_+ - p) G_{+,+}^{(1)}(\bar{k}_+; k_+; k); \quad (9:48)$$

where $p = k_+ - k$ and $G_{+,+}^{(1)}(\bar{k}_+; k_+; k)$ is of the form

$$G_{+,+}^{(1)}(\bar{k}_+; k_+; k) = G_0(\bar{k}_+; k_+; k) + G_1(k_+) G_2(k) \bar{k}_+ \cdot k_+; \quad (\text{A } 6:49)$$

where G_0 represents a suitable sum over connected graphs with four external lines, while G_1 and G_2 represent suitable sums over connected graphs with two external lines.

Using the symmetry of the propagator $D_i(k) = i! D_i(k)$, where, if $k = (k_0; k)$, $k = (k; k_0)$, one easily gets the following symmetry properties for the functions appearing in (9.48):

$$G_{+,+}^{(1)}(\bar{k}_+; k_+; k) = i! G_{+,+}^{(1)}(\bar{k}_+; k_+; k); \quad p \cdot \hat{\Phi}_+^{(0)}(k_+; k) = i p \cdot \hat{\Phi}_+^{(0)}(k_+; k): \quad (\text{A } 6:50)$$

The last equation implies that

$$\hat{F}_{2,+}^{(1)}(k_+; k) = \frac{1}{D_+(p)} [p_0 \hat{A}_{+,+}^{(1)}(0; k) + p \hat{A}_{+,+}^{(1)}(k_+; k)]; \quad (\text{A } 6:51)$$

where $\hat{A}_{+,+}^{(1)}$ are smooth functions satisfying

$$\hat{A}_{+,+}^{(1)}(k_+; k) = i! \hat{A}_{+,+}^{(1)}(k_+; k): \quad (\text{A } 6:52)$$

It follows that, if we define

$$L\hat{F}_{2,+}^{(1)}(k_+; k) = \frac{1}{D_+(p)} [p_0 \hat{A}_{+,+}^{(1)}(0; 0) + p \hat{A}_{+,+}^{(1)}(0; 0)]; \quad (\text{A } 6:53)$$

then

$$L\hat{F}_{2;+}^{(1)}(k_+; k_-) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{D}{D_+} \frac{(p)}{(p)}; \quad L\hat{F}_{2;+}^{(1)}(k_+; k_-) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{D}{D_+} \frac{(p)}{(p)}; \quad (A.6.54)$$

where c_1 are real constants, as it can be verified by symmetry.

We now consider the contribution $F_{1,+}^{(-1)}$ in (A.6.47). Its Fourier transform has two contributions, the first of the form

$$\hat{F}_{1,+}^{(-1)}(k_+; k_-) = \frac{\mathbb{C}_{h;0}(k_-) \mathbb{D}_+(k_-) g_+^{(0)}(k_+) u_0(k_+)}{\mathbb{D}_+(p)} G_+^{(2)}(k_+); \quad (\text{A.6.55})$$

where u_0 is defined in Appendix A.7, see (A.7.4), and the second possible contribution has the same form of (A.6.55), with k_+ and k_- interchanged. The natural way to regularize (A.6.55) is to define

$$LF_{1,+}^{(-1)}(k_+; k_-) = \frac{C_{h;0}(k_-) [D_+(k_-) g_+^{(0)}(k_+) - u_0(k_+)]}{D_+(p)} G_+^{(2)}(0) : \quad (A.6.56)$$

Note however that $G^{(2)}(0) = 0$, by parity, so the local part in (A.656) is vanishing. In other words the dimensional gain here is obtained without the introduction of a renormalization constant. The same procedure can be defined for the term obtained by interchanging k_+ and k_- in (A.655).

We can summarize the previous discussion by defining

$$L_{\mathbf{K}_J^{(1/2)}}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{Z} \int_{\mathbb{R}^n} d\mathbf{x} \, \exp \left[-\sum_{i=1}^n \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_{i+}^T \mathbf{T}_x \mathbf{x}_{i+} + \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{x}_{i+}^T \mathbf{J}_{x,+}^{(1)} \mathbf{x}_{i+} \right) \right] \quad (\text{A.6.57})$$

where, if $\hat{J}_{p;t}$ is the Fourier transform of $J_{x;t}$, $J_{x;t}^{(\cdot)}$ is the Fourier transform of $\hat{J}_{p;t} D$ ($p=D+(p)$).

We are now ready to describe the general step, by defining the action of L over K_j^{j+2} , which can be written, if $j < 1$, after rescaling $[h; j]$, as

[illegible]

where $F_{j+!}^{(j)}(\mathbf{x}; \mathbf{y}; \mathbf{z})$ represent the sum over all graphs with one vertex of type \mathbf{x} and two external eds of type \mathbf{y}, \mathbf{z} , $F_{2+!}^{(j)}$ is the sum over the same kind of graphs with one vertex T_x , whose eds are both contracted and $F_{1+!}^{(j)}$ is the sum over the graphs with one vertex T_x , such that one of its eds is external.

It is important to stress that, thanks to the support properties of $C_1(k_+; k_-)$, given a graph contributing to $F_{2+;+}^{(j)}$, at least one of the fields belonging to T_x is contracted on scale 0. This property will give crucial dimensional gains (through the short memory property) for the contributions to the Beta function for coming from $F_{2+;+}^{(j)}$. It is clear that, because of this property, $F_{2+;+}^{(j)}$ can be rewritten as

$$\hat{F}_{2,+}^{(j)}(k_+; k_-) = \frac{p}{D_+ - (p)} \int_{-1}^1 dK_+ S_+^{(j)}(K_+; K_+ - p) G_+^{(j)}(K_+; k_+; k_-); \quad (\text{A } 6.59)$$

for suitable functions $S_+^{(j)}$ and $G_{+;j}^{(j)}$ satisfying the same symmetry properties of (A 6.50). Then, the action of L over $\hat{F}_{2;j}^{(j)}(k_+; k_-)$ is defined exactly as for $j = 1$. Moreover we define

$$L\hat{F}_{+,+}^{(j)}(k_+, k_-) = \hat{F}_{+,+}^{(j)}(0; 0); \quad (A.6.60)$$

$$e_{\mathbb{Z}}^{v^{(j-1)} \frac{p}{z_{j-1}^{[b;j-1]} + K^{(j-1)} \frac{p}{z_{j-1}^{[b;j-1]} - M^2 E_j}} = \frac{p}{z_{j-1}^{[b;j-1]} + \hat{v}^{(j)} \frac{p}{z_{j-1}^{[b;j-1]} + \hat{v}^{(j)} + K^{(j)} \frac{p}{z_{j-1}^{[b;j-1]} + \hat{v}^{(j)}}} e_{\mathbb{Z}}^{v^{(j)}} \quad (\text{A 6.69})$$

it is easy to see that $V^{(j-1)}$ and $K^{(j-1)}$ are of the same form of $V^{(j)}$ and $K^{(j)}$ and that the procedure can be iterated. Note that the above procedure allows, in particular, to write the running coupling constant g_{j-1} , $0 < j-1 \leq h$, in terms of $g_0, 0 \leq j \leq h$:

$$g_{j-1} = g_j + \beta_j(g_j, \dots, g_0); \quad g_0 = g; \quad (A\ 6.70)$$

and the renormalization constants Z_{j-1} in terms of $z_k; k \leq j$:

$$Z_{j-1} = Z_j + \gamma_j^i(g_j, g_j, \dots, g_0, g_0); \quad g_0 = g; \quad \gamma_j = \gamma_j^i: \quad (A\ 6.71)$$

The functions $\beta_j(g_{j+1}, \dots, g_0)$ and $\gamma_j^i(g_j, g_j, \dots, g_0, g_0)$ are called the β and the γ component of the Beta function, respectively. Both functions can be represented by a tree expansion similar to that exposed in Chapter 5, and we do not repeat here the details.

We now want to show that, if $g_h = g_0$ is small enough, it is possible to choose γ_j as suitable functions of g , in such a way that $g_j \leq C g_0^{\#j}$, for some $\# > 0$. If we manage to prove this, it will soon follow that $\hat{H}_+^{2;l}$, when computed on the IR cutoff scale, can be bounded by (A 6.35), that is by the dimensional bound for $\hat{G}^{2;l}$ times an exponentially small factor $e^{-\#h}$. In fact the renormalized expansion for $\hat{H}_+^{2;l}$ contains contributions that either contain a T_x vertex on scale 0, or a γ_j , with $h < j \leq 0$. If $g_j \leq C g_0^{\#j}$, using the short memory property, it is immediate to verify that both contributions are exponentially small w.r.t. the dimensional bound for $\hat{G}^{2;l}$.

So, let us prove the bound on the renormalization constants γ_j . We rewrite γ_j^i by distinguishing the contributions independent of n_k (which necessarily contain a T vertex on scale 0) and the contribution linear in $n_k, k \leq j$:

$$\gamma_j^i(g_j, g_j, \dots, g_0, g_0) = \gamma_{j1}^i(g_j, \dots, g_0) + \sum_{k=j!}^{X^0} \gamma_{jk}^i(g_j, \dots, g_0): \quad (A\ 6.72)$$

Moreover, by the short memory property, there exists $0 < \# < 1=4$ and positive constants c_1 and c_2 such that

$$|\gamma_{j1}^i(g_j, \dots, g_0)| \leq c_1 h^{-2\#j}; \quad |\gamma_{jk}^i(g_j, \dots, g_0)| \leq c_2 h^{-2\#(j-j^0)}: \quad (A\ 6.73)$$

By iterating (A 6.71), we find:

$$g_{j-1} = g_0 + \sum_{k=j}^{X^0} \gamma_k^i(g_k, g_k, \dots, g_0, g_0); \quad (A\ 6.74)$$

so that, imposing the condition $g_h = g_0$, we get:

$$g_0 = \sum_{k=h+1}^{X^0} \gamma_k^i(g_k, g_k, \dots, g_0, g_0): \quad (A\ 6.75)$$

Inserting the last equation into (A 6.74) we get:

$$g_j = \sum_{k=h+1}^{X^j} \gamma_k^i(g_k, g_k, \dots, g_0, g_0): \quad (A\ 6.76)$$

In other words, the condition $g_h = g_0$ can be satisfied if it can be found a sequence $g_j = f_j^i g_h^{j^i} = g_0$ satisfying (A 6.76). In order to prove that this is possible, we introduce the space $M_{\#}$ of the sequences

$\underline{}$ such that $\max_j \|\underline{j}\|_j \leq c_h \#^j$, for some c ; we shall think $M_\#$ as a Banach space with norm $\|\underline{j}\|_j = \sup_{h+1 \leq j \leq 0} \max_i \|\underline{j}\|_j \#^j_h$. We then look for a fixed point of the operator $T : M_\# \rightarrow M_\#$ defined as:

$$(T\underline{})_j = \sum_{k=h+1}^j X^j_k \left(\begin{matrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} k \\ k \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ 0 \end{matrix} \right) : \quad (\text{A } 6.77)$$

Note that, if c_h is sufficiently small, then T leaves invariant the ball $B_\#$ of radius $c_0 = 2c_1 \sum_{n=0}^P \#^n$ of $M_\#$, c_1 being the constant in (A 6.73). In fact, by (A 6.72) and (A 6.73), if $\|\underline{j}\|_j \leq c_0$, then

$$\|\underline{j}(T\underline{})_j\|_j \leq \sum_{k=h+1}^j X^j_k c_1 \#^{2k} + 2 \sum_{k=h+1}^j X^j_k X^0_k c_0 \#^i c_2 \#^{2(k-i)} c_0 \#^j; \quad (\text{A } 6.78)$$

if $4c_2 \sum_{h=0}^P \#^n \leq 1$.

T is also a contraction on $B_\#$, if c_h is sufficiently small; in fact, if $\|\underline{j}\|_j \leq c_0$, $\|\underline{j}\|_j \leq c_0$,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\underline{j}(T\underline{})_j - \underline{j}(T\underline{})_j^0\|_j &= \sum_{k=h+1}^j X^j_k \left(\begin{matrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} k \\ k \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ 0 \end{matrix} \right) - \sum_{k=h+1}^j X^j_k \left(\begin{matrix} \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \end{matrix} \begin{matrix} k \\ k \\ \cdot \\ \cdot \\ 0 \end{matrix} \right) \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{k=h+1}^j X^j_k X^0_k \|\underline{j}\|_j \#^i c_2 \#^{2(k-i)} - \frac{1}{2} \|\underline{j}\|_j \#^j; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6.79)$$

if $4c_2 \sum_{h=0}^P \#^n \leq 1$, as above. Hence, by the contraction principle, there is a unique fixed point $\underline{}$ of T on $B_\#$. This concludes the proof of the exponential decay of $\|\underline{j}\|_j$ and, as discussed above, of the first correction identity. ■

A 6.5 Ward identities and the second addend in (A 6.8)

Starting from the present section, we begin to deal with the second term in the r.h.s. of (A 6.8), with the aim of showing that it admits a good dimensional bound, as discussed for the first one. The vanishing of the component of the Beta function will be an easy consequence of such a good dimensional bound.

The strategy will be the following: in the present section we will first describe two more Ward identities connecting $\hat{G}^{4;1}_+$ with \hat{G}^4_+ . As the first Ward identity considered above, they will have a correction due to the cutoff function, and these corrections will satisfy new correction identities, presented below in this section. The proof of the new correction identities, which is the main difficulty of all the proof of the present Appendix, will be presented in next section. The present section will be concluded with the proof of the vanishing of the Beta function, obtained by a careful use of the new Ward identities together with the new correction identities.

The new pair of Ward identities we need here is the following, see Fig. 6.

$$\begin{aligned} D_+ \langle \hat{G}^{4;1}_+ \rangle(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) &= \hat{G}^4_+(k_1 - p; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) - \hat{G}^4_+(k_1; k_2 + p; k_3; k_4 - p) + \hat{G}^{4;1}_+; \\ D_- \langle \hat{G}^{4;1}_+ \rangle(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) &= \hat{G}^4_+(k_1; k_2; k_3 - p; k_4 - p) - \hat{G}^4_+(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) + \hat{G}^{4;1}_+; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6.80)$$

where $\hat{G}^{4;1}_+$ are the "correction terms"

$$\hat{G}^{4;1}_+(p; k_1; k_2; k_3) = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k C(k; k - p) < \hat{G}^+_{k_1}; \hat{G}^+_{k_2}; \hat{G}^+_{k_3}; \hat{G}^+_{k_4 - p} >^T : \quad (\text{A } 6.81)$$




Fig. 6. Graphical representation of the Ward identity (A 6.19)

The Ward identities (A 6.80) can be derived from (A 6.23) by deriving four times w.r.t. the external elds. By adding and subtracting suitable counterterms ¹, the first of (A 6.80) can be rewritten as

$$(1 + \epsilon) D_+(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) - D_-(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) = \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; p; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) - \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2 + p; k_3; k_4; p) + \hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p); \quad (\text{A } 6.82)$$

where by definition

$$\hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k C_+(k; k; p) < \hat{\psi}_{k;+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k;p;+}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_1;+}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_2;+}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_3;+}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_4;p;+}^+ >^T \\ \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \epsilon D_-(p) < \hat{\psi}_{k;-}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k;p;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_1;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_2;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_3;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_4;p;-}^+ >^T : \quad (\text{A } 6.83)$$

In the same way, in terms of new counterterms ⁰, the second of (A 6.80) can be written as

$$(1 - \epsilon^0) D_-(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) - \epsilon^0 D_+(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) = \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; p; k_4; p) - \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) + \hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p); \quad (\text{A } 6.84)$$

where

$$\hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k C_-(k; k; p) < \hat{\psi}_{k;-}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k;p;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_1;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_2;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_3;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_4;p;-}^+ >^T \\ \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \epsilon^0 D_-(p) < \hat{\psi}_{k;-}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k;p;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_1;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_2;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_3;-}^+; \hat{\psi}_{k_4;p;-}^+ >^T : \quad (\text{A } 6.85)$$

If we insert in the r.h.s. of (A 6.82) the value of $\hat{G}_+^{4;1}$ taken from (A 6.84), we get

$$(1 + A) D_+(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) = \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; p; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) - \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2 + p; k_3; k_4; p) + B \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_3; p; k_4; p) - \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4; p) + \hat{H}_+^{4;1} + B \hat{H}_+^{4;1}; \quad (\text{A } 6.86)$$

¹ with an abuse of notation, here we call the counterterms with the same symbols as those used for the first correction identity; note that here the new counterterms are different from those of previous section.

where

$$A = \frac{0}{1} ; \quad B = \frac{0}{1} : \quad (\text{A } 6.87)$$

Let us now consider the second term in the r.h.s. of (A 6.8) and let us rewrite it as:

$$\hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) ; \quad (\text{A } 6.88)$$

where: $\chi_M(p)$ is a cutoff function vanishing for scales bigger than $h + \log 2$ (i.e. the presence of $\chi_M(p)$ constraints the transferred momentum to be $O(h)$); $\chi_M(p)$ is a cutoff function vanishing for scales smaller than $h + \log 2$ and bigger than $\log 2$ (i.e. the presence of $\chi_M(p)$ constraints the transferred momentum to be $O(h) - p_j = O(1)$). The two functions are chosen so that they sum up to 1 in the scales range between h and 0.

If we insert in the last term of (A 6.85) the value of $\hat{G}_+^{4;1}$ taken from (A 6.86), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) + \\ & + \frac{\hat{g}(k_4)}{(1+A)} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1 - p; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) - \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2 + p; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} + \\ & + \frac{\hat{g}(k_4)}{(1+A)} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3 - p; k_4 - p) - \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)}{D_+(p)} + \\ & + \frac{\hat{g}(k_4)}{(1+A)} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \frac{\hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) + B \hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} : \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6.89)$$

Note that

$$\frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)}{D_+(p)} = 0 ; \quad (\text{A } 6.90)$$

since $D_+(p)$ is odd. Then, (A 6.89) computed with the momenta equal to

$$k_i = k_i ; \quad k_1 = k_4 = k_2 = k_3 = k ; \quad |k_j| = h ; \quad (\text{A } 6.91)$$

is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \hat{G}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) + \\ & + \frac{\hat{g}(k_4)}{(1+A)} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1 - p; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) - \hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2 + p; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} + \\ & + \frac{\hat{g}(k_4)}{(1+A)} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3 - p; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} + \\ & + \frac{\hat{g}(k_4)}{(1+A)} \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \chi_M(p) \frac{\hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) + B \hat{H}_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} : \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A } 6.92)$$

All the terms appearing in the above equation can be expressed in terms of convergent tree expansions, via a recursive expansion similar to that described in the last section. Dimensional bounds for the terms in

the first three lines can be easily derived, in analogy with the results of Theorem A 6.1. In Appendix A 1 of [BM 2] the following bound is proven:

$$\hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \gamma_M(p) G_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) \leq C_h^3 \frac{z_h^{1h}}{Z_h^2} \quad (\text{A 6.93})$$

where the exponent z_h^{1h} is the same of (A 6.33). However, from the result of previous section (i.e. from the validity of the first correction identity) it follows that $z_h^{1h} = 0$, so that the r.h.s. of (A 6.93) is the right dimensional bound we need. As regarding the terms in the second and the third line of (A 6.89), following a procedure similar to that leading to the second of (A 6.34) (see again Appendix A 1 of [BM 2]), we find

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \gamma_M(p) \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1 - p; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2 + p; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} + \\ & + \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \gamma_M(p) \frac{\hat{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3 - p; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} \leq C_h \frac{3h}{Z_h^2}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.94})$$

that, again, is the right dimensional bound.

The bound on the term in the last line of (A 6.89) is more involved, and requires an analysis similar (but more complicated) to that of previous section. We will prove in next section that

there exists $\epsilon_1 > 0$ and four γ -functions $\gamma_+; \gamma_-; \gamma_+^{(0)}; \gamma_-^{(0)}$ of order h^0 (uniformly in h), such that, if $h < \epsilon_1$,

$$\hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \gamma_M(p) \frac{\hat{H}^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} \leq C_h^2 \frac{4h}{Z_h^2} \quad (\text{A 6.95})$$

Substituting the bounds (A 6.95), (A 6.93), (A 6.94) together with (A 6.37) and the second of (A 6.34) in the Dyson equation (A 6.8), we finally get

$$j_h j = c_j j(1 + O(h)); \quad (\text{A 6.96})$$

which implies

Theorem A 6.2 The model (A 6.3) is well defined in the limit $h \rightarrow 1$. In fact there are constants ϵ_1 and c_2 such that $j_h < \epsilon_1$ implies $j_h < c_2 \epsilon_1$, for any $j < 0$.

Finally, a standard argument shows that, as a consequence of Theorem A 6.2, the first bound in (6.6) holds, that is

$$j_h(h; \dots; h) \leq C_j j_h^2 \epsilon_h; \quad (\text{A 6.97})$$

The proof is by contradiction. Consider the Taylor expansion of $j_h(h; \dots; h)$ in h (which is convergent for h small enough) and let us call $b_r^{(h)}$ the coefficient of $(h)^r$. Let us also call $b_r \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \lim_{h \rightarrow 1} b_r^{(h)}$. By performing the bounds on the trees representing $b_r^{(h)}$, in the same way explained in Chapter 5, we find that necessarily $b_r^{(h)} = b_r + O(\epsilon_h)$, for some $\epsilon > 0$. Now, let us assume by contradiction that, for some $r \geq 2$,

$$j_h(h; \dots; h) = b_r (h)^r + O(j_h j_h^{r+1}) + O(\epsilon_h^2 \epsilon_h); \quad (\text{A 6.98})$$

with b_r a non vanishing constant. By the discussion above and Theorem 5.1, the running coupling constants j_h are analytic functions of h :

$$j_h = \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} c_n^{(h)} h^n + O(h^{r+1}) \quad (\text{A 6.99})$$

and for any fixed h the sequence $c_n^{(h)}$ is a bounded sequence.

Consider the row equation (A 6.70) and rewrite it as

$$c_{h+1} = c_h + \sum_{k=h}^{\infty} D^{h,k} c_k; \quad (\text{A 6.100})$$

where

$$D^{h,k} = c_h(h; \dots; h; k; k+1; \dots; 1) - c_h(h; \dots; h; h; k+1; \dots; 1); \quad (\text{A 6.101})$$

and, by using the short memory property, it is easy to show that $D^{h,k} \leq c_h \#(h-k) j_{h-k} j$ for some $\# > 0$

Inserting (A 6.98) and (A 6.99) into (A 6.100) and keeping at both sides the terms of order r , we find:

$$c_r^{(h+1)} = c_r^{(h)} + b_r + O(r^{-\#h}); \quad (\text{A 6.102})$$

This would mean that $c_r^{(h)}$ is a sequence diverging for $h \rightarrow \infty$, which is in contradiction with the fact, following from Theorem A 6.2 and the discussion above, that c_h is an analytic function of β , uniformly in h . ■

A 6.6 Proof of (A 6.95)

In this section we prove the bound (A 6.95), that is we conclude the proof of the second pair of correction identities and, with this, we conclude the proof of Theorem A 6.2, that is the main result of this Appendix. We shall prove first the bound (A 6.95) for $\hat{H}_+^{4,1}$; the bound for $\hat{H}^{4,1}$ is done essentially in the same way and will be briefly discussed later. By using (A 6.83), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) D_+^{-1}(p) \hat{H}_+^{4,1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) = \\ = \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \frac{C_+(k; k-p)}{D_+(p)} < \hat{c}_{k,+}^+ \hat{c}_{k-p,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_1,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_2,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_3,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_4-p,+}^+ >^T \\ \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \frac{D_-(p)}{D_+(p)} < \hat{c}_k^+ \hat{c}_{k-p}^+; \hat{c}_{k_1,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_2,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_3,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_4-p}^+ >^T \\ + \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k < \hat{c}_{k,+}^+ \hat{c}_{k-p,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_1,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_2,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_3,+}^+; \hat{c}_{k_4-p}^+ >^T : \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.103})$$

Let us define

$$\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = \frac{\mathcal{G}_+^4}{\mathcal{G}_{k_1,+}^+ \mathcal{G}_{k_2,+}^+ \mathcal{G}_{k_3,+}^+ \mathcal{G}_{k_4}^-} \tilde{\mathcal{W}}; \quad (\text{A 6.104})$$

where

$$\tilde{\mathcal{W}} = \log \sum_P (d^+)^e T_1(\cdot)^+ + T_+(\cdot)^+ - T_-(\cdot)^- e^{V(\cdot)^+} \int_0^R dx [\hat{c}_{x;+}^+ \hat{c}_{x;+}^+ + \hat{c}_{x;+}^+ \hat{c}_{x;-}^+]; \quad (\text{A 6.105})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} T_1(\cdot) &= \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \frac{C_+(k; k-p)}{D_+(p)} (\hat{c}_{k,+}^+ \hat{c}_{k-p,+}^+) \hat{c}_{k_4-p}^+ \hat{J}_{k_4} \hat{g}(k_4); \\ T_+(\cdot) &= \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k (\hat{c}_{k,+}^+ \hat{c}_{k-p,+}^+) \hat{c}_{k_4-p}^+ \hat{J}_{k_4} \hat{g}(k_4); \\ T_-(\cdot) &= \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \frac{D_-(p)}{D_+(p)} (\hat{c}_k^+ \hat{c}_{k-p}^+) \hat{c}_{k_4-p}^+ \hat{J}_{k_4} \hat{g}(k_4); \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.106})$$




Fig. 7. Graphical representation of T_1, T_+, T ; the dotted line carries momentum k_4 , the empty circle represents C_+ , the filled one $D_+(p) = D_+(p)$

The vertices T_1, T_+ and T can be graphically represented as in Fig. 7. The wavy lines represent the cut-off function $\sim_M(p)$, constraining the transferred momentum to be $|p| \leq O(\hbar)$.

It is easy to see that \mathcal{G}_+^4 is related to (A 6.103) by an identity similar to (A 6.13). In fact we can write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = & \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \frac{C_+(k; k-p)}{D_+(p)} \langle \hat{\psi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k-p,+}^+ \rangle_{k_4, p; i}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle^T \\ & \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \frac{D_+(p)}{D_+(p)} \langle \hat{\psi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k-p,+}^+ \rangle_{k_4, p; i}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle^T \\ & + \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \langle \hat{\psi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k-p,+}^+ \rangle_{k_4, p; i}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle^T : \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.107})$$

If we introduce the definitions

$$p_{i+} = \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \frac{C_+(p; k)}{D_+(p)} \langle \hat{\psi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k-p,+}^+ \rangle_i; \quad p_{i-} = \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \langle \hat{\psi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k-p,+}^+ \rangle_i; \quad (\text{A 6.108})$$

we can rewrite

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \frac{C_+(k; k-p)}{D_+(p)} \langle \hat{\psi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k-p,+}^+ \rangle_{k_4, p; i}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle^T = & \\ = \langle p_{i+} \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle_{k_4, p; i}^+ \langle \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle^T < p_{i+} \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \rangle^T < \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_4, p; i}^+ \rangle & \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.109})$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \langle \hat{\psi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k-p,+}^+ \rangle_{k_4, p; i}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle^T = & \\ = \langle p_{i+} \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \rangle_{k_4, p; i}^+ \langle \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \rangle^T < p_{i+} \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \rangle^T < \hat{\psi}_{k_3,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_4, p; i}^+ \rangle; & \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.110})$$

where we used the fact that $p \notin 0$ in the support of $\sim_M(p)$ and $\langle p_{i+} \rangle = \langle p_{i-} \rangle = 0$ for $p \notin 0$.

Substituting (A 6.109) and (A 6.110) into (A 6.107), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = & g(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \int_k \sim_M(p) \frac{H_+^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} + \\ & + \sim_M(k_1 - k_2) g(k_4) G^2(k_3) \langle \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \rangle_{k_1 - k_2, +}^+ \rangle^T \\ & + \langle \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \rangle_{k_1 - k_2, +}^+ \rangle^T \frac{D_-(k_1 - k_2)}{D_+(k_1 - k_2)} \langle \hat{\psi}_{k_1,+}^+ \hat{\psi}_{k_2,+}^+ \rangle_{k_1 - k_2, +}^+ \rangle^T \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.111})$$

We now put $k_i = k_i$, see (A 6.91). Since $k_1 = k_2 = 2^{-h}$, $\gamma_M(k_1, k_2) = 0$, hence we get

$$\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = g(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \gamma_M(p) \frac{H_+^{4,1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} : \quad (\text{A 6.112})$$

Remark. (A 6.112) says that the last line of equation (A 6.89) can be written as a functional integral very similar to the one for G_+^4 except that the interaction V (A 6.2) is replaced by $V + T_1 + T_+ + T_-$; we will evaluate it via a multiscale integration procedure similar to the one for G_+^4 , and in the expansion additional running coupling constants will appear; the expansion is convergent again if such new running couplings will remain small uniformly in the infrared cutoff.

A 6.7. The calculation of $\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ is done via a multiscale expansion; we shall concentrate on the differences with respect to that described in §A 6.4, due to the presence in the potential of the terms $T_1(\cdot)$ and $T(\cdot)$.

At each step we will write the effective potential \tilde{W} as:

$$e^{iW(\cdot; J)} = e^{M^2 E_J} \int_{Z_J; \mathbb{C}_{h; J}} (d\varphi; j) e^{V^{(j)}(\cdot; j) + B^{(j)}(\cdot; j) + K^{(j)}(\cdot; j; J)}; \quad (\text{A 6.113})$$

where $V^{(j)}$ and $B^{(j)}$ are defined as in §A 6.4, while

$$K^{(j)}(\cdot; j; J) = V_J^{(j)}(\cdot) + W_R^{(j)}(\cdot; j; J); \quad (\text{A 6.114})$$

with $V_J^{(j)}(\cdot; j; J)$ the sum over the terms containing exactly one J -field and no φ -fields and $W_R^{(j)}$ the rest (not involved in the construction of $\mathcal{G}_4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$).

The iterative construction of (A 6.113) is defined through the analogue of (A 6.69):

$$\begin{aligned} e^{iV^{(j-1)}(\cdot; j-1) + B^{(j-1)}(\cdot; j-1) + K^{(j-1)}(\cdot; j-1; J)} &= \\ &= \int_{Z_{j-1}; \mathbb{C}_{j-1}} (d\varphi; j-1) e^{i\hat{V}^{(j)}(\cdot; j-1) + \hat{B}^{(j)}(\cdot; j-1) + \hat{K}^{(j)}(\cdot; j-1; J)}; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.115})$$

Note that in (A 6.113) we chose not to rescale the fields in $K^{(j)}(\cdot; j; J)$.

In order to define the action of L over $V_J^{(j)}(\cdot; j; J)$, let us first consider in detail the first step of the iterative integration procedure, the integration of the field $\varphi^{(0)}$. We write

$$V_J^{(-1)}(\cdot; j-1) = V_{J;a;1}^{(-1)}(\cdot; j-1) + V_{J;a;2}^{(-1)}(\cdot; j-1) + V_{J;b;1}^{(-1)}(\cdot; j-1) + V_{J;b;2}^{(-1)}(\cdot; j-1); \quad (\text{A 6.116})$$

where $V_{J;a;1}^{(-1)} + V_{J;a;2}^{(-1)}$ is the sum of the terms in which the field $\varphi_{k_4-p}^{+}$ appearing in the definition of $T_1(\cdot)$ or $T(\cdot)$ is contracted, $V_{J;a;1}^{(-1)}$ and $V_{J;a;2}^{(-1)}$ denoting the sum over the terms of this type containing a T_1 or a T -vertex, respectively; $V_{J;b;1}^{(-1)} + V_{J;b;2}^{(-1)}$ is the sum of the other terms, that is those where the field $\varphi_{k_4-p}^{+}$ is an external field, the index $i = 1; 2$ having the same meaning as before.

Note that the condition (A 6.91) on the external momenta k_i forbids the presence of vertices of type φ , if $h < 0$, as we shall suppose. Hence, all graphs contributing to $V_J^{(-1)}$ have, besides the external field of type J , an odd number of external fields of type φ .

Let us consider first $V_{J;a;1}^{(-1)}$; we shall still distinguish different group of terms, those where both fields $\varphi_{k_4-p}^{+}$ and $\varphi_{k_4-p}^{+}$ are contracted, those where only one among them is contracted and those where no one is contracted.

If no one of the elds $\hat{\phi}_{k,+}^+$ and $\hat{\phi}_{k-p,+}$ is contracted, we can only have terms with at least four external lines; for the properties of $\hat{\phi}_{ij}$, see Appendix A7, at least one of the elds $\hat{\phi}_{k,+}^+$ and $\hat{\phi}_{k-p,+}$ must be contracted at scale h . If one of these terms has four external lines, hence it is marginal, it has the following form

$$\int \tilde{d}p \sim_M(p) \hat{\phi}_{k_4-p}^+ G_2^{(0)}(k_4-p) \hat{\phi}^{(0)}(k_4-p) \hat{\phi}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} \int dk \frac{C(k; k-p)}{D_+(p)} \hat{\phi}_{k,+}^+ \hat{\phi}_{k-p,+}; \quad (A6.117)$$

where $G_2^{(0)}(k)$ is a suitable function which can be expressed as a sum of graphs with an odd number of propagators, hence it vanishes at $k=0$. This implies that $G_2^{(0)}(0)=0$, so that we can regularize it without introducing any running coupling.




Fig. 8. Graphical representation of (A6.117)

If both $\hat{\phi}_{k,+}^+$ and $\hat{\phi}_{k-p,+}$ in $T_1(\cdot)$ are contracted, we get terms of the form


$$\tilde{W}_{n+1}^{(-1)}(k_4; k_1; \dots; k_n) \hat{\phi}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} \prod_{i=1}^n \hat{\phi}_{k_i}^{+}; \quad (A6.118)$$

where n is an odd integer. We want to define an R operation for such terms. There is apparently a problem, as the R operation involves derivatives and in $\tilde{W}^{(-1)}$ appears the function $\hat{\phi}^{(0;0)}$ of the form (A7.5) and the cutoff function $\sim_M(p)$, with support on momenta of size h . Hence one can worry about the derivatives of the factor $\sim_M(p)pD_+(p)^{-1}$. However, as the line of momentum k_4-p is necessarily at scale 0 (we are considering terms in which it is contracted), then $|p_j|^{-1} \sim h^{-1} \sim 1=2$ (for $|h|$ large enough), so that no bad factors can be produced by the derivatives acting on $\sim_M(p)pD_+(p)^{-1}$. We can define the L operation in the usual way:

$$\begin{aligned} L\tilde{W}_4^{(-1)}(k_4; k_1; k_2; k_3) &= \tilde{W}_4^{(-1)}(0; \dots; 0); \\ L\tilde{W}_2^{(-1)}(k_4) &= \tilde{W}_2^{(-1)}(0) + k_4 \partial_k \tilde{W}_2^{(-1)}(0); \end{aligned} \quad (A6.119)$$

Note that by parity the first term in the second equation of (A6.119) is vanishing; this means that there are only marginal terms. Note also that the local term proportional to $\hat{J}_{k_4} \hat{\phi}_{k_4}^+$ is such that the eld $\hat{\phi}_{k_4}^+$ can be contracted only at the last scale h ; hence it does not have any influence on the integrations of all the scales $> h$.

If only one among the elds $\hat{\phi}_{k,+}^+$ and $\hat{\phi}_{k-p,+}$ in $T_1(\cdot)$ is contracted, we note first that we cannot have terms with two external lines (including \hat{J}_{k_4}); in fact in such a case there is an external line with momentum k_4 with $! =$ and the other has $! = +$; this is however forbidden by global gauge invariance. Moreover, for the same reasons as before, we do not have to worry about the derivatives of the factor $\sim_M(p)pD_+(p)^{-1}$,

Fig. 9. Graphical representation of $\tilde{W}_4^{(-1)}$ and $\tilde{W}_2^{(-1)}$.

related with the regularization procedure of the terms with four external lines, which have the form

$$\int dk^+ \hat{g}_{k_1;+}^+ \hat{g}_{k_2;+}^+ \hat{g}_{k_3+k_4-k_1;+}^+ \hat{g}_{k_4}^{(0)} \hat{J}_{k_4} \sim_M (k^+ - k) \hat{g}^{(0)}(k_4 - k^+ + k) \left(\frac{\mathbb{C}_{h;0}(k) - 1 \mathbb{D}_+(k) \hat{g}_+^{(0)}(k^+)}{D_+(k^+ - k)} - \frac{u_0(k^+)}{D_+(k^+ - k)} \right); \quad (\text{A } 6.120)$$

or the similar one with the roles of k^+ and k exchanged.




Fig. 10. Graphical representation of a single addend in (A 6.120).

The two terms in (A 6.120) must be treated differently, as concerns the regularization procedure. The first term is such that one of the external lines is associated with the operator $\mathbb{C}_{h;0}(k) - 1 \mathbb{D}_+(k) \mathbb{D}_+(p)^{-1}$. We define $R = 1$ for such terms; in fact, when the $k_{k_2;+}$ external line is contracted (and this can happen only at scale h), the factor $\mathbb{D}_+(k) \mathbb{D}_+(p)^{-1}$ produces an extra factor h in the bound, with respect to the dimensional one. This claim simply follows by the observation that $\mathbb{D}_+(p) \sim 1$ as $p = k^+ - k$ and k^+ is at scale 0, while k , as we said, is at scale h . This factor has the effect that all the marginal terms in the tree path connecting v_0 with the end-point to which is associated the T_1 vertex acquires negative dimension.

The second term in (A 6.120) can be regularized as above, by subtracting the value of the kernel computed at zero external momenta, i.e. for $k = k_4 = k_1 = 0$. Note that such local part is given by

$$\int dk^+ \sim_M (k^+) \hat{g}^{(0)}(k^+) G_4^{(0)}(k^+; 0; -k^+) \frac{u_0(k^+)}{D_+(k^+)}; \quad (\text{A } 6.121)$$

and there is no singularity associated with the factor $D_+(k^+)^{-1}$, thanks to the support on scale 0 of the propagator $\hat{g}^{(0)}(k^+)$.

A similar (but simpler) analysis holds for the terms contributing to $V_{J;a;2}^{(1)}$, which contain a vertex of type T_+ or T_- and are of order ϵ^h . Now, the only thing to analyze carefully is the possible singularities associated with the factors $\sim_M(p)$ and $p D_+(p)^{-1}$. However, since in these terms the field $\hat{\phi}_{k_4-p}$ is contracted, $p_j^2 = 2$, for $|j|$ large enough, a property already used before; hence the regularization procedure can not produce bad dimensional bounds.

We will denote ϵ_1 and ϵ_{-1} , so that

$$L[V_{J;a;1}^{(1)} + V_{J;a;2}^{(1)}](\{h; j\}) = \epsilon_1^h Z^2 F^{[h; j]}(\{h; j\}) + \epsilon_{-1}^{\wedge[h; j]+} D^{(1)}(k_4) \hat{g}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4}; \quad (A6.122)$$

where we used the definition

$$F^{[h; j]}(\{h; j\}) = \frac{1}{(M^2)^4} \sum_{k_1, k_2, k_3 \in \mathbb{C}_{h, j}^1(k_i) > 0} X^{\wedge[h; j]+}_{k_1; j+} \wedge[h; j]_{k_2; j+} \wedge[h; j]+_{k_3; j} (k_1 - k_2 + k_3 - k_4); \quad (A6.123)$$

Note that the fields in the monomial $F^{[h; j]}(\{h; j\}) \hat{g}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4}$ associated to the coupling ϵ_{-1} have no constraint on the transferred momentum, in particular transferred momenta $p_j^2 = O(\epsilon^h)$ are allowed: this deeply distinguishes the term associated to ϵ_{-1} from a term like $T_+(\cdot)$ in (A6.106): the transferred momentum associated to the fields in $T_+(\cdot)$ has instead a lower cutoff ϵ^h .

Let us consider now the terms contributing to $V_{J;b;1}^{(1)}$, that is those where $\hat{\phi}_{k_4-p}$ is not contracted and there is a vertex of type T_1 .

Besides the term of order 0 in ϵ and ϵ_{-1} , equal to $T_1(\{h; j\})$, there are the terms containing at least one vertex \hat{V} ; among these terms, the only marginal ones (those requiring a regularization) have four external lines (including \hat{J}_{k_4}), since the oddness of the propagator does not allow tadpoles. These terms are of the form

$$\sum_{\pm} \int dp \sim_M(p) \hat{\phi}_{k^+; \pm}^+ \int dk^+ \hat{\phi}_{k^+ - p; \pm}^+ \hat{\phi}_{k_4 - p; \pm}^+ \hat{g}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} F_{2; \pm}^{(1)}(k^+; k^+ - p) + F_{1; \pm}^{(1)}(k^+; k^+ - p) + \text{c.c.}; \quad (A6.124)$$

where $F_{2; \pm}^{(1)}$ and $F_{1; \pm}^{(1)}$ are defined as in (A6.47); they represent the terms in which both or only one of the fields in $\hat{\phi}_{p; \pm}$, respectively, are contracted. Both contributions to the r.h.s. of (A6.124) are dimensionally marginal; however, the regularization of $F_{1; \pm}^{(1)}$ is trivial, as the latter is of the form (A6.55) or the similar one, obtained exchanging k^+ with k^- .




Fig. 11. Graphical representation of (A6.124)

As already discussed above, by the oddness of the propagator in the momentum, $G_+^{(2)}(0) = 0$, hence we can regularize such term without introducing any local term; the action of R on it is defined to be the identity.

Moreover, $\hat{F}_{2;+;+}^{(1)}$ satisfies the symmetry properties (A 6.51)-(A 6.52), so that, defining the action of L on $\hat{F}_{2;+;+}^{(1)}$ as in (A 6.53), we get

$$L F_{2;+;+}^1 = Z_1^{3;+} ; \quad L F_{2;+;+}^1 = \frac{D_+(p)}{D_+(p)} Z_1^{3;+} ; \quad (\text{A 6.125})$$

where $Z_1^{3;+}$ and $Z_1^{3;}$ are suitable real constants. Hence the local part of the marginal term (A 6.124) is, by definition, equal to

$$Z_1^{3;+} T_+(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) + Z_1^{3;} T_-(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) ; \quad (\text{A 6.126})$$

Let us finally consider the terms contributing to $V_{J;h;2}^{(1)}$, that is those where $\hat{+}_{k_4 p}$ is not contracted and there is a vertex of type T_+ or T_- . If even this vertex is not contracted, we get a contribution similar to (A 6.126), with $Z_1^{3;}$ in place of $Z_1^{3;+}$. Among the terms with at least one vertex, there is, as before, no term with two external lines; hence the only marginal terms have four external lines and can be written in the form

$$\int dp \sim_M(p) \hat{J}_{k_4} \hat{g}(k_4) \int dk^+ \sum_{\pm} \hat{+}_{k^+; \pm} \hat{+}_{k^+ p; \pm} + G_{+; \pm}^{(0)}(k^+; k^+ p) + \frac{D_+(p)}{D_+(p)} G_{-; \pm}^{(0)}(k^+; k^+ p) ; \quad (\text{A 6.127})$$

By using the symmetry property $D_-(k) = i! D_-(k)$ discussed in the lines above (A 6.50), it is easy to show that $G_{-; \pm}^{(0)}(0; 0) = 0$. Hence, if we regularize (A 6.127) by subtracting $G_{-; \pm}^{(0)}(0; 0)$ to $G_{-; \pm}^{(0)}(k^+; k^+ p)$, we still get a local term of the form (A 6.126).

By collecting all the local term, we can write

$$L[V_{J;h;1}^{(1)} + V_{J;h;2}^{(1)}](\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) = \gamma_{1;+} T_+(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) + \gamma_{1;-} T_-(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) ; \quad (\text{A 6.128})$$

where $\gamma_{1;\pm} = \gamma_{\pm} + Z_1^{3; \pm} + G_{\pm; \pm}^{(0)}(0; 0)$. Hence

$$\begin{aligned} V_J^{(1)}(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) &= T_1(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) + \gamma_{1;+} T_+(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) + \gamma_{1;-} T_-(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) + \\ &+ \sim_1 Z^2 F^{[\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}]}(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) + \sum_{\pm} \hat{+}_{k_4; \pm} D_-(k_4) \hat{g}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} + V_{J;R}^{(1)}(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1}) ; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.129})$$

where $V_{J;R}^{(1)}(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1})$ is the sum of all irrelevant terms linear in the external field J .

Remark. Note that, as already commented after (A 6.123), the structure of the field monomials associated to \sim_1 and to $\gamma_{1;+}$ respectively are deeply different, because of the presence of the cutoff function \sim_M in the definition of $T_+(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1})$. This implies that the coupling constant \sim_1 cannot be included in the definition of $\gamma_{1;+}$ and is really a different marginal coupling.

A 6.8. We now consider the integration of the higher scales. The integration of the field $^{(1)}$ is done in a similar way; we shall call $V_J^{(2)}(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{2})$ the sum over all terms linear in J . As before, the condition (A 6.91) on the external momenta k_i forbids the presence of vertices of type $\hat{+}$, if $h < 1$, as we shall suppose.

The main difference is that there is no contribution obtained by contracting both field variables belonging to $\hat{+}$ in $T_1(\mathbb{h}; \mathbb{1})$ at scale 1 , because of (A 7.2). It is instead possible to get marginal terms with four external lines (two is impossible), such that one of these fields is contracted at scale 1 . However, in this case, the second field variable will be necessarily contracted at scale h , so that we can put $R = 1$ for such terms. In fact, after the integration of the last scale field, an extra factor $^{(1-h)}$ comes out from a bound similar to that described after (A 6.120). Such factor has the effect of automatically regularize these terms, and even the terms containing them as subgraphs.

The term with a T_1 vertex, such that the field variables belonging to are not contracted, can be treated as in xA 6.7, hence do not need a regularization.

It follows that, if the irrelevant part $V_{J;R}^{(1)}$ were absent in the r.h.s. of (A 6.129), then the regularization procedure would not produce any local term proportional to $F^{[h;1]}(\cdot; \cdot; 2)$, starting from a graph containing a T_1 vertex.

It is easy to see that all other terms containing a vertex of type T_1 or T can be treated as in xA 6.7. Moreover, the support properties of $\hat{g}(k_4)$ immediately implies that it is not possible to produce a graph contributing to $V_J^{(2)}$, containing the z_1 vertex. Hence, in order to complete the analysis of $V_J^{(2)}$, we still have to consider the marginal terms containing the \tilde{z}_1 vertex, for which we simply apply the localization procedure defined in (A 6.119). We shall define two new constants \tilde{z}_2 and z_2 , so that $\tilde{z}_2(Z_3)^2$ is the coefficient of the local term proportional to $F^{[h;1]}(\cdot; \cdot; 2)$, while $z_2 Z_2^{\wedge[h;2]_{k_4}} D(k_4) \hat{g}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4}$ denotes the sum of all local terms with two external lines produced in the second integration step.

The above procedure can be iterated up to scale $h+1$, without any important difference. In particular, for all marginal terms (necessarily with four external lines) such that one of the field variables belonging to in $T_1(\cdot)$ is contracted at scale $i \leq j$, we put $R = 1$. We can do that, because, in this case, the second field variable belonging to has to be contracted at scale h , so that an extra factor $(i-h)$ (coming out from a discussion similar to that following (A 6.120)) has the effect of automatically regularize their contribution to the tree expansion of $\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ (that is similar to that described in Chapter 5, with the obvious modifications induced by the presence of new kind of vertices and of a different definition of the L operator).

Note that, as in the case $j = 1$, there is no problem connected with the presence of the factors $\tilde{z}(p)$ and $D(p)D_+(p)^{-1}$. In fact, if the field $\hat{\phi}_{k_4,p}^+$ appearing in the definition of $T_1(\cdot)$ or $T(\cdot)$ is contracted on scale j , each momentum derivative related with the regularization procedure produces the right j dimensional factor, since p is of order j and the derivatives of $\tilde{z}(p)$ are different from 0 only for momenta of order h . If, on the contrary, the field $\hat{\phi}_{k_4,p}^+$ is not contracted, then the renormalization procedure is tuned so that $\tilde{z}(p)$ and $D(p)D_+(p)^{-1}$ are not affected by the regularization procedure.

At step j , we get an expression of the form

$$\begin{aligned} V_{J,2}^{(j)}(\cdot; \cdot; j) &= T_1(\cdot; \cdot; j) + \sum_{j,+} T_+(\cdot; \cdot; j) + \sum_{j,-} T_-(\cdot; \cdot; j) + \\ &+ 4 \tilde{z}_j Z_j^2 F^{[h;j]}(\cdot; \cdot; j) + \sum_{i=j}^{X-1} z_i Z_i^{\wedge[h;j]_{k_4}} D(k_4)^5 \hat{g}(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} + V_{J;R}^j(\cdot; \cdot; 1); \end{aligned} \quad (A 6.130)$$

where $V_{J;R}^j(\cdot; \cdot; 1)$ is thought as a convergent tree expansion (under the hypothesis that h is small enough). Since $Z_1 = 1$, this expression is in agreement with (A 6.129).

The expansion of $\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ is obtained by building all possible graphs with four external lines, which contain one term taken from the expansion of $V_J^{(h)}(\cdot; \cdot; h)$, two terms from $B^{(h)}$ and an arbitrary number of terms taken from the effective potential $V^{(h)}(\cdot; \cdot; h)$. One of the external lines is associated with the free propagator $g(k_4)$, the other three are associated with propagators of scale h and momenta k_i , $i = 1; 2; 3$.

Remark. With respect to the expansion for G_+^4 , there are three additional quartic running coupling constants, $\sum_{j,+}$; $\sum_{j,-}$ and \tilde{z}_j . Note that they are all $O(\cdot)$, despite of the fact that the interaction T_1 has a coupling $O(1)$; this is a crucial property, which follows from the discussion above, implying that either T_1 is contracted at scale 0, or it gives no contribution to the running coupling constants. At a first sight, it seems that now we have a problem more difficult than the initial one; we started from the expansion for G_+^4 , which is convergent if the running coupling \sum_j is small, and we have reduced the problem to that of controlling the flow of four running coupling constants, $\sum_{j,+}$; $\sum_{j,-}$, \sum_j , \tilde{z}_j . However, we will see that, under the hypothesis $h = 1$, also the flow of $\sum_{j,+}$, $\sum_{j,-}$, \sum_j is bounded. In fact one can use the counterterms $\sum_{j,+}$; (this is the reason why we introduced them) to impose that $\sum_{j,+}$; $\sum_{j,-}$ are decreasing and vanishing at $j = h$; moreover it

can be verified that the beta functions for \tilde{z}_j and z_j are identical up to exponentially decaying $O(\epsilon^j)$ terms.

A 6.9. Now we will describe the flow of the new effective constants z_{j+1} , \tilde{z}_j and z_j .

First, let us consider z_{j+1} . Note that the definitions of the previous sections imply that there is no contribution to z_{j+1} , coming from trees with a special endpoint of type \sim or z . Then the contributions to z_{j+1} either contain a constant z_k , $k > j$, or an endpoint of type T_1 , that must be on scale 0. Then, by inductively suppose that the size of z_k , $k > j$ is exponentially small, and using the short memory property, one can show that z_{j+1} is exponentially small, that is $z_{j+1} \leq C_h \epsilon^j$, for some constants $C, \# > 0$. The formal proof can be done using a fixed point argument, following step by step the analogous analysis used to prove that (A 6.70) admits as a solution an exponentially decreasing sequence.

Let us now focus on \tilde{z}_j . We start noting that the beta function equation for z_j can be written as

$$z_{j+1} = \frac{Z_{j+1}}{Z_{j+2}} z_j^2 + z_j + z_j^{(0)}; \quad (\text{A 6.131})$$

where z_j is the sum over the local parts of the trees with at least two endpoints and no endpoint of scale index 0, while $z_j^{(0)}$ is the similar sum over the trees with at least one endpoint of scale index 0.

On the other hand we can write

$$\tilde{z}_{j+1} = \frac{Z_{j+1}}{Z_{j+2}} \tilde{z}_j^2 + \tilde{z}_j + \tilde{z}_j^{(0)} + \tilde{z}_j^{(T)} + \tilde{z}_j^{(\sim)}; \quad (\text{A 6.132})$$

where:

- 1) \tilde{z}_j is the sum over the local parts of the trees with at least two endpoints, no endpoint of scale index 0 and one special endpoint of type \sim .
- 2) $\tilde{z}_j^{(0)} + \tilde{z}_j^{(T)}$ is the sum over the trees with at least one endpoint of scale index 0; $\tilde{z}_j^{(0)}$ and $\tilde{z}_j^{(T)}$ are, respectively, the sum over the trees with the special endpoint of type \sim or T_1 .
- 3) $\tilde{z}_j^{(\sim)}$ is the sum over the trees with at least two endpoints, whose special endpoint is of type T .

A crucial role in the proof has the following Lemma.

Lemma A 6.1 Let $\epsilon = \epsilon_h$; then if ϵ_h is small enough, there exists a constant C , independent of ϵ , such that $z_j \leq C$ and

$$\tilde{z}_j \leq z_j \leq C_h \epsilon^j; \quad h+1 \leq j \leq 1; \quad (\text{A 6.133})$$

Proof - The main point is the remark that there is a one to one correspondence between the trees contributing to z_j and the trees contributing to \tilde{z}_j . In fact the trees contributing to \tilde{z}_j have only endpoints of type \sim , besides the special endpoint v of type \sim , and the external field with \neq and $=$ has to belong to P_v . It follows that we can associate uniquely with any tree contributing to \tilde{z}_j a tree contributing to z_j , by simply substituting the special endpoint with a normal endpoint, without changing any label. This correspondence is surjective, since we have imposed the condition that the trees contributing to \tilde{z}_j and z_j do not have endpoints of scale index 0. Hence, we can write

$$\frac{Z_{j+1}}{Z_{j+2}} z_j^2 + z_j = \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \frac{Z_{j+1}}{Z_{j+2}} (\tilde{z}_i^2 + \tilde{z}_i) + \tilde{z}_j = \sum_{i=j}^{\infty} \tilde{z}_i (\tilde{z}_i + 1); \quad (\text{A 6.134})$$

where, thanks to the "short memory property" and the fact that $Z_{j+1} = Z_{j+2} = 1 + O(\epsilon^j)$, the constants $\tilde{z}_{j,i}$ satisfy the bound $\tilde{z}_{j,i} \leq C_j \epsilon^{2\#(j-i)}$, with $\# > 0$.

Among the four last terms in the r.h.s. of (A 6.132), the only one depending on the \tilde{j} is $\tilde{j}^{(0)}$, which can be written in the form

$$\tilde{j}^{(0)} = \sum_{i=j}^X \frac{X^1}{j_{ji}^0} \tilde{i}; \quad (\text{A 6.135})$$

the $\frac{0}{j_{ji}}$ being constants which satisfy the bound $j_{ji}^0 j \leq C_j 2^{\#j}$, since they are related to trees with an endpoint of scale index 0. For the same reasons, we have the bounds $j_j^{(T)} j \leq C_j 2^{\#j}$, $j_j^{(0)} j \leq C_j 2^{\#j}$. Finally, by using the exponential decay of the $j_{ji}!$, we see that $j_j^{(\cdot)} j \leq C_j h 2^{\#j}$.

We now choose so that

$$\tilde{h} = 0; \quad (\text{A 6.136})$$

and we put

$$x_j = \tilde{j} \quad j \leq h+1 \quad j \geq 1; \quad (\text{A 6.137})$$

We can write

$$x_{j-1} = x_{-1} + \sum_{j^0=j}^2 \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^1}{4} j_{j^0,i}^0 x_i + \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^1}{j_{j^0,i}^0} (x_i + \tilde{i}) + \tilde{j}^{(T)} + \tilde{j}^{(0)} \quad j \geq 5; \quad (\text{A 6.138})$$

On the other hand, the condition (A 6.136) implies that

$$x_{-1} = \sum_{j^0=h+1}^2 \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^1}{4} j_{j^0,i}^0 x_i + \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^1}{j_{j^0,i}^0} (x_i + \tilde{i}) + \tilde{j}^{(T)} + \tilde{j}^{(0)} \quad j \geq 5; \quad (\text{A 6.139})$$

so that, if $h+1 \leq j \leq 1$, the x_j satisfy the equation

$$x_j = \sum_{j^0=h+1}^2 \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^j}{4} j_{j^0,i}^0 x_i + \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^1}{j_{j^0,i}^0} (x_i + \tilde{i}) + \tilde{j}^{(T)} + \tilde{j}^{(0)} \quad j \geq 5; \quad (\text{A 6.140})$$

We want to show that equation (A 6.140) has a unique solution satisfying the bound

$$|x_j| \leq c_0 (1 + j j_h) h^{\#j}; \quad (\text{A 6.141})$$

for a suitable constant c_0 , independent of h , if h is small enough. Hence we introduce the Banach space $M_{\#}$ of sequences $\underline{x} = (x_j)_{h+1 \leq j \leq 1}$ with norm $\|\underline{x}\|_{\#} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \sup_j |x_j| h^{\#j-1}$ and look for a fixed point of the operator $T : M_{\#} \rightarrow M_{\#}$ defined by the r.h.s. of (A 6.140). By using the bounds on the various constants appearing in the definition of T , we can easily prove that there are two constants c_1 and c_2 , such that

$$|T(\underline{x})_j| \leq c_1 h (1 + j j_h) h^{\#j} + c_2 h \sum_{j^0=h+1}^2 \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^j}{j_{j^0,i}^0} |x_i| h^{\#i}; \quad (\text{A 6.142})$$

Hence, if we take $c_0 = M c_1$, $M \geq 2$, and h small enough, the ball B_M of radius $c_0 (1 + j j_h)$ in $M_{\#}$ is invariant under the action of T . On the other hand, under the same condition, T is a contraction in all $M_{\#}$; in fact, if $\underline{x}, \underline{y} \in M_{\#}$, then, if h is small enough,

$$|T(\underline{x})_j - T(\underline{y})_j| \leq c_2 h \sum_{j^0=h+1}^2 \sum_{i=j^0}^X \frac{X^j}{j_{j^0,i}^0} |x_i - y_i| h^{\#i} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\underline{x} - \underline{y}\|_{\#} h^{\#j}; \quad (\text{A 6.143})$$

It follows, by the contraction principle, that there is a unique fixed point in the ball B_M , for any $M \geq 2$, hence a unique fixed point in $M_\#$, satisfying the condition (A 6.141) with $c_0 = 2c_1$.

To complete the proof, we have to show that can be bounded uniformly in h . In order to do that, we insert in the l.h.s. of (A 6.139) the definition of x_{-1} and we bound the r.h.s. by using (A 6.141) and (A 6.142); we get

$$\tilde{j}_{-1} = j_{-1} c_3 h + c_4 j_h^2; \quad (\text{A 6.144})$$

for some constants c_3 and c_4 . Since $j_{-1} j = c_3 j_h$, $\tilde{j}_{-1} = c_6 j_h$ and $j_h = 2j_h$ by the inductive hypothesis, we have

$$j_{-1} j = \tilde{j}_{-1} j + c_3 j_h + c_4 j_h^2 = j_h (c_6 + 2c_3 + 2c_4 j_h) = c_5; \quad (\text{A 6.145})$$

so that, $j_h = 2(c_6 + 2c_3) = c_5$, if $4c_4 h = c_5$. ■

We want now to discuss the properties of the constants $z_j, h = j = 1$, by comparing them with the constants z_j , which are involved in the renormalization of the free measure, see (A 6.64). There is a tree expansion for the z_j , which can be written as

$$z_j = j + j^{(0)}; \quad (\text{A 6.146})$$

where j is the sum over the trees without endpoints of scale index 0, while $j^{(0)}$ is the sum of the others, satisfying the bound $j^{(0)} j \leq C h^{-2} \#j$. The tree expansion of the z_j can be written as

$$z_j = \tilde{j} + \tilde{j}^{(+)} + \tilde{j}^{(0)}; \quad (\text{A 6.147})$$

where \tilde{j} is the sum over the trees without endpoints of scale index $+1$, such that the special endpoint is of type \sim , $\tilde{j}^{(+)}$ is the sum over the trees whose special endpoint is of type T , and $\tilde{j}^{(0)}$ is the sum over the trees with at least an endpoint of scale index 0.

Since there is no tree contributing to $\tilde{j}^{(0)}$ without at least one \sim or T endpoint and since all trees contributing to it satisfy the "short memory property", by using Lemma A 6.1 (which implies that $\tilde{j} j \leq C h$), we get the bound $\tilde{j}^{(0)} j \leq C h^{-2} \#j$. In a similar manner, by using the exponential decay of the constants $j_i!$, we see that $\tilde{j}^{(+)} j \leq C h^{-2} \#j$.

Let us now consider j and \tilde{j} . By an argument similar to that used in the proof of Lemma A 6.1, we can write

$$\tilde{j} = j + \sum_{i=j+1}^X j_i (\tilde{i} - i); \quad (\text{A 6.148})$$

where \tilde{i} is defined as in Lemma A 6.1 and $j_{j+1} j \leq C h^{-2} \#j$. Hence, Lemma A 6.1 implies that

$$\tilde{j} j = z_j j \leq C h^{-2} \#j; \quad (\text{A 6.149})$$
■

A 6.10. In this section we conclude the bound for $\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$. If we consider the tree expansion for \mathcal{G}_+^4 , we realize that there are various classes of trees contributing to it, depending on the type of the special endpoint. Let us consider first the family T_\sim of the trees with an endpoint of type \sim . These trees have the same structure of those appearing in the expansion of $G_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$, except for the fact that the external (renormalized) propagator of scale h and momentum k_4 is substituted with the free propagator $\hat{g}(k_4)$. It follows, by using the bound $\tilde{j} j \leq C h$, that a tree with n endpoint is bounded by $(C h)^n Z_h^{-1-4h}$, larger for a factor Z_h with respect to what we need.

Let us now consider the family T_z of the trees with a special endpoint of type z . Given a tree $T \in T_z$, we can associate with it the class T_z of all $T \in T_z$, obtained by in the following way:

- 1) we substitute the endpoint v of type \sim of T with an endpoint of type z ;
- 2) we link the endpoint v to an endpoint of type z through a renormalized propagator of scale h .

Note that $T_z = \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} T_z^{(j)}$ and that, if T has n endpoints, any $T \in T_z$ has $n+1$ endpoints. Moreover, since the value of k_4 has been chosen so that $f_h(k_4) = 1$, $\hat{g}^{(h)}(k_4) = Z_h^{-1} \hat{g}(k_4)$; hence it is easy to show that the sum of the values of a tree $T \in T_z$, such the special endpoint has scale index $j+1$, and of all $T \in T_z$, is obtained from the value of T , by substituting \sim_j with

$$j = \sim_j + \sum_{j=h}^{\infty} \frac{Z_h^{-1} Z_j Z_j}{Z_h^{-1}} ; \quad (\text{A 6.150})$$

see Fig. 12.




Fig. 12. The resummation of (A 6.150).

On the other hand, (A 6.149) and the bound $Z_j \leq C h^{2j}$, see (5.22), imply that, if h is small enough

$$\sum_{j=h}^{\infty} Z_j \leq \sum_{j=h}^{\infty} C h^{2j} = C h^{2h} \sum_{j=0}^{\infty} h^{2j} = C h^{2h} \frac{1}{1-h^2} < C h : \quad (\text{A 6.151})$$

It follows, by using also the bound (A 6.133), that

$$j = \sim_j + \sum_{j=h}^{\infty} \frac{Z_h^{-1} Z_j Z_j}{Z_h^{-1}} + \frac{O(h)}{Z_h} : \quad (\text{A 6.152})$$

Moreover, since $Z_{j+1} = Z_j(1 + z_j)$, for $j \geq 1; h$, and $Z_1 = 1$, it is easy to check that

$$Z_h^{-1} \sum_{j=h}^{\infty} Z_j Z_j = 1 : \quad (\text{A 6.153})$$

This identity, Lemma A 6.1 and (A 6.152) imply the bound

$$j \leq j + C \frac{h}{Z_h} ; \quad (\text{A 6.154})$$

which gives us the missing Z_h^{-1} factor for the sum over the trees whose special endpoint is of type \sim or z .

Let us now consider the family T of the trees with a special endpoint of type T . It is easy to see, by using the exponential decay of the $j!$ and the "short memory property", that the sum over the trees of this class

with $n = 0$ normal endpoints is bounded, for h small enough, by $(C_h)^{n+1} Z_h^{-1-4h} \prod_{j=h}^P Z_j^{-2-2\#(h,j)}$
 $\#j (C_h)^{n+1} Z_h^{-3-(4\#)h}$, which is even better of our needs.

We still have to consider the family T_1 of the trees with a special endpoint of type T_1 . There is first of all the trivial tree, obtained by contracting all the lines of T_1 on scale h , but its value is 0, because of the support properties of the function $\sim(p)$. Let us now consider a tree $\in T_1$ with $n = 1$ endpoints of type T_1 . If we call $h_{v_1} = j_1 + 1$ the scale of the vertex T_1 , then the dimensional bound of this tree differs from that of a tree with $n + 1$ normal endpoints contributing to $G_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ for the following reasons:

- 1) there is a factor Z_h^{-1} missing, because the external (renormalized) propagator of scale h and momentum k_4 is substituted with the free propagator $\hat{g}(k_4)$;
- 2) there is a factor $j_1 Z_{j_1}^{-2}$ missing, because there is no external field renormalization in the $T_1(h; j_1)$ contribution to $V_J^{(j)}(h; j_1)$, see (A 6.130);
- 3) there is a factor Z_h^{-1} missing, because the factor $Z_{h-1}(k)$ in the r.h.s. of (A 7.16) can only be bounded by a constant, because $Z_{h-1}(k)$ is in general different from Z_{h-1} on the support of $f^{(h)}$.

It follows that the sum of the values of all trees $\in T_1$ with $n = 1$ normal endpoints, if h is small enough, is bounded by $(C_h)^n h^{0-4h} \prod_{j_1=h}^P Z_{j_1}^{-2-2\#(h,j_1)} (C_h)^n h^{4j_1} Z_h^{-2}$.

By collecting all the previous bounds, we prove that the bound (A 6.95) is satisfied in the case of $H_+^{4;1}$.

Remark. In T_1 and in the Grassmannian monomials multiplying $j_{i+}; j_i$, an external line is always associated to a free propagator $\hat{g}(k_4)$; this is due to the fact that, in deriving the Dyson equation, one extracts a free propagator. Then in the bounds there is a Z_h missing (such propagator is not "dressed" in the multiscale integration procedure), and at the end the crucial identity (A 6.153) has to be used to "dress" the extracted propagator carrying momentum k_4 .

A 6.11. We finally describe the modifications to the discussion above needed to bound $H_+^{4;1}$.

If we substitute, in the l.h.s. of (A 6.103) $H_+^{4;1}$ with $H_+^{4;1}$, we can proceed in a similar way. By using (A 6.85), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{L} \sum_p \sim_M(p) D_+^{-1}(p) \hat{H}^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p) = \\ & = \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{L} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{L} \sum_k \frac{C(k; k-p)}{D_+(p)} < \hat{k}; \hat{k-p}; \hat{i}_{k_1;+}; \hat{i}_{k_2;+}; \hat{i}_{k_3}; \hat{i}_{k_4-p}; >^T + \\ & {}^0 \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{L} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{L} \sum_k \frac{D_-(p)}{D_+(p)} < \hat{k}; \hat{k-p}; \hat{i}_{k_1;+}; \hat{i}_{k_2;+}; \hat{i}_{k_3;+}; \hat{i}_{k_4-p}; >^T \\ & {}^0 \hat{g}_+(k_4) \frac{1}{L} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{L} \sum_k < \hat{k}; \hat{k-p}; \hat{i}_{k_1;+}; \hat{i}_{k_2;+}; \hat{i}_{k_3}; \hat{i}_{k_4-p}; >^T : \end{aligned} \quad (A 6.155)$$

We define $\mathcal{G}^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ as in (A 6.104) with \tilde{W} replaced by \tilde{W} given by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{W} &= \log \sum_P (d^+)^{T_2(\cdot)+{}^0T_+(\cdot)+{}^0T_-(\cdot)} e^{V(\hat{\cdot})+ \sum_{i=1}^P R \, dx[\hat{x}_i! + \hat{x}_{i+}! + \hat{x}_{i-}!]}; \\ T_2(\cdot) &= \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \frac{C(k; k-p)}{D_+(p)} (\hat{k}; \hat{k-p}; \hat{i}_{k_4-p}; \hat{J}_{k_4} \hat{g}(k_4); \end{aligned} \quad (A 6.156)$$

$T_+; T_-$ being defined as in (A 6.106). By the analogues of (A 6.111), (A 6.112) we obtain

$$\mathcal{G}^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4) = \hat{g}(k_4) \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_p \sim_M(p) \frac{\hat{H}^{4;1}(p; k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4 - p)}{D_+(p)} : \quad (A 6.157)$$

The calculation of $\mathcal{G}^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ is done via a multiscale expansion essentially identical to the one of $\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$, by taking into account that $p_{;+}$ has to be substituted with

$$p_{;+} = \frac{1}{M^2} \sum_k \frac{C(p; k)}{D_+(p)} (\hat{+}_{k;+} \hat{+}_{k;p;+}) : \quad (\text{A 6.158})$$

Let us consider the first step of the iterative integration procedure and let us call again $V_J^{(-1)}(\hbar; 1)$ the contribution to the effective potential of the terms linear in J . Let us now decompose $V_J^{(-1)}(\hbar; 1)$ as in (A 6.116) and let us consider the terms contributing to $V_{J;a;1}^{(-1)}(\hbar; 1)$. The analysis goes exactly as before when no one or both the fields $\hat{+}_{k;+}$ and $\hat{+}_{k;p;+}$ of $p_{;+}$ are contracted. This is not true if only one among the fields $\hat{+}_{k;+}$ and $\hat{+}_{k;p;+}$ in $T_2(\cdot)$ is contracted, since in this case there are marginal terms with two external lines, which before were absent. The terms with four external lines can be treated as before; one has just to substitute $D_+(k) \mathcal{G}_+^{(0)}(k^+)$ with $D_-(k) \mathcal{G}^{(0)}(k^+)$ in the r.h.s. of (A 6.120), but this has no relevant consequence. The terms with two external lines have the form

$$\int dk \hat{+}_{k_4;+} \mathcal{G}_-(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} \sim_M (k_4 - k) G_1^{(0)}(k) \left(\frac{C_{h;0}''(k_4) - 1}{D_+(k_4 - k)} \mathcal{D}_-(k_4) \mathcal{G}^{(0)}(k) + \frac{u_0(k)}{D_+(k_4 - k)} \right); \quad (\text{A 6.159})$$

where $G_1^{(0)}(k)$ is a smooth function of order 0 in ϵ . However, the first term in the braces is equal to 0, since $j_{k_4} j = -\hbar$ implies that $C_{h;0}''(k_4) - 1 = 0$. Hence the r.h.s. of (A 6.159) is indeed of the form

$$\int dk \hat{+}_{k_4;+} \mathcal{G}_-(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} \sim_M (k_4 - k) G_1^{(0)}(k) \frac{u_0(k)}{D_+(k_4 - k)}; \quad (\text{A 6.160})$$

so that it can be regularized in the usual way.

The analysis of $V_{J;a;2}^{(-1)}(\hbar; 1)$ can be done exactly as before. Hence, we can define again \tilde{z}_1 and \tilde{x}_1 as in (A 6.122), with $\tilde{z}_1 = 0(\epsilon)$ and $\tilde{x}_1 = 0(1)$.

Let us consider now the terms contributing to $V_{J;b;1}^{(-1)}$, that is those where $\hat{+}_{k_4;p}$ is not contracted and there is a vertex of type T_2 . Again the only marginal terms have four external lines and have the form

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{\pm} \int dp \sim_M(p) \hat{+}_{k^+; \pm} \int dk^+ \hat{+}_{k^+; p; \pm} \hat{+}_{k_4; p; \pm} \mathcal{G}_-(k_4) \hat{J}_{k_4} \\ & \frac{D_-(p)}{D_+(p)} \int F_{2; \pm}^{(-1)}(k^+; k^+ - p) + F_{1; \pm}^{(-1)}(k^+; k^+ - p) \int_{\pm} i; \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A 6.161})$$

where we are using again a definition analogue to (A 6.47). The analysis of the terms $F_{1; \pm}^{(-1)}(k^+; k^+ - p)$ is identical to the one in §A 6.7, while, the symmetry property of the propagator under the replacement $k \rightarrow -k$ implies now that, if we define

$$F_{2; \pm}^{(-1)}(k^+; k) = \frac{1}{D_-(p)} [p_0 A_{0; \pm}(k^+; k) + p_1 A_{1; \pm}(k^+; k)]; \quad (\text{A 6.162})$$

and

$$L F_{2; \pm}^{(-1)} = \frac{1}{D_-(p)} [p_0 A_{0; \pm}(0; 0) + p_1 A_{1; \pm}(0; 0)]; \quad (\text{A 6.163})$$

then

$$L F_{2; \pm}^{(-1)} = Z_1^{3; \pm} \frac{D_-(p)}{D_+(p)}; \quad L F_{2; \pm}^{(-1)} = Z_1^{3; \pm}; \quad (\text{A 6.164})$$

where $Z_1^{3,+}$ and $Z_1^{3,-}$ are the same real constants appearing in (A.6.125). Hence, the local part of the marginal term (A.6.161) is, by definition, equal to

$$Z_1^{3,+} T_+(\lfloor h; -1 \rfloor) + Z_1^{3,-} T_-(\lfloor h; -1 \rfloor) : \quad (\text{A.6.165})$$

The analysis of $V_{j,j_2}^{(-1)}$ can be done exactly as before, so that we can write for $V_j^{(-1)}$ an expression similar to (A.6.129), with $T_2(\lfloor h; -1 \rfloor)$ in place of $T_1(\lfloor h; -1 \rfloor)$ and $\alpha_{1,j}^0$ in place of $\alpha_{1,j}^1$.

The integration of higher scales proceed as in §A.6.8. In fact, the only real difference we found in the integration of the first scale was in the calculation of the $O(1)$ terms contributing to z_{-1} , but these terms are absent in the case of z_j , $j \geq 2$, because the second term in the expression analogous to (A.6.159), obtained by contracting on scale $j < 0$ only one of the fields of φ_j , is exactly zero. Also in this case, the constants $\alpha_{j,j}^0$ can be chosen again so that the an exponentially decaying bound is satisfied even by the constants $\alpha_{j,j}^0$.

In the analysis of the constants \tilde{z}_j and z_j there is only one difference, concerning the bound (A.6.149), which has to be substituted with $z_{-1} \leq z_1 \leq C$, in the case $j = -1$, but it is easy to see that this has no effect on the bound (A.6.154). It follows that the final considerations of §A.6.10 stay unchanged and we get for $\mathcal{G}^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$ a bound similar to that proved for $\mathcal{G}_+^4(k_1; k_2; k_3; k_4)$, so ending the proof of the bound (A.6.95).

Appendix A7. The properties of $D_{!}^{(p)} C_{!}^{(k;k-p)}$.

In this Appendix we describe and collect a number of properties of the operator $D_{!}^{(p)} C_{!}^{(k;k-p)}$, useful in the analysis of the correction identities. We follow the analogue discussion in section 4.2 of [BM3].

Let us consider the quantity

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{!}^{(i;j)}(k^{+};k) &= \frac{C_{!}^{(k^{+};k)}}{D_{!}^{(p)}} \hat{g}_{!}^{(i)}(k^{+}) \hat{g}_{!}^{(j)}(k) = \\ &= \frac{1}{Z_{i-1} Z_{j-1}} \frac{1}{D_{!}^{(p)}} \frac{f_i(k^{+})}{D_{!}^{(k^{+})}} \frac{f_j(k)}{f_{h;0}(k)} f_j(k) \frac{f_j(k)}{D_{!}^{(k)}} \frac{f_i(k^{+})}{f_{h;0}(k^{+})} f_i(k^{+})^i; \end{aligned} \quad (A7.1)$$

where $p = k^{+} - k$. The above quantity appears in the expansion for $\hat{H}_{2;1}$ when both the fields of $T_{x;!}$ are contracted. Note first that

$${}_{!}^{(i;j)}(k^{+};k) = 0; \quad \text{if } 0 > i; j > h; \quad (A7.2)$$

since $f_{h;0}(k) = 1$, if $h < i; j < 0$. We will see that this property plays a crucial role; it says that, contrary to what happens for $G^{2;1}$, at least one of the two fermionic lines connected to J_m must have scale 0 or h .

In the cases in which ${}_{!}^{(i;j)}(k^{+};k)$ is not identically equal to 0, since ${}_{!}^{(i;j)}(k^{+};k) = {}_{!}^{(j;i)}(k; k^{+})$, we can restrict the analysis to the case $i = j$.

1) If $i = j = 0$, (A7.1) can be rewritten as

$${}_{!}^{(0;0)}(k^{+};k) = \frac{1}{D_{!}^{(p)}} \frac{f_0(k^{+})}{D_{!}^{(k^{+})}} u_0(k) \frac{f_0(k)}{D_{!}^{(k)}} u_0(k^{+}); \quad (A7.3)$$

where $u_0(k)$ is a C^1 function such that

$$u_0(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |k| \geq 1 \\ 1 - f_0(k) & \text{if } |k| < 1 \end{cases}; \quad (A7.4)$$

We want to show that

$${}_{!}^{(0;0)}(k^{+};k) = \frac{p}{D_{!}^{(p)}} S_{!}^{(0)}(k^{+};k) = \frac{p_0 S_{!;0}^{(0)}(k^{+};k) + p S_{!;1}^{(0)}(k^{+};k)}{D_{!}^{(p)}}; \quad (A7.5)$$

where $S_{!;i}^{(0)}(k^{+};k)$ are smooth functions such that

$$\partial_{k^{+}}^m \partial_k^m S_{!;i}^{(0)}(k^{+};k) \leq C_{m+i+m}; \quad (A7.6)$$

if ∂_k^m denotes a generic derivative of order m with respect to the variables k and C_m is a suitable constant, depending on m .

The proof of (A7.5) is trivial if p is bounded away from 0, for example $|p| \geq 1$. It is sufficient to remark that ${}_{!}^{(0;0)}(k^{+};k)$, by the compact support properties of $f_0(k)$, is a smooth function and put $S_{!;0}^{(0)} = i {}_{!}^{(0;0)}$, $S_{!;1}^{(0)} = {}_{!}^{(0;0)}$. If $|p| \leq 1$, we can use the identity

$$\begin{aligned} {}_{!}^{(0;0)}(k^{+};k) &= \frac{f_0(k^{+}) u_0(k^{+})}{D_{!}^{(k^{+})} D_{!}^{(k)}} + \\ &+ \frac{p}{D_{!}^{(p)}} \int_0^1 dt \frac{k^{+}}{k^{+}} \frac{tp}{tp} f_0^{(0)}(k^{+} - tp) \frac{u_0(k^{+})}{D_{!}^{(k)}} u_0^{(0)}(k^{+} - tp) \frac{f_0(k^{+})}{D_{!}^{(k^{+})}}; \end{aligned} \quad (A7.7)$$

from which (A 7.6) follows.

2) If $i = 0$ and $h - j < 0$, we get

$$S_{!}^{(0;j)}(k^+; k) = \frac{1}{Z_{j-1}} \frac{f_j(k^-) u_0(k^+)}{D_{!}(\rho) D_{!}(k^-)} + jh \frac{1}{Z_{h-1}(k^-)} \frac{f_0(k^+) u_h(k^-)}{D_{!}(\rho) D_{!}(k^+)}; \quad (\text{A 7.8})$$

where

$$u_h(k) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |k| \leq h \\ 1 - f_h(k) & \text{if } |k| > h \end{cases}; \quad (\text{A 7.9})$$

If $j < 1$, the first term in the r.h.s. of (A 7.8) vanishes for $|j| \leq 1$, since $u_0(k^+) \notin 0$ implies that $|k^+| \leq 1$, so that $|k| = |k^+ - p| \leq 1 + 1 = 2$ and, as a consequence, $f_j(k^-) = 0$. Analogously, the second term in the r.h.s. of (A 7.8) vanishes for $|j| \leq 1 - h$, since $f_0(k^+) \notin 0$ implies that $|k^+| \leq 1$, so that $|k| \leq h$ and, as a consequence, $u_h(k^-) = 0$. On the other hand, if $j = 1$, because $f_{-1}(k) u_0(k) = 0$, we can write

$$u_0(k^+) f_{-1}(k^-) = u_0(k^+) p \int_0^{Z_{-1}} dt \frac{k^+ - tp}{|k^+ - tp|^j} f_{-1}^0(k^+ - tp); \quad (\text{A 7.10})$$

It follows that

$$S_{!}^{(0;j)}(k^+; k) = \frac{p}{D_{!}(\rho)} S_{!}^{(j)}(k^+; k); \quad (\text{A 7.11})$$

where $S_{!}^{(j)}(k^+; k)$ are smooth functions such that

$$|S_{!}^{(j)}(k^+; k)| \leq C_{m_0+m_j} \frac{j^{(1+m_j)}}{Z_{j-1}(k^-)}; \quad \text{if } |h-j| < 0; \quad (\text{A 7.12})$$

3) If $i = j = h$ we get

$$S_{!}^{(h,h)}(k^+; k) = \frac{1}{D_{!}(\rho)} \frac{1}{Z_{h-1}(k^+) Z_{h-1}(k^-)} \frac{f_h(k^+) u_h(k^-)}{D_{!}(k^+)} \frac{u_h(k^+) f_h(k^-)}{D_{!}(k^-)}; \quad (\text{A 7.13})$$

Since this expression can appear only at the last integration step, it is not involved in any regularization procedure. Hence we only need its size for values of p of order h or larger. It is easy to see that

$$|S_{!}^{(h,h)}(k^+; k)| \leq \frac{C}{M} \frac{2h}{Z_{h-1}(k^+) Z_{h-1}(k^-)}; \quad \text{if } |p| \leq M^{-h}; \quad (\text{A 7.14})$$

4) If $j = h < i < 1$, we get

$$S_{!}^{(i,h)}(k^+; k) = \frac{1}{Z_{h-1}(k^-) Z_{i-1}} \frac{f_i(k^+) u_h(k^-)}{D_{!}(\rho) D_{!}(k^+)}; \quad (\text{A 7.15})$$

which satisfies the bound

$$|S_{!}^{(i,h)}(k^+; k)| \leq \frac{C}{M} \frac{h-i}{Z_{h-1}(k^-) Z_{i-1}}; \quad \text{if } |p| \leq M^{-h}; \quad (\text{A 7.16})$$

Appendix A 8. Proof of Lemma 7.3

Proceeding as in Chapter 6, we first solve the equations for Z_h and $\mathfrak{m}_h^{(2)}$ parametrically in $\underline{g} = f_h g_{h-h_1}$. If $j_h j \leq c j_j^{(\#(2)(h-h_1))}$, the first two assumptions of (7.14) easily follow. Now we will construct a sequence \underline{g} such that $j_h j \leq c j_j^{(\#(2)(h-h_1))}$ and satisfying the flow equation $z_{h-1} = z_h + \beta_h(\underline{g}; \dots; g_{h_1})$.

A 8.1. Tree expansion for z_h . z_h can be expressed as sum over tree diagrams, similar to those used in x5.5. The main difference is that they have vertices on scales k between h and $h+2$. The vertices on scales $h_v = h_1 + 1$ are associated to the truncated expectations (3.30); the vertices on scale $h_v = h_1$ are associated to truncated expectations w.r.t. the propagators $g_{1;2}^{(1,h_1)}$; the vertices on scale $h_v < h_1$ are associated to truncated expectations w.r.t. the propagators $g_{1;2}^{(2,h_v+1)}$. Moreover the end{points on scale $h_1 + 1$ are associated to the couplings z_h or z_h , as in x5.5; the end{points on scales $h < h_1$ are necessarily associated to the couplings z_h .

A 8.2. Bounds on z_h . The non vanishing trees contributing to z_h must have at least one vertex on scale h_1 : in fact the diagrams depending only on the vertices of type β are vanishing (they are chains, so they are vanishing, because of the compact support property of the propagator). This means that, by the short memory property: $j_h j \leq c j_j^{(\#(h-h_1))}$.

A 8.3. Fixing the counterterm. We now proceed as in Chapter 6 but the analysis here is easier, because no end{points can appear and the bound $j_h j \leq c j_j^{(\#(h-h_1))}$ holds. As in Chapter 6, we can formally consider the flow equation up to $h = 1$, even if h_2 is a finite integer. This is because the beta function is independent of $\mathfrak{m}_k^{(2)}$, $k < h_1$ and admits bounds uniform in h . If we want to fix the counterterm z_{h_1} in such a way that $z_1 = 0$, we must have, for any $h < h_1$:

$$z_h = \sum_{k=h}^X z_{k-h-1} \beta_k(\underline{g}; \dots; g_{h_1}) : \quad (\text{A 8.1})$$

Let \mathcal{M} be the space of sequences $\underline{g} = f_1; \dots; g_{h_1}$ such that $j_h j \leq c j_j^{(\#(2)(h-h_1))}$. We look for a fixed point of the operator $T : \mathcal{M} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$ defined as:

$$(T\underline{g})_h = \sum_{k=h}^X z_{k-h-1} \beta_k(\underline{g}; \dots; g_{h_1}) : \quad (\text{A 8.2})$$

Using that β_k is independent from $\mathfrak{m}_k^{(2)}$ and the bound on the beta function, choosing ϵ small enough and proceeding as in the proof of Theorem 6.1, we find that T is a contraction on \mathcal{M} , so that we find a unique fixed point, and the rest of (7.16) follows.

A 8.4. The flows of Z_h and $\mathfrak{m}_h^{(2)}$. Once that z_{h_1} is fixed via the iterative procedure of xA 8.3, we can study in more detail the flows of Z_h and $\mathfrak{m}_h^{(2)}$ given by (7.10). Note that z_h and s_h can be again expressed as a sum over tree diagrams and, as discussed for z_h , see xA 8.2, any non vanishing diagram must have at least one vertex on scale h_1 . Then, by the short memory property, see x5.11, we have $z_h = O(\epsilon^{2-\#(h-h_1)})$ and $s_h = O(\epsilon^{2-\#(h-h_1)})$ and, repeating the proof of Lemma 6.1, we find the second and third of (7.16).

A 8.5. The Lipschitz property (7.17). Clearly, $z_{h_1}(\underline{g}; \dots; g_1) - z_{h_1}(\underline{g}; \dots; g_1)$ can be expressed via a tree expansion similar to the one discussed above; in the trees with non vanishing value, there is either a difference

of propagators at scale $h = h_1$ with couplings $a_h; b_h$ and $a_h^0; b_h^0$, giving in the dimensional bounds an extra factor $O(j_h - \frac{0}{h} j_h)$ or $O(j_h - \frac{0}{h} j_h)$; or a difference of propagators at scale $h = h_1$ (computed by definition at $\mathfrak{h}_h^{(2)} = 0$) with the "corrections" $a_h^1; b_h^1$ associated to $a_1; b_1$ or $a_1^0; b_1^0$, giving in the dimensional bounds an extra factor $O(j_1 - \frac{0}{1} j_1)$ or $O(j_1 - \frac{0}{1} j_1)$. Then,

$$\begin{aligned} h_1(\cdot; \cdot; \cdot) &= h_1(\cdot; \frac{0}{1}; \frac{0}{1}) + c j j^{\sum_{k=h_1-1}^X} \\ &= \sum_{h=h_1}^h \frac{j_h - \frac{0}{h} j_h}{h} + \frac{j_h - \frac{0}{h} j_h}{h} + \sum_{k=h-h_1}^X j_1 - \frac{0}{1} j_1 + j_1 - \frac{0}{1} j_1^i; \end{aligned} \quad (A.8.3)$$

from which, using (6.21) and (6.22), we easily get (7.17).

Appendix A 9. Independence from boundary conditions.

In this Appendix we prove that the limit $\lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} \frac{1}{M^2} \log \frac{Z_{AT}^{(1;2)}}{Z_{AT}}$ considered in §7.5 is independent of the boundary conditions φ_1, φ_2 , in particular we prove that there exist constants $C, c > 0$ such that

$$\log \frac{Z_{AT}^{(1;2)}}{Z_{AT}} = C e^{-cM^{h_2}}; \quad (A 9.1)$$

where we recall that Z_{AT} is the partition function with antiperiodic boundary conditions in all directions and h_2 is the scale introduced in §7.4. Note that, if $h_2 > 0$, as we are assuming, the propagator $g^{(1)}$ of the field has a mass $O(M^{-h_2})$. The analysis of this Appendix is based on the analogue analysis in Appendix G of [M].

By using the construction and the definitions in §3.2-§3.3, we can write

$$\log \frac{Z_{AT}^{(1;2)}}{Z} = \sum_j P_j^{(1)}(\varphi^{(1)}; \varphi^{(1)}) P_j^{(2)}(\varphi^{(2)}; \varphi^{(2)}) e^{\sim V(\varphi)}; \quad (A 9.2)$$

where $P_j^{(j)}$ are defined as in (4.28) with $P(\varphi)$ in the l.h.s. of (4.28) replaced by $P(\varphi)$ and the φ_j {boundary conditions replacing the antiperiodic ones.

Proceeding as in Chapter 4 and 5, we see that $\log \frac{Z_{AT}^{(1;2)}}{Z}$ can be written as sum of terms of the form $\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W_{1;2}(x_1, \dots, x_n)$, with x_i varying in $[\frac{M}{2}; \frac{M}{2}] \times [\frac{M}{2}; \frac{M}{2}]$ and the W are truncated expectations for which a Pfaffian expansion like (4.14) holds. Note that $W(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is periodic with period M in any of its coordinates, for any φ_1, φ_2 ; this follows from the fact that there is an even number of fields associated to any x_i . Moreover $W(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is translation invariant, so that we can fix one variable to the origin 0, for instance x_1 :

$$\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W_{1;2}(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \sum_{x_2, \dots, x_n} W_{1;2}(0; x_2, \dots, x_n); \quad (A 9.3)$$

We can write $\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W$ as $\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W + \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W$, where \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} is over the coordinates x_i varying in $[\frac{M}{4}; \frac{M}{4}] \times [\frac{M}{4}; \frac{M}{4}]$ and $\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W$ is the rest. Then $\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W$ is $O(e^{-c h_2 M})$, as in W there is surely a chain of propagators exponentially decaying connecting the point 0 with a point outside $[\frac{M}{4}; \frac{M}{4}] \times [\frac{M}{4}; \frac{M}{4}]$.

On the other hand in $\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W$ we can use the Poisson summation formula, stating that

$$\frac{1}{M} \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} f\left(\frac{n2}{M} + \frac{1}{M}\right) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}} \hat{f}(nM) (-1)^n; \quad (A 9.4)$$

where f is any smooth 2-periodic function and $\varphi = 0; 1$. From (A 9.4) we find, if $g_{M; j}(\varphi)(x)$ is the propagator corresponding to $P_j(\varphi^{(j)}; \varphi^{(j)})$:

$$g_{M; j}(\varphi)(x-y) = \sum_{n \in \mathbb{Z}^2} (\varphi_j^{(0)})^n (\varphi_j^{(1)})^{n_0} g(x-y+nM) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} g(x-y) + g_j(x-y); \quad (A 9.5)$$

where $g(x) = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} g_{M; j}(\varphi)(x)$, independent of boundary conditions. Note that the only dependence on boundary conditions in the r.h.s. of (A 9.5) is in $g_j(x-y)$ and it holds, if $|x-y| \geq \frac{M}{2}$, $|x_0-y_0| \geq \frac{M}{2}$:

$$|g_j(x-y)| \leq C e^{-c_2 h_2 M}; \quad (A 9.6)$$

with a proper constant c_2 . Hence all the terms in $\sum_{x_1, \dots, x_n} W$ with at least a $g(x-y)$ are exponentially bounded, while the part with only $g(x-y)$ is independent from boundary conditions (and it cancels in the expansion for $\log \frac{Z_{AT}^{(1;2)}}{Z_{AT}} = \log \frac{Z_{AT}}{Z_{AT}}$). This proves (A 9.1).

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Prof. J.L. Lebowitz for his nice invitations to visit Rutgers University in the last two years. Part of the work I presented here was done in the stimulating atmosphere of Rutgers University.

Vorrei ringraziare il Prof. G. Gallavotti e il Prof. G. Benfatto per la fiducia, la disponibilit  e l'interesse con cui mi hanno seguito in questi anni.

Ringrazio il Prof. G. Gentile e il Prof. F. Bonetto, con i quali ho collaborato durante tutto il corso del Dottorato, e che hanno contribuito moltissimo alla mia formazione scientifica.

Un particolare ringraziamento va infine al Prof. V. Mastropietro: gli ultimi tre anni di stretta collaborazione con lui sono stati per me importantissimi. Senza le sue idee ed il suo fondamentale contributo non sarebbe stato possibile realizzare questo lavoro.

References

- [AT] J. Ashkin, E. Teller: Statistics of Two-Dimensional Lattices with Four Components. *Phys. Rev.* 64, 178-184 (1943).
- [A80] M. Aizenman: Translation invariance and instability of phase coexistence in the two dimensional Ising system, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 73, 83{94 (1980)
- [A82] M. Aizenman: Geometric analysis of φ^4 fields and Ising models. I, II. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 86 1{48 (1982)
- [BG] G. Benfatto, G. Gallavotti: Renormalization group. *Physics notes 1*, Princeton University Press (1995).
- [BG1] G. Benfatto, G. Gallavotti: Perturbation Theory of the Fermi Surface in Quantum Liquid. A General Quasiparticle Formalism and One-Dimensional Systems. *J. Stat. Phys.* 59, 541{664 (1990).
- [BGPS] G. Benfatto, G. Gallavotti, A. Procacci, B. Scoppola: Beta function and Schwinger functions for a Many Fermions System in One Dimension. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 160, 93{171 (1994).
- [BM] G. Benfatto, V. Mastropietro: Renormalization group, hidden symmetries and approximate Ward identities in the XYZ model. *Rev. Math. Phys.* 13 (2001), no. 11, 1323{143; and *Comm. Math. Phys.* 231, 97-134 (2002)
- [BM1] G. Benfatto, V. Mastropietro: Ward identities and Chiral anomaly in the Luttinger liquid, *cond-mat/0409049*
- [BM2] G. Benfatto, V. Mastropietro: Ward Identities and Vanishing of the Beta Function for $d = 1$ Interacting Fermi Systems, *Jour. Stat. Phys.* 115, 143{184 (2004)
- [BM3] G. Benfatto, V. Mastropietro: On the density{density critical indices in interacting Fermi systems, *Comm. Math. Phys.* 231, 97{134 (2002)
- [BMW] E. Barouch, B. M. McCoy, T. T. Wu: Zero-Field Susceptibility of the Two-Dimensional Ising Model near T_c , *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 31, 1409{1411 (1973)
- [Ba] R. J. Baxter: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 26 (1971) 832; *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 26 (1971) 834; *Ann. Phys.* 70 (1972) 193, 323; (with M. N. Barber) *J. Phys. C* 6 (1973) 2913; *J. Stat. Phys.* 15 (1976) 485; *J. Stat. Phys.* 17 (1977) 1
- [Ba82] R. Baxter, *Exactly solved models in statistical mechanics*, Academic Press (1982)
- [Bad] M. Baderhah, S. Bekhechi, A. Benyoussef, M. Touzani: Finite-size-scaling study of the anisotropic spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ Ashkin-Teller model, *Physica B* 291, 394{399 (2000)
- [Bak] P. Bak, P. Kleban, W. N. Unertl, J. Ochab, G. Akinici, N. C. Bartelt, T. L. Einstein: Phase Diagram of Selenium Adsorbed on the Ni(100) Surface: A Physical Realization of the Ashkin-Teller Model, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 54, 1539{1542 (1985)
- [Bar] N. C. Bartelt, T. L. Einstein, L. T. Wille: Phase diagram and critical properties of a two-dimensional lattice-gas model of oxygen ordering in $\text{YBa}_2\text{Cu}_3\text{O}_x$, *Phys. Rev. B* 40, 10759 (1989)
- [Bez] C. G. Bezerra, A. M. Mariz, J. M. de Araujo, F. A. da Costa: The anisotropic Ashkin-Teller model: a Renormalization Group study, *Physica A* 292, 429{436 (2001)
- [Be] S. Bekhechi, A. Benyoussef, A. Elkenz, B. Ettaki, M. Loulidi: Phase transitions in the anisotropic Ashkin-Teller model, *Physica A* 264, 503{514 (1999)
- [BM1] G. Benfatto, V. Mastropietro: Ward identities and Dyson equations in interacting Fermi systems. To appear on *J. Stat. Phys.*
- [BoM] F. Bonetto, V. Mastropietro: Beta function and Anomaly of the Fermi Surface for a $d=1$ System of interacting Fermions in a Periodic Potential. *Comm. Math. Phys.* 172, 57{93 (1995).
- [C] C. G. Callan: Broken Scale Invariance in Scalar Field Theory, *Phys. Rev. D* 2, 1541{1547 (1970)
- [D] R. L. Dobrushin: Gibbsian Random Fields for lattice systems with pairwise interactions, *Func. Anal. and Appl.* 2, 292{301 (1968)

- [D J] C .DiCastro, G .Jona{Lasinio: On the Microscopic Foundation of Scaling Laws, Phys. Lett. 29A , 322-323 (1969)
- [D L] E D zyaloshinski, A . I. Larkin: Correlation functions for a one{dimensional Ferm i system with long{range interaction (Tom onagam odel), Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 65, 411 (1973) [Sov. Phys. JETP 38, 202{208 (1974)]
- [D M] C .DiCastro, W . M etzner: Ward identities and the beta function in the Luttinger liquid, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 3852{3855 (1991); Conservation laws and correlation functions in the Luttinger liquid, Phys. Rev. B 47, 16107{16123 (1993)
- [D R] E .Dom any, E .K .Riedel: Phase Transitions in Two-D im ensional System s Phys. Rev. Lett. 40, 561{564 (1978)
- [F] C .Fan, On critical properties of the Ashkin-Teller m odel, Phis. Lett., 6, 136-136 (1972)
- [F K G] C .M .Fortuin, P .W .K asteleyn, J .G inibre: Correlation inequalities on some partially ordered sets, Com m . M ath. Phys. 22, 89{104 (1971)
- [Fr] J .Froelich: On the triviality of ϕ^4_d theories and the approach to the critical point in (d = 4) dimensions, Nucl. Phys. 200B, 281{296 (1981)
- [G] A .G iuliani: G ruppo dirinormalizzazione per un sistem a di ferm ion i interagenti in due dim ensioni, D iplom a thesis, Rom a 2001.
- [G 1] G .G allavotti: Renom alization theory and U ltraviolet stability via Renom alization G roup m eth-ods, Rev. M od. Phys. 57, 471{569 (1985)
- [G M] G .G entile, V .M astropietro: Renom alization group for one-dim ensional ferm ions. A review on m athem atical results. Phys. Rep. 352 (2001), no. 4-6, 273{43
- [G M 1] A .G iuliani, V .M astropietro: Anom alous universality in the anisotropic Ashkin{Teller m odel, cond-m at/0404701, to appear on Com m . M ath. Phys.
- [G M 2] A .G iuliani, V .M astropietro: Anom alous critical exponents in the anisotropic Ashkin{Teller m odel, cond-m at/0409550, to appear on Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [G M 68] G .G allavotti, S .M iracle{Sole': Correlation functions of a lattice system , Com m . M ath. Phys. 7, 271{288 (1968)
- [G N] G .G allavotti, F .N icolb': Renom alization theory for four dim ensional scalar elds, I and II. Com m . M ath. Phys. 100, 545{590 (1985); and Com m . M ath. Phys. 101, 1{36 (1985)
- [G S] G .G entile, B .Scoppola: Renom alization G roup and the ultraviolet problem in the Luttinger m odel. Com m . M ath. Phys. 154, 153{179 (1993).
- [G r] R .B .G ri ths: Correlations in Ising ferrom agnets, I, Jour. M ath. Phys. 8, 478{483 (1967)
- [H] C .Hurst, New approach to the Ising problem , J M ath. Phys. 7, 2, 305-310 (1966)
- [H i] Y .H iguchi: On the absence of non traslationally invariant Gibbs states for the two dim ensional Ising system , in Random Fields, ed. J .Fritz, J L Lebow itz, D .Szaz, North Holland, Am sterdam (1981)
- [ID] C .Itzykson, J .D rou e, "Statistical eld theory: 1," Cambridge Univ. Press, 1989.
- [K O] B .K aufm an, L : Onsager: C rystal statistics. III. Short range order in a binary Ising lattice, Phys. Rev 76, 1244{1252 (1949)
- [K W] L .P .K adano , F .J .W egner, Phys. Rev. B 4, 3989{3993 (1971)
- [K W a] M .K ac, J .C .W ard: A Combinatorial Solution of the Two-D im ensional Ising M odel, Phys. Rev. 88, 1332{1337 (1952)
- [K a49] B .K aufm an: C rystal statistics. II. Partition function evaluation by spinor analysis, Phys. Rev 76, 1232{1243 (1949)
- [K a63] P .W .K asteleyn, D im er Statistics and phase transitions, J .M ath. Phys. 4, 287 (1963)
- [K a66] L .K adano : Scaling Laws for Ising M odels Near T c, L P .K adano , Physics 2 263 (1966)
- [K a69] L .K adano : Correlations along a line in the two{dim ensional Ising m odel, Phys. Rev. 188, 859{863 (1969)
- [K a77] L .P .K adano , Connections between the C ritical Behavior of the P lanar M odel and That of the Eight-Vertex M odel. Phys. Rev. Lett. 39, 903-905 (1977)
- [L1] E .H .L ieb: Exact solution of the problem of entropy of two-dim ensional ice, Phys. Rev. Lett., 18, 692{694, (1967); The residual entropy of square ice, Phys. Rev. 162, 162{172 (1967)

- [L2] E.H.Lieb: Exact Solution of the Fermion Model of an Antiferroelectric, Phys. Rev. Lett. 18, 1046{1048 (1967)
- [L3] E.H.Lieb: Exact Solution of the Two-Dimensional Slater KDP Model of a Ferroelectric, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 108{110 (1967)
- [LP] A.Luther, I.Peschel: Calculations of critical exponents in two dimension from quantum field theory in one dimension. Phys. Rev. B 12, 3908-3917 (1975)
- [LW] E.H.Lieb, F.Y.Wu: Two Dimensional Ferroelectric Models, in Phase Transitions and Critical Phenomena, edited by C.Domb and M.Green (Academic, 1972), Vol. 1, p. 331{490
- [Le] A.Lesniewski: Effective action for the Yukawa 2 quantum field Theory. Comm. Math. Phys. 108, 437-467 (1987).
- [Le74] J.L.Lebowitz: GHS and other inequalities, Comm. Math. Phys. 28, 313{321 (1974)
- [M] V.Mastropietro: Ising models with four spin interaction at criticality, Comm. Math. Phys. 244, 595{642 (2004)
- [ML] D.Mattis, E.Lieb: Exact solution of a many fermion system and its associated boson field. J. Math. Phys. 6, 304{312 (1965).
- [MW] B.McCoy, T.Wu, The two-dimensional Ising model, Harvard Univ. Press, 1973.
- [MPW] E.Montroll, R.Potts, J.Ward: Correlation and spontaneous magnetization of the two dimensional Ising model. J. Math. Phys. 4, 308 (1963)
- [N] M.P.M.den Nijs: Derivation of extended scaling relations between critical exponents in two dimensional models from the one dimensional Luttinger model, Phys. Rev. B, 23, 11 (1981) 6111-6125
- [O] L.Onsager: Critical statistics. A two dimensional model with an order-disorder transition. Phys. Rev., 56, 117-149 (1944)
- [PB] A.M.M.Pruisken, A.C.Brown: Universality for the critical lines of the eight vertex, Ashkin-Teller and Gaussian models, Phys. Rev. B, 23, 3 (1981) 1459-1468
- [PS] H.Pinson, T.Spencer: Universality in 2D critical Ising model, unpublished.
- [Pe] R.Peierls: On Ising's model of ferromagnetism. Proceedings of the Cambridge Philosophical Society 32, 477{481 (1936).
- [Po] J.Polchinski: Renormalization group and effective Lagrangians, Nuc. Phys. B 231, 269{295 (1984)
- [Ru63] D.Ruelle: Correlation functions of classical gases, Annals of Physics 25, 109{120 (1963)
- [Ru69] D.Ruelle: Statistical Mechanics, Benjamin, New York (1969)
- [Ru79] L.Russo: The infinite cluster method in the two dimensional Ising model, Comm. Math. Phys. 67, 251{266 (1979)
- [S] S.Samuel: The use of anticommuting variable integrals in statistical mechanics", J. Math. Phys. 21 (1980) 2806
- [SML] T.D.Schultz, D.Mattis, E.H.Lieb: Two-dimensional Ising model as a soluble problem of many fermions, Rev. Mod. Phys. 36 856{871 (1964)
- [So] J.Solyom: The Fermi gas model of one-dimensional conductors, Adv. Phys. 28, 201{303 (1979)
- [Spe] T.Spencer: A mathematical approach to universality in two dimensions. Physica A 279, 250-259 (2000).
- [Su] B.Sutherland: Exact Solution of a Two-Dimensional Model for Hydrogen-Bonded Crystals, Phys. Rev. Lett. 19, 103{104 (1967); Two-Dimensional Hydrogen Bonded Crystals, J. Math. Phys. 11, 3183{3186 (1970)
- [Sy] K.Symon: Small distance behaviour in field theory and power counting, Comm. Math. Phys. 18 227-246 (1970)
- [TM] C.A.Tracy, B.M.McCoy: Neutron Scattering and the Correlation Functions of the Ising Model near T_c , Phys. Rev. Lett. 31, 1500{1504 (1973)
- [W] F.J.Wegner: Duality relation between the Ashkin-Teller and the eight-vertex model, J. Phys. C, 5, L131{L132 (1972)
- [W1] K.G.Wilson: Renormalization Group and Critical Phenomena. 1. Renormalization Group and The Kadanoff Scaling Picture, Phys. Rev. B 4, 3174 (1971)

- [W 2] K.G.Wilson: Renormalization Group and Critical Phenomena. 2. Phase Space Cell Analysis of Critical Behavior, Phys. Rev. B 4, 3184 (1971)
- [W F] K.G.Wilson, M.E.Fisher: Critical exponents in 3.99 dimensions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 28, 240-243 (1972)
- [W L] F.Y.Wu, K.Y.Lin: Two phase transitions in the Ashkin-Teller model. J.Phys. C, 5, L181-L184 (1974).
- [W M T B] T.T.Wu, B.M.McCoy, C.A.Tracy, E.Barouch: Spin-spin correlation functions for the two-dimensional Ising model: Exact theory in the scaling region, Phys. Rev. B 13, 316-374 (1976)
- [W u] F.W.Wu: The Ising model with four spin interaction. Phys. Rev. B 4, 2312-2314 (1971).
- [Ya] C.N.Yang: The spontaneous magnetization of a two-dimensional Ising model, Phys. Rev. 85, 808-816 (1952)
- [Z J] J.Zinn-Justin: Quantum field theory and critical phenomena (Oxford University Press, 2002)