UB-ECM-PF 96/7 hep-ph/9602123 February 1996

W ilsonian vs. 1P I renom alization group ow irreversibility

JordiCOMELLAS and Jose Ignacio LATORREY

Departament d'Estructura i Constituents de la Materia and I.F.A.E. Facultat de Fisica, Universitat de Barcelona Diagonal 647, 08028 Barcelona, Spain

#### A bstract

We present a line of reasoning based on the analysis of scale variations of the W ilsonian partition function and the trace of the stress tensor in a curved manifold which results in a statement of irreversibility of W ilsonian renormalization group ow for unitary theories. We also analyze subtleties related to subtractions in the case of the 1PIe ective action ow.

e-m ail: com ellas@ sophia.eom ub.es <sup>y</sup>e-m ail: latorre@ sophia.eom ub.es

#### N ote

An error in section 2 (which does not a ect sections 3 and 4) invalidates the ow equation for  $c_w$ . The paper has been temporarily withdrawn from publication.

### 1 A bit of history

Loss of inform ation seems inevitable as short-distance degrees of freedom are integrated out in favor of an e ective long-distance description of any physical system. This intuition, which amounts to a statement of irreversibility of renormalization group (RG) trajectories, m ight be deceptive. A renormalization group transformation is made out of two steps: integration of modes (K adano transformation) followed by a rescaling of the variables of the system. Their combination is not obviously irreversible, in particular when a reshu ing of the H ilbert space comes along with the long distance realization of the theory.

The e orts to sort out this question started with the perturbative analysis of  $4 \text{ with N} - \cos m$  ponents m ade by W allace and Zhia [1], proving that the beta functions of the m odel are indeed gradient ows up to three loops. The irreversibility conjecture was proven to be correct in that context and, furtherm ore, it was im m ediate to realize that

$$i = \mathcal{Q}_{iC} \qquad ! \qquad \begin{array}{c} & Z & g_{IR} \\ & g_{IV} & dg^{i} & i = C & 0; \end{array}$$
(1)

where  $c = c(g^i)$  is the function from which i are derived and  $g_{UV}$ ;  $g_{IR}$  label the UV and IR xed points delimiting the RG ow. Thus, a su cient, but not necessary, condition for inversibility of RG ows is that the -functions of a theory are gradient ows. What is just necessary to prove is that an observable quantity existing in any theory decreases monotonically along the RG ows.

W ith the advent of conform al eld theories, Zam olodchikov constructed a function that decreases along RG trajectories in two-dimensional unitary eld theories [2]. This function reduces to the central charge of the conform all theory at xed points (thus, Zam olodchikov's result is often referred as the c-theorem). The elements of Zam olodchikov's proof were Lorentz invariance, conservation of the stress tensor and unitarity.

Later on, som e groups have forcefully tried to extend Zam olodchikov's remarkable achievem ent to higher dimensional theories. Cardy [3] considered the ow of the integrated trace of the stress tensor on a sphere,  $S^n$ , as a candidate of a c-function. H is idea consisted in trading the explicit subtraction point dependence () for the one in the radius of the sphere (a<sup>1</sup>),

$$c(g(t);t) = h \qquad g(x) \qquad (x)i; \qquad (2)$$

where t  $\ln \frac{1}{a}$ , so that  $\ell = a\ell_a$ , where a is the inverse of the radius of the sphere. A RG transform ation, usually unsderstood as an enlargement of all relative distances, is here realized as a blow up of the sphere. The RG ow of this c-candidate is related to the correlator of two stress tensors, yet the appearance of other contributions seemed to spoil the irreversibility proof. An appealing feature of C ardy's idea is that his candidate reduces to the Euler density coe cient of the trace anomaly at conformal eld theory [4]. For instance, in four dimensions,

h (x) 
$$i_{\text{ft}} = \frac{1}{2880}$$
 (3aF (x) + bG (x) + c $\square$ R (x)) =) h  $p_{\overline{g}} = \frac{1}{2880} 32^{-2}$ b (M); (3)

where  $F = C^2 = R^2 2R^2 + \frac{1}{3}R^2$ ,  $G = R^2 4R^2 + R^2$  and (M) the Euler characteristic of the manifold. Whereas a has been proven to be related to the positive coe cient of the spin 2 structure in the correlator of two stress tensors in at space [5], b is only empirically known to be positive for conformal free bosons, fermions and vectors (its actual value is 1, 11 and 62, respectively). This b coe cient as a candidate was further analyzed and modiled by 0 sborn [6] proving an evolution equation reminiscent of the two-dimensional case. Unitarity did not enter the construction and, again, irreversibility was not proven.

A di erent approach was taken in ref. [5, 7] where the starting point was unitarity via the spectral representation of two stress tensor correlators. A reform ulation of Zam olodchikov's result is achieved considering

$$hT (x)T (0)i = \frac{z_1}{3} d c(;t) \frac{d^2p}{(2)^2} e^{ipx} \frac{(g p^2 p p)(g p^2 p p)}{p^2 + 2} :$$
(4)

The spectral function describes the central charge of UV and  $\mathbb{R}$  xed points associated to a given ow as  $\mathbf{Z}$ 

 $c(;t) = q_{IR} () + g_{m ooth} (;t) \quad q_{UV} = d c(;t)$  (5)

where t is the RG  $\,$  ow parameter. Therefore,  $c_{UV}$   $c_{IR}$ . At long distances, only massless modes survive, entering the spectral representation as a delta of the spectral parameter. Unitarity yields positivity of  $c_{sm \ ooth}$ , thus, interversibility. This proof emphasizes the role of the stress tensor as a mean to account for all degrees of freedom, and to quantify the decoupling of massive ones along RG trajectories. The extension of this idea to higher dimensions encounters a rst complication due to the existence of two spin structures in the hTTi correlator. Since RG ows are related to a change of scale, it is natural to focus attention in the spin 0 spectral density. The problem turns out to be that, at conform all eld theories in n dimensions,

$$c^{(0)}() ! c^{(0) n 2}()$$
 (6)

and  $c^{(0)}$  is unobservable, at least as a well-de ned quantity of the conform al eld theory. The way out proposed was to de ne  $c^{(0)}$  using a limit from the ow itself

$$c^{(0)}$$
 ()  $\lim_{t \to 0} \frac{c^{(0)}(;t)}{n 2}$  : (7)

Any limiting procedure which allows for a de nition of  $c^{(0)}$  yields a decreasing quantity. The ctheorem is then proved in any perturbative expansion. These results were veriled through examples in ref. [7].

Further e orts have been devoted to understand the validity of the above proposed candidates as well as to form ulate the theorem by other means [8]. Let us here sum marize what we think are essential ingredients of the statem ent of irreversibility of RG ow s and, consequently, ought to enter its proof in one way or another. We reduce such essentials to two:

a) The c-function must be sensitive to all degrees of freedom of the theory.

b) The sign of the derivative of the c-function with respect to the ow parameter must be dictated by unitarity.

Therefore, it is not essential that the c-function reduces to any simple quantity known in the theory, although it would be welcome that such a possibility were realized. Neither much emphasis should be put on the fact that beta-functions are gradient of the c-function.

Upon a simple relection, it is clear that all candidates so far explored, including Zam olodchikov's original one in two dimensions, are constructed from the stress tensor. This operator exists for every theory and couples to all degrees of freedom. Furthermore, it does not pick anom alous dimensions and its correlators obey useful W and identities. It is not yet settled whether the attemps to form ulate the theorem in higher dimensions have so far missed some basic ingredient. On one hand, the integrated trace of the energy momentum tensor, which carries spin 0, generates a change of scale, but its variation has not been related to unitarity. On the other hand, the spectral representation approach lacks the explicit formulation of a candidate at the conform all theory. Yet the above requisits may be too stringent. The lesson from two dimensions is that c counts massless degrees of freedom whereas c quantiles the decoupled massive modes. This modiles a little bit the above point a). Similarly, we may also bring down unitarity requirements of point b) in the following way. If the c-function is stationary at xed points, it is just su cient to nd a negative sign of its derivative anywhere along the low. Then, the function will remain decreasing till a new xed point is reached.

W e here propose to combine all this accumulated know ledge in the following way. There is an obvious quantity in any eld theory which is sensitive to all degrees of freedom : the W ilsonian partition function. W e de ne it (in euclidean space) as

$$Z [g^{i}(t);t] \qquad d'_{p} e^{S}; \qquad (8)$$

where t  $\ln \frac{UV}{IR}$  is the RG ow parameter. As more degrees of freedom are integrated out, t! 1.0 ften, we consider eld theories with the purpose of computing G reen functions. Then, the renormalization procedure trades  $_{UV}$  for a subtraction point and  $_{IR}$  can be safely sent to 0 if external momenta are di erent from zero (otherwise, an IR regulator is necessary). We shall come back to this generating function for connected G reen functions later on.

The absence of external sources shields the properties of the partition function from a simple analysis. We have found most convenient to consider eld theories de ned on a curved space, e.g. on the S<sup>n</sup> sphere with radius a <sup>1</sup>. We may consider a to be arbitrarily small, so that we use it both as an external source for the stress tensor and as an IR regulator, taking over the role of  $_{\rm IR}$ . Stress tensor correlators are de ned as [5],

$$h^{p} \overline{g} T \quad (x)i = 2V \frac{\partial \ln Z}{\partial g \quad (x)}; \qquad (9)$$

$$h^{p}\overline{g}T (x)^{p}\overline{g}T (y)i = 4V^{2}\frac{\theta}{\theta g(x)}\frac{\theta}{\theta g(y)}hZ + \frac{V}{n}hi^{n}(x y)^{p}\overline{g}ggg(g') g'g'); (10)$$

where  $V = \frac{2}{\binom{n+1}{2}}$  is the standard volume factor of a sphere. A simple de nition of these correlators in terms of functional derivatives with respect to the metric would lead to a violation of dieom orphism W and Identities at contact terms. This is the reason to subtract a delta term in eq. (10), which has been further simplied using properties of maximally symmetric spaces. As it stands, both r hT i = 0 and r hT T i = 0 are obeyed. Further properties of T are discussed in ref. [9, 10].

We are now in the position of stream lining our construction.

### 2 Irreversibility of the W ilsonian RG

Consider a eld theory de ned on a S<sup>n</sup> sphere of radius a <sup>1</sup>. We construct the following dim ensionless quantity based on the W ilsonian partition function

$$a_{W} (g^{i}(t);t) = g(x)h (x)i + nV \ln Z;$$
(11)

where  $t = \ln \frac{1}{2}$ , being an UV scale. This function obeys the RG equation

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} + \frac{\theta}{i \theta g^{i}} c_{W} (g^{i}(t);t) = 0:$$
(12)

W e need to study the RG  $\,$  ow of  $c_W$  , that is

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} c_{W} = \frac{\theta}{1 \theta g^{i}} c_{W} : \qquad (13)$$

The t dependence can be com puted as

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} = -a \frac{\theta}{\theta a}; \qquad (14)$$

which rejects the fact that changing the scale at which physics is considered can be done by varying the radius of the sphere. This is nothing else than the starting point of Cardy's analysis. In a symmetric space it is also true that

$$a\frac{\theta}{\theta a} = 2 g (x) \frac{g}{g (x)}; \qquad (15)$$

a change in the scale factor is obtained as a W eyl transform ation.

U sing the de nitions in eq. (9, 10) we, rst, have that

$$f_{g(x)h}(x)i = 2Vg(x) - \frac{1}{g(x)} \ln Z;$$
 (16)

$$q - \frac{1}{g(x)h(x)(y)i} = 2Vg(x) - \frac{1}{g(x)h(y)i}$$
(17)

As a particular case, these relations control the trace anomaly at conformal eld theory. The trace of the energy momentum tensor does not vanish, neither its correlators at coincident points, although  $_i(g^j) = 0$ . Putting together all the ingredients

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} q_{W} = a \frac{\theta}{\theta a} q_{W} = 2 g (x) \frac{1}{g (x)} c = \frac{1}{V} \frac{z z q}{x y} \frac{-q}{g (x)} \frac{q}{g (y)} h (x) (y) i \qquad (18)$$

Thus,

$$\frac{\varrho}{\varrho t} c_{W} = \frac{1}{V} h_{X}^{Z} p_{\overline{g}} (x)_{Y}^{Z} p_{\overline{g}} (y) i \quad 0:$$
(19)

The c-function we have constructed from the W ilsonian partition function decreases along RG ow s. All intermediate steps are well-de ned as the partition function is equipped with both an UV and

IR cut-o at the outset. This obviates problem s related to subtractions or non-analiticity at zero momentum, in close analogy to the currently widely used idea that the W ilsonian e ective action is analytic in momenta. The exact renorm alization group equation can be expanded in momenta due to the ubiquous presence of cut-o s. It is a delicate issue how to handle the case of the ow for the 1PIe ective action, which we postpone to the next section.

O ur candidate in eq. (11) provides a synthesis of several ideas previously considered. It takes C ardy's conjecture as a starting point, bringing a piece of the needed irreversibility together with a term which spoils it. This is connected with the introduction of the log of the partition function. Some a authors had conjectured that the partition function itself would be enough to provide a c-function. Such a possibility is de nitely ruled out in at space as easily seen in the example of a free boson plus a free ferm ion. The overall partition function cancels, therefore the piece coming from a free boson ows decreases as the one for a free ferm ion increases. It also follows that a naive use of the exact renorm alization group equation to settle irreversibility of the ow is insu cient. The equation controls the ow of the partition function which does not decrease monotonically as we just pointed out.

## 3 1PIe ective action ow

We would like to explore the limit of the ow equation we have gotten in the previous section to the case where  $_{\rm UV}$  is sent to in nity. This is carried through a standard renorm alization procedure that trades  $_{\rm UV}$  for a subtraction point , often sending also  $_{\rm IR}$  ! 0, when external m om enta of G reen functions are kept di erent from zero. This limit of the partition function leads, upon a legendre transform ation, to the 1PI e ective action. For convenience, we shall call it 1PI partition function. The W ilsonian partition function ow interpolates between two theories, but loops associated to the second, IR, theory remain to be done. In the 1PI e ective action we do integrate all modes.

From the point of view of our inneversibility argument, two issues need to be reconsidered. The rst one, IR ! 0 is bypassed since the curvature provides a natural IR cut-o. To keep b as an essential ingredient of the c-function at conform alpoints, it is necessary to work in curved space. Therefore, we concentrate on the UV limit.

Let us rst note that the stress tensors correlators are de ned from the renorm alized partition function. Standard coupling constants and wave-function renorm alizations have been performed. Furthermore, the stress tensor combines the wave-function renorm alization of its constituent elds with a composite operator one such that  $_{\rm bare} = _{\rm ren}$  and, thus, carries no anom alous dimensions. W hat remains is just a subtraction in the two-point correlator hT (x)T (0)i. It is convenient to understand this point in terms of the freedom of scheme brought by the renorm alization procedure. In four dimensions, the above correlator has dimension 8, but W and Identities dictate the presence of 4 derivatives which leaves a freedom of a contact term.

On a sphere of radius a  $^{1}$ , the spectral representation takes the form

h (x) (0) 
$$i = \frac{2}{40} a^2 a^2$$
 d ()  $4a^2 G(;r);$  (20)

where labels the scalar representations of SO  $(1;4)_{h}$  is the covariant laplacian, r the geodesic distance and G (;r) the appropriate G reen function,  $a^{2}(2 - \frac{9}{4}) G(;r) = \frac{p^{4}(x)}{q(x)}$ . At CFT,

() = 0  $(\frac{5}{2})$ . A detailed analysis [5] reveals the presence of a contact term

h (x) (y) 
$$i = \frac{2}{40}a^2$$
 c  $4a^2 - \frac{4}{p}\frac{(x-y)}{q(x)}$ : (21)

U sing eq. 17, one proves that this contact term is related to the coe cient of the spectral function at the conform alpoint,  $_0$  0, and the b trace anom aly coe cient in the following way [5]

$$b = _{0} + _{c}$$
: (22)

Through examples,  $_{c}$  at most cancels  $_{0}$  (in odd dimensions) but never overcomes it, heaving b 0 always. We have a weak argument for this result. Take a resolution of the identity on the r.h.s. of (19), Z = Z

$$\begin{array}{cccc} x & z & p \\ h & \overline{g} & jnihn & \overline{g} & \overline{g} & i & 0 \end{array}$$
(23)

A unitarity argument of this sort, if applicable on integrated objects, yields irreversibility for the 1PI e ective action. The above argument is protected from IR in nities in S<sup>4</sup>. This reasoning would preserve the sign of the rhs. in eq. (19) in the 1PI case at the same time that would also explain the elusive positivity of b.

# 4 Review of Cardy's proposal

A s discussed earlier, a theorem stating inversibility of RG trajectories just needs proving a de nite sign for the derivative of an observable quantity on the ow parameter. This, though, stays one step short from a powerful quantitative tool if there is no simple way to characterize the c-function. The discussion in the two previous sections is missing such a point. We already noted that the welcom e properties of a c-function are those o ered by the original two-dimensional case: the c-function should be stationary at conform all eld theory; at these points, the c-number should be easily computable; and, in the best of the worlds, beta-functions should be gradient ow s.

The understanding of contact terms in stress tensor correlators, as explored in the previous section, allows for a more detailed analysis of a simpler candidate for the c-theorem. Let us reconsider C ardy's proposal of eq. (2) in dimension 4. Its variation along the ow can be derived using the equations in section 2,

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} c(g^{i}(t);t) = \frac{1}{V} \frac{\sum Q}{x y} \frac{q}{g(x)} \frac{q}{g(y)h}(x) (y)i + n c(g^{i}(t);t):$$
(24)

This quantity is not obviously negative due to the presence of the last term . One can trace the two terms in the rhs. to the variation of  $and^p \overline{g}$  respectively. In a way, the competition of these two terms is forced by the adim ensional character of c. At conformal eld theory, this c-function reduces to the b coe cient of the trace anom aly and is stationary,

$$\frac{\theta}{\theta t} c_{q^{i}=q^{i}} = \frac{\theta}{\theta t} b = 0;$$
(25)

because the r.h.s. yields and exact cancellation between the contact term coming from the two-point correlator and the trace anomaly, as derived from eq. (17).

It is clear that  $@_tc = 0$  at xed points in plies that it is su cient to nd a negative sign of  $@_tc$  at any interm ediate point to have a proof of irreversibility. This, indeed, was done by C ardy near a xed point using conform alperturbation theory for quasi-m arginal deform ations. H is computation builds m ore con dence of the validity of the theorem but is still not a proof.

Let us go back to the above observation about the exact cancellation of the rhs. of eq. (24) at xed points. The origin of this simplication is rooted in the operator product expansion of (x) (0). It is known that the identity contribution in the at space OPE is [4, 5, 10]

T (x)T (0) 
$$c^{(2)}$$
; (0)  $\frac{1}{x^4}$  + ::: (26)

where  $\binom{(2)}{2}$ ; (C) stands for a spin 2 projector and  $c^{(2)}$  can be shown to coincide with the a coe cient of the W eyl square density in the trace anom aly (3). This, indeed, provides a connection between spin 2 at space non-local correlators and spin 0 contact terms in curved space. In curved space, the OPE for the traces of stress tensors contains a delta term

(x) (0) 
$$\frac{4}{V}$$
 (0)  $4$  (x) + non-local term s (27)

Indeed, this contact term is needed in the OPE for consistency of the anomaly in curved space. The factor 4 is related to the classical (as well as quantum) dimension of , whereas the factor V is present due to our de nition of . No other contact terms are present by dimensional and scaling arguments. The global prefactor is xed by the way the OPE works in the conform al case. A way from the xed point, we have so far no control on the relation between the two terms in the rh.s. of eq.(24).

The above analysis adds some understanding to the RG ow of the Euler density coe cient in the trace anomaly but does not prove its irreversibility yet. More inconclusive but tantalizing evidence was presented through an example by Cardy. Consider QCD at short and long distances. A symptotic freedom allows for an easy computation of  $c_{\rm UV} = 11N_{\rm f}N_{\rm c} + 62(N_{\rm c}^2 - 1)$  whereas its chiral realization in plies  $c_{\rm IR} = (N_{\rm f}^2 - 1)$ , since b = 1;11;62 for bosons, fermions and vectors. It follows that  $c_{\rm UV} > c_{\rm IR}$ . Moreover, in ref. [11], a large number of exact results have been checked against the above c-function and system atic validity of the would-be theorem has been found.

O ne deep, uncanny lesson hidden in this ideas is that ferm ions weight m ore than bosons. This is not so in two dimensions as a D irac ferm ion has the same central charge as a boson, which is at the origin of exact bosonization. This is no longer true in higher dimensions. Long distance realizations would, in general, favor bosons. This might represent just a glim pse of a deep reletation between RG irreversibility and G oldstone theorem.

## 5 A cknow ledgm ents

W e are indebted for the insights shared in countless discussions with A.Cappelli, P.E.Haagensen, E.M oreno and P.Pascual.

F inancial support from C IC Y T, contract A E N 95-0590, and C IR IT, contract G R Q 93-1047, are also acknow ledged.

#### References

[1] D J.W allace and R K P. Zhia, Phys. Rep. 12C (1974) 75

- [2] A B.Zam olodchikov, JEPT Lett. 43 (1986) 730; Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. 46 (1987) 1090
- [3] J.L. Cardy, Phys. Lett. B 215 (1988) 749
- [4] M J.Du , Nucl. Phys. B125 (1977) 334
- [5] A. Cappelli, D. Friedan and J.I. Latorre, Nucl. Phys. B 352 (1991) 616
- [6] H.Osborn, Phys. Lett. B222 (1989) 97;
   I.Jack and H.Osborn, Nucl. Phys. B343 (1990) 647
- [7] A. Cappelli, J.I. Latorre and X. Vilas s-Cardona, Nucl. Phys. B376 (1992) 510;
   D. Freedman, J.I. Latorre and X. Vilas s-Cardona, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 6 (1991) 531;
   G.M. Shore, Phys. Lett. B253 (1991) 380; B256 (1991) 407
- [8] A.H.Castro Neto and E.Fradkin, Nucl.Phys.B400 (1993) 525;
  P.Haagensen, Yu.Kubishin, J.I.Latorre and E.Moreno Phys.Lett.B323 (1994) 330;
  X.Vilas s-Cardona, Nucl.Phys.B435 (1995) 635;
  A.C.Petkou, Phys.Lett.B359 (1995) 101;
  V.Periwal, Mod.Phys.Lett.A10 (1995) 1543;
  J.Gaite and D.O'Connor, \Field Theory entropy and the renormalization group", hep-th/9511090
- [9] J.Polchinski, Nucl.Phys.B303 (1988) 226;
   E.K raus and K.Sibold, Nucl.Phys.B372 (1992) 113;
   S.Deser and A.Schwimmer, Phys.Lett.B309 (1993) 279
- [10] A.Cappelli and A.Coste, Nucl. Phys. B 314 (1989) 707
- [11] F.Bastianelli, \Tests for C-theorem s in 4D ", hep-th/9511065