Renormelization

As is common in QFT, we encounter ultraviolet (NV) divergences when we comparte quentum corrections. In a renormelizable theory, these can be absorbed into renormalized perameters and the field normelizations. To control the divergences, one needs to regularize the theory. This regularization can destroy some symmetries of the theory, e.g. a hard cutoff on momente destroys Lorentz invariance and gauge invariance. It can be very cumpersome to reffore these someties ty had after renormalization.

using dim. reg. In principle, renormalization in QED and QCD is fimilar, but the sciency which are used are different. In QED one typically chooses puysical quantities, e.g. me and then absorbs the divergences into these. In QCD, the low-energy dynamics is complicated and there is no physical querk meet and no physical compaint

There is only on known regularization which preserves both gange & Lorentz invariance: dimensional regularization (dim. reg.). For this reason permative all modern QFT computations are performed

analogous to
$$\alpha = \alpha(q^2 = 0)$$
 in QED.
Instead, one simply absorbs divergences
into parameters in d to obtain finite
Green's functions. Since the parameters
are not physical, they typically
depend on the renormalization scale μ .
let us define renormalized parameters:
 $g_0 = Z_g g_s \mu^2$
bare renormalized $g_r = g_r(\mu)$
 $m_{g_0} = Z_m m_f$
 $g_0 = Z_g g \leq m_f^2$

We also define renormalized fields

 $A^{a}_{o\mu} = Z^{\nu_{2}}_{A} A^{e}_{\mu} ,$ $\Psi_{0} = 2^{\frac{1}{2}} \Psi_{1}$ $\gamma_{0} = \overline{z}_{\gamma}^{\prime \prime} \gamma_{\gamma}$ We then expend $\alpha_s = \frac{9^s}{4\pi}$ $\overline{Z}_{i} = 1 + \frac{\alpha_{s}}{4\pi} \left[\frac{c_{i}^{\varsigma-1}}{s} + c_{i}^{\varsigma-7} \right]$ $+ \frac{\alpha_{s}^{2}}{4\pi} \left[\begin{array}{c} c_{i}^{(2)} \\ \vdots \\ s^{2} \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} c_{i}^{(-1)} \\ \varepsilon \end{array} + \begin{array}{c} c_{i}^{(-1)} \\ \varepsilon \end{array} \right]$

where d = 4 - 25 is the space-time dimension. Divergences show up as $\frac{1}{5}$ poles in loop integrals.

2-point



















-point

3













To investigate whether & diagrem is nu divergent, one counts the powers of momenta in the integrand.



coor v L

fordk ~ kd ~ kt

yon ~ k

(dervative Compling)

e.g.

Superficiel degrée of divergence D=0. $\int_{k}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \sum_{k=1$... logerithmicely divergen t

Of course, it can happen that the divergent part vanishes when comparing the integral, e.g.



but a diagram au never be more divergent than the superficiel degree of divergence introduced above.

When we introduced renormalized parameters, we implicitly assumed that the renormalized Lagrengian has the same somethic as the tree-level one, i.e. we introduced only one renormalized compling, despite the fact that there are several terms where 8 appears



It is quite natural (teaque of gauge invariance) that this works and one can show that it works to all orders by using Slavnov-Taylor identifies which relate different Green's functions, Let us look gt an explicit example, In the exercise clers we computed

$$Z_{\Psi} \overline{\Psi}(i \not \partial - z_m m) \Psi$$

$$= \overline{\Psi}(i \not \partial - m) \Psi + \delta_{\Psi} \overline{\Psi}(i \not \partial - m) \Psi$$

$$- \delta_m m \overline{\Psi} \Psi + O(\delta^2)$$

 $\sim q^4 \sim \alpha_s^2$

$$-i\Sigma = i \not = d \psi + \cdots$$

$$- \not = - \not = \delta_{\psi} + m_{\zeta} (d_{\psi} + \delta_{m})$$

$$S_{4} = \frac{\alpha_{s}}{4\pi} \left[\frac{c_{\mp}}{\epsilon} \left(1 - \frac{2}{5} \right) + c_{4}^{(o)} \right]$$
$$S_{m} = \frac{\alpha_{s}}{4\pi} \left[-\frac{c_{\mp}}{\epsilon} 3 + c_{m}^{(o)} \right]$$

The finiteness of the two-point fuction fixes the divergent pert,

but different choices for the finite part are possible. The Simplest scheme is Minimal subtraction (MS), where only the divergent pieces are subtracted. Proceeding in this way, we now have a finite quarle mass mg(m). This qual mass is a parameter in daco. It is not directly physical (depends on p!) but we can compute physical quantities in terns of this mass. This makes

taking about quark metters a bit deficate: since we do not have free quarks, there is no such thing as THE quark mass. Inspeed, we must specify the scheme & scale, when telking about these quentity.

$$\mathcal{Z}_{g} = \Lambda - \frac{\alpha_{s}}{4\pi} \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \left(\frac{11}{3} C_{\mp} - \frac{4}{3} n_{g} T_{\mp} \right)$$

With this, we have remometized the theory at one loop. When expressed in terms of the MS parameters $m_{g}(\mu)$, $\alpha_{s}(\mu) = g_{s(\mu)/\omega\pi}$, we obtain finite remits for the Green's functions of the theory. Of conse, since these are Green's functions of querke and gluons, it is not clear at all what their physical significance is. We will cone back to this in the second part of the lecture.