

The low-momentum ghost dressing function and the gluon mass

Ph. Boucaud^a, M. E. Gómez^b, J.P. Leroy^a, A. Le Yaouanc^a, J. Micheli^a,
O. Pène^a, J. Rodríguez-Quintero^b

^aLaboratoire de Physique Théorique¹

Université de Paris XI, Bâtiment 211, 91405 Orsay Cedex, France

^bDpto. Física Aplicada, Fac. Ciencias Experimentales,
Universidad de Huelva, 21071 Huelva, Spain.

Abstract

We study the low-momentum ghost propagator Dyson-Schwinger equation (DSE) in Landau gauge, assuming for the truncation a constant ghost-gluon vertex, as it is extensively done, and a simple model for a massive gluon propagator. Then, regular DSE solutions (the zero-momentum ghost dressing function not diverging) appear to emerge and we show the ghost propagator to be described by an asymptotic expression reliable up to the order $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$. That expression, depending on the gluon mass and the zero-momentum Taylor-scheme effective charge, is proven to fit pretty well the low-momentum ghost propagator obtained through big-volume lattice simulations.

UHU-FP/10-023

LPT-Orsay/10-29

1 Introduction

A few years ago (see for instance [1]), a vanishing gluon propagator and a diverging ghost dressing function at zero-momentum in Landau gauge were extensively accepted as the solutions for the tower of Dyson-Schwinger equations (DSE). In contrast, alternative DSE solutions were also predicted to give a massive gluon propagator [2,3]. Lattice QCD (LQCD) estimates for those propagators appeared to be also in contradiction with a gluon propagator that vanishes at zero-momentum or with a ghost dressing function that diverges [4–7]. We addressed this issue in two recent papers [8,9] and tried to clarify the contradiction. After assuming in the vanishing momentum limit a ghost dressing function behaving as $F(q^2) \sim (q^2)^{\alpha_F}$ and a gluon propagator as $\Delta(q^2) \sim (q^2)^{\alpha_G-1}$ (or, by following a notation commonly used, a gluon dressing function as $G(q^2) = q^2\Delta(q^2) \sim (q^2)^{\alpha_G}$), we proved that the ghost propagator DSE (GPDSE) admits two types of solutions:

- If $\alpha_F \neq 0$, the low-momentum behaviour of both gluon and ghost propagators are related by the condition $2\alpha_F + \alpha_G = 0$ implying that $F^2(q^2)G(q^2)$ goes to a non-vanishing constant when $q^2 \rightarrow 0$.
- If $\alpha_F = 0$, the low-momentum leading term of the gluon propagator is constrained not any longer by the leading but instead by the next-to-leading one of the ghost propagator, and LQCD solutions indicating that $F^2(q^2)G(q^2) \rightarrow 0$ when $q^2 \rightarrow 0$ [4,5] can be pretty well accomodated within this case.

¹Unité Mixte de Recherche 8627 du Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique

that, after omitting colour indices and dividing both sides by k^2 , in Landau gauge reads

$$\frac{1}{F(k^2)} = 1 + g_0^2 N_c \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \left(\frac{F(q^2) \Delta((q-k)^2)}{q^2(q-k)^2} \left[\frac{(k \cdot q)^2}{k^2} - q^2 \right] H_1(q, k) \right); \quad (1)$$

where F stands for the ghost dressing function and Δ for the full gluon propagator form factor,

$$\langle \tilde{A}_\mu^a(k) \tilde{A}_\nu^a(-k) \rangle = g_{\mu\nu}^T(k) \delta^{ab} \Delta(k^2), \quad (2)$$

with $k^2 g_{\mu\nu}^T(q) = k^2 g_{\mu\nu} - k_\mu k_\nu$. The standard tensor decomposition for the ghost-gluon vertex,

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Gamma}_\nu^{abc}(-q, k; q-k) &= i g_0 f^{abc} q_{\nu'} \tilde{\Gamma}_{\nu'\nu}(-q, k; q-k) \\ &= i g_0 f^{abc} (q_\nu H_1(q, k) + (q-k)_\nu H_2(q, k)), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

is applied, where q and k are respectively the outgoing and incoming ghost momenta and g_0 is the bare coupling constant. It should be noticed that, because of the transversality condition, H_2 defined in eq. (3) does not contribute for the GPDSE in the Landau gauge. The integral equation (1) is written in terms of bare Green functions. However, this equation is only meaningful after the specification of some appropriate UV-cut-off Λ , for instance: $F(k^2) \rightarrow F(k^2, \Lambda)$. It can be cast into a renormalized form by dealing properly with UV divergencies, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} g_R^2(\mu^2) &= Z_g^{-2}(\mu^2, \Lambda) g_0^2(\Lambda) \\ k^2 \Delta_R(k^2, \mu^2) &= Z_3^{-1}(\mu^2, \Lambda) G(k^2, \Lambda) \\ F_R(k^2, \mu^2) &= \tilde{Z}_3^{-1}(\mu^2, \Lambda) F(k^2, \Lambda), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where μ^2 is the renormalization momentum and Z_g, Z_3 and \tilde{Z}_3 the renormalization constants for the coupling, the gluon and the ghost respectively. Z_g is related to the ghost-gluon vertex renormalization constant (defined by $\tilde{\Gamma}_R = \tilde{Z}_1 \Gamma_B$) through $Z_g = \tilde{Z}_1 (Z_3^{1/2} \tilde{Z}_3)^{-1}$. Then Taylor's well-known non-renormalization theorem, which states that $H_1(q, 0) + H_2(q, 0) = 1$ in Landau gauge and to any perturbative order, can be invoked to conclude that \tilde{Z}_1 is finite. Thus,

$$\frac{1}{F_R(k^2, \mu^2)} = \tilde{Z}_3(\mu^2, \Lambda) + N_C \tilde{Z}_1 g_R^2(\mu^2) \Sigma_R(k^2, \mu^2; \Lambda) \quad (5)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_R(k^2, \mu^2; \Lambda) &= \int^{q^2 < \Lambda^2} \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \\ &\times \left(\frac{F_R(q^2, \mu^2) \Delta_R((q-k)^2, \mu^2)}{q^2(q-k)^2} \left[\frac{(k \cdot q)^2}{k^2} - q^2 \right] H_{1,R}(q, k; \mu^2) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

One should notice that the UV cut-off, Λ , is still required as an upper integration bound in eq. (6) since the integral is UV-divergent, behaving as $\int dq^2/q^2 (1 + 11\alpha_S/(2\pi) \log(q/\mu))^{-35/44}$. In fact, this induces a cut-off dependence in Σ_R that cancels against the one of \tilde{Z}_3 in the r.h.s. of eq. (5), as can be easily seen by checking that $\tilde{Z}_3^{-1}(\mu^2, \Lambda) \Sigma_R(k^2, \mu^2; \Lambda)$ approaches some finite limit as $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ since the ghost and gluon propagator anomalous dimensions and the beta function verify the relation $2\tilde{\gamma} + \gamma + \beta = 0$. This is in accordance with the fact that the

l.h.s. does not depend on Λ . Then, we will apply a MOM renormalization prescription: this means that all the Green functions take their tree-level value at the renormalization point,

$$F_R(\mu^2, \mu^2) = \mu^2 \Delta_R(\mu^2, \mu^2) = 1 . \quad (7)$$

The subtraction point can be taken at any non-zero scale, μ^2 ; however we prefer it to lie on the UV momentum domain (to have to deal, for instance, with renormalization constants or a renormalized coupling, $g_R(\mu^2)$, in eq. (5) that could be estimated from perturbation theory). We will also choose to renormalize the ghost-gluon vertex at the Taylor-theorem kinematics (*i.e.*, a vanishing incoming ghost momentum), thus

$$\tilde{Z}_1(\mu^2) \underbrace{(H_1(q, 0) + H_2(q, 0))}_1 = 1 . \quad (8)$$

Now, in the following, $H_1(q, k)$ will be approximated by a constant with respect to both momenta and our MOM prescription implies thus

$$H_{1,R}(k, q; \mu^2) = \tilde{Z}_1 H_1(k, q) = H_1 , \quad (9)$$

where H_1 is the assumed-to-be constant bare ghost-gluon vertex.

Although we cannot forget that the UV cut-off dependences in both sides of eq. (5) match only in virtue of the previously mentioned relation between the ghost and gluon propagator anomalous dimension and the beta function, in order not to have to deal with the UV cut-off, we can proceed as follows: we consider eq. (5) for two different scales, k and p , such that $p^2 - k^2 = \delta^2 k^2$ (δ being an extra parameter that, for the sake of simplicity, will be taken to be small enough as to expand on it around 0) and subtract them

$$\frac{1}{F_R(k^2, \mu^2)} - \frac{1}{F_R(p^2, \mu^2)} = N_C g_R^2(\mu^2) \left(\Sigma_R(k^2, \mu^2; \infty) - \Sigma_R(p^2, \mu^2; \infty) \right) . \quad (10)$$

Then, the subtraction renders UV-safe the integral in the r.h.s. and the limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ can be explicitly taken,

$$\begin{aligned} \Sigma_R(k^2, \mu^2; \infty) - \Sigma_R(p^2, \mu^2; \infty) &= H_1 \int \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \left(\frac{F(q^2, \mu^2)}{q^2} \left(\frac{(k \cdot q)^2}{k^2} - q^2 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. \times \left[\frac{\Delta((q-k)^2, \mu^2)}{(q-k)^2} - \frac{\Delta((q-p)^2, \mu^2)}{(q-p)^2} \right] \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

An accurate analysis of eq. (10) requires [5], in addition, to cut the integration domain of eq. (11) into two pieces by introducing some new scale q_0^2 (q_0 is a momentum scale below which the IR behaviour is a good approximation for both ghost and gluon),

$$\Sigma_R(k^2, \mu^2; \infty) - \Sigma_R(p^2, \mu^2; \infty) = H_1 \left(I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) + I_{\text{UV}}(k^2) \right) \quad (12)$$

where I_{IR} represents the integral in eq. (11) over $q^2 < q_0^2$ and I_{UV} over $q^2 > q_0^2$. We only wrote explicitly the dependence on k^2 for the r.h.s. because we shall expand on δ around zero with μ^2 kept fixed. Then, for $k^2, p^2 \ll q_0^2$, we will propose the following ansatz³:

$$\Delta_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2) \simeq \frac{B(\mu^2)}{q^2 + M^2} = \frac{B(\mu^2)}{M^2} \left(1 - \frac{q^2}{M^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{q^4}{M^4}\right) \right) , \quad (13)$$

³This is the massive gluon propagator where the gluon running mass [16], $M(q^2)$, appears to be approximated by its frozen value at vanishing momentum, $M(0)$.

for a massive gluon propagator that implies of course $\alpha_G = 1$, as the current lattice data seems to point to. At this stage, we should remember that eq. (13), or any other additional hypothesis about the low-momentum gluon behaviour, is needed to specify the $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$ -correction (next-to-leading) for the ghost dressing function. It should be also noted that, provided that the gluon propagator is to be multiplicatively renormalized, the mass scale, M , in eq. (13) does not depend on renormalization scale, μ^2 . Now, we shall look for the ghost dressing function, F_{IR} , its leading behaviour being parameterized through a general power law behaviour,

$$F_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2) = A(\mu^2) \left(\frac{q^2}{M^2} \right)^{\alpha_F} \left(1 + \dots \right), \quad (14)$$

where $\alpha_F > -2$ to keep the integral I_{IR} infrared convergent. After some algebra (see appendix 26), we obtain:

$$I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) \simeq -\frac{\delta^2}{M^{2+2\alpha_F}} \frac{2A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (4k^2)^i C_i \int_0^{q_0} q^{3+2i+2\alpha_F} dq K_i(q^2; k^2, M^2) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4) \quad (15)$$

where

$$K_i(q^2; k^2, M^2) = \frac{i}{(q^2 + k^2 + M^2)^{2i+1}} - \frac{i}{(q^2 + k^2)^{2i+1}} + k^2 \left(\frac{2i+1}{(q^2 + k^2)^{2i+2}} - \frac{2i+1}{(q^2 + k^2 + M^2)^{2i+2}} \right) \quad (16)$$

and

$$C_i = \frac{12\pi^2 4^i}{\Gamma(-3/2 - i)\Gamma(1/2 - i)\Gamma(5 + 2i)}. \quad (17)$$

From now on, we will focus on the decoupling case: $\alpha_F = 0$. Then, as shown in appendix B, the integral in eq. (15) can be written as a series in powers of k^2 , the leading term given by

$$I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) \simeq \delta^2 \frac{A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{64\pi^2} \frac{k^2}{M^2} \left[\ln \frac{k^2}{M^2} - \frac{5}{6} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M^2}{q_0^2}\right) \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k^4}{M^4}, \delta^4\right) \quad (18)$$

Then, the first correction to the leading constant term for the ghost dressing function should be

$$F_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2) = A(\mu^2) \left(1 + A_2(\mu^2) \frac{q^2}{M^2} \left[\ln \frac{q^2}{M^2} - \frac{11}{6} \right] + \dots \right), \quad (19)$$

such that

$$\frac{1}{F(k^2, \mu^2)} - \frac{1}{F(p^2, \mu^2)} \simeq \delta^2 \frac{A_2(\mu^2)}{A(\mu^2)} \frac{k^2}{M^2} \left(\ln \frac{k^2}{M^2} - \frac{5}{6} \right) + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k^4}{M^4}, \delta^4\right), \quad (20)$$

the eq. (10) being satisfied when:

$$A_2(\mu^2) = N_C g_R^2(\mu^2) H_1 \frac{A^2(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{64\pi^2} \quad (21)$$

Thus, up to corrections of the order of k^4/M^4 , one shall have:

$$F_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2) = F_{\text{IR}}(0, \mu^2) \left(1 + \frac{N_C H_1 R}{16\pi} q^2 \left[\ln \frac{q^2}{M^2} - \frac{11}{6} \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{q^4}{M^4}\right) \right) \quad (22)$$

where:

$$R = \frac{g_R^2(\mu^2)}{4\pi} F_{\text{IR}}^2(0, \mu^2) \Delta_{\text{IR}}(0, \mu^2) = \lim_{q^2 \rightarrow 0} \frac{\alpha_T(q^2)}{q^2} \quad (23)$$

It worth pointing that, provided that g_R is renormalized in the Taylor scheme (the incoming ghost momentum vanishing in the renormalization point) R is a μ -independent (RGI) quantity⁴, as it is manifest from eq. (23), where $\alpha_T = g_T^2/(4\pi)$ is the perturbative strong coupling defined in this Taylor scheme [17]. However, for phenomenological purposes a coupling vanishing at zero-momentum is not convenient and, instead of that, a non-perturbative effective charge is defined from the gluon propagator in ref. [18], within the framework of the pinching technique [19], which can be appropriatedly extended to the Taylor ghost-gluon coupling [15]. As a consequence of the appropriate *amputation* of a massive gluon propagator, where the gluon mass scale is the same RI-invariant mass scale appearing in eq. (13), this Taylor effective charge is frozen at low-momentum and gives a non-vanishing zero-momentum value [15],

$$\bar{\alpha}_T(0) = \lim_{q \rightarrow 0} (q^2 + M^2) \frac{\alpha_T(q^2)}{q^2} = M^2 R, \quad (24)$$

in terms of which the ghost-dressing-function subleading correction can be expressed:

$$F_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2) = F_{\text{IR}}(0, \mu^2) \left(1 + \frac{N_C H_1}{16\pi} \bar{\alpha}_T(0) \frac{q^2}{M^2} \left[\ln \frac{q^2}{M^2} - \frac{11}{6} \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{q^4}{M^4}\right) \right) \quad (25)$$

It should be also noted that eqs. (19,22) imply to take $M^2/q_0^2 \ll 1$, as it is manifest from eq. (18). However, any correction to that approximation will not play at the order of the coefficient eqs. (23,24), that will keep the same value disregarding that of M^2/q_0^2 , but at the order of the gluon mass, M^2 , inside the logarithm (exactly like the factor 5/6 in eq. (18)).

3 Comparison with ghost propagator lattice data

In the last few years, many works have been devoted, at least partially, to the computation of the ghost propagator by using lattice simulations. In ref. [13], some of those ghost propagators results were collected, mainly the ones for big lattice volumes from ref. [6], and studied in a different context but shown to verify the asymptotic low-momentum expansion for the ghost propagator where only the leading term, $q^2 \log(q^2)$, was kept (see fig. 3 of ref. [13]).

Now, we will consider among the results collected in ref. [13] those for the bigger lattice volumes and confront them to eq. (22) or eq. (25), where the $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$ -corrections have been incorporated. Thus, the low-momentum behaviour of the ghost dressing function being determined by the gluon mass, M , and the zero-momentum effective charge, $\bar{\alpha}_T(0)$, they could be obtained by fitting eq. (22) to the lattice data and applying eq. (23). However, as previously pointed, $R = \bar{\alpha}_T(0)/M^2$ is a RGE-quantity that can be directly obtained from bare lattice ghost and gluon propagators. The latter is done in ref. [13], in particular at $\beta = 5.7$ for a 80^4 lattice (precisely exploiting the lattice data from ref. [6]) and $R \simeq 10 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ is obtained. Thus, we will fit eq. (25), where we approximate $H_1 = 1$ and take $\bar{\alpha}_T(0)/M^2 = 10 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$, to the ghost propagator lattice data and obtain the curve plotted in fig. 1 for the best-fit parameters given in tab. 1.

Thus, the ghost propagator lattice data behave pretty well as eq. (25) asks for with a gluon mass, $M = 0.50(2) \text{ GeV}$, in the right ballpark (roughly from 400 MeV to 700 MeV) defined

⁴This claim is equivalent to that of ref. [13] about the cut-off independence of the bare ghost-dressing-function subleading term.

	$R = \bar{\alpha}_T(0)/M^2$ (GeV $^{-2}$)	M (GeV)	$\bar{\alpha}_T(0)$
$\beta = 5.7(80^4)$	10(1)	0.50(2)	2.5(3)

Table 1: Best-fit parameters obtained by describing the ghost dressing function lattice data with eq. (25) (see fig. 1). The errors quoted do not account for any systematical uncertainty.

by phenomenological tests [20] or direct lattice measurements from the gluon propagator [21]. It should be emphasized that, the RGI quantity R being determined by vanishing-momentum ghost and gluon propagators [13], the only parameter controlling the functional behaviour of the ghost propagator to be fitted is the gluon mass. However, it should be remembered that $\mathcal{O}(M^2/q_0^2)$ -corrections in eq. (18) will play at the order of $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$ in eq. (25) and, although not modifying the low-momentum functional behaviour, the fitted gluon mass can be borrowing something from these corrections. Consequently, the latter prevents us to take that fitted gluon mass as a precise determination but as an approximative value that indeed appears to be in the very right ballpark.




Figure 1: Ghost dressing function from lattice data [6,13] pretty well described by the low-momentum formula, eq. (25), with a $R = 10(1)$ GeV $^{-2}$ from [13] and a best-fit for $M = 0.50(2)$ GeV.

In summary, the low-momentum ghost propagator dressing function computed from big-volume lattices can be very well described by the asymptotical formula eq. (25) with a value for the vanishing-momentum effective charge, $\bar{\alpha}_T(0) \simeq 2.5$, pretty well in agreement with its direct lattice determinations as the gluon mass, $M \simeq 0.5$ GeV, lies on its phenomenological range.

4 Conclusions

The ghost propagator DSE, with the only assumption of taking $H_1(q, k)$ from the ghost-gluon vertex in eq. (3) to be constant in the infrared domain of q , can be exploited to look into the low-momentum behaviour of the ghost propagator. The two classes of solutions

named “decoupling” and “scaling” can be indentified and shown to depend on whether the ghost dressing function achieves a finite non-zero constant ($\alpha_F = 0$) at vanishing momentum or not ($\alpha_F \neq 0$). In accordance with the fact that the lattice simulations indicates that the gluon propagator is finite and non-vanishing at zero momentum, we applied in this paper a model with a massive gluon for the infrared gluon propagator to obtain the low-momentum behaviour of the ghost propagator. We focussed on $\alpha_F = 0$ (decoupling) and derive an asymptotic expression reliable up to $\mathcal{O}(q^2)$ for the low-momentum ghost propagator. This low-momentum behaviour results to be regulated by the gluon propagator mass and by a regularization-independent dimensionless quantity that appears to be the effective charge defined from the Taylor-scheme ghost-gluon vertex at zero momentum. Finally, this asymptotic expression is also proven to fit pretty well the low-momentum ghost propagator data obtained from very big lattices simulations with a gluon mass, $M \sim 500$ MeV, that appears to lie on the right ballpark.

Acknowledgements: JRQ and MEG acknowledge support from the research projects P07FQM02962 funded by “Junta de Andalucía”, FPA2009-10773 and Consolider-Ingenio CSD2007-00042 funded by the Spanish MICINN.

A The integral I_{IR}

The integral I_{IR} is defined as:

$$I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) = \int_{q^2 < q_0^2} \frac{d^4 q}{(2\pi)^4} \left(\frac{F_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2)}{q^2} \left(\frac{(k \cdot q)^2}{k^2} - q^2 \right) \times \left[\frac{\Delta_{\text{IR}}((q-k)^2, \mu^2)}{(q-k)^2} - \frac{\Delta_{\text{IR}}((q-p)^2, \mu^2)}{(q-p)^2} \right] \right). \quad (26)$$

where, as shown in eqs. (13,14), we take:

$$\Delta_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2) \simeq \frac{B(\mu^2)}{q^2 + M^2}, \quad (27)$$

$$F_{\text{IR}}(q^2, \mu^2) \simeq A(\mu^2) \left(\frac{q^2}{M^2} \right)^{\alpha_F}. \quad (28)$$

Provided that $\alpha_F > -2$, the integral I_{IR} shall be infrared convergent and one then obtains:

$$I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) \simeq -\frac{2A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{(2\pi)^3 M^{2\alpha_F}} \int_0^{q_0} q^{3+2\alpha_F} dq \int_0^\pi \sin^4 \theta d\theta \times \left(\frac{1}{q^2 + k^2 - 2kq \cos \theta} \frac{1}{q^2 + k^2 + M^2 - 2kq \cos \theta} - \frac{1}{q^2 + p^2 - 2kq \cos \theta} \frac{1}{q^2 + p^2 + M^2 - 2kq \cos \theta} \right) \quad (29)$$

$$\simeq -\frac{1}{M^{2(1+\alpha_F)}} \frac{2A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{(2\pi)^3} \int_0^{q_0} q^{3+2\alpha_F} dq \int_0^\pi \sin^4 \theta d\theta \times \left(\frac{1}{q^2 + k^2 - 2kq \cos \theta} - \frac{1}{q^2 + p^2 - 2pq \cos \theta} - \frac{1}{q^2 + k^2 + M^2 - 2kq \cos \theta} + \frac{1}{q^2 + p^2 + M^2 - 2pq \cos \theta} \right). \quad (30)$$

We now apply that:

$$\int_0^\pi \sin^4 \theta \, d\theta \frac{1}{q^2 + k^2 - 2kq \cos \theta} = \frac{1}{q^2 + k^2} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{2kq}{q^2 + k^2} \right)^{2i} \underbrace{\int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^4 \theta \cos^{2i} \theta}_{C_i}, \quad (31)$$

where we have taken into account that angular integral vanishes for odd powers of the cos. The coefficients C_i can be analytically obtained:

$$C_i = \int_0^\pi d\theta \sin^4 \theta \cos^{2i} \theta = \frac{12\pi^2 4^i}{\Gamma(-3/2 - i)\Gamma(1/2 - i)\Gamma(5 + 2i)}. \quad (32)$$

Then, one can write:

$$I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) \simeq -\frac{1}{M^{2+2\alpha_F}} \frac{2A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{(2\pi)^3} \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (4k^2)^i C_i \int_0^{q_0} q^{3+2i+2\alpha_F} dq \quad (33)$$

$$\times \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{(q^2 + k^2)^{2i+1}} - \frac{(1 + \delta^2)^i}{(q^2 + p^2)^{2i+1}} + \frac{(1 + \delta^2)^i}{(q^2 + p^2 + M^2)^{2i+1}} - \frac{1}{(q^2 + k^2 + M^2)^{2i+1}} \right)}_R$$

and thus expand in terms of δ ,

$$R = \delta^2 \left[\frac{i}{(q^2 + k^2 + M^2)^{2i+1}} - \frac{i}{(q^2 + k^2)^{2i+1}} + k^2 \left(\frac{2i+1}{(q^2 + k^2)^{2i+2}} - \frac{2i+1}{(q^2 + k^2 + M^2)^{2i+2}} \right) \right] + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4), \quad (34)$$

to obtain eq. (15).

B The case $\alpha_F = 0$

When $\alpha_F = 0$, the integral I_{IR} in eq. (15) can be expanded as a series on powers of k^2 led by the following term:

$$I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) \simeq -\delta^2 \frac{2A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{1}{M^2} \times \quad (35)$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} (4k^2)^i C_i \int_0^{q_0} q^{3+2i} dq \left(\frac{i}{(q^2 + k^2 + M^2)^{2i+1}} - \frac{i}{(q^2 + k^2)^{2i+1}} + \frac{(2i+1)k^2}{(q^2 + k^2)^{2i+2}} - \frac{(2i+1)k^2}{(q^2 + k^2 + M^2)^{2i+2}} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\delta^4)$$

$$\simeq -\delta^2 \frac{A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{k^2}{M^2} \times$$

$$\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} 4^i C_i \int_0^\infty dt t^{1+i} \left(\frac{i}{(1+t + \frac{M^2}{k^2})^{2i+1}} - \frac{i}{(1+t)^{2i+1}} + \frac{2i+1}{(1+t)^{2i+2}} - \frac{2i+1}{(1+t + \frac{M^2}{k^2})^{2i+2}} \right) + \dots \quad (36)$$

Then, by integrating in eq. (36) and expanding consistently in terms of k^2/M^2 , one obtains:

$$I_{\text{IR}}(k^2) \simeq \delta^2 \frac{A(\mu^2)B(\mu^2)}{64\pi^2} \frac{k^2}{M^2} \left[\ln \frac{k^2}{M^2} - \frac{5}{6} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{M^2}{q_0^2}\right) \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k^4}{M^4}, \delta^4\right), \quad (37)$$

which is the eq. (18) that gives the result for I_{IR} in the regular case.

References

- [1] R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, Phys. Rept. **353** (2001) 281 [arXiv:hep-ph/0007355]; C. S. Fischer and R. Alkofer, Phys. Lett. B **536** (2002) 177 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202202]; M. Q. Huber, R. Alkofer, C. S. Fischer and K. Schwenzer, Phys. Lett. B **659** (2008) 434 [arXiv:0705.3809 [hep-ph]].
- [2] A. C. Aguilar and J. Papavassiliou, JHEP **0612** (2006) 012; Eur. Phys. J. A **31** (2007) 742; A. C. Aguilar and A. A. Natale, JHEP **0408** (2004) 057.
- [3] A. C. Aguilar, D. Binosi and J. Papavassiliou, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 025010 [arXiv:0802.1870 [hep-ph]].
- [4] A. Sternbeck, E.-M. Ilgenfritz, M. Müller-Preussker and A. Schiller, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **140** (2005) 653; AIP Conference Proceedings **756** (2005) 284, [arXiv:hep-lat/0412011].
- [5] P. Boucaud *et al.*, [arXiv:hep-ph/0507104].
- [6] I. L. Bogolubsky, E. M. Ilgenfritz, M. Müller-Preussker and A. Sternbeck, Phys. Lett. B **676** (2009) 69 [arXiv:0901.0736 [hep-lat]]; I. L. Bogolubsky, E. M. Ilgenfritz, M. Müller-Preussker and A. Sternbeck, PoS **LAT2007** (2007) 290 [arXiv:0710.1968 [hep-lat]].
- [7] A. Cucchieri and T. Mendes, PoS **LAT2007** (2007) 297 [arXiv:0710.0412 [hep-lat]]; Phys. Rev. Lett. **100** (2008) 241601 [arXiv:0712.3517 [hep-lat]]; arXiv:0904.4033 [hep-lat];
- [8] Ph. Boucaud, J. P. Leroy, A. L. Yaouanc, J. Micheli, O. Pene and J. Rodriguez-Quintero, arXiv:0801.2721 [hep-ph].
- [9] Ph. Boucaud, J. P. Leroy, A. Le Yaouanc, J. Micheli, O. Pene and J. Rodriguez-Quintero, JHEP **0806** (2008) 099 [arXiv:0803.2161 [hep-ph]].
- [10] C. S. Fischer, A. Maas and J. M. Pawłowski, Annals Phys. **324** (2009) 2408 [arXiv:0810.1987 [hep-ph]].
- [11] D. Dudal, S. P. Sorella, N. Vandersickel and H. Verschelde, arXiv:0711.4496 [hep-th]; D. Dudal, J. A. Gracey, S. P. Sorella, N. Vandersickel and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 065047 [arXiv:0806.4348 [hep-th]];
- [12] K. I. Kondo, Phys. Lett. B **678** (2009) 322 [arXiv:0904.4897 [hep-th]]; arXiv:0907.3249 [hep-th]; arXiv:0909.4866 [hep-th]; D. Dudal, S. P. Sorella, N. Vandersickel and H. Verschelde, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 121701 [arXiv:0904.0641 [hep-th]]; A. C. Aguilar, D. Binosi and J. Papavassiliou, arXiv:0907.0153 [hep-ph].

- [13] Ph. Boucaud, J. P. Leroy, A. L. Yaouanc, J. Micheli, O. Pene and J. Rodriguez-Quintero, arXiv:0909.2615 [hep-ph].
- [14] M. Tissier and N. Wschebor, arXiv:1004.1607 [hep-ph].
- [15] A. C. Aguilar, D. Binosi, J. Papavassiliou and J. Rodriguez-Quintero, arXiv:0906.2633 [hep-ph].
- [16] M. Lavelle, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 26 (1991); A. C. Aguilar and J. Papavassiliou, Eur. Phys. J. A **35** (2008) 189 [arXiv:0708.4320 [hep-ph]].
- [17] Ph. Boucaud, F. De Soto, J. P. Leroy, A. Le Yaouanc, J. Micheli, O. Pene and J. Rodriguez-Quintero, Phys. Rev. D **79** (2009) 014508 [arXiv:0811.2059 [hep-ph]]; A. Sternbeck, K. Maltman, L. von Smekal, A. G. Williams, E. M. Ilgenfritz and M. Muller-Preussker, PoS **LAT2007** (2007) 256 [arXiv:0710.2965 [hep-lat]].
- [18] A. C. Aguilar, D. Binosi and J. Papavassiliou, PoS **LC2008** (2008) 050 [arXiv:0810.2333 [hep-ph]].
- [19] J. M. Cornwall, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 1453 (1982); D. Binosi and J. Papavassiliou, Phys. Rept. **479** (2009) 1 [arXiv:0909.2536 [hep-ph]].
- [20] F. Halzen, G. I. Krein and A. A. Natale, Phys. Rev. D **47** (1993) 295; M. B. Gay Ducati, F. Halzen and A. A. Natale, Phys. Rev. D **48** (1993) 2324 [arXiv:hep-ph/9304276]; A. C. Aguilar, A. Mihara and A. A. Natale, Phys. Rev. D **65** (2002) 054011 [arXiv:hep-ph/0109223]; E. G. S. Luna, A. F. Martini, M. J. Menon, A. Mihara and A. A. Natale, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005) 034019 [arXiv:hep-ph/0507057].
- [21] F. D. R. Bonnet, P. O. Bowman, D. B. Leinweber, A. G. Williams and J. M. Zanotti, Phys. Rev. D **64** (2001) 034501 [arXiv:hep-lat/0101013]; F. D. R. Bonnet, P. O. Bowman, D. B. Leinweber and A. G. Williams, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 051501 [arXiv:hep-lat/0002020].