

# Renormalization, Decoupling and the Hierarchy Problem

Kang-Sin Choi\*

*Scranton Honors Program, Ewha Womans University, Seoul 03760, Korea  
Institute of Mathematical Sciences, Ewha Womans University, Seoul 03760, Korea*

## Abstract

The hierarchy problem is associated with the renormalization and decoupling. We can account for the smallness of the scalar mass against loop corrections and its insensitivity to ultraviolet physics by the decoupling of heavy fields. It is essential to correctly identify the observable parameters as the renormalized ones as opposed to the bare ones. The renormalized loop corrections are finite, independent of regularization and perturbatively expandable. They are suppressed as powers of the external momentum to the mass (of the field in the loop) ratio, according to the Appelquist–Carazzone decoupling theorem which we complete for the case of the scalar mass.

---

\*email:kangsin@ewha.ac.kr

# 1 Introduction and summary

In quantum field theory, a physical quantity is corrected by loop amplitudes. To the bare mass-squared parameter  $m_B^2$  of a scalar field, e.g. the Higgs, loop corrections are added as

$$m_B^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2), \quad (1)$$

where

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2) \propto g_1^{l_1} g_2^{l_2} \dots g_n^{l_n}, \quad l_i = 0, 1, 2, \dots \quad (2)$$

are so-called self-energy with the external momentum  $p$ , characterized by their Feynman diagrams with two external legs of the scalar. The subscripts denote the dependence on the couplings  $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n$  — the gauge, the Yukawa couplings and so on.

The scalar field theory suffers the hierarchy problem [1–7] (see also [8–14]). It is well-known that each correction  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2)$  diverges quadratically, scaling as  $\Lambda^2$ , where  $\Lambda$  is the momentum cutoff of the field in the loop. It is usually regarded as the scale up to which the Standard model as an effective theory is valid. However, we shall see that this  $\Lambda$  has little to do with the hierarchy problem. What is relevant are the other scaleful parameters, such as the mass  $M$  of a field in the ultraviolet (UV) physics in the loop. This seems to mean that the scalar mass is sensitive to unknown UV physics and not well-defined in low energy.

This paper points out that the hierarchy problem is related to renormalization and decoupling. By carefully following the renormalization procedure, we show that the heavy fields decouple and do not affect the scalar mass.

It is crucial to identify the observable physical parameters as the renormalized ones. Although the bare parameters define the theory, they can never be observed because the interactions modify them [1, 2]; hence, only the whole combination (1) can be observed. Thus, it is *not necessary* to make the *unrenormalized* loop corrections  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2)$  in (1) *small*, as attempted in the usual formulation. The common premise that  $m_B^2$  is finite and small is not necessarily true, either. Note the renormalization condition

$$m^2 = m_B^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(\mu^2), \quad (3)$$

where  $m^2$  is the mass-squared observed at a renormalization point  $p^2 = \mu^2$ . From this, we see that for small  $m^2$ , the other two, the bare mass and the sum of the self-energies, should be comparable.

At first sight, the fine-tuning between the two huge parameters seems miraculous. However, the cancellation is natural if we rewrite the bare mass using the relation (3).

In effective field theory, the parameters in the Lagrangian quantify our ignorance and we fit them from the experiments. We can *define the same theory* using the mass  $m^2$  instead of  $m_B^2$  through (3).

Then, the Higgs mass admits well-defined perturbative expansion in terms of renormalized corrections

$$\begin{aligned} m^2(p^2) &= m^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} \delta m_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}^2(p^2) \\ &\equiv m^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} (1 - t_\mu^2) \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $t_\mu^2$  is the Taylor expansion operator up to two differentiations, in  $p$  around the above renormalization point [15, 16]. That is, the bare mass is the constant part of  $m^2(p^2)$  in (4). This combination is the effective mass that we can only observe.

It is shown by Zimmerman [17] that each term in the second line in (4) is finite, even if we extend the momentum integral to infinity. This means the total mass  $m^2(p^2)$  is independent of the cutoff  $\Lambda$  and, in general, regularization. There is no need for a miraculous cancellation. The combination (4) should be finite because the same is obtained by running between the two scales, from  $\mu$  to  $p$ , which is purely low-energy behavior [2]. If we wrote the Lagrangian using (3), there is no problem of infinity.

Our last concern is whether such loop correction depends on the UV parameters [18–20]. For instance, the loop correction by a very heavy field with the mass  $M$  can change a coupling. Then, the Appelquist–Carazzone decoupling theorem states that the corresponding amplitude is suppressed in some powers of  $p^2/M^2$  and  $m^2/M^2$  [22]. In other words, the renormalized loop corrections vanish in the limit  $M \rightarrow \infty$ .

We show that this decoupling theorem also holds for the scalar mass  $m^2(p^2)$ . That is, the effect on a UV field vanishes in the limit of its heavy mass [1, 2]

$$M \rightarrow \infty \quad \implies \quad \delta m_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}^2(p^2) \rightarrow 0, \quad (5)$$

if this particular mass correction involves the field of the heavy mass  $M$ . This justifies the claim that there is no dependence on the UV physics in the scalar mass.

## 2 On-shell renormalization using counterterms

We briefly review the conventional renormalization using counterterms. We are mainly interested in an example of the  $\phi^4$ -theory, which appears as the Higgs sector in the Standard Model. The Lagrangian density is

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi - \frac{1}{2} m_B^2 \phi^2 - \frac{6\lambda_B}{24} \phi^4. \quad (6)$$

The mass  $m_B^2$  and the quartic coupling  $\lambda_B$  are bare parameters defining the theory.

If we calculate the actual scattering amplitude, quantum corrections modify the observed parameters. The number of loops is the dependence on the Planck constant  $\hbar$  [21]. Such corrections typically diverge, which is to be remedied as follows.

We re-normalize the field

$$\phi = \sqrt{Z}\phi_r \quad (7)$$

to *rewrite* the Lagrangian (6)

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi_r\partial^\mu\phi_r - \frac{1}{2}m^2\phi_r^2 - \frac{6\lambda}{24}\phi_r^4 + \frac{1}{2}\delta_Z\partial_\mu\phi_r\partial^\mu\phi_r - \frac{1}{2}\delta_m\phi_r^2 - \frac{6\delta_\lambda}{24}\phi_r^4, \quad (8)$$

with

$$\delta_Z = Z - 1, \quad \delta_m = m_B^2 Z - m^2, \quad \delta_\lambda = \lambda_B Z^2 - \lambda. \quad (9)$$

We are free to choose expansion parameters and their reference points. In the on-shell (OS) or physical scheme (see, e.g., [23, 24]), we regard the parameters  $m^2$  and  $\lambda$  in (8) as the observed ones through the scattering process at a reference scale, to be discussed below. The (Feynman) propagator contains this mass  $m^2$ ,

$$D(p^2) = \frac{i}{p^2 - m^2}. \quad (10)$$

The remaining terms, so-called counterterms, of  $\delta_Z, \delta_m, \delta_\lambda$  are treated as perturbative interactions. They are going to absorb the divergences from the loop amplitude. If we instead newly introduce counterterms on top of the bare Lagrangian, we redefine the theory.

In quantum theory, the mass-squared parameter is always modified by the self-energy  $-i\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$ , the total 1PI amplitude with two external legs. In this one-coupling theory we have formal expansion  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \tilde{\Sigma}_l(p^2)$ , with  $\tilde{\Sigma}_l(p^2) \propto \lambda^l$ . The leading correction comes from the one-loop, proportional to  $\lambda$ ,

$$-i\tilde{\Sigma}_1(p^2) = \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} (-6i\lambda) D(k^2). \quad (11)$$

We impose a renormalization condition in which the mass used in the propagator remains the same. That is, the correction to the propagator should be

$$\left[ \tilde{\Sigma}(p^2) - p^2\delta_Z + \delta_m \right]_{p^2=m^2} = 0, \quad (12)$$

to all orders of perturbation. We also note that the interaction  $\delta_Z$  is momentum-dependent. So we impose further boundary condition to  $\mathcal{O}(p^2 - m^2)^1$

$$\left[ \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}}{dp^2}(p^2) - \delta_Z \right]_{p^2=m^2} = 0. \quad (13)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Here and in what follows,  $d/dp^2$  means differentiation with respect to  $p^2$ .

From dimensional analysis, the self-energy  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$  is quadratic polynomial in  $\sqrt{p^2}$ . The constant  $\delta_m$  is always chosen to keep the total mass at the specific value at  $p^2 = m^2$  unchanged. At the same time, it takes away the quadratic divergence in  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$ . Our theory has parity symmetry, so there is no linear term for  $p$ . The constant  $\delta_Z$  absorbs the logarithmic divergence in the coefficient of  $p^2$  in  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$ .

We regard the interaction as a small perturbation and calculate loop corrections order by order; further corrections may also modify the observed parameters. Thus, we regard that the parameters in the counterterms are to be expanded in powers of the coupling  $\lambda$  [25]

$$\delta_Z = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \lambda^l \delta_{Zl}, \quad \delta_m = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \lambda^l \delta_{ml}, \quad \delta_\lambda = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \lambda^l \delta_{\lambda l}. \quad (14)$$

At each loop order  $l$ , the conditions (12) and (13) mean, to the accuracy  $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^{l+1})$ ,

$$\delta_{ml} = -\tilde{\Sigma}_l(m^2) + m^2 \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_l}{d(m^2)}(m^2), \quad \delta_{Zl} = \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_l}{dp^2}(m^2). \quad (15)$$

Although the mass corrections are divergent, the theory admits well-defined perturbative expansion. The divergence in the self-energy  $\tilde{\Sigma}_l(p^2)$  is canceled by the counterterms of the same order  $\delta_{ml}, \delta_{Zl}$ , so that each  $\mathcal{O}(\lambda^l)$ -term is as small as  $\lambda^l$  with order-one coefficient. We can generalize it to theories with multiple couplings, having a generalized self-coupling (2).

What is the prediction if all the quantum corrections to the propagator do not modify the observed mass by default? We have fixed the counterterm to order  $p^2$  in (13). In terms of the renormalized field  $\phi_r$ , the following effective interactions are induced in the momentum space

$$\delta\mathcal{L} = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2} \left[ -\tilde{\Sigma}_l(m^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_l}{dp^2}(m^2) \right] \phi_r^2, \quad (16)$$

in addition to the canonical terms. In the scattering experiment, always the combination

$$m^2(p^2) = m^2 + \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} \left[ \tilde{\Sigma}_l(p^2) - \tilde{\Sigma}_l(m^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_l}{dp^2}(m^2) \right], \quad (17)$$

appears in the  $S$ -matrix due to the superposition of all possible interactions. It follows that *the momentum dependence is the only observational consequence* of the loop corrections in the OS scheme. We measure the mass  $m^2(p^2)$  at different energy scales specified by the external momentum from the reference mass  $m^2$ . Higher order correction gives us more precise dependence on the momentum. A good and timely example is the Higgs mass profile by the loop corrections dominated by the top quark [1, 2].

### 3 Renormalization without counterterms

We have another way to achieve renormalization without introducing counterterms.<sup>2</sup> The free particle is described by the propagator

$$D^B(p^2) = \frac{i}{p^2 - m_B^2}, \quad (18)$$

encoding the information on the bare mass. It receives quantum corrections by the 1PI self-energy  $-i\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$ . Collecting all the reducible diagrams, we have the geometric sum [25]

$$\begin{aligned} D'(p^2) &= D^B(p^2) + D^B(p^2)[-i\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)]D^B(p^2) + \dots \\ &= \frac{i}{p^2 - m_B^2} \frac{1}{1 + i\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)\frac{i}{p^2 - m_B^2}} \\ &= \frac{i}{p^2 - m_B^2 - \tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The mass, to be probed by scattering experiments with this propagator, is changed. We take a reference mass for the expansion as the pole mass  $m$  defined as

$$\left[ p^2 - m_B^2 - \tilde{\Sigma}(p^2) \right]_{p^2=m^2} = 0. \quad (20)$$

At this pole, the residue of the propagator is changed, which comes from the next leading order expansion of  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$  from the reference mass

$$p^2 \rightarrow m^2 : \frac{i}{p^2 - m_B^2 - \tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)} \rightarrow \frac{iZ}{p^2 - m^2} + \mathcal{O}((p^2 - m^2)^2). \quad (21)$$

We renormalize the field as in (7), with the field strength  $Z$  being

$$Z^{-1} = 1 - \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}}{dp^2}(m^2). \quad (22)$$

The resulting propagator is the same as that in (10) to  $\mathcal{O}(p^2 - m^2)$ , justifying its use. Therefore, we calculate the amplitude, including the above  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$ , using the physical mass  $m$ .

A scattering amplitude with the momentum  $p^2$  will be described by the newly normalized propagator. From its denominator, we are naturally led to define the momentum-dependent ‘‘running mass’’

$$m^2(p^2) \equiv m_B^2 + \tilde{\Sigma}(p^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}}{dp^2}(m^2). \quad (23)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>Wilsonian approach [38] does not need the counterterms and deals only with the bare parameters. However, we expect that the expansion parameters are not the bare ones but the physical ones, in the end [2, 24].

Using the pole mass, (20), we can eliminate the bare mass to obtain (17)

$$m^2(p^2) = m^2 + \tilde{\Sigma}(p^2) - \tilde{\Sigma}(m^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}}{dp^2}(m^2). \quad (24)$$

The bare parameter is not observable, and we may choose not to use it in the renormalization. What is important is that, using the relation (24), we can write the equivalent Lagrangian (16) as the original one and define the same theory without reference to the bare parameters. It follows that the only parameter defining the scalar mass is the pole mass  $m^2$ .

Of course, this description is equivalent to the previous one with counterterms if we absorb the counterterms for  $\delta_M, \delta_Z$  in the mass and the propagator, not treating them as perturbative interactions. There is a one-to-one correspondence between the loop correction and the counterterm as in (15); there is no arbitrariness in separating the physical parameters from those of counterterms. Although the last term in (24) arises from the unit residue condition, we may regard the last two terms in (24) as the “closest and the most general polynomial” to  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$ , which *cannot be separated* from  $m^2(p^2)$  in the scattering if present. Their presence is unavoidable if the effective field theory is generic. We may understand this modification as coming from the collection of all the quadratic interactions in the perturbative sense, as in (19), which is going to be generalized in the next section.

The formalism in this section makes the following clear. Since the counterterms provide interactions, we are tempted to take into account all the possible loop corrections with them. It can also give rise to divergences, for example, from the amplitude in Fig. 1 (a). Then, we worry that we need a quartic counter-counterterm to cancel the additional divergence. This gives rise to proliferating counterterms, which is the criterion for non-renormalizability. However, this should be a feature of the renormalizable theory.

Only a particular combination can cancel the divergence arising from the counterterms. We define the one-loop correction for the  $\phi^4$ -vertex

$$iV(p^2) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} D(k)D(k+p). \quad (25)$$

Identifying the counterterm  $\delta_{\lambda_1} \sim V(\mu)$  by a similar renormalization condition as (15), the amplitude for Fig. 1 (a) is expressed in a suggestive form

$$\int d^4k_2 V(\mu)V(p+k_2)V(\mu). \quad (26)$$

Its main divergence can be canceled by the physical loop in Fig. 1 (b)

$$\int d^4k_1 d^4k_2 d^4k_3 V(p+k_1)V(p+k_2)V(p+k_3). \quad (27)$$




Figure 1: Neither loop-correction nor counterterm is not separately observable, but only the combination is. (a) The one-loop diagram involving the counterterm coupling  $\delta_{\lambda_1}$  (denoted by crossed circles). The corresponding amplitude is divergent. A counter-counterterm to this may give rise to other divergences, e.g. having the same structure as Fig. (a) with the new counter-counterterm coupling. (b) To avoid the proliferation of counterterms, we need *special combination* with ordinary loop diagrams with physical couplings. (c) If we always have the combination of the renormalized physical couplings (denoted by big dots), there is only a finite number of counterterms.

It is evident from the pair-subtraction structure in the renormalization without counterterms; if we have the amplitude Fig. 1 (b), we always have Fig. 1 (a) and vice versa; whenever we have a counterterm parameter in the amplitude, we have an amplitude with this counterterm replaced with loop sub-amplitude. These two diagrams correspond to parts of the (subdiagram-)renormalized amplitude Fig. 1 (c),

$$\int d^4k_1 d^4k_2 d^4k_3 [V(p+k_1) - V(\mu)] V(p+k_2) [V(p+k_3) - V(\mu)]. \quad (28)$$

The renormalized subdiagram is denoted by big dots in Fig. 1 (c).

We still have some divergence from some subdiagrams. We note that the amplitude (28) is again a part of the completely renormalized three-loop quartic coupling

$$\int d^4k_1 d^4k_2 d^4k_3 [V(p+k_1) - V(\mu)] [V(p+k_2) - V(\mu)] [V(p+k_3) - V(\mu)]. \quad (29)$$



(Of course, there are other diagrams than Fig. 1 (c) that contribute to the loop corrections of the  $\phi^4$ -vertex, and (29) is one finite component.) This also means that the counterterm parameters are not the observables, which is equivalent to saying that the bare parameters are not the observables.

The above pair-subtraction structure is always present in the renormalization, and the cancellation of small-scale physics is a bonus, as we will clarify shortly. The essence of renormalization is to reveal the scale dependence of the physical parameter, not the cancellation of divergence. Although fixing the physical mass itself does not give a prediction, the scale-dependence correction to the mass is a prediction.

## 4 Regularization scheme independence

We discuss the cancellation of the divergence in more detail.

Consider the quartic vertex correction (25), which becomes the following after Feynman parametrization (e.g. [23])

$$V(p^2) = \frac{1}{2} \int_0^1 dx \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(k^2 - \Delta(p^2))^2}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\Delta(p^2) \equiv m^2 - x(1-x)p^2$ . This shows the essential reason for the divergent loop corrections because the momentum integration extends to an arbitrary high scale. This is due to the limitation of our only available calculational tool, the Lorentz-covariant continuum field theory.

Usually, we crystalize the infinity as a limit of a parameter by regularization. A simple (Euclidianized) momentum cutoff at  $-k^2 = -\ell_0^2 - \ell^2 = \Lambda^2$  gives

$$\int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(k^2 - \Delta)^2} = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \left( \log \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Delta} - 1 \right). \quad (31)$$

The dimensional regularization [39, 40], by taking the dimension  $d \equiv 4 - \epsilon$ , gives

$$\int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{(k^2 - \Delta)^2} = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon} - \log \Delta - \gamma + \log(4\pi) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \right). \quad (32)$$

Here  $\gamma$  is the Euler–Mascheroni constant. Identifying  $\log \Lambda = 1/\epsilon$ , we see that the two regularizations are basically the same except for the constant terms in  $\Delta$ .

The lesson from the last section is that physical quantity after renormalization is expressed as the difference between the same quantities at different scales. Any of the regularizations, (31) or (32), gives the renormalized quartic vertex in (29) as

$$V(p^2) - V(\mu^2) = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \log \frac{m^2 - x(1-x)p^2}{m^2 - x(1-x)\mu^2}, \quad (33)$$

which is independent of the choice. Even we see that the difference is *insensitive* to the high-momentum modes of  $k$ , independent of  $\Lambda$  or  $1/\epsilon$ . We will further see that the renormalization does *not* care about the *divergence* of the loop amplitudes.

Especially for the scalar mass (24), there is a natural cancellation of the parameter  $\Lambda$  or  $\epsilon$  as well as the scheme-dependent constants [1]. Because the loop-correction of the mass dimension two quantity is spanned by the previous integral (31) or (32) and the following:

$$\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{k^2 - \Delta} = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \left( -\Lambda^2 + \Delta \log \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Delta} \right), \quad (34)$$

$$\int \frac{d^d k}{(2\pi)^d} \frac{1}{k^2 - \Delta} = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \left( \frac{2}{\epsilon} \Delta - \Delta \log \Delta - \gamma \Delta + \Delta \log(4\pi) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \right), \quad (35)$$

The only substantial difference is the dimensional regularization neglects the quadratic divergence. The corresponding divergence in the cutoff regularization may be treated as a constant and *cancel in the physical quantity* [1, 2]. The remaining scheme dependence is the linear terms in  $\Delta$ . In what follows, we show that the result is independent of regularization.

This natural cancellation behavior is rephrased as in the Bogoliubov–Parasiuk–Hepp–Zimmermann (BPHZ) scheme [17, 26–30] (see also [32, 33]). The renormalized quantity  $Q(p^2)$  is defined

$$Q(p^2) = Q_B + \int I = Q_{\text{phy}} + (1 - t_\mu^D) \int I, \quad (36)$$

where  $D$  is the superficial degree of divergence [31]. The integration for the Feynman diagram is done over the loop momenta.

As we have seen in the mass, we include the Taylor expansion operator  $t_\mu^D$  up to two  $D$  differentiations in  $p$  around the renormalization point [15, 16]

$$t_m^D f(p) \equiv \sum_{n=0}^D \frac{1}{n!} (p_{i_1}^{\mu_1} - m_{i_1}^{\mu_1}) \dots (p_{i_n}^{\mu_n} - m_{i_n}^{\mu_n}) \frac{\partial^n}{\partial p_{i_1}^{\mu_1} \dots \partial p_{i_n}^{\mu_n}} f(p) \Big|_{p^2=m^2} \quad (37)$$

because they all interfere in the observed scattering, forming inseparable observable. The functions appearing in this paper are all invariant under  $p \rightarrow -p$ , so that they are functions of  $p^2$ . The above removes, assuming that possible subdiagram divergences are canceled by BPHZ prescription [17, 26–30].

The quartic vertex (33) has  $D = 0$ , and the Taylor expansion has only the constant term. The scalar mass-squared (44) has  $D = 2$  and contains quadratic divergence in four dimensions. Thus, we have

$$m^2(p^2) = m^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} (1 - t_m^2) \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2). \quad (38)$$

In the RHS, each term is separately finite and independent of regularization; we can do the renormalization order-by-order in any perturbative coupling.

Since  $\Delta$  is quadratic in  $p$ , the relation holds

$$\Delta_n(p^2) - \Delta_n(m^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\Delta_n}{dp^2}(m^2) = 0, \quad (39)$$

translating  $\Delta$  into  $p^2$ . It follows that the linear terms in  $\Delta$  vanish in the “difference function” (38). In particular, possible divergences and scaleful parameters in the logarithm are linear in  $\Delta$  from the relation  $\Delta \log(\Lambda/\Delta) = \Delta \log \Lambda - \Delta \log \Delta$ . The only nonvanishing contribution is  $\Delta \log \Delta$ . Higher loop amplitudes can also be expanded in the “basis”

$$\int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{(k^2 - \Delta)^{3-n}}, \quad n = 1, 2, 3, \dots, D/2. \quad (40)$$

As long as the relation (39) holds, we can show that the polynomials in  $\Delta$  cancel in the amplitude, yielding only terms involving  $\Delta^n \log \Delta$  which are free of divergence and *independent of regularization*.

Regardless of regularization, Zimmermann showed that the integral (36) is convergent by slightly modifying the Feynman prescription even if the integral is Lorentzian [17].

We may even use the subtracted integrand, whose leading power cancels and has a lower power in the momentum. Thus, BPHZ uses the finite quantity

$$Q(p^2) = Q_{\text{phy}} + \int (1 - t_\mu^D) I, \quad (41)$$

which is scheme-independent by default (if the exchange is permissible). Suppose we do not deal with the individual quantity in the subtract pair. In that case, we do not need to modify short-distance physics by introducing fields with wrong spin-statistics or heavy vector bosons [34]. There is no arbitrariness in the quantity  $Q(p^2)$  except for the integration constants, which are to be completely fixed by the experiments. (The original BPHZ prescription uses the zero-momentum as the reference point. However, we can move the reference point by finite renormalization.)

Therefore, specifying the renormalization conditions at an agreed scale completely specifies the physical parameters. Since this is the only *observable combination*, it is natural to define this as the *running physical quartic coupling*. It is independent of the regularization scheme in the above sense. In this paper, running physical parameters are scale-dependent. We may view the external momentum as the running scale, and the full physical quantity contains the UV scales like the masses of the heavy fields.<sup>3</sup>

---

<sup>3</sup>Therefore, the dimensional regularization, although known as a scale-independent scheme [34, 35], eventually gives us a scale-dependent result. We do not need manual matching if we use the running physical parameters.

The above shows that the momentum cutoff  $\Lambda$  in the integral has nothing to do with the hierarchy. Evidently, the loop correction by a massless field introduces no scale, providing an example that  $\Lambda$  is not related. What we require is that the physical quantities we calculate have sufficiently close asymptotic behavior so that, for instance, for the self-energy  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$  is close to its Taylor expansion to the accuracy  $\mathcal{O}(p^2/\Lambda^2)$ , [1]

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2) = t_m^2 \tilde{\Sigma}(p^2), \quad \mathcal{O}(p^2/\Lambda^2). \quad (42)$$

Due to the natural pair-subtraction property, sufficient high-momentum contributions cancel and  $\Lambda$  does not appear in the (super-)renormalizable parameters. In fact, the parameter  $\Lambda$  is human-made, which is overlooked in the Wilsonian renormalization [2,24], in which it appears explicitly. However, the cutoff must be replaced by another dimensionful parameter, e.g., the mass  $M$ , of the fields involved in the loop provided by Nature.

In the above example, the effective mass  $m^2(p^2)$ , in the end, is given by the solution to the renormalization-group equation with the initial condition set at a reference scale,  $m^2$ . Therefore this quantity does not see a high-scale contribution. The Wilsonian approach more clearly shows this [2].

## 5 The Hierarchy Problem

Now, we discuss the hierarchy problem. If one regards the bare mass  $m_B^2$  in (23) as “God-given” from the beginning,

$$m^2(p^2) = m_B^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} \left[ \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(m^2)}{dp^2} \right], \quad (43)$$

using the notation in (2), it seems miraculous to have the rest of the corrections canceled to perfect accuracy to yield the observed small mass. There is, in general, more than one coupling, so some coupling we have yet to consider would also ruin the finite mass. In the Standard Model, we have corrections involving three gauge and Yukawa couplings, in addition to the quartic self-coupling. Every loop correction from them has divergence. So, we need more delicate relations between counterterms.

Traditionally, the hierarchy problem has been why the correction  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$  is small, assuming small  $m_B^2$  for some reason. Its understanding is guided by the naturalness criterion of 't Hooft [36]. If we make the parameter (here, the bare mass) zero, there emerges symmetry forbidding this parameter. This means the loop corrections are proportional to the original coupling by this symmetry, or the renormalization is multiplicative. This explains the smallness of the whole parameter; if we have some

reason to have a small original parameter, all the corrections are proportional to it, and the total coupling becomes parametrically small. Known examples are gauge symmetry and chiral symmetry. It is well-known that scalar mass renormalization is not protected by symmetry and is not multiplicative.

However, the renormalization condition (20) suggests that  $m_B^2$  should be big around the UV scale. Then, the required cancellation becomes more unnatural because there should be a cancellation between  $m_B^2$  and all the  $\tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}$ 's to fine-tune the mass. A technical hierarchy problem arises once we force the quantum-corrected mass to be finite (presumably the observable value) at a given order  $g_1^{l_1} g_2^{l_2} \dots g_n^{l_n}$ , always higher order correction ruins the smallness, making the sum divergent. There needs to be a miraculous cancellation in any case.

We emphasize that we do not need to explain the smallness of the  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p^2)$  part. Because this and the bare parameters are *never separable*; what needs to be small is the *combination* [1].

Remember that our theory is the effective field theory, and the parameter  $m_B^2$  in the Lagrangian is just parametrizations of our ignorance but valid below a certain scale and is to be matched with the counterpart in the UV completion or simply the observables (see e.g. [19, 42, 43]). We have another *equivalent but better alternative one-parameter* parametrization  $m^2$ , seen in Eq. (17). Using the relation, the running physical mass (43) is expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} m^2(p^2) &= m^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} \left[ \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p^2) - \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(m^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(m^2)}{dp^2} \right] \\ &\equiv m^2 + \sum_{\{l_i\}} (1 - t_m^2) \tilde{\Sigma}_{l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n}(p). \end{aligned} \tag{44}$$

Since the mass always appears in this combination, the cancellation of divergence is built-in. We understand why the loop corrections are canceled to be finite order by order. Each term in the square bracket is finite and small; it is interpreted as the perturbative expansion of the mass giving the relation (4), is small, in coupling  $g_1, g_2, \dots, g_n$  in  $l$ -loop. As long as there is no convergence problem, it is not difficult to convince ourselves that each correction becomes smaller and the perturbation works. Higher-order terms and/or loops in different couplings are parametrically small, and we can approximate and calculate them to the desired accuracy. We need Dirac's naturalness: all the parameters appearing in the loop correction are of order one [41].

Although the bare parameter defines the effective theory, it is not observable. What is observable is the running mass (17), which can be determined without the reference to the bare parameter. It is desirable to remove unobservable bare

parameters. That is, we may alternatively *define* the theory using the physical mass  $m$  that is measurable, then the bare mass is *derived* from the relation (20),

$$m_B^2 = m^2 - \tilde{\Sigma}(m^2). \quad (45)$$

Once we fix  $m^2$ , calculating higher-order loop corrections makes the bare mass more precise. Conversely, if we regard the bare mass  $m_B^2$  fixed, the calculation more precisely corrects the (constant part) of the physical parameter. The difference can also be understood as fixing the counterterms. This also justifies the expansion (14) through the identification of the counterterms using (44).

The original formulation by Gildener essentially addressed a technical hierarchy problem concerning stability against higher-order loop corrections discussed in this paper [3, 4]. In the Grand Unified Theory (GUT), however, this problem is tightly related to the hierarchy of scales. In the original formulation, the minimization condition for the scalar field, required for breaking the unified group like  $SU(5)$  down to the Standard Model group, should satisfy the hierarchical relation. However, loop corrections generically ruin it.

In modern understanding, we can separate the symmetry-breaking source for the GUT and Standard Model groups. In string-theory-based construction, the former is broken by instantons in the extra dimensions and the latter by the Higgs scalar (see, e.g., [37]), which are not *a priori* dependent.

The above discussion enables us to distinguish between the “big” hierarchy problem and the technical hierarchy problem. The former is about the physical parameters such as  $M$ , which is why the electroweak scale is way much smaller than the fundamental, the Planck scale. We clarified the latter problem about the regularization parameters such as  $\Lambda$  and  $1/\epsilon$ .

## 6 Decoupling in the scalar mass

Finally, we propose that decoupling solves the technical hierarchy problem. So far, we have seen that the loop corrections are perturbative and cutoff-independent. It remains to be shown that any of them involving heavy fields are suppressed.

The Appelquist–Carazzone decoupling theorem states that a 1PI amplitude involving a heavy field in the loop is suppressed as powers of  $p^2/M^2$  [22]. The sketch of the proof goes as follows. A loop amplitude with  $n$  external bosons with momentum  $\sim \sqrt{p^2}$  scales like  $p^{4-n}$ . Considering a subdiagram in the loop diagram with the internal propagator of the field with the mass  $M$ , the subdiagram amplitude behaves like  $M^{f-n}$  in the heavy mass limit, where  $f$  is the minimal number of cuts on the internal gauge boson lines, severing the loop. This subdiagram shrinks and becomes  $(f-n)$ -point amplitude. The total amplitude behaves like  $M^{4-f} M^{f-n} = M^{4-n}$ . It




Figure 2: The one-loop self-energy of a scalar  $\phi$  involving a UV fermion  $\psi$  of the mass  $M$ . Although it itself does not vanish in the decoupling limit  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , its contribution to the mass of  $\phi$  does. There are two counterterms in  $p^0, p^2$  with the external momentum  $p$ , although we draw one collectively.

has shown that the heavy fields decouple in the strictly renormalizable (marginal) quantity. This means we do not need to care about heavy fields in the low energy limit.

One technical gap is a possible exception of the scalar mass-squared parameter, which defines the technical hierarchy problem. Although the original proof considers the vacuum polarization, which is free of quadratic divergence due to gauge symmetry, the logic does not apply to the case of scalar self-energy. We complete it.

Let us suppose that, in addition to the ‘‘Higgs’’ scalar described in (6), there are a scalar  $X$  and a Dirac field  $\psi$  at the UV having interactions

$$\Delta\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2}M_s^2 X^2 - \frac{1}{4}\kappa\phi^2 X^2 - M_f\bar{\psi}\psi - y\phi\bar{\psi}\psi + \dots \quad (46)$$

The UV scale is characterized by huge values of  $M_s$  and  $M_f$ . (The masses in (46) are bare; however, we assume that they are to be renormalized in the same sense as before, and for brevity, we denote them in the same notation without confusion.) The decoupling limit is  $M_s, M_f \rightarrow \infty$  or  $M_s^2, M_f^2 \gg m^2, p^2$  to be precise.

## 6.1 Decoupling of one-loop fermion

As a warming-up, we first show that the one-loop correction by the fermion in (46) shows decoupling [2]. The amplitude comes from the Yukawa interaction

$$\begin{aligned} -i\tilde{\Sigma}_2(p^2) &= -2y^2 \int_0^1 dx \int \frac{d^4\ell}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\ell^2 + \Delta(p^2)}{(\ell^2 - \Delta(p^2))^2} \\ &= \frac{2y^2}{16\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \left[ \Lambda^2 - 2\Delta(p^2) \log \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Delta(p^2)} - \Delta(p^2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

where the subscript in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_2(p^2)$  denotes the dependence on the Yukawa coupling and we define

$$\Delta(p^2) \equiv M_f^2 - x(1-x)p^2. \quad (48)$$

We introduced a simple momentum cutoff  $\Lambda$ . Although  $\tilde{\Sigma}_2(p^2)$  diverges as  $\Lambda^2$ , the combination (17)

$$\begin{aligned} \delta m_2^2(p^2) &= -\frac{y^2}{16\pi^2} \left[ p^2 - m^2 + 6 \int_0^1 dx \Delta(p^2) \log \frac{\Delta(p^2)}{\Delta(m^2)} \right] + \mathcal{O}(y^3) \\ &\simeq -\frac{y^2(p^2 - m^2)^2}{16\pi^2 M_f^2} \left[ \frac{1}{10} + \frac{p^2 + 2m^2}{140M_f^2} + \dots \right], \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

and hence the running physical mass  $m^2(p^2)$  in (59) converge. It is suppressed as  $p^4/M_f^2, m^4/M_f^4$  and vanishes in the limit  $M_f \rightarrow \infty$ . The cancellation of  $\Lambda$  is not a tuning because the  $\delta m_1^2(p^2)$  in (49) and hence  $m^2(p^2)$  in (17) is the difference of the same functions with different arguments. Alternatively, an equivalent definition of  $m^2(p^2)$  in the way in (41) contains no cutoff  $\Lambda$  from the beginning.

## 6.2 General decoupling in the scalar mass

Now, we present the general formula. We note that the higher order amplitude should also be the function of the similar arguments  $\Delta(p^2), \Delta(m^2)$  of the logarithm in (49) as the integration formula (47) shows. So, we identify the argument and expand the resulting self-energy amplitude in the decoupling limit to show essentially the same behavior as the suppressed amplitude (49).

The general form of the  $n$ -loop self-energy amplitude is (we consider one coupling for simplicity, but the multi-coupling generalization is straightforward)

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_n(p^2) = \int d^4k_1 \dots d^4k_n P(p, k_1, \dots, k_n) \prod_{j=1}^l \frac{1}{L_j(p, k_1, \dots, k_n) - m_j^2}, \quad (50)$$

where  $L_j$  are quadratic functions of the momenta, and  $P$  is a polynomial arising from the spins of the fields. Using the Feynman parameterization, we can complete the denominator

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_n(p^2) = \int d\mathbf{x} \int d^4k_1 \dots d^4k_n \frac{\tilde{P}(k_1, \dots, k_n)}{[Q(p, k_1, \dots, k_n) + \Delta_n(p^2)]^l} \quad (51)$$

with the collective notation  $d\mathbf{x} = dx_1 \dots dx_n$  allowing some monomial factors  $x_i^k$ .  $\tilde{P}$  is another polynomial and  $Q$  is a quadratic function in  $k_i$ , whose details are not important here. By completing the square in every  $k_i$  and shifting some momenta, we can always single out the dependence in  $p^2$  into the unique combination

$$\Delta_n(p^2) = -f_n(\mathbf{x})p^2 + \sum_i g_{ni}(\mathbf{x})m_i^2, \quad (52)$$



where  $f_n(\mathbf{x}), g_{ni}(\mathbf{x})$  are the coefficients of  $p^2, m_i^2$ , respectively. In the previous example,  $f(x) = x(1-x), g(x) = 1$ . (Note that once we fix the Feynman parameter, the combination  $\Delta_n(p^2)$  is unique, however, there can be other possible parameterizations. Nevertheless, the following argument is valid for any fixed parametrization.)

We imagine that some of the masses  $m_i$  are those of heavy fields in (46). It is convenient to introduce the average mass  $M$  as

$$g_n(\mathbf{x})M^2 \equiv \sum_i g_{ni}(\mathbf{x})m_i^2, \quad (53)$$

with some coefficient  $g_n(\mathbf{x})$ . If one of  $m_i$  is large,  $M$  is also.<sup>4</sup> In the decoupling limit, we thus have  $M^2 \gg m^2, p^2$ . At this moment, the only important thing is the  $\Delta_n(p^2)$  in (52) and its dependence on the large mass  $M$ ,

$$\Delta_n(p^2) = -f_n(\mathbf{x})p^2 + g_n(\mathbf{x})M^2. \quad (54)$$

Note that  $\tilde{\Sigma}_n(p^2)$  is of mass dimension two and is a function of  $\Delta_n(p^2)$  that is also dimension two. After the momentum integration and cancellation of subdiagram divergence a la BPHZ, dimensional analysis suggests the amplitude has the form

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_n(p^2) = \int d\mathbf{x} \left[ A_n + c_n \Delta(p^2) + (d_n + e_n \Delta_n(p^2)) \log \frac{B_n}{\Delta_n(p^2)} \right], \quad (55)$$

for each  $n$ , where  $c_n, e_n$  are order-one constants. In principle, we may have a constant of mass dimension two  $d_n$ , however, the repeated indefinite integration of relations (34)-(32) shows that we can have only positive powers of  $\Delta_n(p^2)$ , thus  $d_n = 0$ . The dimensionless constant  $c_n$  can appear, depending on the choice of regularization. In the previous example with cutoff, we had one-loop  $n = 1$  and  $b_1 = -1, c_1 = 0, e_1 = -2$ . Dimensional regularization would give us nonzero  $c_1$ . However, we see that the corresponding term shall vanish in the end. The divergence is regularized as a  $p^2$ -independent constants  $A_n$  and  $B_n$ , both of which have mass dimension two.

The mass correction (17) that we observe in the experiment is

$$\begin{aligned} \delta m_n^2(p^2) &= \tilde{\Sigma}_n(p^2) - \tilde{\Sigma}_n(m^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_n}{dp^2}(m^2) \\ &= e_n \int d\mathbf{x} \left[ \Delta_n(p^2) \log \frac{\Delta_n(p^2)}{\Delta_n(m^2)} + f_n(\mathbf{x})(p^2 - m^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (56)$$

The crucial relations are

$$\frac{d\Delta_n}{dp^2}(m^2) = -f_n(\mathbf{x}), \quad \Delta_n(p^2) - \Delta_n(m^2) = -f_n(\mathbf{x})(p^2 - m^2). \quad (57)$$

---

<sup>4</sup>Of course, the coefficients  $g_i$  are generic and there should no miraculous cancellation between any  $g_i m_i^2$ 's.

The scheme-dependent term proportional to  $c_n$  vanishes thanks to this relation, or equivalently the relation (39), as promised. The quadratic divergence  $A_n$  is cancelled in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_n(p^2) - \tilde{\Sigma}_n(m^2)$  and the logarithmic divergence  $B_n$  is cancelled in the first order expansion in  $p^2$  [1].

Now, in the decoupling limit  $M \rightarrow \infty$ , we have

$$\log \Delta_n(p^2) \simeq g_n M^2 \left( 1 - \frac{f_n p^2}{g_n M^2} + \dots \right), \quad (58)$$

so that, for each  $n$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} \delta m_n^2(p^2) &= e_n \int d\mathbf{x} \left[ g_n M^2 \left( \frac{f_n p^2}{g_n M^2} + \frac{f_n^2 p^4}{2g_n^2 M^4} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p^6}{M^6}\right) - \frac{f_n m^2}{g_n M^2} - \frac{f_n^2 m^4}{2g_n^2 M^4} - \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^6}{M^6}\right) \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - f_n(p^2 - m^2) \right] \\ &= \frac{e_n f_n^2}{g_n^2} \int d\mathbf{x} \left[ \frac{p^4}{2M^2} - \frac{m^4}{2M^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p^6}{M^4}\right) - \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^6}{M^4}\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (59)$$

The cancellation of the quadratic terms in  $p$  and  $m$  takes place. Naively, the loop correction (55) seems proportional to  $M^2 \log M^2$ . However, in the physical mass combination (56), the leading order contributions cancel, and the total amplitude is suppressed as

$$\frac{p^4}{M^2} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{m^4}{M^2}. \quad (60)$$

In the heavy mass limit, the corresponding mass correction vanishes

$$M \rightarrow \infty \quad \implies \quad \delta m_n^2(p^2) \rightarrow 0. \quad (61)$$

This is the suppression expected by the Appelquist–Carazzone decoupling theorem, which we extend for the case with two external bosons. We expect a similar decoupling behavior in the super-renormalizable operators. It exhibits power running, seen from the dependence in  $p^2$  [2]. Light fields can correct the mass sizably, but they are not hierarchical.

### 6.3 Decoupling of two-loop scalar

Another example is a two-loop contribution including the heavy scalar  $X$ , which is drawn in Fig. 3. Its amplitude is

$$i\tilde{\Sigma}_2(p^2) = \frac{3}{2} \int \frac{d^4 l}{(2\pi)^4} \int \frac{d^4 k}{(2\pi)^4} (-i\kappa)^2 \frac{i}{l^2 - M_s^2} \frac{i}{(p+k+l)^2 - M_s^2} \frac{i}{k^2 - m^2}, \quad (62)$$

where the subscript in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_2(p^2)$  denotes the dependence on the coupling  $\kappa$  between  $\phi$  and  $X$ . To renormalize it, we decompose the amplitude into two,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_2(p^2) = \tilde{\Sigma}_2^a(p^2) + \tilde{\Sigma}_2^b(p^2), \quad (63)$$




Figure 3: The two-loop self-energy of a scalar  $\phi$  involving a UV scalar  $X$ . As in the previous case of the fermion loop, the renormalized combination vanishes in the decoupling limit.

where the two terms on RHS

$$i\tilde{\Sigma}_2^a(p^2) \equiv S_1 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} (-i\kappa)^2 \frac{i}{k^2 - m^2} iV_{M_s}((p+k)^2), \quad (64)$$

$$iV_{M_s}((p+k)^2) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4l}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{i}{l^2 - M_s^2} \frac{i}{(p+k+l)^2 - M_s^2} \quad (65)$$

$$i\tilde{\Sigma}_2^b(p^2) \equiv S_2 \int \frac{d^4l}{(2\pi)^4} (-i\kappa)^2 \frac{i}{l^2 - M_s^2} iW((p+l)^2) \quad (66)$$

$$iW((p+l)^2) \equiv \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{i}{(p+k+l)^2 - M_s^2} \frac{i}{k^2 - m^2}. \quad (67)$$

are identical up to appropriate symmetry factors  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ .  $V_M(p)$  is the one-loop corrected vertex (25) with the mass of the internal scalar  $M_s$ .

Following subdiagram renormalization in Section 3, the self-energies free of subdiagram divergence are

$$i\tilde{\Sigma}_2^{a,\text{ren}}(p^2) \equiv S_1 \int \frac{d^4k}{(2\pi)^4} (-i\kappa)^2 \frac{i}{k^2 - m^2} [iV_{M_s}((p+k)^2) - iV_{M_s}((p+k)^2)_{p^2=m^2}], \quad (68)$$

$$i\tilde{\Sigma}_2^{b,\text{ren}}(p^2) \equiv S_2 \int \frac{d^4l}{(2\pi)^4} (-i\kappa)^2 \frac{i}{l^2 - M_s^2} [iW((p+l)^2) - iW((p+l)^2)_{p^2=m^2}]. \quad (69)$$

This time,  $V_{M_s}(m^2)$  is not proportional to  $W(m^2)$ , so we need separate renormalization. The momentum dependences of the integrands suggest that the last terms in (68) and (69) are indeed the “counterterms”, whose diagrams are the second and the third, respectively, in Fig. 3. The overall-renormalized mass correction is

$$\delta m_2^2(p) = \tilde{\Sigma}_2^{\text{ren}}(p^2) - \tilde{\Sigma}_2^{\text{ren}}(m^2) - (p^2 - m^2) \frac{d\tilde{\Sigma}_2^{\text{ren}}}{dp^2}(m^2). \quad (70)$$

The second and the third terms are the “counterterms” for the main divergence, which is collectively depicted as the last diagram in Fig. 3.

The amplitude (68) separately vanishes in the decoupling limit as a consequence of the decoupling theorem. An explicit calculation using any regularization gives the finite result

$$\begin{aligned} V_{M_s}((p+k)^2) - V_{M_s}((p+k)^2)_{p^2=m^2} &= \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \int_0^1 dx \log \frac{M_s^2 - x(1-x)(p+k)^2}{M_s^2 - x(1-x)(p+k)^2_{p^2=m^2}} \\ &= \frac{m^2 - p^2}{192\pi^2 M_s^2} + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{m^4}{M_s^4}, \frac{(p+k)^4}{M_s^2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (71)$$

(In the second line, we used the fact that this is the integrand of the  $k$ -integration, and the odd monomials in  $k$  like  $p \cdot k$  shall vanish.) As a result, it is suppressed in powers of  $m^2/M_s^2$  and  $p^2/M_s^2$ . Although we may have a large- $k$  contribution in the higher order terms in  $k$  in  $\tilde{\Sigma}_2^{\text{a,ren}}(p^2)$ , it is to be canceled in the fully-renormalized total amplitude (70).

The nontrivial one is the (unrenormalized) amplitude (66) that is evaluated as<sup>5</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} i\tilde{\Sigma}_2^{\text{b}}(p^2) &= S_2(-i\kappa)^2 \int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d} V((p+l)^2) \frac{i}{l^2 - m^2} \\ &= \frac{S_2 \kappa^2}{2} \int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d} \int dx \frac{\Gamma(2 - \frac{d}{3})}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} [M_s^2 - x(1-x)(p+l)^2]^{d/2-2} \frac{i}{l^2 - m^2} \\ &= \frac{S_2 \kappa^2}{2} \int \frac{d^d l}{(2\pi)^d} \int dx dy \frac{\Gamma(3 - \frac{d}{2})}{(4\pi)^{d/2}} y^{1-d/2} \\ &\quad \times [ym^2 - xy(1-x)(p+l)^2 + (1-y)(l^2 - M_s^2)]^{d/2-3}. \end{aligned} \quad (72)$$

This time, we employed dimensional regularization in computing the first line. The third line does not yet diverge in the limit  $d \rightarrow 4$  that we use from now on. Then, it has the structure

$$i\tilde{\Sigma}_2^{\text{b}}(p^2) = c \int dx dy y^{-1} \int \frac{d^4 l}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{l^2 - \Delta(p^2)}, \quad (73)$$

$$\Delta(p^2) = -f(x, y)p^2 + g_m(x, y)m^2 + g_M(x, y)M_s^2, \quad (74)$$

with appropriate coefficients  $c, f(x, y), g_m(x, y), g_M(x, y)$ . We also performed a shift of the  $l$ . Naively, it diverges quadratically, as expected. We may perform the  $l$ -integration using (34) or (35) so that

$$\delta m_2^2(p^2) = C \int dx dy y^{-1} \left[ \Delta(p^2) \log \frac{\Delta(p^2)}{\Delta(m^2)} + f(x, y)(p^2 - m^2) \right]. \quad (75)$$

<sup>5</sup>For  $\text{Re } \alpha_j > 0$  for all  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , we have [24]

$$\frac{1}{A_1^{\alpha_1} \cdots A_n^{\alpha_n}} = \frac{\Gamma(\alpha_1 + \cdots + \alpha_n)}{\Gamma(\alpha_1) \cdots \Gamma(\alpha_n)} \int_0^1 du_1 \cdots \int_0^1 du_n \frac{\delta(1 - \sum_{k=1}^n u_k) u_1^{\alpha_1-1} \cdots u_n^{\alpha_n-1}}{(\sum_{k=1}^n u_k A_k)^{\sum_{k=1}^n \alpha_k}}.$$

(The  $p$ -independent terms involving  $W((p+l)^2)_{p^2=m^2}$  in (69) cancel.) This is of the form (56) with  $e_2 = 1, f_2 = f(x, y)$ . It follows that the heavy scalar  $X$  decouples in the limit  $M_s \rightarrow \infty$ .

In summary, the scalar mass is not sensitive to UV physics because the correction of the heavy field is suppressed. Also, the renormalized physical quantity is scheme-independent. Correct identification of physical observables is essential.

## Acknowledgments

The author thanks Jong-Hyun Baek, Sungwoo Hong, Hyung-Do Kim, Bumseok Kyaee, Lisa Im, Stefan Groot Nibbelink, Hans-Peter Nilles, Ruiwen Ouyang, Mu-In Park, Jaewon Song and Piljin Yi for discussions. This work is partly supported by the grant RS-2023-00277184 of the National Research Foundation of Korea.

## References

- [1] K.-S. Choi, “On the observables of renormalizable interactions,” *J. Korean Phys. Soc.* **84** (2024) no.8, 591-595 doi:10.1007/s40042-024-01025-7 [arXiv:2310.00586 [hep-ph]].
- [2] K.-S. Choi, “Exact renormalization of the Higgs field,” *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) no.7, 076008 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.076008 [arXiv:2310.10004 [hep-th]].
- [3] E. Gildener, “Gauge Symmetry Hierarchies,” *Phys. Rev. D* **14** (1976), 1667 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.14.1667
- [4] E. Gildener, “GAUGE SYMMETRY HIERARCHIES REVISITED,” *Phys. Lett. B* **92** (1980), 111-114 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(80)90316-0
- [5] S. Weinberg, “Gauge Hierarchies,” *Phys. Lett. B* **82** (1979), 387-391 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(79)90248-X
- [6] A. A. Natale and R. C. Shellard, “THE GAUGE HIERARCHY PROBLEM,” *J. Phys. G* **8** (1982), 635 doi:10.1088/0305-4616/8/5/005
- [7] L. Susskind, “THE GAUGE HIERARCHY PROBLEM, TECHNICOLOR, SUPERSYMMETRY, AND ALL THAT.,” *Phys. Rept.* **104** (1984), 181-193 doi:10.1016/0370-1573(84)90208-4
- [8] Y. Hamada, H. Kawai and K. y. Oda, “Bare Higgs mass at Planck scale,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) no.5, 053009 [erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) no.5, 059901] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.053009 [arXiv:1210.2538 [hep-ph]].

- [9] M. Farina, D. Pappadopulo and A. Strumia, “A modified naturalness principle and its experimental tests,” *JHEP* **08** (2013), 022 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2013)022 [arXiv:1303.7244 [hep-ph]].
- [10] J. D. Wells, “The Utility of Naturalness, and how its Application to Quantum Electrodynamics envisages the Standard Model and Higgs Boson,” *Stud. Hist. Phil. Sci. B* **49** (2015), 102-108 doi:10.1016/j.shpsb.2015.01.002 [arXiv:1305.3434 [hep-ph]].
- [11] A. Hebecker, “Lectures on Naturalness, String Landscape and Multiverse,” [arXiv:2008.10625 [hep-th]].
- [12] N. Craig and S. Koren, “IR Dynamics from UV Divergences: UV/IR Mixing, NCFT, and the Hierarchy Problem,” *JHEP* **03** (2020), 037 doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2020)037 [arXiv:1909.01365 [hep-ph]].
- [13] S. Koren, “The Hierarchy Problem: From the Fundamentals to the Frontiers,” [arXiv:2009.11870 [hep-ph]].
- [14] S. Mooij and M. Shaposhnikov, “QFT without infinities and hierarchy problem,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **990** (2023), 116172 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2023.116172 [arXiv:2110.05175 [hep-th]].
- [15] F. J. Dyson, *Phys. Rev.* **75** (1949), 1736-1755 doi:10.1103/PhysRev.75.1736.
- [16] N. N. Bogoliubov and D. V. Shirkov, “Problems in quantum field theory. I and II,” *Uspekhi Fiz. Na.uk* 55, (1955), 149–214 and 57, (1955), 3-92-in Russian; for German translation see *Fortschr. d. Physik* 3 (1955) 439-495 and 4 (1956) 438-517.
- [17] W. Zimmermann, “Convergence of Bogolyubov’s method of renormalization in momentum space,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **15**, 208-234 (1969) doi:10.1007/BF01645676;  
W. Zimmermann, in S. Deser, M. Grisaru, H. Pendleton, *Lectures on Elementary Particles and Quantum Field Theory. Volume 1.* 1970 Brandeis University Summer Institute in Theoretical Physics, 1970.
- [18] G. F. Giudice, “Naturalness after LHC8,” *PoS EPS-HEP2013* (2013), 163 doi:10.22323/1.180.0163 [arXiv:1307.7879 [hep-ph]].
- [19] T. Cohen, “As Scales Become Separated: Lectures on Effective Field Theory,” *PoS TASI2018* (2019), 011 [arXiv:1903.03622 [hep-ph]].

- [20] N. Craig, “Naturalness: past, present, and future,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) no.9, 825 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11928-7 [arXiv:2205.05708 [hep-ph]].
- [21] Y. Nambu, “S Matrix in semiclassical approximation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **26** (1968), 626-629 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(68)90436-X
- [22] T. Appelquist and J. Carazzone, “Infrared Singularities and Massive Fields,” *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, 2856 (1975) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.11.2856
- [23] M. E. Peskin and D. V. Schroeder, “An Introduction to quantum field theory,” Addison-Wesley, 1995, ISBN 978-0-201-50397-5
- [24] S. Weinberg, “The Quantum theory of fields. Vol. 1: Foundations,” Cambridge University Press, 2005, ISBN 978-0-521-67053-1, 978-0-511-25204-4 doi:10.1017/CBO9781139644167
- [25] S. Coleman, B. G. g. Chen, D. Derbes, D. Griffiths, B. Hill, R. Sohn and Y. S. Ting, “Lectures of Sidney Coleman on Quantum Field Theory,” WSP, 2018, ISBN 978-981-4632-53-9, 978-981-4635-50-9 doi:10.1142/9371
- [26] N. Bogoliubov and O. Parasiuk, *Über die Multiplikation der Kausalfunktionen in der Quantentheorie der Felder*, *Acta Math.* **97** (1957) 227–266.
- [27] K. Hepp, *Proof of the Bogolyubov-Parasiuk theorem on renormalization*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **2** (1966) 301–326.
- [28] W. Zimmermann, *Local field equation for  $A^4$ -coupling in renormalized perturbation theory*, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **6** (1967) 161–188.
- [29] J. H. Lowenstein, “Convergence Theorems for Renormalized Feynman Integrals with Zero-Mass Propagators,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **47** (1976), 53-68 doi:10.1007/BF01609353
- [30] J. H. Lowenstein and W. Zimmermann, “The Power Counting Theorem for Feynman Integrals with Massless Propagators,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **44** (1975), 73-86 doi:10.1007/BF01609059
- [31] S. Weinberg, “High-energy behavior in quantum field theory,” *Phys. Rev.* **118**, 838-849 (1960) doi:10.1103/PhysRev.118.838;
- [32] Bogoliubov, D. V. Shirkov, “Introduction to the Theory of Quantized Fields.” John Wiley & Sons Inc; 3rd edition (1980).

- [33] D. N. Blaschke, F. Gieres, F. Heindl, M. Schweda and M. Wohlgenannt, “BPHZ renormalization and its application to non-commutative field theory,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013), 2566 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2566-8 [arXiv:1307.4650 [hep-th]].
- [34] H. Georgi, “Effective field theory,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **43** (1993), 209-252 doi:10.1146/annurev.ns.43.120193.001233
- [35] H. Georgi and H. D. Politzer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **36** (1976), 1281 [erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37** (1976), 68] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.36.1281
- [36] G. 't Hooft, “Naturalness, chiral symmetry, and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking,” *NATO Sci. Ser. B* **59** (1980), 135-157 doi:10.1007/978-1-4684-7571-5\_9
- [37] K.-S. Choi, “SU(3) x SU(2) x U(1) Vacua in F-Theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **842** (2011), 1-32 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2010.08.012 [arXiv:1007.3843 [hep-th]];  
K.-S. Choi, “On the Standard Model Group in F-theory,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014), 2939 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2939-7 [arXiv:1309.7297 [hep-th]].
- [38] K. G. Wilson, “Renormalization group and critical phenomena. 1. Renormalization group and the Kadanoff scaling picture,” *Phys. Rev. B* **4**, 3174-3183 (1971) doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.4.3174;  
K. G. Wilson, “Renormalization group and critical phenomena. 2. Phase space cell analysis of critical behavior,” *Phys. Rev. B* **4**, 3184-3205 (1971) doi:10.1103/PhysRevB.4.3184
- [39] G. 't Hooft and M. J. G. Veltman, “Regularization and Renormalization of Gauge Fields,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **44**, 189-213 (1972) doi:10.1016/0550-3213(72)90279-9.
- [40] C. G. Bollini and J. J. Giambiagi, “Dimensional Renormalization: The Number of Dimensions as a Regularizing Parameter,” *Nuovo Cim. B* **12**, 20-26 (1972) doi:10.1007/BF02895558
- [41] P. A. M. Dirac, “The Cosmological constants,” *Nature* **139** (1937), 323 doi:10.1038/139323a0
- [42] A. V. Manohar, “Introduction to Effective Field Theories,” doi:10.1093/oso/9780198855743.003.0002 [arXiv:1804.05863 [hep-ph]].
- [43] I. Brivio and M. Trott, “The Standard Model as an Effective Field Theory,” *Phys. Rept.* **793** (2019), 1-98 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2018.11.002 [arXiv:1706.08945 [hep-ph]].