

# Critical behavior of (2 + 1)-dimensional QED: $1/N_f$ corrections in an arbitrary nonlocal gauge

A. V. Kotikov<sup>1</sup> and S. Teber<sup>2,3</sup><sup>1</sup>*Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, 141980 Dubna, Russia*<sup>2</sup>*Sorbonne Universités, UPMC Université Paris 06, UMR 7589, LPTHE, F-75005 Paris, France*<sup>3</sup>*CNRS, UMR 7589, LPTHE, F-75005 Paris, France*

(Received 27 September 2016; published 12 December 2016)

Dynamical chiral symmetry breaking ( $D\chi$ SB) is studied within (2 + 1)-dimensional QED with  $N$  four-component fermions. The leading and next-to-leading orders of the  $1/N$  expansion are computed exactly. The analysis is carried out in an arbitrary nonlocal gauge. Resumming the wave-function renormalization constant at the level of the gap equation yields a strong suppression of the gauge dependence of the critical fermion flavor number,  $N_c(\xi)$ , where  $\xi$  is the gauge-fixing parameter, which is such that  $D\chi$ SB takes place for  $N < N_c(\xi)$ . Neglecting the weak gauge-dependent terms yields  $N_c = 2.8469$ , while, in the general case, it is found that  $N_c(1) = 3.0084$  in the Feynman gauge,  $N_c(0) = 3.0844$  in the Landau gauge, and  $N_c(2/3) = 3.0377$  in the  $\xi = 2/3$  gauge where the leading order fermion wave function is finite. These results suggest that  $D\chi$ SB should take place for integer values  $N \leq 3$ .

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevD.94.114011

## I. INTRODUCTION

We consider quantum electrodynamics in 2 + 1 dimensions ( $\text{QED}_3$ ) which is described by the Lagrangian

$$L = \bar{\Psi}(i\hat{\partial} - e\hat{A})\Psi - \frac{1}{4}F_{\mu\nu}^2, \quad (1)$$

where  $\Psi$  is taken to be a four-component complex spinor. In the presence of  $N$  fermion flavors, the model has a  $U(2N)$  symmetry. A (parity-invariant) fermion mass term,  $m\bar{\Psi}\Psi$ , breaks this symmetry to  $U(N) \times U(N)$  (the case of a parity-noninvariant mass will not be considered here). In the massless case, loop expansions are plagued by infrared divergences. The latter soften upon analyzing the model in a  $1/N$  expansion [1,2]. Since the theory is super-renormalizable, the mass scale is then given by the dimensionful coupling constant  $a = Ne^2/8$ , which is kept fixed as  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . Early studies of this model [3,4] suggested that the physics is rapidly damped at momentum scales  $p \gg a$  and that a (parity-invariant) fermion mass term breaking the flavor symmetry is dynamically generated at scales which are orders of magnitude smaller than the intrinsic scale  $a$ . Since then, dynamical chiral symmetry breaking ( $D\chi$ SB) in  $\text{QED}_3$  and the dependence of the dynamical fermion mass on  $N$  have been the subject of extensive studies; see, e.g., [3–22].

A central issue is related to the value of the critical fermion number,  $N_c$ , which is such that  $D\chi$ SB takes place only for  $N < N_c$ . An accurate determination of  $N_c$  is of crucial importance to understanding the phase structure of  $\text{QED}_3$ , with far-reaching implications ranging from particle physics to planar condensed matter physics systems having relativisticlike low-energy excitations such as some two-

dimensional antiferromagnets [23] and graphene [24]. It turns out that the values that can be found in the literature vary from  $N_c \rightarrow \infty$  [3,5–7], corresponding to  $D\chi$ SB for all values of  $N$ , all the way to  $N_c \rightarrow 0$  in the case where no sign of  $D\chi$ SB is found [8,9]. Recent works based on conformal field theory techniques tend to narrow this range, but the upper bound found for  $N_c$  still varies:  $N_c < 3/2$  [10] or  $N_c < 4.4$  [11] or  $N_c < 9/4$  [12]. Other works suggest that there might be two different critical flavor numbers [13,14]:  $N_c < N_c^{\text{conf}}$ , where  $N_c \approx 4$  [13],  $N_c \leq 4.422$  [14], and, above  $4.1 < N_c^{\text{conf}} < 10.0$  [13],  $N_c^{\text{conf}} \approx 6.24$  [14], the theory is quasiconformal. Of importance to us in the following is the approach of Appelquist *et al.* [4], who found that  $N_c = 32/\pi^2 \approx 3.24$  by solving the Schwinger-Dyson (SD) gap equation using a leading order (LO)  $1/N$  expansion. Lattice simulations in agreement with a finite nonzero value of  $N_c$  can be found in [15]. Soon after the analysis of [4], Nash approximately included next-to-leading order (NLO) corrections and performed a partial resummation of the wave-function renormalization constant at the level of the gap equation; he found [16]  $N_c \approx 3.28$ . Recently, upon refining the work of [17], the NLO corrections could be computed exactly in the Landau gauge yielding (in the absence of resummation) [18]  $N_c \approx 3.29$ , a value which is surprisingly close to the one of Nash [25]. More recently, using different methods, several new estimates were given:  $N_c = 1 + \sqrt{2} \approx 2.41$  in [19],  $N_c \approx 2.89$  in [20], and  $N_c \approx 2.85$  in [21].

The purpose of this work is to extend the exact results of [18] to an arbitrary nonlocal gauge [26]. Such an achievement represents an essential improvement with respect to

Nash's approximate NLO results which were carried out in the Feynman gauge 27 years ago. In this respect, there is presently a strong ongoing interest in the study of the gauge dependence of  $D\chi\text{SB}$  in several models; see [22,27]. The choice of the Landau gauge in [18] was motivated by recent results on  $\text{QED}_3$  [22] showing the gauge invariance of  $N_c$  in this gauge when using the Ball-Chiu vertex [28]. Actually, after resumming the wave-function renormalization constant, we find that the LO term in the gap equation becomes gauge invariant, in agreement with Nash, but also that NLO terms become only weakly gauge variant. As will be shown in the following, this leads to a very stable value of  $N_c$  upon varying the gauge-fixing parameter. Moreover, the large- $N$  limit of the photon propagator in  $\text{QED}_3$  has precisely the same momentum dependence as the one in the so-called reduced QED; see [29] and also [30]. One difference is that the gauge-fixing parameter in reduced QED is 2 times less than the one in  $\text{QED}_3$ . Such a difference can be taken into account with the help of our present results for  $\text{QED}_3$ , together with the multiloop results obtained in [31,32]. The case of reduced QED, and its relation with dynamical gap generation in graphene, which is the subject of active ongoing research (see, e.g., the reviews in [33,34]), will be considered in a separate paper [35]. In the following, we shall focus exclusively on  $\text{QED}_3$ .

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, the LO results are presented, and in Sec. III the NLO ones including Nash's resummation are presented. In Sec. IV, the Conclusion is given, and in the Appendix some details related to the resummation procedure within our working frame are provided.

## II. SCHWINGER-DYSON EQUATIONS AND LEADING ORDER

With the conventions of Ref. [18], the inverse fermion propagator is defined as  $S^{-1}(p) = [1 + A(p)](i\hat{p} + \Sigma(p))$ , where  $A(p)$  is the fermion wave function and  $\Sigma(p)$  is the dynamically generated parity-conserving mass, which is taken to be the same for all of the fermions. The SD equation for the fermion propagator may be decomposed into scalar and vector components as follows:

$$\tilde{\Sigma}(p) = \frac{2a}{N} \text{Tr} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\gamma^\mu D_{\mu\nu}(p-k) \Sigma(k) \Gamma^\nu(p,k)}{[1 + A(k)](k^2 + \Sigma^2(k))}, \quad (2a)$$

$$A(p)p^2 = -\frac{2a}{N} \text{Tr} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{D_{\mu\nu}(p-k) \hat{p} \gamma^\mu \hat{k} \Gamma^\nu(p,k)}{[1 + A(k)](k^2 + \Sigma^2(k))}, \quad (2b)$$

where  $\tilde{\Sigma}(p) = \Sigma(p)[1 + A(p)]$  and  $D_{\mu\nu}(p)$  is the photon propagator in the nonlocal  $\xi$  gauge:

$$D_{\mu\nu}(p) = \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^\xi(p)}{p^2[1 + \Pi(p)]},$$

$$P_{\mu\nu}^\xi(p) = g_{\mu\nu} - (1 - \xi) \frac{p_\mu p_\nu}{p^2}. \quad (3)$$

$\Pi(p)$  is the polarization operator and  $\Gamma^\nu(p,k)$  is the vertex function. In the following, Eq. (2) will be studied for an arbitrary value of the gauge-fixing parameter  $\xi$ . All calculations will be performed with the help of the standard rules of perturbation theory for massless Feynman diagrams as in [36]; see also the recent short review [37]. For the most complicated diagrams, the Gegenbauer polynomial technique will be used following [38].

To start with, let us consider the LO approximations in the  $1/N$  expansion. The latter are given by  $A(p) = 0$ ,  $\Pi(p) = a/|p|$ , and  $\Gamma^\nu(p,k) = \gamma^\nu$ , where the fermion mass has been neglected [39] in the calculation of  $\Pi(p)$ . A single diagram contributes to the gap equation (2a) at LO (see Fig. 1), and the latter reads

$$\Sigma(p) = \frac{8(2 + \xi)a}{N} \times \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Sigma(k)}{(k^2 + \Sigma^2(k))[(p-k)^2 + a|p-k|]}. \quad (4)$$

Following [4], we consider the limit of large  $a$  and linearize Eq. (4), which yields

$$\Sigma(p) = \frac{8(2 + \xi)}{N} \int \frac{d^3k}{(2\pi)^3} \frac{\Sigma(k)}{k^2|p-k|}. \quad (5)$$

The mass function may then be parametrized as [4]

$$\Sigma(k) = B(k^2)^{-\alpha}, \quad (6)$$

where  $B$  is arbitrary and the index  $\alpha$  has to be self-consistently determined. Using this ansatz, Eq. (5) reads

$$\Sigma^{(\text{LO})}(p) = \frac{4(2 + \xi)B}{N} \frac{(p^2)^{-\alpha}}{(4\pi)^{3/2}} \frac{2\beta}{\pi^{1/2}}, \quad (7)$$

from which the LO gap equation is obtained:




FIG. 1. LO diagram to the dynamically generated mass  $\Sigma(p)$ . The crossed line denotes mass insertion.

$$1 = \frac{(2 + \xi)\beta}{L}, \quad \text{where } \beta = \frac{1}{\alpha(1/2 - \alpha)} \quad \text{and} \quad L \equiv \pi^2 N. \quad (8)$$

Solving the gap equation yields

$$\alpha_{\pm} = \frac{1}{4} \left( 1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{16(2 + \xi)}{L}} \right), \quad (9)$$

which reproduces the solution given by Appelquist *et al.* [4]. The gauge-dependent critical number of fermions,  $N_c \equiv N_c(\xi) = 16(2 + \xi)/\pi^2$ , is such that  $\Sigma(p) = 0$  for  $N > N_c$ , and

$$\Sigma(0) \approx \exp[-2\pi/(N_c/N - 1)^{1/2}] \quad (10)$$

for  $N < N_c$ . Thus, D $\chi$ SB occurs when  $\alpha$  becomes complex: that is, for  $N < N_c$ .

The gauge-dependent fermion wave function may be computed in a similar way. At LO, Eq. (2b) simplifies as

$$A(p)p^2 = -\frac{2a}{N} \text{Tr} \int \frac{d^D k}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{P_{\mu\nu}^{\xi}(p-k) \hat{p} \gamma^{\mu} \hat{k} \gamma^{\nu}}{k^2 |p-k|}, \quad (11)$$

where the integral has been dimensionally regularized with  $D = 3 - 2\varepsilon$ . Taking the trace and computing the integral on the rhs yields

$$\begin{aligned} A(p) &= \frac{\Gamma(1 + \varepsilon)(4\pi)^{\varepsilon} \mu^{2\varepsilon}}{p^{2\varepsilon}} C_1(\xi) \\ &= \frac{\bar{\mu}^{2\varepsilon}}{p^{2\varepsilon}} C_1(\xi) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  parameter  $\bar{\mu}$  has the standard form  $\bar{\mu}^2 = 4\pi e^{-\gamma_E} \mu^2$ , with the Euler constant  $\gamma_E$ , and

$$C_1(\xi) = +\frac{2}{3\pi^2 N} \left( (2 - 3\xi) \left[ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} - 2 \ln 2 \right] + \frac{14}{3} - 6\xi \right). \quad (13)$$

We note that, in the  $\xi = 2/3$  gauge, the value of  $A(p)$  is finite and  $C_1(\xi = 2/3) = +4/(9\pi^2 N)$ . From Eqs. (12) and (13), the LO wave-function renormalization constant may be extracted:




FIG. 2. NLO diagrams to the dynamically generated mass  $\Sigma(p)$ . The shaded blob is defined in Eq. (20).

$$\lambda_A = \mu \frac{dA(p)}{d\mu} = \frac{4(2 - 3\xi)}{3\pi^2 N}, \quad (14)$$

a result which coincides with the one of [41].

### III. NEXT-TO-LEADING ORDER

#### A. Self-energy contributions

We now consider the NLO contributions and parametrize them as

$$\Sigma^{(\text{NLO})}(p) = \left( \frac{8}{N} \right)^2 B \frac{(p^2)^{-\alpha}}{(4\pi)^3} (\Sigma_A + \Sigma_1 + 2\Sigma_2 + \Sigma_3), \quad (15)$$

where each contribution to the linearized gap equation is represented graphically in Fig. 2. Adding these contributions to the LO result, Eq. (7), the gap equation has the following general form:

$$1 = \frac{(2 + \xi)\beta}{L} + \frac{\bar{\Sigma}_A(\xi) + \bar{\Sigma}_1(\xi) + 2\bar{\Sigma}_2(\xi) + \bar{\Sigma}_3(\xi)}{L^2}, \quad (16)$$

where  $\bar{\Sigma}_i = \pi\Sigma_i$ , ( $i = 1, 2, 3, A$ ). In [18], these contributions were computed in the Landau gauge,  $\xi = 0$ . After very tedious and lengthy calculations, these computations could be extended to an arbitrary nonlocal gauge. We now summarize our results.

The contribution  $\Sigma_A$  [see Fig. 2(a)] originates from the LO value of  $A(p)$  and is singular. Using dimensional regularization, and for an arbitrary parameter  $\xi$ , it reads

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Sigma}_A(\xi) &= 4 \frac{\bar{\mu}^{2\varepsilon}}{p^{2\varepsilon}} \beta \left[ \left( \frac{4}{3}(1 - \xi) - \xi^2 \right) \left[ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} + \Psi_1 - \frac{\beta}{4} \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \left( \frac{16}{9} - \frac{4}{9}\xi - 2\xi^2 \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\Psi_1 = \Psi(\alpha) + \Psi(1/2 - \alpha) - 2\Psi(1) + \frac{3}{1/2 - \alpha} - 2 \ln 2, \quad (18)$$

and  $\Psi$  is the digamma function.

The contribution  $\Sigma_1$  [see Fig. 2(b)] is finite and reads

$$\bar{\Sigma}_1(\xi) = -2(2 + \xi)\beta\hat{\Pi}, \quad \hat{\Pi} = \frac{92}{9} - \pi^2, \quad (19)$$

where the gauge dependence comes from the fact that we work in a nonlocal gauge and  $\hat{\Pi}$  arises from the two-loop polarization operator in dimension  $D = 3$  [31,42,43], which may be graphically represented as



$$= 2 \times \text{diagram} + \text{diagram}. \quad (20)$$

The contribution  $\Sigma_2$  [see Fig. 2(c)] is again singular. Dimensionally regularizing it yields

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Sigma}_2(\xi) = & -2 \frac{\bar{\mu}^{2\epsilon}}{p^{2\epsilon}} \beta \left[ \frac{(2 + \xi)(2 - 3\xi)}{3} \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} + \Psi_1 - \frac{\beta}{4} \right) \right. \\ & + \frac{\beta}{4} \left( \frac{14}{3}(1 - \xi) + \xi^2 \right) + \frac{28}{9} + \frac{8}{9}\xi - 4\xi^2 \left. \right] \\ & + (1 - \xi)\hat{\Sigma}_2, \end{aligned} \quad (21a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_2(\alpha) = & (4\alpha - 1)\beta[\Psi'(\alpha) - \Psi'(1/2 - \alpha)] \\ & + \frac{\pi}{2\alpha} \tilde{I}_1(\alpha) + \frac{\pi}{2(1/2 - \alpha)} \tilde{I}_1(\alpha + 1), \end{aligned} \quad (21b)$$

where  $\Psi'$  is the trigamma function and  $\tilde{I}_1(\alpha)$  is a dimensionless integral that was defined in [18].

The singularities in  $\bar{\Sigma}_A(\xi)$  and  $\bar{\Sigma}_2(\xi)$  cancel each other out and their sum, therefore, is finite. Defining  $\bar{\Sigma}_{2A}(\xi) = \bar{\Sigma}_A(\xi) + 2\bar{\Sigma}_2(\xi)$ , the latter reads

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Sigma}_{2A}(\xi) = & 2(1 - \xi)\hat{\Sigma}_2(\alpha) - \left( \frac{14}{3}(1 - \xi) + \xi^2 \right) \beta^2 \\ & - 8\beta \left( \frac{2}{3}(1 + \xi) - \xi^2 \right). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Finally, the contribution  $\Sigma_3$  [see Fig. 2(d)] is finite and reads

$$\bar{\Sigma}_3(\xi) = \hat{\Sigma}_3(\alpha, \xi) + (3 + 4\xi - 2\xi^2)\beta^2, \quad (23a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_3(\alpha, \xi) = & \frac{1}{4}(1 + 8\xi + \xi^2 + 2\alpha(1 - \xi^2))\pi\tilde{I}_2(\alpha) \\ & + \frac{1}{2}(1 + 4\xi - \alpha(1 - \xi^2))\pi\tilde{I}_2(1 + \alpha) \\ & + \frac{1}{4}(-7 - 16\xi + 3\xi^2)\pi\tilde{I}_3(\alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (23b)$$

where the dimensionless integrals  $\tilde{I}_2(\alpha)$  and  $\tilde{I}_3(\alpha)$  were defined in [18].

## B. Gap equation (1)

Combining all of the above results, the gap equation (16) may be written in an explicit form as

$$\begin{aligned} 1 = & \frac{(2 + \xi)\beta}{L} + \frac{1}{L^2} \left[ 8S(\alpha, \xi) - 2(2 + \xi)\hat{\Pi}\beta \right. \\ & \left. + \left( -\frac{5}{3} + \frac{26}{3}\xi - 3\xi^2 \right) \beta^2 - 8\beta \left( \frac{2}{3}(1 - \xi) - \xi^2 \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

$$S(\alpha, \xi) = (\hat{\Sigma}_3(\alpha, \xi) + 2(1 - \xi)\hat{\Sigma}_2(\alpha))/8. \quad (25)$$

At this point, we consider Eq. (24) directly at the critical point  $\alpha = 1/4$ , i.e., at  $\beta = 16$ . This yields

$$\begin{aligned} L_c^2 - 16(2 + \xi)L_c - 8[S(\xi) - 4(2 + \xi)\hat{\Pi} \\ - 16(4 - 50\xi/3 + 5\xi^2)] = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where  $S(\xi) = S(\alpha = 1/4, \xi) = (\hat{\Sigma}_3(\xi) + 2(1 - \xi)\hat{\Sigma}_2)/8$ , with  $\hat{\Sigma}_2 = \hat{\Sigma}_2(\alpha = 1/4)$  and  $\hat{\Sigma}_3(\xi) = \hat{\Sigma}_3(\alpha = 1/4, \xi)$ . Solving Eq. (26), we have two standard solutions:

$$\begin{aligned} L_{c,\pm} = & 8(2 + \xi) \pm \sqrt{d_1(\xi)}, \\ d_1(\xi) = & 8 \left[ S(\xi) - 8 \left( 4 - \frac{112}{3}\xi + 9\xi^2 + \frac{2 + \xi}{2}\hat{\Pi} \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

In order to provide a numerical estimate for  $N_c$ , we have used the series representations [18] to evaluate the integrals:  $\pi\tilde{I}_1(\alpha = 1/4) \equiv R_1$  and  $\pi\tilde{I}_2(\alpha = 1/4 + i\delta) \equiv R_2 - iP_2\delta + O(\delta^2)$ , where  $\delta \rightarrow 0$  regulates an artificial singularity in  $\pi\tilde{I}_3(\alpha = 1/4) = R_2 + P_2/4$ . With 10000 iterations for each series, the following numerical estimates are obtained [18]:

$$R_1 = 163.7428, \quad R_2 = 209.175, \quad P_2 = 1260.720, \quad (28)$$

from which the complicated part of the self-energies can be evaluated:

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{\Sigma}_2 = & 4R_1, \\ \hat{\Sigma}_3(\xi) = & (\xi^2 - 1)R_2 - (7 + 16\xi - 3\xi^2)P_2/16. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

Combining these values with the one of  $\hat{\Pi}$  yields

$$N_c(\xi = 0) = 3.29, \quad N_c(\xi = 2/3) = 3.09, \quad (30)$$

where  $-$  solutions are unphysical and there is no solution in the Feynman gauge. In the Landau gauge, we recover the

result of [18]. The range of  $\xi$  values for which there is a solution corresponds to  $\xi_- \leq \xi \leq \xi_+$ , where  $\xi_+ = 0.88$  and  $\xi_- = -2.36$ .

### C. Gap equation (2)

Following Ref. [16], we would like to resum the LO term together with the part of the NLO corrections containing terms  $\sim\beta^2$ . In order to do so, we will now rewrite the gap equation (24) in a form which is suitable for resummation. This amounts to extracting the terms  $\sim\beta$  and  $\sim\beta^2$  from the complicated parts of the fermion self-energy, Eqs. (21b) and (23b). All calculations done, this yields

$$\hat{\Sigma}_2(\alpha) = \beta(3\beta - 8) + \tilde{\Sigma}_2(\alpha), \quad (31a)$$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_2 = \tilde{\Sigma}_2(\alpha = 1/4) = 4\tilde{R}_1, \quad \tilde{R}_1 = 3.7428, \quad (31b)$$

where the rest,  $\tilde{\Sigma}_2 = \tilde{\Sigma}_2(\alpha = 1/4)$ , was determined by imposing Eq. (29). Similarly,

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_3(\xi) = -4\xi(4 + \xi)\beta + \tilde{\Sigma}_3(\alpha, \xi), \quad (32a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\Sigma}_3(\alpha, \xi) &= \frac{1}{4}(1 + 8\xi + \xi^2 + 2\alpha(1 - \xi^2))\pi\tilde{J}_2(\alpha) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2}(1 + 4\xi - \alpha(1 - \xi^2))\pi\tilde{J}_2(1 + \alpha) \\ &- \frac{1}{4}(-7 - 16\xi + 3\xi^2)\pi\tilde{J}_3(\alpha), \end{aligned} \quad (32b)$$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_3(\xi) = (\xi^2 - 1)\tilde{R}_2 - (7 + 16\xi - 3\xi^2)\frac{\tilde{P}_2}{16}, \quad (32c)$$

where the form of the rest,  $\tilde{\Sigma}_3(\xi) = \tilde{\Sigma}_3(\alpha = 1/4, \xi)$ , is imposed by Eq. (29). Equating Eqs. (32c) with (32b) for  $\alpha = 1/4$  and using the values

$$\pi\tilde{J}_2(\alpha = 1/4) = \pi\tilde{J}_2(\alpha = 5/4) = \tilde{R}_2^N = 17.175, \quad (33a)$$

$$\pi\tilde{J}_3(\alpha = 1/4) = \tilde{R}_2^N + \tilde{P}_2^N/4, \quad (33b)$$

$$\tilde{P}_2^N = -19.28 \quad (33c)$$

yields

$$\tilde{R}_2 = \tilde{R}_2^N - 16 = 1.175, \quad \tilde{P}_2 = \tilde{P}_2^N = -19.28. \quad (34)$$

With the help of the results (31) and (32), the gap equation (24) may be written as

$$\begin{aligned} 1 &= \frac{(2 + \xi)\beta}{L} + \frac{1}{L^2} \left[ 8\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) - 2(2 + \xi)\hat{\Pi}\beta \right. \\ &\left. + \left( \frac{2}{3} - \xi \right) (2 + \xi)\beta^2 + 4\beta \left( \xi^2 - \frac{4}{3}\xi - \frac{16}{3} \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where

$$\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) = (\tilde{\Sigma}_3(\alpha, \xi) + 2(1 - \xi)\tilde{\Sigma}_2(\alpha))/8. \quad (36)$$

At this point, Eqs. (24) and (35) are strictly equivalent to each other and yield the same values for  $N_c(\xi)$ .

### D. Resummation

Equation (35) is the convenient starting point for performing a resummation of the wave-function renormalization constant. Up to second order, the expansion of the latter reads

$$\lambda_A = \frac{\lambda^{(1)}}{L} + \frac{\lambda^{(2)}}{L^2} + \dots, \quad \lambda^{(1)} = 4 \left( \frac{2}{3} - \xi \right), \quad (37)$$

where  $\lambda^{(1)}$  is the LO part and  $\lambda^{(2)}$  the NLO one. The latter can be obtained from Gracey's calculations [43] and reads

$$\lambda^{(2)} = -8 \left( \frac{8}{27} + \left( \frac{2}{3} - \xi \right) \hat{\Pi} \right). \quad (38)$$

As can be seen from Eq. (35), the NLO term  $\sim\beta^2$  is proportional to the LO wave-function renormalization constant. This term and the LO term in the gap equation can be thought of the first and zeroth order terms, respectively, of an expansion in  $\lambda_A$ . Following Nash, it is possible to resum the full expansion of  $\lambda_A$  at the level of the gap equation (see the Appendix for details), leading to

$$1 = \frac{8\beta}{3L} + \frac{\beta}{4L^2} \left( \lambda^{(2)} - 4\lambda^{(1)} \left( \frac{14}{3} + \xi \right) \right) + \frac{\Delta(\alpha, \xi)}{L^2}, \quad (39)$$

where

$$\Delta(\alpha, \xi) = 8\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) - 4\beta(\xi^2 + 4\xi + 8/3) - 2\beta(2 + \xi)\hat{\Pi}. \quad (40)$$

Interestingly, the LO term in Eq. (39) is now gauge independent. With the help of Eqs. (37) and (38), Eq. (39) can now be written explicitly as

$$1 = \frac{8\beta}{3L} + \frac{1}{L^2} \left[ 8\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) - \frac{16}{3}\beta \left( \frac{40}{9} + \hat{\Pi} \right) \right], \quad (41)$$

which displays a strong suppression of the gauge dependence even at NLO, as  $\xi$ -dependent terms do exist, but they enter the gap equation only through the rest,  $\tilde{S}$ , which is very small numerically.

We now consider Eq. (41) at the critical point,  $\alpha = 1/4$  ( $\beta = 16$ ), which yields

$$L_c^2 - \frac{128}{3}L_c - \left[ 8\tilde{S}(\xi) - \frac{256}{3} \left( \frac{40}{9} + \hat{\Pi} \right) \right] = 0. \quad (42)$$

Solving Eq. (42), we have two standard solutions:

$$L_{c,\pm} = \frac{64}{3} \pm \sqrt{d_2(\xi)}, \quad (43a)$$

$$d_2(\xi) = \left(\frac{64}{3}\right)^2 + \left[8\tilde{S}(\xi) - \frac{256}{3}\left(\frac{40}{9} + \hat{\Pi}\right)\right]. \quad (43b)$$

In order to provide a numerical estimate for  $N_c$ , we have used the values of  $\tilde{R}_1$ ,  $\tilde{R}_2$ , and  $\tilde{P}_2$  of Eqs. (31) and (34). Combining these values with

$$\tilde{S}(\xi = 0) = \tilde{R}_1 - \frac{\tilde{R}_2}{8} - \frac{7\tilde{P}_2}{128}, \quad (44a)$$

$$\tilde{S}(\xi = 1) = -\frac{5\tilde{P}_2}{32}, \quad (44b)$$

$$\tilde{S}(\xi = 2/3) = \frac{\tilde{R}_1}{3} - \frac{5\tilde{R}_2}{72} - \frac{49\tilde{P}_2}{384}, \quad (44c)$$

together with the value of  $\hat{\Pi}$ , yields, for  $L_c(\xi)$  and  $N_c(\xi)$  (– solutions being unphysical),

$$L_c(0) = 30.44, \quad L_c(2/3) = 29.98, \quad L_c(1) = 29.69, \quad (45a)$$

$$N_c(0) = 3.08, \quad N_c(2/3) = 3.04, \quad N_c(1) = 3.01. \quad (45b)$$

Actually, solutions exist for a broad range of values of  $\xi$ :  $\tilde{\xi}_- \leq \xi \leq \tilde{\xi}_+$ , where  $\tilde{\xi}_+ = 4.042$  and  $\tilde{\xi}_- = -8.412$ ; this is consistent with the weak  $\xi$  dependence of the gap equation. Moreover, following [29], we think that the “right” (that is, the best) gauge choice is one close to  $\xi = 2/3$  where the LO fermion wave function is finite. Indeed, as can be seen by comparing Eqs. (30) and (45b), upon resumming the theory, the value of  $N_c(\xi)$  increases (decreases) for small (large) values of  $\xi$ . For  $\xi = 2/3$ , the value of  $N_c$  is very stable, decreasing by only 1% to 2% during resumming. Finally, if we neglect the rest, i.e.,  $\tilde{S}(\xi) = 0$  in Eq. (42), the gap equation becomes  $\xi$  independent and we have

$$\bar{L}_c = 28.0981, \quad \bar{N}_c = 2.85. \quad (46)$$

The results of Eq. (46) are in full agreement with the recent results of [21], where the NLO corrections have been analyzed in an approximation corresponding to  $\tilde{S}(\xi) = 0$ , i.e., taking into account only the NLO terms  $\sim\beta$  and  $\sim\beta^2$ ; see the Appendix for details.

## IV. CONCLUSION

We have studied  $D\chi$ SB in  $\text{QED}_3$  by including  $1/N^2$  corrections to the SD equation exactly and taking into account the full  $\xi$  dependence of the gap equation. Following Nash, the wave-function renormalization constant has been resummed at the level of the gap equation, leading to a very weak gauge variance of the critical fermion number,  $N_c$ . The value obtained for the latter, Eq. (45b), suggests that  $D\chi$ SB takes place for integer values  $N \leq 3$  in  $\text{QED}_3$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful to Valery Gusynin for the discussions. A. V. K. was supported by RFBR Grant No. 16-02-00790-a. Financial support from Université Pierre et Marie Curie and CNRS is acknowledged.

## APPENDIX: RESUMMATION

In this appendix, we give some details related to the resumming procedure of Nash [16] within our working frame. As we shall explain below, the resumming procedure consists of resumming the LO term together with the part of the NLO corrections containing terms  $\sim\beta^2$ . In order to do so, we consider the gap equation corresponding to Eq. (35) in the main text, which we reproduce here for clarity:

$$1 = \frac{(2 + \xi)\beta}{L} + \frac{1}{L^2} \left[ 8\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) - 2(2 + \xi)\hat{\Pi}\beta + \left(\frac{2}{3} - \xi\right)(2 + \xi)\beta^2 + 4\beta\left(\xi^2 - \frac{4}{3}\xi - \frac{16}{3}\right) \right], \quad (A1)$$

where (as displayed in the main text)

$$\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) = (\tilde{\Sigma}_3(\alpha, \xi) + 2(1 - \xi)\tilde{\Sigma}_2(\alpha))/8, \quad (A2)$$

and (as found in the main text)

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_2(\alpha = 1/4) = 4\tilde{R}_1, \quad \tilde{R}_1 = 3.7428, \quad (A3a)$$

$$\tilde{\Sigma}_3(\alpha = 1/4, \xi) = (\xi^2 - 1)\tilde{R}_2 - (7 + 16\xi - 3\xi^2)\frac{\tilde{P}_2}{16},$$

$$\tilde{R}_2 = 1.175, \quad \tilde{P}_2 = -19.28. \quad (A3b)$$

Equation (A1) is a convenient starting point to perform a resumming *à la* Nash [16]. In order to implement this resumming, let us first consider the integral

$$\int_0^a d|k| \frac{\Sigma(|k|)}{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)} \left[ \frac{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)}{\text{Min}(|k|, |p|)} \right]^\lambda, \quad (A4)$$

with some arbitrary  $\lambda$ . Using the fact that  $\Sigma(p) = B(p^2)^{-\alpha}$ , we have

$$1 = \frac{1}{\Sigma(p)} \int_0^a d|k| \frac{\Sigma(|k|)}{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)} \left[ \frac{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)}{\text{Min}(|k|, |p|)} \right]^\lambda$$

$$= \left( \frac{1}{2\alpha - \lambda} + \frac{1}{1 - 2\alpha - \lambda} \right) = \frac{1 - 2\lambda}{(2\alpha - \lambda)(1 - 2\alpha - \lambda)}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Taking the derivative of  $\lambda$  and putting  $\lambda = 0$ , we have another important integral:

$$1 = \frac{1}{\Sigma(p)} \int_0^a d|k| \frac{\Sigma(|k|)}{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)} \ln \left[ \frac{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)}{\text{Min}(|k|, |p|)} \right]$$

$$= \left( \frac{1}{(2\alpha)^2} + \frac{1}{(1 - 2\alpha)^2} \right) = \frac{\beta}{16} (\beta - 8). \quad (\text{A6})$$

Thus, we can now represent the gap equation (A1) in the form

$$1 = \frac{4(2 + \xi)}{L\Sigma(p)} \int_0^a d|k| \frac{\Sigma(|k|)}{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)} \times \left\{ 1 + \frac{4(2 - 3\xi)}{3L} \ln \left[ \frac{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)}{\text{Min}(|k|, |p|)} \right] \right\} + \frac{\Delta(\alpha, \xi)}{L^2}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

where

$$\Delta(\alpha, \xi) = 8\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) - 4\beta \left( \xi^2 + 4\xi + \frac{8}{3} + \frac{2 + \xi}{2} \hat{\Pi} \right). \quad (\text{A8})$$

Following Nash [16], the integral (A7) may be viewed as the first 2 orders of the expansion of the integral (A4), with the anomalous dimension  $\lambda$  corresponding to the wavefunction renormalization constant:

$$\lambda_A = \frac{\lambda^{(1)}}{L} + \frac{\lambda^{(2)}}{L^2} + \dots, \quad \lambda^{(1)} = 4 \left( \frac{2}{3} - \xi \right), \quad (\text{A9})$$

where  $\lambda^{(1)}$  is the LO part and  $\lambda^{(2)}$  the NLO one. In order to resum this contribution, we perform the following replacement:

$$\int_0^a d|k| \frac{\Sigma(|k|)}{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)} \left\{ 1 + \frac{4(2 - 3\xi)}{3L} \ln \left[ \frac{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)}{\text{Min}(|k|, |p|)} \right] \right\}$$

$$\rightarrow \int_0^a d|k| \frac{\Sigma(|k|)}{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)} \left[ \frac{\text{Max}(|k|, |p|)}{\text{Min}(|k|, |p|)} \right]^{\lambda_A}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

After this replacement, the gap equation (A7) takes the form

$$1 = \frac{4(2 + \xi)}{L} \frac{1 - 2\lambda_A}{(2\alpha - \lambda_A)(1 - 2\alpha - \lambda_A)} + \frac{\Delta(\alpha, \xi)}{L^2}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

It is convenient to multiply Eq. (A11) by the factor  $(2\alpha - \lambda_A)(1 - 2\alpha - \lambda_A)$ . This yields

$$(2\alpha - \lambda_A)(1 - 2\alpha - \lambda_A) = \frac{4(2 + \xi)}{L} (1 - 2\lambda_A)$$

$$+ (2\alpha - \lambda_A)(1 - 2\alpha - \lambda_A) \frac{\Delta(\alpha, \xi)}{L^2}. \quad (\text{A12})$$

Note that the lhs can be represented as  $2\alpha(1 - 2\alpha) - \lambda_A(1 - \lambda_A)$ , which leads to

$$2\alpha(1 - 2\alpha) = \lambda_A(1 - \lambda_A) + \frac{4(2 + \xi)}{L} (1 - 2\lambda_A)$$

$$+ (2\alpha - \lambda_A)(1 - 2\alpha - \lambda_A) \frac{\Delta(\alpha, \xi)}{L^2}. \quad (\text{A13})$$

From Eq. (A13), we see that, after resummation,  $\lambda_A$ , Eq. (A9), will contribute to the gap equation up to NLO. The expression of  $\lambda^{(2)}$  can be obtained from Gracey's calculations [43] and reads

$$\lambda^{(2)} = -8 \left( \frac{8}{27} + \left( \frac{2}{3} - \xi \right) \hat{\Pi} \right). \quad (\text{A14})$$

Hence,

$$\lambda_A(1 - \lambda_A) + \frac{4(2 + \xi)}{L} (1 - 2\lambda_A)$$

$$= \frac{4(2 + \xi) + \lambda^{(1)}}{3L} + \frac{1}{L^2} (\lambda^{(2)} - (\lambda^{(1)})^2 - 8(2 + \xi)\lambda^{(1)})$$

$$= \frac{32}{3L} + \frac{1}{L^2} \left( \lambda^{(2)} - 4\lambda^{(1)} \left( \frac{14}{3} + \xi \right) \right), \quad (\text{A15})$$

which shows the complete cancellation of the  $\xi$  dependence at LO. Now, it is convenient to return to the standard form for the gap equation by multiplying Eq. (A13) by the factor  $1/[2\alpha(1 - 2\alpha)]$ . This yields

$$1 = \frac{8\beta}{3L} + \frac{\beta}{4L^2} \left( \lambda^{(2)} - 4\lambda^{(1)} \left( \frac{14}{3} + \xi \right) \right) + \frac{\Delta(\alpha, \xi)}{L^2} \quad (\text{A16})$$

or, more explicitly (as shown in the main text),

$$1 = \frac{8\beta}{3L} + \frac{1}{L^2} \left[ 8\tilde{S}(\alpha, \xi) - \frac{16}{3}\beta \left( \frac{40}{9} + \hat{\Pi} \right) \right], \quad (\text{A17})$$

which displays a strong suppression of the  $\xi$  dependence at NLO: the  $\xi$  dependence exists, but only through terms which are very small numerically.

We may now consider Eq. (A17) at the critical point,  $\alpha = 1/4$  ( $\beta = 16$ ), which yields

$$L_c^2 - \frac{128}{3}L_c - \left[ 8\tilde{S}(\xi) - \frac{256}{3} \left( \frac{40}{9} + \hat{\Pi} \right) \right] = 0, \quad (\text{A18})$$

where  $\tilde{S}(\xi) = \tilde{S}(\alpha = 1/4, \xi)$ . Solving Eq. (A18), we have two standard solutions:

$$L_{c,\pm} = \frac{64}{3} \pm \sqrt{d_2(\xi)},$$

$$d_2(\xi) = \left( \frac{64}{3} \right)^2 + \left[ 8\tilde{S}(\xi) - \frac{256}{3} \left( \frac{40}{9} + \hat{\Pi} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{A19})$$

As explained in the main text, a numerical estimate of  $N_c$  can be obtained by using the values of  $\tilde{R}_1$ ,  $\tilde{R}_2$ , and  $\tilde{P}_2$  in Eqs. (A3a) and (A3b). Combining these values with (as displayed in the main text)

$$\tilde{S}(\xi = 0) = \tilde{R}_1 - \frac{\tilde{R}_2}{8} - \frac{7\tilde{P}_2}{128},$$

$$\tilde{S}(\xi = 1) = -\frac{5\tilde{P}_2}{32},$$

$$\tilde{S}(\xi = 2/3) = \frac{\tilde{R}_1}{3} - \frac{5\tilde{R}_2}{72} - \frac{49\tilde{P}_2}{384},$$

together with the value of  $\hat{\Pi} = 92/9 - \pi^2$ , yields, for  $L_c(\xi)$  and  $N_c(\xi)$ ,

$$L_c^+(0) = 30.44, \quad L_c^-(0) = 12.22,$$

$$L_c^+(2/3) = 29.98, \quad L_c^-(2/3) = 12.69$$

$$L_c^+(1) = 29.69, \quad L_c^-(1) = 12.98, \quad (\text{A20a})$$

$$N_c^+(0) = 3.08, \quad N_c^-(0) = 1.24,$$

$$N_c^+(2/3) = 3.04, \quad N_c^-(2/3) = 1.29$$

$$N_c^+(1) = 3.01, \quad N_c^-(1) = 1.31, \quad (\text{A20b})$$

where the  $-$  solutions are considered as unphysical. The  $+$  solutions are the ones presented in the main text. Notice that, if we neglect the rest in Eq. (A18), i.e., we assume that  $\tilde{S}(\xi) = 0$  in Eq. (A18), the gap equation becomes  $\xi$  independent and we have (as given in the main text)

$$\bar{L}_c = 28.0981, \quad \bar{N}_c = 2.85. \quad (\text{A21})$$

The result of Eq. (A21) is in full agreement with the recent results of Ref. [21], where the NLO corrections have been analyzed in an approximation corresponding to  $\tilde{S}(\xi) = 0$ , i.e., taking into account only the NLO terms  $\sim\beta$  and  $\sim\beta^2$  in the rhs of Eq. (A1).

- 
- [1] T. Appelquist and R. D. Pisarski, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 2305 (1981).
- [2] R. Jackiw and S. Templeton, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 2291 (1981); T. Appelquist and U. Heinz, *Phys. Rev. D* **24**, 2169 (1981).
- [3] R. D. Pisarski, *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 2423 (1984).
- [4] T. Appelquist, D. Nash, and L. C. R. Wijewardhana, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 2575 (1988).
- [5] M. R. Pennington and D. Walsh, *Phys. Lett. B* **253**, 246 (1991); D. C. Curtis, M. R. Pennington, and D. Walsh, *Phys. Lett. B* **295**, 313 (1992).
- [6] R. D. Pisarski, *Phys. Rev. D* **44**, 1866 (1991).
- [7] V. Azcoiti and X. Q. Luo, *Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl.* **30**, 741 (1993); V. Azcoiti, V. Laliena, and X. Q. Luo, *Nucl. Phys. B, Proc. Suppl.* **47**, 565 (1996).
- [8] D. Atkinson, P. W. Johnson, and P. Maris, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 602 (1990).
- [9] N. Karthik and R. Narayanan, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 045020 (2016); *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 065026 (2016).
- [10] T. Appelquist, A. G. Cohen, and M. Schmaltz, *Phys. Rev. D* **60**, 045003 (1999).
- [11] S. Giombi, I. R. Klebanov, and G. Tarnopolsky, *J. Phys. A* **49**, 135403 (2016).
- [12] L. Di Pietro, Z. Komargodski, I. Shamir, and E. Stamou, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 131601 (2016).
- [13] J. Braun, H. Gies, L. Janssen, and D. Roscher, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 036002 (2014).
- [14] L. Janssen, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 094013 (2016).
- [15] E. Dagotto, J. B. Kogut, and A. Kocic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1083 (1989); E. Dagotto, A. Kocic, and J. B. Kogut, *Nucl. Phys. B* **334**, 279 (1990); S. J. Hands, J. B. Kogut, L. Scorzato, and C. G. Strouthos, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 104501 (2004); C. Strouthos and J. B. Kogut, *Proc. Sci., LAT2007* (2007) 278.
- [16] D. Nash, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 3024 (1989).
- [17] A. V. Kotikov, *JETP Lett.* **58**, 734 (1993); *Phys. At. Nucl.* **75**, 890 (2012).
- [18] A. V. Kotikov, V. I. Shilin, and S. Teber, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 056009 (2016).
- [19] S. Giombi, G. Tarnopolsky, and I. R. Klebanov, *J. High Energy Phys.* **08** (2016) 156.
- [20] I. F. Herbut, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 025036 (2016).
- [21] V. P. Gusynin and P. K. Pyatkovskiy, arXiv:1607.08582.
- [22] A. Bashir, A. Raya, S. Sanchez-Madrigal, and C. D. Roberts, *Few-Body Syst.* **46**, 229 (2009).
- [23] J. B. Marston and I. Affleck, *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 11538 (1989); L. B. Ioffe and A. I. Larkin, *Phys. Rev. B* **39**, 8988 (1989).
- [24] G. W. Semenoff, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **53**, 2449 (1984); P. R. Wallace, *Phys. Rev.* **71**, 622 (1947).



- [25] We were informed by V. Gusynin (see also [21]) that Eq. (15) in Ref. [16] contains an error: “341” should be replaced by “277,” which then leads to  $N_c = 3.52$ .
- [26] E. H. Simmons, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 2933 (1990); T. Kugo and M. G. Mitchard, *Phys. Lett. B* **282**, 162 (1992).
- [27] A. Ahmad, J. J. Cobos-Martinez, Y. Concha-Sanchez, and A. Raya, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 094035 (2016).
- [28] J. S. Ball and T. W. Chiu, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 2542 (1980).
- [29] E. V. Gorbar, V. P. Gusynin, and V. A. Miransky, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 105028 (2001).
- [30] E. C. Marino, *Nucl. Phys.* **B408**, 551 (1993); N. Dorey and N. E. Mavromatos, *Nucl. Phys.* **B386**, 614 (1992); A. Kovner and B. Rosenstein, *Phys. Rev. B* **42**, 4748 (1990).
- [31] S. Teber, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 025005 (2012); A. V. Kotikov and S. Teber, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 087701 (2013).
- [32] A. V. Kotikov and S. Teber, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 065038 (2014); S. Teber, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 067702 (2014).
- [33] V. N. Kotov, B. Uchoa, V. M. Pereira, F. Guinea, and A. H. Castro Neto, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 1067 (2012).
- [34] V. A. Miransky and I. A. Shovkovy, *Phys. Rep.* **576**, 1 (2015); V. P. Gusynin, *Probl. At. Sci. Technol.* **2013N3**, 29 (2013).
- [35] A. V. Kotikov and S. Teber, [arXiv:1610.00934](https://arxiv.org/abs/1610.00934) [*Phys. Rev. D* (to be published)].
- [36] D. I. Kazakov, *Phys. Lett.* **133B**, 406 (1983); Report No. E2-84-410, 1984.
- [37] S. Teber and A. V. Kotikov, [arXiv:1602.01962](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.01962).
- [38] A. V. Kotikov, *Phys. Lett. B* **375**, 240 (1996).
- [39] A study of the fermion mass contribution to  $\Pi(p)$  can be found, for example, in [40].
- [40] V. P. Gusynin, A. H. Hams, and M. Reenders, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 2227 (1996).
- [41] J. A. Gracey, *Nucl. Phys.* **B414**, 614 (1994); C. S. Fischer, R. Alkofer, T. Dahm, and P. Maris, *Phys. Rev. D* **70**, 073007 (2004).
- [42] V. P. Gusynin, A. H. Hams, and M. Reenders, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 045025 (2001).
- [43] J. A. Gracey, *Phys. Lett. B* **317**, 415 (1993).