## Comment on "Superinstantons and the Reliability of Perturbation Theory in Non-Abelian Models"

In a recent Letter [1] Patrascioiu and Seiler argued that the results of standard perturbation theory (PT) are not valid for two-dimensional models with a non-Abelian global symmetry. They considered such a theory in a finite box of size  $L$ , with special boundary conditions (BC) called "superinstantons" (SI), and showed that in the thermodynamic limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  the 2-loop corrections are finite, but differ from those obtained from PT with standard BC. They concluded that, when SI configurations are taken into account, renormalization group (RG)  $\beta$  functions are modified, and that the limit  $L \rightarrow \infty$  and the weak-coupling expansion do not commute.

In fact, the results of [1] do not contradict standard<br>PT. Indeed one can show from general principles Indeed one can show from general principles the following: (1) PT with a SI BC is infrared (IR) divergent; (2) the IR divergent items are associated, via the short distance operator product expansion (OPE), with singular local operators, not present for classical backgrounds; (3) taking into account these operators, the perturbative RG functions are not modified.

Let us show this for the nonlinear  $O(N)$   $\sigma$ -model considered in [1], with N-component unit vector field  $\vec{S} = (\vec{\pi}, \sigma = \sqrt{1 - \vec{\pi}^2})$ , defined in a square box  $\Lambda_L = [-L/2, L/2] \times [-L/2, L/2]$ , with Dirichlet (D) BC  $\vec{\pi} = 0$  on  $\partial \Lambda_L$ , and with the additional SI constraint  $\vec{\pi}(0) = 0$  at the origin. The 2-point function with the SI  $BC$  is related to that with the  $D$   $BC$  by

$$
\langle \vec{S}(x) \cdot \vec{S}(y) \rangle_{\text{SI}} = \frac{\langle \vec{S}(x) \cdot \vec{S}(y) \delta(\vec{\pi}(0)) \rangle_D}{\langle \delta(\vec{\pi}(0)) \rangle_D}, \quad (1)
$$

with  $\delta(\vec{\pi})$  the Dirac distribution in  $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ . Its perturbative expansion is  $\langle \vec{S}(x) \cdot \vec{S}(y) \rangle_{SI} = 1 + c_1 g + c_2 g^2 + \cdots$ For simplicity we first regularize the short-distance divergences by using dimensional regularization, with space dimension  $D = 2 - \epsilon \ (\epsilon > 0)$ , and use the continuum action  $S = (1/2g) \int d^D x [\partial \tilde{S}(x)]^2$ . Adapting the results of [2], and the techniques of [3,4] to deal with the singular operator  $\delta(\vec{\pi})$ , it is easy to show that the  $L \to \infty$ expansion of Eq. (1) is given by a sum over local operators  $A(0)$  located at  $x = 0$ , and with support in field space<br>at  $\{\vec{\pi}(0) = 0\}$ ,<br> $\langle \vec{S}(x) \cdot \vec{S}(y) \rangle_{\text{SI}} = \sum_{A} C^{A}(x, y) \frac{\langle A(0) \rangle_{D}}{\langle \delta(\vec{\pi}(0)) \rangle_{D}}$ , (2) at  $\{\vec{\pi}(0) = 0\},\$ 

$$
\langle \vec{S}(x) \cdot \vec{S}(y) \rangle_{\text{SI}} = \sum_{A} C^{A}(x, y) \frac{\langle A(0) \rangle_{D}}{\langle \delta(\vec{\pi}(0)) \rangle_{D}}, \quad (2)
$$

where the OPE coefficients  $C^A$  are independent from the specific BC used and from  $L$ , and are *finite* in PT. The BC and L dependence is contained entirely in the expectation value ratios (evaluated in the box  $\Lambda_L$  with D BC)  $\langle A(0)\rangle_D/\langle \delta(\vec{\pi}(0))\rangle_D$ , which scale as  $L^{-\dim[A]}f_A(gL^{\epsilon}),$ with  $f_A$  calculable in PT, and where dim[A] is the canonical dimension of A  $(\dim[\vec{\pi}] = 0, \dim[x] = -1)$ . Only operators with  $\dim[A] = 0$  can give finite or divergent

contributions when  $L \rightarrow \infty$ ; operators with dim $[A] > 0$ give subdominant corrections. The first dimensionless operator is  $A_0 = \delta(\vec{\pi})$ :  $f_{A_0=1}$ , and the coefficient  $C^{A_0} =$  $c_1 + c_1^{(0)}g + c_2^{(0)}g^2 + \cdots$  gives the standard IR finite PT. However, additional operators appear, of the form  $A_n = (\Delta_{\pi})^n \delta(\vec{\pi})$ , with  $\Delta_{\pi}$  the Laplacian in  $\mathbb{R}^{N-1}$ . The first one,  $A_1$ , is such that  $C^{A_1} = c_2^{(1)} g_1^2 + c_3^{(1)} g_3^3 +$ and that  $f_{A_1}(g) = f_{-1}^{(1)}g^{-1} + f_0^{(1)} + f_{-1}^{(1)}g + \cdots$ ,<br>and that  $f_{A_1}(g) = f_{-1}^{(1)}g^{-1} + f_0^{(1)} + f_{-1}^{(1)}g + \cdots$ . Simbe diagrammatics shows that  $C^{A_n} = \mathcal{O}(g^{2n})$  and  $f_{A_n}$  $\mathcal{D}(g^{-n})$ . Therefore, the coefficient of g of Eq. (1) behaves as  $c_1 = c_1^{(0)} + L^{-\epsilon} c_2^{(1)} f_{-1}^{(1)} + \cdots$  when L Its IR limit coincides with the standard PT result  $c_1^{(0)}$ . The coefficient of  $g^2$  behaves as  $c_2 = c_2^{(0)} + c_2^{(1)} f_0^{(1)} +$  $L^{-\epsilon} c_3^{(1)} f_{-1}^{(1)} + \cdots$  and has a finite IR limit, different from the PT result  $c_2^{(0)}$ . However, the coefficient of  $g^3$  is IR (in singular  $c_3 = c_2^{(1)} f_1^{(1)} L \epsilon + \cdots$ , as well as the higher order terms. The existence of these IR divergences is generic, except for the Abelian  $O(2)$  model, where one can show that they vanish identically.

These conclusions are independent of the regularization, and can be extended to the  $D = 2$  lattice model of [1]: With SI BC, the 2-point function is IR finite at order  $g^2$  but differs from standard PT; at order  $g^n$ ,  $n > 2$ (it is IR divergent) with  $ln(L)^{n-2}$  terms. These results are valid *order by order* in PT, and apply to the renormalized theory as well: to construct the continuum limit for finite L, besides the coupling constant and wave-function renormalization, one must also renormalize the SI insertion operator  $A_0(0)$ . Taking this effect into account, the PT  $\beta$ functions are unchanged, but the renormalized theory with SI BC is IR divergent at order  $g^3$  and beyond. Similar problems are expected to occur for the non-Abelian gauge theories considered in Ref. [5].

The author is associated with CNRS.

Franqois David

Commissariat a 1'Energie Atomique Service de Physique Théorique Centre d'Etudes de Saclay F-91191 Gif-sur- Yvette Cedex, France

Received 26 April 1995

PACS numbers: 11.15.Bt, 11.15.Ha, 75.10.Jm

- [1] A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 1920-1923 (1995).
- [2] F. David, Commun. Math Phys. **81**, 149 (1981).
- [3] F. David, B. Duplantier, and E. Guitter, Nucl. Phys. **B394**, 555 (1993).
- [4] M. Lässig and R. Lipowsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1131 (1993).
- [5] A. Patrascioiu and E. Seiler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 74, 1924— 1927 (1995).