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Padé-improvement of four-loop β-functions in massive φ⁴ scalar field theory is shown to predict the known five-loop contribution with astonishing (0.2%) accuracy, supporting the applicability of Padé-summations for approximating all-orders MS QCD β-functions, as suggested by Ellis, Karliner, and Samuel. Surprisingly, the most general set of [2|2] approximants consistent with known two-, three-, and four-loop contributions to the QCD β-function with up to six flavours fail to exhibit any zeros that could be interpreted as positive infrared fixed points, regardless of the unknown five-loop term. When they occur, positive zeros of such [2|2] approximants are preceded by singularities, leading to a double-valued β-function that is decoupled entirely from the infrared region, similar to the β-function of SUSY gluodynamics.

Higher order terms of the QCD MS β-function

\[ \mu^2 \frac{d \alpha_s}{d \mu^2} = \beta(x), \]  
\[ \beta(x) = -\sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \beta_i x^{i+2}, \]

where \( x \equiv \alpha_s(\mu)/\pi \) are, upon truncation, known to permit the occurrence of fixed points other than the ultraviolet fixed point at \( x = 0 \); e.g. the positive infrared fixed point (IRFP) which occurs for \( 9 \leq n_f \leq 16 \) when the series for \( \beta(x) \) in (1) is truncated after two terms \([\beta_0 = (11 - 2n_f/3)/4; \beta_1 = (102 - 38n_f/3)/16; x_{IRFP} = -\beta_0/\beta_1]\). However, the fixed points arising from such truncation are likely to be spurious, as the candidate-value for \( x_{IRFP} \) is sufficiently large for the highest-order term in the series \( \beta(x_{IRFP}) \) to be comparable in magnitude to lower terms [e.g. \( |\beta_1 x^3| = |\beta_0 x^2| \)].

In a recent paper, Ellis, Karliner and Samuel predicted the coefficient \( \beta_3 \) via Padé approximant methods, and claimed that \( \beta_0-2 \) and their prediction for \( \beta_3 \) yield a Padé summation of the \( M^S \) β-function with a nonzero IRFP consistent with an earlier prediction by Mattingly and Stevenson. This Mattingly-Stevenson scenario leads to the freezing-out of the coupling to a constant value in the infrared region, as shown schematically in Fig. 1.

![Figure 1: Mattingly-Stevenson scenario](image)

whose Maclaurin expansion reproduces the known terms in the infinite series (2):

\[ S_{[N|M]}(x) = \frac{1 + a_1 x + \ldots + a_N x^N}{1 + b_1 x + \ldots + b_M x^M} = 1 + R_1 x + R_2 x^2 + R_3 x^3 + \ldots . \]

An IRFP of the β-function would, in this approximation, necessarily be identified with a positive zero of \( \beta_{[N|M]} \); i.e. a positive zero of \( x_{num} \) of \( 1 + a_1 x + \ldots + a_N x^N \), the numerator of \( S_{[N|M]} \), provided \( S_{[N|M]} \) remains positive for \( 0 \leq x \leq x_{num} \). This latter requirement precludes the existence of a positive zero (\( x_{den} \)) of the denominator 1 + \( b_1 x + \ldots + b_M x^M \) that falls in the interval 0 \( \leq x \leq x_{num} \).

One cannot automatically dismiss the possibility of such a denominator zero occurring within the true QCD...
\( \beta \)-function. The \( \beta \)-function of SU(N) SUSY gluodynamics is known \textit{exactly} if no matter fields are present and exhibits precisely such a zero:

\[
\beta(x) = -\frac{3Nv^2}{4} \left[ \frac{1}{1 - Nv/2} \right].
\]

(4)

The \( \beta \)-function (4) has been discussed further by Kogan and Shifman. If (4) is incorporated into (1a), the resulting Kogan-Shifman scenario (Fig. 2) for \( x(\mu) \) is indicative of both a strong phase in the ultraviolet region (the upper branch of Fig. 2) as well as the existence of an infrared cut off \( (\mu_c) \) on the domain of \( x(\mu) \) that renders the infrared region \( \mu < \mu_c \) inaccessible. \( ^a \)

Figure 2: The Kogan-Shifman scenario \([x_{den} = x(\mu_c)]\)

Without use of Padé summation methods, as described above, the known terms of the infinite series representation (2) for the \( \overline{\text{MS}} \) QCD \( \beta \)-function offer little information as to whether the Mattingly-Stevenson (Fig. 1) or Kogan-Shifman (Fig. 2) scenario is appropriate for the evolution of the strong coupling. However, there is reason to believe that Padé summation representations of the \( \beta \)-function [eq. (3a)] may indeed be appropriate for quantum field theoretical calculations. Ellis, Gardi, Karliner, and Samuel have argued that Padé-summations (3) converge to their perturbative series (2) as \( N \) and \( M \) increase for any such series dominated by a finite set of renormalon poles, consistent with the following asymptotic error formula for the difference between \( \hat{R}_{N+M} \) in (2) and the value \( R_{N+M}^{\text{Padé}} \) predicted via use of the \([N|M]\) approximant in (3b):

\[
\delta_{N+M} \equiv \frac{R_{N+M}^{\text{Padé}} - R_{N+M}}{R_{N+M}}
\]

In (5), \( \{a, b, A\} \) are constants to be determined.

To demonstrate the utility of this asymptotic error formula, consider the known \( \beta \)-function for massive \( \phi^4 \) scalar-field theory:

\[
\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2} (\partial_\beta \phi)(\partial^\mu \phi) + \frac{1}{2} m^2 \phi^2 + g \left( \frac{16\pi^2}{4!} \right) (\phi^2)^2,
\]

(6)

\[
\beta(\mu) = 1.5g^2 \left[ 1 - \frac{17}{9}g + 10.8499g^2 - 90.5353g^3 + R_4g^4 + \ldots \right].
\]

(7)

Using the first two terms of (7) to generate a \([0|1]\) approximant, as in (3), one would predict \( R_2^{\text{Padé}} = (-17/9)^2 \), in which case we see from (5) that

\[
\delta_2 = \frac{(-17/9)^2 - 10.8499}{10.8499} = \frac{-A}{1 + (a + b)}.
\]

(8)

Using the first three terms of (7) to generate a \([1|1]\) approximant, one would predict \( R_4^{\text{Padé}} = (10.8499)^2/(-17/9) \), in which case

\[
\delta_3 = \frac{(10.8499)^2/(-17/9) - (-90.5353)}{-90.5353} = \frac{-A}{2 + (a + b)}.
\]

(9)

Equations (8) and (9) are two equations for the unknown constants \( A \) and \( (a + b) \), with solutions

\[
A = \frac{1}{\delta_2 - 1/\delta_3} - 1, (a + b) = \frac{\delta_2 - 2\delta_3}{\delta_3 - \delta_2}.
\]

(10)

We can substitute (10) into (5) to determine \( R_4 \).

The first three terms in the series (7) generate a \([2|1]\) approximant whose Maclaurin expansion (3b) predicts

\[
R_4^{\text{Padé}} = (90.5353)^2/(10.8499).
\]

Upon substitution of \( A \), \( (a + b) \), and \( R_4^{\text{Padé}} \) into (5) we find that this asymptotic error formula predicts that

\[
R_4 = R_4^{\text{Padé}}/(1 + \delta_4)\]

\[
= R_4^{\text{Padé}}\left[ 3 + (a + b) \right]/\left[ 3 + (a + b) - A \right] = 947.8
\]

(11)

The value of \( R_4 \) in (7) has been explicitly calculated to be 949.5, in very close agreement with (11). The series of steps leading from (5) to (11), a methodological recipe first presented in ref. 6, has also been applied to N-component scalar field theory, for which the Lagrangian (6) is modified such that \( \phi \rightarrow \phi_0, \phi^2 \rightarrow \sum_{n=1}^{N} \phi_n^\phi_0^2 \), \( N = \{2,3,4\} \). Agreement with calculated values of \( R_4 \) (\( R_4 \equiv \beta_4/\beta_0 \)) remains within 3.5% for \( N \leq 4 \).

This startling agreement suggests that Padé methodology may also be applicable to the QCD \( \beta \)-function, particularly in the \( n_f = 0 \) gluodynamic limit where
1. such methods are expected to be most accurate.

2. comparison with the Kogan-Shifman scenario for
SUSY gluodynamics is most relevant.

For $n_f = 0$, the 4-loop $\overline{\text{MS}}$ QCD $\beta$-function, as defined by (1a), is given by

$$
\beta(x) = -\frac{11}{4} x^2 \left[ 1 + 2.31818 + 8.11648 x^2 + 41.5383 x^3 + \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} R_k x^k \right].
$$

(12)

The coefficients $R_k$ are presently not known for $k \geq 4$.

The first three terms in the series (12) are sufficient in themselves to determine the Padé approximants $S_{1[1]}$ and $S_{2[1]}$, as defined in (3). These approximants are

$$
\beta_{[2;1]}(x) = -\frac{11}{4} x^2 \left[ 1 - 2.7936 x - 3.7475 x^2 \right],
$$

(13)

$$
\beta_{[1;2]}(x) = -\frac{11}{4} x^2 \left[ 1 - 5.9672 x - 1 - 8.2854 x + 11.091 x^2 \right].
$$

(14)

In both (13) and (14), the (first) positive denominator zero precedes the positive numerator zero: for (13), $x_{\text{num}} = 0.264 > x_{\text{den}} = 0.195$; for (14), $x_{\text{num}} = 0.168 > x_{\text{den}} = 0.151$. Consequently, $x_{\text{num}}$ cannot be identified with the Mattingly-Stevenson IRFP in either case, as this zero is separated from the small $x$-region by a singularity past which the $\beta$-function switches sign. Indeed the ordering $0 < x_{\text{den}} < x_{\text{num}}$ is suggestive of a Kogan-Shifman scenario in which $x_{\text{num}}$, if taken seriously, is an ultraviolet fixed point (UVFP) characterizing the strong phase [i.e., the upper branch of Fig 2].

We can apply the asymptotic error formula (5) to the series (12) in precisely the same way we applied it to (7). We then obtain an estimate $R_4 = 302.2$, analogous to (11). Using this value of $R_4$ in conjunction with the known terms of (12), it is possible to obtain a $[2;2]$-approximant $\beta$-function

$$
\beta_{[2;2]}(x) = -\frac{11}{4} x^2 \left[ 1 - 9.6296 x + 4.3327 x^2 \right].
$$

(15)

The first positive numerator zero $x_{\text{num}} = 0.1092$ is again larger than the first positive denominator zero

$$
x_{\text{den}} = 0.1063,
$$

precluding the identification of $x_{\text{num}}$ as the IRFP of the Mattingly-Stevenson scenario (Fig. 1). Instead, the $\beta$-function (15) is consistent with the Kogan-Shifman scenario of Fig. 2, with $x_{\text{num}}$ again identified as a nonzero UVFP for the strong phase.

Curiously, the ordering $0 < x_{\text{den}} < x_{\text{num}}$ characterizes $[2;2]$-approximant $\beta$-functions even if $R_4$ is allowed to be arbitrary. The most general such $\beta$-function that reproduces the first four terms of (12) [the first three being known] is

$$
\beta_{[2;2]}(x) = -\frac{11}{4} x^2 \times 
\left\{ 1 + (13.403 - 0.076215 R_4) x - (22.915 - 0.090166 R_4) x^2 \right\}
\frac{1 + (11.084 - 0.076215 R_4) x - (56.727 - 0.26685 R_4) x^2}{1 + (11.084 - 0.076215 R_4) x - (56.727 - 0.26685 R_4) x^2}.
$$

(16)

It is easy to verify the first positive numerator zero of (16) is always larger than the first positive denominator zero [Fig. 1], although these zeros become asymptotically close as $R_4 \to +\infty$. Thus, we see that the first positive zero of any $[2;2]$ Padé approximant whose Maclaurin expansion reproduces the known terms of eq. (12) cannot be identified as an IRFP, nor is such Padé-summation indicative of a Fig. 1 scenario for the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ $n_f = 0$ $\beta$-function.

Remarkably, the same set of conclusions can be drawn for the physically interesting case of three light flavours. When $n_f = 3$, the 4-loop $\overline{\text{MS}}$ QCD $\beta$-function is given by

$$
\beta(x) = -\frac{9 x^2}{4} \left[ 1 - (16/9) x + 4.471065 x^2 + 20.99027 x^3 + \sum_{k=4}^{\infty} R_k x^k \right],
$$

(17)

with $R_k$ not presently known for $k \geq 4$. The known terms in (17) determine $[2;1]$ and $[1;2]$ Padé-summation representations of the $n_f = 3$ $\beta$-function,

$$
\beta_{[2;1]}(x) = -\frac{9 x^2}{4} \left[ 1 - 2.91691 x - 3.87504 x^2 \right],
$$

(18)

$$
\beta_{[1;2]}(x) = -\frac{9 x^2}{4} \left[ 1 - 8.17337 x - 9.95115 x + 13.2199 x^2 \right].
$$

(19)

The positive zero of $\beta_{[2;1]}(x)$ ($x = 0.2559$) occurs after the pole at $x = 0.2130$; the positive zero of $\beta_{[2;1]}(x)$ at $x = 0.1223$ similarly occurs after a pole at $x = 0.1194$. The most general $[2;2]$ approximant consistent with (17) is

$$
\beta_{[2;2]}(x) = -\frac{9 x^2}{4} \times 
\left\{ 1 + (7.1945 - 0.10261 R_4) x - (11.329 - 0.075643 R_4) x^2 \right\}
\frac{1 + (5.4168 - 0.10261 R_4) x - (25.430 - 0.25806 R_4) x^2}{1 + (5.4168 - 0.10261 R_4) x - (25.430 - 0.25806 R_4) x^2}.
$$

The Maclaurin expansion of (20) reproduces the series in (17), including its (unknown) $R_4 x^4$ term. As was the case in (16), the first positive zero of the denominator of (20) is always seen to precede the first positive zero of the numerator, regardless of $R_4$. Thus the $[1;2]$, $[2;1]$ and most general possible $[2;2]$-approximant representations of the $n_f = 3$ $\overline{\text{MS}}$ $\beta$-function uphold the ordering
$0 < x_{\text{den}} < x_{\text{num}}$, an ordering that precludes the identification of $x_{\text{num}}$ with the IRFP of the Mattingly-Stevenson scenario. Moreover, $2|2|$-approximant β-functions for arbitrary $R_4$ have been constructed analogous to (16) and (20) for $n_f = \{4, 5, 6\}$, and for each of these, the $0 < x_{\text{den}} < x_{\text{num}}$ ordering persists regardless of $R_4$. A range for $R_4$ for which an ordering compatible with Fig. 1 ($0 < x_{\text{num}} < x_{\text{den}}$) is possible does not occur until $n_f = 7$.

As noted above, the ordering $0 < x_{\text{den}} < x_{\text{num}}$ suggests the occurrence of a double-valued QCD coupling constant, as is the case in SUSY gluodynamics (Fig. 2). Such a scenario is seen to decouple the infrared region $\mu < \mu_c$ from the domain of $\alpha_s$, provided $\alpha_s$ is understood to be real. Such a scenario is also indicative of a strong phase at short distances, with possible implications for dynamical electroweak symmetry breaking, suggesting that QCD may even furnish its own “technicolour.”
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