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#### Abstract

Using block spin renormalization group techniques, we rigorously control the functional integral of a weakly coupled critical lattice $\phi^{4}$ theory in four euclidean dimensions proving the infrared asymptotic freedom of the model. This solves the infrared counterpart of and sheds some light on the problem of existence of continuum renormalizable ultraviolet asymptotically free models.


## 1. Introduction

One of the fundamental problems of Quantum Field Theory (QFT) is the existence of non-trivial models describing couplings of fields and scattering of particles. Such models do exist on the level of formal renormalized perturbation series, where renormalization removes the ultraviolet (UV) divergences of the naive perturbation expansion. The problem of non-perturbative existence can be viewed as equivalent to a non-perturbative understanding of renormalization. Up to now, the attempts at a non-perturbative control of the QFT models (constructive QFT [23], exactly soluble models [26]), although very instructive, have failed to produce quantum field theories in four space-time dimensions.

Much of our present understanding of the existence problem for QFT comes from the Renormalization Group (RG) approach. The RG, in its most full-fledged version [41] cast into the statistical mechanical framework in the euclidean spacetime, replaces the static point of view of renormalized perturbation theory by a dynamical one. We try to see, mostly also perturbatively, how the local (euclidean) field theory may be obtained from its cut-off non-local versions in which the source of the troubles: the short distance (UV) singularities are regularized in order to guarantee the existence of the model. One of the crucial concepts arising from the RG approach is that of (UV) asymptotic freedom [25,35]: a model is UV asymptotically free if its short distance asymptotics is non-interacting (free).

[^0]Asymptotic freedom provides a self-consistency condition on the perturbative approach to the local limit field theory. This is the reason behind a common belief (not quite shared by us) that only asymptotically free models (or their transforms) have a chance to exist in four dimensions.

Unfortunately, the simplest model of a renormalizable quantum field in four dimensions, the $\lambda \phi^{4}$ theory, turned out not to be (perturbatively) UV asymptotically free for $\lambda>0$ [38]. This raised serious doubts about the existence of a nontrivial local limit for this case [41] confirmed by detailed studies [2, 3, 13, 14]. Today, although not completely excluded [15], positive coupling $\phi_{4}^{4}$ quantum field theory is generally believed not to exist.

Fortunately, the four dimensional non-abelian gauge theories, pure as well as with not too many fermion flavors (QCD) provide text-book examples of renormalizable, UV asymptotically free models [25, 35, 27]. This gives importance to the non-perturbative study of renormalizability and asymptotic freedom.

In the present paper, we consider the infrared (IR) counterpart of the UV problem presented above: a massless euclidean lattice theory which is IR renormalizable (has a dimensionless coupling constant and renormalizable IR divergences in every order of naive perturbation expansion) and is expected to be IR asymptotically free: its long distance asymptotics is perturbatively free (gaussian). Specifically, we consider the massless lattice $\lambda \phi_{4}^{4}$ theory with $\lambda>0$. We could have also treated a model more realistic from the point of view of statistical mechanics: the Landau-Ginzburg theory of the uniaxial dipolar ferromagnet [10, 29] which exhibits a similar behavior, confirmed by experiment [1], in three dimensions.

The massless $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory presents in two ways non-trivial renormalization problems. In perturbation theory, the $\lambda \phi_{4}^{4}$ model with vanishing bare mass has IR divergences in arbitrarily high order due to the self-energy diagrams [32]


However, if we fix the physical mass to zero (the correlation length to infinity) adjusting the bare mass appropriately (this may be viewed as IR renormalization), then the mass insertions

will subtract the self-energy diagrams turning them to

and will render the perturbative expansion finite. [In terms of the RG this is the problem of relevant perturbations or the naturality problem. In UV renormaliza-
tion it corresponds to a careful adjustment of the bare mass at large cut-off to get an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ mass at the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ scale.]

The other, more fundamental, question is the IR divergence of perturbation theory at vanishing external momenta. The RG predicts that the (rescaled) Green's functions at large distances become those of the free theory.

The method by which we achieve a rigorous control of the weakly-coupled massless- $\phi_{4}^{4}$-theory functional integral is the block spin (BS) version of the RG [28]. We split the integration into a sequence of steps. In step $n$, we fix the (rescaled) averages of fields over cubes of size $L^{n}$ ( $n^{\text {th }}$ block spins) and integrate out the fluctuations of the averages over cubes of size $L^{n-1}$. At the critical point, the $n^{\text {th }}$ BS effective theory can be viewed as statistical mechanics described essentially by a local $\phi^{4}$ interaction (plus irrelevant, approximately local corrections) with the (running) coupling constant $\lambda_{n}$ changing from scale to scale. The second order perturbative computation gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{n}=\lambda_{n-1}-\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda_{n-1}^{2}\right), \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

which results in

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda_{n} \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

This expresses the perturbative IR asymptotic freedom of the massless $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory. The slow (logarithmic) decrease of $\lambda_{n}$ is characteristic for the renormalizable models with dimensionless couplings and should be contrasted with the (superrenormalizable) behavior of the critical $\phi_{d}^{4}$ theory with $d>4$, where $\lambda_{n}=\mathcal{O}\left(L^{n(4-d)}\right)$.

Our aim is to show that the corrections to the perturbative analysis which evaluates the contribution of the fluctuations on the distance scale $L^{n}$ by expanding it to the second order in the effective coupling $\lambda_{n}$ of this scale are small and do not change the qualitative picture of the IR behavior. This is not obvious since the perturbation expansion is divergent. Note, however, that the $\lambda_{n}$-perturbation theory should be contrasted with the usual perturbative expansion in the initial coupling constant (on all scales) which lacks self-consistency of the latter and exhibits very non-uniform behavior of remainders. The bounds on the corrections are obtained by carefully weighting the essentially perturbative contributions of small fields against the non-perturbative ones of large fields. The big help in the analysis is provided by good analyticity properties of effective interactions of the BS fields in the field variables for which we can trade their bad analyticity properties in $\lambda_{n}$. Finally cluster expansion techniques [24] are used to exhibit the approximate locality of the BS effective interactions.

The present paper contains the proof of the convergence of the BS effective interactions to zero at the pace predicted by the perturbative argument $\left[\right.$ i.e. like $\left.\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)\right]$. In the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$, the distribution of the BS fields becomes free (Gaussian). One can easily extend the present method to give the control of correlation functions and of their massless decay, compare [18]. Existence of logarithmic corrections to scaling [40] should be also confirmed by a straightforward analysis of the higher correlations. This way, we expect to bridge our work with the UV problem, as in [2] the triviality of positive coupling continuum $\phi_{4}^{4}$
theory was deduced from the presence of the logarithmic corrections to scaling in the critical lattice theory (for all $\lambda>0$ ).

However, there seems to exist a more direct UV application of our method. We expect to be able to show the existence of the continuum euclidian nontrivial UV asymptotically free $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory for the (physical) coupling in the following region of the complex (cut) plane


On the lattice, these theories may easily be written in terms of stable models which are perturbatively UV asymptotically free. The control of the continuum limit is very similar to what is done in the present paper: we only have to start very close to the free theory and study the departure of the RG flow from it. All these models seem, however, to lack the physical positivity (i.e. the quantum mechanical interpretation in the Minkowski space). On the negative axis, there exist two natural proposals for the theory. It is also easy to set up a stable physically positive lattice version of the $\lambda<0 \phi_{4}^{4}$ model. The latter probably does not have the UV asymptotically free continuum limit, however.

In conclusion, our work seems to provide a right approach to the construction of renormalizable asymptotically free models, both in IR and UV.

The non-perturbative control of a simple IR model having been achieved, we may ask questions about the relation of the (renormalized) perturbation expansion to the non-perturbative constructs. This is a more difficult problem. We hope to produce a proof of the Borel summability of the perturbative expansion for the IR $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory soon. The renormalon singularities [5, 30, 34, 39] of the Borel transform of the expansion sit in this case on the negative axis and do not obstruct the Borel summability although render its proof more complicated than in the superrenormalizable case $[12,19,33]$. In general, we expect the renormalon singularities due essentially to the slow change of the effective coupling $\lambda_{n}$ from scale to scale to be much easier to treat than the instanton ones [31, 9] which encode a detailed information about the large field behavior of the effective interactions, see [20], where we apply Ecalle's theory [11] of resurgent functions to the study of the Borel-transform analytic structure for a simplified model.

These problems are not tackled in the present paper which is organised as follows:

Section 2 sets up the BS RG formalism.
Section 3 contains the perturbative analysis of a single BS transformation and studies its validity.

In Sect. 4, we discuss a general form of the effective interaction of a BS field exhibiting its leading terms, approximate locality and analyticity properties.

Section 5 describes how this form carries over from the BS interaction on scale $L^{n}$ to the one on scale $L^{n+1}$. This is done by establishing a cluster expansion for a functional integral over the fluctuations of the $L^{n}$ BS fields about fixed $L^{n+1} \mathrm{BS}$ values.

Section 6 states expected bounds on the contributions of various terms to the effective BS interactions inspired by the discussion of Sect. 3.

In Sects. 7-11, we show how these bounds carry inductively from one length scale to the next one. This is the technical core of the paper. We estimate in turn the local contributions to the new effective interactions (Sect. 7), the non-local small field ones (Sect. 8), the quartic term of the interaction and the new effective coupling constant (Sect. 9), the large field contributions (Sect. 10) and, at the end, the quadratic terms of the interaction and mass and wave function renormalizations (Sect. 11).

The technical work is done in finite periodic volumes but with volume independent estimates. This allows us to pass to the thermodynamic limit what we do in Sect. 12. For the infinite volume theory, we localize the critical values of the parameters (mass squared) of the initial theory. For the critical point of the model, the IR asymptotic freedom follows from our inductive bounds of Sect. 6.

Finally in Appendix 1, we estimate the contributions of the second order Feynman graphs to the change of the running coupling constant $\lambda_{n}$, crucial in obtaining the $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$ decrease of the latter.

In Appendix 2, we prove a simple fact, related to the Gleason's problem [21] about functions of complex variables, used in Sect. 11 to control the mass and field strength renormalizations.

The paper is essentially self-contained. Some of the earlier results concerning the BS formalism are, however, quoted here without proof. The general idea and much of the technical analysis we do is close to that of [17] (the renormalizable case proves to be in fact not much more difficult and quite similar to the superrenormalizable one, contrary to the gneral expectation). We try to avoid referring directly to [17] being, however, more sketchy in arguments which were worked out to greater detail there.

As we learn, J. Feldman, J. Magnen, V. Rivasseau, and R. Sénéor expect also to control the critical weakly coupled $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory using a version of the phase-space cell expansion of [22] strengthened by the RG type of analysis.

## 2. Block Spin Renormalization Group

Let us consider a scalar field on the unit lattice $\phi \equiv\left(\phi_{x}\right), x \in \mathbb{Z}^{4}$. We shall define the Hamiltonian of the system for $\phi$ with compact support by

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathscr{H}(\phi) & =\frac{1}{2} \sum_{\langle x y\rangle}\left(\phi_{x}-\phi_{y}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} m_{0}^{2} \sum_{x} \phi_{x}^{2}-6 \lambda_{0} \sum_{x} G_{0 x x} \phi_{x}^{2}+\lambda_{0} \sum_{x} \phi_{x}^{4} \\
& \equiv \frac{1}{2}\langle\phi| G_{0}^{-1}|\phi\rangle+V(\phi), \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\langle x y\rangle$ runs through unordered pairs of nearest neighbor points (i.e. $|x-y|=1)$ and $-G_{0}^{-1}=\Delta$ is the lattice Laplacian. Note that in (1) the quadratic contribution to the Wick ordering of the quartic term has been separated from the
mass term. We would like to control the Gibbs state (states) corresponding to (1) with $m_{0}^{2}=m_{\text {crit }}^{2}\left(\lambda_{0}\right)$ such that the correlation length of the model is infinite (physical mass is zero). Our approach to the problem of the thermodynamic limit will be pragmatic. We shall first put our system in a finite periodic box $\Lambda=\left(\mathbb{Z}_{L^{N}}\right)^{4}$ for $L$ even, $N \geqq 0$ integers, and then, only after having done the whole analysis in finite volume, we shall pass to the thermodynamical limit. In principle other reasonable boundary conditions could be handled too at a cost of additional technical complications but we expect that they do not produce different states.

It is convenient to identify $\Lambda$ with $\left(-\frac{1}{2} L^{N}, \frac{1}{2} L^{N}\right]^{4} \subset \mathbb{Z}^{4}$, with the algebraic operations taken modulo $L^{N}$. Let us define the finite volume (periodic boundary condition) Hamiltonian by

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathscr{H}^{\wedge}(\phi)= & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\langle x y\rangle \subset \Lambda}\left(\phi_{x}-\phi_{y}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \xi \Lambda^{-1}\left(\sum_{x \in \Lambda} \phi_{x}\right)^{2} \\
& +\frac{1}{2} m_{0}^{2} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \phi_{x}^{2}-6 \lambda_{0} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} G_{0 x x}^{\wedge} \phi_{x}^{2}+\lambda_{0} \sum_{x \in \Lambda} \phi_{x}^{4} \\
& \equiv \frac{1}{2}\langle\phi| G_{0}^{\wedge}|\phi\rangle+V^{\wedge}(\phi), \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

where the periodic boundary condition inverse covariance is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(G_{0}^{\wedge}\right)_{x y}^{-1}=2 d \delta_{x y}-\sum_{\substack{v \\|v|=1}} \delta_{x+v y}+\xi \Lambda^{-1} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

$x, y \in \Lambda$ ( $\Lambda$ denotes also the number of points in $\Lambda$ ). For convenience, we have also regularized the zero mode of the periodic Laplacian by introducing $\xi>0$ to make $\left(G_{0}^{\wedge}\right)^{-1}$ strictly positive (in the thermodynamical limit the $\xi$ dependence is wiped out). Note that for $\phi$ with compact support, $\mathscr{H}^{\wedge}(\phi) \rightarrow \mathscr{H}(\phi)$. In the periodic volume $\Lambda$, we define the Gibbs measure as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{Z_{\wedge}} \exp \left[-\mathscr{H}^{\wedge}(\phi)\right] \dot{D}^{\wedge} \phi \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
D^{\wedge} \phi=\prod_{x \in \Lambda} d \phi_{x} \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $Z_{\wedge}$ is the partition function in $\Lambda$ normalizing (4). In what follows, we shall stay inside finite volume doing nevertheless volume independent estimates. This will be crucial for the final passage with $\Lambda$ to $\mathbb{Z}^{4}$. To simplify the notation, we shall drop the superscript $\Lambda$ on the finite volume expressions.

In order to study the contributions of various distance scales to (4), we introduce the block spin (BS) fields $[28,16] \phi^{n} \equiv\left(\phi_{x}^{n}\right), x \in \Lambda_{n} \equiv\left(L^{-n} \Lambda\right) \cap \mathbb{Z}^{4}$, $n=1, \ldots, N$, by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{x}^{n}=z_{n}^{-1 / 2} L^{-3 n} \sum_{-1 / 2 L^{n}<y^{\mu} \leqq 1 / 2 L^{n}} \phi_{L^{n} x+y} \equiv z_{n}^{-1 / 2}\left(C^{n} \phi\right)_{x} \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where by $C$ we have denoted the lattice operator with the matrix elements

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{x y}=L^{-3} \sum_{-1 / 2 L<v^{\mu} \leqq 1 / 2 L} \delta_{L x+v y} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The factors $z_{n}$ giving the (finite) wave function renormalization will be determined later. The block spin fields are distributed with Gibbs measures given by effective Hamiltonians

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-\mathscr{H}^{n}\left(\phi^{n}\right)\right]= & \exp \left[f_{n} \Lambda\right] \int \exp [-\mathscr{H}(\phi)] \delta\left(\phi^{n}-z_{n}^{-1 / 2} C^{n} \phi\right) D \phi \\
= & \exp \left[\delta f_{n-1} L^{-4(n-1)} \Lambda\right] \int \exp \left[-\mathscr{H}^{n-1}\left(\phi^{n-1}\right)\right] \\
& \delta\left(\phi^{n}-\zeta_{n-1}^{-1 / 2} C \phi^{n-1}\right) D \phi^{n-1} . \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\mathscr{H}^{n}$ 's are normalized so that $\mathscr{H}^{n}(0)=0, \zeta_{n-1}=z_{n} / z_{n-1}, \zeta_{0}=z_{1}$, and $f_{n}$ stands for the free energy up to the distance scale $L^{n}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{n}=-\frac{1}{\Lambda} \log \int \exp [-\mathscr{H}(\phi)] \delta\left(z_{n}^{-1 / 2} C^{n} \phi\right) D \phi \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is a sum of contributions from scales $L^{k}, 0 \leqq k<n$,

$$
\begin{gather*}
f_{n}=\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{-4 k} \delta f_{k}  \tag{10}\\
\delta f_{k}=\frac{(-1)}{L^{-4 k} \Lambda} \log \int \exp \left[-\mathscr{H}^{k}(\phi)\right] \delta\left(\zeta_{k}^{-1 / 2} C \phi^{k}\right) D \phi^{k} . \tag{11}
\end{gather*}
$$

If the interaction $V=0$ in (2) then (for $z_{n} \equiv \zeta_{n} \equiv 1$ ),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{H}^{n}\left(\phi^{n}\right)=\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\phi^{n}\right| G_{n}^{-1}\left|\phi^{n}\right\rangle, \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{n}=C^{n} G_{0} C^{+n} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

( ${ }^{+}$denotes the transposition). All the covariances $G_{n}$ are versions of a massless one (see [16]) and in the thermodynamic limit $\Lambda \rightarrow \mathbb{Z}^{4}$ converge with $n$ to

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{\infty x y}=\int_{\square_{x}} d x \int_{\square_{y}} d y\left(-\Delta_{\text {cont }}\right)^{-1}(x-y), \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\Delta_{\text {cont }}$ is the continuum Laplacian and $\square_{x}, \square_{y}$ are unit cubes centered at $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}^{d}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{H}_{\mathrm{free}}^{\infty}(\phi)=\frac{1}{2}\langle\phi| G_{\infty}^{-1}|\phi\rangle \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

is the limit Hamiltonian, the massless Gaussian fixed point of the BS transformation.

Still in the case $V=0$, it is convenient to realize the random field $\phi$ distributed with the Gaussian probability $d \mu_{G_{0}}(\phi)\left(G_{0}\right.$ is the covariance of $\left.\phi\right)$ as a sum of independent contributions from different scales.

One can write for $n=0,1, \ldots, N$ (see $[16,17]$ for the details)

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{0 x y}=L^{-2 n} \mathscr{G}_{n L^{-}-n_{x} L^{-} n_{y}}+\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{-2 k} \mathscr{T}_{k L^{-} k_{x L^{-}-k y}} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathscr{G}_{n} \equiv\left(\mathscr{G}_{n x y}\right), x, y \in L^{-n} \Lambda$, and $\mathscr{T}_{k} \equiv\left(\mathscr{T}_{k x y}\right), x, y \in L^{-k} \Lambda$, are positive but not strictly positive operators (kernels). $\mathscr{G}_{n}$ has massless decay whereas $\mathscr{T}_{k}$ have massive ones (uniform in $k$ ). The decomposition (16) corresponds to the one used
in the heuristic momentum space RG, see [41], where one splits the momentum region $|p|<K$ into layers and scales:

$$
\begin{align*}
\int_{|p|<K} e^{i p(x-y)} p^{-2} d^{4} p= & L^{-2 n} \int_{|p|<K} e^{i L^{-n} p(x-y)} p^{-2} d^{4} p \\
& +\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{-2 k} \int_{L^{-1} K<|p|<K} e^{i p L^{-k}(x-y)} p^{-2} d^{4} p . \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

The degeneration of $\mathscr{G}_{n}$ and $\mathscr{T}_{k}$ is easily visible from the representations (see [16])

$$
\begin{gather*}
G_{n x y}=\sum_{x, y \in A_{n}} \mathscr{A}_{n x y} G_{n x y} \mathscr{A}_{n y y} \equiv\left(\mathscr{A}_{n} G_{n} \mathscr{A}_{n}^{+}\right)_{x y},  \tag{18}\\
\mathscr{T}_{k x y}=\sum_{\substack{x, y \in \Lambda_{k} \\
u, v \in \bar{\Lambda}_{k}}} \mathscr{A}_{k x x} Q_{x u} \Gamma_{k u v} Q_{y v} \mathscr{A}_{k y y} \equiv\left(\mathscr{A}_{k} Q \Gamma_{k} Q^{+} \mathscr{A}_{k}^{+}\right)_{x y}, \tag{19}
\end{gather*}
$$

where $\bar{\Lambda}_{k}=\Lambda_{k} \backslash L \mathbb{Z}^{4}$ and

$$
Q_{x u}=\left\{\begin{array}{ll}
\delta_{x u} & \text { if } x \notin L \mathbb{Z}^{4},  \tag{20}\\
-1 & \text { if } x \in L \mathbb{Z}^{4} \\
0 & \text { otherwise } .
\end{array} \text { and }-\frac{1}{2} L<x^{\mu}-u^{\mu} \leqq \frac{1}{2} L\right.
$$

(Notice that $C Q=0$.) Kernels $\mathscr{A}_{n}$ are independent, translationally invariant by unit lattice vectors and have uniform exponential decay. $G_{n}$ and $\Gamma_{k}$ are strictly positive operators. $\Gamma_{k}$ do not depend on $\xi$, are translationally invariant by vectors of $L \mathbb{Z}^{4}$ and also have uniform exponential decay. Moreover, there are two useful relations, see [16],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\square_{x}} d x \mathscr{A}_{n x y}=\delta_{x y}, \quad x, y \in \Lambda_{n}, \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the integral stands for the Riemann sum on $L^{-n} \mathbb{Z}^{4}$ (here over the unit cube $\square_{x}$ centered at $x$ ) and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{x \in \Lambda_{n}} \mathscr{A}_{n x x}=1 . \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

The decomposition (16) can be used to realize $\phi$ distributed with $d \mu_{G_{0}}$ as a sum of independent contributions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{x}=L^{-n} \psi_{L^{-n_{x}}}^{n}+\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{-k} \mathscr{Z}_{L^{-k_{x}}}^{k}, \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\psi^{n} \equiv\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right), x \in L^{-n} \Lambda, \mathscr{Z}^{k} \equiv\left(\mathscr{Z}_{x}^{k}\right), x \in L^{-k} \Lambda$, are centered Gaussian fields distributed with covariances $\mathscr{G}_{n}$ and $\mathscr{T}_{k}$ respectively.

By (18) and (19) we can write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{x}^{n}=\sum_{x \in \Lambda_{n}} \mathscr{A}_{n x x} \phi_{x}^{n} \equiv\left(\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}\right)_{x}, \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{Z}_{x}^{k}=\sum_{\substack{x \in \Lambda_{k} \\ u, v \in \bar{\Lambda}_{k}}} \mathscr{A}_{k x x} Q_{x u} I_{k u v}^{1 / 2} Z_{v} \equiv\left(\mathscr{A}_{k} Q \Gamma_{k}^{1 / 2} Z^{k}\right)_{x} \equiv\left(M_{k} Z^{k}\right)_{x} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\phi^{n}$ is a $\Lambda_{n}$-lattice field distributed with covariance $G_{n}$ and $Z^{k}$ is a $\bar{\Lambda}_{k}$ - one with covariance 1 . In fact substituting (24) and (25) in to (23) and using (20) and (21) one
can easily show that in the realization (23), $\phi^{n}$ as given by (24) coincides with the BS field (6) (for $z_{n} \equiv 1$ ) so that our notation is not abusive. As a byproduct, we obtain a relation inverse to (24):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\phi_{x}^{n}=\int_{\square_{x}} d x \psi_{x}^{n} \text {. } \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (23) it follows that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{x}^{n}=L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1} x_{x}}^{n+1}+\mathscr{Z}_{x}^{n}, \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

and, since $\psi^{n+1}$ and $\mathscr{Z}^{n}$ are independent as well as $\phi^{n+1}$ and $Z^{n}$, that the Gaussian measures split:

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \mu_{G_{n}}\left(\phi^{n}\right)=d \mu_{G_{n+1}}\left(\phi^{n+1}\right) \otimes d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{n}\right) . \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now let us pass to the perturbed case when $V \neq 0$. We shall rescale the fields by substituting $\phi^{n} \rightarrow z_{n}^{1 / 2} \phi^{n}, Z^{n} \rightarrow z_{n}^{1 / 2} Z^{n}, \psi^{n} \rightarrow z_{n}^{1 / 2} \psi^{n}, \mathscr{Z}^{n} \rightarrow z_{n}^{1 / 2} \mathscr{Z}^{n}$. Hence (27) and (28) become

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{x}^{n}=L^{-1} \zeta_{n}^{1 / 2} \psi_{L^{-1} x}^{n+1}+\mathscr{Z}_{x}^{n} \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
d \mu_{G_{n}}\left(\phi^{n}\right)=d \mu_{\zeta_{\bar{n}}^{1} G_{n+1}}\left(\phi^{n+1}\right) \otimes d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{n}\right) . \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the first effective Hamiltonian, see (8), we obtain using (29) and (30):

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp & {\left[-\mathscr{H}^{1}\left(\phi^{1}\right)\right] } \\
= & \exp \left[\delta f_{0} \Lambda\right] \int \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2}\langle\phi| G_{0}^{-1}|\phi\rangle-V(\phi)\right] \delta\left(\phi^{1}-\zeta_{0}^{-1 / 2} C \phi\right) D \phi \\
= & \exp \left[\delta f_{0} \Lambda+\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi G_{0}\right)\right] \int \exp [-V(\phi)] \delta\left(\phi^{1}-\zeta_{0}^{-1 / 2} C \phi\right) d \mu_{G_{0}}(\phi) \\
= & \exp \left[\delta f_{0} \Lambda+\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi G_{0}\right)\right] \\
& \cdot \int \exp \left[-V\left(L^{-1} \zeta_{0}^{1 / 2} \tilde{\psi}_{L^{-1}}^{1}+Z^{0}\right)\right] \delta\left(\phi^{1}-\tilde{\phi}^{1}\right) d \mu_{\zeta_{0}{ }^{-1} G_{1}}\left(\widetilde{\phi}^{1}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{0}\right) \\
= & \exp \left[\delta f_{0} \Lambda+\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi G_{0}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi \zeta_{0}^{-1} G_{1}\right)-\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{0}\left\langle\phi^{1}\right| G_{1}^{-1}\left|\phi^{1}\right\rangle\right] \\
& \cdot \int \exp \left[-V\left(L^{-1} \zeta_{0}^{1 / 2} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{1}+Z^{0}\right)\right] d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{0}\right) . \tag{31}
\end{align*}
$$

This way the first BS transformation has been expressed by the integral over the fluctuations $Z^{0}$.

From (31) we read off

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-\mathscr{H}^{1}\left(\phi^{1}\right)\right]= & \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \zeta_{0}\left\langle\phi^{1}\right| G_{1}^{-1}\left|\phi^{1}\right\rangle\right] \\
& \cdot \int \exp \left[-V\left(L^{-1} \zeta_{0}^{1 / 2} \psi_{L^{-1 .}}^{1}+\mathscr{Z}^{0}\right)\right] d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{0}\right) /\left(\phi^{1}=0\right) \tag{32}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta f_{0}=-\frac{1}{2 \Lambda} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi G_{0}\right)+\frac{1}{2 \Lambda} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi \zeta_{0}^{-1} G_{1}\right)-\frac{1}{\Lambda} \log \int \exp \left[-V\left(\mathscr{Z}^{0}\right)\right] d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{0}\right) . \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us define the effective interaction $V^{1}$ by

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-V^{1}\left(\psi^{1}\right)\right]= & \exp \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\zeta_{0}\right) \sum_{\mu} \int d x\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{1}\right)^{2}\right] \\
& \cdot \int \exp \left[-V\left(L^{-1} \zeta_{0}^{1 / 2} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{1}+\mathscr{Z}^{0}\right)\right] d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{0}\right) /\left(\psi^{1}=0\right) \tag{34}
\end{align*}
$$

$\zeta_{0}$ is chosen so that the subtraction in (34) removes the marginal $\int\left(\partial \psi^{1}\right)^{2}$ term from $V^{1}$, see Sect. 10. Since, as was shown in [16] and [17],

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\mu} \int d x\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{1}\right)^{2}=\left\langle\phi^{1}\right| G_{1}^{-1}\left|\phi^{1}\right\rangle-L^{6} \xi \Lambda^{-1}\left(\sum_{x} \phi_{x}^{1}\right)^{2} \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

we obtain from (32) and (34):

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-\mathscr{H}^{1}\left(\phi^{1}\right)\right]=\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\phi^{1}\right| \bar{G}_{1}^{-1}\left|\phi^{1}\right\rangle-V^{1}\left(\psi^{1}\right)\right] \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{G}_{1}^{-1}=E_{1}^{\perp} G_{1}^{-1}+L^{2} z_{1} \xi E_{1}, \tag{37}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $E_{n}$ being the orthogonal projection on functions constant on $\Lambda_{n} . \bar{G}_{1}$ differs from $G_{1}$ only by the value of the infrared regulator $\xi$.

Upon iteration of (31)-(37), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-\mathscr{H}^{n+1}\left(\phi^{n+1}\right)\right]=\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\phi^{n+1}\right| \bar{G}_{n+1}^{-1}\left|\phi^{n+1}\right\rangle-V^{n+1}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)\right] \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \exp \left[-V^{n+1}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)\right]= \exp \left[\frac{1}{2}\left(1-\zeta_{n}\right) \sum_{\mu} \int d x\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{n+1}\right)^{2}\right] \\
& \cdot \int \exp \left[-V^{n}\left(L^{-1} \zeta_{n}^{1 / 2} \psi_{L^{-1} .}^{n+1}+\mathscr{Z}^{n}\right)\right] d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{n}\right) /\left(\psi^{n+1}=0\right)  \tag{39}\\
& \bar{G}_{n+1}^{-1}=E_{n}^{\perp} G_{n+1}^{-1}+L^{2(n+1)} z_{n+1} \xi E_{n+1} \tag{40}
\end{align*}
$$

Moreover

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta f_{n}= & -\frac{1}{2 \Lambda_{n}} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi \bar{G}_{n}\right)+\frac{1}{2 \Lambda_{n}} \operatorname{Tr} \log \left(2 \pi \zeta_{n}^{-1} C \bar{G}_{n} C^{+}\right) \\
& -\frac{1}{\Lambda_{n}} \log \int \exp \left[-V^{n}\left(\mathscr{Z}^{n}\right)\right] d \mu_{1}\left(Z^{n}\right) . \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

This realizes the $n^{\text {th }} \mathrm{BS}$ transformation as an integral over the fluctuation field $Z^{n}$. Our aim will be to show that the effective interactions $V^{n}$ in the thermodynamical limit converge with $n$ to zero in a suitable sense.

Let us stress that the expression of the interactions $V^{n}$ as functionals of $\psi^{n}$ rather than $\phi^{n}$ is not accidental. Due to the locality of the relation (29), it is much more convenient to follow the dependence of $V^{n}$ on $\psi^{n}$. In the next section we shall also see that the $\psi^{n}$ dependence arises naturally in the perturbative approach. Before closing this section, let us list some of the (uniform in the volume) decay properties of the kernels $\mathscr{A}_{n}$ and $\Gamma_{n}$ following directly by a momentum space analysis of their explicit form,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathscr{A}_{n x x}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\beta|x-x|} \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|\mathscr{A}_{n x x}-\mathscr{A}_{n y x}\right| /|x-y| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1)\left(e^{-\beta|x-x|}+e^{-\beta|y-x|}\right)  \tag{43}\\
\left|\left(\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A}_{n} \nabla_{\mu}^{-1}\right)_{x x}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\beta|x-x|} \tag{44}
\end{gather*}
$$

( $\partial$ denotes the gradient on $L^{-n} \Lambda, \nabla$ the one on $\Lambda_{n}$ ),

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A}_{n x x}-\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A}_{n y x}\right| /|x-y|^{2 / 3} \leqq \mathcal{O}(1)\left(e^{-\beta|x-x|}+e^{-\beta|y-x|}\right)  \tag{45}\\
\left|\Gamma_{k u v}^{1 / 2}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) e^{-\beta|u-v|} \tag{46}
\end{gather*}
$$

for an $L$-dependent constant $\beta$. [In fact $\beta$ can be chosen $L$ independent in (42) to (45) whereas in (46) it is $\mathcal{O}\left(L^{-1}\right)$.] Expressions (42), (44), and (46) were already stated and proven in Appendix to [16] and Appendix 1 to [17]. Expressions (43) and (45), which we find more convenient to use here, are proven the same way (separately for $|x-y| \leqq 1$ and $|x-y|>1$ ).

## 3. Perturbative Approach to the Renormalization Group and Its Significance

Here we shall study the effective interactions in the leading orders of the perturbation expansion. It has to be stressed that we shall not expand in the powers of the initial coupling constant $\lambda_{0}$ of the quartic term since such expansion is not self-consistent already in second order. Instead we shall perform a perturbative analysis (to the second order) of each BS transformation in terms of the effective quartic coupling constant $\lambda_{n}$ of the corresponding scale.

Let us start with an ansatz

$$
\begin{align*}
V^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)= & \frac{1}{2} m_{n}^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{2}-6 \lambda_{n} \int d x \mathscr{G}_{n x x}\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{2}+\lambda_{n} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{4} \\
& -8 \lambda_{n}^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{V}_{n x y}\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{n}\right)^{3}, \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

where $m_{n}^{2} \in\left[-\lambda_{n}^{3 / 2}, \lambda_{n}^{3 / 2}\right] \equiv I_{n}$, say, and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{2}_{n x y}=\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{2(n-k)} \mathscr{T}_{k L^{n-k_{x}} L^{n-k_{y}}}=L^{2 n} G_{0 L^{n} x L^{n} y}-\mathscr{G}_{n x y} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

The second quadratic term in (1) contributes to the Wick ordering of the quartic one. The sixth order term corresponds to the diagram with the middle line being the sum of the propagators of the fluctuation fields $\mathscr{Z}^{k}$ with $k<n$. Although irrelevant (of negative dimension), this term has to be carefully taken into consideration because it gives an $\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda_{n}^{2}\right)$ feedback to the quartic term in the new interaction $V^{n+1}$, which has to be weighted against other $\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda_{n}^{2}\right)$ contributions. Thus for $V^{n}$ given by (1), let us compute $V^{n+1}$ to order $\lambda_{n}^{2}$ in the perturbation calculus. We shall show that, up to a mass term and irrelevant terms with negative dimensions which do not contribute to the $\int \psi^{4}$ term in the next step, (1) reproduces itself with $\lambda_{n} \rightarrow \lambda_{n+1}-\alpha_{n} \lambda_{n}^{2}$, where $\alpha_{n}=\mathcal{O}(\log L)>0$. Hence the second order computation exhibits the dynamics of the quartic coupling which does not change under the linear approximation to the RG transformation: as opposed to the case of higher or lower dimension, in dimension $4, \int \psi^{4}$ is a marginal (dimensionless) perturbation. The $L$ dependence of $\alpha_{n}$ shows why the perturbation expansion in $\lambda_{0}$
is not self-consistent. Computing $\lambda_{n}$ to the second order in $\lambda_{0}$ is equivalent to computing $\lambda_{1}$ to $\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda_{0}^{2}\right)$ for $L \rightarrow L^{n}$. Now, even for very small $\lambda_{0}$, this would give a large and negative result for $n$ sufficiently large due to the logarithmic divergence of $\alpha_{1}$ with $L \rightarrow \infty$.

To simplify the notation, let us drop the index $n$ and let us replace $n+1$ by prime. (2.39) gives

$$
\begin{align*}
V^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & -\frac{1}{2}(1-\zeta) \sum_{\mu} \int d x\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} L^{2} \zeta m^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-6 L^{2} \zeta \lambda \int d x \mathscr{G}_{L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +6 L^{2} \zeta \lambda \int d x \mathscr{T}_{L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right) \text { terms quadratic in } \psi^{\prime} \\
& +\zeta^{2} \lambda \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}-72 L^{4} \zeta^{2} \lambda^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \zeta^{2} \lambda^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{L y L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -36 L^{4} \zeta^{2} \lambda^{2} \int d x d y\left(\mathscr{T}_{L x L y}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \zeta^{2} \lambda^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{T}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{L_{y} L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& +48 L^{4} \zeta^{2} \lambda^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{G}_{L y L y} \mathscr{T}_{L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -8 L^{2} \zeta^{3} \lambda^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& -8 L^{2} \zeta^{3} \lambda^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{T}_{L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3}+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{5 / 2}\right) . \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

The third and the fourth term on the right-hand side of (3) make up

$$
\begin{equation*}
-6 \zeta \lambda \int d x \mathscr{G}_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}, \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

since

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{G}_{x y}^{\prime}=L^{2}\left(\mathscr{G}_{L x L y}-\mathscr{T}_{L x L_{y}}\right), \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

see (2.16). The rest of the quadratic terms may be written as a sum of a relevant mass term of dimension two $\frac{1}{2}\left(L^{2} \zeta m^{2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right)\right) \int(\psi)^{2}$, a marginal (dimensionless) kinetic term $\frac{1}{2}\left(\zeta-1+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right)\right) \int\left(\partial \psi^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ and irrelevant (negative dimension) quadratic contributions. This step, as well as its analogue for the quartic terms discussed below, are in fact somewhat more tricky than usual since the kernels of the expressions on the right-hand side of (3) have only $\mathbb{Z}^{d}$ translation invariance while living on $L^{-n} \Lambda$. The precise way to circumvent this difficulty in extracting the "zero momentum" or " $p$ " contributions to the diagrams will be discussed later. The wave function renormalization $\zeta$ of $\psi^{\prime}$ will be taken as to eliminate the $\int\left(\partial \psi^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ term from $V^{\prime}$. Hence $1-\zeta=\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right)$ and can be dropped from the other terms of (3) in our approximation. The non-local terms of the fourth order in (3) can be written as the local marginal expression $\delta \lambda^{1} \int\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}, \delta \lambda^{1}=\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{2}\right)$, plus irrelevant contributions of negative dimensions,

$$
\begin{align*}
\delta \lambda^{1}= & -72 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\square_{0}} d x \int d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L_{y}} \mathscr{T}_{L x L y}-48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\square_{0}} d x \int d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{L_{y L y}} \\
& -36 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\square_{0}} d x \int d_{y}\left(\mathscr{T}_{L x L y}\right)^{2}-48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\square_{0}} d x \int d_{y} \mathscr{T}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{L y L y} \\
& +48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\square_{0}} d x d y \mathscr{T}_{L x L x} \mathscr{G}_{L y L_{y}} . \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

In Appendix 1, we show that the main contribution to the right-hand side for $L$ large comes from the third term corresponding to the bubble with two $\mathscr{T}$ lines. The bubble diverges like $\mathcal{O}(\log L)$ for $L \rightarrow \infty$. This term dominates for $L \geqq \bar{L}$ the other ones corresponding to the bubble $\propto$ with one $\mathscr{T}$ and one "harder" line or to
$\qquad$ with $\mathscr{T}$ or a "harder" propagator on the open line (the latter terms vanish in fact). Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
4 C_{+}^{-1} \lambda^{2} \leqq-\delta \lambda^{1} \leqq \frac{1}{4} C_{-}^{-1} \lambda^{2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for some $n$-independent (but $L$ dependent) constants $C_{-}, C_{+}>0$. Altogether the fourth order terms on the right-hand side of (3) may be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(\lambda+\delta \lambda^{1}\right) \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\text { irrelevant terms of order } \lambda^{2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{5 / 2}\right), \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\delta \lambda^{1}$ satisfying (7).
Finally, since by (2)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{Q}_{x y}^{\prime}=L^{2} \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y y}+L^{2} \mathscr{T}_{L x L y}, \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

the sixth order term of (3) is

$$
\begin{equation*}
-8 \lambda^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{Q}_{x y}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} . \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Summarizing,

$$
\begin{align*}
V^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & \frac{1}{2}\left(L^{2} m^{2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right)\right) \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-6 \lambda^{\prime} \int d \dot{x} \mathscr{G}_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& + \text { irrelevant quadratic terms of order }\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +\lambda^{\prime} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\text { irrelevant quartic terms of order }\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -8\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{Q}_{x y}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3}+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{5 / 2}\right) \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\lambda^{\prime}=\lambda+\delta \lambda^{1}+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{5 / 2}\right) . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is clear that we could have added to $V$ irrelevant quadratic and quartic terms of order, say, $\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{3 / 2}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{7 / 4}\right)$ respectively and six or higher order $\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{13 / 6}\right)$ terms without essentially changing the result of our analysis. From the form of the new mass term in (11), it is obvious that we can find a closed subinterval $J \subset I$ such that for $m^{2}$ going through it while other entries of $V^{n}$ change continuously, $m^{\prime 2}=L^{2} m^{2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{2}\right)$ sweeps $I^{\prime} \equiv\left[-\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2},\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{3 / 2}\right]$. This will allow us to choose in an iterative procedure a sequence $I_{0} \supset J_{0}^{\prime} \supset J_{0}^{\prime \prime} \supset \ldots \supset J_{0}^{(n)} \supset \ldots$ of closed intervals such that for $m_{0}^{2}$ running through $J_{0}^{(n)}, m_{n}^{2}$ sweeps $I_{n}$. Following [6], we locate the critical mass of the infinite volume theory, $m_{\text {crit }}^{2}\left(\lambda_{0}\right)$, as the point of $\cap J_{0}^{n}$. For $m_{0}^{2}=m_{\text {crit }}^{2}\left(\lambda_{0}\right)$ we can iterate our perturbative analysis. From (7),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\lambda}+3 C_{+}^{-1} \leqq \frac{1}{\lambda+\delta \lambda^{1}} \leqq \frac{1}{\lambda}+\frac{1}{3} C_{-}^{-1} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

for small $\lambda$, so that the assumption

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{C_{-}}{n_{0}+n} \leqq \lambda \leqq \frac{C_{+}}{n_{0}+n} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

carries through: the effective fourth order couplings $\lambda_{n}$ should decrease like $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{n}\right)$.

This shows the perturbative asymptotic freedom in IR of the critical $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory.
Summarizing: Our perturbative analysis carried over to the second order of the effective coupling constant at each distance scale (to be distinguished from the second order analysis in $\lambda_{0}$ ) tells us that the effective interactions vanish in the limit of long distances. The purpose of this paper is to prove this rigorously by providing appropriate estimates for the perturbative and non-perturbative corrections to the above arguments.

The problem with the perturbation expansion is that it is based on expanding the right-hand side of (2.39) (or of its logarithm) into powers of $V$ which, even if given by (1) with small $\lambda$, becomes arbitrarily large in certain regions of the functional space of the fields $\psi=L^{-1} \zeta^{1 / 2} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{Z}$, namely, where $|\psi|>\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{-1 / 4}\right)$. Let us consider first small BS fields $\psi^{\prime},\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|<\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{-1 / 4}\right)$. Still $V$ becomes large if $|\mathscr{Z}|$ is large and the perturbation expansion for $V^{\prime}$ in terms of powers of $\lambda$ would diverge [we may expect the behavior of the type of $\mathcal{O}(n!)$ for large order $n$, typical for $\phi^{4}$ integrals]. If we limit the functional integral in (2.39) to fields $Z$ [and hence, by (2.25), (2.42), and (2.46) also fields $\mathscr{Z}]$ with absolute value smaller than $\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{-1 / 4}\right)$, we may easily bound small corrections to the first perturbative orders using more or less standard cluster expansion arguments to control the volume dependence of the expressions. The corrections coming from the large values of $Z$ will be shown to always carry non-perturbative small factors $\mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\varepsilon \lambda^{-1 / 2}}\right)$ due to the small $d \mu_{1}$-probability of $\left|Z_{x}\right| \geqq \mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{-1 / 4}\right)$. However, we have to know that as well as the contributions of large fluctuations $Z$ to $V^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$, also the ones to the first Taylor expansion coefficients of $V^{\prime}$ around $\psi^{\prime}=0\left(e . g\right.$. to $\left.\lambda^{\prime}\right)$ are small. We shall guarantee this by passing to fields $\psi$ and $\psi^{\prime}$ with small imaginary parts, $|\operatorname{Im} \psi|$, $\left|\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right|<\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{-1 / 4}\right)$ (i.e. in strips) and proving together with the bounds for small and large $Z$ contributions to $V^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ their analyticity in $\psi^{\prime}$. Then the bounds for the contributions to the derivatives of $V^{\prime}$ at $\psi^{\prime}=0$ will follow by Cauchy estimates. As far as the properties of $V(\psi)$ for large $\psi$ are concerned, we shall assume inductively stability bounds for the large $\psi$ contribution to the Boltzmann factor $e^{-V(\psi)}$. They will guarantee the strip-analyticity of $e^{-V^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)}$ and will assure that the small $d \mu_{1^{-}}$ probability of large fluctuations $Z$ is not affected for small $\psi^{\prime}$ by the interaction.

Of course small or large field values may occur simultaneously in different space-time regions and our analysis has to take into account the space-time relations ignored in the above discussion. Here we shall follow the spirit of [4]. The crucial fact is that, although the recursion (2.39) does not preserve the locality of $V$, it may be expected to preserve its approximate locality because the only new nonlocality present in (2.39) is due to the approximately local relation (2.25) between $\mathscr{Z}$ and $Z$. Hence we expect coupling of different space-time regions in (2.39) to be exponentially decaying [with the correlation length being $\mathcal{O}(L)$ ] and shall use cluster (high temperature) expansion techniques to exhibit the decay. The expansion will allow us to perform the small field-large field analysis in an essentially local way. This will be the topic of the next section. Let us stress the contrast between (2.39) and the complete functional integral of a critical theory with infinite correlation length. The success of the RG lies just in the reduction of the latter problem to a sequence of high-temperature ones with bounded correlation lengths.

## 4. General Form of Effective Interactions

In this section the inductive assumptions concerning the analyticity properties of $V^{n}$ are stated. Let us start by describing the sets of small fields $\psi^{n}$. As introduced, $\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}, \phi^{n}$ being the independent variables. Since the above relation is nonlocal and it will be essential to trace the local dependence (and analyticity) of $V^{n}$ on $\psi^{n}$ rather than on $\phi^{n}$, we shall enlarge the space of small fields to a certain space of complex $\psi^{n}$ 's not necessarily of the form $\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}$.

Let us pave $L^{-n} \Lambda$ with the lattice of blocks $\Delta$ of size $L^{N_{0}}$ centered at points of $L^{N_{0}} \mathbb{Z}^{4} . L^{N_{0}}$ will later appear as the scale of the cluster expansion. A subset of $L^{-n} \Lambda$ being a union of blocks $\Delta$ will be called paved. For a paved set $X \subset L^{-n} \Lambda$, let

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathscr{K}(X)= & \left\{\operatorname{complex} \psi^{n} \equiv\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right), x \in L^{-n} \Lambda \cap X:\right. \\
& \left|\psi_{x}\right|<C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \text { for } x \in X, \\
& \left|\psi_{x}^{n}-\psi_{y}^{n}\right| /|x-y|<C_{0} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \text { for } x \neq y, x, y \in X, \\
& \left|\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{n}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{n}\right| /|x-y|^{2 / 3}<C_{0} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \quad \text { for } \quad x \neq y, \\
& \left.x, y, x+L^{-n} e_{\mu}, y+L^{-n} e_{\mu} \in X\right\} . \tag{1}
\end{align*}
$$

This will be the set of small fields on $X$. As we see, we have bounded not only the values of $\psi^{n}$ but also those of its derivatives and of the exponent $2 / 3$ Hölder derivatives of the derivatives of $\psi^{n}$. Let us notice that for $\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}$, the first bound of (1) with $X=L^{-n} \Lambda$ would imply the next ones [for $C_{0} \geqq \bar{C}_{0}(L)$, as we assume] due to (2.26), (2.43), and (2.45). For more general small fields, we postulate these bounds in order to guarantee the smallness of irrelevant terms of $V_{n}$ in which derivatives of $\psi^{n}$ will appear, see below.

We shall inductively assume $V^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ to be an even analytic functional on $\mathscr{K}\left(L^{-n} \Lambda\right)$ vanishing at zero. We shall also assume $V^{n}$ to possess all the euclidean symmetries of the unit lattice.

Let us denote by $V_{k}^{n}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ the $k^{\text {th }}$ order of the Taylor series for $V^{n}$ at zero and by $V_{\geqq k}^{n}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ the remainder of the expansion up to order $k-1$. We shall take the quadratic term of $V^{n}$ of the form:

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{2}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)=\frac{1}{2} m_{n}^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{2}-6 \lambda_{n} \int d x G_{n x x}\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{2}+\sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y K_{n x y}^{\mu v}\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{n}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{n}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}^{n} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

This specifies the form of the second order irrelevant terms. Notice the absence of the $\int(\partial \psi)^{2}$ term entirely absorbed into the Gaussian measure by wave function renormalization, as discussed in the previous sections.

For the quartic term in $V^{n}$, we put

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{4}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)=\lambda_{n} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{4}+\sum_{Y} \tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ is the restriction to the diagonal of a quartic nonsymmetric form $\tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi_{1}^{n}, \psi_{2}^{n}, \psi_{3}^{n}, \psi_{4}^{n}\right)$ depending on the fields $\psi_{i}^{n}$ defined on the paved set $Y . \psi_{4}^{n}$ enters $\tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi_{1}^{n}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{n}\right)$ only through its differences at pairs of points. This guarantees the irrelevant character of $\sum_{Y} \widetilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$, to be contrasted with the marginality of $\lambda_{n} \int\left(\psi^{n}\right)^{4}$.

We could have written the irrelevant contribution to $V_{4}^{n}$ in a more transparent way as $\int d \delta d t d u d x d y N_{n_{\Delta t u x y}} \psi_{s}^{n} \psi_{t}^{n} \psi_{u}^{n}\left(\psi_{x}^{n}-\psi_{y}^{n}\right)$. The other form is preferable since
we would not be able to extract satisfactory bounds for the kernels $N_{n}$. The twidle in $\tilde{V}_{4 Y}$ signals that these expressions do not contain the whole quartic contribution to $V^{n}$.

Finally, for the sixth and higher order contributions to $V^{n}$, we assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\geqq 6}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)=-8 \lambda_{n}^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{V}_{n x y}\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{n}\right)^{3}+\sum_{Y} \tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right), \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

see (3.1) and (3.2). Even functionals $\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ are assumed to depend only on $\psi^{n}$ restricted to the paved set $Y$, to be analytic on $3 \mathscr{K}(Y)$ and to have the Taylor series starting with sixth order terms.

In the next sections, we shall formulate inductive bounds for the building blocks of the interaction $V^{n}$ introduced here. For the time being it is enough if we keep in mind that $m_{n}^{2}, K_{n}, \lambda_{n}, \lambda_{n}^{2}, Q_{n}, \widetilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}$, and $\widetilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{n}$ are small and exponentially decaying with the separation of the points of the kernels or of the points of the sets $Y$, the second property expressing the approximate locality of $V^{n}$.

Now let us discuss the large field contributions to the Boltzmann factor $e^{-V^{n}}$. First, notice that we may write

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\geqq 4}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)=\lambda \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{4}+\sum_{Y} \tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right) \equiv \lambda \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{4}+\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right), \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{V}_{\geqq}^{n} n Y\left(\psi^{n}\right)=\tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)-8 \lambda_{n}^{2} \sum_{\substack{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}\right) \\ \Delta_{1} \Delta_{2}=Y^{\prime}}} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{V}_{n x y}\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{n}\right)^{3}+\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right) . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

This implies for the Boltzmann factor

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-V_{\geqq 4}^{n}\right] & =\prod_{Y}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y}^{n}\right]-1+1\right) \exp \left[-\lambda_{n} \int\left(\psi^{n}\right)^{4}\right] \\
& =\sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\alpha}}^{n}\right]-1\right) \exp \left[-\lambda_{n} \int\left(\psi^{n}\right)^{4}\right] \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

Let us introduce the following convenient terminology. A paved set $X$ will be called connected with respect to a collection $S$ of paved sets if each set of $S$ lies either in $X$ or outside $X$ and if $X$ cannot be divided into two proper paved subsets without dividing some of the sets of $S$. $X$ will be called connected if it is connected with respect to pairs of nearest neighbor blocks $\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}$ in $X$.

Now let $D$ be a paved set in $L^{-n} \Lambda$. Let $S$ be composed of connected components (c.c.) of $D$ and of sets of $\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}$. Let $\left\{X_{i}\right\}$ be the collection of the c.c. with respect to $S$ of $D \cup\left(\bigcup_{\alpha} Y_{\alpha}\right)$ intersecting $D$. Let us fix $\left\{X_{i}\right\}$. It is clear that the sum over $\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}$ factorizes now to the sums inside each $X_{i}$ and the outside sum. Thus we obtain from (7)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-V_{\geqq 4}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right]=\sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\}} \prod_{i} g_{X_{i}}^{n D}\left(\psi^{n}\right) \exp \left[-\lambda \int_{\sim D} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \subset \sim \cup X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right] \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the sum over $\left\{X_{i}\right\}$ runs through collections of paved disjoint sets such that $D$ $\subset \bigcup_{i} X_{i}$ and each $D \cap X_{i}$ is a non-empty union of c.c. of $D$. In (8),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.g_{X_{i}}^{n D}\left(\psi^{n}\right)=\sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\widetilde{V}_{\geqq}^{n} \Psi_{Y_{\alpha}}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right]-1\right) \exp \left[-\lambda \int_{D \cap X_{i}} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{4}\right)\right], \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}$ running through collections of paved subsets of $X_{i}$ such that $X_{i}$ is connected with respect to the c.c. of $D$ and $Y_{\alpha}$ 's. Notice that $g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ depends only on $\psi^{n} \mid X_{i}$.

The main point of the partial resummation of the Mayer expansion (7) inside $D$ is that (8) remains valid also for fields which become large inside $D$. Given $\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}$ for a real BS field $\phi^{n}$, define $D\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ as the smallest paved set such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\psi_{x}^{n}\right|<2 C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \exp \left[\frac{1}{10} \alpha d\left(x, \sim D\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right)\right] \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\alpha=\varepsilon \beta$ [for $\beta$ see (2.42) to (2.46)] with some sufficiently small $\varepsilon>0$. Thus $D\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ is the set of points, where $\psi^{n}$ becomes large but only exponentially fast with the distance from $\sim D\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ (the last condition will take care of the exponentially decreasing tails in the interfield coupling). The set of the large fields will be defined as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{D}(D, X)=\bigcup_{\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}}\left(\left.\psi^{n}\right|_{X}+\mathscr{K}(X)\right), \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the union is taken over real fields $\phi^{n}$ such that $D\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ is a subset of the paved set $D$. Notice that although we have admitted arbitrary small fields $\psi^{n}$, the large fields have the original form $\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}, \phi^{n}$ real, up to a small field correction. Notice also that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mathscr{D}(D, X)\right|_{X \backslash D} \subset 3 \mathscr{K}(X \backslash D) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed, for $\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}$ with $D\left(\psi^{n}\right) \subset D$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\psi_{x}^{n}\right| \leqq 2 C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \quad \text { if } \quad x \notin D \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

by (10). Moreover

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\psi_{x}^{n}-\psi_{y}^{n}\right| /|x-y| & \leqq \sum_{x}\left(\left|\mathscr{A}_{n x x}-\mathscr{A}_{n y x}\right| /|x-y|\right)\left|\phi_{x}^{n}\right| \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x}\left(e^{-\beta|x-x|}+e^{-\beta|y-x|}\right) \int_{\square_{x}} d x\left|\psi_{x}^{n}\right| \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \sum_{x}\left(e^{-\beta|x-x|}+e^{-\beta|y-x|}\right) e^{\frac{1}{10} \alpha d(x, \sim D)} \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \leqq 2 C_{0} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

for $x, y \notin D$ and $C_{0} \geqq \bar{C}_{0}(L)$ by (2.43), (2.26), and (10). Similarly

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{n}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{n}\right| /|x-y|^{2 / 3} \leqq 2 C_{0} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $x, y \notin D$ and $C_{0}$ large enough. Hence $\psi^{n} \in 2 \mathscr{K}(\sim D)$ [or more precisely $\left.\left.\psi^{n}\right|_{\sim D} \in 2 \mathscr{K}(\sim D)\right]$ and (12) follows from (11).

For large fields, we shall not insist on the analyticity (or even on the existence for complex $\psi^{n}$ ) of $V^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ but will simply assume the analyticity of the Boltzmann factor $\exp \left[-V^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right]$ on $\mathscr{D}\left(D, L^{-n} \Lambda\right)$ together with the representation (8) for $\exp \left[-V_{\geq 4}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right]$, where $g_{X_{i}}^{n D}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ are even functionals depending on $\left.\psi^{n}\right|_{X_{i}}$, analytic on $\mathscr{D}\left(D, X_{i}\right)$. The precise stability bounds on $g_{X_{i}}^{n D}$ will be stated in Sect. 6. Here we mention only that $g_{X_{i}}^{n D}$ decays exponentially with the separation of points of $X_{i}$ and is bounded but not necessarily small.

For large fields, the relation (9) does not make sense any more but we shall still have a relation between $g_{X}^{n D}$ and $g_{X}^{n D_{1}}$ for $D \supset D_{1}$ easily following from (8). Namely,
on $\mathscr{D}\left(D_{1}, X\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{X}^{n D}=\sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\},\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \prod_{i} g_{X_{i}}^{n D_{1}} \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\alpha}}^{n}\right]-1\right) \exp \left[-\lambda_{n} \int_{\left(D \backslash D_{1}\right) \cap X}\left(\psi^{n}\right)^{4}\right] \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we sum over collections of disjoint sets $X_{i} \subset X, D_{1} \cap X \subset \cup X_{i}, D_{1} \cap X_{i}$ is a non-empty union of c.c. of $D_{1}$ and $Y_{\alpha} \subset\left(X \backslash \cup X_{i}\right)$ with $X$ connected with respect to c.c. of $D, X_{i}$, and $Y_{\alpha}$. Notice that (9) follows from (16) (and analytic continuation) if we put $D_{1}=\emptyset$. Equation (16) also implies that if $D \cap X=D_{1} \cap X$ then $g_{X}^{n D}$ and $g_{X}^{n D_{1}}$ coincide on $\mathscr{D}\left(D_{1}, X\right)$.

## 5. Local Analysis of the Renormalization Group Recursion

The proof that the general form of the effective interaction discussed in the previous section is preserved by the RG transformation is based on a cluster expansion argument for the fluctuation integral of (2.39).

Again in order to simplify the notation, we drop the sub-(super-) script $n$ and replace $n+1$ by prime. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]=\int \exp \left[-V\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{Z}\right)\right] d \mu_{1}(Z) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

As compared to $V^{\prime}$, see (2.39), $W^{\prime}$ contains a constant term as well as a $\int\left(\partial \psi^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ one and the field strength has not been renormalized in it.

The first step of the expansion for the right-hand side of (1) consists of localizing the regions in which $\mathscr{Z}$ field is large. This is done with the help of a partition of unity

$$
\begin{equation*}
1=\sum_{\bar{p}} \chi_{\bar{p}}(Z) \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\bar{p}=\left(p_{u}\right), u \in \Lambda_{n} \equiv \Lambda_{n} \backslash L \mathbb{Z}^{4}, p_{u}=0,1, \ldots$, and $\chi_{\bar{p}}$ is the following characteristic function

$$
\begin{equation*}
\chi_{\bar{p}}(Z)=\prod_{u \in \bar{\Lambda}_{n}} \chi_{\left\{\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} p_{u} \leqq\left|Z_{u}\right|<\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\left(p_{u}+1\right)\right\}} . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that $\bar{p}=0$ selects small $Z$ and hence (due to (2.25), (2.42), and (2.46)) small $\mathscr{Z}$.
Given $\bar{p}$, let us define the large $\mathscr{Z}$ region $R$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
R=\bigcup_{u \in \bar{A}_{n}}\left\{L \Delta: \Delta \subset L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda, d(L \Delta, u)<10 \alpha^{-1} \log \left(p_{u}+1\right)\right\} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus $Z$ can become large in $R$ but only exponentially fast in the distance from $\sim R$.
Given set $D^{\prime}$, where the BS field $\psi^{\prime}$ may get large and the set $R$ of large fluctuations $\mathscr{Z}$, let us define the set $D$ of large fields $\psi \equiv L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1} .}^{\prime}+\mathscr{Z}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
D=L D^{\prime} \cup R \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that if $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda\right)$ and $Z$ is in the support of $\chi_{\bar{p}}$ then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi \in \frac{3}{4} \mathscr{D}\left(D, L^{-n} \Lambda\right) \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed

$$
\begin{equation*}
L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime} \in \frac{2}{3} \mathscr{D}\left(L D^{\prime}, L^{-n} \Lambda\right) \subset \frac{2}{3} \mathscr{D}\left(D, L^{-n} \Lambda\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Moreover, by (2.25), (2.42), (2.46), (3), and (4),

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\mathscr{Z}_{x}\right| & =\left|\left(\mathscr{A} Q \Gamma^{1 / 2} Z\right)_{x}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{u \in \bar{\Lambda}_{n}} e^{-\frac{3}{4} \beta|x-u|}\left|Z_{n}\right| \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \sum_{u} e^{-\frac{3}{4} \beta|x-u|}\left(p_{u}+1\right) \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \sum_{u} e^{-\frac{3}{4} \beta|x-u|+\frac{1}{10} \alpha d(u, \sim R)} \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} e^{\frac{1}{10} \alpha d(x, \sim R)} \leqq \frac{1}{12} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} e^{\frac{1}{10} \alpha d(x, \sim R)} \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

for $C_{1} \geqq \bar{C}_{1}(L)$ so that $\mathscr{Z} \in \frac{1}{12} \mathscr{D}\left(R, L^{-n} \Lambda\right) \subset \frac{1}{12} \mathscr{D}\left(D, L^{-n} \Lambda\right)$. Thus after inserting (2) under the integral of the right-hand side of (1), we may express the integrand $\exp [-V(\psi)]=\exp \left[-V_{2}(\psi)\right] \exp \left[-V_{\geqq 4}(\psi)\right]$ using (4.2) and (4.8) with $D$ given by (5).

This way we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]= & \sum_{p} \sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\}} \int \prod_{i} g_{X_{i}}^{D}(\psi) \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} m^{2} \int d x \psi_{x}^{2}+6 \lambda \int d x G_{x x} \psi_{x}^{2}\right. \\
& -\sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y K_{x y}^{\mu v}\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}-\lambda \int_{\sim D} d x \psi_{x}^{4} \\
& \left.-\sum_{Y \subset \sim U X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y}(\psi)\right] \chi_{\bar{p}}(Z) d \mu_{1}(Z) . \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

Let us localize the irrelevant quadratic term of $V, \sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y K_{x y}^{\mu v}\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}$ by writing it as $\sum_{Y} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}(\psi)$, where $Y$ is the smallest paved set containing $x, y, x+L^{-n} e_{\mu}$ and $y+L^{-n} e_{\mu}$. Mayer expanding

$$
\exp \left[-\sum_{Y \nless X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}-\sum_{Y \subset \sim U X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y}\right] \text { for all } i
$$

under the integral of (9), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \exp \left[-W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]=\sum_{\bar{p}} \sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\}} \sum_{\left.Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}} \int \prod_{i} g_{X_{i}}^{D}(\psi) \\
& \quad \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} m^{2} \int d x \psi_{x}^{2}+6 \lambda \int d x \mathscr{G}_{x x} \psi_{x}^{2}-\sum_{i} \sum_{Y \subset X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}(\psi)-\lambda \int_{\sim D} d x \psi_{x}^{4}\right] \\
& \quad \cdot \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{2 Y_{\alpha}}(\psi)\right]-1\right) \prod_{\beta}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\beta}}(\psi)\right]-1\right) \chi_{\bar{p}}(Z) d \mu_{1}(Z), \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

where $Y_{\alpha}$ are not contained in a single $X_{i}$ and $Y_{\beta}$ do not intersect $\cup X_{i}$.
We still have to decouple the non-locality of the right-hand side due to the kernels $\mathscr{A} Q \Gamma^{1 / 2} \equiv \mathscr{M}$ relating the fluctuation fields $\mathscr{Z}$ and $Z$, see (2.25). Let $\left\{U_{k}\right\}$ be the partition of the volume $L^{-n} \Lambda$ into unions of blocks $L \Delta\left(\Delta \subset L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda\right)$ connected with respect to $X_{i}, Y_{\alpha}, Y_{\beta}$ and the pairs of the nearest neighbor blocks $L \Delta_{1}, L \Delta_{2}$ such that $L \Delta_{1} \subset R$. The reason for taking this "collar" around $R$ will become clear in a moment. Define

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi^{s}=L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{M}^{s} Z \equiv L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{Z}^{s} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where (for $x_{U_{k}}$ being the characteristic function of $U_{k}$ )

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{M}^{s}=\sum_{k} \chi_{U_{k}} \mathscr{M} \chi_{U_{k}}+\sum_{k<k^{\prime}} s_{k k^{\prime}}\left(\chi_{U_{k}} \mathscr{M} \chi_{U_{k^{\prime}}}+\chi_{U_{k^{\prime}}} \mathscr{M} \chi_{U_{k}}\right) \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that for $\left(s_{k k^{\prime}}\right)=0, \mathscr{M}^{s}$ does not couple different $U_{k}$. We shall admit complex $s_{k k^{\prime}}$ with

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|s_{k k^{\prime}}\right| \leqq 2 r \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} \beta d\left(U_{k}, U_{k^{\prime}}\right)\right] \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $r$ will be chosen later. Notice that for $x \in U_{k}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{Z}_{x}^{s}=\left(\mathscr{M} \chi_{U_{k}} Z\right)_{x}+\sum_{k^{\prime} \neq k} s_{k k^{\prime}}\left(\mathscr{M} \chi_{U_{k}} Z\right)_{x} \equiv \mathscr{Z}_{1 x}+\mathscr{Z}_{2 x}^{s} \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where for $k^{\prime}<k$, we have put $s_{k k^{\prime}} \equiv s_{k^{\prime} k}$. Following (8), we show that the first term on the right-hand side is in $\frac{1}{12} \mathscr{D}\left(R_{k}, U_{k}\right)$, where $R_{k} \equiv R \cap U_{k}$. Let us consider the second term. Proceeding again like in (8), we notice after the fourth step that for $u \in U_{k^{\prime}}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{2}{3} \beta|x-u| \geqq \frac{1}{10} \alpha d(u, \sim R)+\frac{1}{2} \beta d\left(U_{k}, U_{k^{\prime}}\right) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

(since for $u \in R|x-u| \geqq d(u, \sim R)$ by the construction of $U_{k}$ 's) and conclude that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathscr{Z}_{2 x}^{s}\right| \leqq \frac{1}{4} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $C_{1} \geqq \bar{C}_{1}(L, r)$. Similarly, we show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathscr{Z}_{2 x}^{s}-\mathscr{Z}_{2 y}^{s}\right| /|x-y| \leqq \frac{1}{4} C_{0} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \quad \text { for } \quad x, y \in U_{k} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{Z}_{2 x}^{s}-\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{Z}_{2 y}^{s}\right| /|x-y|^{2 / 3} \leqq \frac{1}{4} C_{0} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \\
& \quad \text { for } \quad x, y, x+L^{-n} e_{\mu}, y+L^{-n} e_{\mu} \in U_{k} \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

[note the crucial character of the limitation of the points to a single $U_{k}$ in (17) and (18)].

Altogether, we infer [using also (7)] that for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda\right)$ [or $\left.\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, L^{-1} U_{k}\right)\right]$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{Z}_{1} \in \frac{1}{12} \mathscr{D}\left(R_{k}, U_{k}\right), \mathscr{Z}_{2}^{s} \in \frac{1}{4} \mathscr{K}\left(U_{k}\right) \quad \text { and } \quad \psi^{s} \in \mathscr{D}\left(L D^{\prime} \cup R_{k}, U_{k}\right) \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall use the following formula [24] interpolating between $s=0$ and $s=1$ expressions:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{F}(1)=\sum_{\Gamma} \int d s_{\Gamma} \partial_{s_{\Gamma}} \mathscr{F}(s) \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the sum runs over graphs $\Gamma$ (collections of pairs $k<k^{\prime}$ : called in what follows lines), $d s_{\Gamma}=\prod_{\ell \in \Gamma} \chi_{\{[0,1]\}}\left(s_{\ell}\right) d s_{\ell}, \quad \partial_{s_{\Gamma}} \mathscr{F}(s)=\prod_{\ell \in \Gamma} \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{\ell}} \mathscr{F}(s)$ and in the argument of $\mathscr{F}$ on the right-hand side of (20), $s_{\ell}$ are set to zero for $\ell \notin \Gamma$.

Splitting $\Gamma$ into the connected components, we may rewrite (20) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{F}(1)=\sum_{\left\{थ_{\gamma}\right\}} \int \prod_{\gamma} S\left(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}\right) \mathscr{F}(s), \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left\{\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}\right\}$ is a partition of $\left\{U_{k}\right\}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
S\left(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}\right)=\sum_{\Gamma_{c}} \int d s_{\Gamma_{c}} \partial_{s_{\Gamma_{c}}} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

with the sum running through the connected graphs on $\mathscr{U}_{\gamma} . S\left(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}\right)=1$ if $\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}$ is composed of one $U_{k}$.

Applying (21) to (10), with $s$-dependence introduced according to (11) and (12), we obtain

$$
\begin{gather*}
\exp \left[-W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]=\sum_{\bar{p}} \sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}\right\}} \int \prod_{\gamma} S\left(\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}\right) \prod_{i} g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{s}\right) \\
\cdot \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} m^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}+6 \lambda \int d x \mathscr{G}_{x x}\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}-\sum_{i} \sum_{Y \subset X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{s}\right)-\lambda \int_{\sim D} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{4}\right] \\
\cdot \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{2 Y_{\alpha}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right]-1\right) \prod_{\beta}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\beta}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right]-1\right) \chi_{\bar{p}}(Z) d \mu_{1}(Z) . \tag{23}
\end{gather*}
$$

But the integral on the right-hand side of (23) decouples and the sums factorize over the sets $\underline{\mathscr{U}}_{\gamma}=\bigcup_{U_{k} \in \mathscr{U}_{\gamma}} U_{k}$. For the later, one of the crucial observations is that for $X_{i} \subset U_{k}$ we may replace $g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$ by $g_{X_{i}}^{L D^{\prime} \cup \boldsymbol{R}_{k}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$, since $\psi^{s} \in \mathscr{D}\left(L D^{\prime} \cup R_{k}, U_{k}\right)$ and $D$ $\cap U_{k}=\left(L D^{\prime} \cup R_{k}\right) \cap U_{k}$, see the remark following (4.16). Also, for the factorization of $\sum_{\bar{p}}$ over $\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}$ it is important that together with $L \Delta_{1} \subset R_{k}$, we have included into $U_{k}$ all the nearest neighbor blocks $L \Delta_{2}$. Otherwise we would encounter the nonfactorizing condition that $\mathscr{U}_{\gamma} \cap R$ is a c.c. of $R$.

Let us introduce paved sets $X_{\gamma}^{\prime} \subset L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda$ such that $L X_{\gamma}^{\prime}=\mathscr{U}_{\gamma}$ but admitting $X_{\gamma}^{\prime}=\Delta$ only inside $D^{\prime}$. We can rewrite (23) as a partition function of a polymer system with (disjoint) polymers $X_{\gamma}^{\prime}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]=\sum_{\left\{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}\right\}} \prod_{\gamma} \varrho_{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}}^{D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \exp \left[-\sum_{\Delta \subset \sim D^{\prime}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right] \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

The polymer activities are given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \varrho_{X^{\prime}}^{D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{\overline{\bar{p}}} \sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}} \int S(\mathscr{U}) \prod_{j} g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{s}\right) \\
& \quad \cdot \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} m^{2} \int_{L X^{\prime}} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}+6 \lambda \int_{L X^{\prime}} d x^{\mathscr{G}_{x x}}\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}-\sum_{i} \sum_{Y \subset X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{s}\right)-\lambda \int_{L X^{\prime} \backslash D} d x\left(\psi_{x x}^{s}\right)^{4}\right] \\
& \quad \cdot \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{2 Y_{\alpha}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right]-1\right) \prod_{\beta}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\beta}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right]-1\right) \chi_{\bar{p}}\left(Z_{L X^{\prime}}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L X^{\prime}}\right) \\
& \quad \cdot \exp \left[\sum_{\Delta \subset X^{\prime} \backslash D^{\prime}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right] \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\bar{p}=0$ outside $L X^{\prime}, R \equiv R(\bar{p}) \subset L X^{\prime}$ together with all blocks $L \Delta$ having nearest neighbors in $R, D=L D^{\prime} \cup R, X_{i}$ are disjoint subsets of $L X^{\prime}$ and each $D \cap X_{i}$ is a nonempty union of c.c. of $D, D \cap L X^{\prime} \subset \cup X_{i}, Y_{\alpha} \subset L X^{\prime}$ but not in a single $X_{i}, Y_{\beta} \subset L X^{\prime}$ $\left(\cup X_{i}\right)$ and $\mathscr{U}$ is the partition of $L X^{\prime}$ into unions of blocks $L \Delta$ connected with respect to $X_{i}, Y_{\alpha}, Y_{\beta}$ and pairs of nearest neighbor blocks $L \Delta_{1}, L \Delta_{2}, L \Delta_{1} \subset R$. In (25) $\psi^{s}=L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{M}^{s} Z_{L X^{\prime}}$, where $Z_{L X^{\prime}}$ vanishes outside $L X^{\prime}$. We recall that $X^{\prime}$ can be equal to a single block $\Delta$ only of it lies inside $D^{\prime}$.

The contributions of the single $\Delta$ clusters outside $D^{\prime}$ are gathered in

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]= & \int \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} m^{2} \int_{L \Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{0}\right)^{2}+6 \lambda \int_{L \Delta} d x \mathscr{G}_{x x}\left(\psi_{x}^{0}\right)^{2}\right. \\
& \left.-\sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{0}\right)-\lambda \int_{L \Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{0}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right] \chi_{0}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) \tag{26}
\end{align*}
$$

It should be clear (see the precise estimates in the next sections), that $W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ as well
 $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$ respectively.

For $\psi^{\prime} \operatorname{small}\left(D^{\prime}=\emptyset\right)$ in $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$ put $\varrho_{X^{\prime}}^{\emptyset}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \equiv \varrho_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$. In this case the activities $\varrho_{X^{\prime}}$ will be small and exponentially decaying with the separation of points of $X^{\prime}$. We may exponentiate the right-hand side of (24), see e.g. Sect. I. 3 of [37], obtaining for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}\left(L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda\right)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{Y} W_{Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

where for $Y$ bigger than $\Delta$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=-\sum_{\substack{(X) \xi \\\left(X_{\xi}\right)=1 \\ \cup X_{\xi}=Y}} \frac{1}{\Xi!} \sum_{\gamma_{c}} \prod_{\ell \in \gamma_{c}} A(\ell) \prod_{\zeta} \varrho_{X_{\xi}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

In (28) $\gamma_{c}$ runs over connected graphs of lines $\ell$ joining vertices $\{1, \ldots, \Xi\}$, $A(\ell)=-1$ if $X_{\ell_{-}}^{\prime} \cap X_{\ell_{+}}^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$, where $\ell=\left(\ell_{-}, \ell_{+}\right)$and zero otherwise. The sum in (28) will be shown to converge and give again small $W_{Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ with exponential decay in $Y$. Using the Taylor expansion, we write

$$
\begin{align*}
W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) & =W^{\prime}(0)+W_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+W_{4}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+W_{\geqq 6}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \\
& =\sum_{Y}\left(W_{Y}^{\prime}(0)+W_{2 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+W_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+W_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right) . \tag{29}
\end{align*}
$$

For a general set $S \subset L^{-n} \Lambda$, denote by $\bar{S}$ the smallest paved set containing $S$. Let us write for the quartic terms of $W^{\prime}$

$$
\begin{align*}
W_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) & =\sum_{\Delta=Y^{\prime}} \lambda \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\sum_{Y:\left(L^{-1} Y^{-}=Y^{\prime}\right.} \tilde{V}_{4 Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}\right)+\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \\
& \equiv \sum_{\Delta=Y^{\prime}} \lambda \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\tilde{W}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\tilde{W}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{30}
\end{align*}
$$

$\tilde{W}_{Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ contains the $\mathcal{O}\left(V_{\geqq 6}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}\left((V)^{2}\right)$ contributions to $W_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$. As we shall show below,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\delta \lambda \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}$, as $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}$, possess the expected properties of $\tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ (in particular, they are irrelevant).

The extraction of the marginal term $\delta \lambda \int\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}$ will be described in detail in Sect.9. Here let us only mention that (31) cannot be written as $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\int d x \delta \lambda_{Y}(x)\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\widetilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$, if only this still holds approximately up to exponentially decaying tails.

Let us come back to (24) for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda\right)$. We shall now extract from $W^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ the constant and the quadratic term as well as the part of the non-local quartic one. The latter, after reshuffling it according to (31), will be reinstated back in a moment.

Let us then introduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-\bar{W}_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right] \equiv \exp [-W] \exp \left[W^{\prime}(0)+W_{2}^{\prime}+\sum_{Y} \tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right] \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

By (24) and (29),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-\bar{W}_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right]=\sum_{\left\{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}\right\}} \prod_{\gamma} \varrho_{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}}^{D^{\prime}} \exp \left[-\sum_{\Delta \subset \sim D^{\prime}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}+\sum_{Y}\left(W_{Y}^{\prime}(0)+W_{2 Y}^{\prime}\right)+\sum_{Y} \tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right] \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us define the interior $\dot{X}$ of a paved set $X$ as the union of $\Delta \subset X$ which do not touch blocks $\Delta C \sim X$. Mayer expanding $\exp \left[\sum_{Y}\left(W_{Y}^{\prime}(0)+W_{2 Y}^{\prime}\right)+\sum_{Y} \tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right]$, the sum running over the paved sets $Y$ which do not lie entirely in the interior $D_{i}^{\prime}$ of a single c.c. $D_{i}^{\prime}$ of $D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}$ and resumming the clusters of this expansion outside the large field region $D^{\prime}$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
& \exp \left[-\bar{W}_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right]=\sum_{\left\{\bar{X}_{l}\right\}} \prod_{l} \bar{g}_{X_{l}}^{\prime} \sum_{\left\{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}\right\}} \prod_{\gamma} \varrho_{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}} \\
& \quad \cdot \exp \left[-\lambda \int_{\cup \bar{X}_{l} \backslash D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{\Delta \subset \sim \cup \bar{X}_{l}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}+\sum_{\mathrm{Y},} \sum_{\sim \cup \bar{X}_{l}}\left(W_{Y}^{\prime}(0)+W_{2 Y}^{\prime}\right)+\sum_{Y \subset \sim \cup \bar{X}_{l}} W_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right] . \tag{34}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $\bar{X}_{l}$ runs through the collections of disjoint paved sets such that $D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}_{l}$ is a non-empty union of c.c. of $D^{\prime}, D^{\prime} \subset \cup \bar{X}_{l}, X_{\gamma}^{\prime}$ are disjoint and $X_{\gamma}^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}_{l}=\emptyset$.

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{g}_{X}^{\prime} D^{\prime}= & \sum_{\left\{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}} \prod_{\gamma} \varrho_{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}}^{D^{\prime}} \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[W_{Y_{\alpha}}^{\prime}(0)+W_{2 Y_{\alpha}}^{\prime}\right]-1\right) \\
& \cdot \prod_{\beta}\left(\exp \left[\tilde{W}_{4 Y_{\beta}}^{\prime}\right]-1\right) \exp \left[-\sum_{\Delta \subset \bar{X} \backslash D^{\prime}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}+\lambda \int_{\bar{X} \backslash D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right. \\
& \left.+\sum_{D_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}}\left(W_{Y}^{\prime}(0)+W_{2 Y}^{\prime}+\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right)\right], \tag{35}
\end{align*}
$$

where $X_{\gamma}^{\prime}$ are disjoint, $\emptyset \neq D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X} \subset \cup X_{\gamma}^{\prime}$, no $Y_{\alpha}$ and no $Y_{\beta}(\subset \bar{X})$ lie entirely in the interior of a single c.c. $D_{i}^{\prime}$ of $D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}$ and $\bar{X}$ is connected with respect to $X_{y}^{\prime}, Y_{\alpha}$, and $Y_{\beta}$.

In (34) we may exponentiate the sum over $\left\{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}\right\}$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\left\{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}\right\}} \prod_{\gamma} \varrho_{X_{\gamma}^{\prime}} \exp \left[-\sum_{\Delta \subset \sim \cup \bar{X}_{l}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\right]=\exp \left[-\sum_{Y \subset \sim \bar{X}_{l}} W_{Y}^{\prime}\right], \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

see (28). Inserting (36) to (34) and using (29) and (30), we obtain

$$
\exp \left[-\bar{W}_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right]=\sum_{\left\{\bar{X}_{l}\right\}} \prod_{l} \bar{g}_{\bar{X}_{l}}^{\prime D_{l}^{\prime}} \exp \left[-\lambda \int_{\sim D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \subset \sim \cup \bar{X}_{l}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}-\sum_{Y \subset \sim \cup \bar{X}_{l}} W_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\right] \cdot(3
$$

Now, using (31), we shall reinstate the factor $\exp \left[-\sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]$ removed in
$\left[-\bar{W}_{\geq 4}^{\prime}\right]$, see (32). $\exp \left[-\bar{W}_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right]$, see (32).

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-W_{\geqq}^{\prime}\right]= & \exp \left[-\bar{W}_{\geqq}^{\prime}\right] \exp \left[-\delta \lambda \int\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\right] \\
= & \sum_{\left\{X_{X}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{_{\beta}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{Y}\right\}} \prod_{l} \bar{g}_{\bar{X}_{l}}^{D^{\prime}} \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{W}_{4 Y_{\alpha}}^{\prime}\right]-1\right) \\
& \cdot \prod_{\beta}\left(\exp \left[-W_{\geqq}^{\prime} 6 Y_{\beta}\right]-1\right) \prod_{\gamma}\left(\exp \left[-W_{4 Y_{\gamma}}^{\prime 2}\right]-1\right) \\
& \cdot \exp \left[-\lambda \int_{\sim D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\delta \lambda \int\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{D_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\right], \tag{38}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have partly Mayer expanded the non-local terms in the exponential. In (38), $Y_{\alpha}, Y_{\beta} \subset \sim \cup \bar{X}_{l}$ and no $Y_{\gamma}$ lies entirely in the interior of a single c.c. of $D^{\prime}$. Fixing the clusters of the expansion on the right-hand side of (38) intersecting $D^{\prime}$ and exponentiating the outside sum, we shall obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-W_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right]=\sum_{\left\{X_{j}\right\}} \prod_{j} \tilde{g}_{X_{j}}^{\prime D^{\prime}} \exp \left[-(\lambda+\delta \lambda) \int_{\sim D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \subset \sim \cup X_{j}}\left(\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}+\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}+W_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\right)\right], \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left\{X_{j}\right\}$ runs through the collections of disjoint paved sets such that $D^{\prime} \cap X_{j}$ is a non-empty union of c.c. $D_{j i}^{\prime}$ of $D^{\prime}$ and $D^{\prime} \subset X_{j}$.

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}= & \sum_{\left\{\bar{X}_{l}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\gamma}\right\}} \prod_{l} \bar{g}_{\bar{X}_{l}^{\prime}}^{\prime} \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{W}_{4 Y_{\alpha}}^{\prime}\right]-1\right) \prod_{\beta}\left(\exp \left[-W_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right]-1\right) \\
& \cdot \prod_{\gamma}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{W}_{4 Y_{\gamma}}^{2}\right]-1\right) \exp \left[-6 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} X}(\psi)^{4}-\sum_{D_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\right] \tag{40}
\end{align*}
$$

with $\bar{X}_{l}, Y_{\alpha}, Y_{\beta}$, and $Y_{\gamma}$ as in (38) except that they lie in $X$ and $X$ has to be connected with respects to them.

We still have to deal with the second order contributions to $W_{2}^{\prime}$. In fact we shall show that for $\psi^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
W_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) & +6(\lambda+\delta \lambda) \zeta \int d x \mathscr{G}_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}=\frac{1}{2}\left(L^{2} m^{2}+\delta m^{2}\right) \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \delta c \sum_{\mu} \int d x\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +\sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y\left(L^{4} K_{L x L y}^{\mu v}+\delta K_{x y}^{\mu v}\right)\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{\prime}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \tag{41}
\end{align*}
$$

Now choosing the wave function renormalization

$$
\begin{equation*}
\zeta=(1+\delta c)^{-1} \tag{42}
\end{equation*}
$$

[as will be shown $|\delta c| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{7 / 4}\right)$ and hence $|1-\zeta| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\lambda^{7 / 4}\right)$ ], we may rewrite (41) as

$$
\begin{align*}
W_{2}^{\prime}\left(\zeta^{1 / 2} \psi^{\prime}\right)= & \frac{1}{2}\left(L^{2} m^{2}+\delta m^{2}\right) \zeta \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -6(\lambda+\delta \lambda) \zeta^{2} \int d x \mathscr{G}_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2}(1-\zeta) \sum_{\mu} \int d x\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +\zeta \sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y\left(L^{4} K_{L x L y}^{\mu \nu}+\delta K_{x y}^{\mu \nu}\right)\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{\prime}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \tag{43}
\end{align*}
$$

Now for $V_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ with $\psi^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}$, we shall get from (2.39) and (1),

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\frac{1}{2} m^{2 \prime} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-6 \lambda^{\prime} \int d x \mathscr{G}_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y K_{x y}^{\prime \mu \nu}\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{\prime}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

provided that we define

$$
\begin{gather*}
m^{2 \prime} \equiv\left(L^{2} m^{2}+\delta m^{2}\right) \zeta,  \tag{45}\\
\lambda^{\prime}=(\lambda+\delta \lambda) \zeta^{2},  \tag{46}\\
K_{x y}^{\prime \mu \nu}=\left(L^{4} K_{L x L y}^{\mu \nu}+\delta K_{x y}^{\mu \nu}\right) \zeta . \tag{47}
\end{gather*}
$$

By definition, we shall extend (44) to any $L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda$ fields $\psi^{\prime}$ obtaining this way (4.2) with $n \mapsto n+1$.

For the quartic term $V_{4}^{\prime}$, we obtain from (2.39), (1), (30), and (31)

$$
\begin{align*}
V_{4}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & W_{4}^{\prime}\left(\zeta^{1 / 2} \psi^{\prime}\right)=(\lambda+\delta \lambda) \zeta^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\zeta^{2} \sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \\
& +\zeta^{2} \sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \equiv \lambda^{\prime} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\sum_{Y} \tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{48}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{V}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime}=\zeta^{2}\left(\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}+\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\right) \equiv \zeta^{2} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime} \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

Equation (48) reproduces (4.3) for $n \mapsto n+1$. Similarly

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\geqq 6}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=W_{\geqq 6}^{\prime}\left(\zeta^{1 / 2} \psi^{\prime}\right)=-8\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{2} \int d x d y \mathscr{Z}_{x y}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3}+\sum_{Y} \tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right), \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=W_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\left(\zeta^{1 / 2} \psi^{\prime}\right)+8\left(\lambda^{\prime}\right)^{2} \sum_{\substack{\left(\Lambda_{1}, \Lambda_{2}\right) \\ \Delta_{1} \cup \Delta_{2}=Y}} \int_{\Lambda_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{P}_{x y}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} . \tag{51}
\end{equation*}
$$

This gives (4.4) for $n \mapsto n+1$. As we shall see, (49) holds e.g. on $3 \mathscr{K}\left(L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda\right)$ and the contributions on the right-hand side have the desired analycity properties (which should be clear already now).

For large $\psi^{\prime}$ e.g. in $\mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, L^{-(n+1)} \Lambda\right),(2.39),(4.6),(1),(39),(49)$, and (51) give

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-V_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]=\sum_{\left\{X_{j}\right\}} \prod_{j} g_{X_{j}}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \exp \left[-\lambda^{\prime} \int_{\sim D^{\prime}} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \subset \sim X_{j}} \widetilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right], \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\zeta^{1 / 2} \psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{53}
\end{equation*}
$$

(52) is (4.8) for $n \mapsto n+1$. Again $g_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}$ are analytic on $\mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$.

Equations (44), (48), (50), and (52) show that the general form of the effective interactions described in Sect. 4 reproduces itself under (2.39). It is a straightforward exercise left to the reader to show that (4.16) also holds for $n \mapsto n+1$, compare Appendix 2 of [17]. In the following sections, we shall see how inductive bounds on various contributions to the effective interactions carry through (2.39), and shall show that they behave in accordance with predictions of Sect. 3 [e.g. $\left.\lambda_{n}=\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)\right]$. This will establish the IR asymptotic freedom of the weakly coupled lattice critical $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory.

## 6. Inductive Bounds for the Effective Interactions

## Small Fields

For a paved set $X$, by $\mathscr{L}(X)$ we shall denote the length of the shortest tree on the centers of the $\Delta$ blocks building $X$ and, possibly, other points of the (periodic) continuum.

The quadratic irrelevant term of the effective interactions will be controlled by means of the estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y\left|K_{n x y}^{\mu v}\right| /|x-y|^{2 / 3} \leqq\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2} \exp \left[-\alpha \mathscr{L}\left(\Delta_{1} \cup \Delta_{2}\right)\right], \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\alpha=\varepsilon \beta$ is the same constant which appeared in (4.10).
The effective coupling constant will be bounded by

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{-}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1} \leqq \lambda_{n} \leqq C_{+}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1} \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $0<C_{-}<C_{+}, C_{+}=C_{+}(L)$.
For the irrelevant quartic contributions, we assume

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi_{1}^{n}, \psi_{2}^{n}, \psi_{3}^{n}, \psi_{4}^{n}\right)\right| \leqq\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 4} \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\psi_{1}^{n}, \psi_{2}^{n}, \psi_{3}^{n} \in \mathscr{K}(Y)$ and $\psi_{4}^{n}$ satisfying the bounds defining $\mathscr{K}(Y)$, see (4.1), except the first one for its absolute value [we recall that $\tilde{V}_{4 Y}\left(\psi_{1}^{n}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{n}\right)$ depends only on the differences of $\psi_{4}^{n}$ at pairs of points of $Y$ ].

Finally $\widetilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ are analytic on $3 \mathscr{K}(Y)$ satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right| \leqq\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

The choice of powers of $\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}=\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda_{n}\right)$ in (1), (3), and (4) has been dictated by convenience. We could have respectively chosen $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right), \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right)$, $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)$, and $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)$ as well since the main contributions to $K_{n}$ and $\tilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}$ come from the second order graphs $-\bigcirc$ and $\nprec$ and to $\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}$ from the third order graph $H$. The factors $\exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]$ in our bounds exhibit the approximate locality of $V^{n}$.

## Large Fields

We assume that the large field contributions $g_{X}^{n D}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ to the Boltzmann factor $\exp \left[-V_{\geqq 4}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right]$ are analytic on $\mathscr{D}(D, X)$ satisfying there

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{X}^{n D}\left(\psi^{n}\right)\right| \leqq \exp \left[C_{2}|D \cap X|-\lambda_{n}^{1 / 2} \int_{D \cap X} d x\left|\psi_{x}^{n}\right|^{2}+20 \lambda_{n} \int_{D \cap X} d x\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi_{x}^{n}\right)^{4}-\alpha \mathscr{L}(X)\right] \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $C_{2}=C_{2}\left(L, N_{0}\right)$ and for a paved set $Y,|Y|$ denotes the number of the $\Delta$ blocks building $Y$.

The choice of (5) is one of the crucial contributions into the analysis of the nonperturbative corrections to the effective interactions (besides the idea to use the analyticity in the field variables instead of the one in coupling constants). Let us notice that (5) has a chance to iterate: $\int\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{n}\right)^{4}$ goes more or less through the RG recursion unchanged and $\lambda_{n}^{1 / 2} \int\left|\psi^{n}\right|^{2} \mapsto\left(L^{2} \lambda_{n}^{1 / 2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\lambda_{n}\right)\right) \int\left|\psi^{n+1}\right|^{2}$, which in the large field region and for large $C_{1}$ [see (4.10)] should match the increase of the constant term $C_{2}|D \cap X|$ providing even a contractive factor which will be used to control the combinatories of the cluster expansion.

At the initial step of the iteration when $V(\phi)$ is given by $(2.2), K_{0 x y}^{\mu \nu}=0, \widetilde{V}_{4 Y}=0$, $\mathscr{2}_{0 x y}=0, \widetilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}=0$ and

$$
g_{X}^{0 D}= \begin{cases}\exp \left[-\lambda_{0} \sum_{X \in X} \phi_{x}^{4}\right] & \text { if } X \text { is a c.c. of } D  \tag{6}\\ 0 & \text { otherwise }\end{cases}
$$

Choice of $n_{0}$ corresponds by (2) to a choice of $\lambda_{0}$ (the bigger $n_{0}$, the smaller $\lambda_{0}$ ). Writing $\lambda_{0}^{1 / 4} \phi_{x}=a+i b$ with real $a, b$, we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\lambda_{0} \operatorname{Re} \phi_{x}^{4} & =a^{4}-6 a^{2} b^{2}+b^{4} \geqq \frac{1}{2} a^{4}-17 b^{4} \geqq \frac{1}{2}\left(a^{4}+b^{4}\right)-20 b^{4} \\
& \geqq-C+2\left(a^{2}+b^{2}\right)-20 b^{4}=-C+3 \lambda_{0}^{1 / 2}\left|\phi_{x}\right|^{2}-20 \lambda_{0}\left(\operatorname{Im} \phi_{x}\right)^{4} \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

so that (5) for $n=0$ clearly follows for $C_{2} \geqq \bar{C}_{2}\left(L^{4 N_{0}}\right)$.
We shall always assume that $L \geqq \bar{L}, N_{0} \geqq \bar{N}_{0}(L), C_{0} \geqq \bar{C}_{0}(L), C_{2} \geqq \bar{C}_{2}\left(L, N_{0}\right)$, $C_{1} \geqq C_{1}\left(L, N_{0}, C_{2}\right)$ and $n_{0} \geqq \bar{n}_{0}\left(L, N_{0}, C_{0}, C_{1}, C_{2}\right)$. The initial $\phi^{4}$ interaction given by (2.2) has the form described in Sect. 4 and for small $\lambda_{0}>0$ satisfies the inductive bounds.

## The Main Technical Result

that we want to prove is the following: Suppose that $V^{n}$ has the properties described in Sect. 4 and fulfills the bounds of the present section with $m_{n}^{2} \in I_{n}$ $\equiv\left[-\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2},\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{3 / 2}\right]$. Then $V^{n+1}$ has again the same properties with $n \mapsto n+1$ except for the new mass squared which satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|m_{n+1}^{2}-L^{2} m_{n}^{2}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 7. Inductive Step: Estimation of the Local Small Field Contribution to the New Effective Interaction

We shall start the proof of the above stated result from the analysis of $W_{\Delta}^{\prime}$, see (5.26). $W_{\Delta}^{\prime}$ carries the main contribution to $V^{\prime}$.

Let us assume that $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{3}{2} L \mathscr{K}(\Delta)$ and let $\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\left(\psi^{0}\right)$ denote the argument of the exponential on the right-hand side of (5.26). We recall that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{x}^{0}=L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1} x}^{\prime}+\sum_{u \in L \Delta} \mathscr{M}_{x u} Z_{u} \text { for } \quad x \in L \Delta \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right)=\chi_{0}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) / \int \chi_{0}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is straightforward to see that for $Z$ in the support of $d v_{L \Delta}, \psi^{0} \in 3 \mathscr{K}(L \Delta)$. We shall compute $W_{\Delta}^{\prime}$ perturbatively. Let us denote

$$
\begin{equation*}
\langle-\rangle_{t}=\int-\exp \left[-t^{t} \mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right] d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) / \int \exp \left[-t \mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right] d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{align*}
W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & -\log \int \exp \left[-\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right] d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right)-\log \int \chi_{0}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) \\
= & -\int_{0}^{1} \frac{d}{d t} \log \int \exp \left[-t \mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right] d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{0}\left(e^{-\varepsilon\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 2}}\right) \\
= & \left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{0}-\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta} ; \mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{0}^{T}+\frac{1}{2} \int_{0}^{t} d t(1-t)^{2}\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta} ; \mathscr{V}_{L \Delta} ; \mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{t}^{T} \\
& +\mathcal{O}_{0}\left(e^{-\varepsilon\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 2}}\right), \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\langle; \ldots ;\rangle_{t}^{T}$ denotes the truncated expectation and the subscript at $\mathcal{O}(-)$ points to the order of the expression in $\psi^{\prime}$ [we use the weak definition of $\mathcal{O}(-)$ which does not exclude $o(-)]$.

In estimating the expectations on the right-hand side of (4), we shall use the fact that if $\mathscr{U}_{\geqq k L \Delta}(\psi)$ is an expression of order $\geqq k$ in $\psi$ which is bounded on $\mathscr{K}(L \Delta)$ by $C$, then, since $\left.\mathscr{M}_{u}\right|_{L \Delta} \in \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \mathscr{K}(L \Delta)$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int\left|\mathscr{U}_{\geqq k L \Delta}\left(\mathscr{M} Z_{L \Delta}\right)\right| d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) \leqq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int_{0}^{1} d t(1-t)^{k-1} \int\left|\frac{d^{k}}{d t^{k}} \mathscr{U}_{\geqq k L \Delta}\left(t \mathscr{M} Z_{L \Delta}\right)\right| d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) \\
& \quad \leqq \frac{1}{(k-1)!} \int d t(1-t)^{k-1} \sum_{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{k} \in L \Delta} \\
& \left.\quad \cdot \int\left|\prod_{i=1}^{k} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_{i}}\right|_{t_{i} \equiv 0} \mathscr{U}_{\geqq k L \Delta}\left(t \mathscr{M} Z_{L \Delta}+\sum_{i=1}^{k} t_{i} \mathscr{M}_{\cdot u_{i}}\right) \prod_{i=1}^{k} Z_{u_{i}} \right\rvert\, d v\left(Z_{L \Delta}\right) \leqq C \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-k / 4}\right), \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have used the Cauchy estimate to bound the $t$ derivatives. Loosely speaking, the integral on the right-hand side of (5) contains at least $k / 2$ contractions of pairs of $Z$ fields and each such contraction yields an additional $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)$ factor as compared to the bound for the expression on $\mathscr{K}(L \Delta)$.

Let us start the estimation with the first term on the right-hand side of (4)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{0}=\frac{1}{2} L^{2} m^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-6 L^{2} \lambda \int_{\Delta} d x \mathscr{G}_{L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +\lambda \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+6 \lambda L^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta} \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\mathscr{M}_{L x u}\right)^{2}\left\langle Z_{u}^{2}\right\rangle_{0}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +\sum_{Y \subset L \Delta}\left[\tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L-1 .}^{\prime}\right)+V_{4 Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L-1 .}^{\prime} .\right)\right. \\
& +\sum_{1 \leqq i<j \leqq 4} \sum_{u \in L \Delta}\left\langle Z_{u}^{2}\right\rangle_{0} \tilde{V}_{4 Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}, \ldots, M_{\hat{\imath}} \cdot u, \ldots, M_{\mathcal{j}} \cdot u, \ldots, L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}\right) \\
& \left.+\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right\rangle_{0}-\left.\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right\rangle_{0}\right|_{\psi^{\prime}=0}\right]-8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& -72 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta}\left\langle Z_{u}^{2}\right\rangle_{0} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{M}_{L x u} \mathscr{M}_{L y u}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta}\left\langle Z_{u}^{2}\right\rangle_{0} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{M}_{L x u} \mathscr{M}_{L y u}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -72 L^{6} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{4} \in L \Delta}\left\langle Z_{u_{1}} \ldots Z_{u_{4}}\right\rangle_{0} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L_{y}} \mathscr{M}_{L x u_{1}} \\
& \text { - } \mathscr{M}_{L x u_{2}} \mathscr{M}_{L_{y} u_{3}} \mathscr{M}_{L_{y} u_{4}} \psi_{x}^{\prime} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -48 L^{6} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u_{1}, \ldots, u_{4} \in L \Delta}\left\langle Z_{u_{1}} \ldots Z_{u_{4}}\right\rangle_{0} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L L_{y}} \mathscr{M}_{L_{y} u_{1}} \\
& \text { - } \mathscr{M}_{L_{y} u_{2}} \mathscr{M}_{L_{y} u_{3}} \mathscr{M}_{L_{y} u_{4}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\left.\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{0}\right|_{\psi^{\prime}=0} . \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

We shall estimate various terms of (6) with the use of (5). Note first that the kernel $\mathscr{2}$ satisfies the following bound

$$
\begin{align*}
& \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y\left|\mathscr{Q}_{x y}\right| \leqq \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{2(n-k)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mid \mathscr{T}_{k L^{-n_{x}} L^{n-k_{y}} \mid} \\
& \quad \leqq(1) \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4} \beta \mathscr{L}\left(\Delta_{1} \cup \Delta_{2}\right)\right] \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{2(n-k)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4} \beta L^{n-k}|x-y|\right] \\
& \quad \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4} \beta \mathscr{L}\left(\Delta_{1} \cup \Delta_{2}\right)\right] \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L^{-2(n-k)} \int d y e^{-1 / 4 \beta|y|} \\
& \quad \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4} \beta \mathscr{L}\left(\Delta_{1} \cup \Delta_{2}\right)\right] \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have used the uniform exponential decay of $\mathscr{T}_{k}$ following from (2.19), (2.42), and (2.46). Inequality (7) and the inductive bounds of Sect. 6 give

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}=\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{4}(1)+\mathcal{O}_{\geqq 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

on small fields. Thus, by virtue of (5), the constant in (6) satisfies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle\right|_{\psi^{\prime}=0}=\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us pass to the quadratic contributions to $\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{0}$. Using (6.3), we obtain ( $\left.\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{3}{2} L \mathscr{K}(\Delta)!\right)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \sum_{i<j} \sum_{u \in L \Delta}\left\langle Z_{u}^{2}\right\rangle_{0} \tilde{V}_{4 Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}, \ldots, \mathcal{M}_{\hat{i} \cdot u}, \ldots, \mathcal{M}_{\hat{\jmath}} \cdot \ldots, L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}\right) \mid \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 4}\right) \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

(one $Z$ contraction provides additional $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)$ ). The quadratic contribution from $\sum_{Y \subset L \Delta}\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right\rangle_{0}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{1}{2} \sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \frac{d^{2}}{d t^{2}}\right|_{t=0}\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(t L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{M} Z_{L \Delta}\right)\right\rangle_{0} \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

and by virtue of (6.4) and (5) is bounded by $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 3}\right)$ (there are at least two $Z$ contractions here). The last but one and last but two terms on the right-hand side of (6) are, with the use of (8), bounded by $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right)$.

The quartic contribution from $\sum_{Y \subset \Delta}\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right\rangle_{0}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{1}{4!} \sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \frac{d^{4}}{d t^{4}}\right|_{t=0}\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(t L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{M} Z_{L \Delta}\right)\right\rangle_{0} \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

and is bounded by $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right)$ (at least one $Z$ contraction).
The remainder of $\sum_{Y \subset \Delta}\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 \mathrm{Y}}\left(\psi^{0}\right)\right\rangle_{0}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{5!} \sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \int_{0}^{1} d t(1-t)^{5} \frac{d^{6}}{d t^{6}}\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(t L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{M} Z_{L \Delta}\right)\right\rangle_{0} \equiv \tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 \Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since by (6.4)

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\sum_{Y \subset L \Delta}\left\langle\tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(t L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}+\mathscr{M} Z_{L \Delta}\right)\right\rangle_{0}\right| & \leqq\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \\
& \leqq\left(L^{4}+1\right)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \tag{14}
\end{align*}
$$

for $N_{0} \geqq \bar{N}_{0}(L)$ and since the constant, quadratic and quartic contributions to this expressions were bounded [using (5)] by $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-13 / 6}\right), \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 3}\right)$ and $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right)$ respectively,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{\geqq 64}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq\left(L^{4}+2\right)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

(all the time for $\left.\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{3}{2} L \mathscr{K}(\Delta)\right)$.
Finally, let us notice that $\left\langle\Pi Z_{u_{i}}\right\rangle_{0}$ are given by their gaussian values with $\mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\varepsilon\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 2}}\right)$ corrections. Denoting

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \tilde{V}_{L Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1} .}^{\prime}\right) \equiv \tilde{W}_{2 \Delta}^{1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right),  \tag{16}\\
& \sum_{Y \subset L \Delta} \tilde{V}_{4 Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}\right) \equiv \tilde{W}_{4 \Delta}^{1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right), \tag{17}
\end{align*}
$$

we may summarize the above discussion by writing

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{0}= & \mathcal{O}_{0}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)+\frac{1}{2} L^{2} m^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-6 L^{2} \lambda \int_{\Delta} d x \mathscr{G}_{L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +6 \lambda L^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta} \int d x\left(\mathscr{M}_{L x u}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\tilde{W}_{2 \Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 4}\right) \\
& +\lambda \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}-72 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L L y} \mathscr{M}_{L x u} \mathscr{M}_{L y y u}\left(\psi_{x x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{M}_{L y u} \mathscr{M}_{L y u}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)_{x}^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& +\tilde{W}_{4 \Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right)-8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& +\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 \Delta}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) . \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (4), $-\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L A} ; \mathscr{V}_{L \Lambda}\right\rangle_{D}^{T}$, is treated similarly as the first one with the additional use of the fact that $\mathscr{V}_{L A}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}\right.$.) (i.e. $Z=0$ term) does not contribute to the truncated expectation. A straightforward analysis yields

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\frac{1}{2}\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta} ; \mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right\rangle_{0}^{T}=\mathcal{O}_{0}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \\
& -36 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u_{1}, u_{2} \in L \Delta} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{M}_{L x u_{1}} \mathscr{M}_{L y u_{1}} \mathscr{M}_{L x u_{2}} \mathscr{M}_{L y u_{2}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u_{1}, u_{2} \in L \Delta} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{M}_{L x u_{1}} \mathscr{M}_{L y u_{1}} \mathscr{M}_{L y u_{2}} \mathscr{M}_{L y u_{2}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& +48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{G}_{L y L y} \mathscr{M}_{L x u} \mathscr{M}_{L y u}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime}+\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \\
& -8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \sum_{u \in L \Delta} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{M}_{L x u} \mathscr{M}_{L y u}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3}+\mathcal{O}_{\geqq 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) . \tag{19}
\end{align*}
$$

Equation (19) has been obtained by writing $\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}$ as

$$
\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{4}(1)+\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 4}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{\geqq 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right),
$$

accounting explicitly for some contributions involving the first two terms and estimating the others with the use of (5) which implies that $\left\langle\mathcal{O}_{k}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{p}\right)\right.$; $\left.\mathcal{O}_{1}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{q}\right)\right\rangle_{0}^{T}$ is a sum of $\left.\mathcal{O}_{m}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{p+q-1 / 4(k+l-m)}\right)$.

Finally, let us consider the contribution of the third term on the right-hand side of (4). Let us notice that since for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{3}{2} L \mathscr{K}(\Delta)$ and for $Z$ in the support of $d v$, $\left|\mathscr{V}_{L \Delta}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1)$, when estimating non-vanishing terms $\langle i ; j ; k\rangle_{t}^{T}$, we may undo the truncation and replace the $\left\rangle_{t}\right.$ expectations by the $t=0$ ones, provided we replace the integrands by their absolute values and multiply the whole expression by $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Thus we easily see that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left\langle\mathscr{V}_{L A} ; \mathscr{V}_{L A} ; \mathscr{V}_{L A}\right\rangle_{t}^{T}= & \mathcal{O}_{0}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 2}\right) \\
& +\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{\cong 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 4}\right) \tag{20}
\end{align*}
$$

(in fact the last term can be replaced by $\mathcal{O}_{\geqq 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)$ since the leading third order contribution to it comes from the diagram H which can be exhibited by integration by parts).

Gathering (4), (18)-(20) and denoting

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{T}_{\Delta x y} \equiv \sum_{u \in L \Delta} \mathscr{M}_{x y} \mathscr{M}_{y^{u}} \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

[cf. (2.19) and (2.25)], we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & \mathcal{O}_{0}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)+\frac{1}{2} L^{2} m^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-6 L^{2} \lambda \int_{\Delta} d x \mathscr{G}_{L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +6 L^{2} \lambda \int d x \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\tilde{W}_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 4}\right) \\
& +\lambda \int_{\Delta} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}-72 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L_{y}} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L y L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -36 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y\left(\mathscr{T}_{\Delta L x L y}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L y L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& +48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d y \mathscr{G}_{L y L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& +\tilde{W}_{4 \Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right)-8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d_{y} \mathscr{Q}_{L x L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& -8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \int_{\Delta} d x \int_{\Delta} d_{y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3}+\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 \Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{22}
\end{align*}
$$

for $\psi^{\prime} \in L \mathscr{K}(\Delta)$. In (22)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{\geqq 64}^{\prime}=\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 \Delta}^{\prime}+\mathcal{O}_{\geqq 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 4}\right) . \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

Clearly analyticity of $W_{\Delta}^{\prime}$ on $\frac{3}{2} L \mathscr{K}(\Delta)$ also follows.
By (23) and (15),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 \Delta}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq\left(L^{4}+3\right)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $\frac{3}{2} L \mathscr{K}(\Delta)$.
This ends the estimation of $W_{4}^{\prime}$. Let us notice that (22) contains the same terms of the second order in $\lambda$ as (3.3) except for the localization of the "hard" propagators, $\mathscr{T} \equiv \mathscr{A} Q \Gamma Q^{+} \mathscr{A}^{+} \mapsto \chi_{L \Delta} \mathscr{A} Q \Gamma^{1 / 2} \chi_{L \Delta} \Gamma^{1 / 2} Q^{+} \mathscr{A}^{+} \chi_{L \Delta}$. We shall recover the missing non-local parts of them in the non-local contributions $W_{Y}^{\prime}, Y \neq \Delta$.

## 8. Inductive Step:

Estimation of the Non-Local Small Field Contributions to the New Effective Interactions

In the present section, we shall estimate the small field $\left(D^{\prime}=\emptyset\right)$ polymer activities $\varrho_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\left(\subset \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(\emptyset, X^{\prime}\right)\right)$, as given by (5.25). We shall be somewhat sketchy, since the analysis is straightforward and has been done in detail for the $(\nabla \phi)^{4}$ model in Sect. 5 of [17] with comparison to which the present case is only slightly more tedious.

First notice that for $D^{\prime}=\emptyset, D=R$ in $g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$ appearing under the integral on the right-hand side of (5.25): $\psi^{s}$ can be large only if the fluctuation field $Z_{L X^{\prime}}$ is large.

Consider the terms of the expansion with $R \neq \emptyset$. For $g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$ we shall use the bound (6.5). Since we would like to bound the $s$-derivatives occuring in $S(U)$ by the Cauchy estimate, we have admitted complex values of $s$, see (5.13). This might seem dangerous as the factor $\exp \left[20 \lambda \int_{R \cap X_{i}}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{s}\right)^{4}\right]$ gives a term $\exp \left[\mathcal{O}\left(Z^{4}\right)\right]$ potentially non-integrable in $R$. But [see (5.11), (5.12), and (5.14)]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Im} \psi^{s}=L^{-1} \operatorname{Im} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime} .+\operatorname{Im} \mathscr{Z}_{2}^{s} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence by virtue of $(5.19)$ is bounded,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\operatorname{Im} \psi_{x}^{s}\right| \leqq \frac{3}{4} C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus (6.5) implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|g_{X_{i}}^{R}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| \leqq \exp \left[\mathcal{O}(1)\left|R \cap X_{i}\right|-\alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X_{i}\right)\right] . \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the mass and Wick ordering quadratic terms in (5.25), we easily get

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} m^{2} \int_{L X^{\prime}} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}+6 \lambda \int_{L X^{\prime}} d x \mathscr{G}_{x x}\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}\right]\right| \\
& \quad \leqq \exp \left[\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}\right] . \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

By (4.12) and (5.19), $\mathscr{Z}^{s}$ (as well as $\psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}$.) is small, i.e. bounded by $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\right)$ outside $R$. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|\exp \left[-\lambda \int_{L X^{\prime} \backslash R}\left(\psi^{s}\right)^{4}\right]\right| \leqq \mid \exp \left[-\lambda \int_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\mathcal{O}(1)|R|\right. \\
& \left.\quad+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \int_{L X^{\prime} \backslash R}|\mathscr{Z}|\right]|\leqq| \exp \left[-\lambda \int_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right] \exp [\mathcal{O}(1)|R| \\
& \left.\quad+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}\right] . \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

Also, by (7.22),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\exp \left[\sum_{\Delta \subset X^{\prime}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\right]\right| \leqq\left|\exp \left[\lambda \int_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right]\right| \exp \left[\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|\right] . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore, since $Y_{\beta} \subset L X^{\wedge} \backslash R$, and consequently (again by (4.12) and (5.19)) $\psi^{s} \in 3 \mathscr{K}(L X \backslash R)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\beta}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\beta}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right]-1\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \exp \left[-\alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\beta}\right)\right] . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Finally, we have to treat the $\widetilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$ contributions under the integral of (5.25). Since $Y$ might intersect $R$, they need a careful treatment. It is convenient to use the following general relation.
Lemma. If $\psi \in \mathscr{D}(D, X)$ and $Y \subset X$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi \in\left(\mathcal{O}(1)+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \sum_{\substack{x \in D_{X} X \\ x \in \mathbb{Z}^{4}}} \exp [-\beta d(Y, x)] \int_{\square_{x}}|\psi|\right) \mathscr{K}(Y), \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where, as always, $\square_{x}$ denotes the unit cube centered at $x$.

Notice that in particular if $Y \cap D=\emptyset$, (9) implies that $\left.\mathscr{D}(D, X)\right|_{Y} \subset \mathcal{O}(1) \mathscr{K}(Y)$ which is a weaker version of (4.12).

Proof of Lemma. By the definition (4.11) of $\mathscr{D}(D, X)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi=\mathscr{A} \phi+\tilde{\psi}, \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $D(\mathscr{A} \phi) \subset D$ and $\tilde{\psi} \in \mathscr{K}(X)$. Now for $x \in Y$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|(\mathscr{A} \phi)_{x}\right| \leqq & \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x \in \Lambda_{n}} e^{-\beta|x-x|}\left|\phi_{x}\right| \\
\leqq & \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x} e^{-\beta|x-x|} \int_{\square_{x}}|\mathscr{A} \phi| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x \in D \cap X} e^{-\beta|x-x|} \int_{\square_{x}}|\mathscr{A} \phi| \\
& +\mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x \notin D \cap X} e^{-\beta|x-x|+\frac{1}{10} \alpha|x-x|}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4} \\
\leqq & \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x \in D \cap X} e^{-\beta d(Y, x)} \int_{\square_{x}}|\psi|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\right), \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have used in turn: (2.42), (2.21), (4.10) together with the fact that for $x \notin D$ $\cap X, d(x, \sim D) \leqq d(x, X)$ and smallness of $\tilde{\psi}$. Similarly we show that for $x, y \in Y$, $\left|(\mathscr{A} \phi)_{x}-(\mathscr{A} \phi)_{y}\right| /|x-y|$ is bounded by the right-hand side of $(9)$ as well as $\mid\left(\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A} \phi\right)_{x}$ $-\left(\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A} \phi\right)_{y}\left|/|x-y|^{2 / 3}\right.$ if additionally $x+L^{-n} e_{\mu}$ and $y+L^{-n} e_{\mu}$ are in Y. Equation (9) follows now from the definition (4.1) of $\mathscr{K}(Y)$.

Let us see how (9) works. Since on $\mathscr{K}(Y)$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{V}_{2 Y}(\psi)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

see (4.1) and (6.1) and since, by (5.19), $\psi^{s} \in \mathscr{D}\left(R_{k}, U_{k}\right)$ then, for $Y \subset U_{k}$, (9) implies

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left|\tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| \leqq {\left[\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right)\left(\sum_{x \in R_{k}} \exp [-\beta d(Y, x)]\right.\right.} \\
&\left.\left.\cdot \int_{\square_{x}}\left|\psi^{s}\right|\right)^{2}\right] \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \\
& \leqq \leqq\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \\
& \cdot \sum_{x, y \in R_{k}} \exp [-\beta d(Y, x)-\beta d(Y, y)] \int_{\square_{x}}\left|\psi^{s}\right| \int_{\square_{y}}\left|\psi^{s}\right| . \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

Now if $Y_{\alpha}$ is not in a single $X_{i}$ (or in a simple c.c. of $R$ ), then

$$
\begin{equation*}
d\left(x, \sim R_{k}\right) \leqq d(Y, x)+\mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)+\mathcal{O}(1) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
d\left(y, \sim R_{k}\right) \leqq d(Y, y)+\mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)+\mathcal{O}(1) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, since $\psi^{s} \in \mathscr{D}\left(R_{k}, U_{k}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[-\frac{1}{10} \alpha d\left(Y_{\alpha}, x\right)-\frac{1}{10} \alpha d\left(Y_{\alpha}, y\right)-\frac{1}{5} \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)\right] \int_{\square_{x}}\left|\psi^{s}\right| \int_{\square_{y}}\left|\psi^{s}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\right) \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{gather*}
\left|\tilde{V}_{2 Y_{\alpha}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-\frac{3}{4} \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)\right]  \tag{17}\\
\left|\exp \left[-\tilde{V}_{2 Y_{\alpha}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right]-1\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-\frac{3}{4} a \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)\right] . \tag{18}
\end{gather*}
$$

For other terms $\tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$ appearing in (5.25), namely, those with $Y \subset X_{i}$, we get from (11) applying the Schwartz inequality

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left|\tilde{V}_{2 \gamma_{\alpha}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \exp \left[-\frac{3}{4} \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)\right] \\
& \cdot \sum_{x \in R} \exp [-\beta d(Y, x)] \int_{\mathrm{D}_{x}}\left|\psi^{s}\right|^{2} \tag{19}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\sum_{i} \sum_{Y \subset X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| & \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \sum_{x \in R} \int_{\square_{x}}\left|\psi^{s}\right|^{2} \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2} \tag{20}
\end{align*}
$$

Gathering (3)-(8), (18), and (20) and using the Cauchy estimates to bound the $s$-derivatives of $S(\mathscr{U})$ of (5.25), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\varrho_{X^{\prime}}\right| \leqq & \sum_{p} \sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}} \sum_{\Gamma_{c}=\left\{\left(k, k^{\prime}\right)\right\}} \prod_{\left(k, k^{\prime}\right) \in \Gamma_{c}}\left(r^{-1} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \beta d\left(U_{k}, U_{k^{\prime}}\right)\right]\right) \\
& \cdot \exp \left[\mathcal{O}(1)|R|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|-\alpha \sum_{i} \mathscr{L}\left(X_{i}\right)\right. \\
& \left.-\frac{3}{4} \alpha \sum_{\alpha} \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)-\alpha \sum_{\beta} \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\beta}\right)\right] \prod_{\alpha} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \prod_{\beta} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \\
& \cdot \int \exp \left[\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}\right] \chi_{\bar{p}}\left(Z_{L X^{\prime}}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L X^{\prime}}\right) \tag{21}
\end{align*}
$$

It is straightforward, compare formula (5.38) of [17], to show that the sum of terms with $p \neq 0$ on the right-hand side of (21) [for $\left.r>\bar{r}_{0}\left(L, N_{0}\right)\right]$ is bounded by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{O}\left(e^{\left.-\varepsilon\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 2}\right)} \exp \left[-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right]\right. \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

The non-perturbatively small factor $\mathcal{O}\left(e^{-\varepsilon\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 2}}\right)$ comes from small Gaussian probability of large $Z$. For $p \neq 0$ the integral on the right-hand side of (21) is bounded by $\mathcal{O}\left(\exp \left[-\varepsilon\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 2} \sum_{u} p_{u}^{2}\right]\right)$. This allows us also to control $\sum_{\bar{p}}$ and provides a decay factor in the size of $R$ which together with the other decay factors allows us to extract, say, $\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(L X^{\prime}\right)\right]$ out of the whole expression. This factor is bounded in turn by $\mathcal{O}(1) \exp \left[-\mathcal{O}(L) \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right]$, where, by taking $L \geqq L_{0}$, we have replaced $\mathcal{O}(L)$ by 7 . Sums over $\left\{X_{i}\right\},\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\},\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}$, and $\Gamma_{c}$ are controlled by the remaining decay, and other small factors.

Let us consider now the terms of $(5.25)$ with $p=0$. Their analysis is very similar to that of (7.4). The only substantial difference is that we usually stay in a big volume, with $\prod_{k, k^{\prime}} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{4} \beta d\left(U_{k}, U_{k^{\prime}}\right)\right]$ coming from the $s$-derivatives through the Cauchy estimates and the tree decay factors of $\tilde{V}_{2 Y_{\alpha}}$ or $\tilde{V}_{\geq 4 Y_{\beta}}$ [together with the connectivity constraints imposed on the sums in (2.25)] providing the desired decay factor $\exp \left[-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right]$ for the contributions to $\varrho_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$. As in (7.22), some of the terms of the lowest order will be listed explicitly. Thus we list
a) the quadratic terms linear in $\lambda$ produced by a single $s$-derivative (no $Y_{\alpha}$, no $Y_{\beta}$ ),
b) the quadratic irrelevant terms coming from a single $Y_{\alpha}$ contributing $\tilde{V}_{2 Y_{\alpha}}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}\right.$.) (no $s$-derivatives, no $Y_{\beta}^{\prime}$ 's),
c) the quartic terms coming from a single $Y_{\beta}$ contributing $\tilde{V}_{6 Y_{\beta}}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$ with at most two $s$-derivatives and no $Y_{\alpha}$,
d) the quartic terms proportional to $\lambda^{2}$ coming from the contributions with no $Y_{\alpha}$ and no $Y_{\beta}$ and $s$-derivatives hitting at most twice the exponential of the local part of $V\left(\psi^{s}\right)$, partially cancelled by terms of a) multiplied by the terms $6 L^{2} \lambda \int d x \mathscr{T}_{\Delta L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}$ coming from the expansion of $\exp \left[W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\right]$,
e) the quartic irrelevant terms coming from a single $Y_{\beta}$ contributing $\tilde{V}_{4 Y_{\beta}}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}\right.$.) (no $s$-derivatives, no $Y_{\alpha}^{\prime}$ s),
f) the sixth order terms proportional to $\lambda^{2}$ coming from the contributions with no $Y_{\alpha}$, no $Y_{\beta}$ and $s$-derivatives hitting at most twice the exponential of the local part of $V\left(\psi^{s}\right)$,
g ) the sixth order terms coming from a single $Y_{\beta}$ contributing $\tilde{V}_{6 Y_{\beta}}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}.\right)$ (no $s$-derivatives, no $Y_{\alpha}$ 's).

The terms which are not listed are of higher order and we shall extract from their sums explicit powers of $\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}$ using an analogue of (7.5) (one contraction again produces an extra $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)$. Let us denote for $i=2,4$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{i Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{Y:\left(L^{-1} Y\right)^{-}=Y^{\prime}} \tilde{V}_{i Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime} .\right), \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

compare (5.30), (7.16), and (7.17). A straightforward analysis sketched above (we leave the details as an exercise) results in the following representation for $\varrho_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ into which the $p \neq 0$ contribution bounded by (22) has been also absorbed:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \varrho_{X^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right] \\
& -6 L^{2} \lambda \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{2} L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-\tilde{W}_{2 X^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 4}\right) \\
& \cdot \exp \left[-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right]+72 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Lambda_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d_{y} \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L y L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& +36 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{4}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L_{y}} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{4} L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{4}\right)} \int_{A_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{4} L y L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y^{\mathscr{G}} \mathscr{G}_{L_{y} L_{y}} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -\tilde{W}_{4 X^{\prime}}^{\prime \prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right) \exp \left[-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right] \\
& +8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{2}_{L x L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& +8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& -\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 X^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{\geqq 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 4}\right) \exp [-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{24}
\end{align*}
$$

for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}\left(X^{\prime}\right)$, where in the sums $\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$ are such that $\cup \Delta_{i}=X^{\prime}$ [if there are none such $\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$, the term does not appear],

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \\
& \quad \equiv \frac{1}{5!} \sum_{Y:\left(L^{-1} Y^{-}\right)^{-}=Y^{\prime}} \int_{0}^{1} d t(1-t)^{5} \frac{d^{6}}{d t^{6}} \int \tilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}\left(t L^{-1} \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}++\mathscr{M} Z_{L Y^{\prime}}\right) \chi_{0}\left(Z_{L Y^{\prime}}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L Y^{\prime}}\right) \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

As in (7.14) and (7.15), for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(Y)$, we have

$$
\left|\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \begin{cases}\left(L^{3}+2\right)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]  \tag{26}\\ \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3}\right) & \exp [-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)],\end{cases}
$$

where the factor $L^{3}$ is due to the presence of at most $L^{3} Y$ 's in the sum of (25) with $\mathscr{L}(Y)=\mathscr{L}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)$.

It is instructive to compare (24) with (7.22) or (3.3) to find out that it contains, besides the non-local terms of the second order in $\lambda$ missing in (7.22), also a term corresponding to a disconnected second order perturbative diagram (the third quartic term).

Given (24), (5.28) implies a similar representation for $W_{Y}^{\prime}$ (with $Y \neq \Delta$ ), compare (5.54) of [17]. The difference, besides the change $X^{\prime} \mapsto Y$, consists of the disappearance of the perturbative quartic term corresponding to the disconnected diagram cancelled by the $\Xi=2$ contribution of (5.28) and of replacement $7 \alpha \rightarrow 6 \alpha[\mathrm{a}$ fraction of the tree decay factors is used to bound the sums on the right-hand side of (5.28)].
Thus for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(Y)$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& W_{Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\mathcal{O}_{0}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \\
& +6 L^{2} \lambda \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{2} L x L x}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +\tilde{W}_{2 Y}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{2}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 4}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \\
& -72 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L_{y}} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L y L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& -36 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{4}\right)} \int_{A_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L_{y}} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{4} L x L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& -48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{4}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{4} L y L y}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3} w_{y}^{\prime} \\
& +48 L^{4} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y^{\mathscr{G}} \operatorname{G}_{L_{y} L y} \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& +\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \\
& -8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2}\right)} \int_{\Lambda_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{Q}_{L x L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& -8 L^{2} \lambda^{2} \sum_{\left(\Lambda_{1}, \ldots, \Delta_{3}\right)} \int_{\Delta_{1}} d x \int_{\Delta_{2}} d y \mathscr{T}_{\Delta_{3} L x L_{y}}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{3}\left(\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right)^{3} \\
& +\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right), \tag{28}
\end{align*}
$$

where the sums over $\left(\Delta_{i}\right)$ are restricted by requiring that $\cup \Delta_{i}=Y$.

Notice that the quadratic terms linear in $\lambda$, quartic ones linear and quadratic in $\lambda$ as well as the sixth order contributions proportional to $\lambda^{2}$ on the right-hand side of (7.22) and (28) are localizations of the corresponding terms of (3.3) (with $\zeta=1$ ). For the last term of (28), we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}=\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}+\mathcal{O}_{\geqq 6}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 4}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{29}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(Y)$. Thus, by (26),

$$
\left|\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\right| \leqq\left\{\begin{array}{l}
\left(L^{3}+3\right)\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]  \tag{30}\\
\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]\right.
\end{array}\right.
$$

Of course the analyticity of $W_{Y}^{\prime}$ on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(Y)$, and hence also of $\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}$ follows. Since $z \mapsto z^{-6} \tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\left(z \psi^{\prime}\right)$ is an analytic function, we infer from the maximum principle that by restricting ourselves to $\psi^{\prime} \in 4 \mathscr{K}(Y)$ we gain an additional factor $\left(4 L^{-1}\right)^{6}$ on the right-hand side of (30). So, for $L$ big enough,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \frac{1}{2}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2 / 3} \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $4 \mathscr{K}(Y)$. By virtue of (7.24), this holds also for $Y=\Delta$. Estimate (31) expresses the irrelevance of the sixth and higher order contributions to the effective interactions.

## 9. Inductive Step: Extraction of the New Effective Coupling Constant

Here, we present the treatment of the fourth order contributions $W^{\prime}$ to $W_{4}^{\prime}$. This is the most important but also the most technical part of the argument.

By virtue of (5.30), (7.22), and (8.28), $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ [on $\left.\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(Y)\right]$ are given by the quartic terms of second order in $\lambda$ on the right-hand side of (7.22) or (8.28) respectively, plus $\mathcal{O}_{4}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]$. Let us denote these contributions by $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}$ respectively. It is easy to see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(Y)$. We have to represent $\tilde{W}_{4}^{\prime} \equiv \sum_{Y} \tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}$ as a sum of a local quartic interaction and of approximately local irrelevant quartic terms as in (5.31). This will be done in several steps which might look technically complicated and not quite natural but which guarantee good bounds on the obtained expressions. At the begining, let us polarize $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{(i)}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right), i=1,2$, producing a symmetric quartic form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime(i)}\left(\psi_{1}, \ldots, \psi_{4}\right)=\left.\frac{1}{4!} \prod_{i=1}^{4} \frac{\partial}{\partial t_{i}}\right|_{t=0} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime(i)}\left(\sum_{i=1}^{4} t_{i} \psi_{i}\right) . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

By the Cauchy estimate,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{1}, \ldots, \psi_{4}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 \mathbf{Y}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}, \ldots, \psi_{4}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 6}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\psi_{i} \in \mathscr{K}(Y)$. Introduce symmetric kernels

$$
\begin{equation*}
\Lambda_{Y x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4}}^{(i)}=\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{Y}^{\prime(i)}\left(\mathscr{A}_{\cdot x_{1}}^{\prime}, \ldots, \mathscr{A}_{\cdot x_{4}}^{\prime}\right) \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since by virtue of (2.42), (2.43), (2.45), and (4.1),

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\mathscr{A}_{\cdot x \mid}^{\prime}\right|_{Y} \in \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \exp [-\beta d(x, Y)] \mathscr{K}(Y)  \tag{6}\\
& \left|\Lambda_{Y x_{1} \ldots x_{4}}^{1}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right) \exp \left[-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y \cup \overline{\left\{x_{i}\right\}}\right)\right] \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\Lambda_{Y x_{1} \ldots x_{4}}^{2}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-13 / 6}\right) \exp \left[-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y \cup \overline{\left\{x_{i}\right\}}\right)\right] \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\psi^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}$, then $\Lambda_{Y}^{(i)}$ are the $\phi^{\prime}$-kernels of $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{(i)}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$. We also recall that in this case $\phi_{x}^{\prime}=\int_{\square_{x}} \psi^{\prime}$, see (2.26). For a general $\psi^{\prime}$, we shall write

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}+\left(\psi^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where for $x \in \Lambda_{n}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{\psi}_{x}=\int_{\square_{x}} \psi \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that because of (2.22)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{x}^{\prime}-\left(\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}\right)_{x}=\psi_{x}^{\prime}-\sum_{x} \mathscr{A}_{x x}^{\prime} \int_{\square_{x}} d y \psi_{y}^{\prime}=\sum_{x} \mathscr{A}_{x x}^{\prime} \int_{\square_{x}} d y\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}-\psi_{y}^{\prime}\right), \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that $\psi^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}$ depends on $\psi^{\prime}$ through its differences at pairs of points only. We may write

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & \sum_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4}} \Lambda_{Y x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4}} \bar{\psi}_{x_{1}}^{\prime} \ldots \bar{\psi}_{x_{4}}^{\prime} \\
& +\sum_{i=1}^{4} \tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}, \ldots, \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}, \psi^{\prime} \overline{\hat{i}}^{\prime} \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}\right) . \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

The second term on the right-hand side of (12) will be shown to be irrelevant due to the dependence of $\psi^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}^{\prime}$ on differences of $\psi^{\prime}$ only. The first term will be transformed into

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{x} \delta \lambda_{Y x}\left(\bar{\psi}_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\sum_{i=2}^{4} \sum_{\left(x_{i}\right)} \Lambda_{Y x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4}} \bar{\psi}_{x_{1}}^{\prime} \ldots \bar{\psi}_{x_{1}}^{\prime}\left(\bar{\psi}_{x_{i}}^{\prime}-\bar{\psi}_{x_{1}}^{\prime}\right) \bar{\psi}_{x_{i+1}}^{\prime} \ldots \bar{\psi}_{x_{4}}^{\prime} \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta \lambda_{Y x}^{(i)}=\sum_{x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}} \Lambda_{Y x x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}}^{(i)} . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Proceeding further, we rewrite the first term of (13) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{x} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\sum_{i=1}^{4}\binom{4}{i} \sum_{x} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4-i}\left(\bar{\psi}_{x}^{\prime}-\psi^{\prime}\right)^{i} . \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, gathering (12), (13), and (15), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & \sum_{x} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\sum_{i=1}^{4}\left[\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}_{i-1}^{\prime}, \psi_{i}^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}_{i}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}_{4}^{\prime}\right)\right. \\
& +\sum_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4}} \Lambda_{Y x_{1} \ldots x_{4}} \bar{\psi}_{1 x_{1}}^{\prime} \ldots \bar{\psi}_{i-1 x_{1}}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}_{i x_{i+1}}^{\prime} \ldots \bar{\psi}_{3 x_{4}}^{\prime}\left(\bar{\psi}_{4 x_{i}}^{\prime}-\bar{\psi}_{4 x_{1}}^{\prime}\right) \\
& \left.+\binom{4}{i} \sum_{x} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}} \psi_{1}^{\prime} \ldots \psi_{4-i}^{\prime}\left(\bar{\psi}_{4-i+1 x}^{\prime}-\psi_{4-i+1}^{\prime}\right) \ldots\left(\bar{\psi}_{4 x}^{\prime}-\psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)\right]\left.\right|_{\psi_{i}^{\prime} \equiv \psi^{\prime}},(16) \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have written the irrelevant quartic term as a four-linear (non-symmetric) form restricted to the diagonal into which $\psi_{4}$ enters only through its differences at pairs of points. The different irrelevant terms on the right-hand side of (16) depend also on fields $\psi_{i}^{\prime}$ outside $Y$. We shall localize this dependence by writing

$$
\begin{gather*}
\psi_{i}^{\prime}=\psi_{i}^{\prime} \chi_{Y}+\sum_{\Delta \cap Y=\emptyset} \psi_{i}^{\prime} \chi_{\Delta},  \tag{17}\\
\psi_{4}^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}_{4}^{\prime}=\left(\psi_{4}^{\prime} \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \chi_{Y}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime}\left(\overline{\psi_{4}^{\prime}} \chi_{Y}\right)\right)+\sum_{\Delta \cap Y=\emptyset}\left(\psi_{4}^{\prime} \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \chi_{\Delta}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime}\left(\overline{\psi_{4}^{\prime} \chi_{\Delta}}\right)\right) \tag{18}
\end{gather*}
$$

(note special localization of $\psi_{4}^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \bar{\psi}_{4}^{\prime}$ which uses (2.22)). After localizing the irrelevant terms on the right-hand side of (16), we shall gather those in which the union of the localization squares $\Delta$ is $P$ into $\tilde{W}_{4 Y Y \cup P}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)$ (do not get confused about the superscripts: $\tilde{W}_{4}^{\prime 2}$ gathers non-local contributions from $\widetilde{W}_{4}^{\prime}$ $\left.\equiv \widetilde{W}_{4}^{\prime 1}+\widetilde{W}_{4}^{\prime 2}\right)$. With $\tilde{W}_{4 Y Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \equiv \tilde{W}_{4 Y Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi^{\prime}\right)$, (16) becomes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{x} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\sum_{Y^{\prime} \supset Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) . \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to notice the $x$-independence of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{Y} \delta \lambda_{Y x}^{(i)} \equiv \delta \lambda^{(i)} \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

Indeed since $W^{\prime}$ possesses all the unit lattice euclidean symmetries, so does $\tilde{W}_{4}^{\prime}$, and hence $\sum_{Y} \Lambda_{Y x_{1} \ldots x_{4}}$. Since $\sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}$ (given by the quartic $0\left(\lambda^{2}\right)$ terms of $(3.3)$ with $\zeta=1$ ) is also symmetric, so are $\sum_{Y} \Lambda_{Y x_{1} \ldots x_{4}}^{i}$. But $\sum_{Y} \delta \lambda_{Y x}^{(i)}=\sum_{x_{2}, x_{3}, x_{4}, Y} \Lambda_{Y x x_{2} x_{3} x_{4}}^{(i)}$, which is $x$ independent due to the translation invariance of $\sum_{Y} \Lambda_{Y x_{1} \ldots x_{4}}$. Using also (2.22), it is easy to show that $\delta \lambda^{1}$ defined by (20) coincides with $\delta \lambda^{1}$ of (3.6). For $\delta \lambda^{2}$, (8) yields

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\delta \lambda^{2}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-13 / 6}\right), \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that $\delta \lambda^{2}$ is small correction to $\delta \lambda^{1}=\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right)$ in $\delta \lambda=\delta \lambda^{1}+\delta \lambda^{2}$.
Upon defining

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{Y \subset Y^{\prime}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right) \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \equiv \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi^{\prime}\right) \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

(19) and (20) imply (5.31).

We still have to bound $\tilde{W}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)$. Suppose that $\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \psi_{2}^{\prime}$ and $\psi_{3}^{\prime} \in \mathscr{K}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)$ and that $\psi_{4}^{\prime}$ fulfills all the bounds of (4.1) defining $\mathscr{K}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)$ except the first one for $\left|\psi_{4}^{\prime}\right|$. Notice that by virtue of (2.42), (2.43), and (2.45), for $i=1,2,3$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \chi_{Y} \bar{\psi}_{i}^{\prime} \in \mathcal{O}(1) \mathscr{K}(Y) \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \chi_{\Delta} \bar{\psi}_{i}^{\prime} \in \mathcal{O}(1) \exp [-\beta d(Y, \Delta)] \mathscr{K}(Y) . \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $x \in Y$ and

$$
\begin{gather*}
\omega_{x} \equiv \psi_{4 x}^{\prime}\left(\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \chi_{Y}\right)_{x}-\left(\mathscr{A}^{\prime}\left(\bar{\psi}_{4}^{\prime} \chi_{Y}\right)\right)_{x}=\sum_{x \in Y} \mathscr{A}_{x x}^{\prime} \int_{\square_{x}} d z\left(\psi_{4 x}^{\prime}-\psi_{4_{x}}^{\prime}\right), \\
\left|\omega_{x}\right| \leqq \sum_{x \in Y}\left|\mathscr{A}_{x x}^{\prime}\right|(|x-x|+1) \int_{\square_{x}} d_{y}\left|\psi_{4 x}^{\prime}-\psi_{4_{y}}^{\prime}\right|| | x-y \mid \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\right) . \tag{26}
\end{gather*}
$$

Furthermore, for $x, y \in Y$ and $|x-y| \leqq 1$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\omega_{x}-\omega_{y}\right| /|x-y|= & \left|\sum_{x \in Y} \int_{\square_{x}} d \approx\left(\mathscr{A}_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{4 x}^{\prime}-\psi_{4_{x}}^{\prime}\right)-\mathscr{A}_{y_{x}}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{4_{y}}^{\prime}-\psi_{4_{x}}^{\prime}\right)\right)\right|||x-y| \\
\leqq & \sum_{x \in Y}\left(\left|\mathscr{A}_{x x}^{\prime}-\mathscr{A}_{y_{x}}^{\prime}\right| /|x-y|\right) \int_{\square_{x}} d z\left|\psi_{4 x}^{\prime}-\psi_{4_{x}}^{\prime}\right| \\
& +\sum_{x \in Y}\left|\mathscr{A}_{y_{x}}^{\prime}\right|\left|\psi_{4_{x}}^{\prime}-\psi_{4_{y}}^{\prime}\right| /|x-y| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\right) . \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

The same holds for $|x-y|>1$ due to (26).
Finally for $x, y, x+L^{-(n+1)} e_{\mu}, y+L^{-(n+1)} e_{\mu} \in X$, since

$$
\begin{align*}
&\left(\partial_{\mu} \omega\right)_{x}= \sum_{x \in Y}\left(\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A}_{\cdot x}^{\prime}\right)_{x} \int_{\square_{x}} d z\left(\psi_{4 x}^{\prime}-\psi_{4 x}^{\prime}\right)+\sum_{x \in Y} \mathscr{A}_{x x}^{\prime} \partial_{\mu} \psi_{4 x}^{\prime} \\
&+L^{-(n+1)} \sum_{x \in Y}\left(\partial_{\mu^{\prime}} \mathscr{A}_{\cdot x}^{\prime}\right)_{x} \partial_{\mu} \psi_{4 x}^{\prime}  \tag{28}\\
&\left|\left(\partial_{\mu} \omega\right)_{x}-\left(\partial_{\mu} \omega\right)_{y}\right| /|x-y|^{2 / 3} \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\right) \tag{29}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{4}^{\prime}\left(\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \chi_{Y}\right)-\mathscr{A}^{\prime}\left(\bar{\psi}_{4}^{\prime} \chi_{Y}\right) \in \mathcal{O}(1) \mathscr{K}(Y) \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

and similarly we show that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{4}^{\prime}\left(\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \chi_{\Delta}\right)-\mathscr{A}^{\prime}\left(\overline{\psi_{4}^{\prime}} \chi_{\Delta}\right) \in \mathcal{O}(1) \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \beta d(Y, \Delta)\right] \mathscr{K}(Y) \tag{31}
\end{equation*}
$$

From (3), (4), the assumptions on $\psi_{i}^{\prime}$, (24), (25), (30), and (31), it follows that the contribution to $\tilde{W}_{4 Y Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)$ coming from the first term in the brackets on the right-hand side of $(16)$ is bounded by $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)\right]$. From (7) and (8) in turn, we infer that the contributions of the second and the third term in the brackets are estimated by $\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-5 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)\right]$.

Altogether

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-5 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)\right] \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-4 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)\right] \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\psi_{i}^{\prime} \in \mathscr{K}\left(Y^{\prime}\right), i=1,2,3$, and $\psi_{4}^{\prime}$ satisfying the bounds defining $\mathscr{K}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)$ except the one for $\left|\psi_{4}^{\prime}\right|$.

For the other irrelevant quartic contributions to $W_{4}^{\prime}$, one has

$$
\left.\begin{align*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y^{\prime}}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)\right| & =\mid \sum_{Y:\left(L^{-1} Y^{-}=Y^{\prime}\right.} \tilde{V}_{4 Y}\left(L^{-1} \psi_{1 L^{-1}}^{\prime}, \ldots, L^{-1} \psi_{4 L^{-1}}^{\prime} .\right.
\end{align*} \right\rvert\,
$$

where in the first bound we have used the fact that there are at most $L^{4} Y$ 's with $\mathscr{L}(Y)=\mathscr{L}\left(Y^{\prime}\right)$, and for $\psi_{4}^{\prime}$ satisfying the second and the third inequality of (4.1) for $n+1, L \psi_{L^{-1}}^{\prime}$. almost satisfies it for $n$ (this produces the additional $L^{-1}$ ). In $\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}$ $\equiv \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 1}+\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}$ the second term is a small correction. Expression (33) and the first inequality of (34) show that the bound for $\widetilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}$ contracts with respect to that for $\widetilde{V}_{4 Y}$ if $L$ is big enough:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{1}^{\prime}, \ldots, \psi_{4}^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \frac{1}{2}\left(n_{0}+n+1\right)^{-3 / 4} \exp [-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\psi_{i}^{\prime} \in \mathscr{K}(Y)$ for $i=1,2,3$ and $\psi_{4}^{\prime}$ satisfying the defining bounds of $\mathscr{K}(Y)$ except for the first one. This demonstrates the irrelevant character of these terms.

As for the marginal contribution, (21) shows that our perturbative analysis of the change of the effective quartic coupling performed in Sect.3, see (3.13), essentially remains valid:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{\lambda}+2 C_{+}^{-1} \leqq \frac{1}{\lambda+\delta \lambda} \leqq \frac{1}{\lambda}+\frac{1}{2} C_{-}^{-1} \tag{36}
\end{equation*}
$$

## 10. Inductive Step: The Large Field Bound

In this section we shall show how the large field bound (6.5) iterates. Let us start with the estimation of $\varrho_{X^{\prime}}^{D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ as given by (5.25) with $D^{\prime} \neq \emptyset\left[\right.$ for $\left.\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)\right]$. The main difference as compared to the $D^{\prime}=\emptyset$ case treated in Sect. 8 is in the contribution of $\prod_{i} g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{s}\right)$, which becomes more subtle to estimate when $\psi^{\prime}$ is large. On the other hand, we shall need only a rather rough upper bound and tracing of powers of $\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}$ contributed by the expansion outside the large field region will not be necessary.

First let us notice that, since $D=L D^{\prime} U R$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{2} \sum_{i}\left|D \cap X_{i}\right| \leqq L^{4} C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}\right|+C_{2}|R| \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furthermore

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\lambda^{1 / 2} \sum_{i} \int_{D \cap X_{i}} d x\left|\psi_{x}^{s}\right|^{2} \\
& \quad \leqq-\frac{1}{2} L^{-2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \sum_{i} \int_{D \cap X_{i}} d x\left|\psi_{L^{-1} x}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\lambda^{1 / 2} \sum_{i} \int_{D \cap X_{i}} d x\left|\mathscr{Z}_{x}^{S}\right|^{2} \\
&  \tag{2}\\
& \leqq-\frac{1}{2} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}} d x\left|\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\mathcal{O}(1)|R|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}
\end{align*}
$$

and, by (5.11), (5.12), (5.14),

$$
\begin{align*}
20 \lambda \sum_{i} \int_{D \cap X_{i}} d x\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{4} \leqq & 20 L^{-4} \lambda \sum_{i} \int_{D \cap X_{i}} d x\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi_{L^{-1} x_{x}}^{\prime}\right)^{4} \\
& +\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \int_{L X^{\prime}} d x\left|\operatorname{Im} \mathscr{Z}_{x}^{s}\right| \tag{3}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have used the smallness of $\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}$ and $\operatorname{Im} \mathscr{Z}^{s}=\operatorname{Im} \mathscr{Z}_{2}^{s}$, see (5.19). Thus

$$
\begin{align*}
20 \lambda \sum_{i} \int_{D \cap X_{i}}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{s}\right)^{4} \leqq & 20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}+\mathcal{O}(1)|R|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right| \\
& +\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4} \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}\right. \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

Inequalities (1), (2), and (4), together with (6.5) give

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\prod_{i} g_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| \leqq & \exp \left[L^{4} C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}(1)|R|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|\right. \\
& -\frac{1}{2} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \\
& \left.\cdot \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}+20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\alpha \sum_{i} \mathscr{L}\left(X_{i}\right)\right] \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

which replaces (8.3). In turn (8.4) is replaced by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\left\lvert\, \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} m^{2} \int_{L X^{\prime}} d x\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}+6 \lambda \int_{L X^{\prime}} d x G_{x x}\left(\psi_{x}^{s}\right)^{2}\right]\right.\right] \\
& \quad \leqq \exp \left[\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}} d x\left|\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right|^{2}+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}\right.\right.\right. \\
& \left.\left.\quad+n)^{-1}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}\right] \tag{6}
\end{align*}
$$

(8.5) by

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\exp \left[-\lambda \int_{L X^{\prime} \backslash D}\left(\psi^{s}\right)^{4}\right]\right| \leqq & \left|\exp \left[-\lambda \int_{X^{\prime} \backslash D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right]\right| \exp \left[\mathcal{O}(1)|R|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|\right. \\
& \left.+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}\right] \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

and (8.6) by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\exp \left[\sum_{\Delta \subset X^{\prime} \backslash \boldsymbol{D}^{\prime}} W_{\Delta}^{\prime}\right]\right| \leqq\left|\exp \left[\lambda \int_{X^{\prime} \backslash \boldsymbol{D}^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right]\right| \exp \left[\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|\right] \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $\tilde{V}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\beta}}$ terms, (8.7) and (8.8) still hold since $Y_{\beta} \subset L X \backslash D$. The $\tilde{V}_{2 Y}$ terms are also estimated identically as in Sect. 8. Namely (8.13)-(8.20), except for the last inequality of (20), remain valid if we change $R_{k}$ to $D_{k}=\left(L D^{\prime} \cup R\right) \cap U_{k}$ and $R$ to $\left(L D^{\prime}\right.$ $\cup R) \cap L X^{\prime}$. Hence (8.17) and (8.18) still hold and

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\sum_{i} \sum_{Y \subset X_{i}} \tilde{V}_{2 Y}\left(\psi^{s}\right)\right| \leqq & \mathscr{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2} \\
& +\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2} . \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

Substitution of (5)-(8), (8.8), (8.18), and (9) to (5.25) gives [on $\left.\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)\right]$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\mid \varrho_{X^{\prime}}^{D^{\prime}} \leqq & \sum_{\bar{p}} \sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \sum_{\left\{Y_{\beta}\right\}} \sum_{\Gamma_{c}} \prod_{\left(k, k^{\prime}\right) \in \Gamma_{c}}\left(r^{-1} \exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \beta d\left(U_{k}, U_{k^{\prime}}\right)\right]\right) \\
& \cdot \exp \left[L^{4} C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}(1)|R|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right)\left|X^{\prime}\right|\right. \\
& -\frac{1}{3} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}+20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4} \\
& \left.-\alpha \sum_{i} \mathscr{L}\left(X_{i}\right)-\alpha \sum_{\alpha} \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)-\alpha \sum_{\beta} \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\beta}\right)\right] \prod_{\alpha} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \prod_{\beta} \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \\
& \cdot \int \exp \left[\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4}\right) \sum_{u \in L X^{\prime}} Z_{u}^{2}\right] \chi_{\bar{p}}\left(Z_{L X^{\prime}}\right) d \mu_{1}\left(Z_{L X^{\prime}}\right) \\
\leqq & \exp \left[\left(L^{4}+1\right) C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}\right|-\frac{1}{3} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}\right. \\
& \left.+20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X^{\prime}}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-7 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(X^{\prime}\right)\right] \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

for $C_{2} \geqq \bar{C}_{2}\left(L, N_{0}\right)$, the sums being controlled as for $\varrho_{X^{\prime}}^{\emptyset}$.
Let us pass to the estimation of the large field contributions $\bar{g}_{\bar{X}}^{\prime D^{\prime}}$ to $\exp \left[-\bar{W}_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}\right]$, see (5.34) and (5.35). By (7.22) and (8.28),

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left|W_{Y}^{\prime}(0)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]  \tag{11}\\
& \left|W_{2 Y}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

the last on $\mathscr{K}(Y)$. Proceeding as in (8.13)-(8.20), we show that for $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X^{\prime}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|W_{2 Y_{\alpha}}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \exp [-5 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $Y_{\alpha}$ not in the interior of a single c.c. $D_{i}^{\prime}$ of $D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\sum_{\bar{D}_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} W_{2 x}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right)|\bar{X}|+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \int_{D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2} . \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now, on $\mathscr{K}(Y)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence by virtue of (8.9), on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, \bar{X}\right)$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right| \leqq & \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)]+\mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right) \sum_{x_{1}, \ldots, x_{4} \in D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}} \\
& \cdot \exp \left[-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y \cup \overline{\left\{x_{i}\right\}}\right)\right] \prod_{i=1}^{4} \int_{\square_{x_{i}}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right| . \tag{16}
\end{align*}
$$

Again for $Y$ not in the interior of a single c.c. of $D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}$, the exponentially decaying factor $\exp \left[-\frac{1}{2} \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y \cup \overline{\left\{x_{i}\right\}}\right)\right]$ can be used to match the growth of $\prod_{i=1}^{4} \int_{\square_{x_{i}}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|$, and another one to bound the sum over $x_{i}$. Thus on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, \bar{X}\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y_{\beta}}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp [-5 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] . \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (8), (10), (8.24), (13), (14), and (17), we immediately infer from (5.35) that on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, \bar{X}\right)$,

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\bar{g}_{\bar{X}}^{\prime}\right| \leqq & \leqq \exp \left[\left(L^{4}+2\right) C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}\right|-\frac{1}{4} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}\right. \\
& \left.\left.+20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-4 \alpha \mathscr{L}(\bar{X})\right] \mid \exp \left[\sum_{D_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} \tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\right]\right] \tag{18}
\end{align*}
$$

We have not estimated the quartic contributions $\tilde{\tilde{W}}_{4 Y}^{\prime}$ with $Y$ within $D_{i}^{\prime}$ since their main part will be canceled in the next step reinstating the quartic terms of $W^{\prime}$ missing in $\bar{W}_{\geqq 4}^{\prime}$.

Let us then pass to the estimation of $\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}$ given by (5.40). Since $Y_{\alpha}$ and $Y_{\beta}$ lie outside $D^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 Y_{\alpha}}^{\prime 1}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 4}\right) \exp \left[-4 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\alpha}\right)\right], \tag{19}
\end{equation*}
$$

[see (9.34)] and [see (7.8), (7.22), (7.44), (8.28), and (8.30)]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|W_{\geqq 6 Y_{\beta}}^{\prime}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2}\right) \exp \left[-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\beta}\right)\right] \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$. Furthermore, (9.33) implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{W}_{4 \boldsymbol{Y}_{\gamma}}^{\prime 2}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right) \exp \left[-3 \alpha \mathscr{L}\left(Y_{\gamma}\right)\right] \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

again on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$, in the same way as (15) implied (17). Finally, we shall have to estimate

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}-\delta \lambda \int_{D_{i}^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2} \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$. Let $\psi^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}+\tilde{\psi}^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$ with $\phi^{\prime}$ real, $D\left(2 L^{-1} \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}\right) \subset D^{\prime}$ and $\tilde{\psi}^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(X)$, see (4.11). Via multiplication by an appropriate smooth
function being 1 on $D_{i}^{\prime}$ and zero outside $D_{i}$, we may replace $\tilde{\psi}^{\prime}$ by a globally defined function $\tilde{\tilde{\psi}}^{\prime} \in \mathcal{O}(1) \mathscr{K}\left(\Lambda_{n+1}\right)$ coinciding with $\tilde{\psi}^{\prime}$ on $\stackrel{D}{D}_{i}^{\prime}$. Clearly

$$
\begin{equation*}
\omega^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}+\widetilde{\psi^{\prime}} \in \mathcal{O}(1) \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, \Lambda_{n+1}\right) \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

and coincides with $\psi^{\prime}$ and $D_{i}^{\prime}$. Thus the values of (22) on $\psi^{\prime}$ and $\omega^{\prime}$ are equal. Now, by virtue of (9.20) and (9.22),

$$
\begin{equation*}
(22)\left(\omega^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}\left(\omega^{\prime}\right)-\sum_{Y} \sum_{x \in D_{i}} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\omega^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \subset Y^{\prime} \subset D_{i}^{\prime}} \tilde{W}_{4 Y Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\omega^{\prime}\right) \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Insertion of (9.19) into (24) gives

$$
\begin{align*}
(22)\left(\omega^{\prime}\right)= & \sum_{Y \subset D_{i}^{\prime} i} \sum_{x \notin D_{i}^{\prime} i} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\omega^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\sum_{Y \not \subset \dot{D}_{i}^{\prime}} \sum_{x \in \dot{D}_{i}^{\prime}} \delta \lambda_{Y x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\omega^{\prime}\right)^{4} \\
& +\sum_{\substack{Y \subset \dot{D}_{i}^{\prime} \\
Y^{\prime} \supset Y: Y^{\prime} \subset D_{i}^{\prime}}} \tilde{W}_{Y Y^{\prime}}^{\prime 2}\left(\omega^{\prime}\right) . \tag{25}
\end{align*}
$$

On the right-hand side, we have only tail terms localized in bigger sets than $D_{i}^{\prime}$. As by (9.7), (9.8), and (9.14),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\delta \lambda_{Y x}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-2}\right) \exp [-5 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y U \overline{\{x\}})] \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

we can use part of the tree decay factor to match the growth of $\omega^{\prime}$ inside $D^{\prime}$ in the first two terms on the right-hand side of (25). The third term is estimated as in (21) with the use of (9.32), and the constraint that $Y^{\prime}$ does not lie in the interior of a single c.c. of $D^{\prime}$. This way we show that on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
|(22)| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1}\right)\left|D_{i}\right| \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

Expressions (18) to (21) and (27), when inserted to (5.40), yield

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\right| \leqq \exp \left[\left(L^{4}+3\right) C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X\right|-\frac{1}{4} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}+20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-2 \alpha \mathscr{L}(X)\right] \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$. The analyticity of $\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}$ on this set clearly also follows.
Inequality (28) is almost what we want, see (6.5), except the growth of the constant in front of $\left|D^{\prime} \cap X\right|$ (field independent perturbation is relevant). In the remainder of this section we shall show how to bring this constant down to $C_{2}$ using the extra strength of the quadratic expression. Roughly speaking, on $D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}$, $\psi^{\prime}$ is at least of order $\mathcal{O}\left(C_{1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{1 / 4}\right)$ so that $-\frac{1}{10} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}$ should provide $-\mathcal{O}\left(C_{1}^{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap \bar{X}\right|\right)$ constant cancelling the growth of $C_{2}$ for large $C_{1}$. The problem with this argument is that first $\psi^{\prime}$ may be big in $D^{\prime}$ but does not have to, and second, even if it is big in absolute value, at some point it could contribute little to the $L^{2}$ norm.

Let us fix $\psi^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$ with $\psi^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}+\tilde{\psi}^{\prime}, \phi^{\prime}$ real, $D\left(S L^{-1} \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi\right) \equiv D_{1}^{\prime} \subset D^{\prime}$, $\tilde{\psi}^{\prime} \in \frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{K}(X)$. If we take $D_{1}^{\prime}$ as a new $D^{\prime}$, the first difficulty will be avoided. By a version of (4.16) for $\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}$, which the reader will easily establish following the lines of Appendix 2 of [17],

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & \sum_{\left\{X_{i}\right\},\left\{Y_{\alpha}\right\}} \prod_{i} \tilde{g}_{X_{-}}^{\prime D_{1}^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \prod_{\alpha}\left(\exp \left[-\tilde{W}_{\geqq 4 Y_{\alpha}}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right]-1\right) \\
& \cdot \exp \left[-(\lambda+\delta \lambda) \int_{\left(D^{\prime} \backslash D_{1}^{\prime}\right) \cap X}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right] \tag{29}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{W}_{\geqq 4 Y}^{\prime} \equiv \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime}+W_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime} \equiv \tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 1}+\tilde{W}_{4 Y}^{\prime 2}+W_{\geqq 6 Y}^{\prime}, \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $X_{i}$ are disjoint, $D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X \subset \cup X_{i}, Y_{\alpha} \subset X \backslash \cup X_{i}$ and $X$ is connected with respect to c.c. of $D^{\prime}, X_{i}$ and $Y_{\alpha}$. Notice that using (29) would be dangerous for establishing the analyticity of $\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ since $D_{1}^{\prime}$ depends on $\psi^{\prime}$, but once this is done, we shall employ it to improve (28). Inequality (28) for $\tilde{g}_{X_{i}}^{D}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ and the $W_{Y}^{\prime}$ estimates easily imply

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq & \exp \left[\left(L^{4}+3\right) C_{2}\left|D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X\right|+\frac{1}{3} C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X\right|-\frac{1}{4} L^{2} \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}\right. \\
& \left.+20 \lambda \int_{D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\alpha \mathscr{L}(X)\right]\left|\exp \left[-\lambda \int_{\left(D^{\prime} \backslash D_{1}^{\prime}\right) \cap X}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right]\right| \tag{31}
\end{align*}
$$

But by (6.7),

$$
\begin{align*}
\exp \left[-(\lambda+\delta \lambda) \int_{\left(D^{\prime} \backslash D^{\prime}\right) \cap X}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right] \mid \leqq & \exp \left[\frac{1}{3} C_{2}\left|\left(D^{\prime} \backslash D_{1}^{\prime}\right) \cap X\right|-2 \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{\left(D^{\prime} \backslash D^{\prime}\right) \cap X}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}\right. \\
& \left.+20 \lambda \int_{\left(D^{\prime} \backslash D_{1}^{\prime}\right) \cap X}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}\right] \tag{32}
\end{align*}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
\left|\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq & \exp \left[\frac{2}{3} C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X\right|-2 \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}+20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\alpha \mathscr{L}(X)\right] \\
& \cdot \exp \left[\left(L^{4}+3\right) C_{2}\left|D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X\right|-\left(\frac{1}{4} L^{2}-2\right) \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}\right] . \tag{33}
\end{align*}
$$

We still have to show that the second exponential on the right-hand side of (33) is bounded by 1 , i.e. that whenever $\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|$ gets large it contributes sufficiently to the $L^{2}$ norm. Here we shall use crucially the fact that $\psi^{\prime}$ is equal to $\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}$ plus a small correction $\tilde{\psi}^{\prime}$ and that $\partial_{\mu^{\prime}} \mathscr{A}^{\prime}$ is a bounded exponentially decaying kernel.

Let us rescale $C_{1}$ and $n_{0}+n$ out of the problem by introducing

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi^{\prime \prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime \prime}+\tilde{\psi}^{\prime \prime}=2 L^{-1} C_{1}^{-1}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 4} \psi^{\prime} \tag{34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that $D_{1}^{\prime}$ is by definition the smallest paved set such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime \prime}\right|<2 \exp \left[\frac{1}{10} \alpha d\left(x, \sim D_{1}^{\prime}\right)\right] \tag{35}
\end{equation*}
$$

see (4.10). Define for $\Delta \subset X$

$$
\begin{gather*}
A_{\Delta}=\sup _{\Delta}\left|\psi^{\prime \prime}\right|,  \tag{36}\\
B_{\Delta}=\left(\int_{\Delta}\left|\psi^{\prime \prime}\right|^{2}\right)^{1 / 2},  \tag{37}\\
C_{\Delta}=\sup _{\Delta}\left|\partial \psi^{\prime \prime}\right| . \tag{38}
\end{gather*}
$$

Let

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{D}^{\prime}=\left\{\Delta \subset D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X: A_{\Delta} \geqq 1\right\} \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since somewhere in $D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X,\left|\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime \prime}\right| \geqq 2$ (otherwise $D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X$ would be empty and we would be done), and since $\left|\tilde{\psi}^{\prime \prime}\right|<1, \tilde{D}^{\prime} \neq \emptyset$. We have the following estimate for $C_{\Delta}$

$$
\begin{align*}
C_{\Delta} & \leqq \sup _{\Delta}\left(\left|\partial \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime \prime}\right|+\left|\partial \tilde{\psi}^{\prime \prime}\right|\right) \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x} \exp [-\beta d(\Delta, x)]\left|\phi_{x}^{\prime \prime}\right|+C_{0} \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x \in D^{\prime} \cap X} \exp [-\beta \mathrm{d}(\Delta, \mathrm{x})]\left|\phi_{x}^{\prime \prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}(1) \\
& =\mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{x \in D_{D^{\prime} \cap X}} \exp [-\beta d(\Delta, x)]\left|\int_{\square_{x}} \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime \prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}(1) \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \int_{x \in D^{\prime} \cap X} \exp [-\beta d(\Delta, x)] \int_{\square_{x}}\left|\psi^{\prime \prime}\right|+\mathcal{O}(1) \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \int_{\Delta^{\prime} \subset D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X} \exp \left[-\beta d\left(\Delta, \Delta^{\prime}\right)\right] B_{\Delta^{\prime}}+C_{3} \tag{40}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have used (2.43) [or (2.44)], (2.21) and the smallness of $\tilde{\psi}^{\prime \prime}$. Let

$$
\begin{gather*}
\widetilde{D}_{1}^{\prime}=\bigcup_{\Delta \in \tilde{D}^{\prime}: C_{\Delta} \leq 2 C_{3} A_{\Delta}} \Delta,  \tag{41}\\
\widetilde{D_{2}^{\prime}}=\widetilde{D} \backslash \widetilde{D_{1}^{\prime}} . \tag{42}
\end{gather*}
$$

Since on $\Delta \subset \widetilde{D}_{1}^{\prime}$ the derivatives of $\psi^{\prime \prime}$ are bounded by the supremum of $\left|\psi^{\prime \prime}\right|, \psi^{\prime \prime}$ has to contribute sizably to the $L^{2}$ norm:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\Delta} \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) B_{\Delta} \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{\Delta \subset D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X} B_{\Delta}^{2} \geqq \sum_{\Delta \subset D_{1}^{\prime}} A_{\Delta}^{2} . \tag{44}
\end{equation*}
$$

For $\Delta \subset \widetilde{D}_{2}^{\prime}$, we use (40):

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{\Delta} \leqq 2 A_{\Delta}-1<C_{3}^{-1} C_{\Delta}-1 \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{\Delta^{\prime} \subset D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X} \exp \left[-\beta d\left(\Delta, \Delta^{\prime}\right)\right] B_{\Delta^{\prime}} \tag{45}
\end{equation*}
$$

Upon squaring and summation over $\Delta \subset \tilde{D}_{2}^{\prime}$, this gives

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{\Delta \subset \tilde{D}_{2}^{\prime}} A_{\Delta}^{2} \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{\substack{\Delta \subset \tilde{D}^{\prime} \\ \Delta^{\prime}, \Delta^{\prime \prime} \subset D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X}} \exp \left[-\beta\left(d\left(\Delta, \Delta^{\prime}\right)+d\left(\Delta, \Delta^{\prime \prime}\right)\right)\right] B_{\Delta^{\prime}} B_{\Delta^{\prime \prime}} \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{\Delta \subset D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X} B_{\Delta}^{2} \tag{46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since by (35)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{\Delta \subset \bar{D}^{\prime}} \log ^{4}\left(1+A_{\Delta}\right) \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

(44) and (46) imply

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{\Delta \subset D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X} B_{\Delta}^{2}=\mathcal{O}(1) C_{1}^{-2}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-1 / 2} \int_{D_{1}^{\prime} \cap X}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}, \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathcal{O}(1)$ is $C_{1}$ independent. Thus for $C_{1} \geqq \bar{C}_{1}\left(L, N_{0}, C_{2}\right)$, we obtain from (33)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\right| \leqq \exp \left[\frac{2}{3} C_{2}\left|D^{\prime} \cap X\right|-2 \lambda^{1 / 2} \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X}\left|\psi^{\prime}\right|^{2}+20 \lambda \int_{D^{\prime} \cap X}\left(\operatorname{Im} \psi^{\prime}\right)^{4}-\alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)\right] \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

on $\frac{1}{2} L \mathscr{D}\left(D^{\prime}, X\right)$.

Since $\tilde{g}_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ differs from the final $g_{X}^{\prime D^{\prime}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)$ only by the wave function renormalization $\psi^{\prime} \mapsto \zeta^{1 / 2} \psi^{\prime}$, see (5.53), (49) will yield directly the inductive bound (6.5) for $n \mapsto n+1$.

## 11. Inductive Step: Mass and Wave Function Renormalization

By (7.22) and (8.28), with the use of (3.5), the second order contribution to $W^{\prime}$ can be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
W_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\frac{1}{2} L^{2} m^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}-6 \lambda \int d x G_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\sum_{Y}\left(\tilde{W}_{2 Y}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+\tilde{W}_{2 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right) \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where on $\mathscr{K}(Y)$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left|\tilde{W}_{2 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-5 / 4}\right) \exp [-6 \alpha \mathscr{L}(Y)] . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that by virtue of (7.16) and (8.23)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{2 Y}^{\prime 1}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=L^{4} \sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y K_{L x L_{y}}^{\mu v}\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{\prime}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us introduce

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{W}_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right) \equiv \sum_{Y} \tilde{W}_{2 Y}^{\prime 2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)+6(\lambda(\zeta-1)+\delta \lambda \zeta) \int d y G_{x x}^{\prime}\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

for

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\zeta-1| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

We shall limit ourselves to $\psi^{\prime}=\mathscr{A}^{\prime} \phi^{\prime}$ only. It is easy to see using (2) that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{W}_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\sum_{x, y \in \Lambda_{n+1}} I_{x y} \phi_{x}^{\prime} \phi_{y}^{\prime}, \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $I_{x y}=I_{y x}$ possesses the unit-lattice euclidean symmetries and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|I_{x y}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) \exp [-5 \alpha|x-y|] . \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

As shown in Appendix 2, we may rewrite (6) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{W}_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \sum_{x}\left(\phi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\sum_{\mu, v} \sum_{x, y} J_{1 x y}^{\mu \nu} \nabla_{\mu} \phi_{x}^{\prime} \nabla_{v} \phi_{y}^{\prime}, \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\delta m^{2}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $J_{1 x y}$ is again symmetric and satisfies the bound

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|J_{1 x y}^{\mu \nu}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) \exp [-2 \alpha|x-y|] . \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

as $\phi_{x}^{\prime}=\int_{\square_{x}} \psi^{\prime}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2}\left(\phi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}=\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{2}-\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\psi^{\prime}-\phi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

But for $x \in \square_{x}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\psi_{x}^{\prime}-\phi_{x}^{\prime}=\psi_{x}^{\prime}-\int_{\square_{x}} \psi^{\prime}=\sum_{\mu} \int d y r_{x y}^{\mu} \partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{\prime}, \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we can choose $r_{x y}^{\mu}$ supported by $y \in \square_{x}$ and with all the unit-lattice euclidean symmetries. Hence

$$
\begin{align*}
& -\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \sum_{x} \int_{\square_{x}}\left(\psi^{\prime}-\phi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& =-\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \sum_{\mu, v} d x d y d z r_{x y}^{\mu} r_{x z}^{v} \partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \partial_{v} \psi_{x}^{\prime} \\
& =-\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \sum_{\mu, v} \sum_{x, y} \int^{2} d x d y d z r_{x y}^{\mu} r_{x z}^{v}\left(\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A}_{\mu}^{\prime} \nabla_{\mu}^{-1}\right)_{y x}\left(\partial_{\mu} \mathscr{A}^{\prime} \nabla_{\mu}^{-1}\right)_{z y} \nabla_{\mu} \phi_{x}^{\prime} \nabla_{v} \phi_{y}^{\prime} \\
& \equiv \sum_{\mu, v} \sum_{x, y} J_{2 x y}^{\mu \nu} \nabla_{\mu} \phi_{x}^{\prime} \nabla_{v} \phi_{y}^{\prime}, \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

where (by (9) and (2.44))

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|J_{2 x y}^{\mu \nu}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) \exp [-\beta|x-y|] \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $J_{2 x y}^{\mu \nu}$ is also euclidean symmetric. Setting

$$
\begin{equation*}
J=J_{1}+J_{2} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

We can rewrite (8) as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{W}_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \int\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\sum_{\mu, v} \sum_{x, y} J_{x y}^{\mu v} \nabla_{\mu} \phi_{x}^{\prime} \nabla_{v} \phi_{y}^{\prime} . \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Now

$$
\begin{equation*}
\nabla_{\mu} \phi_{x}^{\prime}=\sum_{v} \int d x h_{\mu x x}^{v} \partial_{v} \psi_{x}^{\prime} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
h_{\mu x_{x}}^{v}=0 \text { for } \mu \neq v, \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for $\mu=v, h_{\mu x x}^{\mu}$ is a lattice version of a function whose $\mu$-derivatives is 1 on $\square_{x}$ and -1 on $\square_{x+e_{\mu}}^{\mu}$ :

$$
\begin{gather*}
\partial_{\mu}^{(x)} h_{\mu x x}^{\mu}=  \tag{19}\\
\chi_{\square_{x}}\left(x+L^{-(n+1)} e_{\mu}\right)-\chi_{\square_{x}+e_{\mu}}\left(x+L^{-(n+1)} e^{\mu}\right),  \tag{20}\\
h_{\mu x x}^{\mu}=0 \quad \text { for } \quad x \notin \square_{x} \cup \square_{x+e_{\mu}} .
\end{gather*}
$$

These (tensor) functions are again euclidean symmetric and moreover

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int d x h_{\mu x x}^{\mu}=1=\sum_{x} h_{\mu x x}^{\mu} \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

Substituting (17) to (16), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\bar{W}_{2}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)=\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y \delta K_{x y}^{\mu v} \partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime} \partial_{v} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \tag{21}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\delta K_{x y}^{\mu \nu}=\sum_{x, y} J_{x y}^{\mu \nu} h_{\mu x x}^{\mu} h_{v y_{y}}^{\nu} . \tag{23}
\end{equation*}
$$

$\delta K_{x y}^{\mu \nu}$ has all the unit-lattice euclidean symmetries. By virtue of (10), (14), (15), and (23),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left|\delta K_{x y}^{\mu v}\right| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) \exp [-2 \alpha|x-y|] . \tag{24}
\end{equation*}
$$

Using (21) and the symmetries of $J$, we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int d x \delta K_{x y}^{\mu \nu}=\sum_{x, y} J_{x y}^{\mu \nu} h_{v y_{y}}^{\nu}=\sum_{x} J_{x 0}^{\mu \nu} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \delta c \delta^{\mu \nu} \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

(for non-symmetric interactions we could get a matrix which is not proportional to identity on the right-hand side). Clearly

$$
\begin{equation*}
|\delta c| \leqq \mathcal{O}\left(\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-7 / 4}\right) . \tag{26}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, we may give (22) the following form

$$
\begin{align*}
\bar{W}_{2}^{\prime}\left(\psi^{\prime}\right)= & \frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2} \int d x\left(\psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2}+\frac{1}{2} \delta c \sum_{\mu} \int d x\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}\right)^{2} \\
& +\sum_{\mu, v} \int d x d y \delta K_{x y}^{\mu v}\left(\partial_{\mu} \psi_{x}^{\prime}-\partial_{\mu} \psi_{y}^{\prime}\right) \partial_{v} \psi_{y}^{\prime} \tag{27}
\end{align*}
$$

Equations (1), (3), (4), and (27) imply (5.40). Due to (26), (5), and (5.42) are compatible.

Now (5.46), (6.1) for $n$, (5) and (24) yield easily (6.1) for $n \mapsto n+1$. Relations (5.45), (9.36), and (5) produce (6.2) for $n \mapsto n+1$ as well as (5.49), (9.35), and (5) do (6.3) for $n \rightarrow n+1$. Form the definition (5.50) and (7.22), (8.28), (3.2), (8.31), with the use of (5), (6.4) with $n \mapsto n+1$ also follows.

This proves the small field inductive assumptions for the new effective interactions. Similarly (10.49), by virtue of (5.52) and (5) do the large field ones given by (6.5) with $n \mapsto n+1$. Finally from (44), (5), and (9), (6.8) follows. This completes the proof of the Main Technical Result (see the end of Sect. 6).

## 12. Thermodynamic Limit and Infrared Asymptotic Freedom of the Critical Point Theory

Up to now, we have worked in finite periodic volumes. Nevertheless our estimates were volume indepenent. This makes the thermodynamical limit fairly simple. Define the sets $\mathscr{K}(X)$ and $\mathscr{D}(D, X)$ of small and large $\Lambda=\mathbb{Z}^{4}$ fields as before but whith finite sets $X$ in (4.1) and with finite sets $D, X$ and compact support $\phi$ in (4.11). Since the kernels $\mathscr{A}_{n}$ and $\Gamma_{n}$ in finite volumes are periodizations of the infinite volume ones satisfying the bounds of the end of Sect. 2, it is easy to see that infinite volume $(1-\varepsilon) \mathscr{D}(D, X)$ is contained in the finite volume $\mathscr{D}(D, X)$ 's for large volumes (we recall that periodic $\Lambda$ has been identified with an $L^{N}$-block in $\mathbb{Z}^{4}$ ). Suppose now inductively, that $m_{n}^{2}, K_{n x y}^{\mu \nu}, \lambda_{n}, \widetilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right), \widetilde{V}_{\geq{ }_{\geq}}^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ and $g_{X}^{n D}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ satisfy our inductive assumptions and converge when $\Lambda \nearrow \overline{\mathbb{Z}}^{4}$, the latter two for $\psi^{n} \in 3 \mathscr{K}(Y)$ and $\psi^{n} \in(1-\varepsilon) \mathscr{D}(D, X)$ respectively. From analycity of $\widetilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n}, \widetilde{V}_{\geqq 6 Y}^{n}$ and $g_{X}^{n D}$ and the uniform bounds, also their almost uniform convergence follows. $W_{Y}^{n+1}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)$ and $\tilde{g}_{X}^{n+1 D}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)$ depend on the volume through $V_{Y}^{n}$ and $g_{X}^{n D}$ and through the kernels $\mathscr{M}_{n}$ entering their arguments. Using the almost uniform convergence of $V_{Y}^{n}$ and $g_{X}^{n D}$ together with the convergence of $\mathscr{M}_{n}$ and the dominated convergence
theorem, we infer the convergence of $W_{Y}^{n+1}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)$ and $\tilde{g}_{X}^{n+1 D}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)$. From the latter, the desired convergence of $m_{n+1}^{2}, K_{n+1 x y}^{\mu v}, \widetilde{V}_{4 Y}^{n+1}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right), \widetilde{V}_{\geqq}^{n+1}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)$ and $g_{X}^{n+1 D}\left(\psi^{n+1}\right)$ with the volume follows. We also see easily that these objects are continuous functions of the initial parameters $m_{0}^{2}$ and $\lambda_{0}$ provided that the previous scale ones where.

Let us notice that, under our inductive assumptions, for $\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi^{n}$ and $\phi^{n}$ with compact support, $V^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right)$ exists in the thermodynamical limit and satisfies (4.2)(4.4) or (4.8) depending on whether $\psi^{n}$ is small or big. For the infinite volume weakly coupled $\phi^{4}$ theory, we shall choose the critical point by setting $m_{0}^{2}$ $=m_{\text {crit }}^{2}\left(\lambda_{0}\right)$ with the latter in $\cap J_{0}^{(n)}$, where

$$
J_{0}^{(n+1)} \subset J_{0}^{(n)} \subset \ldots \subset J_{0}^{\prime} \subset I_{0}=\left[-n_{0}^{-3 / 2}, n_{0}^{-3 / 2}\right]
$$

is a sequence of the closed intervals of the values of $m_{0}^{2}$ chosen inductively [with the use of (6.8) and the continuity in $\left.m_{0}^{2}\right]$ so that $m_{n}^{2}$ sweeps $I_{n}=\left[-\left(n_{0}+n\right)^{-3 / 2},\left(n_{0}\right.\right.$ $\left.+n)^{-3 / 2}\right]$ when $m_{0}^{2}$ runs through $J_{0}^{(n)}$. At the critical point, all our effective interactions satisfy the bounds of sect. 6, and clearly

$$
\begin{equation*}
V^{n}\left(\psi^{n}\right) \underset{n \rightarrow \infty}{\longrightarrow} 0 \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\psi^{n}=\mathscr{A}_{n} \phi$ and $\phi$ with compact support. This establishes the IR asymptotic freedom of the weakly coupled critical lattice $\phi_{4}^{4}$ theory which is the main result of the present paper.

A reader of [18] will also understand that an easy extension of the present method allows rigorous treatment of correlation functions of the model which have a massless decay. We plan to come back to this problem in order to exhibit the logarithmic corrections to scaling [40, 7, 8] and in the context of the UV asymptotically free negative coupling theory.

As to whether our work provides a general tool to treat renormalizable asymptotically free models (first of all the UV problem of the gauge theories), we leave the jugement to the reader (and the future).

## Appendix 1

Here we shall establish (3.7) for $\delta \lambda^{1}$ given by (3.6). Consider first the third term on the right-hand side of (3.6). We shall derive lower and upper bounds for

$$
\begin{equation*}
L^{4} \int_{\square_{0}} d x \int d y\left(\mathscr{T}_{n L x L y}\right)^{2} \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

For a lower bound (recall (3.5))

$$
\begin{align*}
(1)= & L^{-4} \int_{L \square_{0}} d x \int d y\left(\mathscr{T}_{n x y}\right)^{2} \\
& \geqq L^{-4} \int_{L \square} d x \int_{L \square_{0}} d y\left(\mathscr{T}_{n x y}\right)^{2}=L^{-4} \int_{L \square_{0}} d x \int_{L \square_{0}} d y\left(\mathscr{G}_{n x y}-L^{-2} \mathscr{G}_{n+1 L^{-1} x L^{-1} y_{y}}\right)^{2} \\
& \geqq L^{-4} \int_{L \square_{0}} d x \int_{L \square_{0}} d y\left(\mathscr{G}_{n x y}\right)^{2}-2\left[L^{-4} \int_{L \square_{0}} d x \int_{L \square_{0}} d y\left(\mathscr{G}_{n x y}\right)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2} \\
& \cdot\left[L^{-4} \int_{L \square_{0}} d x \int_{L \square_{0}} d y L^{-4}\left(\mathscr{G}_{n+1 L^{-1} x_{x} L^{-1} y_{y}}\right)^{2}\right]^{1 / 2} \tag{2}
\end{align*}
$$

But

$$
\begin{equation*}
L^{-8} \int_{L \square_{0}} d x \int_{L \square_{0}} d y\left(\mathscr{G}_{n+1 L^{-1} x L^{-1} y_{y}}\right)^{2}=\int_{\square_{0}} d x \int_{\square_{0}} d y\left(\mathscr{G}_{n+1 x y}\right)^{2} \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

with $\mathcal{O}(1) L$ independent. On the other hand [recall (2.21)]

$$
\begin{align*}
& L^{-4} \int_{L \square_{0}} d x \int_{L \square_{0}} d y\left(G_{n x y}\right)^{2} \geqq L^{-4} \sum_{x, y \in L \square_{0}}\left(\int_{\square_{x}} d x \int_{\square_{y}} d y \mathscr{G}_{n x y}\right)^{2} \\
& =L^{-4} \sum_{x, y \in L \square_{0}}\left(G_{n x y}\right)^{2}=L^{-4} \sum_{x, y \in L \square \square_{0}} \frac{1}{\Lambda_{n}^{2}} \sum_{\substack{0 \neq p, q \in 2 \pi L^{-N+n} \\
-\pi<p_{\mu}, q_{\mu} \leq \pi}} \\
& \text { - } e^{-i p(x-y)} \hat{G}_{n}(p-q) \hat{G}_{n}(q) \\
& =L^{-4} \frac{1}{\Lambda_{n}^{2}} \sum_{0 \neq p, q} \prod_{\mu}\left(\frac{\sin L p_{\mu} / 2}{\sin p_{\mu} / 2}\right)^{2} \sum_{\substack{0 \neq p, q \\
-\pi<p_{\mu}, q_{\mu} \leqq \pi}} \hat{G}_{n}(p-q) \hat{G}_{n}(q) \\
& \geqq \mathcal{O}(1) L^{4} \frac{1}{\Lambda_{n}^{2}} \underset{\substack{0 \neq p, q,\left|p_{\mu}\right|<\frac{\pi}{L} \\
-\pi<q_{\mu} \leqq \pi}}{ } \frac{1}{|p-q|^{2}} \frac{1}{|q|^{2}} \\
& \geqq \mathcal{O}(1) L^{4} \frac{1}{\Lambda_{n}} \sum_{\substack{0 \neq p \\
\left|p_{\mu}\right|<\frac{\pi}{L}}}\left|\log p^{2}\right| \geqq \mathcal{O}(1) \log L, \tag{4}
\end{align*}
$$

where in the fifth step we have used the uniform bounds for the Fourier transforms $\hat{G}_{n}(p)$, see Appendix of [16]. Equations (2)-(4) give immediately

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1) \geqq \mathcal{O}(1) \log L \text {. } \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

To get a similar upper bound, take for simplicity $L=L_{0}^{m}$ with $L_{0}=\mathcal{O}(1)\left(\right.$ say $\left.L_{0}=2\right)$ and $m$ large. Denoting explicitly the $L$ dependence of $\mathscr{T}$, we have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathscr{T}_{k x y}^{(L)}=\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} L_{0}^{-2 l} \mathscr{T}_{k m+l L_{0}^{-1} x L_{0}^{-1} y}^{\left(L_{0}\right)} . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus

$$
\begin{align*}
&(1)= L^{-4} \int_{L \square 0} d x \int d y\left(\sum_{l=0}^{m-1} L_{0}^{-2 l} \mathscr{T}_{n m+l L_{0}^{-1}\left(L_{0}\right)} L_{0^{-1} y}\right)^{2} \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} L_{0}^{-4 l} \int d y \exp \left[-\varepsilon L_{0}^{-l}|y|\right] \\
&+\mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} \sum_{k=l+1}^{m-1} L_{0}^{-2(l+k)} \int d y \exp \left[-\varepsilon\left(L_{0}^{-l}+L_{0}^{-k}\right)|y|\right] \\
& \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} L_{0}^{-4 l} L_{0}^{4 l}=\mathcal{O}(1) m=\mathcal{O}(1) \log L . \tag{7}
\end{align*}
$$

This establishes the desired upper bound for (1).

As for the other contributions to $\delta \lambda^{1}$, the first term on the right-hand side of (3.6) becomes for $L \mapsto L_{0}^{m}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& -72 L^{-4} \lambda^{2} \int_{L \square 0} d x \int d y\left(\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} L_{0}^{2(n-k) m} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} L_{0}^{-2 l} \mathscr{T}_{k m+l L_{0}^{(n-k) m-l_{x}}\left(L_{0}^{(n-k) m-l_{y}}\right)}^{\cdot_{l=0} \sum_{l} L_{0}^{-2 l} \mathscr{T}_{n m+l L_{0}^{-1} x L_{0}^{-1} y}^{\left(L_{0}\right)}}\right. \\
& |(8)| \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \lambda^{2} \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} \sum_{l=0}^{m-1} L_{0}^{2[(n-k] m-l]} \int d y \exp \left[-\varepsilon L_{0}^{(n-k) m-l}|y|\right]  \tag{8}\\
& \quad \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \lambda^{2} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} L_{0}^{-2 l} \leqq \mathcal{O}(1) \lambda^{2} .
\end{align*}
$$

The other terms on the right-hand side of (3.6) vanish. Indeed by (2.19) and (2.21),

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\square_{x}} d x \mathscr{T}_{k L x L y}=L^{-4} \sum_{\substack{y \\-\frac{1}{2} L<y^{\mu}-L x^{\mu} \leqq \frac{1}{2} L}}\left(Q \Gamma_{k} Q^{+} \mathscr{A}_{k}^{+}\right)_{y L y}=L^{-1}\left(C Q \Gamma_{k} Q^{+} \mathscr{A}_{k}^{+}\right)_{x L y}=0 \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

as $C Q=0$. Equations (3.2) and (10) imply also that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\int_{\square_{x}} d x \mathscr{Q}_{n L x L y}=0 . \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

This way, (5), (7), and (9) show that for $L=L_{0}^{m}$ with $m$ large,

$$
-\mathcal{O}(1) m \lambda^{2} \leqq \delta \lambda^{1} \leqq-\mathcal{O}(1) m \lambda^{2}
$$

from which (3.7) follows.

## Appendix 2

For $I_{x y}$ given by (11.6) define

$$
\varphi(p)=\sum_{x \in \Lambda_{n}} e^{-i p x} I_{0 x}
$$

$\varphi(p)$ is periodic in each $p_{\mu}$ with the period $2 \pi$ and, due to (11.7) is analytic for $\left|\operatorname{Im} p_{\mu}\right|$ $<\frac{5}{2} \alpha$. Equations (11.8)-(11.10) are corollaries of the following result giving a solution to the Gleason problem [36].

Lemma. Let $f\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{d}\right)$ be a function analytic for $\left|\operatorname{Im} p_{j}\right|<a$, periodic in each $p_{\mu}$ with period $2 \pi$ such that

$$
\frac{\partial^{l} f(0)}{\partial p_{\mu_{1}} \ldots \partial p_{\mu_{l}}}=0 \quad \text { for } \quad l=0,1, \ldots, k-1
$$

Then there exist functions $f_{\mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}(p)$ with the same analyticity and periodicity properties satisfying

$$
f(p)=\sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{k}} \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(e^{-i p_{\mu_{j}}}-1\right) f_{\mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}(p)
$$

$f_{\mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}$ can be taken linearly depending on $f$ and such that for each $0<a_{1}<a_{2}<a$,

$$
\sup _{\left|\operatorname{Im} p_{\mu}\right| \leqq a_{1}}\left|f_{\mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}(p)\right| \leqq C\left(d, k, a_{1}, a_{2}\right) \sup _{\left|\operatorname{Im} p_{\mu}\right| \leqq a_{2}}|f(p)|
$$

Proof. Define $\tilde{f}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{d}\right)$ analytic for $e^{-a}<\left|z_{j}\right|<e^{a}$ by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{f}\left(e^{-i p_{1}}, \ldots, e^{-i p_{d}}\right) \equiv f\left(p_{1}, \ldots, p_{d}\right) . \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Again

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{\partial \mathfrak{f}(1, \ldots, 1)}{\partial z_{\mu_{1}} \ldots \partial z_{\mu_{l}}}=0 \text { for } l=0,1, \ldots, k-1 . \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Notice that by the Cauchy formula,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \tilde{f}(z)=\sum_{\substack{\sigma=\left(\sigma_{1}, \ldots \ldots \sigma_{\alpha}\right) \\
\sigma_{\mu}= \pm 1}} \frac{1}{(2 \pi i)^{d}} \sum_{\left|\left.\right|_{1}\right|=e^{\tau_{1}(a-\varepsilon)}} d \zeta_{1} \\
& \cdots \int_{\left|\zeta_{d}\right|=e^{\sigma_{d}(a-e)}} d \zeta_{d} \frac{\tilde{f}\left(\zeta_{1}, \ldots, \zeta_{d}\right)}{\left(\zeta_{1}-z_{1}\right) \ldots\left(\zeta_{d}-z_{d}\right)} \\
& \equiv \sum_{\sigma} \tilde{f}_{\sigma}\left(z_{1}^{\sigma_{1}}, \ldots, z_{d}^{\sigma_{d}}\right) .  \tag{7}\\
& \tilde{f}_{\sigma}\left(v_{1}, \ldots, v_{d}\right)=\frac{1}{(2 \pi i)^{d}}{ }_{\left|\eta_{1}\right|} \int_{=e^{a-\varepsilon}} d \eta_{1} \ldots \int_{\left|\eta_{d}\right|=e^{a-e}} d \eta_{d} \\
& \frac{\tilde{f}\left(\eta_{1}^{\sigma_{1}}, \ldots, \eta_{d}^{\sigma_{d}}\right)}{\left(\eta_{1}-v_{1}\right), \ldots,\left(\eta_{d}-v_{d}\right)} \prod_{\mu=1}^{d}\left(v_{\mu} / \eta_{\mu}\right)^{\frac{1-\sigma_{\mu}}{2}} \tag{8}
\end{align*}
$$

(the integrals over $|z|=e^{a-\varepsilon}$ are counter-clockwise and the ones over $|z|=e^{-a+\varepsilon}$ are clockwise). Clearly $\tilde{f}_{\sigma}(v)$ are analytic functions for $\left|v_{\mu}\right|<e^{a}$ and for $l=0,1, \ldots, k$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\sup _{\left|v_{j}\right| \leqq e^{a_{1}}}\left|\frac{\partial^{l} \tilde{f}_{\sigma}(v)}{\partial v_{\mu_{1}} \cdots \partial v_{\mu_{l}}}\right| \leqq \bar{C}\left(d, k, a_{1}, a_{2}\right) \sup _{e^{-a_{2}} \leqq\left|z_{\mu}\right| \leqq e^{a_{2}}}\left|\tilde{f}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{d}\right)\right| . \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

But, Taylor expanding, we may write

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{f}_{\sigma}(v)= & \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{l}} \frac{\partial f_{\sigma}(1, \ldots, 1)}{\partial v_{\mu_{1}} \ldots \partial v_{\mu_{l}}} \prod_{j=1}^{l}\left(v_{\mu_{j}}-1\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{(k-1)!} \sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{k}} \int_{0}^{1} d t(1-t)^{k-1} \\
& \cdot \frac{\partial^{k} \tilde{f_{\sigma}}}{\partial v_{\mu_{1}} \ldots \partial v_{\mu_{k}}}\left(1-t+t v_{1}, \ldots, 1-t+t v_{d}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(v_{\mu_{j}}-1\right) \tag{10}
\end{align*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{f}_{\sigma}\left(z_{1}^{\sigma_{1}}, \ldots, z_{d}^{\sigma_{d}}\right)= & \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \frac{1}{l!} \sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{l}} \frac{\partial f_{\sigma}(1, \ldots, 1)}{\partial v_{\mu_{1}} \cdots \partial v_{\mu_{l}}} \prod_{j=1}^{l}\left(-z_{\mu_{j}}\right)^{\frac{\sigma_{\mu_{j}}-1}{2}}\left(z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right) \\
& +\frac{1}{(k-1)!} \sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{k}} \int_{0}^{1} d t(1-t)^{k-1} \\
& \cdot \frac{\delta^{k} f_{\sigma}}{\partial v_{\mu_{1}} \ldots \partial v_{\mu_{k}}}\left(1-t+t z_{1}^{\sigma_{1}}, \ldots, 1-t+t z_{d}^{\sigma_{d}}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(-z_{\mu_{j}}\right)^{\frac{\sigma_{\mu}-1}{2}}\left(z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right) . \tag{11}
\end{align*}
$$

In the first sum on the right-hand side of (11), we may expand

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(-z_{\mu_{j}}\right)^{-1}=-\left(1+z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right)^{-1}=\sum_{n=0}^{k-l-1}(-1)^{n+1}\left(z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right)^{n}-(-1)^{k-l_{z_{j}}^{-1}}\left(z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right)^{k-l} . \tag{12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence (grouping the terms in a somewhat arbitrary way), we obtain

$$
\begin{align*}
\tilde{f}_{\sigma}\left(z_{1}^{\sigma_{1}}, \ldots, z_{d}^{\sigma_{d}}\right)= & \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{l}} a_{\sigma \mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{l}} \prod_{j=1}^{l}\left(z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right) \\
& +\sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{k}} \tilde{f}_{\sigma \mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}\left(z_{1}, \ldots, z_{d}\right) \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right) \tag{13}
\end{align*}
$$

with $\tilde{f}_{\sigma \mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}(z)$ analytic for $e^{-a}<z_{\mu}<e^{a}$ linear in $\tilde{f}$ and satisfying (4) with $C \rightarrow 2^{-d} C$, say. Upon the summation over $\sigma$ of (13) the lower order terms $(l<k)$ must vanish and hence by (7), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
\tilde{f}(z)=\sum_{\mu_{1}, \ldots, \mu_{k}} \widetilde{f}_{\mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}(z) \prod_{j=1}^{k}\left(z_{\mu_{j}}-1\right) \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $\tilde{f}_{\mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}} \equiv \sum_{\sigma} \tilde{f}_{\sigma \mu_{1} \ldots \mu_{k}}$. This completes the proof of Lemma.
We apply Lemma with $k=2$ to $f(p)=\varphi(p)-\varphi(0)$ where $\varphi$ is given by (1). Let $\varphi_{\mu \nu}(p)=-f_{\mu \nu}(p) e^{-i p_{v}}$. We have

$$
\begin{equation*}
\varphi(p)=\sum_{\mu, v}\left(e^{-i p_{\mu}}-1\right)\left(e^{i p_{v}}-1\right) \varphi_{\mu v}(p) \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and put

$$
\begin{gather*}
\frac{1}{2} \delta m^{2}=\varphi(0),  \tag{16}\\
J_{1 x y}^{\mu \nu}=\frac{1}{\Lambda_{n+1}} \sum_{\substack{p \in 2 \pi L^{-N}-N^{\prime}+n+1 \\
-\pi<p_{\mu} \leqq \pi}} e^{i p(x-y)} \varphi_{\mu \nu}(p) . \tag{17}
\end{gather*}
$$

The symmetry properties of $J_{1 x y}^{\mu \nu}$ may be guaranteed by averaging

$$
e^{-\frac{i}{2} p_{\mu}} e^{\frac{i}{2} p_{v}} \varphi_{\mu v}(p)
$$

over the lattice rotations and reflections. Equation (11.10) follows from the uniform bound for $\varphi_{\mu \nu}(p)$ for $\left|\operatorname{Im} p_{\mu}\right|<2 \alpha$.
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