85-9-195 DEUTSCHES ELEKTRONEN-SYNCHROTRON DESY DESY 85-050 June 1985

THE STANDARD HIGGS-MODEL ON THE LATTICE

bу

I. Montvay

Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Hamburg

ISSN 0418-9833

NOTKESTRASSE 85 · 2 HAMBURG 52

DESY behält sich alle Rechte für den Fall der Schutzrechtserteilung und für die wirtschaftliche Verwertung der in diesem Bericht enthaltenen Informationen vor.

DESY reserves all rights for commercial use of information included in this report, especially in case of filing application for or grant of patents.

To be sure that your preprints are promptly included in the HIGH ENERGY PHYSICS INDEX, send them to the following address (if possible by air mail) :



ISSN 0418-9833

DESY 85-050 June 1985

THE STANDARD HIGGS-MODEL ON THE LATTICE *

I. Montvay Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Hamburg

ABSTRACT

Some recent Monte Carlo calculations in the SU(2) Higgs-model with a scalar doublet field are reviewed. Questions about the dependence on the scalar self-coupling are discussed in the framework of a strong self-coupling expansion. The numerical results are consistent with an asymptotically free continuum limit at vanishing bare gauge coupling.

1. INTRODUCTION

Most of the recent efforts in Monte Carlo simulations of lattice gauge field theories 1,2 are concentrated on the study of pure SU(N) gauge theories and QCD-like theories with SU(N) gauge fields and a number of spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ fermion fields. The numerical study of quantum field theories containing scalar matter fields received up to now only a relatively limited amount of interest. The detailed investigation of pure gauge field theories is certainly the basis for any future understanding of the physical theories with matter fields, therefore it is unavoidable. The extraordinary numerical efforts invested in the latest simulations of QCD with quarks is motivated by the great challenge represented by the complex and experimentally well measured hadron spectrum. The fermionic matter fields are, however, notoriously difficult for numerical studies. Scalar matter fields are, from the numerical point of view, much simpler.

In the standard SU(3) \otimes SU(2) \otimes U(1) theory of strong-electroweak interactions scalar fields play a very important rôle, because they are responsible, via the "Higgs-mechanism", for the masses of all the particles. Experimentally the "Higgs-sector" of the standard model is unknown, the Higgs-particle and its couplings are not yet directly observed. Therefore, the numerical study of field theories with scalar matter fields, in particular the Higgssector of the standard model, is both interesting and important. Since from the technical point of view scalar fields are simpler, it is conceivable that the study of quantum field theories containing scalar matter fields can contribute rather substantially to our understanding of the gauge-matter interactions.

One of the possible reasons for the limited interest in performing Monte Carlo simulations with scalar fields is, perhaps, the almost rigorously proven triviality of the simplest renormalizable scalar field theory. Namely, as a result of almost 15 years of hard work ³⁾, we almost definitely know, that the single-component ϕ^4 -theory in the four-dimensional continuum is trivial, i.e. equivalent to a free field theory. This fact, and the large number of apparently free parameters, discredited the Higgs-sector, too, because neglecting fermions and electromagnetism, the Higgs-sector of the standard model is the SU(2)-gauged version of a four-component (doublet) scalar field theory with ϕ^4 self-interaction. It is, however, a priori not clear what is the consequence of the triviality of interaction for the "standard" SU(2) Higgs-model with doublet scalar field. There are, in principle, several possibilities:

i) the standard Higgs-model, too, is trivial in the four-dimensional continuum;

- 2.-

^{*} Lecture given at the Conference "Advances in Lattice Gauge Theory", April 1985, Tallahassee, Florida.

ii) its continuum limit is non-trivial but λ -independent (the ϕ^4 self-coupling λ is "irrelevant");

iii) it is non-trivial and λ -dependent.

In the first case, the ϕ^4 self-coupling "spoils" the otherwise nice gauge-interaction too, and the only possible continuum limit is a free theory of massive, spin-1 vector bosons ("W-bosons") and a single massive scalar ("Higgs-boson"). In the other two cases the ϕ^4 coupling has to be, presumably, asymptotically free, because the gauge interaction is asymptotically free. At high energies the gauge coupling is negligible and we are left with the "asymptotically trivial" (i.e. asymptotically free) ϕ^4 -theory. In the interesting case ii) the continuum theory has one independent parameter less than the bare theory. Therefore, the Higgs-boson mass, for instance, is a function of the W-boson mass and of the (renormalized) gauge coupling constant.

2. STRONG SELF-COUPLING EXPANSION

2.1 Motivation

The standard Higgs-model has three bare coupling parameters: $\beta \equiv 4/g^2$ is the SU(2) gauge coupling, \varkappa the hopping parameter of the scalar doublet field and λ is the ϕ^4 self-coupling (the precise definitions see below in the lattice action). In renormalized perturbation theory the renormalized ϕ^4 coupling λ_{ren} is a free parameter which can be traded, for instance, against the value of the mass of physical Higgs-particle m_{H} . At tree level the relation is

$$m_{\rm H} = m_{\rm W} \frac{\sqrt{8\lambda_{\rm ren}}}{9\,{\rm ren}} \,. \tag{1}$$

Here m_W is the W-boson mass and g_{ren} denotes the renormalized SU(2) coupling constant. The low energy phenomenology (below ~100 GeV)

is rather insensitive to λ_{ren} (or to the Higgs-mass $m_{\rm H}$). If, however, $m_{\rm H}$ is very large ($m_{\rm H} \sim 1$ TeV), then the ϕ^4 self-coupling of the Higgs-field implies a strongly interacting Higgs-sector, which can produce rich, non-perturbative phenomena in the few-hundred GeV range $^{4,5)}$.

According to the tree-level formula (1), for $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ the Higgsmass goes to infinity. Of course, due to the strong interaction, the tree level relation is not valid and therefore m_a can stay finite. In fact, there are large-N expansion arguments ⁶⁾ implying that a "Higgs-remnant" with the quantum numbers of the physical Higgsparticle remains in the spectrum even for $\lambda
ightarrow \infty$. A first rough Monte Carlo investigation of the correlations showed $^{7)}$, that $m_{\rm u}/m_{\rm u} \rightleftharpoons 0(1)$ is possible even at infinitely strong bare selfcoupling $\lambda = \infty$. A more detailed numerical study of the λ -dependence was also carried out recently $^{(8)}$, showing a remarkable universal behaviour of the mass gaps for different λ -values. Plotting, for instance, the W-mass in lettice units (am_W) for fixed β = 2.3 and $\lambda = 0.1, 0.5, 1.0$ and ∞ , as a function of an appropriately chosen third variable, one obtains Fig. 1. This shows, that the λ -dependence in the given λ -range is surprisingly weak, in fact, it is too weak to be seen by the limited numerical accuracy in Ref. 8). The interesting question is, of course, whether the λ -dependence goes away completely in the continuum limit or not. We shall see below, that a powerful tool for the study of λ -dependence is the strong self-coupling expansion (SSCE).

2.2 Lattice Action

The gauge field is described on the lattice, as usual, by the link variables $U(x, \mu) \in SU(2)$ (x = lattice point, $\mu = \pm 1, \pm 2, \pm 3, \pm 4$ lattice directions). The doublet field on the lattice points can be represented by its length $Q_x \ge 0$ and by an angular variable $\propto_x \in SU(2)$. Since \propto_x is equivalent to the



- 5 -



local gauge freedom, it is possible to introduce the gauge invariant link variables $\bigvee(x_1,\mu) \equiv \alpha_{x+\mu}^{+} U(x_1,\mu) \alpha_{x}$ ($\mu = unit$ vector in direction μ). In terms of the physical degrees of freedom the lattice action is

$$S_{\lambda\beta\kappa}^{(\Lambda)} = \beta \sum_{p} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} V_{p} \right) + \frac{1}{2} \left\{ -3 \ln \varphi_{x} + \lambda s^{4} \left[\varphi_{x}^{2} - s^{-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda} \right) \right]^{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda} \right) \right\}^{2} - \frac{1}{2} \left\{ -2 \ln \varphi_{x} + \lambda s^{4} \left[\varphi_{x}^{2} - s^{-2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2\lambda} \right) \right]^{2} \right\}^{2} \right\}$$

- 6 -

Here \sum_{μ}^{γ} means a summation over plaquettes. The arbitrary scale factor A>0 in $S_{\lambda\beta\mu}^{(4)}$ corresponds to the rescaling $Q_{\chi} \rightarrow AQ_{\chi}$ of the integration variable Q_{χ} . The integration measure for the action (2) is dQ_{χ} times the SU(2) Haar-measure $d^{3}V(x,\mu)$. In the limit $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ the length is fixed to the value $Q_{\chi} = A^{-1}$ For s = 1, the $\lambda = \infty$ limit of the action is

$$S_{\beta,\mathcal{H}}^{\lambda=\infty} = \beta \sum_{\mathcal{P}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} V_{\mathcal{P}}\right) - \mathcal{H} \sum_{x_{\mathcal{P}} \mathcal{L}} \operatorname{Tr} V(x_{\mathcal{P}}). \quad (3)$$

2.3 General Scheme of SSCE

The action in Eq. (2) can be splitted up into its A = 1, $\lambda = \infty$ limit (3) at the hopping parameter value SR plus the rest. The strong self-coupling expansion is obtained by expanding into powers of the coupling term $SR(Q_{x+\mu}, Q_x - \Lambda)$ $TrV(x_{\mu})$ and then performing the integrations dq_x over the length of the Higgs-field. The occurring integrals can be expressed by the parabolic cylinder function $D_n(z)$ like

 $J_{\underline{k}}(\lambda) = \int_{-1\overline{\lambda}} dx \qquad e^{-x^{2}} \left(1 + \frac{x}{\sqrt{\lambda}} - \frac{1}{2\lambda}\right)^{4+\frac{k}{2}} = (4)$ $= \exp\left[-\frac{1}{4}\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}} - \sqrt{2\lambda}\right)^{2}\right] \frac{\Gamma(2+\frac{k}{2})}{\sqrt{2}(2\lambda)^{4/2+\frac{k}{2}/4}} \sum_{-2-\frac{k}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}} - \sqrt{2\lambda}\right)^{2}\right]$

In the expectation values only the ratios (k = 1, 2, ...)

$$i_{\chi} = \frac{J_{\kappa}(\lambda)}{J_{\rho}(\lambda)} = \frac{\Gamma(2 + \frac{k}{2}) D_{-2 - \frac{k}{2}} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}} - \sqrt{2\lambda}\right)}{(2\lambda)^{6/4} D_{-2} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2\lambda}} - \sqrt{2\lambda}\right)}$$
(5)

appear. These behave asymptotically like

$$\dot{\mathbf{x}}_{\mathbf{k}} \rightarrow \begin{cases} (\lambda \Rightarrow \infty) & 1 + \frac{\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{k}-2)}{\mathbf{\lambda}6\lambda} + \sigma(\lambda^{2}) ; \\ (\lambda \Rightarrow \sigma) & \Gamma(2 + \frac{\mathbf{k}}{2}) \left(1 - \lambda \frac{\mathbf{k}(\mathbf{k}+6)}{4} + \sigma(\lambda^{2})\right)^{(6)} . \end{cases}$$

From the first line it can be seen, that for $\lambda \rightarrow \infty$ the expansion is similar to a series expansion into the inverse powers of λ . For small λ , however, every term in the series remains finite.

In general, the terms of the SSCE series are given by some correlation functions at $\lambda = \infty$. In particular, as we shall see below, in many important quantities the expectation value of $T_{\rm ev}V(x_1\mu)$ appears. Therefore, it is natural to choose the freedom in the scale factor s by requiring

$$\langle T_{T}V(x_{1}\mu)\rangle_{\lambda\beta\mu} = \langle T_{T}V(x_{1}\mu)\rangle_{\lambda=0}, \beta, \delta^{2}\mu$$
.⁽⁷⁾

This means that SSCE is done (for fixed β) along the curves with constant link expectation value $\langle T_{\tau} \vee (x_{1} \mu) \rangle$. Since the phase transition between the confinement-like and Higgs-like phases (for fixed β and different λ) occurs at nearly the same value of $\langle T_{\tau} \vee (x_{1} \mu) \rangle^{-8}$, the choice in Eq. (7) implies that the expansion is done along curves which do not cross the phase transition surface. This is, of course, important for an optimal convergence radius.

2.4 Examples: Average arepsilon and Two-Link Correlations

The second order expansion for the average Higgs-field length is, to a good approximation,

$$\langle 9_{y} \rangle_{\lambda \beta x} = \dot{i}_{1} + 8 \times \dot{i}_{1} (\dot{i}_{2} - \dot{i}_{1}^{2}) \langle \text{Tr} V(x_{1} \mu) \rangle_{\lambda = 0} + (8)$$

$$+ 4 \times^{2} (\langle \text{Tr} V(x_{1} \mu) \rangle_{\lambda = 0})^{2} (\dot{i}_{3} \dot{i}_{2} + 7 \dot{i}_{3} \dot{i}_{1}^{2} + 13 \dot{i}_{3} \dot{i}_{2}^{2} + 30 \dot{i}_{3}^{5} - 51 \dot{i}_{2} \dot{i}_{1}^{3}) + \cdots$$

The complete second order contains, in addition, an s-dependent piece which is proportional to some specific combinations of the connected 2-link correlations $\langle T+V(x_1,\mu_1)T+V(x_2,\mu_2)\rangle_{\lambda=\infty}^{c}$. For the choice of s in Eq. (7), however, this is only a small correction to the second order contribution given above. As another example, the lowest non-trivial order of the connected two-link correlation function is

$$\langle T_{T'} V(y_{1} v_{1}) T_{T'} V(y_{2} v_{2}) \rangle_{\lambda \beta \varkappa}^{c} = \langle T_{T'} V(y_{1} v_{1}) T_{T'} V(y_{2} v_{2}) \rangle_{\lambda \varkappa \ll (\vartheta)}^{c}$$

$$+ \varkappa (i_{1}^{2} - S^{c}) \sum_{x_{j} \mu > 0} \langle T_{T'} V(y_{1} v_{1}) T_{T'} V(y_{2} v_{2}) T_{T'} V(x_{j} \mu) \rangle_{\lambda \varkappa \ll (\vartheta)}^{c} + \cdots$$

Such expressions can be used, for instance, for the SSCE of the mass gaps.

The comparison of Eq. (8) with the Monte Carlo data ⁸⁾ at $\lambda = 1.0$ and 0.1 is shown by Table I. As it can be seen, the agreement of this low order SSCE and the lont. Carlo results is impressive. As a preliminary numerical study has shown, Eq. (8) qualitatively describes the average Higgs-field length $\langle \varphi_{y} \rangle$ even at $\lambda = 0.01$. Higher order expansions for the $I_W = 0$ and $I_W = 1$ mass gaps, and a detailed comparison to numerical data will be published elsewhere ⁹. The present conclusion concerning SSCE is:

i) $\lambda \gtrsim 0.1$ seems to be the region of strong self-coupling, where low orders of SSCE are sufficient;

The second order SSCE for the average Higgs-field length $\langle \varrho \rangle_{sc}$ compared to the Monte Carlo data $\langle \varrho \rangle_{Mc}^{8)}$ at $\lambda = 1.0; 0.1$ and for $\beta = 2.3; \omega$.

$\lambda = 1.0$					
x(B=2.3)	1975c	<97mc	X(B=00)	(q)sc	< 97Mc
0.2	1.059	1.060	0.22	1.069	1.070
0.3	1.114	1.115	0.24	1.080	1.081
0.31	1.151	1.152	0.25	1.096	1.092
0.32	1.178	1.178	0.26	1.122	1.124
0,35	1,246	1.241	0.27	1.148	1.149
0.4	1.347	1.331	0.28	1.173	1,173
	ļ		0.3	1.219	1.216
	ĺ		0.32	1,289	1,256
λ=0,1					
X(B=2.3)	<9>sc	< 87mc	X(β=∞)	< 975c	< g7mc
0.19	1.336	1.353	0.155	1.280	1.290
0,195	1.423	1,450	0,16	1.291	1.302
0.2	1.523	1.558	0.163	1.306	1.319
0.205	1.594	1.636	0.165	1.330	1.346
0.21	1,663	1.712	0.167	1.360	1.379
0.22	1.780	1.845	0.17	1.408	1.430
0.3	2,535	2,628	0.175	1.484	1.514
			0.18	1.554	1.589

ii) SSCE may well be a convergent expansion for all $\lambda > 0$ values; iii) a natural variable, instead of the hopping parameter \mathcal{K} (for fixed β and fixed lattice size) is $L = \langle \frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} V(x, \mu) \rangle$.

The practical advantage of SSCE is, that it allows to concentrate the numerical study to $\lambda = \infty$. The time consuming coverage

- 10 -

of the whole 3-parameter space $(\lambda, \beta, \varkappa)$ with the measured points is not necessary. Combined with the usual lattice perturbation theory in the gauge coupling g (at g=0), the SSCE may also help to pin down the question of λ -dependence in the continuum limit. A completely analytic study is also possible if, in addition, a hopping parameter expansion is done in the remaining $(\lambda = \infty, \beta = \infty)$ non-linear σ -model. This latter procedure is equivalent to the combination of the usual "high temperature expansion" ¹⁰ in the $\beta = \infty$ ϕ^4 -model with the g = 0 perturbation theory.

3, SOME RECENT NUMERICAL RESULTS

To two recent papers $^{7,8)}$ the correlations in W-boson and Higgsboson channels and the static energy of an external colour charge pair were investigated in the standard Higgs-model by numerical Monte Carlo simulation. (For references to earlier numerical studies in the standard Higgs-model see these papers. For some new results see also the lecture of J. Jersák in these Proceedings). The numerical study of the correlations is useful for the understanding of the phase structure and of the continuum limit. In general, it is relatively easy to determine the correlations (much easier than e.g. the plaquette-plaquette correlations in pure gauge theory). In the vicinity of the phase transition between the confinement-like and Higgs-like regions, however, the long range correlations require large lattices and the critical slowing down (or metastability) is very dangerous. Sometimes surprisingly long runs are needed in order to be reasonably sure that the results refer to the equilibrium situation.

As examples of some new, high statistics results on 12⁴ lattices with the full SU(2) group ¹¹⁾ let us consider the W-boson and Higgs-boson masses in lattice units in two points. At ($\lambda = \infty$, $\beta = 2.3$, $\chi = 0.41$), which is above the phase transition surface, one obtains am_W = 0.507(14) and am_H = 0.79(3). Lorentz-invariance is well

- 11 -

satisfied in this point. In particular, one obtains from the zero momentum correlations am_W = 0.505(15) and from the p=1 (in lattice units) correlations am_W = 0.510(48). In another point ($\lambda = \infty$, $\beta = 2.3$, $\chi = 0.39$), below the phase transition surface, the result is: am_W = 1.27(8) and am_H = 0.39(2).

In Ref. 8) the static energy of an external colour charge pair (in short, "potential") was investigated in detail on 12⁴ lattice and using the icosahedral approximation for SU(2). The aim was to obtain information about the renormalization group trajectories (RGT's), since along a RGT the potential can be rescaled to a common, physical curve. (This method was used for the study of scaling in pure SU(2) gauge theory in Ref. 12).) It turns out 8). that the potential shape sensitively depends on the value of $m_{\rm ul}/m_{\rm ul},$ therefore the RGT's can be determined quite well. An important point is, that the rescaling of the potential is possible, to a good accuracy, along curves in the λ = const. planes. This and the weak dependence of the masses on λ (if plotted like in Fig. 1) suggests, that the continuum limit can be λ -independent. Of course, this question has to be considered in more detail in future studied. In particular, the crucial point is, whether comparing the appropriate λ = const. RGT's, the λ -dependence weakens for growing β . For fixed λ the scaling properties of the standard lattice Higgs-model are qualitatively similar to the situation in QCD with a single quark mass parameter, i.e. there is an asymptotically free fixed point at $\beta = \infty$ and a (λ -dependent) critical hopping parameter $\mathbf{X} = \mathbf{X}_{crit}(\lambda)$. The different RGT's are parametrized by the mass parameter in the Higgs-potential: above the phase transition line there are the trajectories with spontaneous symmetry breaking, below the phase transition line the trajectories describing a confining theory with scalar matter fields (see Fig. 2).

Once the questions concerning the continuum limit are cleared, it becomes possible to calculate such phenomenologically interesting quantities like the ratio of the Higgs-boson mass to the W-boson mass $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{H}}/\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{W}}$. Since the renormalized SU(2) coupling is weak phenomenologically ($\mathrm{g}_{\mathrm{ren}}^2 \approx 0.5$ at the energy scale of m_{W}), one has to perform the Monte Carlo calculation at high β . This makes the calculation difficult. In a first attempt one can simplify the shape of the RGT's: as a zeroth approximation one can assume that the RGT goes nearly parallel to the phase transition surface between $\beta=\infty$ and the considered large β , and then it departs almost perpendicularly towards $\mathcal{X}=\infty$.

In the Monte Carlo calculation I took $\lambda = 1.0$; $\beta = 8.0$ and $\chi = 0.30$ on 10^4 lattice with the full SU(2) group. The measured value of the renormalized gauge coupling, as determined by the Coulomb-potential at lattice distances 1-5, is $\alpha = 0.034(3)$. This roughly corresponds to the expected value $3g_{ren}^2/(16\pi) \cong 0.03$. From 10000 measured sweeps, I obtained for the masses in lattice units am_H = 1.4(2) and am_W = 0.23(3), therefore

$$\frac{m_{\rm H}}{m_{\rm W}} \sim 6 \tag{10}$$

I also checked in similar runs, that this ratio does not change appreciably between $\times = 0.28$ and $\times = 0.32$. Eq. (10) gives for the physical Higgs-boson mass m_H ~ 500-600 GeV, but this has to be considered only as a first estimate. Completely neglected are here the virtual fermion loops and the electromagnetic U(1)-coupling. Furthermore, there is an unknown (presumably large) error due to finite lattice size effects. One has to study, in the future, also the scaling in this β -range (the precise shape of the physical RGT) and the question of λ -dependence.

- 13 -



Fig. 2

Fig. 2. The schematic shape of the RGT's in a $\lambda = \text{const. plane}$. The full line gives the position of the phase transition. The dashed-dotted lines are the RGT's in the Higgs-phase, the dashed ones the RGT's in the confinement-like phase.

4. DISCUSSION

An important parameter in the standard Higgs-model is the ratio of the Higgs-boson mass to the W-boson mass $\mathcal{F} \cong m_{\text{H}}/m_{\text{W}}$. According to the Monte Carlo simulations ^{7,8,11} is greater than 1 in the Higgs phase and smaller than 1 in the confinement phase. For the phenomenological value of the weak SU(2) coupling a first numerical estimate gives $\mathcal{F} \sim 6.1f$ in the continuum limit ($\lambda = \text{const.}$, $\mathcal{F} \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{K} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\text{cont}}(\lambda)$) the second alternative mentioned in the introduction is realized (i.e. if λ is irrelevant) then, besides the Λ -parameter for the SU(2) gauge coupling, \mathcal{F} is the only free physical parameter of the theory. Every other quantity, like for instance ${\tt m}_W/\Lambda_{SU(2)}$ or the value of the φ^4 coupling at some specific point (λ_{ren}) , is a function of $\Lambda_{SU(2)}$ and ξ . The renormalization group equations for the renormalized Green's functions are valid with only two coupling parameters. In the usual weak coupling perturbation theory of the standard Higgs-model there are three free parameters. In order to take into account the non-perturbative constraint implied by the requirement of the existence of a mathematically well defined continuum theory, one has to impose on the three parameters of renormalized perturbation theory some external constraint. This is similar to the situation in pure φ^4 theory, where λ_{ren} = 0 is such an external constraint.

REFERENCES

- 1) K.G.Wilson, Phys. Rev. D10, 2445 (1974)
- for references and a collection of early papers see "Lattice gauge theories and Monte Carlo simulations", edited by C. Rebbi, World Scientific, 1983
- 3) an incomplete list of references is: K.G. Wilson, Phys. Rav. 84, 3184 (1971).
 K.G. Wilson, J. Kogut, Phys. Rep. 12C, 75 (1974)
 G.A. Baker, J. Kincaid, Phys. Rev. Letters 42, 1431 (1979) and Journ. Stat. Phys. 24, 469 (1981).
 B. Freedman, P. Smolensky, D. Weingarten, Phys. Lett. 113B, 481 (1982).
 M. Aizenman, Phys. Rev. Letters 47, 1 (1981) and Commun. Math. Phys. 86, 1 (1982).
 J. Fröhlich, Nucl. Phys. B200 [FS4], 281 (1982) and in "Progress in Gauge Field Theory", Cargese 1983, ed. by G. 't Hooft et al., Plenum 1984.
 4) M. Veltman, Acta Phys. Polonica B8, 475 (1977).
- 4) M. Veltman, Acta Phys. Polonica <u>B8</u>, 475 (1977).
 B.W. Lee, C. Quigg, H.B. Thacker, Phys. Rev. <u>D16</u>, 1519 (1977).
 T. Appelquist, C. Bernard, Phys. Rev. <u>D22</u>, 200 (1980).
 A. Longhitano, Phys. Rev. <u>D22</u>, 1166 (1980).
- 5) for a more recent work see, for instance, R. Casalbuoni, S. De Curtis, D. Dominici, R. Gatto, Phys. Letters <u>1558</u>, 95 (1985).

- 14 -

- 6) M.B. Einhorn, Nucl. Phys. <u>B246</u>, 75 (1984)
- 7) I. Montvay, Phys. Lett. 1508, 441 (1985)
- 8) I. Montvay, DESY preprint 85-005 (1985), submitted to Nucl. Phys. 8.
- 9) K. Decker, I. Montvay, in preparation
- 10) see, for instance, G.A. Baker, J. Kincaid, Journ. Stat. Phys. <u>24</u>, 469 (1981)
- 11) W. Langguth, I. Montvay, in preparation
- 12) F. Gutbrod, I. Montvay, Phys. Lett. <u>1368</u>, 411 (1984).