Field Diffeomorphisms and the Algebraic Structure of Perturbative Expansions

DIRK KREIMER[1] and ANDREA VELENICH[2]

[1]*Departments of Physics and of Mathematics, Humboldt University, Unter den Linden 6, 10099 Berlin, Germany. e-mail: kreimer@mathematik.hu-berlin.de*
[2]*Department of Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Avenue, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA. e-mail: velenich@gmail.com*

Abstract. We consider field diffeomorphisms in the context of real scalar field theories. Starting from free field theories we apply non-linear field diffeomorphisms to the fields and study the perturbative expansion for the transformed theories. We find that tree-level amplitudes for the transformed fields must satisfy BCFW type recursion relations for the S-matrix to remain trivial. For the massless field theory these relations continue to hold in loop computations. In the massive field theory the situation is more subtle. A necessary condition for the Feynman rules to respect the maximal ideal and co-ideal defined by the core Hopf algebra of the transformed theory is that upon renormalization all massive tadpole integrals (defined as all integrals independent of the kinematics of external momenta) are mapped to zero.

Mathematics Subject Classification (2010). 81S99, 81T99.

Keywords. diffeomorphism invariance, Hopf ideals, BCFW relations, tadpoles, renormalization.

1. Introduction: From Field Diffeomorphisms to the Core Hopf Algebra of Graphs

It has long been known that loop contributions to quantum S-matrix elements can be obtained from tree-level amplitudes using unitarity methods based on the optical theorem and dispersion relations. More recently, these perturbative methods have been applied intensively in QCD and quantum gravity, where the KLT relations relate the tree-level amplitudes in quantum gravity to the tree-level amplitudes in gauge field theories ([1] and references therein). Importantly, d-dimensional unitarity methods allow to compute S-matrix elements without the need of

an underlying Lagrangian and represent an alternative to the usual quantization prescriptions based on path integrals or canonical quantization.

In this short paper, we study field diffeomorphisms of a free field theory, which generate a seemingly interacting field theory. This is an old albeit somewhat controversial topic in the literature [2–12]. We address it here from a minimalistic approach: ignoring any path-integral heuristics, we collect basic facts about the Hopf algebra of a perturbation theory which stems from a field diffeomorphism of a free theory.

Relations among correlation functions encode symmetries, typically signaling the presence of redundant degrees of freedom. Conversely, symmetries provide useful shortcuts to compute correlation functions or to prove general results about a theory. In some cases (e.g. in gauge theories) a symmetry is assumed and the relations among correlation functions follow from the symmetry. In other cases (e.g. for the BCFW relations) relations among correlation functions emerge first, suggesting a possible deeper structure of the theory at hand. In this work we will follow the second path for determining the structure of a theory, starting from its correlation functions. We will show that a specific renormalization scheme (in our case a kinematic renormalization scheme) is necessary for the expected relations to hold and, ultimately, for the symmetry to reveal itself.

As any interacting field theory, a field theory whose interactions originate from field diffeomorphisms of a free field theory has a perturbative expansion which is governed by a corresponding tower of Hopf algebras [13,14]. It starts from the core Hopf algebra, for which only one-loop graphs are primitive:

$$\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \Gamma + \sum_{\cup_i \gamma_i = \gamma \subset \Gamma} \gamma \otimes \Gamma/\gamma, \tag{1}$$

and ends with a Hopf algebra for which any 1-PI graph is primitive:

$$\Delta\Gamma = \Gamma \otimes \mathbb{I} + \mathbb{I} \otimes \Gamma. \tag{2}$$

Here, subgraphs γ_i are one-particle irreducible (1PI). Intermediate between these two Hopf algebras are those for which graphs of a prescribed superficial degree of divergence contribute in the coproduct Δ, allowing to treat renormalization and operator product expansions.

All these Hopf algebras allow for maximal co-ideals. In particular, the core Hopf algebra has a maximal ideal related to the celebrated BCFW relations: if the latter relations hold, the Feynman rules are well defined on the quotient of the core Hopf algebra by this maximal ideal [14].

Gravity as a theory for which the renormalization Hopf algebra equals its core Hopf algebra is a particularly interesting theory from this viewpoint [15]. The work here is to be regarded as preparatory work in understanding the algebraic structure of gravity as a quantum field theory.

For gauge theory and gravity, the co-ideals reflect highly non-trivial identities between 1PI Green functions [16]. For our free theory in disguise we expect the

same identities to be fulfilled in the most straightforward manner: revealing all n-point Green functions, $n > 2$, to vanish. This is indeed the case. In the next section we will summarize the algebraic considerations which are the framework of our endeavour, we will then set the definitions and from Sect. 4, present our results in accordance with the expected behaviour of co-ideals in our perturbation theory.

2. Symmetries and Hopf Ideals

In the Hopf algebra of Feynman diagrams, Hopf ideals are known to encode the symmetries of a field theory [14,17]. Such (co-)ideals enforce relations among the n-point one-particle irreducible Green functions ($\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(n)}$) or among the connected Green functions ($\Gamma^{(n)}$), which generically are of the form:

$$\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(n)} = \Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(j)} \frac{1}{\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(2)}} \Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(k)} \qquad \forall j, k > 2; \quad j + k = n + 2, \tag{3}$$

$$\Leftrightarrow \frac{\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(n+1)}}{\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(n)}} = \frac{\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(n)}}{\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(n-1)}}. \tag{4}$$

Here, we let $\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(2)}$ be the inverse propagator.

Note that the relation Equation (4) forms a co-ideal in the core Hopf algebra of graphs which imposes the BCFW recursion relations [14]. In such applications, the propagator

$$\frac{1}{\Gamma_{1\mathrm{PI}}^{(2)}}$$

appears as an off-shell Green function sandwiched between vertex functions for which the other external legs are on-shell.

For connected Green functions,

$$\Gamma^{(n)} = \Gamma^{(j)} \frac{1}{\Gamma^{(2)}} \Gamma^{(k)} \quad \forall j, k > 2; \quad j + k = n + 2. \tag{5}$$

upon iteration. Here, we use a rather condensed notation where the subscript j indicates j external fields of some type.

Note that the 2-point function is never vanishing: a free field theory provides the lowest order in the perturbation expansion of a field theory and $\Gamma^{(2)} \neq 0$ even for vanishing interactions. Hence if $\Gamma^{(3)} = 0$ in Equation (3) we conclude $\Gamma^{(n)} = 0, n \geq 3$.

Not only relations (3) and (4) underlie the BCFW recursive formulae for the computation of tree-level maximally helicity violating (MHV) amplitudes in Quantum Chromodynamics [18,19]; more generally, relations (3) and (4) hold for the corresponding one-loop and multi-loop amplitudes in QED and QCD, embodying the gauge symmetry of those theories, with Ward–Slavnov–Taylor identities being particular instances of such relations when specifying the kinematics of longitudinal and transversal propagation modes.

It is a general graph theoretic result that the sum over one-particle reducible (1-PR) diagrams can be written in terms of one-particle irreducible (1-PI) diagrams connected by one or several internal propagators $1/\Gamma^{(2)}$. Connected n-point Feynman diagrams $\Gamma^{(n)}$ are either 1-PR or 1-PI diagrams, but for the massless theory we will show that the one-loop connected amplitudes vanish when the external legs are evaluated on-shell:

$$\Gamma^{(n)} = \Gamma^{(n)}_{1\text{PI}} + \Gamma^{(n)}_{1\text{PR}} = 0 \quad \Rightarrow \quad \Gamma^{(n)}_{1\text{PI}} = -\Gamma^{(n)}_{1\text{PR}}. \tag{6}$$

and from (6) one obtains Equation (3) which characterizes a Hopf ideal [14]. In this case, the Hopf ideal is related to the diffeomorphism invariance of the massless theory.

In the massive theory, instead, we will see that connected n-point amplitudes do not vanish due to the appearance of tadpole diagrams which spoil the Hopf ideal structure. A necessary condition to regain diffeomorphism invariance is the use of a renormalization scheme which eliminates all contributions from tadpole diagrams. This is also a mathematically preferred scheme (see [20]).

3. Definitions

Let us consider real scalar fields defined on a four-dimensional Minkowski space–time $\phi \equiv \phi(x) : \mathbb{R}^{1,3} \to \mathbb{R}$ and field diffeomorphisms $F(\phi)$ specified by choosing a set of real coefficients $\{a_k\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ which do not depend on the space–time coordinates:

$$F(\phi) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} a_k \phi^{k+1} = \phi + a_1 \phi^2 + a_2 \phi^3 + \cdots \quad (\text{with } a_0 = 1). \tag{7}$$

These transformations are called "point transformations". They preserve Lagrange's equations, they are a subset of the canonical transformations [10], and in the quantum formalism they become unitary transformation of the Hamiltonian [2].

The two field theories which we will consider are derived from the free massless and the massive scalar field theories, with Lagrangian densities $\mathsf{L}[\phi]$ and with F defined as in (7):

$$\mathsf{L}[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi \to \mathsf{L}_{\mathsf{F}}[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu F(\phi)\partial^\mu F(\phi), \tag{8}$$

$$\mathsf{L}[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi - \frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 \to \mathsf{L}_{\mathsf{F}}[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu F(\phi)\partial^\mu F(\phi) - \frac{m^2}{2}F(\phi(x))F(\phi(x)). \tag{9}$$

4. The Massless Theory

Expanding the massless Lagrangian (8) in terms of the field ϕ, we obtain:

$$\mathsf{L}[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi - \partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{n!}d_n\phi^n, \tag{10}$$

where the couplings d_n are defined in terms of the parameters a_n specifying the diffeomorphism F:

$$d_n = n! \sum_{j=0}^{n} (j+1)(n-j+1)a_j a_{n-j}. \tag{11}$$

The Feynman rules for the symmetrized vertices of the Lagrangian (10) are:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{—} \quad &\rightarrow \quad \frac{i}{k^2} \\
\text{⬩} \quad &\rightarrow \quad i\frac{d_1}{2}(k_1^2 + k_2^2 + k_3^2) \\
\text{✖} \quad &\rightarrow \quad i\frac{d_2}{2}(k_1^2 + \ldots + k_4^2) \\
\text{✷} \quad &\rightarrow \quad i\frac{d_3}{2}(k_1^2 + \ldots + k_5^2) \\
&\ldots
\end{aligned}
\tag{12}
$$

Once evaluated on-shell, the n-point tree-level amplitudes vanish for every $n \geq 3$ and, in the classical limit, the field ϕ has the same correlations as a free massless scalar field.

This result is a consequence of the analytic properties of the S-matrix. When a one-particle intermediate state is physical (i.e. the internal propagator is on-shell), the S-matrix element is supposed to develop a pole. However, the contribution of the n-point vertex to the n-point tree-level amplitude vanishes when all external legs are on-shell (being proportional to $\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_i^2$, according to the Feynman rules). Any other contribution to the on-shell tree-level amplitude may only come from tree diagrams with at least one internal propagator (Fig. 1). Let us consider an n-point tree partitioned by an internal propagator into two tree-level diagrams, one m-point and one p-point tree diagrams ($m + p - 2 = n$). Since the external legs of the n-point tree are on-shell by assumption, if the internal propagator is on-shell, then all the external legs of the m-point and of the p-point amplitudes are on-shell. If the m-point and the p-point tree-level amplitudes vanish, then the corresponding S-matrix element vanishes, just the opposite of developing a pole. Since it is easy to show explicitly that the 3-point tree-level amplitudes vanish and


Figure 1. Example of a tree-level Feynman diagram with an internal propagator (blobs represent arbitrary trees). When all the external legs are on-shell, the internal particle becomes physical. However, instead of contributing a pole to the S-matrix element, the diagram can be recursively shown to vanish.

the argument above is a recursive proof that all the tree-level S-matrix elements of the theory vanish for $n \geq 3$.

An alternative proof can be obtained by an argument which is by now standard in the study of massless scattering amplitudes. Assume we have partitioned the n-point scattering amplitude A_n as above. Let us shift one of the incoming momenta in the amplitude A_m by $q_i \to q_i + zq, q^2 = 0 = q_i \cdot q$, for z a complex parameter, and let us shift one of the momenta of the amplitude A_p accordingly, $q_j \to q_j - qz, q \cdot q_j = 0$. We obtain a z-dependent amplitude $A_n(z) = A_m(z) \frac{1}{(\sum_j p_i + zq)^2} A_p(z)$. Using our Feynman rules and the fact that q is light-like so that the contour integral in z has no contribution from a residue at infinity, we find that the residue of $A_n(z)/z$ is the on-shell residue of the intermediate propagator. The on-shell evaluation of A_n is then reduced to on-shell evaluations of A_m, A_p. From the fact that A_3 vanishes on-shell one can then conclude that all higher n-point amplitudes vanish.

Let us consider the mechanism which eliminates the pole at infinity in some detail: consider as an example the $1+2 \to 3+4$ scattering mediated by two 3-valent vertices and an intermediate off-shell propagator. We have

$$A := (q_1^2 + q_2^2 + (q_1 + q_2)^2) \frac{1}{(q_1 + q_2)^2} (q_3^2 + q_4^2 + (q_3 + q_4)^2),$$

where we consider only one out of three possible channels. We also have $q_1 + q_2 + q_3 + q_4 = 0$ and $q_k^2 = 0, k \in \{1, 2, 3, 4\}$.

Shifting $q_1 \to q_1 + zq, q_3 \to q_3 - zq, A \to A(z), q_1.q = 0 = q_3.q$, using the on-shell conditions and momentum conservation, we have for large $|z|$ the dominating behaviour

$$A(z) \to -2zq.q_4,$$

which indeed gives a simple pole at $z = \infty$ on the Riemann sphere.

Summing over all three orientations and remembering that $q_1.q = 0$, we find

$$-2zq.(q_4 + q_3 + q_2) = 2zq.q_1 = 0.$$

This is by no means an accident, but a generic consequence of the fact that in an amplitude we sum over all channels, and of the fact that the pole at infinity in each channel is $\sim q.q_j$ where $j \neq i$; then, in the sum over all channels, momentum conservation does the job.

4.1. LOOP AMPLITUDES

The superficial degree of divergence (s.d.d.) of a loop diagram Γ computed from the Feynman rules in (12) is:

$$\text{s.d.d.}(\Gamma) = |\Gamma|(d - 2) + 2, \tag{13}$$

where $|\Gamma|$ is the number of loops in the diagram and d is the dimension of space–time. Notably, loop diagrams are divergent regardless of the number of their external legs, making the theory non-renormalizable by power counting. This is a consequence of the vertices in (12) being proportional to the square of the incoming momenta and the propagators being proportional to the inverse square of the momentum which they carry, so that the contribution towards the convergence of a loop integration from each propagator is cancelled by the contribution towards divergence from each vertex. A similar power counting appears in the perturbative field theory of gravity [21].

The vanishing of the tree-level amplitudes, implies that the one-loop n-point connected amplitudes vanish for every $n \geq 1$. The proof is a straightforward application of the optical theorem:

$$2\Im M(\text{in} \to \text{out}) = \sum_{\text{mid}} \int \prod_{i \in \text{mid}} \mathrm{d}^d k_i \, M^*(\text{out} \to \text{mid}) M(\text{in} \to \text{mid}) \tag{14}$$

where "in", "out" and "mid" are the initial, final and intermediate states respectively.

The optical theorem is equivalent to the application of the Cutkosky rules [22]: cut the internal propagators in all the possible ways consistent with the fact that the cut legs will be put on shell; replace each cut propagator with a delta function: $(k^2 - m^2 + i\epsilon)^{-1} \to -2\pi i \delta(k^2 - m^2)$; sum the contributions coming from all possible cuts.

These prescriptions reduce the computation of loop amplitudes to products of on-shell tree-level amplitudes. For the theory described by (8) the vanishing of all tree-level amplitudes implies the vanishing of the one-loop connected amplitudes, and similarly at higher loop orders. Note that this implies the use of a kinetic renormalization scheme such that:

(i) the finite renormalized amplitudes have the expected dispersive properties, and
(ii) the finite renormalized amplitudes do not provide finite parts which are not cut-reconstructible.

Any minimal subtraction scheme in the context of dimensional regularization would have to be considered problematic in this context, while a kinetic scheme as in [20] is safe in this respect. Assuming the use of a kinematic renormalization scheme, no counterterms need then to be added to the Lagrangian and the theory is not only renormalizable, but indeed respects the maximal co-ideal Equation (4)

$$\frac{\Gamma^{(n+1)}_{\text{1PI}}}{\Gamma^{(n)}_{\text{1PI}}} = \frac{\Gamma^{(n)}_{\text{1PI}}}{\Gamma^{(n-1)}_{\text{1PI}}} \tag{15}$$

which is solved by $\Gamma^{(3)}_{\text{1PI}} = 0$, $\Gamma^{(2)} \neq 0$ trivially, as expected.

In the following we will see that the cut-constructibility of loop amplitudes from tree amplitudes does not extend to the massive theory (9) due to the appearance of tadpole diagrams which hinder the application of the optical theorem.

5. The Massive Theory

Expanding the massive Lagrangian (9) in terms of the field ϕ, we obtain:

$$\mathsf{L}[\phi] = \frac{1}{2}\partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi - \frac{m^2}{2}\phi^2 + \partial_\mu\phi\partial^\mu\phi \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{2}\frac{1}{n!}d_n\phi^n + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n+2)!}c_n\phi^{n+2} \qquad (16)$$

where the $\{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are defined as in (11) and the $\{c_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ are:

$$c_n = -m^2 \frac{(n+2)!}{2} \sum_{j=0}^{n} a_j a_{n-j} \qquad (17)$$

New Feynman rules for the "massive" vertices proportional to the couplings c_n complement the Feynman rules in (12):

 $\rightarrow \quad i\,c_1$

 $\rightarrow \quad i\,c_2$

 $\rightarrow \quad i\,c_3$ $\qquad\qquad (18)$

$\cdots$

5.1. THE INTERPLAY OF PROPAGATORS AND VERTICES

Defining the inverse propagators P_j's as:

$$\text{propagator} = \frac{i}{P_j} = \frac{i}{k_j^2 - m^2}$$

the derivative vertices in (12) can be re-written in terms of inverse propagators:

$$\text{—} \quad \rightarrow \quad i\frac{d_1}{2}(3m^2 + P_1 + P_2 + P_3)$$

$$\text{—} \quad \rightarrow \quad i\frac{d_2}{2}(4m^2 + P_1 + \ldots + P_4)$$

$$\text{—} \quad \rightarrow \quad i\frac{d_3}{2}(5m^2 + P_1 + \ldots + P_5)$$

$\cdots$

This formulation clearly shows that vertices with derivatives can then cancel the internal propagator connecting them to a second vertex, effectively fusing with the vertex at the other end of the propagator and generating a new contact interaction

Figure 2. Vertices proportional to inverse propagators can effectively generate new contact interactions and modify the topology of Feynman diagrams, occasionally creating new tadpoles.

(Fig. 2). These terms typically do not vanish, even when the external legs are on-shell but, explicit computations reveals that after summing all the relevant terms, all the on-shell tree-level amplitudes do vanish, up to the 6-point amplitudes.[1] A general proof valid for any n-point amplitude is, however, still lacking (once again, the explicit checks up to 6-point amplitudes can also be done by promoting internal propagators into complex space, with cancellation of poles at infinity to be explicitly checked upon summing over all contributing massless or massive vertices and over all channels).

5.2. LOOP AMPLITUDES

For the massive Lagrangian (16) the divergences of one-loop Feynman diagrams do not cancel and the n-point one-loop amplitudes remain divergent. The residues of the 2- and 3-point amplitudes are:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text{Res(2-pt)} &= 2a_1^2\pi^2m^2(2q^2-m^2) \overset{q^2=m^2}{\to} 2a_1^2\pi^2m^4 \\
\text{Res(3-pt)} &= (-8a_1^3+12a_1a_2)\pi^2m^2(q_1^2+q_2^2+q_3^2)+(24a_1^3-30a_1a_2)\pi^2m^4 \\
&\overset{q^2=m^2}{\to} 6a_1a_2\pi^2m^4
\end{aligned}
\tag{19}
$$

Note that, for the 3-point one-loop amplitude, internal massive and massless vertices of valence 3, 4 and 5 contribute so that a rather large class of diagrams had to be computed to find the expected reduction to tadpole terms.

The residues of some of the 2- and 3-point Feynman diagrams contain terms proportional to q^4, which are not present in the original Lagrangian. However, when the residues relative to all the Feynman diagrams are added up, no terms proportional to q^4 are left. Thus, the derivative terms in the Lagrangian can absorb the q^2-dependent part of the residues and the massive terms absorb the q^2-independent part.

Interestingly, the residues of the full 2- and 3-point amplitudes turn out to be proportional to the residue of the corresponding 2- and 3-point tadpoles. Notably, however, the residues of the on-shell 2- and 3-point amplitudes are due not only to tadpole diagrams: they also originate from Feynman diagrams with other topologies whose internal propagators are cancelled by derivative vertices to generate the before-mentioned contact terms (Fig. 2). This gives contributions which are

---

[1]These cancellations in general do not happen for any couplings $\{c_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ but only for couplings $\{c_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ and $\{d_n\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ with relations implicitly encoded in (17) and (11).

effective tadpoles and which renormalize to zero in a kinematic renormalization scheme. In a kinematic renormalization scheme the subtraction of amplitudes evaluated at different energy scales automatically removes tadpole contributions which, by definition, are independent of the external momenta and thus cancel out in the subtraction.

Partial results on the 4-point massive amplitude hint to the fact that this pattern is likely to extend to generic n-point functions.

Summarizing, we can end this short first paper with a conjecture:

In a kinematic renormalization scheme, massless and massive scalar free field theories are diffeomorphism invariant.

Our results clearly show that a kinematic renormalization scheme is necessary and, in the case of diffeomorphisms of a single scalar field, also sufficient.

For the case of several scalar fields, when Feynman rules involve non-trivial scalar products in the numerator, we expect that one can come to the same conclusion from the fact that amplitudes, when summed over all channels, must still be symmetric functions of angles $q_i.q_j, i \neq j$. On shell, with $q_i.q_i = 0$, such symmetric functions should vanish.

A detailed analysis also including spin must be left to future work. Also, future studies will have to focus on an all order proof of the tree-level recursion and an explicit proof that the non cut-reconstructible amplitudes vanish in kinematic renormalization schemes, as reported here for low orders (in the massive case).

References

1. Bern, Z.: Perturbative quantum gravity and its relation to Gauge theory. Living Rev. Relativ. **5**, 5 (2002, cited on 03/01/12). http://www.livingreviews.org/lrr-2002-5
2. Nakai, S.: Point transformation and its application. Prog. Theor. Phys. **13**, 380 (1955)
3. Chisholm, J.S.R.: Change of variables in quantum field theories. Nucl. Phys. **26**, 469–479 (1961)
4. Kamefuchi, S., O'Raifeartaigh, L., Salam, A.: Change of variables and equivalence theorems in quantum field theories. Nucl. Phys. **28**, 529–549 (1961)
5. Salam, A., Strathdee, J.: Equivalent formulations of massive vector field theories. Phys. Rev. D **2**, 2869 (1970)
6. Keck, B.W., Taylor, J.G.: On the equivalence theorem for S-matrix elements. J. Phys. A Gen. Phys. **4**, 291 (1971)
7. Suzuki, T., Hattori, C.: Relativistically covariant formulation in non-linear Lagrangian theories and factor ordering problems. Prog. Theor. Phys. **47**, 1722 (1972)
8. Suzuki, T., Hirshfeld, A.C., Leschke, H.: The role of operator ordering in quantum field theory. Prog. Theor. Phys. **63**, 287 (1980)
9. Weinberg, S.: The Quantum Theory of Fields, vol. 1, Chap. 7.7. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge (1995)
10. de Castro, A.S.: Point transformations are canonical transformations. Eur. J. Phys. **20**, L11 (1999)
11. Apfeldorf, K.M., Camblong, H.E., Ordóñez, C.R.: Field redefinition invariance in quantum field theory. Mod. Phys. Lett. A **16**, 103 (2001)

12. Weinberg, S.: Quantum contributions to cosmological correlations. Phys. Rev. D **72**, 043514 (2005)
13. Kreimer, D.: The core Hopf algebra. In: Proceedings for Alain Connes' 60th birthday, in "Quanta of Maths". Clay Mathematics Proceedings, vol. 11 (2011), pp. 313–322 (2009)
14. Kreimer, D., van Suijlekom, W.D.: Recursive relations in the core Hopf algebra. Nucl. Phys. B **820**, 682 (2009)
15. Kreimer, D.: Not so non-renormalizable gravity. In: Fauser, B., Tolksdorf, J., Zeidlers, E. (eds.) Published in Quantum Field Theory: Competitive Models. Birkhauser (2009). Also in Leipzig 2007, Quantum field theory, pp. 155–162 (2008)
16. Cachazo, F., Mason, L., Skinner, D.: Gravity in Twistor Space and its Grassmannian Formulation. arXiv:1207.4712 (2012)
17. Kreimer, D.: Anatomy of a gauge theory. Ann. Phys. **321**, 2757 (2006)
18. Britto, R., Cachazo, F., Feng, B.: New Recursion Relations for Tree Amplitudes of Gluons. Nucl. Phys. B **715**, 499 (2005)
19. Britto, R., Cachazo, F., Feng, B., Witten, E.: Direct proof of tree-level recursion relation in Yang–Mills theory. Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 181602 (2005)
20. Brown, F., Kreimer, D.: Angles, Scales and Parametric Renormalization. arXiv: 1112.1180 (2011)
21. Kreimer, D.: A remark on quantum gravity. Ann. Phys. **323**, 49 (2008)
22. Cutkosky, R.E.: Singularities and discontinuities of Feynman amplitudes. J. Math. Phys. **1**, 429 (1960)