ANNALES DE L'I. H. P., SECTION A

B. DUCOMET

Logarithmic asymptotic behaviour of the renormalized G-convolution product in four-dimensional euclidean space

Annales de l'I. H. P., section A, tome 41, nº 1 (1984), p. 1-24
<http://www.numdam.org/item?id=AIHPA_1984__41_1_1_0>

© Gauthier-Villars, 1984, tous droits réservés.

L'accès aux archives de la revue « Annales de l'I. H. P., section A » implique l'accord avec les conditions générales d'utilisation (http://www.numdam.org/conditions). Toute utilisation commerciale ou impression systématique est constitutive d'une infraction pénale. Toute copie ou impression de ce fichier doit contenir la présente mention de copyright.

NUMDAM
Article numérisé dans le cadre du programme
Numérisation de documents anciens mathématiques
http://www.numdam.org/

Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré,
Vol. 41, n° 1, 1984, p. 1-24. *Physique théorique*

Logarithmic asymptotic behaviour of the renormalized G-convolution product in four-dimensional Euclidean space

by

B. DUCOMET
Service de Physique Neutronique et Nucléaire,
Centre d'Études de Bruyères-le-Châtel, B. P. n° 561,
92542 Montrouge Cedex, France

ABSTRACT. — We give an asymptotic logarithmic behaviour in r-dimensional Euclidean momentum space of the renormalized G-convolution product H_G^{ren} associated with a general graph G. This study is an extension of previous result which contained only the power law asymptotic behaviour with respect to external momenta.

RÉSUMÉ. — On obtient un comportement asymptotique logarithmique dans l'espace Euclidien à r dimensions des impulsions pour le produit de G-convolution renormalisé H_G^{ren} associé à un graphe général G. Cette étude est une extension de résultats précédents qui contenaient seulement le comportement asymptotique en puissances des impulsions externes.

INTRODUCTION

In [*1*] [*2*], Weinberg functional classes have been introduced to prove convergence of the (Euclidean) renormalized G-convolution product H_G^{ren} associated with a general graph G. In [*3*], an asymptotic behaviour of H_G^{ren} in momentum space has been proved in terms of external r-momenta.

84/01/1/24/$ 4,40 © Gauthier-Villars

In view of the procedure used in [3], it appeared clearly that a more accurate asymptotic estimate including logarithmic behaviour could be easily derived in an analogous way. Moreover, some recent studies of equations of motion concerning Φ_4^4-coupling models ([4]) require this logarithmic increase.

The aim of this paper is then to give a precise logarithmic asymptotic behaviour of the Euclidean renormalized G-convolution product H_G^{ren} in r (and in particular in 4)-dimensions, using the general notion of Weinberg class given in [5], and so produce an extension of the results of [3].

We just mention a work by Fink [6], giving some logarithmic estimates for particular self-energy graphs.

After a brief recall of the main properties of Weinberg's functional class and of the integrability criterium, including logarithmic behaviour, we define the class of symbols $\Sigma^{\mu,\nu}$ (resp. the admissible Weinberg's class $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha,\beta,\sigma,\omega}$) which is a straightforward extension of Σ^{μ} (resp. of $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha,\sigma,\omega}$) introduced in [1], the index ν (resp. β) denoting the logarithmic contribution.

Then we consider a graph G, and we associate to each vertex v with n_v incoming lines (resp. to each line i) of G, a general n_v-point function (resp. a two-point function) H^{n_v} (resp. $H_i^{(2)}$). We use the recursive definition of the euclidean renormalized integrand R_G defined in [1] to prove that R_G belongs to a definite Weinberg class as soon as H^{n_v} and $H_i^{(2)}$ belong to suitable symbol class Σ^{μ_v,ν_v}, Σ^{μ_i,ν_i}. Therefore, a direct use of an analog of Weinberg's theorem gives us the requested asymptotic behaviour of the corresponding renormalized G-convolution product H_G^{ren}.

For conciseness, we have omitted the proof of a technical result (see lemma 2.4, infra), which will appear elsewhere [7].

1. PRELIMINARY RESULTS

1.1. Statement of Weinberg's theorem [5].

1.1.1. *Weinberg's functional classes.*

Let $f : E = \mathbb{R}^n \to \mathbb{C} \cdot f$ is said to be an element of $A_n^{\alpha,\beta}$ if and only if, for each subspace $S \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, there exists two coefficients $\alpha(S)$ and $\beta(S)$ such that, for any choice of $m \leqslant n$ independant vectors $L_1, L_2, \ldots L_m$, and any bounded region $W \subset \mathbb{R}^n$, we have:

$$f(L_1\eta_1\eta_2 \ldots y_m + L_2\eta_2 \ldots \eta_m + \ldots + L_m y_m + C) \\ = O(\eta_1^{\alpha\{L_1\}} (\operatorname{Log} \eta_1)^{\beta\{L_1\}} \ldots \eta_m^{\alpha\{L_1,\ldots,L_m\}} (\operatorname{Log} \eta_m)^{\beta\{L_1,\ldots,L_m\}})$$

when $\eta_k \to \infty$, $C \in W$.

That is to say, if there exists a set of numbers $b_1, \ldots, b_m \geqslant 1$, and a constant $M > 0$ (depending on $L_1, \ldots, L_m$ and W) such that:

$$\left| f\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} L_j \eta_j \ldots \eta_m + C\right)\right| \leq M \prod_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j^{\alpha(\overline{\{L_1,\ldots,L_j\}})} (\operatorname{Log} \eta_j)^{\beta(\overline{\{L_1,\ldots,L_j\}})} \quad (1.1)$$

when the real variables $\eta_j (j = 1, \ldots, m)$ belong to the region $\{ \eta_j \geq b_j \}$; in (1.1) $\{ \overline{L_1, \ldots, L_j} \}$ denotes the linear closure of the set $\{ L_1, \ldots, L_j \}$.

The functions α and β are assumed to be bounded real-valued function on the set of the linear subspaces of E, and are called asymptotic indicatrices of $A_n^{\alpha,\beta}$.

We then can obtain by the above definitions, the following:

PROPOSITION 1.1.

a) $A_n^{\alpha,\beta}$ is a vector space on $\mathbb{R}$ or $\mathbb{C}$.

b) if $f_1 \in A_n^{\alpha_1,\beta_1}$, $f_2 \in A_n^{\alpha_2,\beta_2}$, then $f_1 f_2 \in A_n^{\alpha_1+\alpha_2,\beta_1+\beta_2}$

c) if $\alpha < \alpha'$, $A_n^{\alpha,\beta} \subset A_n^{\alpha',\beta'}$, $\forall \beta, \beta'$

if $\alpha = \alpha'$ and $\beta < \beta'$: $A_n^{\alpha,\beta} \subset A_n^{\alpha',\beta'}$

N. B. — In the following, A_n^{α} denotes the class $A_n^{\alpha,0}$.

1.1.2. *Weinberg's integrability criterium (case* $\beta = 0$*).*

Let I be a subspace of $\mathbb{R}^n$ spanned by $L'_1, \ldots, L'_k$, and consider the integral:

$$\begin{aligned} f_I(P) &= \int_{\mathbb{R}^k} dy_1 \ldots dy_k f(P + L'_1 y_1 + \ldots + L'_k y_k) \\ &= \int_I f(P + P') d^k P' \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

THEOREM 1.1. — *Suppose that* $f \in A_m^{\alpha} \cap L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ (1),

let: $$D_I = \max_{S' \subset I} \{ \alpha(S') + \dim S' \}$$

If $D_I < 0$, *then*:

i) $f_I(P)$ *exists*

ii) $f_I(P) \in A_{n-k}^{\alpha_I}$, *with asymptotic coefficient* $\alpha_I(S)$ *for* $S \subset E$ (*where* $R^n = E \oplus I$) *given by*:

$$\alpha_I(S) = \max_{\Lambda(I)S' = S} \{ \alpha(S') + \dim S' - \dim S \} \quad (1.3)$$

where $\Lambda(I)$ *is the projection along* I *and the* max *is taken on all subspaces* S′ *which project on* S (*cf.* [5]).

(1) $L^1_{loc}(\mathbb{R}^n)$denotes the usual lebesgue space of locally integrable classes of functions in $\mathbb{R}^n$.

We note that the logarithmic behaviour has no influence on the convergence criterium, it is therefore requested for the asymptotic behaviour.

1.2. Logarithmic behaviour.

We consider: $f: \mathscr{E}^{N}_{(K,k)} = \mathscr{E}^{n}_{(K)} \times E^{m}_{(k)} \to \mathbb{C}$.

We suppose that f belongs to the Weinberg class $A^{\alpha,\beta}_{N}$ on $\mathscr{E}^{N}_{(K,k)}$, and we use the notations:

— χ is the canonical projection of $\mathscr{E}^{N}_{(K,k)}$ on $\mathscr{E}^{n}_{(K)}$

— $\mathscr{M} = \{ S' \subset \mathscr{E}^{N}_{(K',k)} : \quad \chi(S') = S, \quad \dim S' = \dim S \}$

— $\mathscr{M}' = \{ S' \subset \mathscr{E}^{N}_{(K,k)} : \quad \chi(S') = S, \quad \dim S' \neq \dim S \}$

— $\alpha_{\mathscr{M}}(S) = \max_{S' \in \mathscr{M}} \alpha(S')$; $\quad \beta_{\mathscr{M}}(S) = \max_{S' \in \mathscr{M}} \beta(S')$, and same notations for $\alpha_{\mathscr{M}'}(S)$ and $\beta_{\mathscr{M}'}(S)$.

Then we have:

THEOREM 1.2. — *Suppose that* $f \in A^{\alpha,\beta}_{N}$ *and* $\max_{S \subset E^{m}_{(k)}} (\alpha(S) + \dim S) < 0$. *Then*

— *the integral* $f_I(K) = \int_{E^{rm}_{(k)}} f(K, k) \cdot d^{rm}k$ *converges absolutely.*

— $f_I \in A^{\alpha_I,\beta_I}_{n}$, *with the coefficients*: $\forall S \subset \mathscr{E}^{n}_{(K)}$:

$$\alpha_I(S) = \max_{\chi(S')=S} (\alpha(S') + \dim S' - \dim S)$$

$$\beta_I(S) = \begin{cases} \beta_{\mathscr{M}}(S) & \text{if} \quad \alpha_I(S) = \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}}(S); \qquad \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}}(S) \neq \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}'}(S) \\ \beta_{\mathscr{M}'}(S) & \text{if} \quad \alpha_I(S) = \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}'}(S); \qquad \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}}(S) \neq \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}'}(S) \\ 1 + \beta_{\mathscr{M}}(S) + \beta_{\mathscr{M}'}(S) & \text{if} \qquad \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}}(S) = \alpha_{I,\mathscr{M}'}(S) \end{cases}$$

Proof.— A direct derivation of Weinberg's estimate in [*5*].

2. SOME NEW FUNCTIONAL CLASSES

2.1. The classes Σ^{μ_p,μ_l}_{n}.

In order to take full account of a logarithmic behaviour, we need to slightly modify the class of symbols Σ^{μ}_{n} introduced in [*3*]. We define then:

DÉFINITION 2.1. — Let μ_p, μ_l arbitrary real numbers. A function f on the vector space $(\mathscr{E}_n, \| \cdot \|)$ is said to belong to the class Σ^{μ_p,μ_l}_{n} if it belongs to $C^{\infty}(\mathscr{E}_n)$ and if, for every $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$ and every homogeneous polynomial $P_\nu(D)$, there is a constant C_{ν,μ_p,μ_l} such that:

$$| P_\nu(D) f(K) | \leq C_{\nu,\mu_p,\mu_l} ||| P_\nu ||| \cdot (1 + \| K \|)^{\mu_p - \nu} (\mathrm{Log}(1 + \| K \|))^{\mu_l - \nu_l} \quad (2.1)$$

where $|||\cdot|||$ is a certain norm of P_ν in $\mathscr{E}_n^{\overset{\otimes}{s}\nu}$ (2), and ν_l is *one* if $\mu_p \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\nu > \mu_p$, *zero* otherwise.

We have then the following connection between $\Sigma_n^{\mu_p,\mu_l}$, and the Weinberg classes :

Let E_N denote a N-dimensional vector space and $\underline{\lambda}$ a linear mapping from E_N to $\mathscr{E}_n$, We have:

LEMMA 2.1. — *For every function f on $\mathscr{E}_n$ which belongs to $\Sigma_n^{\mu_p,\mu_l}$ the inverse image $\underline{\lambda}^* f$ belongs to the Weinberg-class $A_N^{\alpha^\mu,\beta^\mu}$ on E_N, the asymptotic indicatrices of which are given by:*

$$\begin{cases} \alpha^\mu(S) = 0 & \text{if} \quad S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \underline{\lambda} \\ \alpha^\mu(S) = \mu_p & \text{if} \quad S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \underline{\lambda} \end{cases} \tag{2.2}$$

$$\begin{cases} \beta^\mu(S) = 0 & \text{if} \quad S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \underline{\lambda} \\ \beta^\mu(S) = \mu_l & \text{if} \quad S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \underline{\lambda} \end{cases} \tag{2.3}$$

Moreover, for every integer $\nu > 0$, and every homogeneous polynomial $Q_\nu(D)$ of degree ν on E_N, the function $Q_\nu(D)\underline{\lambda}^* f$ belongs to $A_N^{\alpha',\beta'}$ with:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha' = \alpha^\mu - \nu \\ \beta' = \beta^\mu - \lambda(\alpha^\mu, \beta^\mu, \nu) \end{cases} \tag{2.4}$$

where λ is an integer function defined by:

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda(\alpha, \beta, \nu) = 1 \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha \in \mathbb{N}, \quad \beta \neq 0, \quad \nu \geqslant \alpha + 1 \\ &\lambda(\alpha, \beta, \nu) = 0 \quad \text{otherwise}. \end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

Remark. — In the following, and when there is no ambiguity, we write λ_ν instead of $\lambda(\alpha, \beta, \nu)$.

Proof. — Let $(L_1, \ldots, L_m)$ an arbitrary set of independant vectors ($m \leqslant N$) and W a bounded region in E.

Let $J \leq m$ the integer such that:

$$\forall j \leqslant J \qquad \underline{\lambda}(L_j) = \{0\}$$
$$\underline{\lambda}(L_{J+1}) \neq \{0\}$$

If $J = m$

$$\left| (\underline{\lambda}^* f)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} L_j \eta_j \ldots \eta_m + C\right)\right| = |f(\underline{\lambda}(C))| \leqslant M$$

with $M = \sup_{C \in W} |f(\underline{\lambda}(C))|$.

---

(2) $\mathscr{E}_n^{\overset{\otimes}{s}\nu}$ is the νth symmetrized tensor product of $\mathscr{E}_n$.

If $J < m$

$$\left|(\underline{\lambda}*f)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} L_j\eta_j \ldots \eta_m + C\right)\right| = \left|f\left(\sum_{j=J+1}^{m} \underline{\lambda}(L_j)\eta_j \ldots \eta_m + C\right)\right|.$$

Then, with the assumption: $\forall j \leqslant m$, $\eta_j \geqslant 1$, $C \in W$, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \| K \| &= \left\| \sum_{J+1}^{m} \underline{\lambda}(L_j)\eta_j \ldots \eta_m + \underline{\lambda}(C) \right\| \\ &\leqslant \left(\sum_{J+1}^{m} \| \underline{\lambda}(L_j) \| + \sup_{W} \| \underline{\lambda}(C) \| \right) \prod_{J+1}^{m} \eta_j \end{aligned}$$

so :

$$(1 + \| K \|)^{\mu_P} \leqslant M \prod_{j=1}^{m} \eta_j^{\alpha\mu\{\overline{L_1,\ldots,L_j}\}}$$

with α^μ given by 2.2, and the notation:

$$M = C_0\left(1 + \sum_{J+1}^{m} \| \lambda(L_j) \| + \sup_{W} | \lambda(C) |\right)$$

For the log part, we have:

$$\begin{aligned} \operatorname{Log}(1 + \| K \|) &\leqslant \operatorname{Log}\left(M \prod_{J+1}^{m} \eta_j\right) \\ &\leqslant C \prod_{J+1}^{m} \operatorname{Log} \eta_j \end{aligned}$$

with suitable constant $C > 0$. Then:

$$\operatorname{Log}(1 + \| K \|)^{\mu_l} \leqslant C \prod_{j=1}^{m} (\operatorname{Log} \eta_j)^{\beta\mu\{\overline{L_1,\ldots,L_j}\}}$$

with β^μ given by 2.3.

The second part of the lemma is easily derived if we take $P_\nu(D)f$ instead of f in the preceding arguments, if we notice that:

$$\begin{aligned} D(x^\alpha (\operatorname{Log} x)^\beta) &\in A^{\alpha-1,\beta} \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha \neq 0 \\ &\in A^{\alpha-1,\beta-1} \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha = 0 \end{aligned}$$

2.2. The Weinberg admissible classes.

In the following, we consider the vector space:

$$\mathscr{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)} = \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)} \times \mathscr{E}^{r(n-1)}_{(\mathrm{K})}$$

and the canonical projectors χ (resp. π) of $\mathscr{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)}$ on $\mathscr{E}^{r(n-1)}_{(\mathrm{K})}$ (resp. $\mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)}$).

We are going to extend the definition of admissibility given in [3].

We denote by $t^{d}_{(\mathrm{K})}f$ the Taylor expansion of degree d of f with respect to K at $\mathrm{K} = 0$.

DÉFINITION 2.2. — A couple of sets of subspaces (σ, ω), with $\sigma \subset \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)}$ and $\omega \in \mathscr{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)}$ is called « admissible » if it satisfies the following properties:

a) $$\sigma \subset \omega$$

b) $$\forall \mathrm{S} \subset \omega, \qquad \pi(\mathrm{S}) \in \sigma$$

c) $$\mathrm{S} \in \omega \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{S}' \supset \mathrm{S} \quad \text{imply} \quad \mathrm{S}' \subset \omega$$

d) $$\{0\} \notin \sigma, \qquad \{0\} \notin \omega.$$

Let α, β asymptotic indicatrices on $\mathscr{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)}$ such that for every subspace $\mathrm{S} \in \omega$ one has:

$$\alpha(\mathrm{S}) = \alpha(\pi(\mathrm{S}))$$
$$\beta(\mathrm{S}) = \beta(\pi(\mathrm{S}))$$

We associate with α, β, σ, ω a class $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha,\beta,\sigma,\omega}_{r\mathrm{N}}$ of admissible Weinberg functions $f(\mathrm{K}, k)$ by the conditions:

i) $$f \in \mathrm{A}^{\alpha,\beta}_{r\mathrm{N}}$$

ii) For every homogeneous derivative polynomial P_ν, $\mathrm{P}_\nu(\mathrm{D}_\mathrm{K})f$ belongs to the class $\mathrm{A}^{\alpha_\nu,\beta_\nu}_{r\mathrm{N}}$ defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\forall \mathrm{S} \in \omega \qquad \alpha_\nu(\pi(\mathrm{S})) = \alpha_\nu(\mathrm{S}) = \alpha(\mathrm{S}) - \nu \\
&\forall \mathrm{S} \notin \omega \qquad \alpha_\nu(\mathrm{S}) \quad = \alpha(\mathrm{S}) \\
&\forall \mathrm{S} \in \omega \qquad \beta_\nu(\pi(\mathrm{S})) = \beta_\nu(\mathrm{S}) = \beta(\mathrm{S}) - \lambda_\nu \\
&\forall \mathrm{S} \notin \omega \qquad \beta_\nu(\mathrm{S}) \quad = \beta(\mathrm{S})
\end{aligned}$$

LEMMA 2.2. — *Let (σ, ω) be an admissible couple in $\mathscr{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)}$; let $f(\mathrm{K}, k)$ an admissible Weinberg function in $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha,\beta,\sigma,\omega}_{r\mathrm{N}}$ and let $h(\mathrm{K}, k) = t^{d}_{(\mathrm{K})}f(\mathrm{K}, k)$. Then for every admissible couple (σ', ω') in $\mathscr{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)}$ such that $\sigma' \supset \sigma$, there exists a class $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha',\beta',\sigma',\omega'}_{r\mathrm{N}}$ which contains h and which satisfies the following properties:*

i) $$\forall \mathrm{S} \subset \mathscr{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)}$$

a) $$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha'(\mathrm{S}) = \alpha(\pi(\mathrm{S})) && \textit{if} \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}) \in \sigma \\
&\beta'(\mathrm{S}) = \beta(\pi(\mathrm{S})) - \lambda_d && \textit{if} \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}) \in \sigma
\end{aligned}$$

b) $$\begin{aligned}
&\alpha'(\mathrm{S}) = \alpha(\pi(\mathrm{S})) + d && \textit{if} \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}) \notin \sigma \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}) \in \sigma' \\
&\beta'(\mathrm{S}) = \beta(\pi(\mathrm{S})) && \textit{if} \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}) \in \sigma \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}) \in \sigma'
\end{aligned}$$

ii) $$\forall S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)} \quad \textit{with} \quad S \notin \sigma'$$
$$\alpha'(S) = \alpha(S)$$
$$\beta'(S) = \beta(S)$$

Proof. — See [*1*] for the power asymptotic indicatrix. The β' behaviour is easily derived from the lemma 2.1:

We show only the situation for $\pi(S) \notin \sigma$.

We have:

$$h(K, k) = \sum_{0 \leq |\nu| \leq d} \frac{K^\nu}{\nu!} D^\nu_K f(0, k)$$

where ν is a multi-index.

We find that:

for $D^\nu_K f(0, k)$, the logarithmic indicatrix is:

$$\beta_{|\nu|}(S) = \beta(S) - \lambda_{|\nu|} \quad \text{if} \quad S \in \sigma$$
$$\beta_{|\nu|}(S) = \beta(S) \quad \text{if} \quad S \notin \sigma$$

So, for every admissible couple (σ', ω') in $\mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$, $(\sigma' \supset \sigma)$ the function $\pi^*(D^\nu_K f|_{K=0})(K, k) = D^\nu_K f(0, k)$ belongs to $\mathscr{A}^{\hat{\alpha}_\nu, \hat{\beta}_\nu, \sigma', \omega'}$ with:

$$\hat{\beta}_\nu(S) = \beta(\pi(S)) - \lambda_{|\nu|} \quad \text{if} \quad \pi(S) \in \sigma$$
$$\hat{\beta}_\nu(S) = \beta(\pi(S)) \quad \text{if} \quad \pi(S) \notin \sigma$$

Then, in each case:

$$\hat{\beta}_\nu(S) \leq \beta(\pi(S)) - \lambda_d$$
$$\hat{\beta}_\nu(S) = \beta(\pi(S))$$

So, the β' behaviour is that described in *i*), *a*), *b*).

We have also the following result (analogous to lemma 2.2 of [*3*]):

LEMMA 2.3. — *Let $f(K, k)$ an admissible Weinberg function in $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha,\beta,\sigma,\omega}_{rN}$ and $g(K, k)$ the Taylor rest of order d of f: $g = (1 - t^d_{(K)})f$.*

Then for every admissible couple (σ', ω') in $\mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$ with $\sigma' \subset \sigma$, $\omega' \subset \omega$ there exists a class $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha',\beta',\sigma',\omega'}_{rN}$ which contains g and satisfies the following properties:

a) $\forall S \in \omega'$:
$$\alpha'(S) = \alpha'(\pi(S)) = \alpha(S)$$
$$\beta'(S) = \beta'(\pi(S)) = \beta(S)$$

b) $\forall S \notin \omega'$, $S \in \omega$, $S \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$:
$$\alpha'(S) = \alpha(S)$$
$$\beta'(S) = \beta(S)$$

c) $\forall S \notin \omega$, $S \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $\pi(S) \in \sigma$:

$$\alpha'(S) = \sup(\alpha(S), \alpha(\pi(S)))$$
$$\beta'(S) = \sup(\beta(S), \beta(\pi(S)))$$

d) $\forall S \notin \omega$, $S \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $\pi(S) \notin \sigma$:

$$\alpha'(S) = \sup(\alpha(S), \alpha(\pi(S)) + d)$$
$$\beta'(S) = \sup(\beta(S), \beta(\pi(S)))$$

e) $\forall S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S \in \sigma$, $S \notin \sigma'$:

$$\alpha'(S) = \alpha(S) - d - 1$$
$$\beta'(S) = \beta(S) - \lambda_{d+1}$$

f) $\forall S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S \notin \sigma$:

$$\alpha'(S) = \alpha(S)$$
$$\beta'(S) = \beta(S)$$

The proof is a direct application of lemma A.2 for the logarithmic behaviour, and is given in [*3*] for the power-law asymptotic behaviour.

We have then the following lemma giving the « graded » behaviour for Taylor rests of Weinberg function, which is a direct consequence of lemma 2.3 and of a technical result given in [*7*].

LEMMA 2.4. — *Let $f(K, k)$ an admissible Weinberg function belonging to $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha,\beta,\sigma,\omega}$ and let $g(K, k)$ be the Taylor rest of order d of f: $g = (1 - t^d_{(K)})f$. Then $\forall n \geqslant 0$, there exists a class $A^{\alpha_n;\beta_n}_{rN}$ of Weinberg functions which contains every derivative of order n of g, and satisfying the following properties, $\forall S \in \mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$:*

a) If $S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$ and $S \in \omega$:

$$\begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}(S) = \alpha(S) - n \\ \underline{\beta}_n(S) = \beta(S) - \lambda_n \end{cases}$$

b) If $S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$ and $S \in \sigma$:

$$\begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}_n(S) = \alpha(S) - \sup(n, d+1) \\ \underline{\beta}_n(S) = \beta(S) - \sup(\lambda_n, \lambda_{d+1}) \end{cases}$$

c) If $S \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$ and $S \notin \omega$, $\pi(S) \in \sigma$:

$$n \leqslant d: \begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}_n(S) = \sup\{\alpha(S), \alpha(\pi(S)) - n\} \\ \underline{\beta}_n(S) = \sup\{\beta(S), \beta(\pi(S)) - \lambda_n\} \end{cases}$$
$$n > d: \begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}_n(S) = \alpha(S) \\ \underline{\beta}_n(S) = \beta(S) \end{cases}$$

d) If $S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$ *and* $S \notin \omega$, $\pi(S) \notin \sigma$:

$$n \leqslant d: \begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}_n(S) = \sup \{ \alpha(S), \alpha(\pi(S)) + d - n \} \\ \underline{\beta}_n(S) = \sup \{ \beta(S), \beta(\pi(S)) - \lambda_n \} \end{cases}$$

$$n > d: \begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}_n(S) = \alpha(S) \\ \underline{\beta}_n(S) = \beta(S) \end{cases}$$

e) If $S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$ *and* $S \notin \sigma$:

$$\begin{cases} \underline{\alpha}_n(S) = \alpha(S) \\ \underline{\beta}_n(S) = \beta(S) \end{cases}$$

3. ASYMPTOTIC BEHAVIOUR OF THE RENORMALIZED G-CONVOLUTION PRODUCT

We consider a general connected graph G with n external lines and m independant loops. We follow then the definition 2.*b* of [*3*]: with each vertex $v \in \mathcal{N}$ (resp. line $i \in \mathcal{L}$) we associate a completely amputated n_v(point (resp. 2 point) function $H^{n_v}(K^v)$ (resp. $H^{(2)}(l_i)$) on the space $\mathbb{C}^{r(n_v-1)}$ (resp. $\mathbb{C}^r$) of the set

$$K^v = \left\{ K^v_a \subset \mathbb{R}^{r-1} + i\mathbb{R}, \qquad 1 \leqslant a \leqslant n_v, \qquad \sum_a K^v_a = 0 \right\}$$

(resp. of $l_i \in \mathbb{R}^{r-1} + i\mathbb{R}$) of the momenta associated with the vertex (resp. the momentum associated with the line i).

We assume the analogous of hypothesis H.1 of [*3*], with the following modification:

Hypothesis H.1 *bis*

$$\begin{matrix} H^{n_v}(K^v) \in \Sigma^{\mu_v, \mu^l_v}_{r(n_v-1)} \\ H^{(2)}(l_i) \in \Sigma^{\mu^p_i, \mu^l_i}_r \end{matrix} ; \qquad \mu^p_v, \mu^l_v, \mu^p_i, \mu^l_i \text{ integers}.$$

We have then, following the definitions 2.4, 2.5 of [*1*]:

LEMMA 3.1. — *The non-renormalized integrand associated with* G, *defined by*:

$$I_G(K, k) = \prod_{v \in \mathcal{N}} H^{n_v}(K^v(K, k)) \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathcal{L}} H^{(2)}(l_i(K, k)) \tag{3.1}$$

belongs to a class of admissible Weinberg functions $\mathcal{A}^{\alpha_G, \beta_G, \sigma_G, \omega_G}_{rN}$ *with the properties:*

$$\sigma_G = \{ S \in E^{rm}_{(k)} : \quad S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{L} \} \tag{3.2}$$

$$\omega_G = \{ S \in \mathcal{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)} : S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i, \forall i \in \mathcal{L} ; \pi(S) \in \sigma_G \} \tag{3.3}$$

$\forall S \in \mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$;

$$\alpha_G = \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N} \\ S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v^p + \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L} \\ S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i}} \mu_i^p \tag{3.4}$$

$$\beta_G = \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N} \\ S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v^l + \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L} \\ S \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i}} \mu_i^l \tag{3.5}$$

Proof. — A simple derivation of lemma 2.2 of [*1*] for power-law asymptotic behaviour and a strictly analogous argument for the logarithmic one, give the proof.

Following definition 2.*c* of [*3*], we have an analogous result for reduced subgraphs:

We consider subgraphs and forests U(G) of G. For every subgraph $\gamma \subset G$ with n_γ external lines and $m(\gamma)$ independent loops and given a forest U, we consider the functions I_γ (resp. $I_{\bar\gamma(U)}$) defined on $\mathscr{E}^{rN_\gamma}_{(K^\gamma,k)} = \mathscr{E}^{r(n_\gamma - 1)}_{(K^\gamma)} \times \mathscr{E}^{rm(\gamma)}_{(k)}$ with $N_\gamma = n_\gamma - 1 + m(\gamma)$, of the set of external and internal variables of γ by:

$$I_{\bar\gamma(U)}(K^\gamma, k) = \prod_{v \in \mathscr{N}_{\bar\gamma}} H^{n_v}(K^v(K^\gamma, k)) \cdot \prod_{i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar\gamma}} H_i^{(2)}(l_i(K^\gamma, k))$$

and analogous representation for I_γ.

(We denote by $\mathscr{N}_{\bar\gamma}$ (resp. $\mathscr{L}_{\bar\gamma}$) the set of vertices (resp. internal lines) of the reduced graph.).

LEMMA 3.2. — *$I_{\bar\gamma(U)}(K^\gamma, k)$ belongs to the Weinberg admissible class $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha_{\bar\gamma}, \beta_{\bar\gamma}, \sigma_{\bar\gamma}, \omega_{\bar\gamma}}$ with:*

$$\sigma_{\bar\gamma} = \{ S \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)} : S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i^\gamma, \forall i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar\gamma} \} \tag{3.6}$$

$$\omega_{\bar\gamma} = \{ S_\gamma \subset \mathscr{E}^{rN_\gamma}_{(K^\gamma,k)} : S_\gamma \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i^\gamma, \forall i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar\gamma}, \pi(S_\gamma) \in \sigma_{\bar\gamma} \} \tag{3.7}$$

$\forall S_\gamma \subset \mathscr{E}^{rN_\gamma}_{(K^\gamma,k)}$:

$$\alpha_{\bar\gamma}(S_\gamma) = \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L}_\gamma \\ S_\gamma \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i^\gamma}} \mu_i^p + \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N}_\gamma \\ S_\gamma \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v^p \tag{3.8}$$

$$\beta_{\bar\gamma}(S_\gamma) = \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar\gamma} \\ S_\gamma \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i^\gamma}} \mu_i^l + \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N}_{\bar\gamma} \\ S_\gamma \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v^\gamma}} \mu_v^l \tag{3.9}$$

Proof. — Same arguments reproducing those of lemma 3.1.

DÉFINITION. — *i*) For G and every subgraph $\gamma \subset G$ we define the corresponding dimension $d(G)$ and $d(\gamma)$, $d(\overline{\gamma})$ (resp. $d_l(G)$, $d_l(\gamma)$, $d_l(\overline{\gamma})$), by:

$$\begin{cases} d(G) = \sum_{i \in \mathscr{L}} \mu_i^p + \sum_{v \in \mathscr{N}} \mu_v^p + rm \\ d_l(G) = \sum_{i \in \mathscr{L}} \mu_i^l + \sum_{v \in \mathscr{N}} \mu_v^l \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} d(\gamma) = \sum_{i \in \mathscr{L}_\gamma} \mu_i^p + \sum_{v \in \mathscr{N}_\gamma} \mu_v^p + rm(\gamma) \\ d_l(\gamma) = \sum_{i \in \mathscr{L}_\gamma} \mu_i^l + \sum_{v \in \mathscr{N}_\gamma} \mu_v^l \end{cases}$$

$$\begin{cases} d(\overline{\gamma}) = \sum_{i \in \mathscr{L}_{\overline{\gamma}}} \mu_i^p + \sum_{v \in \mathscr{N}_{\overline{\gamma}}} \mu_v^p + rm(\overline{\gamma}) \\ d_l(\overline{\gamma}) = \sum_{i \in \mathscr{L}_{\overline{\gamma}}} \mu_i^l + \sum_{v \in \mathscr{N}_{\overline{\gamma}}} \mu_i^l \end{cases}$$

Remarks. — In the following, we omit the p index in μ^p, when there is no ambiguity.

We have the following identities:

$$d(\gamma) = d(\overline{\gamma}) + \sum_{1 \leqslant a \leqslant c_\gamma} d(\gamma_a)$$

$$d_l(\gamma) = d_l(\overline{\gamma}) + \sum_{1 \leqslant a \leqslant c_\gamma} d_l(\gamma_a)$$

for the reduced graph $\overline{\gamma}$ of γ (relative to a certain forest $U(\gamma)$), the sum holding for all $\gamma_a \in \mathscr{M}_\gamma(U)$ (maximal subgraphs cf. [*1*]).

In the following, we are going to prove (see the notations of th. 1.2):

THEOREM 3.1. — *i*) *The renormalized* G-*convolution product* $H_G^{ren}(K)$ *belongs to a class* $A_{r(n-1)}^{\alpha_H, \beta_H}$ *of Weinberg functions on* $\mathscr{E}_{(K)}^{r(n-1)}$; *the corresponding asymptotic coefficients* α_H, β_H *satisfy*:

α) $\forall S \subset \mathscr{E}_{(K)}^{r(n-1)}$

$$\alpha_H(S) = d(G) + \max_{\chi(S')=S} \left\{ - \sum_{\substack{\mu_i < 0 \\ S' \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i}} \mu_i - \sum_{\substack{\mu_v < 0 \\ S' \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v - \dim \pi(S') + \dim S' - \dim S \right\} \tag{3.10}$$

$$\beta_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{S}) = \begin{cases} \beta_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}') \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{S}) = \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}); \quad \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}) \neq \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}'}(\mathrm{S}) \\ \beta_{\mathcal{M}} \quad (\mathrm{S}) \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{S}) = \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}'}(\mathrm{S}); \quad \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}) \neq \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}'}(\mathrm{S}) \\ 1 + \beta_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}) + \beta_{\mathcal{M}'}(\mathrm{S}) \quad \text{if} \quad \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}}(\mathrm{S}) = \alpha_{\mathrm{H},\mathcal{M}'}(\mathrm{S}) \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

With:

$$\beta(\mathrm{S}') = d_l(\mathrm{G}) - \sum_{\substack{\mu_v^l < 0 \\ \mathrm{S}' \subset \mathrm{Ker}\,\lambda_v}} \mu^l - \sum_{\substack{\mu_i^l < 0 \\ \mathrm{S}' \subset \mathrm{Ker}\,\lambda_i}} \mu_i^l$$

β) *When* $\mu_i > 0$, $\mu_v > 0$; $\forall i \in \mathcal{L}$, $\forall v \in \mathcal{N}$ *then*:

$$\alpha_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{S}) = d(\mathrm{G}) \tag{3.12}$$

$$\beta_{\mathrm{H}}(\mathrm{S}) = 2d_l(\mathrm{G}) + 1 \tag{3.13}$$

DÉFINITIONS. — We consider an arbitrary set of nested spaces $\hat{\mathrm{S}}_j \subset \mathcal{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)}$, $j = 1, \ldots, \mathrm{L}$; $\mathrm{L} \leqslant \mathrm{N}$ (with $\dim \hat{\mathrm{S}}_j = rj$):

$$\hat{\mathcal{F}} = \{ \hat{\mathrm{S}}_j \subset \mathcal{E}^{r\mathrm{N}}_{(\mathrm{K},k)} : \hat{\mathrm{S}}_j \subset \hat{\mathrm{S}}_{j+1}, 1 \leqslant j \leqslant \mathrm{L} \} \tag{3.14}$$

and the corresponding set:

$$\mathcal{F} = \{ \mathrm{S}^{(i)} \subset \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)} : \mathrm{S}^{(i)} = \pi(\hat{\mathrm{S}}), \hat{\mathrm{S}} \in \hat{\mathcal{F}}, 1 \leqslant i \leqslant \tilde{m}, \tilde{m} \leqslant m \} \tag{3.15}$$

We call $\mathcal{M}_\mu(\mathrm{U}) = \{ \mu_a ; 1 \leqslant a \leqslant c_\mu \}$ the set of all subgraphs $\mu_a \in \mathrm{U}(\mu)$ maximal in μ, with respect to the forest U.

We note:

$$\mathrm{W}^j(\mathrm{U}) = \{ \gamma \in \mathrm{U} : \forall i \in \mathcal{L}_{\gamma(\mathrm{U})}, \mathrm{S}_\gamma = \{ \mathrm{K}^\gamma = 0, k \in \mathrm{S}^{(j)} \} \subset \mathrm{Ker}\,\lambda_i^\gamma \} \tag{3.16}$$

$$\mathcal{B}^{\mathcal{F}}(\mathrm{U}) = \{ \gamma \in \mathrm{U} : \exists \mathrm{S}^{(j)} \in \mathcal{F} : \gamma \notin \mathrm{W}^{(j)}(\mathrm{U}) \text{ and } \gamma \in \mathcal{M}_\mu(\mathrm{U}) \text{ for } \mu \in \mathrm{W}^j(\mathrm{U}) \} \tag{3.17}$$

It has been proved in [*3*] that the generalized renormalized integrand $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}(\mathrm{K}, k)$ could be defined as a sum of terms corresponding to the set $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{F})$ of complete forests U w. r. t. $\mathcal{F}$ by the proposition:

PROPOSITION 3.1 [1 *b*]. — *Given any tested set* $\mathcal{F}$, *and the corresponding set of complete forests* $\mathcal{U}(\mathcal{F})$, *we have the following expression for* $\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}(\mathrm{K}, k)$:

$$\mathrm{R}_{\mathrm{G}}(\mathrm{K}, k) = \sum_{\mathrm{U} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{F})} (1 - t^{d(\mathrm{G})}) \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{G}}^{(\mathrm{U})}(\mathrm{K}, k) \tag{3.18}$$

where $\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{G}}^{(\mathrm{U})}$ *and all auxiliary functions* $\{ \mathrm{Y}_\gamma^{(\mathrm{U})} ; \gamma \in \mathrm{U} \}$ *are defined by the recursion formula*:

$$\mathrm{Y}_\gamma^{(\mathrm{U})} = \mathrm{I}_{\gamma(\mathrm{U})} \prod_{\gamma_a \in \mathcal{M}_\gamma(\mathrm{U})} \mathrm{S}_a^* f_a^{(\mathrm{U})} \mathrm{Y}_{\gamma_a}^{(\mathrm{U})} \tag{3.19}$$

with
$$\begin{cases} f_a^{(U)} = (1 - t^{d(\gamma_a)}) & \textit{if} \quad \gamma_a \in \mathscr{B}^{\mathscr{F}}(U) \\ f_a^{(U)} = - t^{d(\gamma_a)} & \textit{if} \quad \gamma_a \notin \mathscr{B}^{\mathscr{F}}(U) \end{cases}$$

DÉFINITIONS 3.1. —

$$\mathscr{B}_\gamma(U) = \{ \mu \in U(\gamma) \cap \mathscr{B}^{\mathscr{F}}(U) : \exists \text{ sequence } \mu_j \text{ of } U(\gamma) \cap \mathscr{B}^{\mathscr{F}}(U) : j = 1, \ldots, r; \mu_{j+1} \supset \mu_j,\ \mu_j \in \mathscr{M}_{j+1}(U),\ \mu_r \in \mathscr{M}_\gamma(U) \} \quad (3.20)$$

$$\hat{\sigma}_\gamma = \{ S \subset E_{(k)}^{rm} : \exists S^{(j)} \in \mathscr{F} \text{ s. t. } \gamma \notin W^j(U) \text{ and } S^{(j)} \subset S \} \quad (3.21)$$

$$\hat{\omega}_\gamma = \left\{ S_\gamma \subset \mathscr{E}_{(K^\gamma, k)}^{rN_\gamma} : S_\gamma \not\subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i^\gamma,\ \forall i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar{\gamma}} U \left(\bigcup_{\mu \in \mathscr{B}_\gamma(U)} \mathscr{L}_{\bar{\mu}} \right);\ \pi(S_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma \right\} \quad (3.22)$$

$$\omega_{\gamma_a}^{(\gamma)} = \begin{cases} \{ S_{\gamma_a} \subset \mathscr{E}_{(K^{\gamma_a}_a, k)}^{rN_{\gamma_a}} ;\ \pi_a(S_{\gamma_a}) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma,\ S_{\gamma_a} \subset \hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a} \} & \text{if } \gamma_a \in \mathscr{B}_\gamma(U) \quad (3.23) \\ \{ S_{\gamma_a} \subset \mathscr{E}_{(K^{\gamma_a}_a, k)}^{rN_{\gamma_a}} : \pi_a(S_{\gamma_a}) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma \} & \text{if } \gamma_a \notin \mathscr{B}_\gamma(U) \quad (3.24) \end{cases}$$

We give then the following notation:

For every $\gamma \subset G$ we denote by $\mathscr{K}_{\bar{\gamma},p}^{(S)}$, $\mathscr{K}_{\bar{\gamma},l}^{(S)}$, the following integers:

$$\mathscr{K}_{\bar{\gamma},p}^{(S)} = - \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N}_{\bar{\gamma}} \\ \{\mu_v^p < 0 ; S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v^\gamma\}}} \mu_v^p - \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar{\gamma}} \\ \{\mu_i^p < 0 ; S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i^\gamma\}}} \mu_i^p \quad (3.25)$$

$$\mathscr{K}_{\bar{\gamma},l}^{(S)} = - \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N}_{\bar{\gamma}} \\ \{\mu_v^l < 0 ; S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v^\gamma\}}} \mu_v^l - \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar{\gamma}} \\ \{\mu_l < 0 ; S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i^\gamma\}}} \mu_i^l \quad (3.26)$$

PROPOSITION 3.2. — *For every* $\gamma \in U(G)$, $U \in \mathscr{U}(\mathscr{F})$, *the corresponding* $Y_\gamma^{(U)}$ *belongs to the class* $\mathscr{A}_{rN}^{\alpha_\gamma, \beta_\gamma, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_\gamma}$ *with the following properties*: *Let* $S \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$. $\forall S_\gamma = s_\gamma^G S$:

i) If $S_\gamma \in \hat{\omega}_\gamma$

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma(S_\gamma) = \alpha_\gamma(\pi(S_\gamma)) \leqslant d(\gamma) + \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\gamma_a \in U(\gamma) \\ \pi(S_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}}} rm(\bar{\gamma}_a) & (3.27) \\ \beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) = \beta_\gamma(\pi(S_\gamma)) \leqslant d_l(\gamma) & (3.28) \end{cases}$$

ii) If $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\omega}_\gamma$, $S_\gamma \subset E_{(k)}^{rm}$

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma(S_\gamma) \leqslant d(\gamma) - \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\gamma_a \in U(\gamma) \\ \pi(S_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}}} rm(\bar{\gamma}_a) + \sum_{\mu \in \mathscr{B}_\gamma(U) \cup \{\gamma\}} \mathscr{K}_{\bar{\mu},p}^{(S)} & (3.29) \\ \beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma) + \displaystyle\sum_{\mu \in \mathscr{B}_\gamma(U) \cup \{\gamma\}} \mathscr{K}_{\bar{\mu},l}^{(S)} & (3.30) \end{cases}$$

iii) If $S_\gamma \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$
— *if* $\exists \gamma_a : S_\gamma \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma(S_\gamma) \leqslant -\sum\limits_{\substack{\gamma_a \in U(\gamma) \\ S_\gamma \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma a}}} rm(\overline{\gamma}_a) - 1 & (3.31) \\ \beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma) - \sum\limits_{\substack{\gamma_a \in U(\gamma) \\ S_\gamma \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma a}}} \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1} & (3.32) \end{cases}$$

— *if* $\forall \gamma_a : S_\gamma \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma(S_\gamma) = 0 & (3.33) \\ \beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) = 0 & (3.34) \end{cases}$$

We show first three auxiliary lemmas, using preceding definitions for $\mathscr{B}_\gamma(U)$, $\hat{\sigma}_\gamma$, $\hat{\omega}_\gamma$, $\omega_\gamma^{(\gamma_a)}$.

LEMMA 3.3. — *The function* $I_{\overline{\gamma}(U)}$ *belongs to the class* $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}, \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_\gamma}$ *which satisfies the properties*:

Let $S \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$; $\forall S_\gamma = s_\gamma^G S$:
If $S_\gamma \in \hat{\omega}_\gamma$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) = \alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}(\pi(S_\gamma)) = d(\overline{\gamma}) - rm(\overline{\gamma}) \\ \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) = \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}(\pi(S_\gamma)) = d_l(\overline{\gamma}) \end{cases} \tag{3.35}$$

If $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\omega}_\gamma$, $S_\gamma \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) \leqslant d(\overline{\gamma}) - rm(\overline{\gamma}) + \mathscr{K}^{(S)}_{\overline{\gamma},p} \\ \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\overline{\gamma}) + \mathscr{K}^{(S)}_{\overline{\gamma},l} \end{cases} \tag{3.36}$$

If $S_\gamma \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) = 0 \\ \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{3.37}$$

Proof. — By lemma 3.2 we know that $I_{\overline{\gamma}(U)} \in \mathscr{A}^{\alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}, \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}, \sigma_{\overline{\gamma}}, \omega_{\overline{\gamma}}}$ defined by (3.6), (3.7), (3.8), (3.9). So by the lemmas (3.10) and (3.11) of [*1*] we can see that $I_{\overline{\gamma}(U)} \in \mathscr{A}^{\alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}, \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_\gamma}$. Moreover, it is easy to verify the following lemma (analogous to lemma 4.1 of [*1*]):

LEMMA 3.4. — $\mathscr{F}$ *and* $U \in \mathscr{U}(\mathscr{F})$ *being given, the function* $I_\gamma(K^\gamma, k)$ *belongs to a class* $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}, \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_\gamma}_{rN_\gamma}$ *of admissible Weinberg functions with the following properties*:

i) For every $S^{(j)} \in \mathscr{F}$ *s. t.* $S^{(j)} \notin \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{\overline{\gamma}}(S^{(j)}) = 0 \\ \beta_{\overline{\gamma}}(S^{(j)}) = 0 \end{cases} \tag{3.38}$$

ii) For every $S^{(j)} \in \mathscr{F}$ *s. t.* $S^{(j)} \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$, *the coefficients corresponding to every* $S_\gamma \in \hat{\omega}_\gamma$ *s. t.* $\pi(S_\gamma) = S^{(j)}$, *satisfy*:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_{\bar{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) = d(\bar{\gamma}) - rm(\bar{\gamma}) \\ \beta_{\bar{\gamma}}(S_\gamma) = d_l(\bar{\gamma}) \end{cases} \tag{3.39}$$

with:

$$d_l(\bar{\gamma}) = \sum_{v \in \mathscr{N}_{\bar{\gamma}}} \mu_v^l + \sum_{i \in \mathscr{L}_{\bar{\gamma}}} \mu_i^l$$

Then, using lemma 3.4 and notations (3.25), (3.26) ends the proof of lemma (3.3).

LEMMA 3.5. — *For every* $\gamma_a \in \mathscr{M}_\gamma(U)$ *with* $\gamma_a \in \mathscr{B}^{\mathscr{F}}(U)$, *the function* $S_a^*(1 - t^{d(\gamma_a)})Y_{\gamma_a}^{(U)}$ *belongs to the class*: $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha_\gamma^{(a)}, \beta_\gamma^{(a)}, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_\gamma}$ *which satisfies the following properties*: *let* $S \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$:

a) if $S_\gamma \in \hat{\omega}_\gamma$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) = \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(\pi(S_\gamma)) \leqslant d(\gamma_a) - \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\mu_a \in U(\gamma_a) \\ \pi(S_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}}} rm(\bar{\mu}_a) & (3.40) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) = \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(\pi(S_\gamma)) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) & (3.41) \end{cases}$$

b) if $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\omega}_\gamma$, $S_\gamma \not\subset E_{(k)}^{rm}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) \leqslant d(\gamma_a) - \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\mu_a \in U(\gamma_a) \\ \pi(S_\gamma) \in \sigma_{\mu_a}}} rm(\bar{\mu}_a) + \sum_{\gamma'_a \in \mathscr{B}_{\gamma_a} \cup \{\gamma_a\}} \mathscr{K}_{\bar{\gamma}'_a, p}^{(S)} & (3.42) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) + \displaystyle\sum_{\gamma'_a \in \mathscr{B}_{\gamma_a} \cup \{\gamma_a\}} \mathscr{K}_{\bar{\gamma}'_a, l}^{(S)} & (3.43) \end{cases}$$

c) If $S_\gamma \subset E_{(k)}^{rm}$, $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) \leqslant - \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\mu_a \in U(\gamma_a) \\ \pi(S_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}}} rm(\bar{\mu}_a) - 1 & (3.44) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) - \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1} & (3.45) \end{cases}$$

or, if $\forall \mu_a \in U(\gamma_a)$, $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) = 0 & (3.46) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(S_\gamma) = 0 & (3.47) \end{cases}$$

Proof. — We suppose that the preceding properties are true for all

$\gamma_a \in \mathscr{M}_\gamma(\mathrm{U})$, then we establish a recursion, in the same manner as for lemma 3.2 in [3]:

Application of lemma 2.3 shows that the function $(1 - t^{d(\gamma_a)})\mathrm{Y}_{\gamma_a}$ belongs to $\mathscr{A}^{\tilde{\alpha}_{\gamma_a}, \tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}, \hat{\sigma}^{(\gamma)}_{\gamma_a}, \hat{\omega}^{(\gamma)}_{\gamma_a}}$. We have:

1) If $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \in \omega^{(\gamma)}_{\gamma_a}$, we obtain, by lemma 2.3 *a*):

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a})) = \beta_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) \tag{3.48}$$

2) *a*) If $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \notin \omega^{(\gamma)}_{\gamma_a}$, $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \in \hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a}$, $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \not\subset \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)}$, lemma 2.3 *b*) yields:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \beta_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) \tag{3.49}$$

b) If $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \notin \omega^{(\gamma)}_{\gamma_a}$, $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \not\subset \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)}$, $\pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$, lemma 2.3 *c*) yields:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \sup\,(\beta_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}), \beta(\pi_a(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}))) \tag{3.50}$$

Then, by (3.49), (3.50) and the recursion hypothesis:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) + \sum_{\gamma'_a \in \{\gamma_a\} \cup \mathscr{B}_\gamma(\mathrm{U})} \mathscr{K}^{(\mathrm{S})}_{\gamma'_a, l} \tag{3.51}$$

c) If $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \notin \hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a}$, $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \not\subset \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)}$, and $\pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$, lemma 2.3 *d*) gives:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \sup\,(\beta_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}), \beta_{\gamma_a}(\pi_a(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a})))$$

Then, we get, in all cases equation (3.51).

3) *a*) If $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \subset \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)}$, $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$, $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \notin \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$, property *e*) of lemma 2.3 yields:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \beta_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) - \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1} \tag{3.52}$$

The couple $\hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$, $\hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a}$ being admissible, we have $\hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a} \subset \hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a}$, we put (3.48) in (3.52) to obtain:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) - \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1} \tag{3.53}$$

b) If $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \subset \mathrm{E}^{rm}_{(k)}$, $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$, property *f*) of lemma 2.3 gives, with (3.47):

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \beta_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) - \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1} \tag{3.54}$$

or
$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = 0, \qquad \text{if} \qquad \forall \mu_a \in \mathrm{U}(\gamma_a), \qquad \mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a} \tag{3.55}$$

We can see then easily that $\mathrm{S}^*_a(1 - t^{d(\gamma_a)})\mathrm{Y}_{\gamma_a} \in \mathscr{A}^{\alpha^{(a)}_\gamma, \beta^{(a)}_\gamma, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_\gamma}$ with:

$$\text{If} \qquad \mathrm{S} \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}, \qquad \forall \mathrm{S}_\gamma = s^{\mathrm{G}}_\gamma \mathrm{S}: \qquad \beta^{(a)}_\gamma(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) = \tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \tag{3.56}$$

with $\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} = \mathrm{S}^\gamma_{\gamma_a}\mathrm{S}_\gamma$.

But we have the property of the $s^{\gamma'}_\gamma$:

$$s^{\mathrm{G}}_{\gamma_a} = s^{\mathrm{G}}_\gamma \circ s^\gamma_{\gamma_a} \tag{3.57}$$

Moreover:
$$\pi_a(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \pi(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \tag{3.58}$$

Then, properties (*a*), (*b*), (*c*) of lemma are obtained from (3.49), (3.51) and (3.54), (3.56).

LEMMA 3.6. — *For every* $\gamma_a \in \mathscr{M}_\gamma(\mathrm{U})$ *with* $\gamma_a \notin \mathscr{B}^{\mathscr{F}}(\mathrm{U})$, *the function* $\mathrm{S}_a^*(-t^{d(\gamma_a)})\mathrm{Y}_{\gamma_a}$ *belongs to the class* $\mathscr{A}_{r\mathrm{N}_\gamma}^{\alpha_\gamma^{(a)},\beta_\gamma^{(a)},\hat{\sigma}_\gamma,\hat{\omega}_\gamma}$ *with the following properties*:

Let $\mathrm{S} \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$, $\forall \mathrm{S}_\gamma = s_\gamma^{\mathrm{G}}\mathrm{S}$:

a) If $\mathrm{S}_\gamma \in \hat{\omega}_\gamma$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) = \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(\pi(\mathrm{S}_\gamma)) \leqslant d(\gamma_a) - \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\mu_a \in \mathrm{U}(\gamma_a) \\ \pi(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}}} rm(\bar{\mu}_a) & (3.59) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) & (3.60) \end{cases}$$

b) If $\mathrm{S}_\gamma \notin \hat{\omega}_\gamma$, $\mathrm{S}_\gamma \not\subset \mathrm{E}_{(k)}^{rm}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \leqslant d(\gamma_a) - \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\mu_a \in \mathrm{U}(\gamma_a) \\ \pi(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}}} rm(\bar{\mu}_a) & (3.61) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) & (3.62) \end{cases}$$

c) If $\mathrm{S}_\gamma \subset \mathrm{E}_{(k)}^{rm}$, $\mathrm{S}_\gamma \notin \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \leqslant - \displaystyle\sum_{\substack{\mu_a \in \mathrm{U}(\gamma_a) \\ \pi(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}}} rm(\bar{\mu}_a) - 1 & (3.63) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) - \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1} & (3.64) \end{cases}$$

or, if $\forall \mu_a \in \mathrm{U}(\gamma_a)$, $\mathrm{S}_j \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) = 0 & (3.65) \\ \beta_\gamma^{(a)}(\mathrm{S}_\gamma) = 0 & (3.66) \end{cases}$$

Proof. — We suppose that $\gamma_a \notin \mathscr{B}^{\mathscr{F}}(\mathrm{U})$. From the recurrence hypothesis, $\mathrm{Y}_{\gamma_a}^{(\mathrm{U})} \in \mathscr{A}^{\alpha_{\gamma_a},\beta_{\gamma_a},\hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a},\hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a}}$ with asymptotic coefficients given by the expression (3.40) to (3.47) with replacement $\gamma \to \gamma_a$, and for $\forall \mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a} = s_{\gamma_a}^{\mathrm{G}}\mathrm{S}$ with $\mathrm{S} \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$. We apply then lemma 2.2 to the function $(-t^{d(\gamma_a)})\mathrm{Y}_{\gamma_a}$. The roles of (σ', ω') (resp. (σ, ω)) are now played by the admissible couples $(\hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a})$ (resp. $(\hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}, \hat{\omega}_{\gamma_a})$) in view of (3.21), (3.22), (3.23), (3.24).

1) Let $\pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$. From properties *i) a) b)* of lemma 2.2, we obtain:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \beta_{\gamma_a}(\pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a})) \quad \text{if} \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a} \tag{3.67}$$

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \beta_{\gamma_a}(\pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a})) - \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)} \quad \text{if} \quad \pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a} \tag{3.68}$$

Then, we insert (3.41) (resp. (3.45), (3.47)) into (3.67) (resp. (3.68)) to obtain:

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a}) = \tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(\pi(\mathrm{S}_{\gamma_a})) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) \tag{3.69}$$

2) Let $S_{\gamma_a} \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$ and $\pi(S_{\gamma_a}) \notin \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$; we have the inclusion property $\hat{\sigma}_\gamma \supset \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$ so: $\pi(S_{\gamma_a}) \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$, so (3.68) holds, in which we insert (3.46):

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(S_{\gamma_a}) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) \tag{3.70}$$

3) Let $S_{\gamma_a} \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_{\gamma_a} \notin \sigma_\gamma$; then $S_{\gamma_a} \notin \sigma_{\gamma_a}$, so we insert property *ii*) of lemma 2.2 in (3.45), (3.47):

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(S_{\gamma_a}) = \beta_{\gamma_a}(S_{\gamma_a}) \leqslant d_l(\gamma_a) - \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1} \tag{3.71}$$

(if $\exists$ at least one $\mu_a \in U(\gamma_a)$ with $S_{\gamma_a} \in \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}$)

$$\tilde{\beta}_{\gamma_a}(S_{\gamma_a}) = 0 \tag{3.72}$$

(if $\forall \mu_a \in U(\gamma_a)$, $S_{\gamma_a} \notin \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$).
We apply then property of S^*_a operation, which ends the proof.

Proof of proposition 3.2. — We apply lemmas (3.3), (3.5), (3.6) to the different factors of the function $Y^{(U)}_\gamma$ in eq. (3.19). Then we use the product-stability of admissible-Weinberg-classes. We find that $Y^{(U)}_\gamma \in \mathscr{A}^{\alpha_\gamma, \beta_\gamma, \hat{\sigma}_\gamma, \hat{\omega}_\gamma}$; the asymptotic coefficients are given by the following, for all $S_\gamma \in \mathscr{E}^{rN_\gamma}_{(K,k)}$ such that $S_\gamma = s^G_\gamma S$, $S \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$:

If $S_\gamma \in \hat{\omega}_\gamma$, by addition of (3.35), (3.41), (3.60), we have:

$$\beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma)$$

If $S_\gamma \notin \hat{\omega}_\gamma$, $S_\gamma \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$:

$$\beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma) + \sum_{\mu \in \mathscr{B}_\gamma(U) \cup \{\gamma\}} \mathscr{K}^{(S)}_{\bar{\mu},l}$$

If $S_\gamma \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_\gamma \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma$:

$$\beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) \leqslant d_l(\gamma) - \sum_{\substack{\gamma_a \in U(\gamma) \\ \pi(S_\gamma) \in \hat{\sigma}_{\mu_a}}} \lambda_{d(\gamma_a)+1}$$

(if $\exists \gamma_a : S_\gamma \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$)

$$\beta_\gamma(S_\gamma) = 0$$

(if $\forall \gamma_a \in U(\gamma)$, $S_\gamma \in \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma_a}$).

THEOREM 3.2. — *The function* $R_G(K, k)$ *and every partial derivative* $D^l_{(K)} R_G(K, k)$ *w. r. t. the external momenta* K, *of total order* $l \geqslant 0$, *belongs to a Weinberg class* $A^{\alpha_l;\beta_l}_{rN}$ *in* $\mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$, *with the properties*: $\forall S \subset \mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$:

if $S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$
if $S \in \omega_G$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_l(S) = d(G) - \dim \pi(S) - l & (3.73) \\ \beta_l(S) = d_l(G) - \lambda_l & (3.74) \end{cases}$$

if $S \notin \omega_G$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_l(S) = d(G) - \dim \pi(S) - \sum\limits_{\substack{\mu_v^p < 0 \\ S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v^p - \sum\limits_{\substack{\mu_i^p < 0 \\ S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i}} \mu_i^p & (3.75) \\ \beta_l(S) = d_l(G) - \sum\limits_{\substack{\mu_v^l < 0 \\ S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v^l - \sum\limits_{\substack{\mu_v^l < 0 \\ S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i}} \mu_i^l & (3.76) \end{cases}$$

if $S \subset E_{(k)}^{rm}$:

$$\begin{cases} \alpha_l(S) = -\dim S - 1 & (3.77) \\ \beta_l(S) = d_l(G) - \inf \left\{ \lambda_l, \lambda_{d(G)+1}, \sum\limits_{\substack{\gamma \in U(G) \\ \pi(S) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma}} \lambda_{d(\gamma)+1} \right\} & (3.78) \end{cases}$$

Proof. — By application of proposition 3.2 to the case $\gamma = G$, we obtain first that $Y_G^{(U)}$ belongs to a class $\mathscr{A}^{\alpha_G, \beta_G, \hat{\sigma}_G, \hat{\omega}_G}$ which satisfies the following properties; $\forall S_j \in \hat{\mathscr{F}}$:

i) if $S_j \in \hat{\omega}_G$:

$$\beta_G(S_j) = \beta_G(\pi(S_j)) \leqslant d_l(G) \tag{3.79}$$

ii) if $S_j \notin \hat{\omega}_G$, $S_j \not\subset E_{(k)}^{rm}$:

$$\beta_G(S_j) \leqslant d_l(G) + \sum_{\mu \in \mathscr{B}(U) \cup \{G\}} \mathscr{K}_{\bar{\mu}, l}^{(S_j)} \tag{3.80 a}$$

— if $\pi(S_j) \in \hat{\sigma}_G$:

$$\beta_G(\pi(S_j)) \leqslant d_l(G) \tag{3.80 b}$$

— if $\pi(S_j) \notin \hat{\sigma}_G$:

$$\beta_G(\pi(S_j)) \leqslant d_l(G) - \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in U(G) \\ \pi(S_j) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma}} \lambda_{d(\gamma)+1} \tag{3.80 c}$$

iii) if $S_j \subset E_{(k)}^{rm}$, $S_j \notin \hat{\sigma}_G$:

$$\beta_G(S_j) \leqslant d_l(G) - \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in U(G) \\ \pi(S_j) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma}} \lambda_{d(\gamma)+1} \tag{3.81}$$

or $$\beta_G(S_j) = 0 \quad \text{if} \quad S_j = \{0\}$$

Then we apply lemma 2.4 to the function $\tilde{X}^{(U)} = (1 - t^{d(G)}) Y_G^{(U)}$; it follows that every partial derivative $D_{(K)}^{(l)} \tilde{X}^{(U)}$ of total order $l \geqslant 0$ of $\tilde{X}^{(U)}$ belongs to a class $A^{\alpha_l^{(U)}, \beta_l^{(U)}}$ of Weinberg functions; the corresponding asymptotic

coefficients are obtained by inserting (3.79), (3.80), (3.81) inside properties *a*, *b*, *c*, *d*, *e* of lemma 2.4:

$S_j \notin E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_j \in \hat{\omega}_G$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) = \beta_G(S_j) - \lambda_l \leqslant d_l(G) - \lambda_l \tag{3.82}$$

$S_j \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_j \in \sigma_G$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) = \beta_G(S_j) - \lambda_l \leqslant d_l - \lambda_l\,; \qquad \text{if} \qquad \lambda_l \leqslant \lambda_{d(G)+1} \tag{3.83}$$
$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) = \beta_G(S_j) - \lambda_{d(G)+1} \leqslant d_l - \lambda_{d+1}\,; \qquad \text{if} \qquad \lambda_l > \lambda_{d(G)+1}$$

$S_j \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_j \notin \hat{\omega}_G$, $\pi(S_j) \in \hat{\sigma}_G$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) = \sup\{\beta_G(S_j), \beta_G(\pi(S_j)) - \lambda_l\} = \beta_G(S_j)$$
$$\leqslant d_l(G) + \sum_{\gamma \in \mathscr{B}_G(U) \cup \{G\}} \mathscr{K}^{(S_j)}_{\bar{\gamma},l} \text{ in all cases } (l \leqslant d+1 \text{ or } l > d+1) \tag{3.84}$$

$S_j \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_j \notin \hat{\omega}_G$, $\pi(S_j) \notin \hat{\sigma}_G$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) = \sup\{\beta_G(S_j), \beta_G(\pi(S_j)) - \lambda_n\}$$
$$\leqslant d_l(G) + \sum_{\gamma \in \mathscr{B}_G(U) \cup \{G\}} \mathscr{K}^{(S_j)}_{\bar{\gamma},l} \text{ in all cases} \tag{3.85}$$

$S_j \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_j \notin \hat{\sigma}_G$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) \leqslant d_l(G) - \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in U(G) \\ \pi(S_j) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma}} \lambda_{d(\gamma)+1}$$

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) = 0 \qquad \text{if} \qquad S_j = \{0\} \tag{3.86}$$

We have then the following inequality:

$$\sum_{\gamma \in \mathscr{B}_G(U) \cup \{G\}} \mathscr{K}^{(S_j)}_{\bar{\gamma},l} \leqslant - \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N} \\ \mu_v < 0 \\ S_j \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v^l - \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L} \\ \mu_i < 0 \\ S_j \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i}} \mu_i^l \tag{3.87}$$

So, by combining (3.82), (3.84), (3.85) with (3.87) we get:

If $S_j \notin E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_j \in \hat{\omega}_G$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) \leqslant d_l(G) - \lambda_l \tag{3.88}$$

If $S_j \in E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S_j \in \hat{\omega}_G$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) \leqslant d_l(G) - \sum_{\substack{v \in \mathscr{N} \\ \mu_v^l < 0 \\ S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_v}} \mu_v^l - \sum_{\substack{i \in \mathscr{L} \\ \mu_i^l < 0 \\ S \subset \operatorname{Ker} \lambda_i}} \mu_i^l \tag{3.89}$$

If $S_j \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$:

$$\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j) \leqslant d_l(G) - \inf\left\{ \lambda_l, \lambda_{d(G)+1}, \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in U(G) \\ \pi(S_j) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma}} \lambda_{d(\gamma)+1} \right\} \tag{3.90}$$

For an arbitrary sequence $\{ L_1, L_2, \ldots, L_{\tilde{n}} \}$ of $\tilde{n}$ independent vectors, with $\tilde{n} \leqslant N$, and an arbitrary bounded region W in $\mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$, we consider the ordered set $\{ (L_1, \ldots, L_j) ; j \leqslant \tilde{n} \}$, and we associate with this set a unique nested set of subspaces: $\tilde{\mathscr{F}} = \{ S_1, \ldots, S_{\tilde{n}} \}$ by the definition:

$$\forall j : 1 \leqslant j \leqslant \tilde{n} : \qquad S_j = \{ L_1, \ldots, L_j \} \tag{3.91}$$

We deduce, from the above results that, for every forest $U \in \mathscr{U}(\mathscr{F})$ there exist numbers $b_j(U) \geqslant 1$ $(1 \leqslant j \leqslant \tilde{n})$ and M_U such that the function $\tilde{X}^{(l)}_U = D^l_{(K)}(1 - t^{d(G)})Y^{(U)}_G$ satisfies the bound:

$$\left| \tilde{X}^{(l)}_U \left(\sum_{j=1}^{n} L_j \eta_j \ldots \eta_n + C \right) \right| \leqslant M_U \prod_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} \eta_j^{\alpha_l^{(U)}(S_j)} (\operatorname{Log} \eta_j)^{\beta_l^{(U)}(S_j)} \tag{3.92}$$

where S_j is defined in (3.91), the asymptotic coefficients $\alpha_l^{(U)}$ and $\beta_l^{(U)}$ are given by (3.73), (3.75), (3.77) (cf. [3]), and (3.88), (3.89), (3.90), provided that $\forall j = 1, \ldots, \tilde{n}$ $\eta_j \geqslant b_j(U)$ and $C \in W$. If we put:

$$M = \sum_{v \in \mathscr{U}(\mathscr{F})} M_U \qquad b_j = \sup_{U \in \mathscr{U}(\mathscr{F})} b_j(U)$$

from the expression (3.18) of R_G, we obtain:

$$\left| D^l_{(K)} R_G \left(\sum_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} L_j \eta_j \ldots \eta_{\tilde{n}} + C \right) \right| \leqslant M \prod_{j=1}^{\tilde{n}} \eta^{\underline{\alpha}_l(S_j)} (\operatorname{Log} \eta_j)^{\beta_l(S_j)}$$

with :

$$\underline{\alpha}_l(S_j) = \sup_{U \in \mathscr{U}(\mathscr{F})} \alpha_l^{(U)}(S_j)$$
$$\underline{\beta}_l(S_j) = \sup_{U \in \mathscr{U}(\mathscr{F})} \beta_l^{(U)}(S_j)$$

provided that $\forall j, \eta_j \geqslant b_j$ and $C \in W$. We define then the class $A^{\alpha_l, \beta_l}_{rN}$ such that: $\forall S \in \mathscr{E}^{rN}_{(K,k)}$:

If $S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S \in \omega_G$,

$$\alpha_l(S) = d(G) - \dim \pi(S) - l$$
$$\beta_l(S) = d_l(G) - \lambda_l$$

If $S \not\subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$, $S \notin \omega_G$

$$\alpha_l(S) = d(G) - \dim \pi(S) - \sum_{\mu_v^p < 0} \mu_v^p - \sum_{\mu_i^p < 0} \mu_i^p$$

$$\beta_l(S) = d_l(G) - \sum_{\mu_v^l < 0} \mu_v^l - \sum_{\mu_i^l < 0} \mu_i^l$$

If $S \subset E^{rm}_{(k)}$

$$\alpha_l(S) = -\dim S - 1$$

$$\beta_l(S) = d_l(G) - \inf\left\{ \lambda_l, \lambda_{d(G)+1}, \sum_{\substack{\gamma \in U(G) \\ \pi(S) \in \hat{\sigma}_\gamma}} \lambda_{d(\gamma)+1} \right\}$$

We obtain then that $D^l_{(K)} R_G \in A^{\alpha_l, \beta_l}_{rN}$, and this ends the proof.

Proof of theorem 3.1. — We shall directly apply Weinberg's theorem 1.2. The asymptotic coefficient β_H for every subspace $S \subset \mathscr{E}^{r(n-1)}_{(K,k)}$ is found by inserting (3.74), (3.76), (3.78) in (1.4).

More precisely for:

$$H^{ren}(K) = \int_{E^{rm}_{(k)}} R_G(K, k) d^{rm}k$$

We have, in view of theorem 1.2

$$\beta_H(S) = \begin{cases} \beta_{\mathscr{M}}(S) & \text{if} \quad \alpha_H(S) = \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}}(S); \quad \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}}(S) \neq \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}'}(S) \\ \beta_{\mathscr{M}'}(S) & \text{if} \quad \alpha_H(S) = \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}'}(S); \quad \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}}(S) \neq \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}'}(S) \\ 1 + \beta_{\mathscr{M}}(S) + \beta_{\mathscr{M}'}(S) & \text{if} \quad \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}}(S) = \alpha_{H,\mathscr{M}'}(S) \end{cases}$$

with $\beta(S)$ given by theorem 3.2.

Moreover, when all μ_v^l and μ_i^l are non negative, we find:

$$\beta_H(S) = 1 + 2d_l(G)$$

This ends the proof.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author would like to thank Dr. M. Manolessou-Grammaticou for proposing to him the subject of this work and for patient explanations of her results in [3], tightly connected with most of the issues treated in this paper.

REFERENCES

[1] J. Bros, M. Manolessou-Grammaticou, *Commun. Math. Phys.*, t. **72**, 1980, p. 175-205 ; *Commun. Math. Phys.*, t. **72**, 1980, p. 207-237.

[2] M. Manolessou-Grammaticou, *Thesis*, Orsay, 1977.

[3] M. Manolessou-Grammaticou, *Ann. Phys.*, t. **122**, 1979, p. 297-320.

[4] M. MANOLESSOU-GRAMMATICOU, *Renormalized normal product and equations of motion of Φ^4-coupling*. Preprint Bielefeld (1982). Private communications.
[5] S. WEINBERG, *Phys. Rev.*, t. **118**, 1960, p. 838-849.
[6] J. P. FINK, *J. Math. Phys.*, t. **9**, 1968, p. 1389-1400.
[7] B. DUCOMET, *Taylor rests of graded Weinberg functions* (C. E. A. Technical Report).

(Manuscrit reçu le 24 mars 1983)
(Version révisée reçue le 20 septembre 1983)