# Quantum Mechanics Requires Vacuum Self-Decoherence

A Holographic Boundary Mechanism for Classical Vacuum Observables and a Possible Physical Interpretation of Renormalization

Steven E. Elliott

June 7, 2026

## Abstract

The measured vacuum energy density entering cosmology is a classical macroscopic quantity. In standard quantum theory, the emergence of classicality from quantum superposition is explained through decoherence: a subsystem loses accessible phase coherence through entanglement with environmental degrees of freedom [1, 2]. This paper applies that same logic to the vacuum itself. An arbitrary finite spherical region of vacuum is treated as an interior quantum subsystem, while its boundary and exterior vacuum degrees of freedom form its environment. Under a holographic assumption, the boundary carries an area-scaling information capacity and functions as the interface through which interior field configurations are encoded relative to the exterior [5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. Tracing over the boundary-exterior environment yields a reduced density matrix for the interior whose off-diagonal components are suppressed by environmental overlap factors. In a Gaussian influence-functional model, the decoherence exponent is controlled by a boundary noise kernel and scales schematically with the number of boundary information cells, $\Gamma_{ij} \sim A/\ell_P^2$, for distinguishable interior configurations [3, 4]. Thus a finite vacuum region cannot be treated as a pristine, perfectly coherent, isolated quantum register. The global vacuum may remain pure, but every finite restriction of it is generically mixed and dynamically decohered by the rest of the vacuum. This vacuum self-decoherence does not by itself calculate the observed cosmological constant. It instead establishes that a finite vacuum region is never operationally described by an unlimited pristine coherent state. This provides a possible physical mechanism underlying the coarse-graining that renormalization implements algebraically [10].

## 1 Introduction

Quantum field theory assigns the vacuum a complicated structure [12]. The vacuum is not an empty classical void. It contains correlations, fluctuations, entanglement, and ultraviolet structure. At the same time, the vacuum energy that appears in cosmology is not observed as an infinite quantum superposition of arbitrary field configurations. It appears as a finite macroscopic classical contribution to the large-scale dynamics of spacetime.

This creates a conceptual tension. If classical systems arise from decoherence, and if the observed vacuum energy is a classical macroscopic measurement, then the vacuum itself must participate in a decoherence process. The vacuum cannot be treated as a perfectly coherent quantum environment at all scales while simultaneously producing a stable classical cosmological observable. The existence of a classical measured vacuum energy suggests that the vacuum has already undergone a reduction of accessible phase information.

The purpose of this paper is to formulate that statement mathematically using standard quantum-mechanical tools. The claim is not that the observed cosmological constant is calculated here from first principles. The narrower claim is that quantum mechanics itself implies a mechanism of vacuum self-decoherence once an arbitrary finite region of vacuum is treated as an open subsystem.

The construction is simple. Choose an arbitrary spherical region $V$ of vacuum with radius $R$. The quantum degrees of freedom inside the sphere define an interior subsystem. The degrees of freedom outside the sphere define an exterior environment. The boundary $\partial V$ acts as the interface through which the interior is encoded relative to the exterior. If the boundary obeys a holographic information bound, then the number of independent boundary degrees of freedom scales with area rather than volume.

The global state may remain pure. However, an observer or effective theory restricted to the interior does not have access to the boundary-exterior environment. The relevant object is therefore not the global density matrix, but the reduced density matrix

$$\rho_{\text{in}} = \operatorname{Tr}_{\partial V,\text{out}} \rho_{\text{total}}. \tag{1}$$

The off-diagonal terms of $\rho_{\text{in}}$ are suppressed when different interior configurations imprint distinguishable states on the boundary and exterior vacuum. This is exactly the structure of decoherence, except that the environment is not external matter, apparatus noise, or a laboratory bath. The environment is the rest of the vacuum.

This motivates the central thesis:

> *The vacuum decoheres with itself because every finite region of vacuum is an open quantum subsystem whose boundary and exterior degrees of freedom continuously encode, monitor, and distinguish its interior configurations.*

The proposed connection to renormalization is interpretive but natural. Renormalization replaces inaccessible ultraviolet structure with effective finite parameters. Vacuum self-decoherence supplies a possible physical process behind that algebraic operation: inaccessible short-distance phase information is not available to finite interior observables because it is continually dispersed into boundary and exterior degrees of freedom.

# 2 Background: Decoherence, Holography, and Renormalization

## 2.1 Decoherence and classicality

In decoherence theory, a quantum subsystem becomes effectively classical when its phase coherence is dispersed into an environment [1, 2]. Let a system $S$ be correlated with an environment $E$:

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i c_i |s_i\rangle |E_i\rangle. \tag{2}$$

The reduced density matrix of the system is

$$\rho_S = \operatorname{Tr}_E |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| = \sum_{ij} c_i c_j^* \langle E_j|E_i\rangle |s_i\rangle\langle s_j|. \tag{3}$$

The off-diagonal terms are controlled by the environmental overlaps

$$D_{ij} = \langle E_j|E_i\rangle. \tag{4}$$

When the environment states become distinguishable,

$$|D_{ij}| \ll 1, \qquad i \neq j, \tag{5}$$

the reduced density matrix becomes approximately diagonal in a preferred, environmentally selected basis. This is the standard mechanism by which classical behavior emerges without requiring the global state to become mixed [1].

### 2.2 Holographic boundary information

The holographic principle suggests that the maximum information associated with a spatial region is bounded by the area of its boundary in Planck units [5, 6, 7, 8, 9]. For a sphere of radius $R$,

$$A = 4\pi R^2. \tag{6}$$

The corresponding entropy bound is

$$S_{\partial V}^{\max} = \log \dim \mathcal{H}_{\partial V} \leq \frac{A}{4\ell_P^2} = \frac{\pi R^2}{\ell_P^2}. \tag{7}$$

This paper uses the holographic principle in a minimal way: the boundary is treated as an information interface with area-scaling capacity. The argument does not require a full theory of quantum gravity. It requires only that the boundary degrees of freedom encode distinguishable information about interior configurations relative to the exterior.

### 2.3 Renormalization as effective coarse-graining

Renormalization is the procedure by which short-distance or high-energy degrees of freedom are absorbed into effective parameters appropriate to a given scale [10]. In modern effective field theory, renormalization is not merely the subtraction of infinities. It is a scale-dependent coarse-graining operation [10].

The question addressed here is whether that algebraic coarse-graining has a physical counterpart. If finite regions of vacuum are continually decohered by their own boundary-exterior environments, then inaccessible ultraviolet phase information is not merely ignored by calculation. It is physically unavailable to finite reduced descriptions. This suggests that renormalization may be the effective mathematical shadow of a deeper vacuum self-decoherence process.

## 3 Finite Vacuum Region as an Open Quantum Subsystem

Let $V$ be a spherical region of vacuum with radius $R$ and boundary $\partial V$. In a regulated effective description, write the total Hilbert space approximately as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} \simeq \mathcal{H}_{\text{in}} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\partial V} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}. \tag{8}$$

Here $\mathcal{H}_{\text{in}}$ denotes the interior degrees of freedom, $\mathcal{H}_{\partial V}$ denotes boundary or edge degrees of freedom, and $\mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}$ denotes exterior vacuum degrees of freedom.

Strict Hilbert-space factorization is subtle in continuum quantum field theory, gauge theory, and gravity [9, 12]. Constraints and edge modes may prevent a naive tensor product from being exact. Equation (8) should therefore be understood as a regulated effective description or as a statement about operator algebras with boundary sectors included. This is sufficient for the decoherence argument, because the essential structure is the division between accessible interior degrees of freedom and inaccessible boundary-exterior degrees of freedom.

Define the environment of the interior region as

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{env}} = \mathcal{H}_{\partial V} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{\text{out}}. \tag{9}$$

The global state of the vacuum restricted to this division may be written in the conditional form

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_i c_i |\phi_i\rangle_{\text{in}} \otimes |E_i(t)\rangle_{\text{env}}. \tag{10}$$

The states $|\phi_i\rangle_{\text{in}}$ denote interior field-configuration states. The states $|E_i(t)\rangle_{\text{env}}$ denote corresponding boundary-exterior states conditioned on the interior configuration.

Equation (10) is not assumed to be an exact Schmidt decomposition. This distinction matters. In the exact Schmidt basis the reduced density matrix is diagonal by construction, so no off-diagonal suppression is visible. Decoherence is instead tracked in a physically meaningful configuration or pointer basis, where distinct interior configurations imprint distinguishable environmental states.

The total density matrix is

$$\rho_{\text{total}}(t) = |\Psi(t)\rangle\langle\Psi(t)|. \tag{11}$$

The reduced density matrix accessible to the interior is

$$\rho_{\text{in}}(t) = \operatorname{Tr}_{\text{env}} \rho_{\text{total}}(t). \tag{12}$$

Substituting Eq. (10), one obtains

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{\text{in}}(t) &= \operatorname{Tr}_{\text{env}} \left[ \sum_{ij} c_i c_j^* |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_j| \otimes |E_i(t)\rangle\langle E_j(t)| \right] \\ &= \sum_{ij} c_i c_j^* \langle E_j(t)|E_i(t)\rangle |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_j|. \end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Define the environmental overlap factor

$$D_{ij}(t) = \langle E_j(t)|E_i(t)\rangle. \tag{14}$$

Then

$$\rho_{\text{in}}(t) = \sum_{ij} c_i c_j^* D_{ij}(t) |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_j|. \tag{15}$$

The diagonal terms obey

$$D_{ii}(t) = 1, \tag{16}$$

so trace preservation is automatic:

$$\operatorname{Tr} \rho_{\text{in}}(t) = \sum_i |c_i|^2 = 1. \tag{17}$$

For distinct interior states, the environmental overlap satisfies

$$|D_{ij}(t)| < 1, \qquad i \neq j, \tag{18}$$

whenever the boundary-exterior environment can distinguish the two interior configurations.

A standard decoherence parametrization is

$$D_{ij}(t) = \exp[-\Gamma_{ij}(t) + i\Phi_{ij}(t)], \tag{19}$$

where

$$\Gamma_{ii}(t) = 0, \qquad \Gamma_{ij}(t) \geq 0. \tag{20}$$

Therefore the reduced density matrix can be written as

$$\rho_{\text{in}}(t) = \sum_i |c_i|^2 |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i| + \sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j^* e^{-\Gamma_{ij}(t) + i\Phi_{ij}(t)} |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_j|. \tag{21}$$

The off-diagonal coherences are suppressed by $e^{-\Gamma_{ij}}$.

## 4 Influence Functional Model for Boundary-Induced Vacuum Decoherence

To make the scaling explicit, suppose the interior configurations couple to boundary degrees of freedom through an interaction of the schematic form

$$S_{\text{int}}^{(i)} = \int_0^\tau dt \int_{\partial V} dA\, J_i(x,t) \hat{\mathcal{O}}(x,t). \tag{22}$$

Here $J_i(x,t)$ is the boundary imprint associated with the interior configuration $i$, and $\hat{\mathcal{O}}(x,t)$ is a boundary-coupled operator belonging to the environment.

Two different interior configurations induce different boundary sources:

$$\Delta J_{ij}(x,t) = J_i(x,t) - J_j(x,t). \tag{23}$$

For a Gaussian boundary-exterior environment, the influence functional gives a decoherence exponent of the schematic form [3, 4]

$$\Gamma_{ij}(\tau) = \frac{1}{2\hbar^2} \int_0^\tau dt \int_0^\tau dt' \int_{\partial V} dA \int_{\partial V} dA'\, \Delta J_{ij}(x,t) N(x,t;x',t') \Delta J_{ij}(x',t'). \tag{24}$$

The noise kernel is

$$N(x,t;x',t') = \frac{1}{2} \left\langle \left\{ \hat{\mathcal{O}}(x,t), \hat{\mathcal{O}}(x',t') \right\} \right\rangle_\Omega. \tag{25}$$

The expectation value is taken in the vacuum state of the boundary-exterior environment.

Equation (24) has the required structure. If $i = j$, then $\Delta J_{ii} = 0$, and therefore

$$\Gamma_{ii} = 0. \tag{26}$$

If $i \neq j$ and the two configurations are distinguishable at the boundary, then $\Delta J_{ij} \neq 0$, and the noise kernel produces positive decoherence:

$$\Gamma_{ij} > 0. \tag{27}$$

The short-distance vacuum correlations make the integral sensitive to an ultraviolet cutoff $\epsilon$. Schematically, for local boundary correlations, the dominant contribution scales as

$$\Gamma_{ij} \sim C_{ij} \frac{A}{\epsilon^2} F(\tau), \tag{28}$$

where $C_{ij}$ measures how distinguishable the two interior configurations are at the boundary, and $F(\tau)$ encodes the time dependence of the coupling.

If the physical cutoff is Planckian,

$$\epsilon \sim \ell_P, \tag{29}$$

then

$$\Gamma_{ij} \sim C_{ij} \frac{A}{\ell_P^2} F(\tau). \tag{30}$$

For a sphere,

$$A = 4\pi R^2, \tag{31}$$

so

$$\Gamma_{ij} \sim 4\pi C_{ij} \frac{R^2}{\ell_P^2} F(\tau). \tag{32}$$

For a macroscopic region $R \gg \ell_P$, the boundary contains an enormous number of Planck-scale information cells. Unless $C_{ij} = 0$, Eq. (32) implies

$$\Gamma_{ij} \gg 1. \tag{33}$$

Consequently,

$$e^{-\Gamma_{ij}} \approx 0, \qquad i \neq j. \tag{34}$$

The reduced interior density matrix becomes approximately diagonal:

$$\rho_{\text{in}}(t) \approx \sum_i |c_i|^2 |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_i|. \tag{35}$$

## 5 The Self-Decoherence Proposition

**Proposition 1** (Vacuum self-decoherence)**.** *Let $V$ be a finite spherical region of vacuum. Suppose that:*

1. *the interior degrees of freedom define an effective subsystem;*
2. *the boundary and exterior vacuum degrees of freedom define an environment;*
3. *distinguishable interior configurations imprint distinguishable states on the boundary-exterior environment;*
4. *the boundary information capacity scales holographically with area.*

*Then the reduced state of the interior region has off-diagonal coherences suppressed by environmental overlap factors. For boundary-distinguishable configurations,*

$$\rho_{ij}^{\text{in}} \propto e^{-\Gamma_{ij}}, \qquad i \neq j, \tag{36}$$

*with a decoherence exponent that scales schematically as*

$$\Gamma_{ij} \sim C_{ij} \frac{A}{\ell_P^2} F(\tau). \tag{37}$$

*Therefore, for $R \gg \ell_P$, the finite vacuum region is not a pristine coherent subsystem but an effectively decohered reduced state.*

*Proof.* The proof follows directly from the partial trace. Write the global state in conditional form:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_i c_i |\phi_i\rangle_{\text{in}} \otimes |E_i(t)\rangle_{\text{env}}. \tag{38}$$

Then

$$\rho_{\text{in}}(t) = \sum_{ij} c_i c_j^* \langle E_j(t)|E_i(t)\rangle |\phi_i\rangle\langle\phi_j|. \tag{39}$$

The off-diagonal terms are proportional to

$$D_{ij}(t) = \langle E_j(t)|E_i(t)\rangle. \tag{40}$$

If the environment distinguishes $i$ and $j$, then $|D_{ij}| < 1$, and one may write

$$D_{ij}(t) = e^{-\Gamma_{ij}(t)+i\Phi_{ij}(t)}. \tag{41}$$

For a Gaussian boundary-environment coupling, the influence functional yields Eq. (24). With a Planck-scale cutoff and area-scaling boundary capacity, the exponent scales as $A/\ell_P^2$. Hence macroscopic $R$ gives exponential suppression of the off-diagonal terms. ☐

# 6 Interpretation: Why This Is Vacuum Self-Decoherence

In ordinary decoherence, the environment is something outside the system: air molecules, photons, a detector, a thermal bath, or unobserved laboratory degrees of freedom [1, 2]. In the present construction, the environment is not external to the universe. It is the boundary and exterior vacuum associated with the chosen finite region.

The global vacuum may still be pure:

$$\rho_{\text{total}} = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|. \tag{42}$$

However, the state of a finite region is not the global state. It is the reduced state:

$$\rho_{\text{in}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\partial V,\text{out}}\, \rho_{\text{total}}. \tag{43}$$

Thus the vacuum self-decoheres in the operational sense that every finite restriction of the vacuum is an open subsystem whose phase coherence is dispersed into the rest of the vacuum.

The phrase "self-decoherence" should therefore be understood precisely. It does not mean that the universe as a whole becomes mixed. It means that the vacuum, when partitioned into finite regions, supplies its own environment. Each finite region is decohered by the boundary-exterior degrees of freedom of the same vacuum.

This also resolves a possible objection. The vacuum is often treated as a stationary state. If the global vacuum is stationary, what is dynamically decohering? The answer is that the reduced interior description is basis- and partition-dependent. The global state may be stationary while finite restrictions of it are mixed and while local configuration coherences are suppressed by environmental distinguishability. The decoherence is not a decay of the global state. It is the suppression of accessible off-diagonal terms in the reduced density matrix of a finite region.

# 7 Connection to Vacuum Energy

The measured vacuum energy density in cosmology is a classical macroscopic quantity. It is not observed as an infinite coherent superposition of all ultraviolet field modes. This motivates the central inference of this paper:

> If classical macroscopic observables arise from decoherence, and if the vacuum energy measured by cosmology is a classical macroscopic observable, then the vacuum must possess a self-decohering reduced description.

This paper does not claim to compute the observed value of the cosmological constant. Decoherence suppresses off-diagonal coherences. It does not automatically eliminate diagonal energy expectation values. The energy expectation of the reduced state is

$$\langle H_{\rm in}\rangle = {\rm Tr}(\rho_{\rm in} H_{\rm in}). \tag{44}$$

If $H_{\rm in}$ is diagonal in the pointer basis, then

$$\langle H_{\rm in}\rangle = \sum_i |c_i|^2 E_i. \tag{45}$$

Therefore, an additional dynamical or gravitational condition is required to derive the observed vacuum energy.

The claim is instead that vacuum self-decoherence supplies a physical precondition for any such suppression. A perfectly coherent vacuum with unlimited accessible ultraviolet phase structure is not the operational state seen by finite regions. The state available to finite observables is already reduced, coarse-grained, and approximately diagonal in a boundary-selected basis.

# 8 Connection to Renormalization

Renormalization removes explicit dependence on inaccessible ultraviolet degrees of freedom by absorbing their effects into effective parameters [10]. In standard field theory, this is implemented algebraically through counterterms, running couplings, and scale-dependent effective actions.

The self-decoherence picture suggests the following physical interpretation:

$$\begin{gathered}\text{Renormalized Effective Theory}\\ \sim \\ \text{Finite-region reduced description after tracing inaccessible vacuum information}\end{gathered} \tag{46}$$

On this view, renormalization is not merely a formal subtraction procedure. It is the algebraic representation of a physical fact: finite observers and finite regions do not have access to the full coherent ultraviolet structure of the global vacuum. That information is encoded across boundary and exterior degrees of freedom and appears to the interior only through effective parameters.

This does not replace the technical machinery of renormalization. Rather, it proposes a physical mechanism that may explain why renormalized descriptions are the ones that correspond to finite measurements. The high-energy phase information that would appear as uncontrolled ultraviolet structure in a naive calculation is not available as coherent interior information after the boundary-exterior trace.

This also clarifies the relation to perturbation theory. Dyson's argument indicates that perturbative expansions in quantum electrodynamics are generically asymptotic rather than convergent [11]. The success of low-order calculations does not imply that the perturbative series is a complete nonperturbative definition of the vacuum. Vacuum self-decoherence gives a possible physical reason why finite effective calculations work: the operational vacuum seen by finite regions is not the pristine infinite coherent object assumed by the unregulated formal expansion.

## 9 Limitations and Open Problems

Several limitations must be stated clearly.

First, this paper does not prove that the cosmological constant has its observed value. Decoherence suppresses off-diagonal phase coherence, while the cosmological constant problem concerns the gravitational effect of diagonal vacuum energy density. Connecting the two requires an additional equation involving semiclassical gravity, such as

$$G_{\mu\nu} + \Lambda g_{\mu\nu} = 8\pi G \langle T_{\mu\nu} \rangle_{\rho_{\mathrm{in}}}, \tag{47}$$

or a generalized entropy/backreaction principle.

Second, the Hilbert-space factorization used here is effective. In gauge theory and gravity, exact factorization across a spatial boundary is obstructed by constraints and edge modes. The present argument treats those edge modes as part of the boundary environment rather than ignoring them.

Third, the area-scaling estimate

$$\Gamma_{ij} \sim A/\ell_P^2 \tag{48}$$

is schematic. A complete calculation requires specifying the boundary operator $\hat{\mathcal{O}}$, the source difference $\Delta J_{ij}$, the cutoff prescription, and the physical time scale $\tau$.

Fourth, the pointer basis of the vacuum is not derived here from first principles. The basis $|\phi_i\rangle$ should be determined by the stability of field configurations under boundary-exterior monitoring. This is analogous to environment-induced superselection in ordinary decoherence theory [1].

These limitations define the next stage of the program. The present paper establishes the reduced-density-matrix mechanism. The remaining problem is to connect this mechanism quantitatively to renormalized stress-energy, gravitational backreaction, and the observed vacuum energy density.

## 10 Conclusion

The measured vacuum energy density is a classical macroscopic observable [12]. In quantum theory, classicality arises when a subsystem loses accessible phase coherence through decoherence. Applying this same logic to the vacuum implies that the vacuum must possess a self-decohering reduced description.

By partitioning an arbitrary spherical region of vacuum into an interior subsystem, a holographic boundary, and an exterior vacuum environment, one obtains a direct reduced-density-matrix mechanism. The interior state is

$$\rho_{\mathrm{in}} = \mathrm{Tr}_{\partial V,\mathrm{out}}\, \rho_{\mathrm{total}}. \tag{49}$$

When different interior configurations imprint distinguishable states on the boundary-exterior environment, the off-diagonal terms are suppressed:

$$\rho_{ij}^{\mathrm{in}} \propto e^{-\Gamma_{ij}}, \qquad i \neq j. \tag{50}$$

In a Planck-regulated holographic estimate, the decoherence exponent scales with the number of boundary information cells:

$$\Gamma_{ij} \sim C_{ij} \frac{A}{\ell_P^2} F(\tau). \tag{51}$$

For macroscopic regions, this produces strong suppression of interior coherences between boundary-distinguishable vacuum configurations.

The result is vacuum self-decoherence. The global vacuum may remain pure, but every finite region of it is an open subsystem decohered by the rest of the vacuum. This provides a possible physical mechanism behind the effective coarse-graining implemented by renormalization [10]. Renormalization may therefore be interpreted as the algebraic shadow of a real physical process: the loss of accessible ultraviolet phase coherence through holographic boundary encoding and exterior-vacuum tracing.

## References

[1] W. H. Zurek, "Decoherence, einselection, and the quantum origins of the classical," *Reviews of Modern Physics* **75**, 715–775 (2003).

[2] J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, "Environment-induced decoherence and the transition from quantum to classical," arXiv:quant-ph/0010011.

[3] R. P. Feynman and F. L. Vernon, "The theory of a general quantum system interacting with a linear dissipative system," *Annals of Physics* **24**, 118–173 (1963).

[4] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, "Path integral approach to quantum Brownian motion," *Physica A* **121**, 587–616 (1983).

[5] J. D. Bekenstein, "Black holes and entropy," *Physical Review D* **7**, 2333–2346 (1973).

[6] S. W. Hawking, "Particle creation by black holes," *Communications in Mathematical Physics* **43**, 199–220 (1975).

[7] G. 't Hooft, "Dimensional reduction in quantum gravity," arXiv:gr-qc/9310026.

[8] L. Susskind, "The world as a hologram," *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **36**, 6377–6396 (1995).

[9] R. Bousso, "The holographic principle," *Reviews of Modern Physics* **74**, 825–874 (2002).

[10] K. G. Wilson, "Renormalization group and critical phenomena. I. Renormalization group and the Kadanoff scaling picture," *Physical Review B* **4**, 3174–3183 (1971).

[11] F. J. Dyson, "Divergence of perturbation theory in quantum electrodynamics," *Physical Review* **85**, 631–632 (1952).

[12] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum Fields in Curved Space*, Cambridge University Press (1982).