University of Pennsylvania
ScholarlyCommons

Department of Physics Papers

Department of Physics

7-1989

Unambiguous Fermionic String Amplitudes

HoSeong La

Philip C. Nelson

University of Pennsylvania, nelson@physics.upenn.edu

Follow this and additional works at: https://repository.upenn.edu/physics_papers

Part of the [Physics Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

La, H., & Nelson, P. C. (1989). Unambiguous Fermionic String Amplitudes. *Physical Review Letters*, 63 (1), 24-27. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.63.24>

This paper is posted at ScholarlyCommons. https://repository.upenn.edu/physics_papers/551
For more information, please contact repository@pobox.upenn.edu.

Unambiguous Fermionic String Amplitudes

Abstract

We show how to treat boundary divergences in heterotic string theory covariantly and unambiguously. The method applies even to theories with nonvanishing tadpoles; in this case the Fischler-Susskind mechanism suffices to ensure well defined answers. Also n -point functions are well defined with no special string-tension renormalizations. As an example we find the loop corrections to the linearized background equations of motion for the $O(16) \times O(16)$ string needed to give unambiguous, finite scattering amplitudes. No splitting or projection of supermoduli space is needed.

Disciplines

Physical Sciences and Mathematics | Physics

Unambiguous Fermionic String Amplitudes

HoSeong La

Physics Department

Boston University

Boston, MA 02215

Philip Nelson

Physics Department

University of Pennsylvania

Philadelphia, PA 19104

We show how to treat boundary divergences in heterotic string theory covariantly and unambiguously. The method applies even to theories with nonvanishing tadpoles; in this case the Fischler-Susskind mechanism suffices to ensure well-defined answers. Also n -point functions are well-defined with no special string tension renormalizations. As an example we find the loop corrections to the linearized background equations of motion for the $O(16) \times O(16)$ string needed to give unambiguous, finite scattering amplitudes. No splitting or projection of supermoduli space is needed.

One way to quantize a field theory is to quantize small fluctuations about a classical ground state configuration. If we inadvertently choose a starting configuration which is not an extremum of the classical potential, various pathologies arise in the resulting perturbation theory. In particular we find that some "particle" states can disappear into the vacuum. If moreover some of these states are massless, then physical amplitudes will diverge due to processes in which a state propagates for a very long time before disappearing. Even if we begin at the classical minimum, loop effects can destabilize the vacuum, giving rise to the same artificial infrared divergences.

In a theory with nonvanishing tadpoles it thus becomes necessary to cut off diagrams which in real space have long on-shell lines, and to introduce compensating shifts in the background in a way which also depends on the cutoff. If all goes well the total, modified theory will have a good limit as the cutoff is removed.

In string theory many of the same considerations apply. Things are not as simple as in the field theory case, however, since it is not so clear how to implement the necessary cutoff. In a multiloop diagram what exactly is the "length" of a given internal tube? There is in fact no coordinate-invariant answer to this question. We must instead introduce into a given diagram some extraneous, coordinate-noninvariant information and hope that the final answer will somehow be independent of this choice.

Fischler and Susskind carried out this program in the bosonic string [1] (see also [2]). By introducing a world-sheet metric one can cut off the one loop diagram; the resulting metric dependence in the theory then cancels against another dependence, which arises when the background fields are deformed from a conformally-invariant false ground state (flat spacetime) to a conformally-noninvariant true ground state (deSitter space). Many new results and extensions followed. In particular, Callan, Lovelace, Nappi, and Yost and

Polchinski and Cai found that a similar mechanism worked for the type I superstring to one loop [3]. We will argue below, however, that the full subtlety of the problem is not apparent from this case.

The case of closed fermionic strings has remained unclear. In the picture-changing formalism [4] an apparent ambiguity was found, associated with the boundary of supermoduli space [5][6][7]. In particular the problem seemed to be an inherent pathology associated to superspace integration [6][8]. It was found to be harmless in the case of certain theories having no tadpoles, though even in such cases it appeared necessary to renormalize the string tension by hand for the various n -point loop amplitudes [9]. Since ultimately we are interested in theories which break their supersymmetry, it is desirable to extend this result; while presumably a successful string theory will break supersymmetry nonperturbatively, still it is important to understand the perturbative situation first. Similarly one cannot expect to get the corresponding issue in string field theory straight without understanding the first-quantized situation.

In this letter we will argue that tachyon-free heterotic string theories satisfying a certain condition do not suffer from any ambiguity in perturbation theory. The same mechanism used by Fischler and Susskind, as interpreted by Polchinski [2], suffices to get well-defined amplitudes from such theories [10]. Our argument does not require any facts about the global structure of supermoduli space nor indeed any other new mathematical results. As in [2], we will see how the operator formalism for string theory greatly clarifies the issues; some of the necessary ingredients for the fermionic case appear in [12], while a general reference is [13].

As an example we will discuss the $O(16) \times O(16)$ heterotic string [14], obtaining the linearized corrections to its background equations of motion. Many more details will

appear in [15]. Bowing to tradition we will leave a careful treatment of multiple divergences to future work. We expect that similar considerations apply to type II superstrings as well. Our approach was suggested in the conclusion of ref. [9] and in [16]. Other authors have proposed approaches to the ambiguity problem which seem very different [17].

To put the issues in focus, suppose we are given a volume form μ on the complex plane of the form $\mu = |q|^{-2} dq \wedge d\bar{q} + (\text{regular})$, where q is the standard complex coordinate. The integral of μ over the unit disk diverges. We can try defining $I_\epsilon = \int_{|q| > \epsilon} \mu$, but we must keep in mind that this depends not only on ϵ and the form μ , but also on the choice of coordinate q used to exclude an ϵ -ball. If $q' = aq + bq^2 + \dots$ is another coordinate centered at zero then we can define I'_ϵ by excluding $\{|q'| < \epsilon\}$; then $I'(\epsilon) = I(\epsilon) - 4\pi i \log |a| + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. Thus if we propose to find a "counterterm" to add to $I(\epsilon)$ so as to get a good limit as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$, the former must also depend on the same choice of q in a way which cancels the dependence in $I(\epsilon)$. Note that as the cutoff is removed it is only the magnitude of a , the first Taylor coefficient, which matters; were μ more divergent we would have needed more coefficients.

Now suppose there are several more variables, $\vec{m}$, and $\mu = |q|^{-2} dq \wedge d\bar{q} \wedge \Omega + (\text{regular})$ where Ω is some form in $\vec{m}$. Now $I(\epsilon)$ is the integral excluding a cylinder $\{|q| < \epsilon\}$. Once again we can expand $q' = a(\vec{m})q + \mathcal{O}(q^2)$, and once again all that matters as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ is the function $|a(\vec{m})|$. In particular if we can exclude a cylinder about the locus $\Delta \equiv \{q = 0\}$ in a way which is canonical, or standard, up to first derivatives then we have a canonical way to cut off the integral of μ . If however Δ is some complicated surface then in general there will be no natural cutoff prescription and we have to make choices.

In a string theory without tachyons the string measure behaves like μ above. The dangerous locus $\{q \sim 0\}$ consists of surfaces with very long tubes, or equivalently very

narrow necks. If the theory has nonvanishing tadpoles it is these configurations which give rise to the divergence described above. The mechanism proposed in [1] for cancelling the divergence works as follows. One chooses a local pinching coordinate q and cuts off the path integral over surfaces of genus $g_1 + g_2$. One then perturbs the background fields by an amount $\delta\phi_{b,g.}^{(g_2)}$ of order λ^{g_2} where λ is the string coupling. The amplitude to order $\lambda^{g_1+g_2}$ now consists of the original part plus a part obtained by inserting $\delta\phi_{b,g.}^{(g_2)}$ into a surface of genus g_1 . There are two other contributions as well, shown in Fig. 1.

At first Fig. 1 seems paradoxical. The counterterms I_1, I_3 know nothing about the right side of the original diagram, while I_2, I_3 know nothing about the left side. How then can $I_1 + I_2 + I_3$ cancel the cutoff dependence of I , which in general depends jointly on the shape of *both* sides? The answer is that in general they cannot [18]. If we choose the pinching coordinate q wisely, however, we can nevertheless obtain a good prescription.

Let us build a family of pinching surfaces as follows. Choose a family of surfaces of genus g_1 with one marked point (X_1, P_1) depending on complex coordinates $m_{(1)}^1, \dots, m_{(1)}^{3g_1-2}$. Repeat for side two. Then we get a family Δ of pinched surfaces parametrized by $\vec{m}_{(1)}, \vec{m}_{(2)}$ simply by gluing P_1 to P_2 . To thicken these up, however, we need more data. For each $\vec{m}_{(1)}$ choose a local coordinate $z_{(1)}$ on X_1 centered at P_1 , and similarly with side two. The usual "plumbing fixture" construction then gives an almost pinched surface for each value of $\vec{m}_{(1)}, \vec{m}_{(2)}$, and a new variable q . The point we wish to make here is that while the construction depends on the slices $z_{(i)}, i = 1, 2$, still it does so in a very special way. Suppose that we instead choose $z'_{(i)} = \alpha_{(i)}(\vec{m}_{(i)})z_{(i)} + \mathcal{O}(z_{(i)}^2)$ for some functions $\alpha_{(i)}$. Then we get new coordinates; the surface formerly described by $\vec{m}_{(1)}, \vec{m}_{(2)}, q$, is now described by $\vec{m}'_{(1)}, \vec{m}'_{(2)}, q'$, where in particular

$$q' = \alpha_{(1)}(\vec{m}_{(1)})\alpha_{(2)}(\vec{m}_{(2)})q + \mathcal{O}(q^2). \quad (1)$$

Thus the logarithm of the leading coefficient is the sum of a term knowing nothing about side two, plus a term independent of side one. If we use only pinching coordinates q chosen in this way, then, we can hope that the prescription symbolized in Fig. 1 can cancel the “ambiguity” in the bosonic string integral. The details of how this works are given in [2].

Mathematically the above discussion can be succinctly restated as follows: Δ naturally has the structure of a Cartesian product, but moreover so does its *normal bundle* in the full moduli space. We can deal with tadpoles if we use transverse coordinates q which respect this extra structure. This is our proposal for how to generalize the coordinates used for the genus-2 0-point function in [6] to arbitrary g and N .

When viewed in this way the heterotic case is very easy to understand. The integration measure itself is intrinsically defined on supermoduli space, a fact which is clearer in the coordinate-invariant operator formalism [12] than in the picture-changing language. The total derivative ambiguities appearing in coordinate-dependent formulas just describe indecision concerning the *region* of integration. As in the bosonic case there is no standard way to choose this cut-off region, but again the super plumbing fixture construction helps [19][13]. For a super (i.e. Neveu-Schwarz) pinch, one again finds a class of pinching coordinates related by (1), where now $\alpha_{(i)}$ depends on the even and odd moduli of side i . Such coordinates define a *superconformally covariant* cutoff. We must cut off the genus $g_1 + g_2$ integration using such a q and then try to find insertions $\delta\phi_{b,g}$ on lower genus surfaces which cancel the dependence on chosen local superconformal coordinates z_1, z_2 near the attachment points. We need not consider spin (i.e. Ramond) pinches, since in the heterotic string Ramond states cannot disappear into the vacuum.

We should also be requiring that BRST-exact states decouple from loop amplitudes; indeed this condition subsumes the requirement that the dependence on z_1, z_2 cancel [2][15].

To implement it we first analyze the factorization of an amplitude with one exact state $Q\psi$ inserted. The sewing state is $\sum_a q^{L_0} \bar{q}^{\bar{L}_0} b_0^{(1)} \bar{b}_0^{(1)} \phi_a^{(1)} \otimes \phi^{a(2)}$, where the superscript denotes which Fock space $\phi^{(i)}$ lives in (or $b_0^{(i)}$ acts on), and $\phi^a = (\phi_a)^T$; the adjoint is defined by the standard sphere[20]. We then get

$$\begin{aligned} \int \frac{d^{10}k}{(2\pi)^{10}iK} q^{k^2/2-1/2} \bar{q}^{k^2/2-1} \exp \left[\sum_{Z_+} \left\{ q^n \left(-\alpha_{-n}^{(1)} \cdot \alpha_{-n}^{(2)} + c_{-n}^{(1)} b_{-n}^{(2)} - b_{-n}^{(1)} c_{-n}^{(2)} \right) + \text{conj.} \right\} \right. \\ \left. + \sum_{Z_+-1/2} \left\{ i q^k \left(\beta_{-k}^{(1)} \gamma_{-k}^{(2)} - \gamma_{-k}^{(1)} \beta_{-k}^{(2)} - d_{-k}^{(1)} \cdot d_{-k}^{(2)} \right) - i \bar{q}^k \bar{d}_{-k}^{(1)} \cdot \bar{d}_{-k}^{(2)} \right\} \right] \\ \times c_1^{(1)} \bar{c}_1^{(1)} c_1^{(2)} \bar{c}_1^{(2)} \delta(\gamma_{1/2}) \delta(\gamma_{1/2}) |k\rangle^{(1)} \otimes |k\rangle^{(2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here K is the string coupling defined in [2], d_k^μ are modes of the ten spacetime fermions, $\bar{d}_k^A$ are modes of the current algebra fermions, and Z_+ are the positive integers.

We can forget about the tachyons in (2); since G -parity is not anomalous, any amplitude with all external states allowed by the modified GSO projection [14] will get no contribution from tachyons in separating pinches. (For the nonseparating case see [15].) Since the order of a differential at the divisor Δ is a coordinate-invariant number, it makes sense to say that the order of (2) is zero. Now multiply (2) by $|q|^{-2} dq d\bar{q}$ and consider changing coordinates from q to q' ; then only the first Taylor coefficient of the change matters, and we see that we indeed have the situation discussed earlier. Among the leading (massless) terms of (2), only two are relevant, namely $\frac{1}{10} |\text{grav}\rangle \otimes |\text{grav}\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |\text{dil}\rangle \otimes |\text{dil}\rangle$, where $|\text{grav}\rangle = d_{-1/2} \cdot \bar{\alpha}_{-1} c_1 \bar{c}_1 \delta(\gamma_{1/2}) |1\rangle$ and $|\text{dil}\rangle = - \left(\frac{1}{2} c_1 \gamma_{-1/2} + 2 c_1 \bar{c}_1 \bar{c}_{-1} \beta_{-1/2} \right) \delta(\gamma_{1/2}) |1\rangle$. Here $|1\rangle$ is the $\text{Osp}(2|1)$ -invariant vacuum. Note that each of these states is physical, i.e. BRST-closed. This is crucial to the success of our procedure; it is the additional condition on a heterotic theory mentioned in the introduction, a point also stressed in [9].

One might think that $|\text{dil}\rangle$ would decouple, being itself BRST-exact. Instead it turns out to be the total derivative of a form which is not quite globally defined (see [11][15]),

and so can have nonvanishing expectation value on a surface with nontrivial Euler number $\chi = 2 - 2g$. One gets

$$\langle\langle \text{grav} \rangle\rangle_g = -\frac{i\pi}{2} \cdot 10 \cdot (\chi - 2) i\mathcal{Z}_g \quad ; \quad \langle\langle \text{dil} \rangle\rangle_g = -i\pi\chi i\mathcal{Z}_g, \quad (3)$$

where $i\mathcal{Z}_g \equiv \langle\langle 1 \rangle\rangle_g$ is the vacuum amplitude at g loops. The only effect of choosing the $O(16) \times O(16)$ string instead of the usual $SO(32)$ case is that in the former case the g -loop partition function $i\mathcal{Z}_g \neq 0$, while in the latter it vanishes.

As is well known, nonvanishing vevs of massless fields at genus g_2 can lead to a failure of BRST invariance at genus $g_1 + g_2$, when a BRST-exact state gives a total derivative which is nonzero on Δ . Accordingly we now introduce a BRST-*noninvariant* $\delta\phi_{b.g.}^{(g_2)}$ to eliminate the problem:

$$\begin{aligned} |\delta\phi_{b.g.}^{(g_2)}\rangle = & \frac{1}{4\pi} \left[(B_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}) d_{-1/2}^\mu \bar{\alpha}_{-1/2}^\nu c_1 \bar{c}_1 - \tilde{\Phi} \left(\frac{1}{2} c_1 \gamma_{-1/2} + 2c_1 \bar{c}_1 \bar{c}_{-1} \beta_{-1/2} \right) \right. \\ & \left. + (c_0 + \bar{c}_0) \left(\zeta_\mu c_1 d_{-1/2}^\mu + \eta_\mu c_1 \bar{c}_1 \beta_{-1/2} \bar{\alpha}_{-1}^\mu \right) \right] \delta(\gamma_{1/2}) |1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here $B_{\mu\nu}$, $h_{\mu\nu}$, $\tilde{\Phi}$, ζ_μ , and η_μ are all functions of the zero mode of x^μ . Eqn. (4) is the most general background with quantum numbers appropriate to cancel the boundary term; for example we have not included any gauge fields, as they will not be induced to lowest order in tadpoles. Applying the BRST operator to $|\delta\phi_{b.g.}^{(g_2)}\rangle$ we get the condition for overall BRST decoupling:

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial^2 h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu (\zeta_\nu + \frac{1}{2} \eta_\nu) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\nu (\zeta_\mu + \frac{1}{2} \eta_\mu) = \eta_{\mu\nu} \frac{8\pi^2}{K} \frac{1}{10} \langle\langle \text{grav} \rangle\rangle_{g_2} \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial^2 B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu (\zeta_\nu - \frac{1}{2} \eta_\nu) - \frac{1}{2} \partial_\nu (\zeta_\mu - \frac{1}{2} \eta_\mu) = 0 \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} - \frac{1}{2} \partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu} + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \tilde{\Phi} - \frac{1}{2} \eta_\mu = 0 \quad (7)$$

$$\partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} + \partial^\nu B_{\mu\nu} + \partial_\mu \tilde{\Phi} - 2\zeta_\mu = 0 \quad (8)$$

$$\frac{1}{4}\partial^2\tilde{\Phi} + \frac{1}{2}\partial^\mu\zeta_\mu = \frac{8\pi^2}{K}\frac{1}{4}\langle\langle\text{dil}\rangle\rangle_{g_2} \quad (9)$$

$$\partial^2\tilde{\Phi} + \partial^\mu\eta_\mu = \frac{8\pi^2}{K}\langle\langle\text{dil}\rangle\rangle_{g_2}. \quad (10)$$

After eliminating the auxiliary fields ζ and η , we get a homogeneous, decoupled equation for B . To make the remaining equations look more familiar we can define $\tilde{\Phi} = \Phi - \frac{1}{2}h^\alpha_\alpha$. Thus we have

$$\partial^2\Phi = \frac{8\pi^2}{K}(\langle\langle\text{grav}\rangle\rangle_{g_2} + \langle\langle\text{dil}\rangle\rangle_{g_2}) \quad ; \quad \partial^\mu\partial^\nu h_{\mu\nu} - \partial^2 h^\alpha_\alpha + 2\partial^2\Phi = \frac{8\pi^2}{K}\langle\langle\text{dil}\rangle\rangle_{g_2}. \quad (11)$$

Using (3) we can now recognize (11) as the same equations of motion as those arising in the bosonic string [2], namely the equations of linearized gravity plus dilaton with a cosmological constant given by the vacuum amplitude $i\mathcal{Z}$.

Thus we see that the loop-corrected equations of motion for physical background fields are well-defined at $g_1 + g_2$ loops if they are well-defined at fewer loops. We therefore obtain inductively finite, unambiguous string dynamics, as in the bosonic case [21] and as in the no-tadpole case [9].

Note added:

We have recently learned that the result (1) has been worked out by S. Wolpert [22].

We are grateful to L. Alvarez-Gaumé, S. Giddings, C. Gomez, G. Moore, A. Morozov, C. Vafa, H. Verlinde, and especially J. J. Atick, J. Polchinski and E. Witten for many discussions on the operator formalism and superspace. We also thank M. Green for suggesting the $O(16) \times O(16)$ example. P.N. would like to thank CERN for hospitality in the

initial stages of this work. This work was supported in part by NSF grant PHY88-57200, by DOE contract DE-AC02-88ER-40284, and by the A. P. Sloan Foundation.

References

- [1] W. Fischler and L. Susskind, "Dilaton tadpoles, string condensates, and scale invariance, I; II," *Phys. Lett.* **171B** (1986) 383; **173B** (1986) 262.
- [2] J. Polchinski, "Factorization of bosonic string amplitudes," *Nucl. Phys.* **B307** (1988) 61.
- [3] C. Callan, C. Lovelace, C. Nappi, and S. Yost, "Adding holes and crosscaps to the superstring," *Nucl. Phys.* **B293** (1987) 83; J. Polchinski and Y. Cai, "Consistency of open superstring theories," *Nucl. Phys.* **B296** (1987) 91.
- [4] D. Friedan, E. Martinec, and S. Shenker, "Conformal invariance, supersymmetry, and string theory," *Nucl. Phys.* **B271** (1986) 93.
- [5] E. Verlinde and H. Verlinde, "Multiloop calculations in covariant superstring theory," *Phys. Lett.* **192B** (1987) 95.
- [6] J.J. Atick, J.M. Rabin, and A. Sen, "An ambiguity in fermionic string perturbation theory," *Nucl. Phys.* **B299** (1988) 279.
- [7] G. Moore and A. Morozov, "Some remarks on two-loop superstring calculations," *Nucl. Phys.* **B306** (1988) 387.
- [8] J. J. Atick, G. Moore, and A. Sen, "Some global issues in string perturbation theory," *Nucl. Phys.* **B307** (1988) 221.
- [9] J. J. Atick, G. Moore, and A. Sen, "Catoptric tadpoles," *Nucl. Phys.* **B308** (1988) 1.
- [10] Such a result was speculated in the conclusion to [9]. The result was described in P. Nelson, unpublished (Aug., 1988) and mentioned in [11].
- [11] P. Nelson, "Covariant insertions of general vertex operators," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62** (1989) 993.
- [12] L. Alvarez-Gaumé, C. Gomez, P. Nelson, G. Sierra, and C. Vafa, "Fermionic strings

- in the operator formalism," Nucl. Phys. **B311** (1988) 333.
- [13] P. Nelson, "Lectures on supermanifolds and strings," in *Particles, strings, and supernovae*, ed. A. Jevicki and C.-I. Tan (World Scientific, 1989).
 - [14] L. Dixon and J. Harvey, "String theories in ten dimensions without spacetime supersymmetry," Nucl. Phys. **B274** (1986) 93; L. Alvarez-Gaumé, P. Ginsparg, G. Moore, and C. Vafa, "An $O(16) \times O(16)$ heterotic string," Phys. Lett. **171** (1986) 155.
 - [15] H.S. La and P. Nelson, Penn preprint UPR-0391T=BUHEP-89-9 (1989).
 - [16] J. J. Atick, talk at Strings '88, Maryland, 1988 (unpublished).
 - [17] H. Verlinde, "A note on the integral over the fermionic supermoduli," Utrecht preprint THU-87/26, 1987 (unpublished); M. Martellini and P. Teofilatto, "Global structure of the superstring partition function and resolution of the supermoduli measure ambiguity," Phys. Lett. **211B** (1988) 293; A. Morozov and A. Perelomov, "A note on many-loop calculations for superstrings in the NSR formalism," ITEP preprint, 1988; E. D'Hoker and D. Phong, "The geometry of string perturbation theory," Rev. Mod. Phys. **60** (1988) 917; N. Berkowitz, in *Strings 88*, ed. S.J. Gates, Jr, R. C. Preitschopf, and W. Siegel (World Scientific, 1989); S. Mandelstam, in *The Storrs Meeting*, ed. K. Haller et al. (World Scientific, 1989); A. Restuccia and J.G. Taylor, "Light-cone gauge analysis of superstrings," Phys. Reports **174** (1989) 285.
 - [18] Note that the issue does not arise in [3], where side two is a disk or crosscap, and so has no moduli.
 - [19] J. Cohn, "Modular geometry of superconformal field theory." Nucl. Phys. **B306** (1988) 239.
 - [20] Our conventions differ somewhat from [12]. See [15].
 - [21] A. Sen, "Mass renormalization and cancellation of BRST anomalies in string theories,"

Nucl. Phys. **B304** (1988) 403; G. Moore and N. Seiberg, unpublished.

[22] S. Wolpert, *Annales Academiæ Scientiarum Fennicæ, Series AI Mathematica* (1988).

Figure caption:

Fig. 1: Contributions needed to make the 3-loop diagram well-defined.