

## NSR measures on hyperelliptic locus and non-renormalization of 1,2,3-point functions

A.Morozov

ITEP, Moscow, Russia

## ABSTRACT

We demonstrate (under a modest assumption) that the sums over spin-structures of the simplest combinations of fermionic correlators (Szego kernels) and DHP/CDG/Grushevsky NSR measures vanish at least on the hyperelliptic loci in the moduli space of Riemann surfaces – despite the violation of the  $\theta_e^4$  hypothesis at  $g > 2$ . This provides an additional important support to validity of these measures and is also a step towards a proof of the non-renormalization theorems in the NSR approach.

**1. Introduction.** According to [1]-[3], the Feynman diagram technique in perturbative string theory in critical dimensions is formulated in terms of holomorphic measures on the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_g$  of Riemann surfaces (complex curves) of genus  $g$ , where  $g$  is the number of string loops: somewhat symbolically string amplitudes in the three simplest cases of  $26d$  bosonic,  $10d$  super- and heterotic models are given by integrals over  $\mathcal{M}_g$  with the measures

$$\frac{1}{\det^{13}\text{Im}(T)} \left| d\mu_{bos} \right|^2, \quad \frac{1}{\det^5\text{Im}(T)} \left| \sum_e \dots d\mu_e \right|^2, \quad \frac{1}{\det^5\text{Im}(T)} \overline{d\mu_{het}} \left( \sum_e \dots d\mu_e \right) \quad (1)$$

and appropriate vertex-operator insertions. The basic Mumford measure  $d\mu_{bos} = \frac{\det \bar{\partial}_2}{\det^{13} \partial_0}$  is well known, though in a somewhat transcendental form, which, however simplifies for low genera  $g \leq 4$  [1] and on hyperelliptic loci  $\mathcal{H}_g \subset \mathcal{M}_g$  [4] of complex codimension  $g - 2$ . The measures for two basic heterotic models are given by [1]

$$d\mu_{het}^{E_8 \times E_8} = \xi_4^2 d\mu_{bos}, \quad d\mu_{het}^{SO(32)} = \xi_8 d\mu_{bos} \quad (2)$$

which actually coincide (at least are believed to coincide) on  $\mathcal{M}_g$ . Further compactifications to lower critical dimensions involve additional modular-form factors in the measures, see, for example, [5]. The same measures, restricted to the moduli subspace of *doubles*, describe open and non-oriented strings [6]. The NSR measures  $d\mu_e$ , depending on the boundary conditions for  $2d$  fermions through the spin-structure (half-integer theta-characteristic)  $e$ , remained a puzzle until a breakthrough consideration of E.D'Hoker and D.Phong [7, 8], and now they are known (conjectured) [9, 10] in a very explicit form, see also [11, 12]. The sum over  $e$  describes GSO projection, which eliminates tachyon excitation from the spectrum and makes the theories supersymmetric in 10 dimensions (where they are alternatively described by Green-Schwarz formalism [13]). In the absence of vertex operators  $\sum_e d\mu_e = 0$ . See [12] for notations, explanations, references and further details.

The goal of the present paper is to consider restrictions of DHP-CDG-G NSR measures on hyperelliptic loci  $\mathcal{H}_g \subset \mathcal{M}_g$ , where they become pure algebraic quantities, made from ramification points. This is a natural and standard step in exploration of any theta-function-based formulas in string theory, and it sheds light on the otherwise obscure properties of the measures. Also properties and implications of GSO projection become transparent in these restrictions. All this is especially important because for  $g > 2$  the DHP-CDG-G conjectures has some *a priori* unexpected properties (most important,  $d\mu_e$  does not contain a  $\theta_e^4(0)$  factor, as many people thought it would, and it is interesting to see how the non-renormalization theorems [14] are consistent with this). Of course, hyperelliptic considerations are not conclusive for  $g > 3$  (at  $g = 3$  they describe what happens at codimension-one subspace in  $\mathcal{M}_3$ , and this is often enough to draw far-going conclusions), still they are very instructive.

**2. DHP/CDG/G conjectures and non-renormalization theorems.** If NSR correlators are defined from supermoduli integration, there are numerous different contributions [8]. Most of them vanish after GSO summation over boundary conditions (theta-characteristics) due to Riemann identities. This cancelation becomes transparent for special choice of odd moduli ("unitary gauge"), largely for the reasons which were outlined long ago in [15]. There is however a non-trivial part, associated with the DHP-NSR measure

$$d\mu_e = \Xi_e \cdot d\mu_{bos} \quad (3)$$

where  $e$  is the even theta-characteristic,  $d\mu_{bos}$  is the Mumford measure [1] and  $\Xi_e$  is the weight-eight modular form, discovered in [7, 9, 10], which in Grushevsky basis [10] can be written as [12]

$$\Xi_e = \sum_{p \geq 0} (-)^p \kappa_p G_e^{(p)}, \quad \kappa_p = \prod_{i=1}^p \frac{1}{2^i - 1}, \quad \kappa_0 = 1 \quad (4)$$

The sum is actually up to  $p = g$  where  $g$  is the genus (the number of string loops), because Grushevsky's forms  $G^{(p)} = 0$  for  $p > g$ . If  $\Xi_e$  in (4) is multiplied by  $2^{-g}$  the measures (3) are properly factorized at the boundaries of moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_g$ , where genus- $g$  Riemann surface degenerates into low-genera surfaces.

Because of the modular ambiguity of contributions, annihilated in GSO projection by Riemann identities [16], one can optimistically *assume* that they do *not* contribute to any correlators at all, so that for any observable  $A$  in superstring theory

$$\langle A \rangle = \sum_e \int_{\mathcal{M}_g} A_e \Xi_e \cdot d\mu_{bos} \quad (5)$$

If this assumption is true, one can indeed call  $d\mu_e$  from (3) the *NSR measure* in the first-quantized superstring theory – to be further compared with the Green-Schwarz measure [13].

In this framework the celebrated non-renormalization conjectures [14] imply that

$$\sum_e A_e \Xi_e = 0 \quad (6)$$

for

$$A_e = 1 \quad (7)$$

or given by two combinations of Szego kernels [3]  $\Psi_e(x, y) = \frac{\theta_e(\bar{x}-\bar{y})}{\theta_e(\bar{0})E(x, y)}$

$$A_e(x, y) = [\Psi_e(x, y)]^2 \quad (8)$$

and

$$A_e(x, y, z) = \Psi_e(x, y)\Psi_e(y, z)\Psi_e(z, x) \quad (9)$$

For  $A_e = 1$  eq.(6) implies the vanishing of string-loop corrections to cosmological constant, while (8) and (9) are needed for vanishing of string-loop corrections to 2-point and 3-point functions respectively. Under assumption (5) corrections to 1-point function vanish automatically (without this assumption they get contribution from correlators of  $A$  with the supercurrents).

**3. The case of hyperelliptic surfaces.** If restricted to hyperelliptic locus  $\mathcal{H}_g \subset \mathcal{M}_g$  of codimension  $g - 2$  in the moduli space  $\mathcal{M}_g$ , both Szego kernels and DHP/CDG/G measure become proportional to rational functions of ramification points  $a_i$ ,  $i = 1, \dots, 2g + 2$ , moreover all the dependence on the fermion boundary conditions (half-integer theta-characteristic)  $e$  is contained in these rational factors. Non-vanishing contributions come only from non-singular even characteristics, which are in one-to-one correspondence with divisions of  $2g + 2$  ramification points into two equal-size subsets  $\{a\} = \{\tilde{a}\} \cup \{\tilde{\tilde{a}}\}$  each containing  $g + 1$  points. Obviously, there are  $C_{2g+2}^{g+1}$  non-singular among the  $2^{g-1}(2g + 1)$  even characteristics. The theta-constant and Szego kernel on hyperelliptic locus are given by

$$\theta_e^4(0) = \det \sigma^2 \prod_{i < j}^{g+1} (\tilde{a}_i - \tilde{a}_j)(\tilde{\tilde{a}}_i - \tilde{\tilde{a}}_j) \quad (10)$$

and

$$\Psi_e(x, y) = \frac{1}{2} \left( \sqrt{\frac{u_e(x)}{u_e(y)}} + \sqrt{\frac{u_e(y)}{u_e(x)}} \right) \frac{\sqrt{dx dy}}{x - y} \quad (11)$$

where

$$u_e(x) = \sqrt{\prod_{i=1}^{g+1} \frac{x - \tilde{a}_i}{x - \tilde{\tilde{a}}_i}} = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{g+1} (x - \tilde{a}_i)}{s(x)} \quad (12)$$

and

$$s^2(x) = \prod_{I=1}^{2g+2} (x - a_I) = \prod_{i=1}^{g+1} (x - \tilde{a}_i)(x - \tilde{\tilde{a}}_i) \quad (13)$$

This means that on the hyperelliptic locus  $\mathcal{H}_g$  the vanishing relations (6) for (8) and (9) are reduced to

$$\sum_e \Xi_e = 0 \quad (14)$$

and

$$\sum_e \left( \frac{u_e(x)}{u_e(y)} + \frac{u_e(y)}{u_e(x)} \right) \Xi_e = 0 \quad (15)$$

In what follows we often omit the transcendental factors  $\det \sigma$  inessential for our considerations.

**4. Genus one.** Projective transformations allow to take for the four ramification points  $\{0, 1, \infty, \lambda\}$  with modular transformations restricted to six equivalences  $\lambda \sim 1 - \lambda \sim 1/\lambda \sim 1/(1 - \lambda) \sim (\lambda - 1)/\lambda \sim \lambda/(\lambda - 1)$ . The three even characteristics, all non-singular, are associated with the three pairs  $(0, \lambda)$ ,  $(1, \lambda)$  and  $(0, 1)$ . The corresponding three theta-constants  $\theta_e^4$  are  $\lambda$ ,  $\lambda - 1$  and  $1$ , linearly related by a single Riemann identity  $\sum_e^3 \langle e, * \rangle \theta_e^4 \sim \lambda - (\lambda - 1) - 1 = 0$ . The DHP/CDG/G forms  $\Xi_e = \sum_e \theta_e^{16} - \frac{1}{2} \theta_e^8 (\sum_e \theta_e^8)$  are given by  $\lambda^4 - \lambda^2(\lambda^2 - \lambda + 1) = \lambda^2(\lambda - 1)$ ,  $-\lambda(\lambda - 1)^2$ ,  $-\lambda(\lambda - 1)$ , and (14) is obviously true:

$$\sum_e^3 \Xi_e = \lambda(\lambda - 1) (\lambda - (\lambda - 1) - 1) = 0 \quad (16)$$

At genus one the same forms  $\Xi_e$  are also given by  $\langle e, * \rangle \theta_e^4 \eta^{12}$ , see eq.(28) in [12], and (14) is a direct consequence of Riemann identity. As to eq.(15), it looks like<sup>1</sup>

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_e^3 \frac{u_e(x)}{u_e(y)} \Xi_e &\sim \lambda(\lambda - 1) \frac{s(y)}{s(x)} \left( \lambda \frac{x(x - \lambda)}{y(y - \lambda)} - (\lambda - 1)^4 \frac{(x - 1)(x - \lambda)}{(y - 1)(y - \lambda)} - \frac{x(x - 1)}{y(y - 1)} \right) = \frac{\lambda^2(\lambda - 1)^2(x - y)}{s(x)s(y)}, \\ \sum_e^3 \left( \frac{u_e(x)}{u_e(y)} + \frac{u_e(y)}{u_e(x)} \right) \Xi_e &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

**5. Genus two.** From Thomae formula (10) and explicit form of

$$\Xi_e \stackrel{[7,9]}{\sim} \frac{2}{3} \theta_e^{16} - \frac{1}{2} \theta_e^8 \sum_{e_1}^{10} \theta_{e+e_1}^8 + \frac{1}{12} \theta_e^4 \sum_{e_1, e_2}^{10} \theta_{e+e_1}^4 \theta_{e+e_2}^4 \theta_{e+e_1+e_2}^4 \stackrel{[10]}{\sim} G_e^{(0)} - G_e^{(1)} + \frac{1}{3} G_e^{(2)} \quad (18)$$

(see [12] for normalization conventions and other details) we deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{g} = 2 : \quad \Xi_e &\sim \frac{1}{2} \theta_e^4(0) \left( \sum_{i \neq j \neq k}^{g+1} \tilde{a}_i \tilde{a}_j \tilde{a}_k - \sum_{i \neq j}^{g+1} \tilde{a}_i \tilde{a}_j \sum_k \tilde{a}_k + \sum_i^{g+1} \tilde{a}_i \sum_{j \neq k}^{g+1} \tilde{a}_j \tilde{a}_k - \sum_{i \neq j \neq k}^{g+1} \tilde{a}_i \tilde{a}_j \tilde{a}_k \right) \prod_{I < J}^{2g+2} (a_I - a_J) \\ &\theta_e^4(0) \sim \prod_{i < j}^{g+1} (\tilde{a}_i - \tilde{a}_j)(\tilde{\tilde{a}}_i - \tilde{\tilde{a}}_j) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

For example,

$$\Xi_{123|456} \sim (a_{12} a_{13} a_{23})^2 (a_{45} a_{46} a_{56})^2 (3a_1 a_2 a_3 - (a_1 a_2 + a_1 a_3 + a_2 a_3)(a_4 + a_5 + a_6) +$$

---

<sup>1</sup>Note that the sum in first line in (17) is not vanishing, contrary to erroneous statement in [17] (repeated afterwards in some subsequent papers). In fact it was the second line of (17) which was meant, used and derived there: as rightly explained in [17], the sum over characteristics is equivalent to antisymmetrization over ramification points, – but this is true for the second, not for the first line in (17).

$$+(a_1 + a_2 + a_3)(a_4a_5 + a_4a_6 + a_5a_6) - 3a_4a_5a_6) \cdot a_{14}a_{15}a_{16}a_{24}a_{25}a_{26}a_{34}a_{35}a_{36}$$

Note that this expression is symmetric under permutation of two triples 123 and 456 and also under permutations of any two points inside the triple: in this sense it is indeed a function of a given characteristic. We now apply the argumentation of [17] to prove the vanishing theorems (14) and (15). Sum over  $e$  is symmetrization w.r.t. *all* permutations of all the six ramification points:

$$\sum_e \Xi_e \sim \sum_{\text{perms of } abcdef} \Xi_{abc|def} \quad (20)$$

Since all  $\Xi_e$  have a common factor  $\Pi(a) \equiv \prod_{I < J}^{2g+2} (a_I - a_J)$ , which is *antisymmetric* w.r.t. the two points permutation,  $\Pi(a)^{-1} \sum_e \Xi_e$  should be an *antisymmetric* function, i.e. should itself be proportional to  $\Pi(a)$ . However, this sum has degree 9 in  $a_I$ , while the  $\Pi(a)$  has degree 15 – and this means that

$$\mathbf{g} = \mathbf{2} : \quad \sum_e^{10} \Xi_e = 0 \quad (21)$$

Similarly,

$$\sum_e \left( \frac{u_e(x)}{u_e(y)} + \frac{u_e(y)}{u_e(x)} \right) \Xi_e = \frac{1}{s(x)s(y)} \sum_e \left( \prod_{i=1}^{g+1} (x - \tilde{a}_i)(y - \tilde{a}_i) + \prod_{i=1}^{g+1} (x - \tilde{a}_i)(y - \tilde{a}_i) \right) \Xi_e \quad (22)$$

should be proportional to  $(x - y)\Pi(a)^2$ , since it should vanish at  $x = y$ , what is impossible because the sum has degree 15 in  $x, y, a_I$ , what is less than 16 – the degree of  $(x - y)\Pi(a)^2$ . This means that the sum (22) vanishes, and (15) is true for  $g = 2$ . Note that for this standard argument [17] to work it is important that  $\Pi(a)$  is factored out from (19): if this did not happen, such simple calculus would not work. At the same time, the factorization of  $\theta_e^4$  is not important: even if there was no such factor, the argument would perfectly work.

**6. From genus  $g$  to genus  $g - 1$ , e.g. from genus two to genus one.** Degeneration of hyperelliptic surfaces and factorization of theta-constants in Thomae formula look a little tricky: this is the price to be paid for simplifications of Riemann and other relations between theta-constants in this parametrization. The simple degeneration is  $\mathcal{H}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{g-1}$  – shrinking of a handle: then just some two of ramification points approach each other and the corresponding cut turns into a puncture. However, from the point of view of string measures this degeneration is not the simplest one, because it is associated with insertion of non-trivial vertex operators, describing propagation of string excitations with non-trivial spins along the shrinking handle. Much simpler from this point of view is degeneration  $\mathcal{H}_{g_1+g_2} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_{g_1} \times \mathcal{H}_{g_2}$ , when no spin-carrying particles can propagate along the long tube and measures simply factorize, in particular,  $\Xi_e^{(g_1+g_2)} \rightarrow \Xi_{e_1}^{(g_1)} \Xi_{e_2}^{(g_2)} + \dots$ . However, the corresponding behavior of ramification points is more involved. In what follows we consider only the simplest degeneration of this kind,  $\mathcal{H}_g \rightarrow \mathcal{H}_1 \times \mathcal{H}_{g-1}$ , all others can be analyzed in the same way.

In this limit some *three* ramification points, let them be  $A_1 = a_{2g}$ ,  $A_2 = a_{2g+1}$  and  $A_3 = a_{2g+2}$  approach each other and finally become a single point  $A$  (they are sometimes underlined in formulas below). The  $2g$  ramification points of emerging curve of genus  $g - 1$  are  $a_1, \dots, a_{2g-1}, A$ , while the decoupling torus (genus-one curve) is characterized by the set  $A_1, A_2, A_3, \infty$ , so that  $A_{23} = \lambda A_{13}$ ,  $A_{12} = (1 - \lambda)A_{13}$ , and  $A_{12} \rightarrow 0$ , while  $\lambda$  remains finite and becomes the modulus of the torus. For  $g = 2$  the 10 theta-constants behave in this limit as follows:

$$\theta_{123|\underline{456}}^4 = \det^2 \sigma a_{123}a_{456} = \det^2 \sigma a_{123}A_{123} = \lambda(1 - \lambda)a_{123} \cdot (A_{13}^3 \det^2 \sigma) \rightarrow 0 \quad (23)$$

and, say,

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{124|\underline{356}}^4 &= \det^2 \sigma a_{124}a_{356} \rightarrow (1 - \lambda)a_{12}(A - a_1)(A - a_2)(A - a_3)^2 \cdot (A_{13} \det^2 \sigma) \left(1 + O(A_{13})\right) \rightarrow \\ &\rightarrow \underbrace{(1 - \lambda)}_{\theta_{1\lambda|0\infty}^{(1)}} \underbrace{a_{12}(A - a_3)}_{\theta_{12|3A}^{(1)}} \underbrace{(A - a_1)(A - a_2)(A - a_3)}_{P(A)} P(A)^{-1} \sim \theta_{1\lambda|0\infty}^{(1)} \theta_{12|3A}^{(1)} \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

and similarly for the other 8 characteristics where the three underlined points appear among both  $\tilde{a}$  and  $\tilde{\tilde{a}}$ . In taking these limits we used that

$$\det \sigma^{(g)} \xrightarrow{A_{13} \rightarrow 0} \frac{1}{\sqrt{A_{13} P(A)}} \det \sigma^{(1)} \det \sigma^{(g-1)} \quad (25)$$

To understand this behavior one needs to recall that  $\sigma$  is a matrix of  $A$ -periods of  $g$  non-canonical holomorphic differentials  $\frac{x^{0,1,\dots,g-1}dx}{s(x)}$ . In the limit of our interest  $s^{(g)}(x) \rightarrow (x-A)s^{(g-1)}(x)$  and only  $g-1$  of these  $g$  differentials, namely

$$\frac{(x-A)x^{0,1,\dots,g-2}dx}{s^{(g)}(x)} \rightarrow \frac{x^{0,1,\dots,g-2}dx}{s^{(g-1)}(x)} \quad (26)$$

behave smoothly and turn into the same kind of holomorphic differentials on the genus  $g-1$  curve. The last differential naively looks singular,  $\frac{dx}{s(x)} \rightarrow \frac{dx}{(x-A)s^{(g-1)}(x)}$ , however the singularity is actually resolved while the three points  $A_1, A_2, A_3$  remain different. In appropriate coordinate  $x = A + A_{13}\chi$  this differential looks like the ordinary holomorphic differential on the torus,  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{A_{13}P(A)}} \frac{d\chi}{\sqrt{\chi(\chi-1)(\chi-\lambda)}}$  only with the coefficient, which diverges as  $A_{13} \rightarrow 0$ . Therefore the matrix  $\sigma^{(g)}$  consists of non-singular  $\sigma^{(g-1)}$  and an extra singular element  $\frac{\sigma^{(1)}}{\sqrt{A_{13}P(A)}}$  on diagonal. Non-singular elements in associated row and column do not affect the singular asymptotics (25) of  $\det \sigma$ .

It remains to see what happens to  $\rho_e$ , and here we again return to genus two. Since  $\theta_{123|456}$  vanishes in the limit, the behavior of  $\rho_{123|456}$  is of no interest. Thus we need to look only at

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{124|356} &= 3a_1a_2a_4 - (a_1a_2 + a_1a_4 + a_2a_4)(a_3 + a_5 + a_6) + (a_1 + a_2 + a_4)(a_3a_5 + a_3a_6 + a_5a_6) - 3a_3a_5a_6 \rightarrow \\ &\rightarrow 3(Aa_1a_2 - A^2a_3) - (a_1a_2 + A(a_1 + a_2))(a_3 + 2A) + (a_1 + a_2 + A)(2Aa_3 + A^2) = \\ &= (A - a_1)(A - a_2)(A - a_3) = P(A) \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

**7. Other genera.** In general one can *assume* that on hyperelliptic locus

$$\Xi_e = \det \sigma^8 R_e \prod_{I < J}^{2g+2} (a_I - a_J) \quad (28)$$

Since by Thomae formula the weight-two form  $\theta_e^4$  has degree  $g(g+1)$  in ramification points, the weight-eight form  $\Xi_e$  has degree  $4g(g+1)$ , while the product  $\prod_{i < j}^{2g+2} a_{ij}$  has degree  $(g+1)(2g+1)$ . Thus  $R_e$  is a polynomial of degree  $g(g+1) + g^2 - 1 = (g+1)(2g-1)$  in ramification points. Explicit expression for it can be straightforwardly deduced from the theta-constant expression (4), but this exercise remains beyond the scope of the present paper: it is a very important problem for the future research. The most important question is if the  $\Pi(a)$  factor is indeed extracted from  $\Xi_e$  on the hyperelliptic locus. If this happens— as we now *assume* — then the simple power-counting of [17], reminded above for the simplest case of  $g=2$ , is sufficient to prove the two vanishing identities (14) and (15). Indeed, we have two polynomials

$$\sum_e \Xi_e \stackrel{(28)}{\sim} \sum_e R_e = 0 \quad (29)$$

and

$$s(x)s(y) \sum_e \left( \frac{u_e(x)}{u_e(y)} + \frac{u_e(y)}{u_e(x)} \right) \Xi_e \stackrel{(28)}{\sim} \sum_e R_e \left( \prod_{i=1}^{g+1} (x - \tilde{a}_i)(y - \tilde{a}_i) + \prod_{i=1}^{g+1} (y - \tilde{a}_i)(x - \tilde{a}_i) \right) = 0 \quad (30)$$

of degrees  $(g+1)(2g-1)$  and  $(g+1)(2g+1)$  respectively, and they should be *antisymmetric* under permutations of all ramification points, i.e. should be divisible by  $\Pi(a)$  which has degree  $(g+1)(2g+1)$ . It follows, that the first polynomial vanishes and, as a corollary, the second one should be additionally divisible by  $(x-y)$  – and then it also needs to vanish.

At genus  $g=2$  the polynomial  $R_e$  is further decomposed as  $R_e = \theta_e^4 \rho_e$ , but this need not happen for higher genera. We emphasize once again that this does not affect the validity of pre-renorminvariance theorems (14) and (15). This observation, though confined to the hyperelliptic locus, can still be an additional source of optimism about the DHP-CDG-G conjecture [7, 9, 10]: even without the  $\theta_e^4$  factors *some* important properties of the correlators can survive.

**8. A little more on  $g \rightarrow 1 + (g-1)$  factorization of hyperelliptic measures.** Of  $C_{2g+2}^{g+1}$  theta-constants with non-singular characteristics the  $C_{2g-1}^{g-2}$  of the form  $\theta_{123\dots}$  vanish in degeneration limit, while the remaining  $3C_{2g-1}^{g-1}$  turn into

$$\begin{aligned} & \theta_{A_1 A_2 \dots | A_3 \dots}^{(g)} \xrightarrow{\quad} \det^2 \sigma A_{12} \prod_{i < j}^{g-1} \tilde{a}_{ij} \prod_{i < j}^g \tilde{\tilde{a}}_{ij} \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} (A - \tilde{a}_i)^2 \prod_{i=1}^g (A - \tilde{\tilde{a}}_i) = \\ & = \underbrace{\det^2 \sigma A_{12}}_{\theta_{12|3\infty}^{(1)}/P(A)} \underbrace{\left( \prod_{i=1}^{g-1} (A - \tilde{a}_i) \prod_{i < j}^{g-1} \tilde{\tilde{a}}_{ij} \right)}_{\theta^{(g-1)}} \underbrace{\left( \prod_{i < j}^g \tilde{\tilde{a}}_{ij} \prod_{I=1}^{2g-1} (A - a_I) \right)}_{P(A)} \sim \theta_{12|3\infty}^{(1)} \theta_A^{(g-1)} \underbrace{\dots}_{g-1} | \underbrace{\dots}_g \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where  $P(A) \equiv \prod_{I=1}^{2g-1} (A - a_I)$  is a specific auxiliary polynomial of degree  $2g - 1$ . It follows that

$$\Xi_{e_g}^{(g)} \xrightarrow{\quad} \Xi_{e_1}^{(1)} \Xi_{e_{g-1}}^{(g-1)} \quad (32)$$

At the same time

$$\Pi^{(g)}(a) \xrightarrow{\quad} \lambda(1 - \lambda) A_{13}^3 \prod_{I < J}^{2g-1} (a_I - a_J) \prod_{I=1}^{2g-1} (A - a_I)^3 = A_{13}^3 \cdot \Pi^{(1)} \Pi^{(g-1)} P(A)^2 \quad (33)$$

(one  $P(A)$  is absorbed into  $\Pi^{(g-1)}$ ).

From (32), (33) and (25) it follows that  $R_e$  in (28) should factorize as

$$R_{e_g}^{(g)} \xrightarrow{\quad} R_{e_1}^{(1)} R_{e_{g-1}}^{(g-1)} P^2(A) A_{13} \quad (34)$$

where the genus one  $R_e^{(1)} = \theta_e^4 / \det^2 \sigma$  (i.e.  $\rho_e^{(1)} = 1$ ). In comparison to (27) one should remember that at genus two  $R_e \det^2 \sigma = \theta_e^4 \rho_e$ , the  $A_{13}$  factor is absorbed into factorization of  $\det \sigma$ , and  $\rho_e$  transforms with a single  $P(A)$  factor. Factorization (34) respects the power counting:

$$(g+1)(2g-1) = g(2g-3) + 2(2g-1) + 1$$

(if  $\rho_e$  could exist, i.e. if  $\theta_e^4$  factors out from  $\Xi_e$  and  $R_e$  at least on hyperelliptic locus, then it would be a polynomial of degree  $g^2 - 1 = (g-1)(g+1)$  in ramification points and factorization  $g \rightarrow 1 + (g-1)$  would imply the following power counting:  $g^2 - 1 = (g-1)^2 - 1 + 2g - 1$ .)

**9. Conclusion.** To summarize, we considered restriction of DHP-CDG-G NSR measures on hyperelliptic locus and argued that validity of identities (14) and (15), underlying the non-renormalization theorems is not too much affected by the violation of the " $\theta_e^4$ -hypothesis" by these measures for  $g \geq 3$ . The argument is not a full proof because it uses a (plausible) assumption that  $\Pi(a)$  is factored out from the hyperelliptic measure (28). This assumption can be checked by substitution of Thomae formula (10) into (4), what is straightforward but somewhat tedious exercise (in this paper it is performed only for  $g = 2$ ). Alternatively information about the structure of  $R_e$  can be provided by explicit generalization of factorization relation (27) to (34) for  $g > 2$ . These exercises deserve to be done in any case, also because the explicit knowledge of  $R_e$  (presumably, a nice expression) will be of direct use for evaluation of 4- and higher-point functions, at least on the hyperelliptic locus. One of the main goals of this letter is to remind about the power and simplicity of hyperelliptic calculus and advocate its application in the new attack on the bastions of the first-quantized string theory.

## Acknowledgements

This work is partly supported by Russian Federal Nuclear Energy Agency and Russian Academy of Sciences, by the joint grant 06-01-92059-CE, by NWO project 047.011.2004.026, by INTAS grant 05-1000008-7865, by ANR-05-BLAN-0029-01 project, by RFBR grant 07-02-00645 and by the Russian President's Grant of Support for the Scientific Schools NSh-3035.2008.2

## References

- [1] A.Belavin and V.Knizhnik, *Algebraic Geometry and the Geometry of Quantum Strings*, Phys.Lett. **168B** (1986) 201-206; ZhETF **91** (1986) 247;  
A.Belavin, V.Knizhnik, A.Morozov and A.Perelomov, *Two- and three-loop amplitudes in the bosonic string theory*, Phys.Lett. **177B** (1986) 324; Pis'ma v ZhETF, **43** (1986) 319;  
G.Moore, *Modular Forms and Two-Loop String Physics*, Phys.Lett. **176B** (1986) 69;  
A.Beilinson and Yu.Manin, *The Mumford form and the Polyakov measure in string theory*, Comm. Math. Phys. **107** (1986) 359-376;  
A.Morozov, *Explicit formulae for one, two, three and four loop string amplitudes*, Phys.Lett. **184B** (1987) 171-176; *Analytical Anomaly and Heterotic String in the Formalism of Continual Integration*, Phys.Lett. **184B** (1987) 177-183
- [2] L.Alvarez-Gaume, J.Bost, G.Moore, P.Nelson and C.Vafa, *Bosonisation on Higher Genus Riemann Surfaces*, Comm.Math.Phys. **112** (1987) 503; *Modular forms and the cosmological constant*, Phys.Lett. **178B** (1986) 41;  
E.Verlinde and H.Verlinde, *Chiral Bosonization, Determinants and the String Partition Function*, Nucl. Phys. **B288** (1987) 357-396;  
E.D'Hoker and D.Phong, Nucl.Phys. **B292** (1987) 109; *The Geometry of String Perturbation Theory*, Rev. Mod.Phys., **60** (1988) 917-1065
- [3] For description of free-field calculus on Riemann-surfaces which underlies description of first-quantized strings in critical dimensions see:  
V.Knizhnik, *Multiloop Amplitudes in the Theory of Quantum Strings and Complex Geometry*, Usp. Phys. Nauk, **159** (1989) 401-453;  
A.Gerasimov, A.Marshakov, A.Morozov, M.Olshanetsky and S.Shatashvili, *Wess-Zumino-Witten model as a theory of free fields*, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A5** (1990) 2495-2589, sec.5;  
A.Morozov and A.Perelomov, *Strings and Complex Geometry*, in Modern Problems of Mathematics, VINITI, Moscow, 1990; Encyclopedia of Mathematical Sciences, **54** (1993) 197-280, Springer;  
A.Gorsky, A.Marshakov, A.Mironov and A.Morozov, *RG equations from Witham hierarchy*, Nucl.Phys. **B527** (1998) 690-716, hep-th/9802007  
These papers also contain the relevant extracts from the basic text-books on Riemannian theta-functions,  
J.-I.Igusa, *On the graded ring of theta-constants*, Amer.J.Math. **86** (1964) 219-246; *ibid.* **84** (1962) 175; *ibid.* **89** (1967) 817; *Theta Functions*, Springer-Verlag, 1972; *Schottky's invariant and quadratic forms*, E.B.Christoffel Int.Symp., Aachen (1981) 352-362;  
J.Fay, *Theta functions on Riemann surfaces*, Lect.Notes Math. **352**, Springer, 1973;  
D.Mumford, *Tata Lectures on Theta*, Progr.in Math. **28**, **43**, Birkhauser, 1983, 1984
- [4] Al.Zamolodchikov, *Conformal Scalar Field On The Hyperelliptic Curve And Critical Ashkin-Teller Multi-point Correlation Functions*, Nucl.Phys. **B285** (1987) 481-503;  
D.Lebedev and A.Morozov, *Statistical sums of strings on hyperelliptic surfaces*, Nucl.Phys. **B302** (1988) 163
- [5] A.Morozov and M.Olshanetsky, *Statistical Sum Of Bosonic String Compactified On Orbifold*, Sov.J.Nucl. Phys. **46** (1987) 566-575
- [6] O.Alvarez, *Theory of Strings with Boundaries*, Nucl.Phys. **B216** (1983) 125;  
S.Carlip, *Sewing Closed String Amplitudes*, Phys.Lett. **209B** (1988) 464;  
S.Blau, S.Carlip, M.Clements, S.Della Pietra and V.Della Pietra, *The String Amplitude on Surfaces with Boundaries and Crosscaps*, Nucl.Phys. **B301** (1988) 285-303;  
A.Morozov and A.Rosly, *Statistical Sums for open and/or non-oriented strings*, Phys.Lett. **195B** (1987) 554; *On many loop calculations in the theory of open strings*, Phys.Lett. **214B** (1988) 522; *Strings and open Riemann surfaces*, Nucl.Phys. **B326** (1989) 205-221
- [7] E.D'Hoker and D.Phong, *Two Loop Superstrings*, Phys.Lett. **B529** (2002) 241-255, hep-th/0110247; Nucl.Phys. **B636** (2002) 3-60, hep-th/0110283; Nucl.Phys. **B636** (2002) 61-79, hep-th/0111016; Nucl.Phys. **B639** (2002) 129-181, hep-th/0111040; Nucl.Phys. **B715** (2005), 91-119, hep-th/0501196;
- [8] E.D'Hoker and D.Phong, *Two Loop Superstrings. VI. Non-Renormalization Theorems and the 4-Point Functions*, Nucl.Phys. **B715** (2005), 3-90, hep-th/0501197; arXiv: 0711.4314

- [9] S.Cacciatori, and F.Dalla Piazza, *Two loop superstring amplitudes and  $S_6$  representations*, arXiv: 0707.0646; S.Cacciatori, F.Dalla Piazza and B.van Geemen, *Modular Forms and Three Loop Superstring Amplitudes*, arXiv: 0801.2543; *Genus Four Superstring Measures*, arXiv: 0804.0457 v1; F.Dalla Piazza and B.van Geemen, *Siegel Modular Forms and Finite Symplectic Groups*, arXiv: 0804.3769; *Lectures on Two-Loop Superstrings*, hep-th/0211111
- [10] S.Grushevsky, *Superstring Amplitudes in Higher Genus*, arXiv: 0803.3469
- [11] K.Aoki, E.D'Hoker and D.Phong, *Two-Loop Superstring on Orbifold Compactifications*, Nucl.Phys. **B688** (2004) 3-69, hep-th/0312181;  
 E.D'Hoker and D.Phong, *Aszygies, Modular Forms and the Superstring Measure*, Nucl.Phys. **B710** (2005) 58-82, hep-th/0411159, Nucl.Phys. **B710** (2005) 83-116, hep-th/0411182;  
 E.D'Hoker, M.Gutperle and D.Phong, *Two-Loop Superstrings and S-Duality*, Nucl.Phys. **B722** (2005) 81-118, hep-th/0503180;  
 Z.-G.Xiao and C.-J.Zhu, *Factorization of the Two-Loop Four-Point Amplitude in Superstring Theory Revisited*, JHEP **0506** (2005) 002, hep-th/0412018;  
 C.-J.Zhu, *A Formula for Multi-Loop 4-Particle Amplitude in Superstring Theory*, hep-th/0503001;  
 M.Matone and R.Volpato, *Higher genus superstring amplitudes from the geometry of moduli space*, Nucl.Phys. **B732** (2006) 321-340, hep-th/0506231;  
 M.Oura and R.Salvati Manni, *On the image of code polynomials under theta map*, arXiv: 0803.4389;  
 R.Salvati Manni, *Remarks on Superstring Amplitudes in Higher Genus*, arXiv: 0804.0512
- [12] A.Morozov, *NSR Superstring Measures Revisited*, arXiv: 0804.3167 v2
- [13] M.Green and J.Schwarz, *Covariant Description of Superstrings*, Phys.Lett. **136B** (1984) 367-370; S.Carlip, Nucl.Phys. **B284** (1987) 365; Phys.Lett. **186B** (1987) 141; R.Kalosh and A.Morozov, *Green-Schwarz action and loop calculations for superstring*, Int.J.Mod.Phys. **A3** (1988) 1943-1958; *On the vanishing of multiloop contributions to 0,1,2,3-point functions in the Green-Schwarz formalism for heterotic string*, Phys.Lett. **207B** (1988) 164-168; N.Berkovits, *Explaining the Pure Spinor Formalism for the Superstring*, arXiv: 0712.0324 and references therein
- [14] E.Martinec, Phys.Lett. **171B** (1986) 189; Nucl.Phys. **B281** (1986) 157; A.Morozov, *Point-wise vanishing of two-loop contributions to 1,2,3-point functions in the NSR formalism*, Nucl.Phys. **B318** (1989) 137-152
- [15] J.Atick and A.Sen, Phys.Lett. **186B** (1987) 319; A.Morozov and A.Perelomov, *Statistical Sums in Superstring Theory. Genus 2*, Phys.Lett. **197B** (1987) 115-118; Pis'ma v ZhETF, **46** (1987) 125; *A note on many-loop calculations for superstring in the NSR formalism*, Phys.Lett. **209B** (1988) 473-476; E.D'Hoker and D.Phong, *Conformal scalar fields and chiral splitting on super Riemann surfaces*, Comm.Math.Phys. **125** (1989) 469-513; O.Lichtenfeld, *Superconformal Ghost Correlations On Riemann Surfaces*, Phys.Lett. **232B** (1989) 193; *On Finiteness of the Superstring*, Nucl.Phys. **B322** (1989) 82; *Factorization and modular invariance of multiloop superstring amplitudes in the unitary gauge*, Nucl.Phys. **B338** (1990) 403-414; O.Lichtenfeld and A.Parkes, *On Covariant Multiloop Superstring Amplitudes*, Nucl.Phys. **B332** (1990) 39
- [16] A.Morozov and A.Perelomov, *On vanishing of vacuum energy for superstrings*, Phys.Lett. **183B** (1987) 296-299; J.Atick, J.Rabin and A.Sen, *An ambiguity in fermionic string perturbation theory*, **B299** (1988) 279-294; G.Moore and A.Morozov, *Some Remarks on Two-Loop Superstring Calculations*, Nucl.Phys. **B306** (1988) 387-404; J.Atick, G.Moore and A.Sen, *Catoptric Tadpoles*, Nucl.Phys. **B307** (1988) 221-273; *Some Global Issues in String Perturbation Theory*, Nucl.Phys. **B308** (1988) 1
- [17] A.Morozov, *Two-loop statsum of superstring*, Nucl.Phys. **B303** (1988) 343; Sov.J.Nucl.Phys. **48** (1988) 555-564