

From Hadrons to Gravitons via Strings

John H. Schwarz¹

Walter Burke Institute for Theoretical Physics

California Institute of Technology

Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

Abstract

The first quantum string theories were developed around 1970, prior to the discovery of QCD, with the goal of producing a theory of hadrons. Basic physical requirements and mathematical consistency of the string theories known at that time turned out to require the inclusion of gravity and the existence of extra spatial dimensions. This came as a complete surprise to everyone who was involved. It led to a completely new and very ambitious goal for string theory research, namely a unified quantum theory of gravity and all other forces. In particular, this goal requires that the string tension is 20 orders of magnitude larger than was previously envisioned. Fifty years later, this goal is widely shared.

¹jhs@theory.caltech.edu

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	The origins of string theory	3
3	The demise of string theory	7
4	Gravity and unification	8
5	Supergravity and supersymmetric strings	9
6	Anomalies	10
7	Conclusion	11

1 Introduction

String theory was developed in the search for a theory of the *strong nuclear force*. In the 1960s, when the search began, the only force for which there already was a satisfactory quantum theory was the *electromagnetic force*. Quantum electrodynamics (QED) was, and still is, a well-established quantum field theory of electrons and photons. The study of gravity was a very remote, and seemingly irrelevant, topic for people interested in particle physics.

The goal of the high-energy theory group in Berkeley in the 1960s was to construct the S matrix that encodes the scattering amplitudes of the strongly interacting particles, which are called hadrons. The correct theory of hadrons, quantum chromodynamics (QCD), was formulated in 1973. It is a Yang–Mills theory of interacting *quarks* and *gluons*, the fundamental constituents of hadrons, that is based on the Yang–Mills gauge group $SU(3)$. It is fortunate that QCD wasn't discovered a few years earlier! Had this happened, it is unlikely that string theory would have been developed – at least for a very long time.

The leaders of S-matrix theory research in Berkeley in the 1960s were Geoffrey Chew and Stanley Mandelstam. Chew argued that quantum field theory would not be useful for the strong interactions, since the expansion parameter is too large. (This turned out to be wrong, at least in certain limits.) Instead, Chew and Frautschi [1] proposed that one could deduce the hadronic S matrix, which encodes all of the scattering amplitudes, from some general principles:

- Unitarity and analyticity of the S matrix
- Analyticity in angular momentum (Regge Pole Theory)
- The bootstrap hypothesis: particle exchanges produce the forces that are responsible for their own existence.

Regge had realized previously that it is sometimes useful to interpolate between the discrete physical values of angular momentum and consider continuous values. Hadrons (especially baryons, many of which were discovered in the 1960s) were observed to lie on approximately linear and parallel *Regge trajectories*

$$J = \alpha(s) = \alpha(0) + \alpha' s.$$

Whenever the function $\alpha(s)$ is a nonnegative integer J (or half-odd integer in the case of fermions), there is a stable particle or unstable resonance of spin J and mass M , where $s = M^2$. In the case of hadrons, the *Regge slope* α' is about 1.0 GeV^{-2} .

In a reaction $1 + 2 \rightarrow 3 + 4$, energy and momentum are conserved

$$p_1^\mu + p_2^\mu = p_3^\mu + p_4^\mu,$$

where $\mu = 0, 1, 2, 3$ for four-dimensional spacetime. The quantities

$$s = (p_1 + p_2)^2, \quad t = (p_1 - p_3)^2, \quad u = (p_1 - p_4)^2$$

are computed using the Lorentz metric. $s + t + u$ is the sum of the squares of the four masses. The bootstrap conjecture is that particle exchanges provide the forces that are responsible for their own existence. This conjecture implies that in a first approximation that neglects resonance widths, scattering amplitudes are given by formulas of the sort

$$A(s, t) = \sum_i \frac{\beta_i(t)}{s - M_i^2} = \sum_i \frac{\beta_i(s)}{t - M_i^2},$$

and the residues β_i are polynomials that are determined by the spins that contribute. Such a formula is only conceivable if there is an infinite spectrum of particles. Then these series are defined outside their regions of convergence by analytic continuation. This is different from conventional quantum field theory, with a finite spectrum, where the two expressions would correspond to distinct Feynman diagrams that should be added together.

2 The origins of string theory

In 1968 Veneziano found an explicit realization of the bootstrap and Regge behavior in the narrow-resonance approximation [2]. A somewhat simplified version of his formula is

$$A(s, t) = g^2 B(-\alpha(s), -\alpha(t)),$$

where B is Euler's beta function

$$B(x, y) = \frac{\Gamma(x)\Gamma(y)}{\Gamma(x+y)}.$$

The Regge trajectories are linear $\alpha(s) = \alpha(0) + \alpha's$. This formula satisfies the bootstrap equations! It is much simpler than anyone previously thought could be possible. Soon thereafter Virasoro proposed, as an alternative,

$$g^2 \frac{\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha(s)}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha(t)}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha(u)}{2})}{\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha(t)+\alpha(u)}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha(s)+\alpha(u)}{2})\Gamma(-\frac{\alpha(s)+\alpha(t)}{2})},$$

which has similar virtues [3]. Remarkably, these two formulas, guessed without a theory, later turned out to be, almost precisely, tree-approximation amplitudes for theories of open-string

and closed-string scattering respectively! In the modern interpretation, discussed later, they correspond to gauge theory and gravity interactions.

The discussion that follows is only intended to give an impressionistic view, omitting various technical details. The N -particle generalization of the Veneziano formula (found in 1969 by several groups) is

$$A_N = g^{N-2} \int \mu_N(y) \prod_{j < k} (y_j - y_k)^{\alpha' p_j \cdot p_k} \prod_{i=1}^N dy_i.$$

The measure $\mu_N(y)$ contains step functions that ensure that $y_{j+1} \geq y_j$. It also contains delta functions such that there are only $N - 3$ integrations. Altogether, A_N has cyclic symmetry in the N particles. By a change of variables A_N can be brought to a form in which the N particles are at points on the boundary of a circular disk (instead of on an infinite line) with a specified cyclic ordering. The particles in this formula are required to belong to the adjoint representation of a gauge group such as $SO(n)$ or $Sp(n)$. The complete tree-approximation amplitude then takes the form

$$T_N = \sum_{perms} C_N A_N.$$

The sum is over all inequivalent cyclic orderings of the N particles. The group-theoretic coefficients, C_N , are traces of a product of matrices associated to the particles with the corresponding cyclic ordering.

Shapiro's N -particle generalization of the Virasoro formula is an analogous formula involving $N - 3$ complex integrations [4]

$$T_N = g^{N-2} \int \tilde{\mu}_N(z) \prod_{i < j} |z_i - z_j|^{\alpha' k_i \cdot k_j} \prod_{i=1}^N d^2 z_i.$$

This formula has total symmetry in the N particles, and there is no associated gauge symmetry group. The coordinates z_i can be recast as N points on a two-dimensional sphere.

These formulas have consistent factorizations on well-defined spectra of single-particle states [5][6], which can be incorporated in a Fock space generated by an infinite set of harmonic oscillators. There is one such set of oscillators in the Veneziano case and two sets in the Shapiro–Virasoro case. Consistent factorization was the first indication that these formulas arise from *theories*, not just intriguing formulas.

In 1970 Nambu, Nielsen, and Susskind independently interpreted the spectrum and amplitudes as arising from a theory of a one-dimensional structure, later called a *string*: open strings (with two ends) in the Veneziano case; closed strings (or loops) in the Shapiro–Virasoro case. Remarkably, the formulas preceded the interpretation! The string tension

is $T = 1/(2\pi\alpha')$. In a Feynman diagram perspective, strings sweep out two-dimensional *world-sheets* in spacetime. Having found the spectrum and tree-approximation amplitudes, it became possible to study radiative corrections (loop amplitudes). These are given by integrals associated to higher-genus Riemann surfaces. These surfaces have boundaries when particles associated to open strings are involved.

In 1970 Gross et al. calculated four-particle open-string one-loop amplitudes for which the string world sheet is topologically a cylinder, *i.e.*, it has two circular boundaries [7]. There were two cases of interest. In the first case, all four particles are attached to one of the boundaries, and in the second case two particles are attached to each boundary (particles 1 and 2 attach to one boundary, and particles 3 and 4 attach to the other boundary.) In the first case the amplitude is given by an integral that has a divergence. It can be removed, leaving a satisfactory finite result, by a procedure previously introduced by Neveu and Scherk [8]. So it is okay. The second case (two particles on each boundary) turned out to be more profound. The amplitude contains *branch points* in the variable $s = (p_1 + p_2)^2$ that *violate unitarity*. Unless one could eliminate these branch points, this could not be a consistent quantum theory. This was a serious problem!

Lovelace rescued the theory by observing that these singularities would become poles (rather than branch points) if

$$\alpha(0) = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad d = 26,$$

where d is the dimension of spacetime ($d - 1$ spatial dimensions and one time dimension) [9]. Nobody working in this field had questioned the assumption that $d = 4$ before this. Lovelace's discovery forced us to take *extra dimensions of space* (22 of them in this case) seriously for the first time. We were aware of the work of Kaluza and Klein many years earlier, but that was in the context of gravity. Why should a theory of hadrons require extra dimensions of space? This was very surprising and unexpected. $\alpha(0) = 1$ implies that the spectrum contains massless spin one particles and spin 0 tachyons, so these are additional issues. Lovelace's poles describe closed-string intermediate states in the reaction $1 + 2 \rightarrow 3 + 4$. This could have been anticipated, because the cylinder can be viewed either as a one-loop open-string diagram or finite propagation of a closed string! Thus, Lovelace's poles correspond to closed-string states. This was the discovery of *open-string - closed-string duality*.

The open-string particle spectrum of the $d = 26$ critical string theory has an infinite algebra of constraints generated by operators L_m , $m \in \mathbb{Z}$ that satisfy the Virasoro algebra

[10]

$$[L_m, L_n] = (m - n)L_{m+n} + \frac{c}{12}(m^3 - m)\delta_{m+n,0}.$$

$c = d = 26$ for the critical bosonic string. These constraints eliminate unphysical negative-norm states (called ghosts) from the physical spectrum. The Virasoro operators generate the group of conformal symmetries of the two-dimensional string world-sheet theory. There is a similar story for the closed-string spectrum involving two copies of the Virasoro algebra.

In 1971 Ramond introduced a string theory analog of the Dirac equation [11], which is the wave equation for a free electron. His proposal was that just as the string's momentum p^μ is the zero mode of a string momentum density $P^\mu(\sigma)$, the Dirac matrices γ^μ should be the zero modes of densities $\Gamma^\mu(\sigma)$. Then he defined Fourier modes

$$F_n = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-in\sigma} \Gamma \cdot P d\sigma \quad n \in \mathbb{Z}.$$

In particular, $F_0 = \gamma \cdot p + \text{oscillator terms}$. He then proposed the wave equation

$$(F_0 + M)|\psi\rangle = 0,$$

which is a stringy generalization of the Dirac equation. (We later realized that the interacting theory containing these fermions requires $M = 0$.) Ramond also observed that the Virasoro algebra generalizes to a super-Virasoro algebra with odd elements F_n and even elements L_n . $\{F_m, F_n\} = F_m F_n + F_n F_m = L_{m+n}$, aside from a central extension, etc. Algebras that include anticommutators in addition to commutators are called *superalgebras*. This motivated the mathematician Kac to give a complete classification of simple superalgebras [12], which constitutes an extension of Cartan's classification of ordinary (bosonic) Lie algebras.

Very soon after Ramond's work, Neveu and I introduced a second bosonic string theory [13]. It involves a similar operator to Ramond's, but the periodic density $\Gamma^\mu(\sigma + 2\pi) = \Gamma^\mu(\sigma)$ is replaced by an antiperiodic one $H^\mu(\sigma + 2\pi) = -H^\mu(\sigma)$. In terms of modes

$$G_r = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{-ir\sigma} H \cdot P d\sigma \quad r \in \mathbb{Z} + 1/2$$

are the odd elements of a super-Virasoro algebra very similar to the one found by Ramond. These bosons and Ramond's fermions combine into a unified theory of bosons and fermions. This was an early version of what would later become superstring theory. Additional important facts remained to be understood first. The titles of these papers show that we were still thinking about hadrons. The critical spacetime dimension of the RNS string is $d = 10$. At the time, we considered this to be a step in the right direction, and we hoped that the next theory would have $d = 4$.

Later in 1971 Gervais and Sakita constructed a world-sheet action for the RNS string [15]

$$S = T \int d\sigma d\tau (\partial_\alpha X^\mu \partial^\alpha X_\mu - i\bar{\psi}^\mu \gamma^\alpha \partial_\alpha \psi_\mu).$$

They pointed out that this simple theory has global supersymmetry

$$\delta X^\mu = \bar{\varepsilon} \psi^\mu, \quad \delta \psi^\mu = -i\gamma^\alpha \varepsilon \partial_\alpha X^\mu,$$

where ε is an infinitesimal constant Grassmann-valued spinor. Even though superalgebras had already been discussed, this is the very first theory ever shown to have *supersymmetry*. It is a free theory in two dimensions, which is about as simple as possible. The symmetry relates bosonic operators X^μ and fermionic operators ψ^μ . This was previously believed not to be possible [16]. Five years later the Gervais–Sakita global supersymmetry together with the super-Virasoro constraints were shown to result from gauge fixing an action with *local* 2d supersymmetry [17][18].

The Gervais–Sakita discovery motivated Wess and Zumino to construct four-dimensional interacting analogs [19][20]. This then inspired the construction of supersymmetric extensions of the standard model and subsequent experimental searches for supersymmetry partners. Even though relatively few physicists cared about strings in this era, many became interested in supersymmetry as possible new physics to be discovered at accelerators.

3 The demise of string theory

In 1973–74 there were many good reasons to stop working on string theory: a successful and convincing theory of hadrons (QCD) was discovered, and string theory had severe problems as a theory of hadrons. These included an unrealistic spacetime dimension ($d = 10$ or $d = 26$), an unrealistic spectrum (including tachyons and massless particles), and the absence of point-like constituents, such as quarks and gluons. A few years of attempts to do better had been unsuccessful. The success of QCD eliminated the need to formulate a theory of hadrons based on strings.

Moreover, convincing theoretical and experimental evidence for the Standard Model was rapidly falling into place. That was where the action was. Even for those seeking to pursue speculative theoretical ideas there were options other than string theory that most of them found more appealing, such as grand unification and supersymmetric field theory. Understandably, string theory fell out of favor. What had been a booming enterprise involving several hundred theorists rapidly came to a grinding halt. Only a few diehards continued to

pursue it. Even today, it remains an open question whether there exists a string theory, not yet discovered, that is equivalent to QCD. Such a dual description of QCD could be useful.

4 Gravity and unification

Yoneya interpreted the massless spin 2 state in the closed-string spectrum as a *graviton* [21][22]. With this identification and a theorem of Weinberg, it was easy to show that this string theory particle has the same interactions as the graviton in general relativity at low energies (compared to the string scale). Similarly, the massless spin 1 states in the open-string spectrum could be interpreted as gauge-theory particle [23].

A few months later, unaware of Yoneya's prior work, Scherk and I rediscovered the graviton in the string spectrum. This led us to propose interpreting string theory as a *quantum theory of gravity, unified with gauge theory forces* rather than as a theory of hadrons [24]. This requires that the string length scale is roughly the Planck scale (10^{-33} cm) rather than the nuclear scale (10^{-13} cm). So the size of the strings decreased by 20 orders of magnitude, and their tensions increased by the same factor. This proposal had several advantages:

- The existence of gravity is *predicted* by the theory.
- String theory has no UV divergences.
- In a gravitational theory extra dimensions could be a good thing. The 4d effective theory is determined by the details of the geometry of the compact extra dimensions, which are determined dynamically.
- Gravity is unified with gauge theory forces.

This was a *serendipitous theoretical discovery* – something that is very unusual. The best known serendipitous scientific discoveries are experimental or observational. A few examples are Dynamite: Nobel (1833); Insulin: Minkowski and von Mering (1889); X-rays: Roentgen (1895); Radioactivity: Becquerel (1896); Penicillin: Fleming (1928); Big Bang CMB: Penzias and Wilson (1965).

How was this proposal received? Scherk and I spoke about our ideas at various conferences and seminars. Everyone we spoke with was polite and showed interest. A few prominent physicists, such as Gell-Mann and Zumino, and later Witten, said that this proposal was potentially very important. Yet, it was largely ignored. The explanation lies in the sociology of the profession at that time. *Relativists*, who thought about black holes,

gravitational waves, the geometry of the universe, etc. had no use for a quantum theory of gravity. It was far removed from anything of interest to them. *Particle theorists*, who were interested in understanding phenomena that could be observed in current or future accelerators, had no interest in gravity, which is very far out of reach. There was a lot of interest in supersymmetry, but not in gravity. Both groups of scientists were correct in their opinions. Therefore the two communities were completely disjoint. A proposal that would bridge the gap had very few takers.

5 Supergravity and supersymmetric strings

Supergravity is a supersymmetric extension of general relativity. It was formulated for $N = 1$ supersymmetry in four-dimensional spacetime in 1976 by Freedman, van Nieuwenhuizen, and Ferrara [25]. Very soon thereafter Deser and Zumino [26] introduced a clever way to simplify some of the calculations. This work was very interesting and quickly received a lot of attention.

Also in 1976, Gliozzi, Scherk, and Olive proposed a projection of the RNS string spectrum (both for bosons and fermions) – the *GSO Projection* – that removes roughly half of the states in the RNS string spectrum including the tachyon [27]. They showed that after the projection the number of bosons and fermions is equal at every mass level. This was compelling evidence for *10d spacetime supersymmetry* of the GSO-projected theory, but it was not a proof. Supersymmetry is necessary for consistency, because the string spectrum contains a massless gravitino. The 1976 10d spacetime supersymmetry proposed by GSO is completely different from the 1971 2d world-sheet supersymmetry identified by Gervais and Sakita. After the GSO projection the RNS theory has supersymmetry in 10d Minkowski spacetime. This symmetry can be spontaneously broken when extra dimensions are compactified.

Also in 1976, Brink, Scherk, and I constructed supersymmetric Yang–Mills theory in ten dimensions [28]. The spinor supercharge in 10d has 16 components, which is the maximum possible for a Yang–Mills theory. By itself, this 10d super Yang–Mills theory is only a classical field theory, not a quantum theory, since it has bad UV divergences. *Dimensional reduction* of the 10d theory was used to deduce the Lagrangian for $N = 4$ super Yang–Mills theory in 4d spacetime for any Yang–Mills gauge group. It was later understood that these are conformally invariant quantum field theories, which implies UV finiteness. These theories have four 4-component Poincaré supercharges and four 4-component conformal supercharges. Though not realistic, these theories have played a prominent role in research since 1997 in

the context of AdS/CFT [29].

In 1978 Cremmer, Julia, and Scherk constructed $d = 11$ supergravity [30]. Eleven is the highest dimension possible for supergravity. This theory contains three fields. In addition to graviton and gravitino fields, there is a three-form tensor field. In the early 1980s there was quite a bit of research studying ways to compactify the seven extra dimensions in an attempt to obtain something realistic in four dimensions. These were useful exercises even though nothing realistic was found. 11d supergravity is very beautiful, but it has severe UV divergences. A good question is whether it could be the low-energy approximation to a consistent well-defined quantum theory. In the mid 1990s it became clear that this is the case, and Witten gave the quantum theory the name *M theory*.

In 1979 Michael Green and I began a collaboration with the initial goal of understanding the ten-dimensional spacetime supersymmetry of the GSO-projected RNS string theory. Whenever possible, we also collaborated with Lars Brink. Over the subsequent five years we formulated (and named) the type I, type IIA, and type IIB superstring theories; proved the 10d spacetime supersymmetry of the spectrum and interactions in each case; computed various tree and one-loop amplitudes and elucidated their properties; formulated superstring field theory in the light-cone gauge for the type I and type IIB theories; formulated an alternative superstring world-sheet theory with manifest 10d spacetime supersymmetry [31][32][33].

In 1983 I constructed the equations of motion of the type IIB superstring in the low-energy supergravity approximation [34]. The last page points out that the equations of motion have a solution describing a 10d geometry of the form $AdS_5 \times S^5$, which is analogous to the $AdS_4 \times S^7$ solution of 11d supergravity discovered a few years earlier by Freund and Rubin [35]. These geometries feature in AdS/CFT. In particular, the $AdS_5 \times S^5$ solution of type IIB superstring theory is dual to $N = 4$ 4d super Yang–Mills theory. The symmetry of both of them is given by the superalgebra $PSU(2, 2|4)$.

6 Anomalies

It is essential for the consistency of a quantum theory that local symmetries (such as gauge symmetries and local Lorentz invariance) of the tree-level/classical theory are not broken by quantum corrections. Such symmetry-destroying quantum corrections, called *anomalies*, potentially occur at the one-loop level in parity-violating theories. The standard model is an excellent example of a theory in which various such anomalies beautifully cancel. If one were to ignore the quarks or the leptons, the quantum theory would be inconsistent. When

both are included, however, their anomaly contributions cancel.

In 1984 we knew three superstring theories: Type I, Type IIA, and Type IIB. Type IIA is parity conserving, and therefore it is anomaly-free. The type IIB theory is parity violating. In 1983 Alvarez–Gaumé and Witten proved that all of the gravitational anomalies of the type IIB theory cancel [36]. For these reasons, Green and I focussed our attention on potential anomalies of Type I superstring theory. Classically, it is a parity-violating theory that is defined for any orthogonal or symplectic gauge group. There are two world-sheet topologies that contribute to pure-gauge anomalies: a cylinder and a Möbius strip. Each of them contributes the same structure, but with different coefficients. We found that the two contributions only cancel if the gauge group is $SO(32)$ [37]. Any other choice of orthogonal or symplectic group is inconsistent at the quantum level.

By an analysis of the low-energy effective field theory we could also analyze local gravitational and mixed anomalies [38]. They all cancelled beautifully for $SO(32)$. (More precisely, the Lie group is $Spin(32)/\mathbb{Z}_2$.) To our surprise, we also discovered that the anomalies could cancel for a second gauge group, namely $E_8 \times E_8$. Both of these groups are 496-dimensional and have rank equal to 16. Also, their weight lattices are the two even self-dual lattices that exist in 16 dimensions. We did not know a superstring theory with gauge group $E_8 \times E_8$, but it was plausible that one should exist, and we set out to find it. Gross, Harvey, Martinec, and Rohm beat us to it. They introduced the *heterotic string* for both gauge groups [39]. Soon thereafter Candelas, Horowitz, Strominger, and Witten introduced *Calabi–Yau compactification* of the six extra dimensions [40], which leads to 4d effective theories with $N = 1$ supersymmetry. Applied to the $E_8 \times E_8$ heterotic string theory, they showed that this could give rise to many realistic features (and some unrealistic ones).

7 Conclusion

The history of string theory is one of *unification*: of particles and forces, of particle theorists and relativists, of math and physics. It has been an exciting journey that is still going strong. After a decade in the shadows (1974-84), superstring theory suddenly became a mainstream activity. A great deal has happened since 1984, a period of 40 years! During the *second superstring revolution* in the mid 1990s many additional important results were discovered: dualities, M theory, black-hole entropy, F theory, etc. Also, the AdS/CFT holographic duality discovery was transformative. Current research directions include new types of symmetries, the swampland program, and celestial holography.

An obvious question is “Where is the experimental evidence?” Before the LHC turned on there was optimism about discovering new particles that are supersymmetry partners of known particles, but so far that has not happened. Such a discovery would not prove that string theory is correct, but it would be extremely informative, perhaps leading eventually to a new standard model. Such a theory could make a better target for “top-down” approaches to aim for. The recent version of a dark-dimension proposal suggests the possible existence of a micron-scale fifth dimension that only supports gravitational strength forces [41]. This might be accessible to experiment. Also, there is considerable effort studying the possible implications of string theory for early universe cosmology. This might also be informative. It seems quite safe to predict that it will take a very long time to figure out how to connect string theory to experiment at all scales. Yet, I am optimistic that it is possible.

Acknowledgments

This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Office of High Energy Physics, under Award Number DE-SC0011632.

References

- [1] G. F. Chew and S. C. Frautschi, “Principle of Equivalence for All Strongly Interacting Particles Within the S Matrix Framework,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **7**, 394-397 (1961)
- [2] G. Veneziano, “Construction of a crossing - symmetric, Regge behaved amplitude for linearly rising trajectories,” *Nuovo Cim. A* **57**, 190-197 (1968)
- [3] M. A. Virasoro, “Alternative constructions of crossing-symmetric amplitudes with regge behavior,” *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2309-2311 (1969)
- [4] J. A. Shapiro, “Electrostatic analog for the Virasoro model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **33**, 361-362 (1970)
- [5] S. Fubini and G. Veneziano, “Level structure of dual-resonance models,” *Nuovo Cim. A* **64**, 811-840 (1969)
- [6] S. Fubini, D. Gordon and G. Veneziano, “A general treatment of factorization in dual resonance models,” *Phys. Lett. B* **29**, 679-682 (1969)
- [7] D. J. Gross, A. Neveu, J. Scherk and J. H. Schwarz, “Renormalization and unitary in the dual-resonance model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **2**, 697-710 (1970)
- [8] A. Neveu and J. Scherk, “Parameter-free regularization of one-loop unitary dual diagram,” *Phys. Rev. D* **1**, 2355-2359 (1970)
- [9] C. Lovelace, “Pomeron form-factors and dual Regge cuts,” *Phys. Lett. B* **34**, 500-506 (1971)
- [10] M. A. Virasoro, “Subsidiary conditions and ghosts in dual resonance models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **1**, 2933-2936 (1970)
- [11] P. Ramond, “Dual Theory for Free Fermions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **3**, 2415-2418 (1971)
- [12] V. G. Kac, “Lie Superalgebras,” *Adv. Math.* **26**, 8-96 (1977)
- [13] A. Neveu and J. H. Schwarz, “Factorizable dual model of pions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **31**, 86-112 (1971)
- [14] A. Neveu and J. H. Schwarz, “Quark Model of Dual Pions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **4**, 1109-1111 (1971)

- [15] J. L. Gervais and B. Sakita, “Field Theory Interpretation of Supergauges in Dual Models,” Nucl. Phys. B **34**, 632-639 (1971)
- [16] S. R. Coleman and J. Mandula, “All Possible Symmetries of the S Matrix,” Phys. Rev. **159**, 1251-1256 (1967)
- [17] S. Deser and B. Zumino, “A Complete Action for the Spinning String,” Phys. Lett. B **65**, 369-373 (1976)
- [18] L. Brink, P. Di Vecchia and P. S. Howe, “A Locally Supersymmetric and Reparametrization Invariant Action for the Spinning String,” Phys. Lett. B **65**, 471-474 (1976)
- [19] J. Wess and B. Zumino, “A Lagrangian Model Invariant Under Supergauge Transformations,” Phys. Lett. B **49**, 52 (1974)
- [20] J. Wess and B. Zumino, “Supergauge Transformations in Four-Dimensions,” Nucl. Phys. B **70**, 39-50 (1974)
- [21] T. Yoneya, “Quantum gravity and the zero slope limit of the generalized Virasoro model,” Lett. Nuovo Cim. **8**, 951-955 (1973)
- [22] T. Yoneya, “Connection of Dual Models to Electrodynamics and Gravidynamics,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **51**, 1907-1920 (1974)
- [23] A. Neveu and J. Scherk, “Connection between Yang-Mills fields and dual models,” Nucl. Phys. B **36**, 155-161 (1972)
- [24] J. Scherk and J. H. Schwarz, “Dual Models for Nonhadrons,” Nucl. Phys. B **81**, 118-144 (1974)
- [25] D. Z. Freedman, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and S. Ferrara, “Progress Toward a Theory of Supergravity,” Phys. Rev. D **13**, 3214-3218 (1976)
- [26] S. Deser and B. Zumino, “Consistent Supergravity,” Phys. Lett. B **62**, 335 (1976)
- [27] F. Gliozzi, J. Scherk and D. I. Olive, “Supersymmetry, Supergravity Theories and the Dual Spinor Model,” Nucl. Phys. B **122**, 253-290 (1977)
- [28] L. Brink, J. H. Schwarz and J. Scherk, “Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theories,” Nucl. Phys. B **121**, 77-92 (1977)
- [29] J. M. Maldacena, “The Large N limit of superconformal field theories and supergravity,” Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231-252 (1998) [arXiv:hep-th/9711200 [hep-th]].

- [30] E. Cremmer, B. Julia and J. Scherk, “Supergravity Theory in 11 Dimensions,” *Phys. Lett. B* **76**, 409-412 (1978)
- [31] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, “Supersymmetrical Dual String Theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **181**, 502-530 (1981)
- [32] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, “Covariant Description of Superstrings,” *Phys. Lett. B* **136**, 367-370 (1984)
- [33] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, “Supersymmetrical String Theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **109**, 444-448 (1982)
- [34] J. H. Schwarz, “Covariant Field Equations of Chiral N=2 D=10 Supergravity,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **226**, 269 (1983)
- [35] P. G. O. Freund and M. A. Rubin, “Dynamics of Dimensional Reduction,” *Phys. Lett. B* **97**, 233-235 (1980)
- [36] L. Alvarez-Gaume and E. Witten, “Gravitational Anomalies,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **234** (1984), 269
- [37] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, “The Hexagon Gauge Anomaly in Type I Superstring Theory,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **255**, 93-114 (1985)
- [38] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, “Anomaly Cancellation in Supersymmetric D=10 Gauge Theory and Superstring Theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **149**, 117-122 (1984)
- [39] D. J. Gross, J. A. Harvey, E. J. Martinec and R. Rohm, “The Heterotic String,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **54**, 502-505 (1985)
- [40] P. Candelas, G. T. Horowitz, A. Strominger and E. Witten, “Vacuum configurations for superstrings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **258**, 46-74 (1985)
- [41] M. Montero, C. Vafa and I. Valenzuela, “The dark dimension and the Swampland,” *JHEP* **02**, 022 (2023) [arXiv:2205.12293 [hep-th]].