

Infinites within Graviton Scattering Amplitudes

David C. Dunbar[†] and Paul S. Norridge[‡]

*Department of Physics
University of Wales, Swansea
Swansea, SA2 8PP
UK*

Abstract

We present unitarity as a method for determining the infinities present in graviton scattering amplitudes. The infinities are a combination of IR and UV. By understanding the soft singularities we may extract the UV infinities and relate these to counter-terms in the effective action. As an demonstration of this method we rederive the UV infinities present at one-loop when gravity is coupled to matter.

[†] d.c.dunbar@swan.ac.uk

[‡] p.s.norridge@swan.ac.uk

1. Introduction

Calculations in perturbative gravity [1] are notoriously difficult to perform. In particular determining the renormalisability of gravity whether coupled to matter or not is a difficult issue. General arguments regarding the symmetries in the action may allow or prohibit counter terms. Such arguments show that the UV infinities vanish on-shell up to one-loop for pure gravity amplitudes and for up to two-loops for the particular matter coupling in supergravities [2]. However in gravity coupled to general matter, there are possible counter terms at one-loop level and a calculation must be performed to determine the coefficient of the potential counter-term. Such calculations have been done for gravity coupled to matter and the explicit coefficients obtained [3,4,2]. These calculations use an algorithm due to 't Hooft and Veltman [3] which examine counter terms in the effective action using the background field method [5]. (The coefficients of the counter terms in pure gravity at two loops have been calculated [6,7] with non-zero result.)

Recently developments have been made in the calculation of on-shell amplitudes using string inspired techniques and the Cutkosky rules. These have enabled new results to be obtained both in QCD [8] and perturbative quantum gravity [9,10]. In this paper we show how these techniques may be used to detect the effect of the counter terms in the one-loop amplitudes - and in fact extract their coefficient. This calculational method is quite distinct from usual techniques.

The Cutkosky rules [11] relate two amplitudes 'sewn' together to the discontinuous parts of an amplitude at higher-order. Knowing the lower order expressions we may impose constraints upon the higher order parts of the amplitude. (For example, the Cutkosky rules relate the imaginary parts of one-loop amplitudes to tree amplitudes sewn together.) The constraints these rules impose upon amplitude can completely reconstruct some amplitudes and constrain the expressions for others [12,13]. In gravity this technique has provided a check for the 1-loop results from the string-inspired rules although several of the four point amplitudes could have been reconstructed entirely from the cuts. In general it is the "more supersymmetric" amplitudes which are cut-constructable. For general amplitudes we may construct, via the Cutkosky rules, expressions containing the correct cuts in all channels. Although such expressions contain finite ambiguities, we may use these expressions to evaluate the infinities present in an amplitude. In fact, we will demonstrate the one-loop UV-infinities present in matter-coupled gravity using this method. To enable us to disentangle the UV and IR infinities we also determine the general structure of the one-loop soft infinities.

Finally, although amplitudes naively calculated using the Cutkosky rules contain finite ambiguities these may be resolved by a more sophisticated use of the rules [14]. We illustrate this with a specific calculation at one-loop involving graviton scattering in a theory with massive scalar matter.

2. Infrared divergences

As we will see later, one can, by using unitarity, extract the infinities present in an amplitude. However, this method will not distinguish between UV and IR infinities. Nonetheless, by knowing the expected form of the IR singularities we may identify the remaining UV infinities. [†]

In this section we determine the IR singularities present in amplitudes involving massless particles. The IR singularities in a QCD amplitude have been calculated [15] and our determination of the IR singularities for gravity follow in a similar manner. One may also deduce the form of the infra-red divergences using general arguments to imply universality and then extract the form from a specific amplitude [16]. As is well known [17] IR singularities in a on-shell loop amplitude occur in soft limits of the loop momentum integrals. That is, when the momentum of internal propagators goes to zero. However, not all such occurrences produce IR singularities. Any massless propagator through which loop momentum flows will be singular for a specific value of the loop momentum but this does not usually yield a singularity. To see this note that, in four dimensions, the singular part of the momentum integral can be expressed

$$\int d^4p \frac{1}{p^2} \sim \int_0 |p|^3 d|p| \frac{1}{|p|^2} \quad (2.1)$$

which is finite at the lower range of integration, $|p| \rightarrow 0$ the singularity having been suppressed by the factor of $|p|^3$. (We always choose gauges where the propagator is Feynman-like $\sim 1/p^2$. Gauges closely related to the string based rules [18] and the “World-line” approach [19] have this feature.) In general three adjacent propagators must vanish simultaneously to obtain a soft divergence. To see this note that three adjacent propagators in a loop will be of the form (we shift the loop momenta such that the middle momenta is the integration momenta)

$$\frac{1}{(p + K_1)^2} \frac{1}{p^2} \frac{1}{(p - K_2)^2} \sim \frac{1}{(p^2 + 2p \cdot K_1 + K_1^2)} \frac{1}{p^2} \frac{1}{(p^2 - 2p \cdot K_2 + K_2^2)} \quad (2.2)$$

We may obtain an IR singularity provided $K_1^2 = 0$ and $K_2^2 = 0$. One can imagine more complicated situations in multi-loop diagrams where adjacent propagators vanish at choices of the multiple integrations. However the equivalent factors to $|p|^3$ in the above equation are of higher powers and suppress the infinities more strongly. After inspection of the possibilities we find the above situation is the generic case for a soft divergence in the loop-momentum integral.

We will only, for general kinematics, find propagators where $K_1^2 = 0$ and $K_2^2 = 0$ if K_1 and K_2 are adjacent external on-shell momentum (for massless particles.) The middle

[†] We thank Lance Dixon [16] for help in realising this possibility

propagator $1/p^2$ is then joining together the two external legs. One may see this general arrangement in fig. 1. Thus the soft limit may be found by taking the amplitude with one less loop and adding a soft particle between two of the external lines. Consider first an individual diagram, rather than the whole amplitude. We initially restrict ourselves to a diagram containing only gravitons. Throughout, amplitudes will be calculated using dimensional reduction [20].

Consider adding a soft graviton to an graviton scattering diagram by attaching a graviton between external legs with momentum k_1 and k_2 as in fig. 1. In doing so we must add a propagator for the graviton, two three point vertices and two extra propagators with momenta $k_1 + p$ and $k_2 - p$ to the normal Feynman diagram expression. The soft singularity, as in eqn. (2.2), will occur in that region of the $\int d^D p$ integral where p is close to zero.




Figure 1. Representation of the soft limit calculation.

Initially consider the soft-divergences in a one-loop diagram. Thus the soft graviton leg will connect two external legs of a tree diagram. Take the off-shell tree diagram as a function of the two external momentum k_1 and k_2 only and of the indices on these two legs only (keeping all others fixed), $A_{(\alpha\beta),(\gamma\mu)}^{\text{tree}}(k_1, k_2)$. The on-shell tree diagram is the contraction of this with the external polarisation tensors (together with k_1 and k_2 becoming onshell),

$$\epsilon_1^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_2^{\gamma\mu} A_{(\alpha\beta),(\gamma\mu)}^{\text{tree}}(k_1, k_2) \quad (2.3)$$

the amplitude being the sum of all such diagrams. The 1-loop diagram can be written in terms of the off-shell tree diagram with the additional three propagators and two vertices,

$$\int \frac{d^{4-2\epsilon} p}{(2\pi)^{4-2\epsilon}} \frac{T^{(\alpha\beta),(\mu\nu)}(k_1, k_2, p)}{(p+k_1)^2 p^2 (p-k_2)^2} A_{(\alpha\beta),(\mu\nu)}^{\text{tree}}(k_1+p, k_2-p) \quad (2.4)$$

The tensor T is

$$T^{(\alpha\beta),(\mu\nu)}(k_1, k_2, p) = \epsilon_1^{\alpha_1\beta_1} \epsilon_2^{\mu_1\nu_1} V_{(\alpha_1\beta_1),(\delta\gamma),(\alpha\beta)}(k_2, -p, -k_2+p) \times P_{(\delta\gamma),(\sigma\rho)} V_{(\mu_1\nu_1),(\sigma\rho),(\mu\nu)}(k_1, p, -k_1-p) \quad (2.5)$$

where $V_{(\mu\nu),(\sigma\rho),(\gamma\eta)}$ is the 3-graviton vertex and $P_{(\alpha\beta),(\sigma\rho)}$ is the propagator [1,21,7]. In the $p \rightarrow 0$ limit, we find T becomes

$$T^{(\alpha\beta),(\gamma\mu)}(k_1, k_2, p) = -\frac{\kappa^2}{4} \epsilon_1^{\alpha\beta} \epsilon_2^{\gamma\mu} (k_1 + k_2)^4 + O(p) \quad (2.6)$$

To examine the leading soft singularity we must therefore look at the integral,

$$\int \frac{d^{4-2\epsilon}p}{(2\pi)^{4-2\epsilon}} \frac{1}{(p+k_1)^2 p^2 (p-k_2)^2} \quad (2.7)$$

which can be evaluated by usual Feynman parameter methods with the result,

$$\frac{-ir_\Gamma}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon} (-s_{12})^{1+\epsilon}} \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \quad (2.8)$$

where $r_\Gamma = \Gamma^2(1-\epsilon)\Gamma(1+\epsilon)/\Gamma(2-\epsilon)$ and $s_{12} = (k_1 + k_2)^2$.[†] The leading singularity as $p \rightarrow 0$ is then simply a factor multiplying the tree diagram. Summing over all diagrams then gives a factor multiplying the tree amplitude. To be precise, we find that the IR divergence, due to a soft graviton exchange between external legs 1 and 2, in a one-loop graviton scattering amplitude is

$$\frac{ir_\Gamma}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{\kappa^2}{4\epsilon^2} \times (-s_{12})^{1-\epsilon} \times A^{\text{tree}} \quad (2.9)$$

There are a few subtleties with the above result. Firstly, we have to take the limit of an off-shell amplitude $A^{\text{tree}}(k_1 + p, k_2 - p)$ as $p \rightarrow 0$. This is trivial for a tree amplitude but for the n -loop case is more subtle. In general this will yield the on-shell result for an amplitude although this is not true merely for a single n -loop diagram [24]. Secondly there are sub-leading terms in eqn.(2.6). These vanish on summing over diagrams because we are then dealing with a physical on-shell amplitude.

We have calculated the IR divergence due to soft graviton exchange between a specific pair of external legs. The total IR divergence in a one-loop amplitude is simply the above result summed over all pairs of external legs.

$$\frac{ir_\Gamma}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{\kappa^2}{4\epsilon^2} \times A^{\text{tree}} \times \sum_{i \neq j}^m (-s_{ij})^{1-\epsilon} \quad (2.10)$$

In gauge theories, amplitudes contain IR divergences from the self-energy corrections to the external legs. [15]. However, by power counting, such divergences do not occur for external graviton legs.

[†] We shall always give amplitudes (and integrals) in the unphysical region where all momentum invariants such as s_{ij} are negative. One may continue back to the physical regime by $\ln(-s) \rightarrow \ln(|s|) - i\pi\Theta(s)$ etc. We also use the convention that all particles are outgoing.

Consider a specific example: namely that of a 1-loop four graviton amplitude. These are given in ref. [10]. Also let us look at the specific helicity configuration $A^{1\text{-loop}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+)$. Summing over all pairs of legs the expected IR divergence is

$$2((-s)^{1-\epsilon} + (-t)^{1-\epsilon} + (-u)^{1-\epsilon}) \times \frac{ir_\Gamma}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{\kappa^2}{4\epsilon^2} A^{\text{tree}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+) \quad (2.11)$$

(A factor of 2 arises because $s_{12} = s_{34} = s$.) This is

$$\frac{ir_\Gamma \kappa^2}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \left(\frac{(s \ln(-s) + t \ln(-t) + u \ln(-u))}{2\epsilon} \right) A^{\text{tree}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+) \quad (2.12)$$

For this amplitude we expect no UV singularities from the general result that pure gravity is one-loop UV finite. If we examine the complete result [10],

$$A^{1\text{-loop}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+) = \frac{istuk^2 r_\Gamma}{4(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} A^{\text{tree}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+) \times \left(\frac{2}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\ln(-u)}{st} + \frac{\ln(-t)}{su} + \frac{\ln(-s)}{tu} \right) + \text{finite terms} \right) \quad (2.13)$$

we find the expected IR infinity structure.

In amplitudes with scalars and gravitons, there are also soft divergences which can be calculated similarly. For the case of a scalars and gravitons there are six configurations which must be considered, as shown in fig. 2. In this figure scalars lines are dashed lines whereas graviton lines are solid. The analysis in all cases closely follows the pure gravity calculation. We find that (a), (b) and (c) all give the same result as the pure gravity case, (2.10); (d) and (e) give no soft contribution. The case (a), (b) and (c) are the diagrams where a soft graviton is exchanged between the two external legs. The result in eqn. (2.10) is then universal. That is, true whether external legs are gravitons or scalars. We can also consider the IR divergences with other types of external particle and find the same universal nature of the soft divergences. This universality may be expected upon general arguments [16].




Figure 2. Possible soft contributions to graviton-scalar amplitudes:

3. Divergences from the Cutkosky Rules

As is well known, [11], unitarity in the form of the Cutkosky rules, relates the imaginary part of a one-loop amplitude to the product of two tree amplitudes integrated over all intermediate states. In ref.[13] situations where the Cutkosky rules determine the amplitude entirely (and not merely the imaginary part) were investigated with the result that in supersymmetric gauge theories the amplitudes may be determined by the Cutkosky rules alone. For gravity only a few amplitudes may be determined from unitarity alone [8]. However, we may determine the infinity structure entirely from the Cutkosky rules.

In general, we consider the cut in the channel $(k_{m_1} + k_{m_1+1} + \dots + k_{m_2-1} + k_{m_2})^2$ for the 1-loop amplitude $A(1, 2, \dots, n)$, depicted in fig. 3 and given by

$$\frac{i}{2} \int d\text{LIPS}(-\ell_1, \ell_2) A^{\text{tree}}(-\ell_1, m_1, \dots, m_2, \ell_2) A^{\text{tree}}(-\ell_2, m_2 + 1, \dots, m_1 - 1, \ell_1). \quad (3.1)$$




Figure 3. The cut to be evaluated in eqn.(3.1)

In a 1-loop amplitude with massless particles, the form of the integrals which may appear is well known (see for example refs. [22,23]) and the one-loop amplitude can be written in the form,

$$A_n = \sum_{i|I_i \in \mathcal{F}_n} c_i I_i , \quad (3.2)$$

where the coefficients c_i are *rational* functions of the momentum invariants and \mathcal{F}_n is a set of integral functions. In the appendices of [13] a particular choice of \mathcal{F}_n is given although many are possible [22,23]. All the cuts arise from the integral functions I_i . These are for a massless theory, rather simple, just arising from the cuts in logarithms or the cuts in dilogarithms. One may see this by simple inspection of the basis of functions in [13]. In general one cannot reconstruct the total amplitude from the simplistic application of eqn. (3.1) however one may be able to reconstruct the structure of the infinities. To see this consider one of the integrals in the set \mathcal{F}_n , The “one-mass” triangle which depends only on the momentum invariant of the massive leg, $s = K^2 \neq 0$,

$$I_{3;i}^{1m} = \frac{r_\Gamma}{\epsilon^2} (-s)^{-1-\epsilon} = \frac{r_\Gamma}{(-s)} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{\ln(-s)}{\epsilon} + \frac{\ln^2(-s)}{2} \right) + O(\epsilon) \quad (3.3)$$

Clearly, the $1/\epsilon^2$ pole is closely related to the $\ln(-s)/\epsilon$ term. The latter is detectable from the Cutkosky rules and from it we can reconstruct the first term. This is true in general, by evaluating the cuts to order ϵ^0 we can obtain the divergences (or rather non-cut terms) to order ϵ^{-1} . We will use this technique to obtain the divergences present in several amplitudes.

As a technical issue we shall not evaluate (3.1) but instead evaluate the the off-shell integral

$$\frac{i}{2} \int \frac{d^D \ell_1}{(2\pi)^D} A^{\text{tree}}(-\ell_1, m_1, \dots, m_2, \ell_2) \frac{1}{\ell_2^2} A^{\text{tree}}(-\ell_2, m_2 + 1, \dots, m_1 - 1, \ell_1) \frac{1}{\ell_1^2} \Big|_{\text{cut}} . \quad (3.4)$$

whose cut in this channel is (3.1) [12]. This replacement is valid only in this channel. In evaluating this off-shell integral, we may substitute $\ell_1^2 = \ell_2^2 = 0$ in the numerator; terms with ℓ_1^2 or ℓ_2^2 in the numerator do not produce a cut in this channel because the ℓ_1^2 or ℓ_2^2 cancels a cut propagator. We emphasise that the cuts are evaluated not for a lone diagram at a time, but for the whole amplitude. After performing the cuts in all channels we may reconstruct the infinities. In practice this means evaluation the amplitude up to finite rational terms.

To illustrate this consider the case of a four-point function with massless particles.

The set of integrals \mathcal{F}_4 can be chosen to be fairly simple. Firstly the “scalar box integral”

$$\begin{aligned} I_4(s, t) &= r_\Gamma \frac{1}{st} \left\{ \frac{2}{\epsilon^2} \left[(-s)^{-\epsilon} + (-t)^{-\epsilon} \right] - \ln^2\left(\frac{-s}{-t}\right) - \pi^2 \right\}, \\ &= r_\Gamma \frac{1}{st} \left\{ \frac{4}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{2 \ln(-s) + 2 \ln(-t)}{\epsilon} + 2 \ln(-s) \ln(-t) - \pi^2 \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

together with $I_4(s, u)$ and $I_4(t, u)$. Then the “triangle and bubble integrals”.

$$\begin{aligned} I_3(s) &= \frac{r_\Gamma}{\epsilon^2} (-s)^{-1-\epsilon} = -\frac{r_\Gamma}{s} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{\ln(-s)}{\epsilon} + \frac{\ln^2(-s)}{2} \right) \\ I_2(s) &= \frac{r_\Gamma}{\epsilon(1-2\epsilon)} (-s)^{-\epsilon} = r_\Gamma \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon} - \ln(-s) + 2 \right) \\ J_2(s) &= r_\Gamma \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

and the corresponding functions of u and t . The function $J_2(s)$ is a linear combination of bubble integrals (see section 3 of ref [13].). In supersymmetric amplitudes the set \mathcal{F}_4 may be more restrictive. (Specifically J_2 may be absent.) A general massless four-point amplitude may be written thus,

$$\begin{aligned} A_4 &= a_1 I_4(s, t) + a_2 I_4(s, u) + a_3 I_4(t, u) + b_1 I_3(s) + b_2 I_3(t) + b_3 I_3(u) \\ &+ c_1 I_2(s) + c_2 I_2(t) + c_3 I_2(u) + d J_2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

where the coefficients a_i etc. are rational functions of the momentum invariants. [†] With this choice of \mathcal{F}_4 it is clear which coefficients may be fixed by the cuts. For example the only integral function containing a $\ln(-s) \ln(-t)$ term is $I_4(s, t)$ so by examining the $\ln(-s)$ cut we can pick out a_1 from the $\ln(-t)$ term in the cut. (Or alternatively the $\ln(-s) \ln(-t)$ term if we evaluate eqn. (3.4).) Similarly by examining the other channels the a_i are simply fixed. The remaining $\ln^2(-s)$ contribution fixes b_1 and similarly the other b_i . Finally the $\ln(-s)$ term will determine c_1 . So the a_i , b_i and c_i may be determined from the cuts with the only remaining ambiguity arising in the dJ_2 term. For our purposes this shows that the only ambiguity will be in finite rational terms - and thus we may determine the infinity structure purely from the cuts.

4. Example: Gravity Coupled to Scalar Matter

In this section we will show how the results of the previous sections may be used to determine the UV divergences in a specific example. The example we choose is that of

[†] If we were to consider the amplitude to higher order than $O(\epsilon^0)$ we would have to expand our basis to include further integral functions.

gravity coupled to scalar matter. The form of the UV divergences in this theory is well known [3]. Although, pure gravity is one-loop UV finite, in the presence of scalar matter infinities are generated in amplitudes which necessitate a counter-term in the action,

$$\frac{203}{320\epsilon}(D_\mu\phi D^\mu\phi)^2 \quad (4.1)$$

Such a term is not present in the original theory and indicates that gravity coupled to scalar matter is non-renormalisable. We hope to arrive at the same conclusions by a consideration of amplitudes. The simplest amplitude effected by such a term is one with four external scalars (and no external gravitons). We look at a theory with only one type of scalar. The intermediate states in eqn.(3.4) can be either gravitons or scalars. We consider the easier case of intermediate Scalars first. The tree amplitude for four scalars (all the same flavour) is :

$$A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4) = \frac{i\kappa^2}{2} \left(\frac{1}{s}(t^2 + u^2) + \frac{1}{t}(s^2 + u^2) + \frac{1}{u}(s^2 + t^2) \right) \quad (4.2)$$

so the product of tree amplitudes appearing in the s -channel cut is

$$\begin{aligned} & A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_{\ell_1}, \phi_{\ell_2}) A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_{\ell_2}, \phi_{\ell_1}, \phi_3, \phi_4) \\ &= \frac{\kappa^4}{4} \left(\frac{1}{s} \left(4(k_2 \cdot \ell_1)^2 + 4(k_1 \cdot \ell_1)^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2(k_2 \cdot \ell_1)} \left(s^2 + 4(k_1 \cdot \ell_1)^2 \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2(k_1 \cdot \ell_1)} \left(4(k_2 \cdot \ell_1)^2 + s^2 \right) \\ & \quad \times \left(\frac{1}{s} \left(4(k_3 \cdot \ell_1)^2 + 4(k_4 \cdot \ell_1)^2 \right) + \frac{1}{2(k_3 \cdot \ell_1)} \left(s^2 + 4(k_4 \cdot \ell_1)^2 \right) \right) \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{2(k_4 \cdot \ell_1)} \left(4(k_3 \cdot \ell_1)^2 + s^2 \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

Inserting this into eqn.(3.4) yields a variety of terms. For example the first term in the expansion of the above has only two propagators ($1/\ell_1^2$ and $1/\ell_2^2$) and so may be identified as a tensor bubble integral and hence evaluated. In total the expansion contains boxes, triangles, and bubbles. These may be evaluated fairly easily using standard techniques. giving an expression for the logarithmic parts

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{\kappa^4 r_\Gamma}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \left(\frac{(u^4 + 2tu^3 + 3u^2t^2 + 2ut^3 + t^4)}{2ut} \ln(-s) \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right. \\ & \quad + \frac{1}{4} (3ut + 2u^2 + 2t^2) \ln(-s)^2 + \frac{s^3 r_\Gamma \ln(-s) \ln(-t)}{2t} + \frac{s^3 r_\Gamma \ln(-s) \ln(-u)}{2u} \\ & \quad \left. + \frac{1}{240} (-161t^2 + 39ut - 161u^2) \ln(-s) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

Next consider the contribution to the cut from intermediate gravitons. The tree-amplitudes needed are those involving two scalars and two gravitons,

$$\begin{aligned}
A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_1, 2^+, 3^+, \phi_4) &= 0 \\
A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_1, 2^-, 3^+, \phi_4) &= \frac{\kappa^2 \langle 1 2 \rangle^4 \langle 4 2 \rangle^4}{(\langle 1 2 \rangle \langle 2 3 \rangle \langle 3 4 \rangle \langle 4 1 \rangle)^2} \frac{st}{4u}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.5}$$

where we have used a spinor helicity convention. The spinor helicity method for vectors is an explicit realisation of the polarisation tensors in terms of spinors

$$\varepsilon_{\mu}^{(+)}(k; q) = \frac{\langle q^- | \gamma_{\mu} | k^- \rangle}{\sqrt{2} \langle q^- | k^+ \rangle}, \quad \varepsilon_{\mu}^{(-)}(k; q) = \frac{\langle q^+ | \gamma_{\mu} | k^+ \rangle}{\sqrt{2} \langle k^+ | q^- \rangle}, \tag{4.6}$$

where $|k^{\pm}\rangle$ is a Weyl spinor, with plus and minus helicities, k is the on-shell momentum of the vector and q is an arbitrary reference momentum satisfying $q^2 = 0$, $k \cdot q \neq 0$. The spinor helicity method for gravitons [25,26] is related to that for vectors [27] by

$$\varepsilon_{\mu\nu}^{++} = \varepsilon_{\mu}^{+} \varepsilon_{\nu}^{+}, \quad \varepsilon_{\mu\nu}^{--} = \varepsilon_{\mu}^{-} \varepsilon_{\nu}^{-} \tag{4.7}$$

where $\varepsilon^{\pm\pm}$ are the graviton helicity polarisations and ε^{\pm} are the vector helicity polarisations defined by Xu, Zhang and Chang. We use the notation for spinor inner products $\langle k_1^- | k_2^+ \rangle = \langle 12 \rangle$ and $\langle k_1^+ | k_2^- \rangle = [12]$. The use of spinor helicity techniques has proved extremely useful in QCD calculation and we will take advantage of the benefits here also. All states are taken to be outgoing and may have plus or minus helicity.

Equation (4.5) implies that the only contribution comes from cuts with gravitons of differing helicity across the cut. The contribution to the cut from these will be

$$\begin{aligned}
&A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \ell_1^-, \ell_2^+) A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_3, \phi_4, \ell_2^-, \ell_1^+) \\
&= \frac{\kappa^4}{16} \frac{\langle 1 \ell_1 \rangle^4 \langle 2 \ell_1 \rangle^4}{(\langle 1 \ell_1 \rangle \langle \ell_1 \ell_2 \rangle \langle \ell_2 2 \rangle \langle 2 1 \rangle)^2} \frac{s(k_1 \cdot \ell_1)}{(k_1 \cdot \ell_2)} \times \frac{\langle 4 \ell_2 \rangle^4 \langle 3 \ell_2 \rangle^4}{(\langle 3 \ell_2 \rangle \langle \ell_2 \ell_1 \rangle \langle \ell_1 4 \rangle \langle 4 3 \rangle)^2} \frac{s(\ell_2 \cdot k_3)}{(\ell_1 \cdot k_3)} \\
&= \frac{\kappa^4}{16 s^2} \frac{(tr_{-}(\not{k}_2 \not{\ell}_2 \not{k}_4 \not{\ell}_1))^4}{(2\ell_1 \cdot k_1)^2 (2\ell_1 \cdot k_2) (2\ell_1 \cdot k_3) (2\ell_1 \cdot k_4)}
\end{aligned} \tag{4.8}$$

Where $[ab] \langle bc \rangle [cd] \dots \langle ma \rangle = tr_{-}(\not{a} \not{b} \not{c} \dots \not{m})$ and $tr_{\pm}(\rho) = tr(\frac{1 \pm \gamma_5}{2} \rho)$ (We must also include the contribution with the other choice of helicities on the internal legs:

$$A(\phi_1, \phi_2, \ell_1^+, \ell_2^-) A(\phi_3, \phi_4, \ell_2^+, \ell_1^-) \tag{4.9}$$

This is equivalent to setting $\ell_2 \rightarrow -\ell_1$ and $\ell_1 \rightarrow -\ell_2$)

If we combine these two contributions and carry out the integrations (which a rather more complicated than those for the scalar case) we find

$$\frac{\kappa^4 r_\Gamma}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \left(\frac{(u^2 - ut + t^2)}{8} \ln(-s)^2 - \frac{1}{240} (u^2 + 41 ut + t^2) \ln(-s) \right. \\ \left. + \frac{t^3 \ln(-t) \ln(-s)}{4s} + \frac{u^3 \ln(-u) \ln(-s)}{4s} \right) \quad (4.10)$$

If we add this to the result for intermediate scalars we obtain

$$\frac{\kappa^4 r_\Gamma}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \left(\frac{(u^4 + 2u^3t + 2ut^3 + 3u^2t^2 + t^4) \ln(-s)}{2ut} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{4} (3u^2 + 2ut + 3t^2) r_\Gamma \ln(-s)^2 \right. \\ \left. + \frac{(t^4 + s^4) \ln(-s) \ln(-t)}{2ts} + \frac{(s^4 + u^4) \ln(-s) \ln(-u)}{2us} \right. \\ \left. + \frac{1}{240} \frac{(-163u^3t - 43u^2t^2 - 163ut^3) \ln(-s)}{ut} \right) \quad (4.11)$$

From this we can write down an expression with the correct cuts in all channels

$$8(s^4 + t^4)I_4(s, t) + 8(s^4 + u^4)I_4(s, u) + 8(u^4 + t^4)I_4(t, u) \\ - 8s(3s^2 + t^2 + u^2)I_3(s) - 8t(3t^2 + s^2 + u^2)I_3(t) - 8u(3u^2 + t^2 + s^2)I_3(u) \\ + \frac{2(163u^2 + 163t^2 + 43tu)}{15} I_2(s) + \frac{2(163u^2 + 163s^2 + 43us)}{15} I_2(t) \\ + \frac{2(163s^2 + 163t^2 + 43ts)}{15} I_2(u) \quad (4.12)$$

This expression has the correct cuts in all channels and contains the correct infinite pieces. It is *not* the correct full result. As discussed in the previous section we expect the full answer to differ from the above by finite, non-logarithmic rational polynomials in the momentum invariants. However the above expression does contain the correct $1/\epsilon$ divergences.

Contained in the above we expect a IR infinity of the form

$$\frac{ir_\Gamma \kappa^2}{2(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{((-s)^{1-\epsilon} + (-t)^{1-\epsilon} + (-u)^{1-\epsilon})}{\epsilon^2} A^{\text{tree}}(\phi_1, \phi_2, \phi_3, \phi_4) \\ = \frac{r_\Gamma \kappa^4}{2(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{((-s)^{1-\epsilon} + (-t)^{1-\epsilon} + (-u)^{1-\epsilon})}{\epsilon^2} \left(\frac{s^2 + t^2}{2u} + \frac{s^2 + u^2}{2t} + \frac{t^2 + u^2}{2s} \right) \quad (4.13)$$

By examination we can identify this term plus an additional infinity,

$$-\frac{203}{160\epsilon} (t^2 + s^2 + u^2) \quad (4.14)$$

Since the IR divergences are accounted for, this must be a UV infinity. By inspection, we can see this corresponds to the counter term in the Lagrangian in eqn. (4.1) - with the correct coefficient.

Before finishing this section we can consider the case where gravity is couple to a set of N scalar ϕ_i . Using the techniques above we can identify the counter Lagrangian to be

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\mathcal{L} = \frac{\sqrt{g}}{\epsilon} & \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^N \left(\frac{202 + N}{80} \right) (\partial_\mu \phi_i \partial^\mu \phi_i)^2 \right. \\ & \sum_{i \neq j} \left(\left(\frac{N - 198}{960} \right) (\partial_\mu \phi_i \partial^\mu \phi_i) (\partial_\nu \phi_j \partial^\nu \phi_j) \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \sum_{i \neq j} \left(\frac{N + 402}{480} \right) (\partial_\mu \phi_i \partial_\nu \phi_i) (\partial^\mu \phi_j \partial^\nu \phi_j) \right) \right\} \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

It is possible to examine the counter terms for a variety of types of matter coupled to gravity. Further examples will be given elsewhere [28].

5. The Cut Calculation of $A^{1\text{-loop}}(1^+, 2^+, 3^+, 4^+)$ with a massive scalar.

Although a naive interpretation the Cutkosky rules suggests that one may only use them to evaluate the amplitudes up to finite rational polynomials in the momentum invariants it may be possible to use the rules to evaluate these also. The idea is fairly simple. In dimensional regularisation, if we can evaluate the cuts to order ϵ^n then we can reconstruct the rational polynomial terms to order ϵ^{n-1} . The difficulty lies in evaluating the cuts consistently to all orders. That this is possible, has been demonstrated by Bern and Morgan in ref. [14] where it was shown how to, with care, evaluate the cuts to higher order in ϵ . Previously we have used the on-shell tree amplitudes with intermediate legs having momenta in $D = 4$. However the loop momentum integral has momenta in $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$. This involves an error, which although not contributing to finite order in $\ln(-s)$ [13], gives an error in terms $\epsilon \ln(-s)$ which feeds down to finite polynomial terms. To correctly carry out the $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$ loop momentum integrals it is convenient to split the D -dimensional momentum into a four dimensional and a -2ϵ momentum, μ , whence

$$p_D^2 = p_4^2 - \mu^2 \quad (5.1)$$

and the integration splits up as

$$d^D p \rightarrow d^4 p d^{-2\epsilon} \mu \quad (5.2)$$

This prescription is well described in ref. [29]. If calculating the amplitude for a massless scalar circulating in the loop the prescription is now clear: one uses on-shell four dimensional amplitudes but where the scalar now has a mass μ^2 and one integrates according to

eqn. (5.2). Hopefully an example will make this clear. The first example we consider will be the contribution to four graviton scattering when the external gravitons all have the same helicity from a massless scalar circulating in the loop,

$$A_{\text{scalar}}^{1\text{-loop}}(1^+, 2^+, 3^+, 4^+) \quad (5.3)$$

[†] This can be found in ref. [10] where it was calculated using string-based diagrammatic rules. The answer is a finite rational polynomial and hence we might expect it not to be calculable using cuts. This is consistent with the fact that the tree amplitudes necessary to evaluate the cuts $A^{\text{tree}}(1^+, 2^+, \phi, \phi)$ vanish for a massless scalar. However if we consider the tree amplitude for a scalar with mass μ^2 we find,

$$A_4(1^s, 2^+, 3^+, 4^s) = -i \frac{\kappa^2 (\mu^4) [23]^2}{4 \langle 23 \rangle^2} \left(\frac{1}{(k_1 + k_2)^2 - \mu^2} + \frac{1}{(k_1 + k_3)^2 - \mu^2} \right) \quad (5.4)$$

When we calculate the cut in the, for example, s_{12} channel the two factors yield two box integrals with ordering of legs 1234 and 1243. The 1234 ordering will contribute (after inserting the factors of $1/(\ell_1^2 - \mu^2)$ and $1/(\ell_2^2 - \mu^2)$)

$$\frac{\kappa^4 [12]^2 [34]^2}{16 \langle 12 \rangle^2 \langle 34 \rangle^2} \int \frac{d^4 p}{(2\pi)^{4-2\epsilon}} d^{-2\epsilon} \mu \times \frac{\mu^8}{(p^2 - \mu^2)((p - k_1)^2 - \mu^2)((p - k_1 - k_2)^2 - \mu^2)((p - k_1 - k_2 - k_3)^2 - \mu^2)}. \quad (5.5)$$

The integrals over -2ϵ loop momenta are evaluated using eqn.(22) of ref. [29].

$$A \int \frac{d^{-2\epsilon} \mu}{(2\pi)^{-2\epsilon}} = A \frac{-\epsilon(4\pi)^\epsilon}{\Gamma(1-\epsilon)} \int_0^\infty d\mu^2 (\mu^2)^{-1-\epsilon} \quad (5.6)$$

and (after Feynman parameterising the $\int d^4 p$ integral)

$$\int_0^\infty d\mu^2 (\mu^2)^{-1-\epsilon} \frac{\mu^8}{(sa_1a_3 + ta_2a_4 - \mu^2)^2} = \frac{\pi(3-\epsilon)}{\sin(\pi\epsilon)} (-sa_1a_3 - ta_2a_4)^{2-\epsilon} \quad (5.7)$$

We can then reconstruct the cut in the s -channel

$$-\frac{i\kappa^4}{16(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{[12]^2 [34]^2}{\langle 12 \rangle^2 \langle 34 \rangle^2} \frac{\pi\epsilon(3-\epsilon)}{\sin(\pi\epsilon)} \frac{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)(2-\epsilon)}{\Gamma(1-\epsilon)\Gamma(1+\epsilon)} \left(I_{1234}^{D=12-2\epsilon} + I_{1243}^{D=12-2\epsilon} \right) \quad (5.8)$$

where the definition of the D -dimensional box integral is

$$I^D \equiv \Gamma(4 - D/2) \int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) \frac{1}{(-sa_1a_3 - ta_2a_4)^{4-D/2}} \quad (5.9)$$

[†] Due to supersymmetric Ward identities [31] this amplitude due to massless scalars circulating is equal to that for gravitons circulating.

By symmetry we can deduce that the following object has the correct all- order in ϵ cuts in all three channels and hence must be the correct amplitude,

$$-\frac{i\kappa^4}{16} \frac{[12]^2 [34]^2}{\langle 12 \rangle^2 \langle 34 \rangle^2} \frac{\epsilon}{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon} \Gamma(1-\epsilon)} \frac{\pi(3-\epsilon)}{\sin(\pi\epsilon)} \frac{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)(2-\epsilon)}{\Gamma(1+\epsilon)} \left(I_{1234}^{D=12-2\epsilon} + I_{1243}^{D=12-2\epsilon} + I_{1323}^{D=12-2\epsilon} \right) \quad (5.10)$$

Since this is now the correct answer to all order in ϵ A we can evaluate it merely at order ϵ^0 . Thus we need $I^{D=12-2\epsilon}$ to order ϵ^{-1}

$$\begin{aligned} I^{D=12-2\epsilon} &= \Gamma(-2+\epsilon) \int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) (-sa_1a_3 - ta_2a_4)^{2-\epsilon} \\ &= \frac{1}{2\epsilon} \int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) (-sa_1a_3 - ta_2a_4)^2 + O(\epsilon^0) \\ &= \frac{2s^2 + st + 2t^2}{5040\epsilon} + O(\epsilon^0) \end{aligned} \quad (5.11)$$

and thus the amplitude is

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{i\kappa^4}{16} \frac{[12]^2 [34]^2}{\langle 12 \rangle^2 \langle 34 \rangle^2} \frac{6}{16(4\pi)^2} \frac{4s^2 + 4t^2 + 4u^2 + st + tu + su}{2520} \\ &= \frac{i\kappa^4}{(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{st}{\langle 12 \rangle \langle 23 \rangle \langle 34 \rangle \langle 41 \rangle} \right)^2 \frac{(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)}{3840} \end{aligned} \quad (5.12)$$

This reproduces the result of ref. [10] for a real scalar. (For a complex scalar multiply by a factor of 2). and is consistent with [30]. thus we have thus demonstrated, as was done for QCD in [14] how the cuts can reproduce the finite rational polynomials in amplitudes.

After demonstrating the validity of the method let us calculate the amplitude with a massive scalar of mass M in the loop. This has been calculated in the $M \rightarrow \infty$ limit previously [16]. This will involve replacing μ^2 by $\mu^2 + M^2$ in the initial cut expression. Following the analysis to eqn. (5.5) μ^8 is replaced by $(\mu^2 + M^2)^4$ in the numerator and μ^2 by $\mu^2 + M^2$ in the numerators. The various terms can then be evaluated using

$$\begin{aligned} &\int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) \int_0^\infty d\mu^2 (\mu^2)^{-1-\epsilon} \frac{\mu^{2n}}{(sa_1a_3 + ta_2a_4 - \mu^2 - M^2)^2} \\ &= \frac{(-1)^n \pi(n-\epsilon-1)}{\sin(\pi\epsilon)} (sa_1a_3 + ta_2a_4 - M^2)^{n-\epsilon-2} \\ &= \frac{(-1)^n \pi(n-\epsilon-1)}{\sin(\pi\epsilon)} A \frac{1}{\Gamma(2+\epsilon-n)} I^{D=2n-2\epsilon+4} \end{aligned} \quad (5.13)$$

Putting the pieces together we may obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{i\kappa^4}{16(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}} \frac{[12]^2 [34]^2}{\langle 12 \rangle^2 \langle 34 \rangle^2} \frac{\pi\epsilon}{\sin(\pi\epsilon)\Gamma(1-\epsilon)\Gamma(1+\epsilon)} \left(\epsilon(1-\epsilon)(2-\epsilon)(3-\epsilon) I_{1234}^{D=12-2\epsilon} \right. \\ &\quad + 4M^2\epsilon(1-\epsilon)(2-\epsilon) I_{1234}^{D=10-2\epsilon} + 6M^4\epsilon(1-\epsilon) I_{1234}^{D=8-2\epsilon} \\ &\quad \left. + 4M^6\epsilon I_{1234}^{D=6-2\epsilon} - M^8 I_{1234}^{D=4-2\epsilon} + \{1243\} + \{1324\} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (5.14)$$

which will be valid to all orders in ϵ . To evaluate to ϵ^0 , we will only need the infinite parts of the $D = 12, D = 10, D = 8$ and $D = 6$ integrals and the finite part of the $D = 4$ integral. (The $D = 6$ integral will drop out to order ϵ^0 since the box is both UV and IR finite in $D = 6$.) We can evaluate these objects to $O(\epsilon^0)$, using

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)(2-\epsilon)}{\Gamma(1+\epsilon)} I_{1234}^{D=12-2\epsilon} A &= \int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) (sa_1 a_3 + ta_2 a_4 - M^2)^{2-\epsilon} \\
&= \frac{2s^2 + st + 2t^2}{2520} - \frac{M^2(s+t)}{60} + \frac{M^4}{6} \\
\frac{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)}{\Gamma(1+\epsilon)} I_{1234}^{D=10-\epsilon} &= \int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) (sa_1 a_3 + ta_2 a_4 - M^2)^{1-\epsilon} = \frac{s+t}{120} - \frac{M^2}{6} \\
\frac{\epsilon}{\Gamma(1+\epsilon)} I_{1234}^{D=8-2\epsilon} &= \int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) (sa_1 a_3 + ta_2 a_4 - M^2)^{-\epsilon} = 1/6
\end{aligned} \tag{5.15}$$

which will yield for the amplitude (for a real scalar),

$$\begin{aligned}
-\frac{i\kappa^4}{16(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{st}{\langle 12 \rangle \langle 23 \rangle \langle 34 \rangle \langle 41 \rangle} \right)^2 \left(\frac{(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)}{240} + \frac{1}{2} M^4 \right. \\
\left. - M^8 (I_{1234}^{D=4} A + I_{1243}^{D=4} + I_{1324}^{D=4}) \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{5.16}$$

This amplitude contains logarithms and dilogarithms from $I_{1234}^{D=4}$. These terms could be correctly obtained from the cuts naively but we also have the additional polynomial terms to give the full correct result. We might also expect that the amplitude should contain terms of the form $\ln(m^2)$, which would not have been recovered in the above analysis. However, we can deduce that no such terms appear by applying the arguments outlined in ref. [14]: Such terms only appear with specific divergent contributions; since we know that the amplitude is UV and IR finite we know that no $\ln(m^2)$ terms will be found. The large M expansion, on $I_{1234}^{D=4}$ is

$$\begin{aligned}
&\int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) (sa_1 a_3 + ta_2 a_4 - M^2)^{-2-\epsilon} \\
&= \int da_i \delta(\sum a_i - 1) (M^2)^{-2-\epsilon} \left(1 - (2+\epsilon) \frac{S}{M^2} + (2+\epsilon)(3+\epsilon) \frac{S^2}{2M^4} \right. \\
&\quad - (2+\epsilon)(3+\epsilon)(4+\epsilon) \frac{S^3}{6M^6} + (2+\epsilon)(3+\epsilon)(4+\epsilon)(5+\epsilon) \frac{S^4}{24M^8} \\
&\quad \left. - (2+\epsilon)(3+\epsilon)(4+\epsilon)(5+\epsilon)(6+\epsilon) \frac{S^5}{120M^{10}} \dots \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{6M^4} - \frac{s+t}{60M^6} + \frac{2s^2 + st + 2t^2}{840M^8} - \frac{3s^3 + st^2 + s^2t + 3t^3}{7560M^{10}} \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{5.17}$$

where $S = sa_1a_3 + ta_2a_4$. From this we obtain the large mass expansion for the amplitude

$$-\frac{i\kappa^4}{16(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{st}{\langle 12 \rangle \langle 23 \rangle \langle 34 \rangle \langle 41 \rangle} \right)^2 \left(\frac{stu}{504M^2} - \frac{(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)^2}{15120M^4} - \frac{stu(s^2 + t^2 + u^2)}{15840M^6} \dots \right) \quad (5.18)$$

This amplitude tends to zero as $M \rightarrow \infty$ as expected with the $1/M^2$ term having the same coefficient as calculated previously [16].

6. Conclusions

In perturbative gravity and gauge theories the calculation of amplitudes is a painful process where huge intermediate expression eventually collapse to relatively small final answers. This computational complexity will remain a challenge despite considerable improvement in both techniques and algebraic computing facilities. Any technique which attempts to avoid this computational explosion must be explored carefully. Unitarity in the form of the Cutkosky rules is one such technique. By sewing together tree amplitudes upon which much simplifications have already been performed one can build upon previous calculations and avoid part of the algebraic complexity. Unfortunately, the full amplitude is not calculated by the Cutkosky rules but the rules are a powerful constraint upon the form of amplitudes. In some cases unitarity is enough to fix the the amplitudes completely, however naively applying the Cutkosky rules in the general case leaves ambiguities. These ambiguities however can be expressed in such a form that they only effect the finite terms polynomial in momentum invariants. Thus, in principle, one can calculate the infinities using the Cutkosky rules. More sophisticated use of the Cutkosky rules [14] can also be used to determine the entire structure of a loop amplitude. In quantum gravity it is most often the infinities in amplitudes which are of more interest rather than the finite terms (The case in QCD is often the other way around.). Here we have shown in several cases how the Cutkosky rules can be practically used to evaluate infinities. In any massless theory there are both IR and UV infinities. Although the cuts do not distinguish between these sources, the general structure of the IR infinities can be determined [16]. With this information we can isolate the UV divergences. We have explicitly shown how the UV infinities in scalar coupled matter appear in an amplitude using this technique and are in agreement with the known results which were obtained by a very different route. Other infinities previously unknown may be obtained in this manner [28].

We would like to thank Zvi Bern and Andrew Morgan for useful discussions regarding the use of Cutkosky rules for massive particles, Christian Schubert for discussions relating to the world-line formalism for gravity and Lance Dixon for discussions both regarding the possibility of disentangling the UV and IR infinities within the amplitudes and for access to his calculations regarding massive scalar amplitudes. This research was supported by PPARC.

References

- [1] B.S. DeWitt, Phys. Rev. 162:1239 (1967);
M. Veltman, in *Les Houches 1975, Methods in Field Theory*, ed R. Balian and J. Zinn-Justin, (North Holland, Amsterdam, 1976).
- [2] M.T. Grisaru, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Phys. Rev. Lett. 37:1662 (1976).
- [3] G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, Ann. Inst. Henri Poincaré 20:69 (1974).
- [4] S. Deser and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. D10:411 (1974);
M.T. Grisaru, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and C.C. Wu, Phys. Rev. D12:1813 (1975).
- [5] G. 't Hooft, Acta Universitatis Wratislavenensis no. 38, 12th Winter School of Theoretical Physics in Karpacz; *Functional and Probabilistic Methods in Quantum Field Theory*, Vol. 1 (1975);
B.S. DeWitt, in *Quantum Gravity II*, eds. C. Isham, R. Penrose and D. Sciama (Oxford, 1981);
L.F. Abbott, Nucl. Phys. B185:189 (1981);
L.F. Abbott, M.T. Grisaru and R.K. Schaeffer, Nucl. Phys. B229:372 (1983).
- [6] M.H. Goroff and A. Sagnotti, Phys. Lett. 160B:81(1985), Nucl. Phys. B266:709 (1986).
- [7] A.E.M. van de Ven, Nucl. Phys. B378:309 (1992).
- [8] Z. Bern and D.A. Kosower, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66:1669 (1991); Nucl. Phys. B379:451 (1992) ;
Z. Bern, L. Dixon and D.A. Kosower, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70:2677 (1993); Nucl. Phys. B437:259 (1995).
- [9] Z. Bern, D.C. Dunbar and T. Shimada, Phys. Lett. 312B:277 (1993).
- [10] D.C. Dunbar and P.S. Norridge, Nucl. Phys. B433:181 (1995).
- [11] L.D. Landau, Nucl. Phys. 13:181 (1959);
S. Mandelstam, Phys. Rev. 112:1344 (1958), 115:1741 (1959);
R.E. Cutkosky, J. Math. Phys. 1:429 (1960).
- [12] Z. Bern, D.C. Dunbar, L. Dixon and D.A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B425:217 (1994) .
- [13] Z. Bern, D.C. Dunbar, L. Dixon and D.A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B435:59 (1995) .
- [14] Z. Bern and A. Morgan, hep-ph/9511336.
- [15] Z. Kunszt, A. Signer and Z. Trocsanyi, Nucl. Phys. B420:550 (1994).
- [16] L. Dixon, private communication .
- [17] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. 140:B516 (1962) .
- [18] Z. Bern and D.C. Dunbar, Nucl. Phys. B379:562 (1992).
- [19] E.S. Fradkin and A.A. Tseytlin, Phys. Lett. 158B:316 (1985); 163B:123 (1985); Nucl. Phys. B261:1 (1985);
M. Strassler, Nucl. Phys. B385:145 (1992);

- M.G. Schmidt and C. Schubert, Phys. Lett. 318B:438 (1993);
D.G.C. McKeon, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 224:139 (1993).
- [20] W. Siegel, Phys. Lett. 84B:193 (1979);
D.M. Capper, D.R.T. Jones and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Nucl. Phys. B167:479 (1980);
L.V. Avdeev and A.A. Vladimirov, Nucl. Phys. B219:262 (1983);
I. Jack, D.R.T. Jones and K.L. Roberts, Z. Phys. C63:151 (1994) .
- [21] S. Sannan, Phys. Rev. D34:1748 (1986).
- [22] L.M. Brown and R.P. Feynman, Phys. Rev. 85:231 (1952);
G. Passarino and M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B160:151 (1979);
G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B153:365 (1979);
R. G. Stuart, Comp. Phys. Comm. 48:367 (1988);
R. G. Stuart and A. Gongora, Comp. Phys. Comm. 56:337 (1990).
- [23] D. B. Melrose, Il Nuovo Cimento 40A:181 (1965);
W. van Neerven and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. 137B:241 (1984);
G. J. van Oldenborgh and J.A.M. Vermaseren, Z. Phys. C46:425 (1990);
G. J. van Oldenborgh, PhD thesis, University of Amsterdam (1990);
A. Aeppli, PhD thesis, University of Zurich (1992).
- [24] Z. Bern and G. Chalmers, Nucl. Phys. B447:465 (1995).
- [25] F.A. Berends, W.T. Giele and H. Kuijf, Phys. Lett. 211B:91 (1988).
- [26] S.F.Novaes and D.Spehler, Phys.Rev. D44:3990 (1991); Nucl.Phys. B371:618(1992);
H.T. Cho, K.L. Ng, Phys. Rev. D47:1692 (1993) .
- [27] F. A. Berends, R. Kleiss, P. De Causmaecker, R. Gastmans and T. T. Wu, Phys. Lett. 103B:124 (1981);
P. De Causmaecker, R. Gastmans, W. Troost and T. T. Wu, Nucl. Phys. B206:53 (1982);
R. Kleiss and W. J. Stirling, Nucl. Phys. B262:235 (1985);
J. F. Gunion and Z. Kunszt, Phys. Lett. 161B:333 (1985);
R. Gastmans and T.T. Wu, *The Ubiquitous Photon: Helicity Method for QED and QCD* (Clarendon Press) (1990);
Z. Xu, D.-H. Zhang and L. Chang, Nucl. Phys. B291:392 (1987).
- [28] P.S. Norridge, in preparation .
- [29] G.D. Mahlon , Phys. Rev. D49 (1994) 2197.
- [30] M.T. Grisaru and J. Zak, Phys. Lett. 90B:237 (1980).
- [31] M.T. Grisaru, H.N. Pendleton and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. D15:996 (1977);
M.L. Mangano and S.J. Parke, Phys. Rep. 200:301 (1991).