

Infinites in Quantum Gravities

S. Deser*

Department of Physics, Brandeis University, Waltham, MA 02454, USA

Abstract

We first present a review, intended for classical relativists, of the ultraviolet difficulties faced by local quantum gravity theories in both the usual Einstein versions and in their supergravity extensions, at least perturbatively. These problems, present in arbitrary dimensions, are traceable to the dimensionality of the Einstein constant. We then summarize very recent results about supergravity at the highest allowed dimension, $D=11$, showing that also this unique model suffers from infinities already at 2 loops, despite its high degree of supersymmetry. The conclusion is that there is no viable nonghost quantum field model that includes general relativity.

1 Introduction

This report on the current state of quantum gravity (QG) will have both a narrower and a broader scope than “QG”: on the one hand, I will only be concerned with ultraviolet behavior – the “renormalizability problem”; on the other, QG here signifies not just $D=4$ quantized Einstein theory (QGR) but more importantly its extensions to supergravities (SUGRA) in all possible dimensions. Indeed, my lecture is primarily dedicated to the very new results I will report on the hitherto unresolved renormalizability properties of the ultimate such theory, $D=11$ SUGRA. This will lead to the conclusion that there are no viable (but otherwise physically acceptable) local quantum field theories that contain or reduce to GR, at least in the perturbative framework available to us. This conclusion of course in no way negates the validity of say GR as an effective, tree level, model; it means that there must be an underlying theory, such as strings, or M-theory, with extended rather than pointlike excitations. Indeed, the fact that superstring theories are both finite and reduce to GR in the local limit is one of their essential attributes.

I will first rapidly review the relevant aspects of QGR, the quantized Einstein theory, then remind you of the now standard SUGRA extensions and their most relevant property, namely a new local invariance – supersymmetry (SUSY). We will then turn to a brief discussion of the renormalizability problem, its fundamental origin in the dimensionality of the Einstein coupling constant, and to the “struggle” between the constraints imposed by higher symmetries and this dimensionality in QGR (at any D) as well as in SUGRAs with $D<11$. Finally, we will consider the maximal, and ultimate, $D=11$ SUGRA whose newly uncovered nonrenormalizability properties will be exhibited. For reasons of space, extensive referencing cannot be provided nor is this review always technically precise.

*deser@brandeis.edu

2 QGR

Classical GR, well defined in arbitrary dimension $D \geq 4$, does not exist at $D=2$, and is defined but not dynamical for $D=3$. Let me immediately state what models are unphysical already classically and hence are not considered here: these are theories for which unitarity would be violated because their spectrum contains ghost or tachyon excitations or which do not limit to GR at all. In particular I exclude both “ $R+R^2$ ” theories that involve higher derivative already at the kinetic level (see below) and “ R^2 ” theories such as Weyl gravity, where there is no Einstein term at all. Theories with R^3 or higher additions to GR share the fate of QGR, so we can neglect them as well. [Here “ R^2 ” and “ R^3 ” mean generic powers of Riemann, Weyl, Ricci or scalar curvatures.] We will also not discuss models with non-vanishing cosmological constant; they can be quantized but are no better behaved.

To define QGR, we must choose a vacuum state about which to expand the metric, the natural choice being flat space, with Minkowski metric $\eta_{\mu\nu}$. While one might perhaps hope that choosing different vacua could affect the result, this seems highly unlikely because the main issue is really the Einstein constant’s dimensionality. Likewise, we do not consider in this context – because none are known – any nonperturbative approaches to the QGR problem. The expansion we will use is

$$g_{\mu\nu} \equiv \eta_{\mu\nu} + \kappa h_{\mu\nu}, \quad g^{\mu\nu} = \eta^{\mu\nu} - \kappa \eta^{\mu\alpha} h_{\alpha}^{\nu} + \dots, \quad h^{\mu\nu} \equiv h_{\alpha\beta} \eta^{\mu\alpha} \eta^{\nu\beta} \quad (1)$$

but again field redefinitions, *e.g.*, expanding $\sqrt{-g} g^{\mu\nu} \equiv \eta^{\mu\nu} + H^{\mu\nu}$ fare no better. The Einstein action $I_E = \kappa^{-2} \int d^D x \sqrt{-g} R$ consists of a free part corresponding to a massless spin 2 field, along with an infinite series of ever higher order vertices. The propagator term is essentially

$$I_F = -\frac{1}{2} \int d^D x (\partial_\alpha h_{\mu\nu})^2. \quad (2)$$

This expression shows why adding $\int d^D x R^2$ terms is forbidden: their propagator contributions are $\sim \int d^D x (\partial h) \partial \partial (\partial h)$, thereby introducing ghost/tachyon states that violate unitarity and energy stability, since the propagator is now a sum of two excitation modes, $\sim p^{-2} - (p^2 + \alpha)^{-1}$ with relative ghost sign, tachyonic mass, or both. It should also be emphasized that, at QGR level, any R^2 terms that arise as radiative (loop) corrections to an underlying purely GR action are *not* to be used to modify the propagator part (2); by the perturbation-theoretic rules, they can only act as vertex corrections, without altering the p^{-2} behavior of the propagator. The infinite series of vertex terms,

$$I_E - I_F \sim \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \int d^D x (\partial h)^2 (\kappa h)^n \quad (3)$$

is characterized by the rising power in κ and a common 2-derivative character. Quantization turns $h_{\mu\nu}$ into an operator, and in units $\hbar = 1 = c$, κ^2 has dimension $[L]^{D-2}$; it is dimensionless only at $D=2$, where the action is just the integrated topological Euler density, and so is empty.

3 SUGRA

Before proceeding to the UV problem, we quickly define the basics of SUGRA. These theories are fermionic extensions of QGR that include at least a spin 3/2 massless field ψ_μ and (depending on the dimension) perhaps also other ($3/2 \geq s \geq 0$) lower spin “matter”. A SUGRA is thus

simply “just another” GR + matter system, but with two deep differences: the most important is the presence of a new local SUSY Grassmannian gauge invariance that interchanges bosons with fermions and constrains its form very strongly; second, because fermions are involved and those are only consistent when (second-) quantized, their gravity and other bosonic components must also be quantized *ab initio*; there is not classical SUGRA (though it does have a classical bosonic limit). For concreteness, I remind you (but only schematically) of the original D=4 N=1 SUGRA [1],

$$I_{SG4} = \int d^4x \left[\kappa^{-2} \sqrt{g} R - i/2 \bar{\psi}_\mu \not{D} \psi^\mu \right] \quad (4)$$

where \not{D} is the (covariant) Dirac operator; the SUSY here is

$$\delta e_{\mu a} = \bar{\alpha}(x) \gamma_a \psi_\mu, \quad \delta \psi_\mu = D_\mu \alpha(x) \quad (5)$$

with $\alpha(x)$ is a Grassmann (anticommuting) function and the graviton is “hidden” in the covariant derivative of the spinor $\alpha(x)$. Another fundamental difference between SUGRAs and GR+matter is that the former must satisfy conditions such as equality of numbers of bose/fermi excitations in order for the SUSY algebra to close. This not only restricts the permitted SUGRAs at any dimension D, but also provide an upper bound, D=11, on the dimension at which SUGRA can exist: beyond D=11, massless spins higher than 2 are required (notoriously difficult to couple consistently to gravity) and there will be more than one graviton as well. We will discuss D=11 and its special properties later.

4 Nonrenormalizability in Gravitational Theories: QGR

Let us begin for contrast with the ultraviolet problem in say QED₄, where the coupling constant α , which also counts closed loop orders (after the usual $eA \rightarrow A$ rescaling), is dimensionless. The ultraviolet (UV) problem – when calculating closed loop corrections to any process, there is in general an infinity – is exemplified by the one-loop correction to the electron’s mass due to a virtual photon line, that contains a logarithmic divergence proportional to the electron mass term itself. There are also (essential!) nonlocal, finite, terms, but this local term can (and must) be removed at the price of introducing the indeterminacy of the bare mass $m_0 \rightarrow m_0 + \delta m$ into the theory. Fortunately, here as well as to any n -loop ($\sim \alpha^n$) order, the counterterm in question retains the *form* of the original QED action’s mass term since there is no new dimensional quantity in the problem. Thus, all infinities can be removed at the cost of redefining a *finite* number of parameters (here charge and mass) in the theory. This is all very familiar; what about dimensionfull couplings? Already in the thirties, Heisenberg noted that theories with coupling constants (and hence loop expansions) having positive dimension (for him the Fermi 4-fermion weak interaction model ($\sim G \int d^4x (\bar{\psi}\psi)^2$)) would have increasing divergences at each order, or in modern language require an ever-increasing number of counterterms and hence of undetermined parameters in the theory: one would need to specify an infinite, and not just a finite, set of parameters before the theory is fixed. [Parenthetically, there are other problems that make QED₄ alone unsatisfactory; by contrast Yang–Mills (YM) theory, while also renormalizable, has other advantages (asymptotic freedom) that effectively obviate the whole counterterm apparatus, and there are even theories with negative dimensional couplings that are “superrenormalizable”. But all that is irrelevant here. Let me finally allude to one conceivable nonperturbative “solution” of the divergence problem. Many years ago, Weinberg suggested that models might exist that are perturbatively unacceptable, but

contain fixed points that would imply well-defined predictions when viewed nonperturbatively. To my knowledge, there is as yet no realistic application of this idea to gravity.]

What loopholes are left by the above generic linkage between dimensional coupling and non-renormalizability? There are basically two. First, the infinite counterterms may all be present but harmless, because they are in some way absorbable without having to introduce a new parameter; second, they may actually not arise at all because forbidden on invariance grounds. [Of course, there could also be accidental cancellations of infinities, but an infinite number of them is infinitely unlikely; we know that (also in physics) what is not forbidden is generically compulsory.] We will see examples of both loopholes, but not for our physical QG models.

Consider first the classic example of source-free D=4 QGR, which was also the first to be studied systematically [2]. Here $\kappa^2 = [L]^2$, so the candidate infinite counterterms are essentially

$$\Delta I_4 = \text{“}\infty\text{”} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \int d^4x (\kappa^2 R)^n R^2 \quad (6)$$

that is, the one-loop candidate infinity is $\sim \kappa^0 \int R^2$, the 2-loop one is $\kappa^2 \int R^3$ etc. Now explicit calculation shows that there is no miracle – the one-loop term is there, but it does benefit from the first of our loopholes, in a way that I merely indicate here: If a counterterm is of the form $\int \delta I_0 / \delta \chi X$, where $\delta I_0 / \delta \chi = 0$ is the original system’s field equation (here $R_{\mu\nu} = 0$) and X is any quantity, then this term can be absorbed by a field redefinition, $\chi \rightarrow \chi + \text{“}\infty\text{”} X$, with no renormalization required [2]. But, thanks to the D=4 Gauss–Bonnet theorem, $\int d^4x R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^2 = \int d^4x (4R_{\mu\nu}^2 - R^2)$, all possible “ R^2 ” terms can be written as $\int d^4x R_{\mu\nu} X^{\mu\nu}$ and hence removed by redefining the metric, and the theory is one-loop safe. What about 2 loops? This is a more difficult matter, involving a very nasty calculation of the coefficient of the on-shell non-vanishing local $\int d^4x (\text{Weyl})^3$ term; two heroic calculations [3] indeed established its presence. Of course, we will never strictly know whether the infinities stop after some finite loop number, but it is safe to say the theory is not viable (barring a truly surprising as yet unknown and infinitely strong symmetry of the Einstein action). The same story holds for QGR in any $D > 4$, since it contains D=4 as a dimensional reduction and the reduction cannot make a finite theory infinite. In any case, pure QGR is rather academic, as already at 1-loop even D=4 QGR plus any matter of spin 0, $\frac{1}{2}$ or 1 is bad, [2, 4] because the infinities do not just enter in the form “ ∞ ” $\int (G^{\mu\nu} - T^{\mu\nu}) X_{\mu\nu}$ and so are not redefinable away.

5 D<11 SUGRA Infinities

What about spin 3/2 “matter”? After all D=4 SUGRA can be thought of in that way as well, so one would expect a one-loop catastrophe. However, there *is* a new symmetry at play here, namely the SUSY of (5). Indeed, this forces the counterterms to be no worse than for pure QGR: they are, as for pure QGR, proportional to the *full* (SUGRA) equations of motion. So far, this merely makes SUGRA no worse than QGR without sources. But in fact, it *is* better as a result of our second, “higher symmetry”, loophole at 2 loops: there exists no SUSY completion of the $R_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^3$ term that destroyed QGR! Does SUSY always “beat” the curse of $\kappa^2 = [L]^2$? Alas, no. At 3 loops [5], there is a SUSY invariant, which happens to start (for deep D=4 and SUSY reasons), as $\kappa^4 \int B_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^2$ where B is the (quadratic in curvature) Bel–Robinson tensor. The same is true for extended versions of SUGRA that involve additional fields and a further symmetry, labelled by an

internal index N , *eg.*, $N=2$ [6]; the series extends all the way to maximal, $N=8$ SUGRA, but $N=8$ enjoys a special, hidden, symmetry. One might suppose that calculation of these coefficients here would be technically overwhelming, and so it remained until quite recently with the development of a powerful new formalism [7], to which we shall return. Indeed, it was possible to show that, due to this symmetry, at least maximal $N=8$ SUGRA enjoys a reprieve until 5 loops [7],[8]. I must refer to the original papers for the technology that made this possible, but mention in passing that it relies on a separately interesting insight, the KLT [9] correspondence between closed and “squares” of open strings that essentially relates graviton scattering amplitudes to “squares” of Yang–Mills amplitudes.

So $D=4$ SUGRAs become infinite as well, at the lowest possible order consistent with their symmetries; they just start a bit later in loop order, but there are no accidental cancellations. In this connection, I should also mention the amusing case of $D=3$ QGR where $\kappa^2 \sim [L]^{+1}$ but where there should be no true infinities simply because the theory has no local excitations. This comes about because in $D=3$ Riemann and Ricci tensors are equivalent so all invariants (not just the one-loop one) vanish on Einstein shell. This simple argument is borne out by explicit calculations in different formalisms [10]; the roles of (and insensitivity to) different background choices are nicely illustrated here.

The new methods I mentioned, together with a reasonable understanding of how to express SUSY invariants in higher dimensional SUGRAs, can be used to show that infinities also appear in all SUGRAs with $D \leq 10$, which have their roots in ($D=10$) superstring theories. This left, as the only model outstanding, the last possible, ($D=11$) SUGRA, to which we now come.

6 $D=11$ SUGRA

Shortly after the original $N=1$ $D=4$ SUGRA was obtained, it was shown that $D=11$ would be the highest possible dimension because beyond it, SUSY would require [11] spin >2 and more gravitons to keep the boson/fermion degree of freedom balance. As mentioned, these are physically inconsistent systems, except of course for the dull case of uncoupled free fields. The $D=11$ theory itself was completely established as well [12]. Because of its amazing properties, and because of its recent “post $D=10$ string” resurgence as a part of the (as yet unknown) M-theory, it has once again become popular in other contexts. The action, of which we only write the bosonic terms here, contains only three basic fields: the graviton, a 3-form potential $A_{[\mu\nu\alpha]}$ and its curl, the gauge invariant field strength $F_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} = \partial_{[\beta} A_{\mu\nu\alpha]}$ 4-form, together with a single vector-spinor ψ_μ ; schematically,

$$I_{(\text{boson})} = \kappa^{-2} \int d^{11}x \sqrt{-g} \left[R + F^2 \right] + \kappa \int d^{11}x \epsilon^{1\dots 11} A_{123} F_{4\dots 7} F_{8\dots 11} . \quad (7)$$

Note the Chern–Simons term (ϵ is the Levi-Civita density) and its explicit κ -dependence, with $\kappa^2 \sim [L]^9$ here. This model is unique: there are no different “ $N > 1$ ” versions possible, there is no “supermatter” which can serve as its source and it cannot even (unlike $D < 11$ SUGRAs), acquire a nonvanishing cosmological constant [13].

What are the obstacles to determining the counterterms here? The first is that their form is hard to find because of the absence of a manifestly SUSY invariant formalism in $D=11$. Because

D is odd, the simplest place to look is at two-loop order,

$$\Delta I_{2\text{-loop}} \sim \kappa^2 \int d^{11}x \sum_{n=2}^0 [R_1 D^{20-n} R_n + \dots] . \quad (8)$$

This rather symbolic expression is intended to mean any dimension 20 invariant made from curvatures and derivatives, plus its SUSY completion if one exists. Clearly, the more D 's and fewer R 's, the easier our task. However, just from linearized SUSY arguments, “ R^2 ” is trivial (because Gauss–Bonnet holds at any D for the leading quadratic terms, while R^3 is likewise not useful as the leading term of a SUSY invariant. Thus, $R^4 D^{12}$ is the most likely place to start.

I will summarize here the work of Seminara and myself [14] in which the invariant term has been obtained. The method consists in realizing that there is a guaranteed linearized SUSY invariant to be constructed from the action (7) – the four-point tree level scattering amplitude – that is, the sum of all possible 4 particle scatterings, from 4-graviton to 4-fermion. Furthermore, because linearized SUSY does not change particle number, and because at tree level bosons and fermions doesn't mix in the sense that the fermions do not affect the bosonic amplitudes, it suffices to consider only the bosonic truncation of (7) to get all 4-boson parts. Before describing the calculation further, we must state that these amplitudes are nonlocal, because they involve exchange of intermediate particles, with accompanying propagator denominators, and they have fewer than the required explicit derivatives besides. We will have to remove the nonlocality and insert further derivatives in a way consistent with SUSY for this construction to be useful; this is indeed possible. I do not give details here; suffice it to say that the operative quantities are (a) the graviton and form propagators, both $\sim p^{-2}$, (b) the three-point vertices, proportional to κp^2 , and (c) the four-point ones $\sim \kappa^2 p^2$. The propagators are well-known in any gauge; there are three types of 3-point vertices, namely the cubic Einstein terms, the cubic pure form Chern–Simons vertex and finally the coupling of the form's stress tensor to the graviton. The four-point contact vertices are needed for gauge-invariance; their local contributions leave net nonlocal amplitudes; the quartic Einstein term does this for the 4-graviton amplitude, while the quartic $FFhh$ term that comes from expanding the kinetic term $\sqrt{-g} F_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} F_{\mu'\nu'\alpha'\beta'} g^{\mu\mu'} \dots g^{\beta\beta'}$ to $\mathcal{O}(h^2)$ is needed for graviton-form “Compton scattering”.

With the above elements, it is easy to see what processes are possible. The first is 4-graviton scattering, just as in Einstein theory. Its amplitude is essentially dimension-independent and can be expressed either in “string”-form $t_8 t_8 RRRR$ (where t_8 is a constant 8-index tensor), as it appears on expanding the gravity sector of string theory beyond the leading Einstein part, or in Bel–Robinson form $\sim B_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}^2$, as it first arises in $D=4$ SUGRAs. At the “opposite” end is the 4-form $\sim F^4$ scattering: it involves the CS-vertices joined with a form propagator plus the $T_{\mu\nu}(F) - T_{\mu\nu}(F)$ graviton-mediated scattering. Next comes a “graviton bremsstrahlung” $F^3 R$ term in which a single graviton is emitted by the $T_{\mu\nu}(F) h_{\mu\nu}$ coupling from any arm of the CS term (the topological CS vertex itself is of course metric-independent). Finally, most complicated is the $FFRR$ scattering involving all of the vertices. [There is no FR^3 term at tree level, since a single matter particle cannot be created.] At this stage, our results may be summarized schematically by the statement that the total bosonic amplitude is of the – very symbolic – form

$$stu M_{\text{tot}} \sim [R^4 + R^2 F^2 + RF^3 + F^4] . \quad (9)$$

Here we are using momentum space form where (s, t, u) are the usual Mandelstam variables quadratic in momentum used to describe 4-point scatterings in QFT. There is work involved in obtaining

(9), because we must, and can, establish that multiplying by stu leads to a local quantity after “spreading” the derivatives over the four field strengths and that SUSY is not lost. Then we must multiply in an stu -symmetric way by 12 more derivatives to get the right dimension, which is accomplished by any combination of $(s^6 + t^6 + u^6)$ and $(stu)^2$.

At this stage we have accomplished the desired construction of a 4-point linearized SUSY invariant. The next question is of course if it actually appears as a two-loop infinite counterterm, *i.e.*, whether its coefficient is non-zero. This has been answered in the affirmative in [7]. Using the methods mentioned earlier, namely using rules relating gravitational to squares of Yang–Mills amplitudes [9], it was possible to calculate the infinite part of the 2 loop 4-graviton counterterm, *i.e.*, of the first term in (9), with dimensional regularization in $D=11-2\epsilon$ dimensions. The result is

$$\Delta I_{2 \text{ loop}}^4 \text{ grav} = \kappa^2 A/\epsilon [438(s^6 + t^6 + u^6) - 53(stu)^2] stu M_{\text{tree}}^4 \text{ grav} \quad (10)$$

where $stu M_{\text{tree}}^{4g} \sim R^4$ and A is a known constant. Barring the infinite unlikelihood that there exist hidden (super)symmetries that are respected by this, but by no higher loop candidate terms, we may conclude that $D=11$ SUGRA is also nonrenormalizable.

7 Conclusions

We have seen in a systematic way that there is no local, unitary (ghost/tachyon-free) quantum field theory whose action reduces to QGR or classical GR that is also free of infinities; the latter are almost certainly there at every order, requiring an infinite number of input parameters to define these theories. The conclusion includes all possible SUGRA models, *i.e.*, from $D=4$ through $D=11$, as well. Although the presence of new counterterms at all loop orders (or at an infinite set of them) cannot reasonably be rigorously demonstrable, the fact that the ones we did see appeared at lowest permitted order (so that no “hidden” invariances prevented them), is quite convincing evidence. The calculations were all within the perturbative framework in which we know how to define and carry out the problem, and may not – perhaps – apply to some putative future nonperturbative formulation. [Remember though that perturbation loop expansion is responsible for all the incredible quantitative successes of the standard model!]

It seems safe to conclude then, that local QFT’s of gravity must be regarded as only effective low energy (compared to Planck scale!) approximations to deeper theories of extended objects, such as strings or M-theory, of which they are the pointlike limits. The $D=11$ invariant given here could, from this point of view, also be considered as a first local finite correction that emerges from M-theory.

8 Acknowledgements

I thank my collaborator D. Seminara for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the National Science Foundation under grant PHY99-73935.

References

- [1] S. Ferrara, D. Freedman, and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. **D13** (1976) 3214; S. Deser and B. Zumino, Phys. Lett. **62B** (1976) 335.
- [2] G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, Ann. Inst. H. Poincaré **20** (1974) 69.
- [3] M.H. Goroff and A. Sagnotti, Nucl. Phys. **B226** (1986) 709; A.E.M. van de Ven, Nucl. Phys. **B378** (1992) 309.
- [4] S. Deser and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **32** (1974) 248; Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 401, 411, 3337 (with H.S. Tsao).
- [5] S. Deser, J.H. Kay, and K. Stelle, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38** (1977) 527.
- [6] S. Deser and J.H. Kay, Phys. Lett. **B76** (1978) 400.
- [7] Z. Bern, L. Dixon, D.C. Dunbar, M. Perelstein, and J.S. Rozowsky, Nucl. Phys. **B530** (1998) 401.
- [8] P.S. Howe and K.S. Stelle, private communication.
- [9] H. Kawai, D.C. Lewellen, and S-H.H. Tye, Nucl. Phys. **B269** (1986) 1.
- [10] E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. **B311** (1988) 46; S. Deser, J. McCarthy, and Z. Yang, Phys. Lett. **B222** (1989) 61.
- [11] W. Nahm, Nucl. Phys. **B135** (1978) 49.
- [12] E. Cremmer, B. Julia, and J. Scherk, Phys. Lett. **B79** (1978) 409.
- [13] K. Bautier, S. Deser, M. Henneaux, and D. Seminara, Phys. Lett. **B406** (1997) 49.
- [14] S. Deser and D. Seminara, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82** (1999) 2435; “Constructing Invariants in and Non-Renormalizability of D=11 Supergravity” (BRX TH-456).