

$E_{7(7)}$ constraints on counterterms in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravityN. Beisert^a, H. Elvang^{bc}, D. Freedman^{de}, M. Kiermaier^f, A. Morales^d, and S. Stieberger^g^a*Max-Planck-Institut für Gravitationsphysik, Albert-Einstein-Institut, Am Mühlenberg 1, 14476 Potsdam, Germany*^b*Michigan Center for Theoretical Physics (MCTP),**Department of Physics, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, USA*^c*Institute for Advanced Study, Princeton, NJ 08540, USA*^d*Department of Mathematics and* ^e*Center for Theoretical Physics,*
Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA^f*Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA, and*^g*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Werner-Heisenberg-Institut, 80805 München, Germany*

(Dated: September 10, 2010)

We prove by explicit computation that the operators D^4R^4 and D^6R^4 in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity have non-vanishing single-soft scalar limits at the 6-point level, and therefore they violate the continuous $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry. The soft limits precisely match automorphism constraints. Together with previous results for R^4 , this provides a direct proof that no $E_{7(7)}$ -invariant candidate counterterm exists below 7-loop order. At 7-loops, we characterize the infinite tower of independent supersymmetric operators D^4R^6 , R^8 , φ^2R^8, \dots with $n > 4$ fields and prove that they all violate $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry. This means that the 4-graviton amplitude determines finiteness at 7-loop order. We show that the corresponding candidate counterterm D^8R^4 has a non-linear supersymmetrization such that its single- and double-soft scalar limits are compatible with $E_{7(7)}$ up to and including 6-points. At loop orders 7, 8, 9 we provide an exhaustive account of all independent candidate counterterms with up to 16, 14, 12 fields, respectively, together with their potential single-soft scalar limits.

INTRODUCTION

$\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity has maximal supersymmetry, and the classical theory has global continuous $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry which is spontaneously broken to $SU(8)$. Explicit calculations have demonstrated that the 4-graviton amplitude in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity is finite up to 4-loop order [1]. Together with string- and superspace-based observations [2, 3], this spurred a wave of renewed interest in the question of whether the loop computations based on generalized unitarity [4] could yield a UV finite result to all orders¹ — or at which loop order the first divergence might occur.

In gravity, logarithmic UV divergences in on-shell L -loop amplitudes are associated with local counterterm operators of mass dimension $\delta = 2L + 2$ composed of fields from the classical theory. The counterterms must respect the non-anomalous symmetries of the theory. It was shown in [7–9] that below 7-loop order, there are only 3 independent operators consistent with linearized $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetry and global $SU(8)$ R-symmetry [10]. These are the 3-, 5- and 6-loop supersymmetric candidate counterterms R^4 , D^4R^4 , and D^6R^4 .

The perturbative S -matrix of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity should respect $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry [11], so one must subject R^4 , D^4R^4 , and D^6R^4 to this test. A necessary condition for a counterterm to be $E_{7(7)}$ -compatible, is that its matrix elements vanish in the ‘single-soft limit’ $p^\mu \rightarrow 0$ for

each external scalar line [12–14]. The scalars of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity are the ‘pions’ of this soft-pion theorem since they are the 70 Goldstone bosons of the spontaneously broken generators of $E_{7(7)}$. It was recently proven [15] that the soft scalar property fails for 6-point matrix elements of the operator R^4 (see also [16]). Thus $E_{7(7)}$ excludes R^4 and explains the finite 3-loop result found in [1].

In the present paper we show first that the 5- and 6-loop operators D^4R^4 and D^6R^4 are incompatible with $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry because their 6-point matrix elements have non-vanishing single-soft scalar limits. Previous string theory [17] and superspace [18] arguments suggested this $E_{7(7)}$ -violation. Our results mean that no UV divergences occur in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity below the 7-loop level.

We then survey the candidate counterterms for loop orders $L = 7, 8, 9$ using two new algorithmic methods: one program counts monomials in the fields of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity in representations of the superalgebra $SU(2, 2|8)$, the other applies Gröbner basis methods to construct their explicit local matrix elements. Our analysis shows that at each loop level 7, 8, 9, there is an infinite tower of independent n -point supersymmetric counterterms with $n \geq 4$. At 7-loop order we find that none of the n -field operators with $n > 4$ are $E_{7(7)}$ -compatible. This leaves D^8R^4 as the only candidate counterterm at $L = 7$. We show that its matrix elements are $E_{7(7)}$ -compatible at least up to 6-points. We observe that it requires remarkable cancellations for $E_{7(7)}$ to be satisfied to all orders for any $L \geq 7$ candidate counterterm.

¹ This question is well-defined whether or not $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity is sensible as a full quantum theory [5, 6].

$E_{7(7)}$ -VIOLATION OF $D^4 R^4$ AND $D^6 R^4$

To investigate $E_{7(7)}$ we study the soft scalar limit of the 6-point NMHV matrix elements $\langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{D^{2k}R^4}$. The external states are two pairs of opposite helicity gravitons and two conjugate scalars. These matrix elements contain local terms from n th order field monomials in the nonlinear SUSY completion of $D^{2k}R^4$ as well as non-local pole diagrams in which one or more lines of the operator are off-shell and communicate to tree vertices from the classical Lagrangian. It is practically impossible to calculate these matrix elements with either Feynman rules (because the non-linear supersymmetrizations of $D^{2k}R^4$ are unknown) or recursion relations (because the matrix elements do not fall off under standard complex deformations of their external momenta). Instead we use the α' -expansion of the closed string tree amplitude to obtain the desired matrix elements.

At tree level, the closed string effective action takes the form

$$S_{\text{eff}} = S_{\text{SG}} - 2\alpha'^3 \zeta(3) e^{-6\phi} R^4 - \zeta(5) \alpha'^5 e^{-10\phi} D^4 R^4 \quad (1)$$

$$+ \frac{2}{3} \alpha'^6 \zeta(3)^2 e^{-12\phi} D^6 R^4 - \frac{1}{2} \alpha'^7 \zeta(7) e^{-14\phi} D^8 R^4 + \dots$$

All closed string amplitudes in this work are obtained via KLT [19] from the open string amplitudes of [20]. The amplitudes confirm the structure and coefficients of (1).

Couplings of the dilaton ϕ break the $SU(8)$ -symmetry of the supergravity theory to $SU(4) \times SU(4)$ when $\alpha' > 0$, and thus the supersymmetric operators of S_{eff} are not the desired $SU(8)$ -invariant operators. As explained in [15], an $SU(8)$ -averaging procedure extracts the $SU(8)$ singlet contribution from the string matrix elements. Specifically, the $SU(8)$ average of the $\langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{e^{-(2k+6)\phi} D^{2k}R^4}$ matrix elements from string theory is

$$\langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{\text{avg}} = \frac{1}{35} \langle ++--\varphi^{1234} \varphi^{5678} \rangle \quad (2)$$

$$- \frac{16}{35} \langle ++--\varphi^{123|5} \varphi^{4|678} \rangle + \frac{18}{35} \langle ++--\varphi^{12|56} \varphi^{34|78} \rangle.$$

The 3 terms on the right side correspond to the 3 inequivalent ways to construct scalars from particles of the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ gauge theory, namely from gluons, gluinos, and $\mathcal{N} = 4$ scalars. There are 35 distinct embeddings of $SU(4) \times SU(4)$ in $SU(8)$. Averaging is sufficient to give the matrix elements of the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ field theory operator R^4 , as done in [15], and we extend it here to $D^4 R^4$. For $D^6 R^4$ a further correction is necessary and is discussed below.

Before proceeding, we note that the operators in the action (1) are normalized such that their 4-point matrix elements are $\langle ++-- \rangle = g(s, t, u) [12]^4 \langle 34 \rangle^4$ with

$$g_{R^4} = 1, \quad g_{D^4 R^4} = s^2 + t^2 + u^2, \quad (3)$$

$$g_{D^6 R^4} = s^3 + t^3 + u^3, \quad g_{D^8 R^4} = (s^2 + t^2 + u^2)^2.$$

5-loop counterterm $D^4 R^4$

At order α'^5 , the $SU(8)$ -average (2) of the string theory amplitudes directly gives the matrix elements of the unique $SU(8)$ -invariant supersymmetrization of $D^4 R^4$. The result is a complicated non-local expression, but its single-soft scalar limit is very simple and local, viz.

$$\lim_{p_6 \rightarrow 0} \langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{D^4 R^4} = -\frac{6}{7} [12]^4 \langle 34 \rangle^4 \sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^2. \quad (4)$$

Since this limit is non-vanishing, the operator $D^4 R^4$ is incompatible with continuous $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry.

6-loop counterterm $D^6 R^4$

The single-soft scalar limit of the $SU(8)$ -singlet part of the closed string matrix element at order α'^6 , obtained by $SU(8)$ -averaging, is

$$\lim_{p_6 \rightarrow 0} \langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{(e^{-12\phi} D^6 R^4)_{\text{avg}}} = -\frac{33}{35} [12]^4 \langle 34 \rangle^4 \sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^3. \quad (5)$$

It is important to realize that at order α'^6 , the 6-point NMHV closed string amplitudes receive contributions from diagrams involving one vertex from $e^{-12\phi} D^6 R^4$ (together with vertices from the supergravity Lagrangian) and from pole diagrams with two 4-point vertices of $e^{-6\phi} R^4$ (which coincides with R^4 at 4-points). Since R^4 is not present in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity, its contributions must be removed to extract the matrix elements of the supergravity operator $D^6 R^4$. The removal process must be supersymmetric.

We first compute the $R^4 - R^4$ pole contributions to the 6-graviton NMHV matrix element $\langle ---++ \rangle$ as follows. This amplitude has dimension 14. Factorization at the pole determines the simple form

$$(12)^4 [45]^4 \langle 3 | P_{126} | 6 \rangle^4 / P_{126}^2 + 8 \text{ permutations}, \quad (6)$$

up to a local polynomial. The 9 terms correspond to the 9 distinct 3-particle pole diagrams. The result (6) is then checked by computation of the Feynman diagrams from the R^4 vertex [21]. As the non-linear supersymmetrization of R^4 may contribute additional local terms, we also consider adding the most general gauge-invariant and bose-symmetric polynomial of dimension 14 that can contribute to $\langle ---++ \rangle$, namely

$$((12)\langle 23 \rangle \langle 31 \rangle [45][56][64])^2 P_{123}^2. \quad (7)$$

To incorporate SUSY, we separately show that there is a basis for $SU(8)$ -invariant 6-particle NMHV superamplitudes (an alternative to the basis in [22]) consisting of $\langle ---++ \rangle$ and 8 distinct permutations of the states. In this basis we write a superamplitude ansatz as the sum of the pole amplitude (6) plus a multiple of (7). We then impose full S_6 permutation symmetry on the ansatz.

This fixes the coefficient of the polynomial (7) to vanish and determines the SUSY completion of the desired pole diagram uniquely!

Finally we project out the scalar-graviton matrix element from this superamplitude and take its single-soft scalar limit to find

$$\lim_{p_6 \rightarrow 0} \langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{(R^4)^2} = -\frac{1}{70} [12]^4 \langle 34 \rangle^4 \sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^3. \quad (8)$$

It is this contribution that we need to subtract from (5) to obtain the single-soft scalar limits of the unique independent $D^6 R^4$ operator in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity. Taking the relative normalization $[-2\alpha'^3 \zeta(3)]^2 / [\frac{2}{3}\alpha'^6 \zeta(3)^2] = 6$ of operators in the string effective action (1) into account, we obtain

$$\lim_{p_6 \rightarrow 0} \langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{D^6 R^4} = -\frac{30}{35} [12]^4 \langle 34 \rangle^4 \sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^3. \quad (9)$$

This non-vanishing result shows that the operator $D^6 R^4$ is also incompatible with continuous $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry.

R^4 , $D^4 R^4$ and $D^6 R^4$ are the only local supersymmetric and $SU(8)$ -symmetric operators for loop levels $L \leq 6$ [7–9]. Hence $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity has no potential counterterms that satisfy the continuous $E_{7(7)}$ symmetry for $L \leq 6$. We stress that string theory is used as a tool to extract $SU(8)$ -invariant matrix elements that must agree with the matrix elements of the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity operators R^4 , $D^4 R^4$ and $D^6 R^4$ because each of these operators is unique. No remnant of string-specific dynamics remains in the final results.

Matching to automorphism analysis

The non-vanishing single-soft scalar limits found above have their origin in local 6-point interactions of the schematic form $\varphi^2 D^{2k} R^4$ which appear in the non-linear completion of $D^{2k} R^4$. Let us encode this completion as $f(\varphi) D^{2k} R^4$, with

$$f(\varphi) = 1 - a [\varphi^{1234} \varphi^{5678} + 34 \text{ inequiv. perms}] + \dots \quad (10)$$

The “...” indicate higher order terms. The constant a depends on the operator; for example $a_{R^4} = \frac{6}{5}$ for R^4 [15]. We can determine a for $D^4 R^4$ by taking a further single-soft limit $p_5 \rightarrow 0$ on (4) and comparing the resulting s, t, u -polynomial with the 4-point normalization of (3). The result is $a_{D^4 R^4} = \frac{12}{7}$.

Ref. [17] used supersymmetry and duality considerations in d dimensions to constrain the moduli dependent functions $f(\varphi)$ of the BPS operators R^4 , $D^4 R^4$ and $D^6 R^4$. Specifically, for R^4 and $D^4 R^4$ in 4 dimensions, they found that $f(\varphi)$ should satisfy the Laplace equation

$$(\Delta + 42) f_{R^4}(\varphi) = 0, \quad (\Delta + 60) f_{D^4 R^4}(\varphi) = 0. \quad (11)$$

Here, Δ is the Laplacian on $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$; in terms of the scalars φ^{abcd} of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity, its leading terms are

$$\Delta = \left[\frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi^{1234}} \frac{\partial}{\partial \varphi^{5678}} + 34 \text{ inequiv. perms} \right] + \dots \quad (12)$$

It is easy to see that the function (10) with the above values of a precisely satisfy the Laplace equations (11). This is a consistency check on our result for the single-soft scalar limits.

Let us now consider the function $f(\varphi)$ for $D^6 R^4$. As explained, the quadratic order of R^4 interferes with $D^6 R^4$ and it is therefore natural that the corresponding Laplace equation in [17] contains an inhomogeneous term that reflects the contribution from $R^4 - R^4$. Adding a general linear combination $\lambda_{R^4} f_{R^4} R^4 + \lambda_{D^4 R^4} f_{D^4 R^4} D^4 R^4$ to the effective action constrains the moduli-dependent functions to satisfy [17]

$$(\Delta + 60) f_{D^6 R^4}(\varphi) = -\frac{\lambda_{R^4}^2}{\lambda_{D^4 R^4}} [f_{R^4}(\varphi)]^2. \quad (13)$$

From (5) and (9), we can reconstruct the coefficient a in (10) of the functions associated with the $SU(8)$ -averaged string-theory operator $(e^{-12\phi} D^6 R^4)_{\text{avg}}$ and with the supergravity operator $D^6 R^4$. We find

$$a_{(e^{-12\phi} D^6 R^4)_{\text{avg}}} = \frac{66}{35}, \quad a_{D^6 R^4} = \frac{60}{35}. \quad (14)$$

For $(e^{-12\phi} D^6 R^4)_{\text{avg}}$, the couplings λ in (13) must take their string theory values $\lambda_{R^4} = -2\alpha'^3 \zeta(3)$ and $\lambda_{D^4 R^4} = \frac{2}{3}\alpha'^6 \zeta(3)^2$. The $\mathcal{N} = 8$ operator $D^6 R^4$, on the other hand, must satisfy (13) with $\lambda_{R^4} = 0$ because the operator R^4 does not appear in the action of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity. Indeed, our results for f for both operators satisfy the Laplace equation with the expected choice of λ 's.

CONSTRUCTION AND COUNTING OF COUNTERTERMS

We now discuss the techniques used to classify and construct local supersymmetric operators, especially those needed for $L \geq 7$. We are interested in $SU(8)$ -invariant operators, which are candidate counterterms, and in operators transforming in the **70** of $SU(8)$. The latter are candidate operators for local single-soft scalar limits (SSL's) of the matrix elements of singlet counterterm operators. First we use representation theory of the superalgebra $SU(2, 2|8)$ to determine the spectrum and multiplicity of these operators. The spectrum is classified by the number n of external fields, the scale dimension, and the order k of the N^k MHV type. Then we construct matrix elements of several operators explicitly using algorithms which incorporate Gröbner basis techniques.

and a similar Schouten identity for square brackets. These polynomials must satisfy bose and fermi symmetries when they contain identical particles. Finally, the polynomials must satisfy SUSY Ward identities. This was ensured in [8] by packaging n -point matrix elements into the manifestly SUSY- and $SU(8)$ -invariant superamplitudes of [22].

In [8], Mathematica was used to construct the required independent polynomials. More efficient algorithms are needed for the higher dimension counterterms studied in this paper. The constraints (19) define an ideal in a polynomial ring, and the Gröbner basis method [25, 26] is well suited to choose a basis in the ideal and generate independent sets of polynomials in the quotient ring.

Given a (conventional) monomial ordering in the ring, a Gröbner basis is a subset of the ideal such that the leading term of any element of the ideal is divisible by a leading term of an element of the subset. Buchberger's algorithm generates the unique reduced Gröbner basis in which no monomial in a polynomial of this basis is divisible by a leading term of the other polynomials in the basis. For the ideal generated by (19), the reduced Gröbner basis is quite simple. By the theory of Gröbner bases, the monomials of degree δ (and specific helicity weights) that are not divisible by any leading term of the reduced Gröbner basis are a vector space basis of the quotient ring. This division test concerns only monomials and is computationally fast. (See Ch. 2, Sec. 7 and Prop. 5.3.1 of [25].)

We used the implementation of the Buchberger's algorithm in the algebraic software system Macaulay2 [27] to generate independent polynomials which satisfy dimension and helicity weight requirements and the constraints (19). These polynomials were then processed by computer programs similar to those used in [8] which imposed bose symmetries. Among the resulting polynomials we select the ones that are independent under the conditions (19).

We have applied the Gröbner basis method to local counterterms with $n \leq 6$. The results are in perfect agreement with the multiplicities found from the enumeration of $SU(2, 2|8)$ superconformal primary operators. In addition to an enumeration of independent operators, the explicit matrix elements allow us to test single-soft scalar limits. We discuss our $L = 7, 8, 9$ results below.

7-LOOP COUNTERTERMS: $D^8 R^4$ AND BEYOND

$E_{7(7)}$ -compatibility of $D^8 R^4$ at 6-points

The 6-point closed-string tree amplitude at order α'^7 only receives contributions from diagrams with one insertion of $e^{-14\phi} D^8 R^4$. No lower-dimension operators in the closed string effective action (1) contribute. For the $SU(8)$ -averaged single-soft scalar limits of $e^{-14\phi} D^8 R^4$ we

obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{p_6 \rightarrow 0} \langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{(e^{-14\phi} D^8 R^4)_{\text{avg}}} \\ &= -2[12]^4 (34)^4 \left[\frac{3}{4} \sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^4 + \frac{1}{16} \left(\sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^2 \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

However, we cannot conclude from this result that the operator $D^8 R^4$ violates $E_{7(7)}$: contrary to the lower-loop cases we have studied, $D^8 R^4$ is not unique. In fact, as we show later in this section, there is an infinite tower of supersymmetric operators of mass dimension 16. It is relevant for the 6-point matrix elements that there are two independent supersymmetrizations of $D^4 R^6$. To any non-linear supersymmetrization of $D^8 R^4$ we can add an arbitrary linear combination of these 6-point operators and obtain another valid supersymmetrization of $D^8 R^4$. The $SU(8)$ -averaged string amplitude picks out one particular such linear combination whose soft-limits (20) happen to be non-vanishing.

We construct the matrix elements of $D^4 R^6$ explicitly with Gröbner basis techniques and find that they have non-vanishing SSL's; specifically we find that the SSL's of the 6-point matrix elements of the operators $D^4 R^6$ span the 2-parameter space

$$\begin{aligned} & \lim_{p_6 \rightarrow 0} \langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{D^4 R^6} \\ &= [12]^4 (34)^4 \left[c_1 \sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^4 + c_2 \left(\sum_{i < j} s_{ij}^2 \right)^2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

It follows from (20) and (21) that we can choose a suitable linear combination of the two $D^4 R^6$ operators to make the SSL of the 6-point matrix elements of the resulting non-linear supersymmetrization of $D^8 R^4$ vanish: thus *there exists a supersymmetrization of $D^8 R^4$ that satisfies*

$$\lim_{p_6 \rightarrow 0} \langle ++--\varphi\bar{\varphi} \rangle_{D^8 R^4} = 0. \quad (22)$$

Since this particular $D^8 R^4$ satisfies the single-soft scalar theorems up to 6 points, it is important to also analyze the *double-soft* limit constraints of [13] that probe the structure of the coset $E_{7(7)}/SU(8)$. We numerically verified that various non-trivial double-soft limits [16] of the 6-point matrix elements of $D^8 R^4$ behave precisely as required for $E_{7(7)}$ -invariance. Therefore the matrix elements of $D^8 R^4$ are compatible with continuous $E_{7(7)}$ up to 6 points.

We would like to alert the reader to an alternative construction of the full n -point superamplitudes for the matrix elements of n -point 7-loop counterterms. Once the counting of the operator's multiplicity has been established by other means (as described above), it is easy to write down a corresponding set of superamplitudes. For the two 6-point superamplitudes of $D^4 R^6$, for example,

3-loop	4-pt	5-pt	6-pt	5-loop	4-pt	5-pt	6-pt	6-loop	4-pt	5-pt	6-pt		
singlet	R^4 1×MHV	$\varphi^2 D^2 R^5$	$\varphi^2 R^4$ non-linear	singlet	$D^4 R^4$ 1×MHV	$\varphi^2 D^6 R^5$	$\varphi^2 D^4 R^4$ non-linear	singlet	$D^6 R^4$ 1×MHV	$\varphi^2 D^8 R^5$	$\varphi^2 D^6 R^4$ non-linear		
70			\swarrow soft $1 \times \varphi R^4$				\swarrow soft $1 \times \varphi D^4 R^4$				\swarrow soft $1 \times \varphi D^6 R^4$		
7-loop	4-pt	5-pt	6-pt	7-pt	8-pt	9-pt	10-pt	11-pt	12-pt	13-pt	14-pt	15-pt	16-pt
singlet	$D^8 R^4$ 1×MHV	$D^6 R^5$ 2×NMHV	$D^4 R^6$ 3×NMHV	$D^2 R^7$ 3×N ² MHV	R^8 3×N ² MHV	$\varphi^2 D^2 R^7$ 4×N ³ MHV	$\varphi^2 R^8$ 4×N ³ MHV	$\varphi^4 D^2 R^7$ 6×N ⁴ MHV	$\varphi^4 R^8$ 6×N ⁴ MHV	$\varphi^6 D^2 R^7$ 8×N ⁵ MHV	$\varphi^6 R^8$ 8×N ⁵ MHV	$\varphi^8 D^2 R^7$ 10×N ⁶ MHV	$\varphi^8 R^8$ 10×N ⁶ MHV
70		\swarrow soft $\varphi D^8 R^4$ 2×	\swarrow soft $\varphi D^4 R^6$ 4×	\swarrow soft φR^8 6×	\swarrow soft $\varphi^3 R^8$ 9×	\swarrow soft $\varphi^5 R^8$ 14×	\swarrow soft $\varphi^7 R^8$ 19×						
8-loop	4-pt	5-pt	6-pt	7-pt	8-pt	9-pt	10-pt	11-pt	12-pt	13-pt	14-pt		
singlet	$D^{10} R^4$ 1×MHV	$D^8 R^5$ 1×MHV	$D^6 R^6$ 3×NMHV	$D^4 R^7$ 3×NMHV	$D^2 R^8$ 8×N ² MHV	R^9 8×N ² MHV	$\varphi^2 D^2 R^8$ 25×N ³ MHV	$\varphi^2 R^9$ 22×N ³ MHV	$\varphi^4 D^2 R^8$ 66×N ⁴ MHV	$\varphi^4 R^9$ 51×N ⁴ MHV	$\varphi^6 D^2 R^8$ 153×N ⁵ MHV		
70		\swarrow $\varphi D^{10} R^4$ 3×	\swarrow $\varphi D^8 R^5$ 4×	\swarrow $\varphi D^6 R^6$ 17×	\swarrow $\varphi D^4 R^7$ 16×	\swarrow $\varphi D^2 R^8$ 81×	\swarrow φR^9 63×	\swarrow $\varphi^3 D^2 R^8$ 232×	\swarrow $\varphi^3 R^9$ 211×	\swarrow $\varphi^5 D^2 R^8$ 1033×			
9-loop	4-pt	5-pt	6-pt	7-pt	8-pt	9-pt	10-pt	11-pt	12-pt				
singlet	$D^{12} R^4$ 2×MHV	$D^{10} R^5$ 1×MHV	$D^8 R^6$ 12×NMHV 2×MHV	$D^6 R^7$ 14×NMHV	$D^4 R^8$ 117×N ² MHV 7×NMHV	$D^2 R^9$ 123×N ² MHV	R^{10} 780×N ³ MHV 36×N ² MHV	$\varphi^2 D^2 R^9$ 783×N ³ MHV	$\varphi^2 R^{10}$ 4349×N ⁴ MHV 169×N ³ MHV				
70		\swarrow $\varphi D^{12} R^4$ 5×N ^{0.5} MHV	\swarrow $\varphi D^{10} R^5$ 8×N ^{0.5} MHV	\swarrow $\varphi D^8 R^6$ 122×N ^{1.5} MHV 5×N ^{0.5} MHV	\swarrow $\varphi D^6 R^7$ 194×N ^{1.5} MHV	\swarrow $\varphi D^4 R^8$ 1814×N ^{2.5} MHV 52×N ^{1.5} MHV	\swarrow $\varphi D^2 R^9$ 2317×N ^{2.5} MHV	\swarrow φR^{10} 16485×N ^{3.5} MHV 469×N ^{2.5} MHV					

TABLE I. Supersymmetric $SU(8)$ -singlet L -loop counterterms and the $SU(8)$ **70** operators which describe their potential single-soft scalar limits. When the singlet operator is in the N^k MHV classification, the single-soft scalar limit operator belongs to the $N^{(k-\frac{1}{2})}$ MHV sector. For $L < 7$, there are no independent singlet operators with $n > 4$, but the non-vanishing single-soft scalar limits arise from the non-linear completions of the 4-point operators $D^{2k} R^4$.

one can choose the basis

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{D^4 R^6} &= \delta(\tilde{Q})\delta(Q) [(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)(\varphi_3, \varphi_4)(\varphi_5, \varphi_6) + \text{perms}], \\ \mathcal{A}_{D^4 R^{6'}} &= \delta(\tilde{Q})\delta(Q) [(\varphi_1, \varphi_2, \varphi_3, \varphi_4)(\varphi_5, \varphi_6) + \text{perms}]. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Here Q, \tilde{Q} are the usual supercharges that act on the Grassmann η -variables of the superamplitude as differentiation and multiplication, respectively, and thus

$$\delta(Q) = \prod_{a=1}^8 \sum_{i < j} [ij] \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \eta_{ia} \partial \eta_{ja}}, \quad \delta(\tilde{Q}) = \prod_{a=1}^8 \sum_{i < j} \langle ij \rangle \eta_{ia} \eta_{ja}. \quad (24)$$

The sums in (23) run over all inequivalent permutations of the external state labels i of the φ_i , and the φ -products are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (\varphi_i, \varphi_j) &\equiv \epsilon^{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4} \times \prod_{t=1}^4 \eta_{i a_t} \eta_{j b_t}, \\ (\varphi_i, \varphi_j, \varphi_k, \varphi_l) &\equiv \epsilon^{a_1 a_2 a_3 a_4 b_1 b_2 b_3 c_1} \epsilon^{d_1 d_2 d_3 d_4 c_2 c_3 c_4 b_4} \\ &\quad \times \prod_{t=1}^4 \eta_{i a_t} \eta_{j b_t} \eta_{k c_t} \eta_{l d_t}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Of course, the choice of contractions is not unique, and only through the previously established multiplicity count do we know that it is sufficient to consider the two

contractions given in (23). A similar construction can be carried out for the three 8-point N^2 MHV superamplitudes of R^8 . Again, one can immediately propose three superamplitudes that span the space of R^8 counterterms, for example by considering three order-8 contractions involving the φ -products (25).

The infinite tower of 7-loop counterterms

We now examine the multiplicity of potential 7-loop n -point counterterms [8]

$$D^8 R^4, D^4 R^6, R^8, \varphi^2 R^8, \varphi^4 R^8, \dots \quad (26)$$

7-loop operators correspond to long multiplets, and are thus supersymmetric descendants of local operators composed from only scalars with no derivatives. This follows from setting $L = 7$ in (16) and (17). $SU(8)$ -singlet operators C only exist for even n at $L = 7$, and we write them schematically as

$$C \simeq Q^{16} \tilde{Q}^{16} \varphi^{2q}. \quad (27)$$

The lowest weight φ^{2q} must be in an $SU(8)$ -singlet combination, and every such singlet gives rise to a long supermultiplet. Hence there is one 7-loop n -point counterterm

for each singlet in the decomposition of the symmetric tensor product of $n = 2q$ $\mathbf{70}$'s. With increasing q there is a (swiftly) increasing number of singlets, as illustrated by the explicit multiplicities up to $n = 16$ in Table I. Consequently, there is an infinite 'tower' of independent 7-loop operators that are potential counterterms. Operators corresponding to their SSL are also listed in Table I. Their construction is similar, and their multiplicities is the number of $\mathbf{70}$'s in a product of $(2q-1)$ $\mathbf{70}$'s.

$E_{7(7)}$ violation of higher-point 7-loop operators

Consider the leading n -point matrix elements of a local counterterm C . If non-vanishing, the SSL produces a local $(n-1)$ -matrix element, which can be generated by an $(n-1)$ -point local operator dC in the $\mathbf{70}$. Locality of C ensures that the SSL operation $C \rightarrow dC$ commutes with the SUSY generators Q and \tilde{Q} . For a long-multiplet ($L \geq 7$) counterterm $C = Q^{16}\tilde{Q}^{16}C_0$ we can therefore write

$$dC = Q^{16}\tilde{Q}^{16}dC_0. \quad (28)$$

$E_{7(7)}$ requires that the SSL vanishes. Now there are two ways to obtain $dC = 0$: either the single-soft limit of C_0 vanishes ($dC_0 = 0$), or dC_0 is annihilated by $Q^{16}\tilde{Q}^{16}$. At the seven-loop level, $C_0 = \varphi^{2q}$ consists of only scalars with no derivatives, and consequently $dC_0 \neq 0$. C_0 is also not annihilated by $Q^{16}\tilde{Q}^{16}$ because $dC_0 = \varphi^{2q-1}$ in a $\mathbf{70}$ satisfies a shortening condition only for $n = 2q \leq 4$ [24]. Therefore, all 7-loop linearized counterterms with $n > 4$ have non-vanishing single-soft scalar limits and thus violate $E_{7(7)}$. (This was also observed in [28].) These operators may, however, play an important role as dependent terms in the non-linear completion of the D^8R^4 operator, as we demonstrated above at the 6-point level.

SSL STRUCTURE: 7-, 8- AND 9-LOOPS

We now show that all our findings on $E_{7(7)}$ -(in)compatibility of operators have a natural explanation in terms of the multiplicities of SSL operators in the $\mathbf{70}$ that is displayed in Table I.⁴ Let us first revisit the case of D^4R^4 and D^6R^4 . At the 5- and 6-loop level, there are no potential 3-point or 4-point SSL operators available. Therefore the matrix elements of D^4R^4 and D^6R^4 must have vanishing soft limits at 4- and 5-points, and this is indeed the case. There exists, however, one potential 5-point SSL operator at $L = 5$ and $L = 6$. Generically, one

expects the soft-limits of the 6-point matrix elements of D^4R^4 and D^6R^4 to be proportional to this operator with some non-vanishing coefficient. This is precisely what happens.

At 7 loops with $n > 4$ points, the number n_S of SSL operators $D^{16}\varphi^{n-1}$ is always at least as large as the number n_C of potential counterterms $D^{16}\varphi^n$. Generically, one therefore expects the soft limits of the potential counterterms to span an n_C -dimensional subspace in the n_S -dimensional space of SSL operators. It would follow that all potential counterterms with $n > 4$ violate $E_{7(7)}$. Indeed, this is what we explicitly proved above for the 7-loop case.

By the same logic, it is not at all surprising that there is a non-linear supersymmetrization of D^8R^4 that preserves $E_{7(7)}$ at the 6-point level. The number of 5-point SSL operators precisely matches the number of D^4R^6 operators. Therefore, the 6-point soft limit of D^8R^4 can be made to vanish after adding an appropriate combination of the two D^4R^6 operators, just as we found above. For the 8-point soft limits of D^8R^4 , however, there are 4 SSL operators available; more than the 3 potential 8-point counterterms R^8 . If the 8-point soft limits of D^8R^4 take a generic value in the 4-dimensional space of SSL operators, no linear combination of R^8 operators can be chosen to give an $E_{7(7)}$ -preserving supersymmetrization of D^8R^4 ; a remarkable cancellation is thus required for D^8R^4 to be compatible with $E_{7(7)}$.

As Table I illustrates, $E_{7(7)}$ becomes more and more constraining as we increase the number of points and loops. For example, the 14-point soft limits of $D^{10}R^4$ have to lie in a specific 153-dimensional subspace of the 1033-dimensional space of SSL operators in order for $D^{10}R^4$ to satisfy $E_{7(7)}$ after an appropriate addition of independent 14-point operators. It follows that $E_{7(7)}$ is a very constraining symmetry even for $L = 7$ and beyond. Although there is an infinite tower of independent counterterms at each of loop $L \geq 7$, we cannot expect any of these operators to preserve $E_{7(7)}$ 'accidentally'. There may, however, be a very good reason for the cancellations of terms that is needed for $E_{7(7)}$ -invariant operators to exist for $L \geq 7$; namely, when there is a construction of a manifestly $E_{7(7)}$ -invariant supersymmetric operator [29, 30]. At the 7-loop level, for example, we can only expect the 8-point single-soft limits of D^8R^4 to vanish after an appropriate addition of R^8 , if the manifestly $E_{7(7)}$ -invariant superspace integral that was proposed as a candidate counterterm in [29] is indeed non-vanishing.

One new feature that emerges at $L = 8, 9$ is the existence of $n > 4$ operators that have vanishing soft-limits at the linearized level. This holds for the MHV operators D^8R^5 , $D^{10}R^5$ and $2 \times D^8R^6$ as well as for at least 7 of the $12 \times D^8R^6$ NMHV operators. The latter follows from the multiplicity 5 of 5-point SSL operators at 9 loops. $E_{7(7)}$ -invariance beyond the linearized level, however, is a highly non-trivial constraint on all of these operators.

⁴ Throughout this section we are only concerned with the lowest-point non-vanishing SSL's of an operator. If an operator has non-vanishing SSL's at n -point, its higher-point matrix elements will generically have *non-local* SSL's, which are not classified by our analysis.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank M. Headrick for suggesting the use of the Gröbner basis for the study of counterterms in supergravity. We thank T. McLoughlin and P. Vanhove for valuable discussions.

The research of DZF is supported by NSF grant PHY-0600465 and by the US Department of Energy through cooperative research agreement DE-FG-0205FR41360. HE is supported by NSF CAREER Grant PHY-0953232, and in part by the US Department of Energy under DOE grants DE-FG02-95ER40899 (Michigan) and DE-FG02-90ER40542 (IAS). The research of MK is supported by the NSF grant PHY-0756966.

-
- [1] Z. Bern, J. J. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson, D. A. Kosower and R. Roiban, “Three-Loop Superfiniteness of $N=8$ Supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 161303 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0702112].
 Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson and R. Roiban, “Manifest Ultraviolet Behavior for the Three-Loop Four-Point Amplitude of $N=8$ Supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 105019 (2008) [arXiv:0808.4112 [hep-th]].
 Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco and H. Johansson, “Progress on Ultraviolet Finiteness of Supergravity,” arXiv:0902.3765 [hep-th].
 Z. Bern, J. J. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson and R. Roiban, “The Ultraviolet Behavior of $N=8$ Supergravity at Four Loops,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 081301 (2009) [arXiv:0905.2326 [hep-th]].
 L. J. Dixon, “Ultraviolet Behavior of $N=8$ Supergravity,” arXiv:1005.2703 [hep-th].
- [2] N. Berkovits, “New higher-derivative R^4 theorems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 211601 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0609006].
 M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, “Non-renormalisation conditions in type II string theory and maximal supergravity,” *JHEP* **0702**, 099 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0610299].
 M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, “Ultraviolet properties of maximal supergravity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 131602 (2007) [arXiv:hep-th/0611273].
 M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, “Modular properties of two-loop maximal supergravity and connections with string theory,” *JHEP* **0807**, 126 (2008) [arXiv:0807.0389 [hep-th]].
 N. Berkovits, M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, “Non-renormalization conditions for four-gluon scattering in supersymmetric string and field theory,” *JHEP* **0911**, 063 (2009) [arXiv:0908.1923 [hep-th]].
- [3] P. S. Howe and K. S. Stelle, “Supersymmetry counterterms revisited,” *Phys. Lett. B* **554**, 190 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0211279].
 K. Stelle, “Finite after all?,” *Nature Phys.* **3**, 448 (2007).
 G. Bossard, P. S. Howe and K. S. Stelle, “The ultraviolet question in maximally supersymmetric field theories,” *Gen. Rel. Grav.* **41**, 919 (2009) [arXiv:0901.4661 [hep-th]].
- K. S. Stelle, “Is $N=8$ supergravity a finite field theory?,” *Fortsch. Phys.* **57**, 446 (2009).
- [4] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, “One loop n point gauge theory amplitudes, unitarity and collinear limits,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **425**, 217 (1994) [arXiv:hep-ph/9403226];
 Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, “Fusing gauge theory tree amplitudes into loop amplitudes,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **435**, 59 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9409265];
 Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, “Two-Loop $g \rightarrow gg$ Splitting Amplitudes in QCD,” *JHEP* **0408**, 012 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0404293].
- [5] Tom Banks, talk at Supergravity vs Superstring Theory in the Ultraviolet Workshop at Penn State, August 27-30, 2009. <http://www.gravity.psu.edu/events/.../supergravity/proceedings.shtml>
- [6] M. B. Green, H. Ooguri and J. H. Schwarz, “Decoupling Supergravity from the Superstring,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 041601 (2007) [arXiv:0704.0777 [hep-th]].
- [7] J. M. Drummond, P. J. Heslop, P. S. Howe and S. F. Kerstan, “Integral invariants in $N = 4$ SYM and the effective action for coincident D-branes,” *JHEP* **0308**, 016 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0305202].
- [8] H. Elvang, D. Z. Freedman and M. Kiermaier, “A simple approach to counterterms in $N=8$ supergravity,” arXiv:1003.5018 [hep-th].
- [9] J. M. Drummond, P. J. Heslop and P. S. Howe, “A note on $N=8$ counterterms,” arXiv:1008.4939 [hep-th].
- [10] N. Marcus, “Composite Anomalies In Supergravity,” *Phys. Lett. B* **157**, 383 (1985).
 P. di Vecchia, S. Ferrara and L. Girardello, “Anomalies Of Hidden Local Chiral Symmetries In Sigma Models And Extended Supergravities,” *Phys. Lett. B* **151**, 199 (1985).
- [11] G. Bossard, C. Hillmann and H. Nicolai, “Perturbative quantum $E7(7)$ symmetry in $N=8$ supergravity,” arXiv:1007.5472 [hep-th].
- [12] M. Bianchi, H. Elvang and D. Z. Freedman, “Generating Tree Amplitudes in $N=4$ SYM and $N = 8$ SG,” *JHEP* **0809**, 063 (2008) [arXiv:0805.0757 [hep-th]].
- [13] N. Arkani-Hamed, F. Cachazo and J. Kaplan, “What is the Simplest Quantum Field Theory?,” arXiv:0808.1446 [hep-th].
- [14] R. Kallosh and T. Kugo, “The footprint of $E7$ in amplitudes of $N=8$ supergravity,” *JHEP* **0901**, 072 (2009) [arXiv:0811.3414 [hep-th]].
- [15] H. Elvang and M. Kiermaier, “Stringy KLT relations, global symmetries, and $E_{7(7)}$ violation,” arXiv:1007.4813 [hep-th].
- [16] J. Broedel and L. J. Dixon, “ R^4 counterterm and $E7(7)$ symmetry in maximal supergravity,” arXiv:0911.5704 [hep-th].
- [17] M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, “Automorphic properties of low energy string amplitudes in various dimensions,” arXiv:1001.2535 [hep-th].
 M. B. Green, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, “String theory dualities and supergravity divergences,” *JHEP* **1006**, 075 (2010) [arXiv:1002.3805 [hep-th]].
 M. B. Green, S. D. Miller, J. G. Russo and P. Vanhove, “Eisenstein series for higher-rank groups and string theory amplitudes,” arXiv:1004.0163 [hep-th].
- [18] G. Bossard, P. S. Howe and K. S. Stelle, “On duality symmetries of supergravity invariants,” arXiv:1009.0743

- [hep-th].
- [19] H. Kawai, D. C. Lewellen and S. H. H. Tye, “A Relation Between Tree Amplitudes Of Closed And Open Strings,” Nucl. Phys. B **269**, 1 (1986).
- [20] S. Stieberger, “On tree-level higher order gravitational couplings in superstring theory,” arXiv:0910.0180 [hep-th].
S. Stieberger and T. R. Taylor, “Complete Six-Gluon Disk Amplitude in Superstring Theory,” Nucl. Phys. B **801**, 128 (2008) [arXiv:0711.4354 [hep-th]].
S. Stieberger and T. R. Taylor, “Supersymmetry Relations and MHV Amplitudes in Superstring Theory,” Nucl. Phys. B **793**, 83 (2008) [arXiv:0708.0574 [hep-th]].
- [21] D. J. Gross and E. Witten, “Superstring Modifications Of Einstein’s Equations,” Nucl. Phys. B **277** (1986) 1.
D. J. Gross and J. H. Sloan, “The Quartic Effective Action for the Heterotic String,” Nucl. Phys. B **291**, 41 (1987).
- [22] H. Elvang, D. Z. Freedman and M. Kiermaier, “Solution to the Ward Identities for Superamplitudes,” arXiv:0911.3169 [hep-th].
- [23] M. Bianchi, J. F. Morales and H. Samtleben, “On stringy AdS(5) x S**5 and higher spin holography,” JHEP **0307**, 062 (2003) [arXiv:hep-th/0305052].
N. Beisert, M. Bianchi, J. F. Morales and H. Samtleben, “On the spectrum of AdS/CFT beyond supergravity,” JHEP **0402**, 001 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0310292].
- [24] M. Flato and C. Fronsdal, “Representations Of Conformal Supersymmetry,” Lett. Math. Phys. **8**, 159 (1984).
V. K. Dobrev and V. B. Petkova, “All Positive Energy Unitary Irreducible Representations Of Extended Conformal Supersymmetry,” Phys. Lett. B **162**, 127 (1985).
B. Binengar, “Conformal Superalgebras, Massless Representations And Hidden Symmetries,” Phys. Rev. D **34**, 525 (1986).
B. Morel, A. Sciarrino and P. Sorba, “Unitary Massless Representations Of Conformal Superalgebras,” Phys. Lett. B **166** (1986) 69.
- [25] David Cox, John Little, Donal O’Shea, *Ideals, Varieties, and Algorithms*, Springer, New York N.Y. (2000)
- [26] Bernd Sturmfels, *Algorithms in Invariant Theory*, Springer, New York N.Y. (2008)
- [27] <http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/>
- [28] R. Kallosh, “The Ultraviolet Finiteness of N=8 Supergravity,” arXiv:1009.1135 [hep-th].
- [29] G. Bossard, P. S. Howe and K. S. Stelle, “A note on the UV behaviour of maximally supersymmetric Yang-Mills theories,” Phys. Lett. B **682**, 137 (2009) [arXiv:0908.3883 [hep-th]].
- [30] P. S. Howe and U. Lindstrom, “Higher Order Invariants In Extended Supergravity,” Nucl. Phys. B **181**, 487 (1981).
R. E. Kallosh, “Counterterms in extended supergravities,” Phys. Lett. B **99**, 122 (1981).