BCFW-type recurrent relations for tree superamplitudes of D=11 supergravity

Igor Bandos [†‡]
[†] *Department of Theoretical Physics, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, P.O. Box 644, 48080 Bilbao, Spain*
[‡] *IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, 48011, Bilbao, Spain*
(Dated: V1: April 30, 2016. V3. Sept. 27, 2016. Phys.Rev.Lett. **118**, 031601 (2017) January 20, 2017)

We propose the on-shell superfield description for tree amplitudes of D=11 supergravity and the BCFW (Britto-Cachazo-Feng-Witten)-type recurrent relations for these superamplitudes.

PACS numbers: 11.25.-w, 11.25.Yb, 04.65.+e, 11.10.Kk, 11.30.Pb

arXiv:1605.00036v3 [hep-th] 6 Feb 2017

Recent years we are witnesses of a great progress in calculations of multiloop amplitudes (see e.g. [1–4] and refs. therein) an important part of which is related to the applications and development of the Britto-Cachazo-Feng-Witten (BCFW) approach [5]. This first allowed to obtain Britto-Cachazo-Feng (BCF) recursion relations for tree amplitudes in D=4 Yang Mills and $\mathcal{N}=4$ supersymmetric Yang-Mills (SYM) theory [6–8] and then was developed for the case of superamplitudes of $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM [9, 10], loop (super)amplitudes and $\mathcal{N}=8$ supergravity [9–12] (see [11, 12] for more references). To lighten the text, below we will mainly omit 'super' in superamplitudes, calling them amplitudes.

This approach was generalized for the tree amplitudes of D=10 SYM model in [13], but then mainly used in the context of type IIB supergravity [14–17] where the presence of complex structure allowed to lighten the 'Clifford superfield' description of amplitudes in [13]. The observation that the constrained bosonic spinor helicity variables used in [13] can be identified with spinor moving frame variables of [18–20] (or equivalently, with Lorentz harmonics of [21, 22]) [44] allowed us to simplify it('s $\mathcal{N}=1$ version) [25] and also to generalize it to the case of $D=11$ supergravity[45]. The results of this 11D generalization of the on-shell superfield description of tree amplitudes and of the BCFW recurrent relations for these will be reported in this letter.

The BCFW recursion relations [5] are written for n-particle tree amplitudes $\mathcal{A}^{(n)}(p_{(1)},\varepsilon_{(1)};...,p_{(n)},\varepsilon_{(n)})$ in spinor helicity formalism, in which the information on the (light-like) momentum $p_{\mu(i)}$ and on helicity of the i-th external particle are encoded in the bosonic spinor $\lambda^A_{(i)} = (\bar\lambda^{\dot A}_{(i)})^*$. The light-like momentum is defined by Cartan-Penrose representation (see [29] and refs. therein)

$$p_{\mu(i)}\sigma^\mu_{A\dot A} = 2\lambda_{A(i)}\bar\lambda_{\dot A(i)} \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad p_{\mu(i)} = \lambda_{(i)}\sigma_\mu\bar\lambda_{(i)}, \quad (1)$$

where $\sigma^\mu_{A\dot A}$ are relativistic Pauli matrices, $A=1,2$ and $\dot A = 1,2$ are Weyl spinor indices and $\mu = 0,...,3$.

All n-particle amplitudes for the fields of the $\mathcal{N}=4$ SYM can be described by a superfield amplitude (superamplitude) [9, 10] $\mathcal{A}^{(n)}(\lambda_{(1)},\bar\lambda_{(1)},\eta_{(1)};...;\lambda_{(n)},\bar\lambda_{(n)},\eta_{(n)})$ depending, besides $\lambda^A_{(i)}$ and $\bar\lambda^{\dot A}_{(i)}$, on the set of n complex fermionic coordinates $\eta^q_{(i)} = (\bar\eta_{q(i)})^*$ (first introduced in [30]), $\eta^q_{(i)}\eta^p_{(j)} = -\eta^p_{(j)}\eta^q_{(i)}$, $\bar\eta_{q(i)}\eta^p_{(j)} = -\eta^p_{(j)}\bar\eta_{q(i)}$, carrying the index $q=1,...,4$ of the fundamental representation of $SU(4)$. These superfield amplitudes are multiparticle counterparts of the so-called on-shell superfield

$$\Phi(\lambda,\bar\lambda,\eta^q) = f^{(-)}(\lambda,\bar\lambda) + \eta^q\chi_q + \tfrac{1}{2}\eta^q\eta^p s_{pq} + \\ + \tfrac{1}{3!}\eta^q\eta^p\eta^r\epsilon_{rpqs}\bar\chi^s + \tfrac{1}{4!}\eta^q\eta^p\eta^r\eta^s\epsilon_{rpqs}f^{(+)} \quad (2)$$

describing all the states of the linearized SYM *provided* it obeys the so-called helicity constraint [29, 30],

$$\hat h\Phi(\lambda,\bar\lambda,\eta) = \Phi(\lambda,\bar\lambda,\eta)\,, \quad (3)$$

$$2\hat h := -\lambda^A\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\lambda^A} + \bar\lambda^{\dot A}\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\bar\lambda^A} + \eta^q\tfrac{\partial}{\partial\eta^q}\,. \quad (4)$$

The n-particle on-shell superfield amplitudes of 4D $\mathcal{N}$=4 SYM, $\mathcal{A}^{(n)}(\lambda_{(1)},\bar\lambda_{(1)},\eta_{(1)};...;\lambda_{(n)},\bar\lambda_{(n)},\eta_{(n)}) \equiv \mathcal{A}^{(n)}(...;\lambda_i,\eta_i;...)$, should obey the set of n helicity constraints,

$$\hat h_{(i)}\mathcal{A}^{(n)}(...;\lambda_i,\bar\lambda_i,\eta_i;...) = \mathcal{A}^{(n)}(...;\lambda_i,\bar\lambda_i,\eta_i;...)\,, \quad (5)$$

with $2\hat h_{(i)} := -\lambda^A_{(i)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda^A_{(i)}} + \bar\lambda^{\dot A}_{(i)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\bar\lambda^A_{(i)}} + \eta^q_{(i)}\frac{\partial}{\partial\eta^q_{(i)}}$.

We refer to [9, 10] for the superfield generalization of the original D=4 BCFW recurrent relations [5], and pass to the 11D generalization of the spinor helicity formalism.

1. Spinor helicity formalism in D=11.

Let us denote the D=11 vector indices by $a,b,c = 0,1,...,9,10$, spinor indices of SO(1,10) by $\alpha,\beta,\gamma,\delta = 1,...,32$ and D=11 Dirac matrices by $\Gamma_{a\alpha}{}^\beta$. In our mostly minus notation, $\eta^{ab} = diag(+1,-1,...,-1)$, both $\Gamma_{a\alpha}{}^\beta$ and the charge conjugation matrix $C^{\alpha\beta} = -C^{\beta\alpha}$ are imaginary. We will also use the real symmetric matrices $\Gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} = \Gamma^{a\gamma}_\alpha C_{\gamma\beta} = \Gamma^a_{\beta\alpha}$, and $\tilde\Gamma^{\alpha\beta}_a = C^{\alpha\gamma}\Gamma_{\gamma}{}^{a\beta} = \tilde\Gamma^{\beta\alpha}_a$.

The light-like momentum of a massless 11D particle can be expressed by the relations similar to (1),

$$k_a\Gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} = 2\rho^\# v^-_{\alpha q}v^-_{\beta q}\,, \qquad \rho^\# v^-_q\tilde\Gamma_a v^-_p = k_a\delta_{qp}\,, \quad (6)$$

in terms of 'energy variable' $\rho^\#$ and a set of 16 constrained bosonic 32-component spinors $v^-_{\alpha q}$, $q,p = 1,...,16$, which can be identified with D=11 spinor moving frame variables [31–33] or Lorentz harmonics [34]. Essentially, the constraints on $v^-_{\alpha q}$ are given by Eq. (6) supplemented by $v^-_{\alpha q}C^{\alpha\beta}v^-_{\beta q} = 0$, and by the requirement that the rank of 32×16 matrix $v^-_{\alpha q}$ is equal to 16. We refer to [32, 33] for the complete description and discussion of

the constraints and gauge symmetries of the spinor moving frame formalism for 11D massless superparticle and only notice that, taking all these into account, the variables $v^-_{\alpha q}$ can be considered as homogeneous coordinates on $\mathbb{S}^9$, the celestial sphere of a D=11 observer,

$$\{v^-_{\alpha q}\} = \mathbb{S}^9 \ . \tag{7}$$

The sign superindices $^-$ and $^\# \equiv^{++}$, carried by $v^-_{\alpha q}$ and $\rho^\#$, characterize their scaling properties with respect to $SO(1,1)$ gauge symmetry of the spinor moving frame (or Lorentz harmonic) approach to massless (super)particle.

One can check that, due to (6) and $v^-_q C v^-_p = 0$, the momentum vector k_a is light-like, $k_a k^a = 0$, and moreover that the spinor moving frame variables $v^-_{\alpha q}$ obey the massless Dirac equation (in momentum representation)

$$k_a \tilde\Gamma^{a\,\alpha\beta} v_{\beta q}{}^- = 0 \qquad \Leftrightarrow \qquad k_a \Gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} v^{-\beta}_q = 0 \ . \tag{8}$$

The 11D counterpart of the 10D spinor helicity variables of [13] are $\lambda_{\alpha q} = \sqrt{\rho^\#} v^-_{\alpha q}$; the counterpart of the polarization spinor of the 10D fermionic field in D=11 is given by the same helicity spinor but with risen spinor index, $\lambda^\alpha_q = \sqrt{\rho^\#} v^{-\alpha}_q = -iC^{\alpha\beta}\lambda_{\beta q}$ $(= (\lambda^\alpha_q)^*)$.

One notices that Eqs. (6) can be written as $\Gamma^a_{\alpha\beta} k_a = 2\lambda_{\alpha q}\lambda_{\beta q}$ and $\lambda_q \tilde\Gamma_a \lambda_p = k_a \delta_{qp}$. However, the energy variable $\rho^\#$ and its canonically conjugate coordinate $x^=$ play an important role in our construction below. In particular the D=11 counterpart of the on-shell superfields are defined on superspace

$$\Sigma^{(10|16)} : \qquad \{(x^=, v^-_{\alpha q}; \theta^-_q)\} \ , \tag{9}$$

with bosonic sector $\mathbb{R}\otimes\mathbb{S}^9$ (see (7)) including $\mathbb{R} = \{x^=\}$.

2. D=11 on-shell superfields

The description of linearized 11D supergravity multiplet by superfields in the on-shell superspace (9) was proposed in [34] (and can be reproduced when quantizing the massless 11D superparticle [25]). It was given in terms of a bosonic antisymmetric tensor superfield $\Phi^{IJK} = \Phi^{[IJK]}(x^=, \theta^-_q, v_{\alpha q}{}^-)$ which obeys

$$D^+_q \Phi^{IJK} = 3i\gamma^{[IJ}_{qp}\Psi^{K]}_p \ , \qquad \gamma^I_{qp}\Psi^I_p = 0 \ . \tag{10}$$

Here $I,J,K = 1,...,9$, $q,p = 1,...,16$, $\gamma^I_{qp} = \gamma^I_{pq}$ are d=9 Dirac matrices, $\gamma^I\gamma^J + \gamma^J\gamma^I = \delta^{IJ}\mathbb{I}_{16\times 16}$, and

$$D^+_q = \partial^+_q + 2i\theta^-_q\partial_= \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial\theta^-_q} + 2i\theta^-_q\frac{\partial}{\partial x^=} \tag{11}$$

is the fermionic covariant derivative obeying the d=1, $\mathcal{N}=16$ supersymmetry algebra $\{D^+_q, D^+_p\} = 4i\delta_{qp}\partial_=$.

The consistency of Eq. (10) requires that fermionic superfield Ψ^I_q satisfies, besides $\gamma^I_{qp}\Psi^I_p = 0$,

$$D^+_q\Psi^I_p = \frac{1}{18}\left(\gamma^{IJKL}_{qp} + 6\delta^{I[J}\gamma^{KL]}_{qp}\right)\partial_=\Phi^{JKL} + \\ +2\partial_= H_{IJ}\gamma^J_{qp} \ , \tag{12}$$

with symmetric traceless $SO(9)$ tensor superfield $H_{IJ} = H_{((IJ))}$, obeying

$$D^+_q H_{IJ} = i\gamma^{(I}_{qp}\Psi^{J)}_p, \qquad H_{IJ} = H_{JI}, \quad H_{II} = 0 \ . \tag{13}$$

The leading component of this bosonic superfield, $h_{IJ}(x^=, v^-_{\alpha q}) = H_{IJ}|_{\theta^-_q=0}$, describes the on-shell degrees of freedom of the 11D graviton (see [34] for more details).

One can collect all the above on-shell superfields in

$$\Psi_Q(x^=, v^-_{\alpha q}; \theta^-_q) = \left\{\Psi_{Iq}\,, \Phi_{[IJK]}\,, H_{((IJ))}\right\}, \tag{14}$$

with multiindex Q taking 128(=144-16) 'fermionic' and 128=84+44 'bosonic values', $Q = \{Iq\,, [IJK]\,, ((IJ))\}$. The set of equations (12), (10) and (13) can be unified in

$$D^+_q\Psi_Q = \Delta_{Q\,qP}\Psi_P, \tag{15}$$

where the operator $\Delta_{Q\,qP}$ can be easily read off Eqs. (12), (10) and (13). It contains differential operator $\partial_=$ when $Q = Iq$ and is purely algebraic otherwise. This difference is diminished when passing to the Fourier images of the superfields with respect to $x^=$ coordinate, $\Psi_Q(\rho^\#, v^-_{\alpha q}; \theta^-_q) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int dx^= \exp(i\rho^\# x^=)\,\Psi_Q(x^=, v^-_{\alpha q}; \theta^-_q)$. These obey the same equation (15) but with $\partial_= \mapsto -i\rho^\#$ and

$$D^+_q = \partial^+_q + 2\rho^\#\theta^-_q \ . \tag{16}$$

As we have already noticed, the set of Eqs. (12), (10) and (13), collected in (15), are dependent. We can choose any of them and reproduce two others from its consistency conditions. Passing to Fourier image makes natural to choose the fermionic superfield as fundamental and to describe the linearized 11D supergravity by the equation

$$D^+_q\Psi^I_p = -\tfrac{i\rho^\#}{18}\left(\gamma^{IJKL} + 6\delta^{I[J}\gamma^{KL]}\right)_{qp}\Phi^{JKL} - \\ -2i\rho^\# H_{IJ}\gamma^J_{qp} \ . \tag{17}$$

Eqs. (15) (i.e. the set of Eqs. (10), (12) and (13)) and $\gamma^I_{qp}\Psi^I_p = 0$ play the role of D=4 helicity constraint (3). Then it is natural to expect that an on-shell tree superfield amplitude should satisfy essentially the same set of equations for each of the scattered particles.

3. Tree on-shell amplitudes in D=11

The tree on-shell n-particle scattering amplitudes can be described as a function in a direct product of n copies of the on-shell superspace (9)

$$\mathcal{A}^{(n)}_{Q_1\ldots Q_n}(k_1, \theta^-_1; ...; k_n, \theta^-_n) \equiv \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_{\ldots Q_l\ldots}(...; k_l, \theta^-_l; ...) \equiv \\ \equiv \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_{\ldots Q_l\ldots}(...; \rho^\#_{(l)}; v^-_{q(l)}; \theta^-_{q(l)}; ...) \ , \tag{18}$$

carrying n multi-indices $Q_l = \{I_l q_l\,, [I_l J_l K_l]\,, ((I_l J_l))\}$ (see (14)). As indicated in (18), for shortness we often write the bosonic argument of the amplitude as $k^a_{(l)}$ instead of $\rho^\#_{(l)}; v^-_{q(l)}$ (implying that $k^a_{(l)}$ is expressed in terms

of these by (6), where $\rho^{\#}_{(l)}$ is allowed to be negative). We will also omit the arguments of the amplitude when this does not produce a confusion.

The set of equations for the 11D amplitudes, playing the role of D=4 helicity constraints (5), includes, besides the γ-tracelessness on every 'fermionic' multiindex $I_l q_l$,

$$\gamma^{I_l}_{p_l q_l} \mathcal{A}_{\dots I_{(l)} q_{(l)} \dots} = 0, \tag{19}$$

the equation

$$D^{+}_{q(l)} \mathcal{A}_{\dots Q_{(l)} \dots} = (-)^{\Sigma_l} \Delta_{Q_l\, q P_{(l)}} \mathcal{A}_{\dots P_{(l)} \dots} \ , \tag{20}$$

where $\Delta_{Q_l\, q P_{(l)}}$ is the same as in (15) (*i.e.* can be read off (17), (10) and (13)), but acting on variables and indices corresponding to l-th particle, and Σ_l can be defined as the number of fermionic, $I_j q_j$, indices among $Q_1, \dots Q_{(l-1)}$, *i.e.*

$$\Sigma_l = \sum_{j=1}^{l-1} \frac{(1-(-)^{\varepsilon(Q_j)})}{2} \ , \quad \begin{cases} \varepsilon([I_j J_j K_j]) = 0 = \varepsilon(\,((I_j J_j))\,) \ , \\ \varepsilon(I_j q_j) = 1 \ . \end{cases} \tag{21}$$

In particular, when $Q_l = I_l p_l$, Eq. (20) reads

$$(-)^{\Sigma_l} D^{+(l)}_{q_l} \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_{Q_1 \dots I_l p_l \dots Q_n} = -2i \rho^{\#}_{(l)} \gamma_{J_l\, qp} \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_{Q_1 \dots ((I_l J_l)) \dots Q_n} - \tfrac{i}{18} \rho^{\#}_{(l)} \left(\gamma^{I_l J_l K_l L_l}_{qp} + 6 \delta^{I_l [J_l} \gamma^{K_l L_l]}_{qp} \right) \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_{Q_1 \dots [J_l K_l L_l] \dots Q_n} \ . \tag{22}$$

4. Generalized BCFW deformation in D=11

To write the generalized BCFW recurrent relations in D=11 we have to define the generalized BCFW deformation of bosonic and fermionic variables of the above described 11D on-shell superfield formalism.

As in the original 4D construction [5], the deformation of say the 1-st and the n-th particle variables should imply the opposite shift of their light-like momenta

$$\widehat{k^a_{(1)}} = k^a_{(1)} - z q^a \ , \qquad \widehat{k^a_{(n)}} = k^a_{(n)} + z q^a \ , \tag{23}$$

on a light-like vector q^a orthogonal to both $k^a_{(1)}$ and $k^a_{(n)}$,

$$q_a q^a = 0 \ , \qquad q_a k^a_{(1)} = 0 \ , \qquad q_a k^a_{(n)} = 0 \ , \tag{24}$$

multiplied by an arbitrary complex number $z \in \mathbb{C}$ [5] (10D construction of [13] used real $z \in \mathbb{R}$). Eqs. (24) guarantee that the deformed momenta remain light-like

$$(k_{(1)})^2 = 0 = (k_{(n)})^2 \quad \Rightarrow \quad (\widehat{k_{(1)}})^2 = 0 = (\widehat{k_{(n)}})^2 . \tag{25}$$

Thus the amplitude depending on these, instead of original $k^a_{(1)}$ and $k^a_{(n)}$, $\mathcal{A}_{z\, Q_1 \dots Q_n}(\widehat{k_{(1)}}, \theta^-_{(1)}; \dots \widehat{k_{(n)}}, \theta^-_{(n)})$, remains an on-shell amplitude.

In D=4 the deformation of the momenta (25) results from the following deformation of the bosonic spinors entering the Penrose representation (1)

$$\widehat{\lambda^A_{(n)}} = \lambda^A_{(n)} + z \lambda^A_{(1)}, \qquad \widehat{\bar\lambda^{\dot A}_{(1)}} = \bar\lambda^{\dot A}_{(1)} - z \bar\lambda^{\dot A}_{(n)}, \tag{26}$$

In D=11 (25) results from the following deformation of the associated spinor moving frame variables

$$\widehat{v^-_{\alpha q(n)}} = v^-_{\alpha q(n)} + z\, v^-_{\alpha p(1)}\, \mathbb{M}_{pq}\, \sqrt{\rho^{\#}_{(1)}/\rho^{\#}_{(n)}} \ , \tag{27}$$

$$\widehat{v^-_{\alpha q(1)}} = v^-_{\alpha q(1)} - z\, \mathbb{M}_{qp}\, v^-_{\alpha p(n)}\, \sqrt{\rho^{\#}_{(n)}/\rho^{\#}_{(1)}} \tag{28}$$

which enter the Penrose-like constraints (6),

$$k^a_{(i)} \Gamma_{a\alpha\beta} = 2 \rho^{\#}_{(i)} v^-_{\alpha q(i)} v^-_{\beta q(i)}, \qquad k_{a(i)} \delta_{qp} = \rho^{\#}_{(i)} v^-_{q(i)} \tilde\Gamma_a v^-_{p(i)} \ . \tag{29}$$

The energy variables $\rho^{\#}_{(i)}$ are not deformed. The matrix $\mathbb{M}_{qp}$ is constructed from the light-like vector q^a of (25)

$$\mathbb{M}_{qp} = -q^a\, (v^-_{q(1)}\, \tilde\Gamma_a v^-_{p(n)})\, \sqrt{\rho^{\#}_{(1)} \rho^{\#}_{(n)}}/(k_{(1)} k_{(n)}) \tag{30}$$

(*cf.* with 10D relations in [13]), with $16 k^a_{(i)} = \rho^{\#}_{(i)} v^-_{q(i)} \tilde\Gamma^a v^-_{q(i)}$ (see (29)), and is nilpotent

$$\mathbb{M}_{rp} \mathbb{M}_{rq} = 0 \ , \qquad \mathbb{M}_{qr} \mathbb{M}_{pr} = 0 \ , \tag{31}$$

due to (24). This nilpotent matrix enters also the deformation rules of the fermionic coordinates

$$\widehat{\theta^-_{p(n)}} = \theta^-_{p(n)} + z\, \theta^-_{q(1)}\, \mathbb{M}_{qp}\, \sqrt{\rho^{\#}_{(1)}/\rho^{\#}_{(n)}} \ , \tag{32}$$

$$\widehat{\theta^-_{q(1)}} = \theta^-_{q(1)} - z\, \mathbb{M}_{qp}\, \theta^-_{p(n)}\, \sqrt{\rho^{\#}_{(n)}/\rho^{\#}_{(1)}} \ . \tag{33}$$

These can be also written as

$$\widehat{\theta^-_{p(i)}} \ = \ e^{-z D^+_{(1)} \mathbb{M} \theta^-_{(n)} - z \theta^-_{(1)} \mathbb{M} D^+_{(n)}}\, \theta^-_{p(i)} \ , \tag{34}$$

where the covariant fermionic derivatives $D^+_{q(i)}$ are defined in (16). Their deformation

$$\widehat{D^+_{q(i)}} = e^{-z D_{(1)} \mathbb{M} \theta_{(n)} - z \theta_{(1)} \mathbb{M} D_{(n)}}\, D^+_{q(i)} e^{z D_{(1)} \mathbb{M} \theta_{(n)} + z \theta_{(1)} \mathbb{M} D_{(n)}} \tag{35}$$

is similar to the deformation of 8d Clifford algebra valued variables in the 10D construction of [13].

5. Generalized BCFW recurrent relations for tree amplitudes in $D = 11$

The deformed tree amplitude is defined as an amplitude depending on deformed momenta and fermionic coordinates. We denote it by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{A}^{(n)}_z}_{\dots Q_l \dots} := \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_z{}_{Q_1 \dots Q_l \dots Q_n}(\widehat{k_{(1)}}, \dots; \widehat{k_{(l)}}, \widehat{\theta^-_{(l)}}; \dots, \widehat{\theta^-_{(n)}}) \tag{36}$$

$$= \mathcal{A}^{(n)}_z{}_{Q_1 \dots Q_n}(\widehat{k_{(1)}}, \widehat{\theta^-_{(1)}}; k_{(2)}, \dots, \theta^-_{(n-1)}; \widehat{k_{(n)}}, \widehat{\theta^-_{(n)}}) \ ,$$

where in the last line it is assumed that the deformed momenta correspond to 1-st and n-th of the scattered particles (so that $\widehat{k_{(l)}}, \widehat{\theta^-_{(l)}} = k_{(l)}, \theta^-_{(l)}$ for $l = 2, ..., (n-1)$), and the subscript z indicates the parameter used in this deformation (27)–(33). Notice that deformed amplitudes (36) satisfy, besides the gamma-tracelessness (19), Eqs. (20) with deformed derivatives (35),

$$\widehat{D^+_{q(l)}}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{z\,Q_1...Q_{(l)}...} = (-)^{\Sigma_l}\Delta_{Q_l\,qP_{(l)}}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{z,Q_1...P_{(l)}...}\ . \quad (37)$$

In particular,

$$(-)^{\Sigma_l}\widehat{D^+_{q_l(l)}}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{z\,...[I_lJ_lK_l]...} = 3i\gamma_{[J_lK_l|q_lp_l}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{z\,...|I_l]p_l\,...}, \quad (38)$$

$$(-)^{\Sigma_l}\widehat{D^+_{q_l(l)}}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{z\,...((I_lJ_l))...} = i\gamma_{q_lp_l((I_l|}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}_{z\,...|J_l))p_l\,...}. \quad (39)$$

The proposed BCFW-type recurrent relation for tree superfield amplitudes of 11D supergravity reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{A}^{(n)}_{Q_1...Q_n}\ &(k_1,\theta^-_{(1)};k_2,\theta^-_{(2)};\ldots;k_n,\theta^-_{(n)}) = \\ = \quad &\sum_l^n \frac{(-)^{\Sigma_{(l+1)}}}{64(\widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l))^2}D^+_{q(z_l)}\Big(\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^{(l+1)}_{z_l\,Q_1...Q_l\,Jp}(\widehat{k_1},\widehat{\theta^-_{(1)}};k_2,\theta^-_{(2)};\ldots;k_l,\theta^-_{(l)};\widehat{P}_l(z_l),\Theta^-)\ \times \\ &\times\frac{1}{(P_l)^2}\overleftrightarrow{D^+}_{q(z_l)}\widehat{\mathcal{A}}^{(n-l+1)}_{z_l\,Jp\,Q_{l+1}...Q_n}(-\widehat{P}_l(z_l),\Theta^-;k_{l+1},\theta^-_{(l+1)};\ldots;k_{n-1},\theta^-_{(n-1)};\widehat{k_n},\widehat{\theta^-_{(n)}})\Big)\,|_{\Theta^-=0}\ .\end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Here

$$P^a_l = -\sum_{m=1}^{l}k^a_m\ , \quad (41)$$

$$\widehat{P^a_l}(z) = -\sum_{m=1}^{l}\widehat{k^a_m}(z) = P^a_l - zq^a\ , \quad (42)$$

$$z_l := P^a_l P_{l\,a}/(2P^b_l q_b)\ , \quad (43)$$

with q^a obeying (24) and (30)[46]. Eq. (42) implies that $(\widehat{P}_l(z))^2 = (P_l)^2 - 2zP_l\cdot q$, so that $\widehat{P^a_l}(z_l)$ is light–like

$$(\widehat{P}_l(z_l))^2 = 0\ , \qquad z_l := (P_l)^2/(2P_l\cdot q)\ . \quad (44)$$

As a result, firstly, both amplitudes in the *r.h.s.* of (40) are on the mass shell, and secondly we can express $\widehat{P^a_l}(z)$ in terms of assiciated spinor movig frame variables $v^-_{\alpha q}(z_l) := v^-_{\alpha q\,\hat{P}_l(z_l)}$ and energy $\pm\widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l)$ (see (6))

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{P_l{}^a}(z_l)\Gamma_{a\alpha\beta} &= 2\widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l)\,v_{\alpha q}{}^-(z_l)v_{\beta q}{}^-(z_l)\ , \\ \widehat{P}_l{}^a(z_l)\delta_{qp} &= \widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l)\,v^-_q(z_l)\tilde{\Gamma}^a v^-_p(z_l)\ .\end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

This $\widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l)$ enters the denominator of the terms in r.h.s. of (40) (which is needed to simplify the relation between amplitude and superamplitude).

Actually, the bosonic arguments of the on-shell amplitudes are energies $\rho^{\#}_{(i)}$ and $v^-_{\alpha(i)}$ related to light-like momenta $k^a_{(i)}$ by (29), and the above $v^-_{\alpha q}(z_l)$ and $\pm\widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l)$; just for shortness in (40), following (18), we hide this writing instead the dependence on the momenta.

Finally, $D^+_{q(z_l)}$ in (40) is the covariant derivative with respect to Θ^-_q constructed with the use of $\widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l)$ of (45),

$$D^+_{q(z_l)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial\Theta^-_q} + 2\widehat{\rho}^{\#}(z_l)\Theta^-_q\ . \quad (46)$$

Notice that the structure of the r.h.s. of (40),

$$\begin{aligned}&D^+_q\left(\mathcal{A}_{...Jp}\overleftrightarrow{D^+}_q\mathcal{A}_{Jp\,...}\right)|_{\Theta^-=0} \equiv \quad (47)\\ &\equiv D^+_q\left(\mathcal{A}_{...Jp}D^+_q\mathcal{A}_{Jp\,...} - (-)^{\Sigma_l}D^+_q\mathcal{A}_{...Jp}\,\mathcal{A}_{Jp\,...}\right)|_0,\end{aligned}$$

can be treated as an integration over the fermionic variable Θ^-_q in (47) with an exotic measure similar to one used in [35, 36] to construct a worldsheet superfield formulation of the heterotic string (see [37] for formal discussion on superspace measures).

To argue that there is no contribution to the r.h.s. of (40) of a pole at $|z| \mapsto \infty$, we can use the line of arguments presented in [13] for 10D case, which refers on the case when external momenta lays in some 4d subspace of spacetime and on the original proof of [5] which was extended to $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity in [9–11].

The calculation of sample tree superamplitudes of 11D supergravity with the use of the above BCFW-type recurrent relations (45), and generalization of these to loop amplitudes will be the subject of subsequent work. See supplemental material to this paper [47] for some technicalities needed to proceed with explicit superamplitude calculations.

Acknowledgements This work has been supported in part by the Spanish MINECO grant FPA2012-35043-C02-01, partially financed with FEDER/ERDF (European Regional Development Fund of the European Union), by the Basque Government Grant IT-979-16, and the Basque Country University program UFI 11/55. The author is thankful to Theoretical Department of CERN for hospitality and support of his visits at different stages of this project, and to Luis Alvarez-Gaume, Boris Pioline, Emeri Sokatchev and Paolo Di Vecchia for useful discussion on related topics during these visits.

[1] Z. Bern, J. J. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson and R. Roiban, Fortsch. Phys. **59** (2011) 561 doi:10.1002/prop.201100037 [arXiv:1103.1848 [hep-th]].

[2] J. M. Drummond, J. Henn, G. P. Korchemsky and E. Sokatchev, Nucl. Phys. B **828** (2010) 317 [arXiv:0807.1095 [hep-th]].

[3] P. Benincasa, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **29** (2014) no.5, 1430005 [arXiv:1312.5583 [hep-th]].

[4] R. Kallosh, "An Update on Perturbative N=8 Supergravity," arXiv:1412.7117 [hep-th].

[5] R. Britto, F. Cachazo, B. Feng and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005) 181602 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.94.181602 [hep-th/0501052].

[6] R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, Nucl. Phys. B **715** (2005) 499 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.02.030 [hep-th/0412308].

[7] M. x. Luo and C. k. Wen, JHEP **0503** (2005) 004 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2005/03/004 [hep-th/0501121].

[8] M. Bianchi, H. Elvang and D. Z. Freedman, JHEP **0809** (2008) 063 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/09/063 [arXiv:0805.0757 [hep-th]].

[9] A. Brandhuber, P. Heslop and G. Travaglini, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008) 125005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.125005 [arXiv:0807.4097 [hep-th]].

[10] N. Arkani-Hamed, F. Cachazo and J. Kaplan, JHEP **1009** (2010) 016 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2010)016 [arXiv:0808.1446 [hep-th]].

[11] P. Heslop and A. E. Lipstein, "On-Shell Diagrams for N = 8 Supergravity Amplitudes," arXiv:1604.03046 [hep-th].

[12] E. Herrmann and J. Trnka, "Gravity On-shell Diagrams," arXiv:1604.03479 [hep-th].

[13] S. Caron-Huot and D. O'Connell, JHEP **1108** (2011) 014 [arXiv:1010.5487 [hep-th]].

[14] R. H. Boels and D. O'Connell, JHEP **1206** (2012) 163 [arXiv:1201.2653 [hep-th]].

[15] R. H. Boels, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109** (2012) 081602 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.081602 [arXiv:1204.4208 [hep-th]].

[16] Y. Wang and X. Yin, Phys. Rev. D **92** (2015) no.4, 041701 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.041701 [arXiv:1502.03810 [hep-th]].

[17] Y. Wang and X. Yin, "Supervertices and Non-renormalization Conditions in Maximal Supergravity Theories," arXiv:1505.05861 [hep-th].

[18] I. A. Bandos and A. A. Zheltukhin JETP Lett. **54** (1991) 421; Phys. Lett. **B288**, 77-83 (1992); "D = 10 superstring: Lagrangian and Hamiltonian mechanics in twistor-like Lorentz harmonic formulation", Preprint IC-92-422, ICTP, Trieste, 1992, [81pp.], published in: Phys. Part. Nucl. **25** (1994) 453-477. [Phys. of Element. Part. and Atom. Nuclei, EChAYa 25 (1994) 1065-1126]

[19] I. A. Bandos and A. A. Zheltukhin, JETP Lett. **55** (1992) 81 Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **8**, 1081 (1993).

[20] I. A. Bandos and A. Y. Nurmagambetov, Class. Quant. Grav. **14** (1997) 1597 [hep-th/9610098].

[21] A. S. Galperin, P. S. Howe and K. S. Stelle, Nucl. Phys. B **368** (1992) 248 [hep-th/9201020].

[22] F. Delduc, A. Galperin and E. Sokatchev, Nucl. Phys. B **368** (1992) 143.

[23] D. V. Uvarov, "Spinor description of $D = 5$ massless low-spin gauge fields," arXiv:1506.01881 [hep-th].

[24] C. Cheung and D. O'Connell, JHEP **0907** (2009) 075 [arXiv:0902.0981 [hep-th]].

[25] I. Bandos, et al "Tree amplitudes and spinor moving frame in D=10 and D=11", paper in preparation.

[26] M. B. Green, M. Gutperle and P. Vanhove, Phys. Lett. B **409** (1997) 177 [hep-th/9706175].

[27] L. Anguelova, P. A. Grassi and P. Vanhove, Nucl. Phys. B **702** (2004) 269 [hep-th/0408171].

[28] M. B. Green and A. Rudra, "Type I/heterotic duality and M-theory amplitudes," arXiv:1604.00324 [hep-th].

[29] R. Penrose and M. A. H. MacCallum, Phys. Rept. **6** (1972) 241. doi:10.1016/0370-1573(73)90008-2

[30] A. Ferber, Nucl. Phys. B **132** (1978) 55. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(78)90257-2

[31] I. A. Bandos, J. A. de Azcarraga and D. P. Sorokin, in: "Quantum, Super and Twistors, Proc. XXII Max Born Symposium, Wroclaw (Poland) 2006", Eds: J. Kowalski-Glikman and Ludwik Turko, Wroclaw University Press 2008, pp. 25-32 [hep-th/0612252].

[32] I. A. Bandos, Phys. Lett. B **659** (2008) 388 [arXiv:0707.2336 [hep-th]].

[33] I. A. Bandos, Nucl. Phys. B **796** (2008) 360 [arXiv:0710.4342 [hep-th]].

[34] A. S. Galperin, P. S. Howe and P. K. Townsend, Nucl. Phys. B **402** (1993) 531.

[35] M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. B **266** (1991) 312. doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)91046-X

[36] M. Tonin, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **7** (1992) 6013. doi:10.1142/S0217751X92002726

[37] B. M. Zupnik and D. G. Pak, Class. Quant. Grav. **6** (1989) 723. doi:10.1088/0264-9381/6/5/014

[38] S. Deser and D. Seminara, Phys. Rev. D **62** (2000) 084010 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.084010 [hep-th/0002241].

[39] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. B **198** (1982) 252. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(82)90556-9

[40] M. B. Green and J. H. Schwarz, Nucl. Phys. B **198** (1982) 441. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(82)90334-0

[41] J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Rept. **89** (1982) 223. doi:10.1016/0370-1573(82)90087-4

[42] D. J. Gross and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **277** (1986) 1. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(86)90429-3

[43] S. Sannan, Phys. Rev. D **34** (1986) 1749. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.34.1749

[44] This observation was also made independently in [23] and used their to develop the spinor helicity formalism for D=5 massless fields. The D=6 spinor helicity formalism was developed in [24].

[45] See [26–28] and refs. therein for other approaches to amplitudes of D=11 supergravity.

[46] One can check that (30) can be formally resolved by $q^a = \sqrt{\rho_1^{\#}\rho_n^{\#}}v^-_{q(1)}\tilde{\Gamma}^a\mathbb{M}_{qp}v^-_{p(n)}/8$.

[47] Supplemental material can be found at http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevLett.118.031601. The references [38] — [43] are cited their.