M arch 24, 2022

Quantum Electrodynam ics at Large D istances III: Veri cation of Pole Factorization and the Correspondence Principle

Takahiro Kawai Research Institute for Mathematical Sciences Kyoto University Kyoto 606-01 JAPAN

> Henry P.Stapp Lawrence Berkeley Laboratory University of California Berkeley, California 94720

Abstract

In two companion papers it was shown how to separate out from a scattering function in quantum electrodynam ics a distinguished part that meets the correspondence-principle and pole-factorization requirements. The integrals that de ne the terms of the remainder are here shown to have singularities on the pertinent Landau singularity surface that are weaker than those of the distinguished part. These remainder terms therefore vanish, relative to the distinguished term, in the appropriate macro-scopic limits. This shows, in each order of the perturbative expansion, that quantum electrodynam ics does indeed satisfy the pole-factorization and correspondence-principle requirements in the case treated here. It also demonstrates the e cacy of the computational techniques developed here to calculate the consequences of the principles of quantum electrodynamics in the macroscopic regimes.

This work was supported by the Director, O ce of Energy Research, O ce of High Energy and Nuclear Physics, Division of High Energy Physics of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract DE-AC03-76SF00098, and by the Japanese M inistry of Education, Science and Culture under a Grant-in-Aid for Scienti c Research (International Scienti c Research Program 03044078).

D isclaim er

This docum ent was prepared as an account for work sponsored by the United States G ovemm ent. Neither the United States G overmm ent nor any agency thereof, nor The R egents of the University of C alifornia, nor any of their employees, makes any warranty, express or implied, or assumes any legal liability or responsibility for the accuracy, completeness, or usefulness of any information, apparatus, product, or process disclosed, or represents that its use would not infringe privately owned rights. R efference herein to any speci c commercial products process, or service by its trade name, trademark, manufacturer, or otherwise, does not necessarily constitute or imply its endorsement, recommendation, or favoring by the United States G overnment or any agency thereof, or The R egents of the University of C alifornia. The view s and opinions of authors expressed herein do not necessarily state or re ect those of the United States G overnment or any agency thereof of The R egents of the University of C alifornia and shall not be used for advertising or product endorsem ent purposes.

Law rence Berkeley Laboratory is an equal opportunity em ployer.

1. Introduction

In papers I^1 and II^2 we exam ined the functions F (g) associated with the innite set of graphs fgg obtained by dressing a simple triangle graph G with soft photons in all possible ways. A distinguished set of contribution to these functions F (g) was singled out and called \dom inant" because these contributions were expected to dom inate the macroscopic behaviour of the scattering functions. Each of these distinguished parts was shown to be well de ned, and to have a singularity of the form log' on the (Landau-Nakanishi) triangle-diagram singularity surface ' = 0. This form log' agrees with the form of the singularity of the original Feynm an function F (G) on ' = 0, and it produces the sam e kind of large-distance fall-o . M oreover, these dom inant contributions yield (exactly once) every term in the perturbative expansion of the triangle-diagram version of the pole-factorization property

D iscF
0
; ${}_{=0} = F_{1}^{0}F_{2}^{0}F_{3}^{0}$:

The left-hand side of this equation represents value at $\prime = 0$ of the discontinuity across the surface $\prime = 0$ of the function F⁰ that is obtained by om itting the contributions from the \classical" photons. These latter contributions are supplied by the unitary operator U (L) | after the transform ation to coordinate space. Consequently, the discontinuity formula given above entails that the contributions from these \dom inant" terms give just the classical-type large-distance behaviour demanded by the correspondence principle: the rate of fall-o at large distances is exactly what follows from the classical concept of three stable charged particles, each moving from one scattering region to another, and the electrom agnetic eld generated by U (L) is exactly the quantum analog of the classical electrom agnetic eld generated by the motions of these three charged particles. In the present article we shall show that, in each order of the perturbation expansion, the terms of the remainder give no contributions to the discontinuity de ned above. Consequently, these \non-dom inant" term s give no contribution to the leading term in the the asymptotic large-distance behaviour, and hence the correspondence-principle requirement is satis ed.

In section 2 we exam ine the simplest example, namely the triangle graph G dressed with one internal soft photon. The remainder part is separated into a sum of terms. For some terms the weakening of the singularity on the surface ' = 0 is associated with the topological complexity of the graph that represents this term, namely its non-separability: cutting the graph at the three lines associated with the three Feynm an-denom inator poles does not separate the graph into three disjoint parts. This means that the integration over the momenta of the internal photons tends to shift the position of the singularity, and hence weaken it. For the remaining terms the weakening of the singularity on ' = 0 is due to the replacement of one or more of the three pole singularities ($p_s^2 = m^2$)¹ of the integrand by a pair of logarithm is singularities: this replacement of the pole singularities in the integrand by logarithm is singularities likew is leads to a weakening of the singularity of the integral on ' = 0.

Our problem s here are institute show that these reductions in the degree of the singularity on ' = 0, which emerge easily within our form alism in this simple one-photon example, hold for every g obtained by dressing the triangle graph G with soft photons, and second to show that the weakening of the singularity is, in every case, a weakening by at least one full power of ', up to a prescribed

nite number of powers of log' that increases linearly with the number of photons, and hence with powers of the coupling constant. This strong result means that the validity of the correspondence {principle in the large{scale limit, which is established here at each order of the perturbative expansion, cannot be upset by an accumulation of powers of $(\log')^n$ that leads to a singularity of the form ', where is of the order of the ne-structure constant (1=137). A ccumulations of this kind occur offen in eld theories. The appearance of the

ne-structure constant in the exponent arises from the fact that usually, just as in our case, the num ber of powers of log' is linearly tied to the num ber of powers of the ne-structure constant. We have not studied, in our case, the num erical factors that multiply the term s of the rem ainder, except to show that they are all nite. Hence we can make here no claim pertaining to meaningfulness of the in nite sum in our case: we plan to exam ine this question later.

To establish our general conclusions we need two auxiliarly results. The rst is a geometric property concerning the structure of the Landau-Nakanishi surface. It is proved in section 3. The second pertains to several singular integrals. The needed computation is performed in section 4. The required properties of the various intergrals are then proved in sections 5, 6, and 7. 2. Exam ination of non-dom inant singularities for the one-photon case.

Let us consider the contributions associated with the graph g shown in Figure 1.

In references 1 and 2 we showed how to separate the contribution represented by the graph of Fig. 1 into a merom orphic part consisting of a sum of the four terms represented by the the four graphs of Figure 2, plus a non-m erom orphic" part.

The term associated with the graph a of Figure 2 is separable, and is classified as dominant. The associated function F_a is given by (4.1) and (4.3) of Ref. 1, and has a logarithm ic singularity along the Landau surface ' = 0. We also claimed there that the other three terms in the merom orphic part are are infrared nite, and have weaker singularities along the Landau surface ' = 0. In the following subsection we verify this claim for the case of the function F_b associated with graph (b) of Fig. 2. The other two cases, c and d, can be treated similarly.

Figure 1: A graph g representing a soft-photon correction to a hard-photon triangle-diagram process G. The letters Q near the ends of the wiggly line that represents the soft photon indicate that this particle is coupled to the charged particle through the \quantum " part of the full quantum -electrodynam ical coupling.



Figure 2: Four graphs representing the four terms in the merom orphic part of the function represented by the graph in g. 1. These four terms arise from a decomposition of the merom orphic parts associated with each of the three sides of the triangle into poles times residues. The lines represent Feynm andenom inator poles. The other charged-particle lines represent residue factors.



2.i. The contribution from a one-photon nonseparable m erom orphic part.

The function F_b was given in (4.4) of Ref. 1:

$$F_{b} = \frac{Z}{(2)^{4}} \frac{d^{4}p}{2} 2rdr^{2} \frac{d^{4}}{(2)^{4}} \frac{i(\frac{2}{0} + \frac{2}{1})}{2 + i0}$$

$$Tr^{(\frac{i(p+m)}{p^{2} m^{2}}V_{1} \frac{(2p_{i} + 2r)^{2}(2p_{1} + 2r^{2})^{1}}{2p_{1} + r^{2}}$$

$$\frac{(p_{1} + r 6 + m)}{(p_{1} + r)^{2} m^{2}}V_{2}$$

$$\frac{2p_{2} - \frac{2}{(2p_{2})} \frac{6}{p_{2} + r^{2}}}{2p_{2} + r^{2}} \frac{(p_{2} + m)}{p_{2}^{2} m}V_{3} \qquad (2 \text{ iii.})$$

It was shown in Ref. 2 that we can distort the -contour so that Im $^2 > 0$ at $^2 = 0$, and Im $p_j > 0$ (j = 1;2) at $p_j = 0$. Then, except for three pole-factors $p^2 m^2$; $(p_1 + r)^2 m^2$ and $p_2^2 m^2$, each denom inator of the integrand of F_b is di erent from zero.

The r-integration ${}^{R}_{0}$ rdr=[$(p_1 + r)^2 m^2$] can be explicitly performed, and when $p_1 \in 0$ its dominant singularity along $p_1^2 = m^2$ is

$$\frac{(p_1^2 m^2) \log (p_1^2 m^2)}{4 (p_1)^2};$$

C om bining this singularity, instead of the ordinary pole $1=(p_1^2 m^2)$, with the other two poles, i.e., $1=(p^2 m^2)$ and $1=(p_2^2 m^2)$, we perform the p-integration and nd a singularity A (q;)' (q) log' (q), with A being analytic. Perform ing the -integration along the compact distorted contour, the dom inant singularity of F_b is '² log'.

E sentially the sam e argum ent covers the case where one of the two m eromorphic parts is due to a C-coupling. Then the factor rdr becom es simply dr, and the singularity becom es ' \log' .

2.ii. The contribution from a pair of non-m erom orphic parts arising from one photon.

The contribution of I in (4.6) in Ref. 1 to the amplitude is

$$F = \int_{j=1}^{Z} \frac{d^{4}}{2 + i0} \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{dr}{r} d^{4}p_{3} \frac{1}{p_{3}^{2} - m^{2} + i0} \log \frac{(q_{1} + p_{3} + r)^{2} - m^{2} + i0}{(q_{1} + p_{3})^{2} - m^{2} + i0}$$
$$\log \frac{(p_{3} - q_{3} - r)^{2} - m^{2} + i0}{(p_{3} - q_{3})^{2} - m^{2} + i0}; \qquad (2 \text{ iii.1})$$

with the p_i defined as in Fig. 1 of ref. Here the -contour is deformed so that Im $^2 > 0$ and Im $p_j > 0$ (j=1,2). Performing the p_3 -integration we nd

$$\begin{array}{c} Z \\ j \neq 1 \end{array} \frac{d^{4}}{2 + i0} & \begin{array}{c} Z \\ 0 \end{array} \frac{dr}{r} (G (q_{1} + r ; q_{3} + r)) \\ G (q_{1} + r ; q_{3}) \end{array} G (q_{1} ; q_{3} + r) + G (q_{1} ; q_{2})); \quad (2 : i : 2) \end{array}$$

where

$$G(q_{1};q_{2}) = '(q_{1};q_{2})^{2} \log('(q_{1};q_{2}) + i0):$$

Sinœ

$$(@=@r)'(q_1 + r;q_3 + r) = (@'=@q_1 + @'=@q_3)$$

= $(1 + 2 + 2) = 3p_3$ & 0

holds by the Landau equation, we can nd non-vanishing functions a (q;q;r;)and b(q;q) for which

$$(q_1 + r; q_3 + r) = a(q; q_3; r;)(r b(q; q_3)'(q_1 + r; q_3))$$

holds (Cfx 3 below). Similar decompositions hold also for ' ($q_1 + r$; q_2) and ' ($q_1;q_2 + r$). Hence application of the results in x 4 below to $\begin{bmatrix} R \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \frac{dr}{r}$ (G ($q_1 + r$; $q_2 + r$) G ($q_1;q_2$)) etc. entails that the r-integration in (2.ii2) produces a singularity of the form ' ($q_1;q_2$)² (log (' ($q_1;q_2$) + i0)² near ' = 0. Since the -integration (along a suitably detoured path) is over the compact set, F itself

behaves as $\prime^2 (\log (\prime + i0))^2$:

2.iii. The contribution from a coupling of a non-m erom orphic part with either a m erom orphic part or a C -part.

If a m erom orphic part is coupled with a non-m erom orphic part, the RHS of (2.ii.1) is replaced by an integral of the following form :

$$\frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{2}}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{1}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{1}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{1}{d^{2}} = \frac{1}{d^{2}} = \frac{d^{4}}{d^{2}} = \frac{1}{d^{2}} = \frac{1}{d$$

By deforming the -contour, in the manner speci ed in ref. 2, so that Im $^2 > 0$ and Im $p_j > 0$ (j = 1;2) [with $p_1 = q_1 + p_3$; $p_2 = p_3 q_3$], we not the singularity of this integral near ' (q_1 ; q_3) = 0 is ' log (' + i0), as there is no potentially divergent factor 1=r.

If the m erom orphic part is replaced by a C -term, then the dom inant singularity is given by an integral similar to (2.iii.1) but with the replacement of the residue factor $1=(2(p_3 q_3) + r^2)$ by $1=r(p_3 q_3)$. Hence a potentially divergent factor 1=r arises. But this problem is circum vented by combining the singularity originating from $\log((q_1 + p_3 + r^2)^2 m^2 + i0)$ and that from $\log((q_1 + p_3)^2 m^2 + i0)$; the results in x 4 show, with a reasoning similar to (but simpler than) that in x 2.ii, that the resulting singularity is ' $(\log(r + i0))^2$.

3. A norm alization of the function de ning a Landau surface.

The purpose of this section is to prove the following $\lim m a$, which is an adaptation of the inplicit function theorem (or the W eierstrass preparation theorem in the theory of holom orphic functions of several variables) to the Landau surface shifted by a vector determined by photons that bridge star lines. (cfx 11. of Ref. 1.). Here and in what follows, $(r_1; :::; r_n)$ denotes a nested set of polar coordinates introduced in Ref. 1, x5.

Lem m a 3.1 Let ' (q) denote a de ning function of the Landau surface for the triangle diagram and let \hat{q} be a point on the surface. Let i be the sm allest j such that j identi es a bridge photon line. (A bridge photon line is a photon line that has m erom orphic couplings on both ends and that com pletes | via the rules de ned below Eqn. (2) of ref. 2 | to a closed photon loop that passes along at least one star line.) Then on a su ciently sm all neighborhood of q_0 and for su ciently sm all $_i = r_1$ i there exist non-vanishing holom orphic functions B (q; $_i; k^0 = _i$) and C (q; $k^0 = _i$) such that

$$'(q) = B(q; _{i}; k^{0} = _{i})(_{i} '(q) = C(q; k^{0} = _{i}))$$
 (3:1)

holds, where k^0 denotes the collection of bridge lines.

P roof. Since i is the st bridge photon line, any bridge photon line k has the form $k_{\cdot} = {}_{i}r_{i+1}$ r. Hence $k^{0} = {}_{i}$ is actually independent of ${}_{i}$. Furthermore, as is shown at the beginning of section 5 ((5.1)), $Q'(q) = Q_{i}j_{i=0} \in 0$ holds. Hence the W eierstrass preparation theorem guarantees the local and unique existence of a non-vanishing holom orphic function B (q; ${}_{i};k^{0} = {}_{i}$), and a holom orphic function R (q; $k^{0} = {}_{i}$), which vanishes for $q_{i} = q_{0}$, for which the follow ing holds:

$$' (q) = B (q; _{i}; k^{0} = _{i}) (_{i} R (q; k^{0} = _{i}))$$
(32)

Setting i = 0 in (3.2) we nd

' (q) = B (q;0; k^0 i) (R (q; k^0 i);

that is,

R
$$(q; k^0 = i) = ' (q) = (B (q; 0; k^0 = i))$$
:

Hence by choosing C $(q;k^0 = i) = B (q;0;k^0 = i)$ we obtain (3.1).

4. Som e auxiliary integrals.

The purpose of this section is to nd an explicit form of the singularities of several integrals that we encounter in dealing with infrared problems. The simplest example of this sort is the following integral I (t):

$$I(t) = \int_{0}^{Z} [\log (r + t + i0) \log (t + i0)] dr = r; (> 0):$$

In spite of the divergence factor 1=r, I(t) is well de ned as a (hyper) function of t. In order to see this, it su ces to decompose I(t) as

$$\int_{0}^{Z} t=2 \int_{t=2}^{z} (\log (r+t) \log t) dr = r + \int_{t=2}^{z} (\log (r+t) \log t) dr = r$$

with Im t > 0: the well-de nedness of the second integral is clear, while the fact that

$$\log(r+t)$$
 $\log t = \log(1+\frac{r}{t}) - \frac{r}{t}$

holds in the dom ain of integration of the stintegralentails its well-de nedness. Furtherm ore I (t) (thus seen to be well-de ned) satis as the following ordinary di erential equation:

$$t \frac{d}{dt} I(t) = \log(t + i0) \log(t + + i0):$$
 (4:1)

Hence $(t_{dt}^{\underline{d}})^2$ is holom orphic near t = 0. Then it follows from the general theory of ordinary di evential equations that I (t) has the form

$$C_2 (\log (t + i0))^2 + C_1 (\log (t + i0)) + h(t);$$
 (42)

where C_1 and C_2 are constants and h (t) is holom orphic near t = 0. Furtherm ore, by substituting (4.2) into (4.1) and comparing the coe cients of singular terms at t = 0, we nd $C_2 = 1=2$.

This computation can be generalized as follows:

Proposition 4.1. Let $J(;j;t) (\in 0;1;2; ;j 1)$ denote the following integral:

Then the singularity of J (; j;t) near t = 0 is of the following form with some constants $C_{(1)}$ ('= 0; ;j 1):

$$((t+i0)^{+1} (\bigcup_{j=0}^{P} C (\log(t+i0)))); \text{ if } \in 1 \\ \sum_{j=0}^{P} C (\log(t+i0))^{+1}; \text{ if } = 1 :$$
 (4.3)

R em ark 4.1. If is a non-negative integer, the integral J (; j;t) is not singular at t = 0.

Proof of Proposition 4.1. The well-de nedness can be veried by the same method as was used for the above example I (t). To nd its singularity structure, we again make use of an ordinary dierential equation as follows:

$$(t\frac{d}{dt} (+1))J(;j;t) = t\frac{d}{dt} (+1)^{j} \frac{d}{2} \frac{d}{1} \frac{d}{1}^{j} \frac{d}{2} \frac{$$

Repeating this computation, we nally obtain

$$(t\frac{d}{dt} (+1))^{j} J(;j;t) = (1)^{j} (t+1) d_{1};$$

and hence we nd $(\frac{d}{dt} (+1))^{j}J(;j;t)$ is holom orphic near t = 0. Again, by using the general theory of ordinary di erential equations, we obtain the required formula (4.3).

Remark 4.2. Although we do not need the exact values of C.'s, we note that $C_{j,1}$ in (4.3) is simply given by $(1)^{j,2} = (j,1)!(+1)$ if \notin 1. In order to not this value it su cess to insert (4.3) into the recurrence relation (td=dt (+1))J(;j;t) = J(;j,1;t) and use the trivial relation

$$t\frac{d}{dt} (+1)^{I} J(;2;t) = \sum_{0}^{Z} (t+1+i0) d_{1}$$
$$= ((t+i0)^{+1}=(+1)) ((t++i0)^{+1}=(+1))$$

as the starting point of the induction. Similarly C_{j-1} for = 1 is equal to $(1)^{j}=j!$. The coe cient of the most singular term can be similarly computed explicitly for the integrals to be dealt with in subsequent propositions.

The following modi cation of Proposition 4.1 is often e ective in actual computations.

Proposition 4.2. (i) Let K (; j;t) ($\frac{6}{5}$ 0;1; ; j 1) denote the following integral:

Then its singularity near t = 0 is of the following form for some constants $C_{\cdot}('=0; ; j = 1)$:

(ii) Let n be a non-negative integer and let I(n; j; t)(j = 1) denote the following integral:

Then its singularity near t = 0 is of the following form with some constants $C_{\cdot}('=0; ; j = 1)$:

$$t^{n+1} e^{\frac{\dot{X}^{1}}{\sum_{0}} C \cdot (\log (t + i0))^{+1} A} :$$
(4.5)

(iii) Let $\hat{F}(n; j; t)$ (n; a non-negative integer, and j 1) denote the following integral:

Then its singularity near t = 0 is of the following form with some constants $C_{(i)} = 0; ; j = 1$:

$$t^{n+2} \overset{0}{\otimes} \overset{1}{\overset{1}{X}^{-1}} C \cdot (\log (t + i0))^{+1} A :$$
(4:6)

Proof. Since $j(t+j) = (t+j)^{+1} t(t+j)$, (i) and (iii) follow respectively from Proposition 4.1 and from (ii) above. Hence it remains to prove (ii). Since

$$\frac{d^{n+1}}{dt^{n+1}} ((t + j)^n \log (t + j + i0)) = \frac{n!}{t + j + i0} + P_n;$$

where P_n is a polynomial of (t + j), Remark 4.1, entails that

$$\frac{d^{n+1}}{dt^{n+1}} I(n;j;t) + n U(1;j;t) + h(t)$$
(4:7)

holds with a holom orphic function h(t). On the other hand, near t = 0 a straightforward computation shows

$${}^{Z}_{t} t^{n} (\log (t + i0))^{m} = \frac{t^{n+1}}{n+1} \sum_{r=0}^{X^{n}} \frac{(1)^{r} m! (\log (t + i0)^{m})^{r}}{(m + 1)^{r}}$$
(4.8)

holds for non-negative integers n, and m : 1. Combining (4.7) and P roposition 4.1, we use (4.8) repeatedly to nd (4.5). We also note that R em ark 4.2 entails $C_{j-1} = (-1)^{j} = j!(n + 1)$ in this case.

The following proposition is a key result of this section.

P roposition 4.3. Let I (t) denote the following integral (4.9), where e_j (j = 1;2; ;n) is a non-negative integer:

Then its singularity near t = 0 is a sum of nitely many term s of the form

$$Ct^{N} (\log(t + i0))^{m}$$
 (4:10)

with a constant C and positive integers N (m in $e_j + 1$) and m (n).

<u>Proof.</u> First of all, let us re-scale the parameter r_1 and the variable t as follow s:

$$r_1 = r_1^0; t = s$$

Then I becom es

$$\sum_{0}^{e_{1}} \sum_{1}^{z} (r_{1}^{0})^{e_{1}} dr_{1}^{0} \int_{0}^{z} r_{2}^{e_{2}} dr_{2} \int_{0}^{z} r_{n}^{e_{n}} dr_{n} (\log (s + r_{1}^{0} r_{2} n) * \log): (4:11)$$

The contribution from log in (4.11) is a nite constant. Thus we may assume from the rst that = 1. Then the roles of $\frac{1}{5}$ s in (4.9) are uniform, and hence we may re-number the index j so that

$$e_1 e_2 n:e$$
 (4:12)

Let us introduce new variables j by

$$_{1} = r_{1}; _{2} = r_{1}r_{2}; _{n} = r_{1} _{n}:r$$
 (4:13)

The integral I (with = 1) can be now expressed as

where $d_j = e_j$ e_{j+1} . The number d_j is nonnegative by (4.12), and this nonnegativity makes our reasoning much simpler: that is why we re-numbered the index j.

The rst integration in (4.14), i.e. $\begin{bmatrix} R & n & 1 \\ 0 & n & n \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} R & n & 0 \\ n & n & 0 \end{bmatrix} (t + n + i0)$, can be done in a straightforward manner: using the identity $e = \begin{bmatrix} P & e \\ j=0 \end{bmatrix} c_j t^j (t + 1)^{e_j}$, where c_j is some constant, we not it is a sum of term soft the form

$$Ct^{j}f(t + n_{1})^{e_{n} j+1} \log(t + n_{1} + i0)$$
$$t^{e_{n} j+1} \log(t + i0)g$$
(4:15)

and polynom ials of the form

$$C^{0}t^{j}f(t+n_{1})^{e_{n}j+1}t^{e_{n}j+1}q;$$

where C and C 0 are some constants.

If $d_{n-1} = 1$, the same computation can be done for the second integration (4.14). In this case we do not need to combine the first term and the second term in (4.15). That is, we perform the integration of these terms separately. If d_{n-1} is equal to 0, we first define an integral J by

where $= e_n \quad j+1$ is a positive integer. Then we have

$$\begin{array}{cccc} (t\frac{d}{dt} &)J(t) \\ &= {\begin{array}{*{20}c} {{}^{2}} & 1 & {\frac{d_{1}}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{d_{2}}{2}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{2}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{2}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{2}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{2}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{2}} & {\frac{Z}{1}} & {\frac{Z}{1}}$$

$$\int_{1}^{n_{Y}(j)} (t \frac{d}{dt} (j)) I_{j}(t) = \int_{k}^{X} (C_{k} \log (t + i0) + C_{k}^{0}) t^{k} + A; \qquad (4:17)$$

where A is analytic att = 0. Here n (j) n 1; (j) is an integer e_n j+1;k ranges over a nite subset of integers e_n j+1, and C_k and C_k^0 are constants. As a solution of the equation (4.17), I_j (t) [m odulo a function analytic att = 0] is a sum of term s of the form

$$C t^{N} (\log(t + i0))^{m}$$

with a constant C and integers N e_n j+1 and m n. Thus I (t) consists of term s of the required form (4.10). Note that m in $e_j = e_n$ by the re-num bering of the index j.

R em ark 4.3. (i) If log $(t + r_1 :::r_n + i0)$ in (4.9) is replaced by $(t + r_1 :::r_n + i0)$ (: non-integer), the resulting integral is a nite sum of terms of the form

$$Ct^{+e} (\log (t + i0))^{m}$$
 (4:10⁰)

with an integer e m in $e_j + 1$ and a non-negative integer m n - 1. If f = 1, then the condition on e is the sam e as above but the condition on m is replaced by m - n.

(ii) Let $a(r^0)$ be an analytic function of $r^0 = (r_1^0 :::; r_n^0)$, in a closed \cube" C = [;1] ::: [;1](> 0). Then the following integral F (a) has the same singularity as I (t), or a weaker one :

$$F(a) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dr_{1}^{0} \cdots \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dr_{n}^{0} a(r^{0}) \int_{0}^{Z} r_{1}^{e_{1}} dr_{1} \cdots \int_{0}^{Z} r_{n}^{e_{n}} dr_{n} \log(t + r_{1}^{0} \cdots r_{n}^{0} + i0):$$

In fact, for r^0 in C we nd

$$= \int_{0}^{Z} r_{1}^{e_{1}} dr_{1} \cdots \int_{0}^{Z} r_{n}^{e_{n}} dr_{n} \log (t + r_{1}^{0} \cdots r_{m}^{0} r_{1} \cdots r_{n} + i0)$$

$$= \int_{0}^{Z} r_{1}^{e_{1}} dr_{1} \cdots \int_{0}^{Z} r_{n}^{e_{n}} dr_{n} f \log (\frac{t}{r_{1}^{0} \cdots r_{m}^{0}} + r_{1} \cdots r_{n} + i0)$$

$$+ \log (r_{1}^{0} \cdots r_{m}^{0}) g:$$

Since the contribution from $\log(r_1^0:::r_m^0)$ to F (a) is an analytic function, it su ces to consider the contribution from $\log(\frac{t}{r_1^0:::r_n^0} + r_1:::r_n + i0)$. Proposition 4.3 then tells us that it is a sum of terms of the form

$$dr_{1}^{0} ::: \overset{Z}{:::} dr_{n^{0}}^{0} a (r^{0}) \frac{t^{N}}{(r_{1}^{0} ::: r_{n^{0}}^{0})^{N}} (\log (t + i0) \log (r_{1}^{0} ::: r_{n^{0}}^{0}))^{m} :$$

Hence the singularity of F (a) near t = 0 is a sum of terms of the form (4.10). Note that the e ect of changing the upper end-point of the integral in (4.9) to

is absorbed by the harm less change of scaling in r variables and t variable (as was employed at the beginning of the proof of P roposition 4.3), on the condition that is a xed positive constant.

To generalize Proposition 4.3 to the form needed in section 6 we prepare the following Lemma:

Lem m a 4.1. Let L_m (t;a) (n = 1;2;:::;a a strictly positive constant), denote the following integral:

$$\int_{0}^{a} \frac{(\log w)^{m}}{t + w + i0} dw:$$

Then the singularity structure of L_m near t = 0 is as follows:

$$L_{m} = \sum_{j=1}^{n_{X}+1} C_{j} (\log (t + i0))^{j} + h (t)$$
(4:18)

where C_j (j = 1; ...; m + 1) are some a-dependent constants and h(t) is an a-dependent holom orphic function near t = 0.

Proof. Since $(\log w)^m$ (w) (a w)(a > 0) is well-de ned as a product of locally sum m able functions, the convolution-type integral L_m (t;a) is well-de ned, and

it is a boundary value of a holom orphic function on fIm t> 0g neart = 0. To nd out its explicit form (4.18), we rst apply an integration by parts:

$$L_{m} = \lim_{\#0} \sum_{w \to 0}^{X} \frac{a}{w} \frac{(\log (w + i0))^{m-1}}{w + i0} \log (t + w + i0) dw$$

$$+ (\log a)^{m} \log (a + t + i0) \quad (\log (+ i0))^{m} \log (t + + i0)$$

$$= \lim_{\#0} \sum_{w \to 0}^{X} \frac{a}{w} \frac{(\log (w + i0))^{m-1}}{w + i0} \log \frac{t + w + i0}{t + i0} dw$$

$$\sum_{w \to 0}^{Z} \frac{a}{w} \frac{(\log (w + i0))^{m-1}}{w + i0} dw \log (t + i0) \quad (\log (+ i0))^{m} \log (t + + i0)g$$

$$+ (\log a)^{m} \log (a + t + i0)$$

$$= \lim_{\substack{w \in \mathbb{Z} \\ w \neq 0}} \frac{m (\log (w + i0))^{m-1}}{w + i0} \log \frac{t + w + i0}{t + i0} dw$$

$$(\log (+i0))^{m} \log \frac{t + + i0}{t + i0} + (\log a)^{m} \log \frac{t + a + i0}{t + i0}$$
(4:19)

Let us note that, if Im t > 0,

$$(\log (+ i0))^{m} \log \frac{t + i0}{t + i0} = (\log (+ i0))^{m} \frac{+ i0}{t + i0} \frac{1}{2} \frac{+ i0}{t + i0} + \frac{!}{!} = 0$$

as #0.Hence we obtain

$$L_m = M_m$$
 (loga)^m log(t + i0) + (loga)^m log(t + a + i0); (4:20)

where

$$M_{m} = \lim_{\#0} \frac{Z_{a}}{w + i0} \frac{m (\log (w + i0))^{m-1}}{w + i0} \log \frac{t + w + i0}{t + i0} dw :$$
(4.21)

Since $(\log (w + i0))^{m-1}$ is locally summable, the reasoning used to verify the well-de nedness of the integral $\int_{0}^{\frac{1}{r}} \log \frac{t + r + i0}{t + i0}$ (cf. the beginning of this appendix) is applicable also to M_m . To indout the explicit form of M_m , let us rst note

$$M_{1} = C_{2} (\log (t + i0))^{2} + C_{1} (\log (t + i0)) + h (t)$$

holds near t = 0 for som e constants C_1 ; C_2 and som e holom orphic function h(t). (Cf. (42)). Thus we can verify (4.18) for n = 1. For n > 1, we use m athem at ical induction: Let us suppose (4.18) is veried for $1 \text{ m} \text{ m}_0$. Since

$$t\frac{d}{dt}M_{m_0+1} = \int_{0}^{2} \frac{(m_0+1)(\log(w+i0))^{m_0}}{t+w+i0} dw = (m_0+1)L_{m_0}; \quad (4.22)$$

using the induction hypothesis, we distribute that $(t_{dt}^{\underline{d}})^{m_0+1}L_{m_0}$ is holom orphic near t = 0. This means that $(t_{dt}^{\underline{d}})^{m_0+2}M_{m_0+1}$ is holom orphic near t = 0. O there is stated,

$$M_{m_0+1} = \int_{j=1}^{m_{X_0}+2} \mathcal{C}_j (\log (t + i0))^j + \hat{h} (t)$$

holds near t = 0 for som e constants $\mathfrak{C}_{j}(j = 1; :::; m_{0} + 2)$ and som e holom orphic function h(t). Therefore (4.20) in plies that (4.18) is true for $m = m_{0} + 1$. Thus the induction proceeds.

P roposition 4.4. (i) Let $K_{n,m}$ (t) (n; m = 1; 2; 3; ...) denote the following integral (with > 0):

$$\int_{0}^{Z} (\log r_{0})^{m} dr_{0} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \cdots \int_{j=1}^{Z_{1}} dr_{j} (t + r_{0}r_{1} \cdots r_{n} + i0)^{-1}$$
(4.23)

Then the singularity structure of $K_{n,m}$ (t) near t = 0 is as follows:

$$K_{n,m}(t) = \int_{j=1}^{n+x^{m+1}} C_{j} (\log (t + i0))^{j} + h(t); \qquad (4.24)$$

where C_j (j = 1; :::; n + m + 1) are some constants and h (t) is some holom orphic function near t = 0.

(ii) Let $J_{n,m}$ (t) (n; m = 1; 2; 3; .::) denote the following integral:

$$\int_{0}^{Z} (\log r_{0})^{m} dr_{0} \prod_{j=1}^{Z} \int_{1}^{Z} r_{j} r_{j} dr_{j} \log (t + r_{0}r_{1} :::r_{n} + i0):$$
(4.25)

Then the singularity structure of $J_{n,m}$ (t) near t = 0 is as follows:

$$J_{n,m}(t) = \int_{j=1}^{n+\chi n+1} C_{j}t(\log(t+i0))^{j} + h(t); \qquad (4.26)$$

where C_j (j = 1; :::; n + m + 1) are some constants and h (t) is some holom orphic function near t = 0.

Proof. (i) Let j(j = 0;1; ...;n) denote $\int_{i=0}^{Q} r_i$. Then $K_{n,m}$ assumes the follow-ing form :

$$\sum_{0}^{Z} \frac{(\log_{0})^{m}}{0} d_{0} \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{d_{1}}{1} \cdots \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{d_{n-1}}{n-1} \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{d_{n-1}}{1} d_{n} (t+n+i0)^{-1}$$

Hencewe nd

$$(t \frac{d}{dt})^{n} K_{n,m} (t) = \int_{0}^{Z} \frac{(\log_{0})^{m}}{t + 0 + i0} d_{0}$$

Therefore Lemma 4.1 shows that $(t_{dt}^{d})^{n+m+1}K_{n,m}$ (t) is holomorphic near t = 0. This entails (4.24).

(ii) Since $\frac{d}{dt} J_{n,m} = K_{n,m}$, the result (i) entails

$$\frac{d}{dt}J_{n} = \int_{j=1}^{n+\chi_{n+1}} C_{j} (\log (t + i0))^{j} + h(t)$$
(4.27)

holds for some constants C_j and a holom orphic function h(t). Hence, by integrating both sides of (4.27), we nd (4.26). Here we have used a form ula

 $\sum_{t=0}^{Z} (\log t)^{N} dt = t \sum_{t=0}^{X^{N}} (1) \frac{N!}{(N-t)!} (\log t)^{N-t}$

The following generalization of Proposition 4.4 is used in section 6 Proposition 4.5. Let $L_{n,m}$ (t) (n; m = 1; 2; 3; ...) denote the following integral (with $_0 > 0$), where e_j (j = 0; 1; ...; n) is a non-negative integer:

$$\sum_{0}^{Z_{0}} (\log r_{0})^{m} r_{0}^{e_{0}} dr_{0} \sum_{0}^{Z_{1}} \cdots \sum_{j=1}^{Z_{1}} r_{j}^{e_{j}} dr_{j} \log (t + r_{0}r_{1}r_{2} \cdots r_{n} + i0):$$

Then the singular part of $L_{n,m}$ (t) near t = 0 is a nite sum of terms of the following form:

$$C_{N,p} t^{N} (\log(t + i0))^{p};$$
 (4.28)

where $C_{N,p}$ is a constant, N is a non-negative integer ($\min_{\substack{0 \ j \ n}} e_j + 1$) and p is a positive integer (n + m + 1).

P roof. Making use of the scaling transformation of r_0 and t as in the proof of P roposition 4.3, we may assume without loss of generality that $_0 = 1$. Furthermore, as the role of variables r_j (j = 1; ...; n) is uniform, we may assume, by re-labelling of the variables r_j (j = 1; ...; n), that $e_1 = e_2 :... = e_n$. If $e_0 = e_1$ then the m ethod used in the proof of P roposition 4.3, supplemented by Lemma 4.1, establishes the required result. However, this condition cannot be expected to hold in general, and hence we must generalize. Introducing the new variables $j = r_0 r_1 : r_j$ (j = 0;1; :::;n) we nd

$$L_{n,m}(t) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} (\log_{0})^{m} \int_{0}^{d_{0} - 1} d_{0} \int_{0}^{0} \int_{1}^{d_{1} - 1} d_{1} \cdots \int_{0}^{n - 2} \int_{n - 1}^{d_{n - 1} - 1} d_{n - 1}$$

where $d_j = e_j \quad e_{j+1}$. As noted above, the proof is nished if $d_j = 0$. Let us consider the case $d_0 < 0$. We then use mathematical induction on m. When m = 1, we use the following:

$$\frac{d}{d_{0}} ((\log_{0}) \circ_{0}^{d_{0}} F(\circ; t)) = d_{0} (\log_{0}) \circ_{0}^{d_{0}-1} F(\circ; t) + \circ_{0}^{d_{0}-1} F(\circ; t) + (\log_{0}\circ) \circ_{0}^{d_{0}} \frac{\partial F(\circ; t)}{\partial \circ} :$$

$$(4.29)$$

C hoosing

as F ($_0$;t), we obtain

$$d_{0}L_{n;1} = (\log_{0}) {}_{0}^{d_{0}}F(_{0};t)j_{0}=1 \lim_{\substack{0 \neq 0 \\ 0 \neq 0}} ((\log_{0}) {}_{0}^{d_{0}}F(_{0};t))$$

$$Z_{1} \qquad Z_{1} \qquad (\log_{0}) {}_{0}^{e_{0}} {}_{0}^{e_{1}} {}_{0}^{e_{1}} {}_{0}^{e_{2}} {}_{1}^{e_{2}} 1$$

$$\int_{0}^{0} Z_{1} \qquad Z_{n}^{n} \qquad (\log_{0}) {}_{0}^{e_{0}} {}_{0}^{e_{1}} {}_{0}^{e_{1}} {}_{0}^{e_{2}} {}_{1}^{e_{2}} 1$$

$$\int_{0}^{d_{2}} Z_{n}^{n} \qquad Z_{n}^{n} \log(t+n+i0)d_{n}: \qquad (4:30)$$

For notational convenience, let A_j (j = 1;2;3;4) denote the j-th term in RHS of (4.30). Since F (1;t) is a well-de ned integral (cf. Proposition 4.3), A_1 vanishes because of the trivial fact log 1 = 0. To con m that A_2 also vanishes, we note that

$$\frac{1}{t+n}$$
 C

holds if Im t > 0 and n is real. Then we nd, for $_0$ 0;

$$f(_{0};t)j = C \int_{0}^{Z} \int_{1}^{0} d_{1} d_{1} \cdots \int_{0}^{n-1} d_{n} d_{n}$$
$$= \frac{C \int_{j=1}^{0} (e_{j}+1)}{2 \int_{j=1}^{n} (e_{j}+1)}:$$

T herefore

$$A_2j$$
 C $\lim_{0^{\# 0}} \frac{(\log_0)}{2} \frac{e_0+1}{1} = 0$:

Since is an arbitrary positive number, this means that A_2 vanishes.

The term A_3 has the same structure as the integral discussed in Proposition 4.3, and hence its singular part is a sum of terms of the form (4.28). Note that we can re-label all variables including r_0 if we go back to r-variables from - variables in the integral A_3 ; the factor log $_0$ has disappeared in A_3 .

F inally let us study A_4 . As it has the form $L_{n-1;1}$, we can apply the above procedure to it. Repeating this procedure, we eventually end up with one of the following two integrals (i) or (ii), together with terms of the form (4.28):

(i)
$$L_{n^{0};1} (n^{0} < n)$$
 with $d_{0} = 0$
(ii) $\overset{R_{1}}{_{0}} (\log_{0}) \overset{e_{0}+1}{_{0}} \log (t + _{0} + i0) d_{0}$.

By using Lemma 4.1 together with the method of the proof of Proposition 4.3, we can verify that the singular part of either of them is a sum of terms of the form (4.28).

Thus the proof is nished if m = 1. Let us consider next the case m = 2. We then use

$$\frac{d}{d_{0}} ((\log_{0})^{m} \circ_{0}^{d_{0}} F(\circ;t)) = d_{0} (\log_{0})^{m} \circ_{0}^{d_{0}-1} F(\circ;t) + m (\log_{0})^{m-1} \circ_{0}^{d_{0}-1} F(\circ;t) + (\log_{0})^{m} \circ_{0}^{d_{0}} \frac{\partial F(\circ;t)}{\partial \theta} :$$

$$(4:31)$$

A sbefore, we concentrate our attention on the case $d_0 < 0$. Choosing as F ($_0$;t) the same integral as was used when m = 1, we indicate the same reasoning as before applies to the contribution from the LHS of (4:31) and the third term on the RHS of (4:31). When integrated over [0, 1] (with respect to $_0$), the

second term on the RHS of (4:31) turns out to be m $L_{n,m-1}$. Thus the induction proceeds, completing the proof.

5. W eakness of the singularity in the general non-separable m erom orphic case.

To con m the weakness of the singularity in the non-separable m erom orphic case we rst need to verify

$$\frac{2}{\theta_{i}}$$
 (q) $j_{=0} \in 0;$ (5.1)

where $_{i} = r_{1}$ $_{i}$, with i being the index labelling the rst bridge line; i.e., i is the smallest j such that the photon line j has a merom orphic coupling on both ends, and completes to a closed loop | constructed according to the rules specified below Eq.(2) in Ref. 2 | that ow's along at least one -segment. The k_{i} -dependent vector is chosen so that at ' = 0 the pole factor associated with each -segment can be evaluated at the critical point $p_{i}(q_{i})$ (s = 1;2;3), de ned below Fig. 1 in Ref. 2, with $q = (q_{i}; q_{i}; q_{i})$ the set of external variables de ned there.

The vector is constructed in the following way. Introduce for each bridge line i an open ow line L (k) that passes along this photon line i, but along no other photon line, and along no -segment. Instead, the ow line L (A) enters the diagram at one of the three vertices v_i and haves at another. Speci cally, let e be an end-point of the photon line i, and let s be the side of the triangle on which e lies. This point e separates s into two connected components, s^0 and s, where s is the part of s that contains the -seqment. Run L (k) along the component s^0 . At the end-point of s^0 that coincides with a vertex v_i of the triangle diagram, run L (k_i) out along the external line q_i (j = 1;2 or 3). Do the same for the other end-point of the line i. Include on L (k_i) also the same ent i itself. This produces a continuous ow line. O rient it so that it agrees with the orientation of the line i. This oriented line is the ow line L (k). Then for each external line q_i along which L (k_i) runs add to the vector q_i either + k_i or k_i according to whether the orientation of L (k_i) is the same as, or opposite to, the orientation of the external line q_i along which L (k_i) runs. Sum up the contributions from all of the bridge lines. This shift in $q = (q_1; q_2; q_3)$ is the vector .

The function of interest has the form

$$F (q) = \begin{cases} Y^{n} Z & Y^{n} Z^{1} \\ & & \\ j = 1 & j^{e_{j}=1} \end{cases} \begin{pmatrix} Y^{n} Z^{1} & r_{j}^{e_{j}} dr_{j} & r_{j}^{e_{j}} dr_{j} \\ & & \\ A (q; ;r) \log' (q); \end{cases}$$
(52)

where

D log' (q) + E =
$$\int_{p}^{Z} d^{4}p \int_{s=1}^{Y^{3}} \frac{1}{p_{s}^{2} - m^{2} + i0}$$
; (5.3)

and A, D, and E are holom orphic.

Here

$$p_{1} = p + q_{1} + \sum_{\substack{m = i \\ m = i}}^{X^{n}} k_{m};$$

$$p_{2} = p \quad q_{3} + \sum_{\substack{m = i \\ m = i}}^{X^{n}} k_{m};$$
(5:4)

and

$$p_3 = p + \sum_{\substack{m = i}}^{X^n} k_m;$$

with each sm either zero or one.

We are interested in the singularity of this function at the point q on ' (q) = 0. This singularity comes from the p-space point p = p(q), and we can consider the p-space domain of integration to be some small neighborhood of p. Similarly, the domain in (r;) is connect to a region R in which the following conditions hold:

$$\begin{pmatrix} p + b_{1} \end{pmatrix} \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m=1}}^{X^{n}} \lim_{\substack{m=1 \\ m=1}} k_{m} = i & i_{1} \\ k_{m} = i & i_{2} \\ m = i & i_{2} \\ p & \sum_{\substack{m=1 \\ m=1}}^{X^{n}} \lim_{\substack{m=1 \\ m=1}} k_{m} = i & i_{3}: \end{cases}$$
(5:5)

That is, the real parts of the three denom inators in (5:3) are close to zero, and the in aginary parts are positive: $_{s}$ 0 (s = 1;2;3); $_{s}^{P}$ > 0. It was shown in Ref. 2 that the contours can be distorted in a way such that (5.5) holds in a neighborhood of the points contributing to the singularity at **q**.

Note that all of the k_m that contribute to (5:5) belong to bridge lines, and hence have a factor i. Thus none of the r_j (j i) enter into (5:5). Hence the region R is independent of the variables r_j (j i).

The quantity = $(_1; _2; _3)$ is added to $q = (q_1; q_2; q_3)$, and it satisfies, in analogy to $P_{q_1} = 0$, the condition $P_{i} = 0$. This trivector is a sum of terms, one for each bridge line. For each bridge line j the corresponding term in

is proportional to k_j . If line j bridges over (only) the star line on side s = 1then the contribution to is $(k_j;k_j;0)$. If line j bridges over (only) the star line on side s = 2 then the contribution to is $(0; k_j;k_j)$. If the line j bridge (only) over the star line on side s = 3 then the contribution to is $(k_j;0; k_j)$.

The gradient of '(q) is also a trivector. The condition $P_{q_i} = 0$ in q space m eans that the gradient (which is in the dual space) is de ned modulo translations: i ! i + X, all i. Thus one can take r' to have a null second component. Then at the point q of interest the gradient has the form ³

$$r' = (_{1}\mathbf{p}_{1};0; _{2}\mathbf{p}_{2});$$
 (5:6)

provided the sign and normalization of ' are appropriately de ned. Hence the quantity on the left-hand side of (5.1) is, at q = q,

$$\frac{\underline{\theta'}(\mathbf{q})}{\underline{\theta}_{i}} = \mathbf{r'} \frac{\underline{\theta}_{i}}{\underline{\theta}_{i}}$$
$$= \sum_{s=1 m = i}^{X^{3} X^{n}} \sum_{s=1 m = i}^{s} \mathbf{p}_{s sm} \mathbf{k}_{m} = \mathbf{i}$$
(5:7)

which, according to (5.5), is nonzero, as claimed in (5.1). Use has been made here of the Landau equation ${}^{P}{}_{s}\mathbf{p}_{s} = 0$.

Using (5.1) we now employ the result in section 3 to normalize the de ning function ' of the Landau surface so that we may apply Proposition 4.3 of Section 4 to the integral F in question. It follows from Lemma 3.1 in Appendix 3 that the following normalization holds on a neighborhood of the point in question:

$$' (q) = B (q; _{i}; k^{0} = _{i}) (_{i} ' (q) = C (q; k^{0} = _{i}));$$
 (5:8)

where B and C are di erent from 0 at any point in question, and k^0 denotes the totality of the bridge lines k_1 . Note that each bridge k_j contains a factor i_j and

that $k^0 = i$ is independent of i. Let us now apply P roposition 4.3 in section 4 to the following integral I:

$$I = \int_{0}^{Z} r_{1}^{e_{1}} dr_{1} \int_{0}^{z} r_{2}^{e_{2}} dr_{2} \int_{0}^{Z} r_{1}^{e_{1}} dr_{1} \log(r_{1} - r_{2}):$$
(5:9)

Then we nd [m odub a function analytic at ' = 0]

$$I = E (q; k^{0} = i) (' (q) = C (q; l^{0} = i))^{N} \qquad \sum_{j=0}^{X^{1}} a_{j} (q; k^{0} = i)$$
$$(\log (' (q) = C (q; k^{0} = i)))^{j} \qquad (5:10)$$

with N 1, and E and a_j being holomorphic in their arguments, and, in particular, in the r_j 's (j > i).

The function A in (5.2) is holom orphic. This factor has no important e ect on the result: it can be incorporated by using Remark 4.3 (ii) of section 4.

6. Computation for the Nonmerom orphic Case

The computation in the nonmerom orphic case is similar to the computation for the merom orphic case described in section 5 with the help of section 3. Let the special index i be now the smallest integer such that photon line i is either a bridge line or a photon line with a nonmerom orphic coupling on at least one end.

If line i is a bridge line (and hence, by de nition, has a merom orphic coupling on each end, and bridges across a -segment) then the argument used for the merom orphic case continues to work. This is because the condition (5.1) of section 5 continues to hold, and each variable $_j$ associated with a nonmerom orphic coupling acts just like a variable r_j (j > i) of sections 3 and 5.

If, on the other hand, the index i labels a line with a nonmerom orphic coupling on at least one end then (5.1) m ay fail, because in this case the variable k_i m ay enter into only in the form $_ik_i$ (or $_i^0k_i$). For example, if the photon line i runs between two di erent sides, s and s^0 , and has a nonmerom orphic coupling on both ends then, according to (10.8b) of ref. 1, the vector k_i enters into only in the combinations $_ik_i$ or $_i^0k_i$, where $_i$ and $_i^0$ are the variables associated with the two di erent nonmerom orphic couplings of line i. Hence the derivative on occurring in (5.7) will introduce a factor $_i$ or $_i^0$ into each k_i -dependent contribution to (5.7). Since $_i$ and $_i^0$ vanish in the domain of integration, and all other contributions have factors r_j (j > i), which can vanish, the property (5.1) can fail.

Similarly, if only one end of line i is coupled nonmerom ophically, say into the side s, but the closed loop i does not pass through the star line for either of the other two sides $s^0 \notin s$, then again (5.1) can fail, for essentially the same reason.

These failures of (5.1) cannot be avoided by simply using ${}^{0}_{i} = {}_{i i}$ (or ${}^{0}_{i i}$) in place of ${}_{i}$, because the condition in (3.1) on $k^{0} = {}_{i}$ fails if ${}_{i}$ is replaced by ${}^{0}_{i}$.

In this section the $\ensuremath{\sc self-energy"}$ photons that couple nonmerom orphically on both ends onto the same side s will be ignored: they are treated in section 7.

To deal with the new cases we introduce the set of variables x_j (j J) to represent both the r_j (j > i), and also the occurring variables $_j$ (j i) and $_j^0$ (j i). This set x_j (j J) replaces the set r_j (j > i) that occurs in the argu-

ments of section 3 and 5.

U sing the evaluation (5.6) for the constant gradient vector r' we de ne a new variable

$$= r'$$

$$= \sum_{s=1m=i}^{X^3} x^n \sum_{sm} b_s \sum_{sm}^0 k_m; \qquad (6:6)$$

where the reasoning leading to (5.7) has been used. However, ${}^0_{sm}$ can be 0, 1, ${}_m$, or 0_m , with the latter two possibilities coming from the possible nonmerom orphic couplings.

In the case under consideration the photon line i has a nonmerom orphic coupling on one or both ends. If this line i has a nonmerom orphic coupling on only one end, and the ${}^{0}_{si}$ associated with the other end is 1, then (5.1) again holds, and the method used in the merom orphic case again works. In the remaining, cases (namely those for which ${}^{0}_{si} \in 1$ for all s) the function $r_{0} = = i$ has a term ${}_{i}p_{s}$ i (or ${}^{0}_{i}p_{s}$ i) and no other dependence on ${}_{i}$ (or ${}^{0}_{i}$). Hence the variable r_{0} may be introduced as a new variable, replacing ${}_{i}$ (or ${}^{0}_{i}$), provided the associated coe cient p_{s} is nonzero.

The arguments of Ref. 2, slightly extended to include the $_j$, show that \dot{p}_s i can be taken to be nonzero near points in the integration domain that lead to a singularity of the integral at \dot{q} . Hence the transform ation to the new set of variables (with r_0 replacing $_i$ or $_i^0$) is a holom orphic transform ation: all analyticity properties are maintained.

The derivative at (q) = iq of' (q) with respect to is

$$\frac{\underline{\theta'}(q)}{\underline{\theta}} = r' \frac{\underline{\theta}(0)}{\underline{\theta}}$$
$$= \frac{\underline{\theta}(r')}{\underline{\theta}}$$
$$= \frac{\underline{\theta}(r')}{\underline{\theta}}$$
$$= \frac{\underline{\theta}}{\underline{\theta}} = 1; \qquad (6:7)$$

Thus (5.1) is now satis ed (with $= r_1 :: r_1$ in place of $i = r_1 r_2 :: r_1$), and we can use the method of sections 3 and 5.

The function F (q) of (5.2) now takes the form

$$F (q) = \sum_{j=1}^{Y^{n} Z} d_{j} \prod_{j=1}^{Y^{i} Z_{1}} r_{j}^{e_{j}} dr_{j} dr_{0} G (q; r; r_{0});$$
(6.8)

where

$$G (q;r;r_0) = \begin{cases} Y & Z_1 \\ & x_j^{e_j} dx_j (r_0 + j^1 r') \\ & J_J & 0 \end{cases}$$

A (q; ;r;x) log' (q); (6:9)

and log' (q) is de ned in (5.3) and (5.4), but with the ${}^0_{sm}$ in place of the ${}_{sm}$. Notice that the ${}^R_{dr_0}$ can be cancelled by the function to give the generalization of (5.2) engendered by the action of the nonmerom orphic-part operators of (10.8b) in Ref. 1.

The expression for G given in (6.9) is well de ned only for realr (i.e., only for real k_j (j i)). A more general de nition is this: (1), have the dr_0 and function out of (6.8) and (6.9); (2), change the variable i (or i^0) to r_0 ; (3), replace the d_i (or d_i^0) by dr_0 ; (4), identify G as the integrand of this integral over dr_0 .

Near the point & one can write

$$(q) = (q) r'$$

= $(q) + r'$
(6:10)

Insertion of (6.10) into (6.8) and (6.9) gives

$$F(q) = \begin{cases} Y^{n-Z} & Y^{i-Z-1} & Z \\ & y^{i-1} & y^{i-2-1} & Y^{i-2-1} \\ & y^{i-1} & y^{i-2-1} & y^{i-2-1} \\ & y^{i-2-1} & y^{i-2-1} & y^{i-2-1} \\$$

where

$$f(r_{0};r;;q) = \int_{j}^{Y} \int_{0}^{Z} x_{j}^{e_{j}} dx_{j} (r_{0} + r' e) A(q;;r;x); \qquad (6:12)$$

and e = 1.

Equation (6.11) exhibits the sm earing of the log ' (q) singularity. If $(r_0; r; ;q)$ were to have a function singularity at $r_0 = 0$ then the expression (6.12) would yield a singularity of the form $\log \prime$ (q). But if f has only a milder singularity at $r_0 = 0$ then F (q) will have a weaker singularity at \prime (q) = 0.

Let us examine, then, the form off $(r_0; r; ;q)$. Let the particular x_j that is i be called simply . Then r' ^e will be (a + P), where P is a sum of terms each of which is a coe cient of the form $p_s(q)_j$ times a product $r_{i+1}r_{i+2}$:: r_j , or $r_{i+1}r_{i+2}$:: r_{j-j} , or $r_{i+1}r_{i+2}$:: r_{j-j}^0 . Eventually the coe cients $p_s(q)_j$ will be shifted to nonzero complex numbers. But we shall evaluate the integrals rst at points where each $p_s(q)_j = 1$, a = A = 1, and each $e_j = 0$.

Consider rst, then, for $0 < \mathfrak{r} < 1$, the simple example $Z_1 Z_1 Z_1$

$$f(\mathbf{r}_{0}) = \begin{bmatrix} d & d\mathbf{x}_{1} & d\mathbf{x}_{2} & (\mathbf{r}_{0} & \mathbf{x}_{1}\mathbf{x}_{2}) \end{bmatrix}$$
(6:13)

Using the function to eliminate the d we obtain (with the Heaviside function)

$$f(r_{0}) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{1} dx_{2} (r_{0} x_{1}x_{2})$$

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{1} dx_{2} (r_{0} x_{1}x_{2})$$

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{1} dx_{2} (1 \frac{r_{0}}{x_{1}})$$

$$+ \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{1} dx_{2} (\frac{r_{0}}{x_{1}} 1)$$

$$= r_{0} \int_{r_{0}}^{Z_{1}} \frac{dx_{1}}{x_{1}} + \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{1}$$

$$= r_{0} (\log r_{0} + 1):$$
(6:14)

Thus in this case the singularity of the function $f(r_0)$ is much weaker than (r_0) : $f(r_0)$ is bounded and tends to zero as r_0 tends to zero.

The general form of $f(r_0)$ is

$$f(r_0) = \int_{j_J^0}^{Y_{2_1}} dx_j (r_0 P); \qquad (6:15)$$

where P is as de ned above. One sees in mediately that f (r_0) is bounded, and tends to zero with r_0 .

To begin the study of the general form of (r_0) let us consider a case slightly more complicated than (6.14):

$$f(\mathbf{r}_{0}) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} d\mathbf{x}_{1} d\mathbf{x}_{2} d\mathbf{x}_{3} (\mathbf{r}_{0} \mathbf{x}_{1}\mathbf{x}_{2}\mathbf{x}_{3})$$

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{1} dh (r_{0} x_{1}h)$$

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{2} dx_{3} (h x_{2}x_{3})$$

$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx_{1} dh (r_{0} x_{1}h)H (h); (6:16)$$

where (for 0 < h < 1)

$$H(h) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \frac{dx_{2}}{dx_{2}} dx_{3} (h x_{2}x_{3})$$
$$= \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} \frac{dx_{2}}{dx_{2}} (1 \frac{h}{x_{2}})$$
$$= \int_{h}^{Z_{1}} \frac{dx_{2}}{dx_{2}} = (\log h):$$
(6:17)

Notice that the last line of (6.16) has the same form as the $\,$ rst line of (6.14), but with a di erent function H . Substituting the function H (h) from (6.17) into (6.16) one obtains, for $0 < r_0 < 1$,

$$f(\mathbf{r}_{0}) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} d\mathbf{x}_{1} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} d\mathbf{h} \left(\frac{\mathbf{r}_{0}}{\mathbf{x}_{1}} - \mathbf{h}\right) \left(\log \mathbf{h}\right)$$

$$= \int_{r_{0}}^{Z_{1}} d\mathbf{x}_{1} \int_{0}^{Z_{r_{0}}=\mathbf{x}_{1}} d\mathbf{h} \left(\log \mathbf{h}\right)$$

$$= \int_{r_{0}}^{Z_{r_{0}}} d\mathbf{x}_{1} \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} d\mathbf{h} \left(\log \mathbf{h}\right)$$

$$= \int_{r_{m}}^{Z} C_{nm} (\mathbf{r}_{0})^{n} (\log \mathbf{r}_{0})^{m}; \qquad (6:18)$$

where only a nite number of the constant coe cients $C_{nm}\,$ are nonzero.

A function of one variable x having, in 0 < x < 1, the form ${}^{P} C_{nm} x^{n} (\log x)^{m}$, and bounded in 0×1 , with some nite number of nonzero coe cients C_{nm} , will be said to have form F. Thus the functions f (r_{0}) specified in (6:14) and (6:16) both have form F.

In fact, the general function $f(r_0)$ of the form specified in (6:15) has form F. To see this note in rst that if we replace the factor H (h) = (logh) in (6.16) by any function H (h) of form F then $f(r_0)$ has form F:

$$f(r_0) = \int_{r_0}^{Z_1} dx_1 \int_{0}^{Z_{r_0=x_1}} dh H(h)$$

$$+ \sum_{0}^{Z} \sum_{r_{0}} \frac{x_{1}}{0} dh H (h)$$

$$= r_{0} \sum_{r_{0}}^{Z} \frac{1}{(x^{0})^{2}} \frac{dx^{0}}{0} dh H (h)$$

$$+ r_{0} \sum_{0}^{Z} \frac{1}{0} dh H (h)$$
(6:19)

Then (4.8) and Lemma 4:1 give the result that if H (h) has form F then f (r_0) has form F. (Note that every term in ${}^{R_{x^0}}_{0}$ dhH (h) has a factor x^0 , and hence the denominator (x^0)² is reduced to x^0 .) So our problem is to show that f (r_0) can be reduced to the form (6.16) with H (h) having the form F.

To show this let I (g) be some function of form F and consider the integral operator H $_{\rm h}$ de $\,$ ned by

$$H_{h}[I(g)] = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dx dg (h xg)I(g):$$
(6.20)

Then, for 0 < h < 1,

$$H_{h}I = \int_{h}^{Z_{1}} \frac{dx}{x} I(\frac{h}{x})$$
$$= \int_{h}^{Z_{1}} \frac{dx^{0}}{x^{0}} I(x^{0}); \qquad (6.21)$$

where $x^0 = h=x$. Then (4.8) and Lemma 4:1 entail that if I has form F, so does H_hI.

Repeated application of this result shows that if $P = x_1 x_2 ::: x_p$ then $f(r_0)$ has form F.One is combines $x_{p-1} x_p$ into h_p , then combines $x_{p-2} h_p$ into h_{p-1} , etc.. At each stage the functions I and H have form F, and hence one nally gets (6.16) with H (h) having form F, as required.

The general form of P is not just a single product r_{i+1} :: r_j : it is a sum of such terms with di erent values of j, some of which can be multiplied by $_j$ or $_j^0$. However, these other terms can be brought into the required form by a generalization of the operator technique used above.

Let us again consider rst a simple case:

$$f(r_0) = \int_{0}^{Z_1} dx dg dg dt (r_0 xt xg)I(g);$$
(6.22)

where I(g) has form F , and t could be a $\ _{\rm j}.$ Then

 $f(r_0) = \int_{0}^{Z_1} dx dh (r_0 xh)H(h); \qquad (6.23)$

where

$$H(h) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dg dt (h t g)I(g):$$
(624)

Thus

$$f(r_0) = \int_{0}^{Z_1} dx dh (r_0 xh)H(h) + \int_{0}^{Z_1} dx dh (r_0 xh)H(h):$$
(6.25)

For 0 < h < 1 the function H (h) is

$$H(h) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dg \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dt (h t g)I(g)$$

= $\int_{0}^{Z_{1}} dg I(g) (h g) (1 (h g))$
= $\int_{0}^{0} dg I(g);$ (6.26)

which has form F. Thus the set term in (6.25) gives a contribution $f_1(r_0)$ to $f(r_0)$ that has form F. The second term is, for $0 < r_0 < 1$,

$$f_{2}(r_{0}) = \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} & z_{2} \\ dx & dh & (r_{0} & xh)H(h) \\ = \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} & z_{2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} dh & (\frac{r_{0}}{x} & h) \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} \\ h & 1 \end{bmatrix} dg I(g) \\ = \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} & z_{r_{0}=x} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} dh & (\frac{r_{0}}{x} & 1) = (2 & \frac{r_{0}}{x}) \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} \\ h & 1 \end{bmatrix} dg I(g) \\ + \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} & z_{2} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} dh & (\frac{r_{0}}{x} & 2) \begin{bmatrix} z_{1} \\ h & 1 \end{bmatrix} dg I(g) \\ = \begin{bmatrix} z_{r_{0}} & z_{r_{0}=x} & z_{1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} dh & dg I(g) \\ = \begin{bmatrix} z_{r_{0}=2} & z_{2} & z_{1} \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} dh & dg I(g) \\ = r_{0} \begin{bmatrix} z_{2} & dx^{0} & z_{x^{0}} & z_{1} \\ 1 & h & 1 \end{bmatrix} dg I(g) + (r_{0}=2) \quad \text{const.} \\ = r_{0} \quad \text{const.}; \qquad (627)$$

which is also of form F.

The two important points are: (1), that the integral operator that reduces a sum t+ g to a single h, just like the operator that reduces a product tg to h, preserves form F; and (2), the extra part h > 1 does not disrupt the argum ent: it adds only a term r_0 const.

By taking combinations of these two kinds of operators, and a third kind with t xed at unity, rather than being integrated over, one can reduce any one of the possible functions $(r_0 P)$ to $(r_0 x_1h)$ combined with an H (h) of form F. Thus all functions f (r_0) of the kind (6:15) will be of the form F, provided we make the simple assignments $1 = a = A = p_s$ $_j = e_j + 1$. The remaining task is to show that essentially the same result follows even when we do not make these simple assignments. One other problem also needs to be addressed: we have computed the integrals on the variables r_j under the assumption that the variables j are held xed, whereas the distortions in the variables j can depend on the r_j .

By following through the arguments just given, but with the e_j now allowed to be nonnegative integers, one indicates the conclusions are not disrupted: the positive power n of r_0 in f (r_0) can be increased, and the positive power m of $\log r_0$ can be decreased, but changes in the opposite direction do not occur. Hence the singularities are at most weakened.

To deal sin ultaneously with the problem s of the dependence of A (q; ;r;x) upon (r;x), and the dependence of the distortion in upon (r;x), we introduce a su ciently small number = 1=N > 0, and divide the domain of integration 0 < x < 1 in each of the variables x_j and r_j into a sum of N intervals of length , such that (1), the distortion of the set of variables can be held xed over each separate product interval, and (2), for any subset of the set of variables r_j and x_j , and for the corresponding space S form ed by the product over of the corresponding set of leading intervals $0 < (r_j; x_j) <$, the dependence of A on these variables can be represented by a power series that converges within S for each point in the space form ed by the product over the complem entary set of variables of the nonleading intervals < x < 1. (See Rem ark 4.3 (ii).) The variables can then be re-scaled so that the original integration dom ains run from 0 to N, and the leading intervals (form erly from 0 to) now run from from 0

to 1. The earlier arguments can then be applied to the re-scaled problem, with the concept Yourn F' replaced by Yourn F⁰: a function of one variable x is said to have form F⁰ if and only if it is bounded in the interval 0 x 1, and in 0 < x < 1 can be written in the form

$$A_{m}$$
 (x) (log x)^m;

where the sum is over a nite set of integers m, and each A_m (x) is analytic on 0 < x < 1. The contributions from the integrations over the nonleading dom ains 1 < x < N do not disrupt the arguments, and form ula (4.8) shows that extra factors n + 1 are introduced into the denom inators at each integration, so that convergence at the level of the integral is, if anything, in proved over the original convergence at the level of the integrand. This takes care of these two problem s.

The nalstep is to remove the assumption that the coe cients of the various terms of P are unity: these coe cients are actually the quantities p_{s-1} .

There is no problem in allowing these coe cients to be strictly-positive -dependent functions: the constants C_{nm} , or the functions A_m , then simply become analytic functions of the variables p_{s-j} over these strictly-positive domains. In fact, these coe cients can be continued into the complex domain without a exting the character of the singularity at $r_j = 0$ provided we keep each coe cient away from the cut along the negative real axis in that variable, and keep the point C in the space of the collection of these coe cients away from all points where $a + P(C; x_j; r_j) = 0$ for some point in the product of the open domains of integration 0 < < 1, and (for all j) $0 < x_j < 1$ and $0 < r_j < 1$. Here $a = p_{s-j}$.

The points in the dom ain of integration over the variables $r_j;x_j; j$ that contribute to the singularity at ' = 0 are points where each of the three starline factors is evaluated at, or very close to, the associated pole. The arguments in ref. 2 show that in this region the start of the variables p_j , namely $p_{s-i} = a$ can be shifted into upper-half plane Im a > 0, and the collection of contours C can be distorted so that a + P is shifted into the upper-half plane provided 0 < 1 and, for all j, $0 < r_j < 1$ and $0 < x_j < 1$. This is exactly the condition that is needed to justify the extension of the results obtained above for positive real coelection the complex points of interest.

The dependence of the distortion of the contour on needs to be described. W hen one introduces the nonmerom orphic couplings, and hence the \mathbf{R}^{R} d , into the formula, the Landau matrix acquires a new column, the d column. However, the parameter enters in an almost trivial way: the pole residues associated with the side s of the triangle into which the vertex associated with is coupled are changed from $p_s(i_1 + ...)$ into $(p_s + i_k)(i_1 + ...)$, and the pole denominator $(p_s)^2$ m² is changed to $(p_s + ik_i)^2$ m². The new set of Landau equations can be satis ed at each of the two end points i = 1 and i = 0. These two solutions correspond to diagram s in which the vertex associated with i is placed at one end or the other of the side s of the triangle. Both solutions to the triangle-diagram equations exist, and, because of the null contributions in all d_i colum ns, the two solutions yield two di erent ways of distorting the i contours, 1 and 0, the rst corresponding to i = 1, the second corresponding to i = 0. An allowed distortion that gives these two cases and smoothly interpolates to the intermediate values of i is $i_1 + (1 i)_0$. It keeps the in aginary part of the pole denom inator strictly positive (near the zero of the realpart) for all values of _i in the dom ain 0 i 1. This distortion, or som e approximation to it, can be used in the argument given above.

For the remaining integrations on the dr_j (j i) one uses P ropositions 4.4 (ii) and 4.5, and R em ark 4.3 (ii). This gives for the singular part of F (q) at q a function of form F^0 , in some appropriately scaled variable ' (q), multiplied by an analytic function of q.

7. Computation for Self-Energy Case.

Contributions from photon lines j coupled nonmerom orphically on both ends into the same side s of the triangle were excluded from the discussion in section 6. For these values of j one can, in order to exclude double counting, in pose the condition $j = {}^{0}_{j}$, where j is the -parameter associated with the nonmerom orphic coupling on the tail of photon line j, and ${}^{0}_{j}$ is the -parameter associated with the nonmerom orphic coupling on the head of line j. M omentum k_{j} ow s along line j from its tail to its head, according to our conventions.

The form ulas of section 2 of Ref. 1 refer to momentum k_j owing out of the charged-particle line at the tail of the photon line j. The coupling at the head can be treated like the coupling at the tail, but with a reversal of the sign of k_j . Then the e ect of the two couplings into the same side s is to replace p_i by $p_s + (j = 0 \ j)k_j$, and to integrate on j_j from zero to one and on $0 \ j_j$ from zero to j_j . The condition Im $p_{s-j} > 0$ then retains its usual from . The reduction of the dom ain of integration does not upset the arguments of section 6.

To bring this case into accord with section 6 we use the following transformations:

$$\begin{array}{rcl}
 & z_{1} & z_{1} & & z_{1} \\
 & d & d^{0}f((& {}^{0})k) \\
 & z_{1} & z_{1} & & \\
 & d & d^{0}f(& (1 & {}^{0})k) \\
 & z_{1} & z_{1} & & \\
 & d & d^{0}f(& {}^{00}k) \\
 & z_{1} & z_{1} & & z_{1} \\
 & dhf(hk) & d & d^{00}(h & {}^{00}) \\
 & z_{1} & z_{1} & z_{1} & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & d & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & d & & \\
 & z_{1} & z_{1} & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & & & \\
 & z_{1} & & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & & & \\
 & z_{1} & & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & & & \\
 & z_{1} & & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & & & \\
 & z_{1} & & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & & & \\
 & dhf(hk) & & & \\
 & z_{1} & & & \\
 & z_{1$$

The variable h plays the role played by in section 6.

References

1. T.Kawai and H.P.Stapp, Quantum Electrodynamics at Large Distances I: Extracting the Correspondence {Principle Part. Law rence Berkeley Laboratory Report LBL 35971. Submitted to Phys. Rev.

2. T.Kawai and H.P.Stapp Quantum Electrodynamics at Large Distances II: Nature of the Dominant Singularities. Law rence Berkeley Laboratory Report LBL 35972. Submitted to Phys. Rev.

3. H.P. Stapp, in Structural Analysis of Collision Amplitudes, ed. R.Balian and D. Iagolnitzer, North Holland, New York (1976)