- The flat gauge we used so far leaves some "residual gauge filldom" Unfixed (related to the null states we have encountered).
- · We will now moke this explicit and fix the gauge further.
- Infinitesimal version: $\overline{\xi}^{IA} = \overline{\xi}^{A} + e^{q}(\overline{\xi})_{i} \qquad h_{ab}^{\prime}(\overline{\xi}) = h_{ab}(\overline{\xi}) - e^{c}\partial_{c}h_{ab} - \left(\partial_{a}e^{c}h_{cb} + \partial_{b}e^{c}h_{ac}\right)$ $= h_{ab} - \left(D_{a}e_{b} + D_{b}e_{a}\right) \qquad (Check!)$
- · The above condition represents 3 indep. eqs., which in light-come courdinates are:
 - $(1) 2 \omega \eta_{+-} = \partial_{+} \epsilon_{-} + \partial_{-} \epsilon_{+} \qquad (2) \partial_{+} \epsilon_{+} = 0 \quad \partial_{-} \epsilon_{-} = 0$ $(1) 2 \omega \eta_{+-} = \partial_{+} \epsilon_{-} + \partial_{-} \epsilon_{+} \qquad \qquad (2) \partial_{+} \epsilon_{+} = 0 \quad \partial_{-} \epsilon_{-} = 0$ $\partial_{+} \epsilon^{-} = 0 \quad \partial_{-} \epsilon^{+} = 0$

- Thus, (2) simply means that $e^- = e^-(6^-)$, $e^+ = e^+(6^+)$. Moreover (1) can always be implemented by deposing an appropriate for. ω .
- We nee that the group of residual gauge-trips is $\left(\text{Diff}(S^1)\right)^2$. We may recall that Diff(S1) is generated by the Wift-algebra (classically) and the Virasoro algebra (in the quantum theory).
- Not surprisingly, these algebras are precisely the algebras of Our constraints. The letter correspond to the statement $T_{ab} = 0$ in flat gauge. Thus, our constraints simply said that physstates must be invariant under residual gauge freedom.
 - With this under standing, we clearly see a logical alternative to DCQ: Fix the residual gauge predom classically. Then we will need fewer constraints when we quantize.
 - The gauge condition is roughly T ~ X⁺ + const.
 In other words, we measure time on the WS using the pullback the coordinate-fet. X⁺. By definition, there are then no X⁺-oscillators.



=>

(We do this gauge fixing on Polutions. It can also be done oll-shell, but this is not essential for us) $\partial_{+}\partial_{-}\left(X^{+}-\frac{2\pi \lambda'}{\ell}p^{+}\tau\right) = 0$ $\int_{-}^{+}\int_{-}^{-}\left(\xi^{+}+\sigma^{-}\right)$ We deliberately choose this to to correspond to the Centre- of-mass motion of our previous solutions.

$$=> \exists fcts. f(\sigma t) \& g(\sigma^{-}) \quad \text{such that}$$

$$X^{+} - (x^{+} + \frac{2\pi dt}{e} p^{+}\tau) = f(\sigma^{+}) + g(\sigma^{-})$$
Use residual gauge fundom to reparametrize $\sigma^{+} \& \sigma^{-} \text{ s.t.}$

$$\frac{2\pi d}{e} p^{+} \cdot \frac{\sigma^{+}}{2} - f(\sigma^{+}) = \frac{2\pi dt}{e} p^{+} \cdot \frac{\sigma^{+}}{2}$$

$$\& \frac{2\pi d}{e} p^{+} \cdot \frac{\sigma^{-}}{2} - g(\sigma^{-}) = \frac{2\pi dt}{e} p^{+} \cdot \frac{\sigma^{-}}{2}$$
Drapping the prime, this gives:
$$X^{+} = \frac{2\pi dt}{e} p^{+} \tau$$

$$I_{1}(h^{+} - cone gauge$$
A straightforward calculation shows: (check this !)
$$T_{ab} = 0 \quad \iff (X \pm X')^{2} = 0$$

$$(f(ve - t) + denote \tau/\sigma denivatives$$

$$and (\cdots)^{2} = (\cdots)^{t}(\cdots)^{t}(\cdots)^{t}(\tau)$$

$$It follows that - 2((X \pm X')^{-} + ((X \pm X))^{t}((X \pm X)^{t}) = 0$$

$$(f(ze - t) - denote \tau/\sigma denivatives)$$

$$(i = 2i^{-}, 0^{-})$$

$$(i = 2i^{-}, 0^{-})$$

$$Et follows that - (X \pm X')^{2} + ((X \pm X))^{t}((X \pm X)^{t}) = 0$$

$$(f(ze - t) - f(ze - t) - f(ze - t))$$

$$(i = 2i^{-}, 0^{-})$$

$$(i = 2i^{-}, 0$$

for the XM and find, by Fourier - decomposing (+):

(Cf. Zwiebach, Ch. 13)

37

$$\widetilde{\alpha}_{n}^{-} = \frac{\sqrt{2/\alpha'}}{p^{+}} \prod_{n=1}^{r-1} ; \quad \alpha_{n}^{-} = \frac{\sqrt{2/\alpha'}}{p^{+}} \prod_{n=1}^{L} \prod_{n=1}^{r-1} (**)$$

$$\omega' H_{n} \prod_{n=1}^{r-1} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} (\pi)^{r} (\pi)^$$

- The Key new point upon growhitchion is (as also in OCQ) the normal ordering ambiguity affecting Lo in (**).
- Formally following the derivation, we find an expression
 Zdndn. It is conventient to split this in Lo (hormal n+0 ordered by definition) and normal ordering constant, as before:

$$p^{+}p^{-} = \frac{1}{2}(p_{\perp})^{2} + \frac{2}{\alpha'} \cdot \frac{1}{2} \underbrace{\leq}_{h \neq 0}^{(m)} \underbrace{\leq}_{h}^{(m)} \underbrace{\leq}_{h \neq 0}^{(m)}$$

$$p^{+}p^{-} = \frac{\pi}{2}(p_{\perp}^{2}) + \frac{2}{\alpha'}\begin{pmatrix}n\\N_{\perp} + a\end{pmatrix}$$

$$\stackrel{(n)}{N_{\perp}} = \frac{\pi}{N_{\perp}}\begin{pmatrix}n\\L\\n > o\end{pmatrix} \stackrel{(n)}{\alpha_{-n}} \stackrel{(n)}{\alpha_{-n$$

Since, in our conventions,
$$m^2 = 2p^+p^- - (p_1)^2$$
, we have

$$m^2 = \frac{4}{\lambda'} \left(N_1 + a \right).$$

We can now be very explicit in that $a = \frac{1}{2} \stackrel{<}{=} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{=}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{\leq}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{1}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{+}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{=}{\xrightarrow{-n}} \stackrel{=}{\xrightarrow{$

• The divergence comes from the UV (of our 2d QFT) and should be physically undershood, regularized, and removed. We will do all that shorthy. For now, just a shoutcut giving the correct result:

$$\Rightarrow a = -\frac{D-2}{24} \Rightarrow Need D = 26 \text{ for the critical case}$$

$$(i.e. \text{ for mossless photol / gravitor}),$$

$$as argued more vaguely before.$$

(<u>Comment</u>: We could have mode this argument for a of the level of OCQ, but the result would have been wrong since the prefactor would have been D, not (D-2). This reduction is very similar the photon not having the naive D but only D-2 phys. d.o.d., cf. "Supta - Blenler - Quantization.)

Summory:
$$m^2 = \frac{4}{d!} (N_{\perp} + a) = \frac{4}{d!} (\tilde{N_{\perp}} + a)$$
; $a = -\frac{D-2}{26}$
followed from our expression This is shill a proper constraint,
for p^- , which is not independent Arising because we can express
 p^- in dependently through the
left & might moving osaillotors.
(We shill have level-motoning:)
 $N_{\perp} = N_{\perp}$

=> Everything very similar to OCQ, but no ± - Oscillators, just the physical transverse modes. Fock space coustinction will have no negative-norm issue. See soon...