W Pair Production at the LHC I. Two-loop Corrections in the High Energy Limit

G. Chachamis*^a* , M. Czakon*a*,*^b* and D. Eiras*^a*

a Institut für Theoretische Physik und Astrophysik, Universität Würzburg Am Hubland, D-97074 Würzburg, Germany

^bDepartment of Field Theory and Particle Physics, Institute of Physics University of Silesia, Uniwersytecka 4, PL-40007 Katowice, Poland

Abstract

We present the result for the two loop virtual QCD corrections to the W boson pair production in the quark-anti-quark-annihilation channel in the limit where all kinematical invariants are large compared to the mass of the W boson. The infrared pole structure is in agreement with the prediction of Catani's general formalism for the singularities of two loop amplitudes.

1 Introduction

The Large Hadron Collider (LHC) will be the centre of interest for particle physics phenomenology in the next years. Open issues that require definite answers are the verification of the consistency and validity of the Standard Model (SM) in the energy range of the LHC as well as insights into New Physics. Several proposed models and concepts that have the SM as their low energy limit theory are either to pass the LHC test or to be proven wrong. Supersymmetry and Extra-dimensions are two of the most illustrious examples.

Probably, the most important goal for the LHC is the discovery of the elusive Higgs boson. The latter is part of the mechanism of dynamical breaking of the Electroweak (EW) symmetry and is responsible for the fermions and gauge bosons mass. Discovering the only constituent of the Standard Model (SM) which has not been experimentally observed yet, along with a systematic measurement of its properties, will be essential for our understanding of mass and the precise gauge structure of the SM. Another important endeavour at the LHC, in connection to the investigation of the non-Abelian gauge structure of the SM, is the precise measurement of the hadronic production of gauge boson pairs, *WW*, *WZ*, *ZZ*, *W*γ, *Z*γ. Deviations from the SM predictions would indicate the presence of either anomalous couplings or new heavy particles which would decay into vector boson pairs $[1, 2]$.

Seen under the prism of the previous argumentation, W pair production via quark-anti-quarkannihilation,

$$
q\bar{q} \to W^+W^-, \tag{1}
$$

is a very important process at the LHC. Firstly, it can serve as a signal process in the search for New Physics since it can be used to measure the vector boson trilinear couplings as predicted by the Standard Model (SM) (actually, this is the favored channel as it involves both trilinear vertices, *WWZ* and *WW* γ). Secondly, $q\bar{q} \rightarrow W^{+}W^{-}$ is the dominant irreducible background to the promising Higgs discovery channel

$$
pp \to H \to W^*W^* \to l\bar{\nu}l'\nu',\tag{2}
$$

in the mass range MH*iggs* between 140 and 180 GeV [3].

Due to its importance, the study of W pair production in hadronic collisions has attracted a lot of attention in the literature. The Born cross section was calculated almost 30 years ago [4], whereas the next-to-leading order (NLO) QCD corrections to the tree-level were computed in Refs. [5–9] and were proven to be large. They enhance the tree-level by almost 70% which falls to a (still) large 30% after imposing a jet veto. Therefore, if a theoretical estimate for the *W* pair production is to be compared against experimental measurements at the LHC, one is bound to go one order higher in the perturbative expansion, namely to the next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO). This would allow, in principle, an accuracy of better than 10%.

High accuracy for the W pair production is also needed when the process is studied as background to Higgs production. The NLO QCD corrections to the signal process for the Higgs discovery via gluon fusion, $gg \to H$, contribute a 70% [10, 11], whereas the NNLO contributions suggest an additional 20% for the LHC [12–14]. With a jet veto, at NNLO the total corrections are of the order of 85% [15–17]. Lastly, the QCD corrections to the cross section for the process $H \to WW \to l\bar{v}l'\nu'$ are known at NNLO [18] whereas the EW ones are known beyond NLO [19]. The ratio of the Higgs signal over background is expected between 1:1 and 2:1 once certain cuts are applied that reject events with high p_T jets. For a consistent QCD analysis, therefore, we need to compare both signal and background cross sections calculated at the same order, that is, at NNLO. Another process that needs to be included in the background is the W pair production in the loop induced gluon fusion channel,

$$
gg \to W^+W^- \,. \tag{3}
$$

This contributes at $O(\alpha_s^2)$ relative to the quark-anti-quark-annihilation channel but is nevertheless enhanced due to the large gluon flux at the LHC. The corrections from gluon fusion increase the W pair background estimate by almost 30% after certain experimental Higgs search cuts are imposed [20, 21].

In this paper, we address the task of computing the NNLO two-loop virtual part, more precisely the interference of the two-loop with the Born amplitude. We work in the limit of fixed scattering angle and high energy, where all kinematical invariants are large compared to the mass *m* of the W. Our result contains all logarithms log *m* as well as all constant contributions while we neglect power corrections in *m*. These will be presented in a following publication.

Our methodology for obtaining the massive amplitude (massless fermion-boson scattering was studied in Ref. [22]) is very similar to the one followed in Refs. [23–25] which is, at its turn, an evolution of the methods employed in Refs. [26, 27]. The amplitude is reduced to an expression that only contains a small number of integrals (master integrals) with the help of the Laporta algorithm [28]. In our calculation there are 71 master integrals. Next comes the construction, in a fully automatised way, of the Mellin-Barnes (MB) representations [29, 30] of all the master integrals by using the MBrepresentation package [31]. The representations are then analytically continued in the number of space-time dimensions by means of the MB package [32], thus revealing the full singularity structure. An asymptotic expansion in the mass parameter is performed by closing contours and the integrals are finally resummed, either with the help of XSummer [33] or the PSLQ algorithm [34].

Our paper is organised as follows. In Section [2](#page-3-0) we introduce our notation, present briefly our methods and define the perturbative expansion of the matrix elements summed over colours and spins. In Section [3](#page-5-0) we study the singular behavior of the NNLO contributions, and verify that it agrees with the general formalism developed by Catani [35] for the infrared structure of two-loop amplitudes. In Section [4](#page-6-0) we present the finite remainder of the interference of the tree and the two-loop amplitude after subtraction of the singular poles of Section [3](#page-5-0) from the explicit result of the two-loop Feynman diagrams. We organise the finite part according to the colour content of the two-loop amplitude. The finite remainders are expressed in terms of logarithms and polylogarithms which are real in the physical domain. Finally, we conclude in Section [5.](#page-14-0)

2 Notation

The charged vector-boson production in the leading partonic scattering process corresponds to

$$
q_j(p_1) + \overline{q}_j(p_2) \rightarrow W^-(p_3, m) + W^+(p_4, m) \,, \tag{4}
$$

where p_i denote the quark and W momenta, *m* is the mass of the W boson and j is a flavour index. We are considering down type quark scattering in our paper. Obtaining the corresponding result for up-type quark scattering is actually trivial as we will show in the following. Energy-momentum conservation implies

$$
p_1^{\mu} + p_2^{\mu} = p_3^{\mu} + p_4^{\mu}.
$$
 (5)

We consider the scattering amplitude M for the process [\(4\)](#page-3-1) at fixed values of the external parton momenta p_i , thus $p_1^2 = p_2^2 = 0$ and $p_3^2 = p_4^2 = m^2$. The amplitude *M* may be written as a series expansion in the strong coupling α_s ,

$$
|\mathcal{M}\rangle = \left[|\mathcal{M}^{(0)}\rangle + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi}\right)|\mathcal{M}^{(1)}\rangle + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi}\right)^2|\mathcal{M}^{(2)}\rangle + O(\alpha_s^3)\right],\tag{6}
$$

and we define the expansion parameter in powers of $\alpha_s(\mu^2)/(2\pi)$ with μ being the renormalisation scale. We work in conventional dimensional regularisation, $d = 4-2\varepsilon$, in the MS-scheme for the coupling constant renormalisation. The W mass *m* on the other hand is always taken to be the pole mass.

We explicitly relate the bare (unrenormalised) coupling α_s^b to the renormalised coupling α_s by

$$
\alpha_s^b S_{\epsilon} = \alpha_s \left[1 - \frac{\beta_0}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right) + \left(\frac{\beta_0^2}{\epsilon^2} - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\beta_1}{\epsilon} \right) \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right)^2 + O(\alpha_s^3) \right],\tag{7}
$$

where we set the factor $S_{\varepsilon} = (4\pi)^{\varepsilon} \exp(-\varepsilon \gamma_E) = 1$ for simplicity and β is the QCD β -function known at present up to the four-loop level [36, 37]

$$
\beta_0 = \frac{11}{6}C_A - \frac{2}{3}T_F n_f, \qquad \beta_1 = \frac{17}{6}C_A^2 - \frac{5}{3}C_A T_F n_f - C_F T_F n_f.
$$
\n(8)

The color factors in a non-Abelian SU(*N*)-gauge theory are $C_A = N$, $C_F = (N^2 - 1)/2N$ and $T_F =$ 1/2. Throughout this paper, *N* denotes the number of colors and n_f the total number of flavors.

In the following, our discussion will be restricted to the two-loop amplitude summed over spins and colours and contracted with the Born one. Nevertheless, it should be stressed that our methods and the results of the present work can be easily extended to the partial amplitudes for the individual helicity combinations of the massive two-loop amplitude $|\mathcal{M}^{(2)}\rangle$ itself.

For convenience, we define the function $A(\varepsilon,m,s,t,\mu)$ for the squared amplitudes summed over spins and colors as

$$
\sum |\mathcal{M}(q_j + \overline{q}_j \to W^+ + W^-)|^2 = \mathcal{A}(\varepsilon, m, s, t, \mu).
$$
 (9)

A is a function of the Mandelstam variables *s*, *t* and *u* given by

$$
s = (p_1 + p_2)^2, \qquad t = (p_1 - p_3)^2 - m^2, \qquad u = (p_1 - p_4)^2 - m^2,\tag{10}
$$

and has a perturbative expansion similar to Eq. [\(6\)](#page-3-2),

$$
\mathcal{A}(\varepsilon, m, s, t, \mu) = \left[\mathcal{A}^{(0)} + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right) \mathcal{A}^{(1)} + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right)^2 \mathcal{A}^{(2)} + O(\alpha_s^3) \right]. \tag{11}
$$

In terms of the amplitudes the expansion coefficients in Eq. [\(11\)](#page-4-0) may be expressed as

$$
\mathcal{A}^{(0)} = \langle \mathcal{M}^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}^{(0)} \rangle, \tag{12}
$$

$$
\mathcal{A}^{(1)} = (\langle \mathcal{M}^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}^{(1)} | \mathcal{M}^{(0)} \rangle), \qquad (13)
$$

$$
\mathcal{A}^{(2)} = \left(\langle \mathcal{M}^{(1)} | \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}^{(2)} | \mathcal{M}^{(0)} \rangle \right), \tag{14}
$$

where $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}$ and $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$ are the massive tree level and one loop amplitudes correspondingly. $\mathcal{A}^{(0)}$ is given by

$$
\mathcal{A}^{(0)} = N \left\{ c_1 \left[16(1-\epsilon)^2 \frac{x}{(1-x)} + 4(3-4\epsilon) \frac{1}{m_s} + \frac{4x(1-x)}{m_s^2} \right] + c_2 \left[-24 + 16x + 16\epsilon (2-x) + 4 \frac{(3-4\epsilon) - 2x(1-x)}{m_s} + \frac{4x(1-x)}{m_s^2} \right] + c_3 \left[-24(1-x(1-x)) + 16\epsilon (2-x(1-x)) + \frac{6-8\epsilon - 8x(1-x)}{m_s} + \frac{2x(1-x)}{m_s^2} \right] \right\},
$$
\n(15)

where we have defined $x = -\frac{t}{s}$ $\frac{t}{s}$, $m_s = \frac{m^2}{s}$ $\frac{n^2}{s}$ and only the leading physical powers (i.e. down to the constant) in the m_s -expansion are retained. Notice that, once the actual values of the c_i are substituted, the terms singular in *m^s* cancel as required by unitarity. This will be the case for the final two-loop expression as well. The coefficients c_1 , c_2 and c_3 are in their essence combinations of EW coupling constants defined as

$$
c_1 = \frac{g_{WL}^4}{4},
$$

\n
$$
c_2 = \frac{1}{4s_w^2} \left(Q_q + 2g_{ZL}^q \frac{c_w}{s_w \left(1 - \frac{M_Z^2}{s}\right)} \right),
$$

\n
$$
c_3 = \frac{c_w^2}{s_w^2 (1 - \frac{M_Z^2}{s})^2} \left((g_{ZA}^q)^2 + \left(g_{ZV}^q + Q_q \frac{s_w \left(1 - \frac{M_Z^2}{s}\right)}{c_w} \right)^2 \right).
$$
\n(16)

The expressions for $\mathcal{A}^{(1)}$ have been presented e.g. in Refs. [5,6]. We have already computed the one-loop⊗one-loop result in the high energy limit, namely the NNLO contribution $\langle \mathcal{M}^{(1)} | \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \rangle$ in $A⁽²⁾$ and it will be published in a forthcoming paper. Here we provide for the first time the result for the real part of the full two-loop contribution $\langle \mathcal{M}^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \rangle$. The leading color coefficient of $\langle \mathcal{M}^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \rangle$ was discussed in Ref. [39].

3 Infrared Pole Structure

In the simpler case of one-loop amplitudes, their poles in ε can be expressed as a universal combination of the tree amplitude and a colour-charge operator $I^{(1)}(\varepsilon)$. The generic form of the $I^{(1)}(\varepsilon)$ operator was found by Catani and Seymour [38] and it was derived for the general one-loop QCD amplitude by integrating the real radiation graphs of the same order in perturbation series in the one-particle unresolved limit.

In a similar way, the divergences of the two-loop amplitude can be written as a sum of two terms: the action of the $I^{(1)}(\varepsilon)$ operator on the one-loop amplitude and the action of a new operator $I^{(2)}(\varepsilon)$ on the tree amplitude. The $I^{(2)}(\varepsilon)$ operator includes a renormalisation scheme dependent term $H^{(2)}$ multiplied by a $1/\varepsilon$ pole. In the following, we give explicit expressions for $I^{(1)}(\varepsilon)$ and I⁽²⁾(ε) which are valid in the \overline{MS} scheme.

At next-to-next-to-leading-order (NNLO), contributions from the self-interference of the oneloop amplitude and the interference of the tree and the two-loop amplitude must be taken into account, so that

$$
\mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}}(s,t,u,m,\mu) = \mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(1\times1)}(s,t,u,m,\mu) + \mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(0\times2)}(s,t,u,m,\mu),\tag{17}
$$

with

$$
\mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(1\times1)}(s,t,u,m,\mu) = \langle \mathcal{M}^{(1)} | \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \rangle, \tag{18}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(0\times2)}(s,t,u,m,\mu) = \langle \mathcal{M}^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \rangle + \langle \mathcal{M}^{(2)} | \mathcal{M}^{(0)} \rangle. \tag{19}
$$

We further decompose the one-loop self-interference and the two-loop contributions as a sum of singular and finite terms,

$$
\mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(1\times1)}(s,t,u,m,\mu) = \text{Catani}^{1\times1}(s,t,u,m,\mu) + \mathcal{F}^{1\times1}_{\text{inite}}(s,t,u,m,\mu) \tag{20}
$$

and

$$
\mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(0\times2)}(s,t,u,m,\mu) = \text{Catani}^{0\times2}(s,t,u,m,\mu) + \mathcal{F}_{\text{inite}}^{0\times2}(s,t,u,m,\mu),\tag{21}
$$

Catani^{1×1} and Catani^{0×2} contain infrared singularities that will be analytically canceled by the infrared singularities occurring in radiative processes of the same order (ultraviolet divergences having already been removed by renormalisation). $\mathcal{F}_{init}^{1\times1}$ and $\mathcal{F}_{init}^{0\times2}$ are the remainders which are finite as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$.

The infrared poles of the interference of the tree and the two-loop amplitudes follow a generic formula developed by Catani in Ref. [35]. Due to the simple colour structure of the process [\(4\)](#page-3-1) the action of $I^{(1)}(\varepsilon)$ and $I^{(2)}(\varepsilon)$ is factorised such that we formally have

$$
Catani^{0\times 2}(s,t,u,m,\mu) = 2\text{Re}\left\{I^{(1)}(\varepsilon)\langle M^{(0)}|M^{(1)}\rangle + I^{(2)}(\varepsilon)\langle M^{(0)}|M^{(0)}\rangle\right\}
$$
(22)

with

$$
I^{(1)}(\varepsilon) = -C_F \frac{e^{\varepsilon \gamma}}{\Gamma(1-\varepsilon)} \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon^2} + \frac{3}{2\varepsilon}\right) \left(-\frac{\mu^2}{s}\right)^{\varepsilon}
$$
(23)

and

$$
I^{(2)}(\varepsilon) = -\frac{1}{2}I^{(1)}(\varepsilon)\left(I^{(1)}(\varepsilon) + \frac{2\beta_0}{\varepsilon}\right) + \frac{e^{-\varepsilon\gamma}\Gamma(1-\varepsilon)}{\Gamma(1-2\varepsilon)}\left(\frac{\beta_0}{\varepsilon} + K\right)I^{(1)}(2\varepsilon) + \frac{e^{\varepsilon\gamma}}{4\varepsilon\Gamma(1-\varepsilon)}H^{(2)}\tag{24}
$$

where

$$
K = \left(\frac{67}{18} - \frac{\pi^2}{6}\right)C_A - \frac{10}{9}T_F n_f.
$$
 (25)

The renormalisation scheme dependent $H^{(2)}$ constant for a QCD amplitude with a $q\bar{q}$ pair is given by

$$
H^{(2)} = 2\left(\frac{\pi^2}{2} - 6\zeta_3 - \frac{3}{8}\right)C_F^2 + 2\left(\frac{13}{2}\zeta_3 + \frac{245}{216} - \frac{23}{48}\pi^2\right)C_A C_F
$$

+2\left(-\frac{25}{54} + \frac{\pi^2}{12}\right)C_F T_F n_f. (26)

We were able to verify that our result has the same infrared structure as the one predicted by Catani's formalism.

4 Results

In this section, we give explicit expressions for the finite remainder of the two-loop contribution $\mathcal{F}_{inite}^{0\times 2}$ defined as

$$
\mathcal{F}_{inite}^{0\times 2}(s,t,u,m,\mu) = \mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(0\times 2)}(s,t,u,m,\mu) - \text{Catani}^{0\times 2}(s,t,u,m,\mu),\tag{27}
$$

or in the rescaled form

$$
\mathcal{F}_{\text{inite}}^{0 \times 2}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}) = \mathcal{A}^{\text{NNLO}(0 \times 2)}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}) - \text{Catani}^{0 \times 2}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}). \tag{28}
$$

The EW structure of the finite remainder for a down-type quark can be factorised as

$$
\mathcal{F}_{\text{inite },\text{down}}^{0\times 2} = \frac{\alpha_s^2}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1,4} c_i \mathcal{I}_i^{\text{down}}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}). \tag{29}
$$

This decomposition allows one, starting from the result for a down-type quark, to obtain the result for an up-type quark scattering. The latter is then given by

$$
\mathcal{F}_{\text{inite}}^{0 \times 2} \text{, up} = \frac{\alpha_s^2}{(2\pi)^2} \frac{N}{2} \sum_{i=1,4} c_i \mathcal{I}_i^{\text{up}}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}) \tag{30}
$$

where one needs to use the following formulae

$$
\mathcal{J}_1^{\text{up}}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}) = \mathcal{J}_1^{\text{down}}(m_s, y, \frac{s}{\mu^2}), \qquad (31)
$$

$$
\mathcal{I}_2^{\text{up}}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}) = -\mathcal{I}_2^{\text{down}}(m_s, y, \frac{s}{\mu^2}), \qquad (32)
$$

$$
J_3^{\text{up}}(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}) = J_3^{\text{down}}(m_s, y, \frac{s}{\mu^2}), \qquad (33)
$$

$$
J_4^{\text{up}}(m_s, x) = -J_4^{\text{down}}(m_s, y)
$$
 (34)

and naturally to make the corresponding changes in the definitions of the couplings c_1 , c_2 , c_3 and *c*₄, namely to use the up-type quark charge and isospin. Here $y = -\frac{u}{s}$ $\frac{u}{s}$. In the following and with no loss of clarity, since our result assumes down-type quark scattering, we will suppress all indices that indicate the type of scattered quark. The functions $\mathcal{J}_i(m_s, x, \frac{s}{m_s^2})$ $\frac{s}{\mu^2}$) in Eq. [\(29\)](#page-6-1) will be presented decomposed according to the colour structure, namely in the form

$$
\mathcal{J}_i(m_s, x, \frac{s}{\mu^2}) = \left(j_i^{(1)} C_F C_A + j_i^{(2)} C_F^2 + j_i^{(3)} C_F T_F n_f \right). \tag{35}
$$

It is obvious from the above, that at the two-loop level a new coupling, *c*4, appears in addition to the couplings c_1 , c_2 and c_3 . It is defined as:

$$
c_4 = -\frac{c_w g_{ZA}^q}{2 s_w^3 (1 - \frac{M_Z^2}{s})}.
$$
\n(36)

The appearance of c_4 is an effect that comes from a specific part of $\langle \mathcal{M}^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}^{(2)} \rangle$. This part consists of two-loop fermionic boxes contracted with the Born diagram that involves an *s*-channel *Z* exchange. A typical example can be seen in Fig. 1.

Fig 1: Born diagram with a *Z* exchanged in the *s*-channel contracted with a fermionic two-loop box.

The main feature of these diagrams is that their EW couplings fall into two disjoint fermionic chains and once the traces are computed the axial part drops out. By adding and subtracting to the surviving vector part the corresponding axial part, one can combine vector and axial contributions into a piece proportional to c_2 . The remaining piece is proportional to what we have defined as c_4 .

We have verified that applying the naive recipe of sending all traces that contain a single γ_5 independently to zero is a valid approach also for this class of diagrams. We did this by calculating

explicitly the output after substituting γ_5 by its alternative form $\gamma_5 = \frac{i}{4!} \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \gamma_\alpha \gamma_\beta$ and confirming that no additional terms survive. This was in fact a non-trivial cancellation as it occurs only for the sum of all the diagrams of this particular class.

We are finally ready to present our result. The functions \mathcal{I}_i , are given by

$$
f^{1}(m_{5},x,\frac{x}{\mu^{2}})=
$$

\n
$$
C_{A}C_{F}\left\{\frac{1}{m_{5}^{2}}\left[\frac{31}{120}(1-x)x\pi^{4}-\frac{107}{36}(1-x)x^{2}-\frac{51157}{648}(1-x)x+\frac{659}{18}(1-x)x^{2}_{53}+\frac{88}{3}(1-x)x1_{s}\right]\right\}
$$

\n
$$
+\frac{1}{m_{5}}\left[\frac{31\pi^{4}}{40}-\frac{107\pi^{2}}{10^{2}}+\frac{659\zeta_{3}}{216}+88L_{s}-\frac{51157}{216}\right]
$$

\n
$$
+\left[\frac{1}{30}\left(-684x^{3}+684x^{2}-114x+\frac{31}{1-x}-31\right)\pi^{4}+\frac{1}{9}\left(1404x^{3}-1404x^{2}+188x-\frac{303}{1-x}+359-\frac{108}{x}\right)\pi^{2} -\frac{8}{3}\left(2-\frac{1}{1-x}\right)L_{2}(x)\pi^{2}+\frac{1}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{x}^{4}+\frac{1}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x-2\right)L_{y}^{4}
$$

\n
$$
-\frac{4}{3}\left(36x^{3}-30x^{2}+11x-\frac{3}{1-x}+3\right)L_{x}^{3}-\frac{8}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{m}L_{x}^{3}
$$

\n
$$
+\frac{4}{9}\left(-108x^{3}+126x^{2}-33x-\frac{22}{1-x}+43-\frac{15}{x}+\frac{9}{x^{2}}\right)L_{y}^{3}-\frac{8}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{x}^{3}L_{y}^{2}
$$

\n
$$
+\left(4\left(39x^{3}-15x^{2}+x-\frac{4}{1-x}+7\right)-\frac{14}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{x}^{3}+4\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{x}^{2}L_{x}^{2}
$$

$$
+\left(80-\frac{64}{1-x}\right)\zeta_{3}+\frac{694}{9(1-x)}-\frac{478}{9}-\frac{24}{x}\right)L_{y}+\frac{16Li_{35}(x)L_{y}}{1-x}+\frac{8}{3}\left(72x^{2}-55x-\frac{11}{1-x}+37-\frac{9}{x}\right)L_{m}L_{y}
$$

\n
$$
+\frac{44}{3}\left(1-\frac{1}{1-x}\right)L_{x}L_{y}-8\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{m}^{2}L_{x}L_{y}+\left(-\frac{4}{3}\left(-42x^{3}+42x^{2}-7x-\frac{2}{1-x}+4\right)\pi^{2} -8\left(36x^{3}-36x^{2}+11x-1\right)L_{m}L_{x}L_{y}
$$

\n
$$
-8\left(-36x^{3}+36x^{2}-7x-\frac{2}{1-x}+1\right)\right)L_{x}L_{y}-\frac{16Li_{2}(x)L_{x}L_{y}}{1-x}-8\left(36x^{3}-36x^{2}+11x-1\right)L_{m}L_{x}L_{y}
$$

\n
$$
-8\left(-36x^{3}+36x^{2}-7x-\frac{2}{1-x}+3+\frac{5}{x}-\frac{3}{x^{2}}\right)S_{1,2}(x)+16\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{m}S_{1,2}(x)
$$

\n
$$
-\frac{16L_{x}S_{1,2}(x)}{1-x}-16\left(2-\frac{1}{1-x}\right)L_{y}S_{1,2}(x)-16\left(-6x^{3}+6x^{2}-x-\frac{3}{1-x}+5\right)S_{1,3}(x)+\frac{16S_{2,2}(x)}{1-x}\right\}
$$

\n
$$
+\frac{1}{x_{y_{y_{y}}}\left[-\frac{1}{g}d^{4}-x^{2}-\frac{284\xi_{y_{y}}}{3}+\frac{1277}{8}\right]+\left[\frac{1}{90}\left(4104x^{3}-4104x^{2}+684x-\frac{103}{1-x}-73\right)\pi^{4} -\frac{4}{3}\left(234x^{3}-234x^{2}+34x-\frac{8}{1-x}+1
$$

$$
+\left(\frac{80}{1-x}-112\right)\zeta_3-\frac{26}{1-x}+34+\frac{32}{x}\right)L_y-\frac{32Li_3(x)L_y}{1-x}-8\left(48x^2-41x-\frac{2}{1-x}+15-\frac{4}{x}\right)L_wL_y,
$$

\n
$$
+16\left(6x^3-6x^2+x\right)L_w^2L_uL_uL_y+\left(\frac{8}{3}\left(-42x^3+42x^2-7x-\frac{2}{1-x}+4\right)\pi^2
$$

\n
$$
+6\left(39x^3-39x^2+8x-\frac{2}{1-x}+1\right)\right)L_xL_y+\frac{32Li_2(x)L_xL_y}{1-x}+16\left(36x^3-36x^2+11x-1\right)L_wL_xL_y,
$$

\n
$$
-8\left(72x^3-72x^2+16x-\frac{5}{1-x}+3-\frac{12}{x}+\frac{4}{x^3}\right)S_{1,2}(x)-32\left(6x^3-6x^2+x\right)L_wS_{1,2}(x)
$$

\n
$$
+\frac{32L_xS_{1,2}(x)}{1-x}+32L_yS_{1,2}(x)+32\left(-6x^3+6x^2-x-\frac{1}{1-x}+3\right)S_{1,3}(x)+16\left(3-\frac{1}{1-x}\right)S_{2,2}(x)\right]\}
$$

\n
$$
+n_fT_cC_{\frac{1}{2}}\left\{\frac{1}{m_c}\left[\frac{14}{3}-\frac{4\zeta_3}{5}-64L_x+\frac{4085}{87}\right]\left(-\frac{8}{45}\left(1-x\right)x-\frac{4}{9}\left(1-x\right)x\zeta_3-\frac{64}{3}\left(1-x\right)x\zeta_3\right]
$$

\n
$$
+\frac{32}{m_c}\left[\frac{14}{3}-\frac{4\zeta_3}{5}-64L_x+\frac{4085}{87}\right]+\left[\frac{88}{45}\left(1-\frac{2}{1-x}\right)\pi^4-\frac{8}{8}\left(35x+\frac{12}{1-x}+22-\frac{27}{x}\right)\pi^2
$$

\n
$$
+\frac{32}{3}\left(1-\frac{2}{1-x
$$

$$
f^{2}(m_{s}, x, \frac{s}{\mu^{2}}) =
$$

\n
$$
C_{A}C_{F} \left\{ \frac{1}{m_{s}^{2}} \left[\frac{31}{120} (1-x) x \pi^{4} - \frac{107}{36} (1-x) x \pi^{2} - \frac{51157}{648} (1-x) x + \frac{659}{18} (1-x) x \zeta_{3} + \frac{88}{3} (1-x) x \zeta_{3} \right] + \frac{1}{m_{s}} \left[\frac{31}{120} (2x^{2} - 2x + 3) \pi^{4} - \frac{107}{36} (2x^{2} - 2x + 3) \pi^{2} - \frac{51157}{648} (2x^{2} - 2x + 3) + \frac{659}{18} (2x^{2} - 2x + 3) \zeta_{3} \right]
$$

$$
+\frac{48}{18} (2x^2 - 2x + 3) L_4 + \frac{1}{60} (-684x^3 + 684x^2 - 52x - 93) \pi^4 + \frac{1}{18} (1296x^3 - 1224x^2 - 346x - \frac{88}{1-x} + 465 - \frac{108}{x}) \pi^2 + \frac{8}{3} L_{12}(x) \pi^2 + \frac{1}{6} (6x^3 - 6x^2 + x) L_{\pi}^4 + \frac{1}{6} (6x^3 - 6x^2 - x + 8) L_{\pi}^4 - \frac{2}{3} (36x^3 - 30x^3 + 11x - \frac{3}{1-x} + 3) L_{\pi}^3 - \frac{4}{3} (6x^3 - 6x^2 + x) L_{\pi}L_{\pi}^3 - \frac{2}{9} (108x^3 - 126x^2 + 34x - 56 + \frac{15}{x} - \frac{9}{x^2}) L_{\gamma}^3 - \frac{4}{3} (6x^3 - 6x^2 + x) L_{\pi}L_{\gamma}^3 + \frac{2}{3} (6x^3 - 6x^2 + x) L_{\pi}L_{\pi}^3
$$

+ (2 (6x³ - 6x² + x) \pi^2 + 12x) L_{\pi}^2 + 2 (6x³ - 6x² + x) L_{\pi}^2L_{\pi}^2 + (2 (36x³ - 10x² - 6x + \frac{1}{1-x} + 2))
- \frac{7}{3} (6x³ - 6x² + x) \pi^2) L_{\pi}^2 - 4 (6x³ - 6x² + x) L_{\pi}^4L_{\pi}^2 + (2 (36x³ - 10x² - 6x + \frac{1}{1-x} + 2))
- \frac{7}{3} (6x³ - 6x² + x) L_{\pi}^3L_{\pi}^2 + (6x³ - 6x² + x) L_{\pi}^4L

$$
+\frac{1}{m_{x}}\left[\frac{1}{24}\left(-2x^{2}+2x-3\right)\pi^{4}+\frac{1}{2}\left(-18x^{2}+18x+1\right)\pi^{2}+\frac{1}{8}\left(1534x^{2}-1534x+1277\right)\right.\newline-\frac{4}{3}\left(66x^{2}-66x+71\right)\zeta_{3}\right]+\left[\frac{1}{180}\left(4104x^{3}-4104x^{2}+742x-131\right)\pi^{4}\right.\\\newline\left. +\frac{1}{3}\left(-432x^{3}+408x^{2}+23x+\frac{46}{1-x}-63+\frac{24}{x}\right)\pi^{2}-\frac{4}{3}(5x-6)Li_{2}(x)\pi^{2}+\frac{1}{3}\left(-6x^{3}+6x^{2}-x\right)L_{x}^{4}\right.\newline+\frac{1}{3}\left(-6x^{3}+6x^{2}+x-8\right)L_{x}^{4}+\frac{4}{3}\left(x-\frac{1}{1-x}+2\right)L_{m}^{3}+\frac{4}{3}\left(36x^{3}-30x^{2}+11x-\frac{3}{1-x}+3\right)L_{x}^{3}\newline-\frac{8}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{m}L_{x}^{3}-\frac{4}{3}\left(-36x^{3}+42x^{2}-x+\frac{2}{1-x}-\frac{6}{x}+\frac{2}{x^{2}}\right)L_{y}^{3}+\frac{8}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{m}L_{y}^{3}\newline-\frac{4}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{m}^{2}L_{x}^{3}+\left(-4\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)\pi^{2}-2\left(14x-\frac{5}{1-x}+9\right)\right)L_{m}^{2}\newline-\frac{4}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{m}^{2}L_{x}^{2}+\left(\frac{14}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)\pi^{2}-4\left(36x^{3}-10x^{2}-6x+\frac{1}{1-x}+2\right)\right)L_{x}^{2}\newline-\frac{4}{3}\left(6x^{3}-6x^{2}+x\right)L_{x}^{2}L_{x}^{2}+\
$$

$$
+\frac{1}{m_s}\left[\frac{14}{9}(2x^2-2x+3)\pi^2+\frac{4085}{81}(2x^2-2x+3)-\frac{4}{9}(2x^2-2x+3)\zeta_3-\frac{64}{3}(2x^2-2x+3)L_s\right]
$$

+
$$
\left[\frac{88}{45}(x+1)\pi^4-\frac{4}{9}\left(-26x+\frac{58}{1-x}+27-\frac{54}{x}\right)\pi^2-32Li_2(x)\pi^2+\frac{8}{3}\left(2x^2-2x-\frac{4}{1-x}+\frac{3}{(x-1)^2}+1\right)L_x^3-\frac{8}{9}\left(6x^2-10x+11-\frac{12}{x}+\frac{9}{x^2}\right)L_y^3-8\left(10x-\frac{16}{1-x}+\frac{6}{(x-1)^2}+7\right)L_x^2-8\left(\frac{3}{(x-1)^2}+1-\frac{4}{1-x}\right)L_mL_x^2
$$

-16(x-2)L_x^2L_y^2+\frac{8}{9}\left(-103x-\frac{12}{1-x}+203-\frac{144}{x}+\frac{54}{x^2}\right)L_y^2+8\left(1-\frac{4}{x}+\frac{3}{x^2}\right)L_mL_y^2+\frac{16}{3}(x-2)L_xL_y^2
-8(2x-1)L_xL_z^2-\frac{2}{81}\left(-8854x+\left(1296x^2-10296x+\frac{2592}{1-x}-\frac{1944}{(x-1)^2}+1188\right)\zeta_3-\frac{1368}{1-x}+13623\right)
+16\left(2x^2-12x+\frac{4}{1-x}-\frac{3}{(x-1)^2}\right)L_3(x)+\left(\frac{16}{9}\left(13x-\frac{13}{1-x}+32\right)-8(2x-1)\pi^2\right)L_m
+
$$
\frac{16}{3}\left(-17x-\frac{2}{1-x}+26\right)L_s-\frac{32}{3}\left(x-\frac{1}{1-x}+2\right)L_mL_s-32\left(x^2-x\right)L_m^2L_x
$$

+
$$
\left(48\left(-4x^2+2x-\frac{1}{1-x}+2\right)-\frac{8}{3}\
$$

$$
f^{3}(m_{s},x,\frac{s}{\mu^{2}}) =
$$
\n
$$
C_{A}C_{F}\left\{\frac{1}{m_{s}^{2}}\left[\frac{31}{240}(1-x)x\pi^{4} - \frac{107}{72}(1-x)x\pi^{2} - \frac{51157(1-x)x}{1296} + \frac{659}{36}(1-x)x\zeta_{3} + \frac{44}{3}(1-x)x\zeta_{3}\right] + \frac{1}{m_{s}}\left[\frac{31}{240}(4x^{2} - 4x + 3)\pi^{4} - \frac{107}{72}(4x^{2} - 4x + 3)\pi^{2} - \frac{51157(4x^{2} - 4x + 3)}{1296} + \frac{659}{36}(4x^{2} - 4x + 3)\zeta_{3}\right] + \left[-\frac{31}{20}(x^{2} - x + 1)\pi^{4} + \frac{107}{6}(x^{2} - x + 1)\pi^{2}\right] + \frac{1}{108}(51157x^{2} - 51157x + (-23724x^{2} + 23724x - 23724)\zeta_{3} + 51157) - 176(x^{2} - x + 1)L_{s}\right]\right\}
$$
\n
$$
+ C_{F}^{2}\left\{\frac{1}{m_{s}^{2}}\left[-\frac{1}{48}(1-x)x\pi^{4} - \frac{9}{4}(1-x)x\pi^{2} + \frac{767}{16}(1-x)x - 22(1-x)x\zeta_{3}\right] + \frac{1}{m_{s}}\left[\frac{1}{48}(-4x^{2} + 4x - 3)\pi^{4} + \frac{1}{4}(-36x^{2} + 36x + 1)\pi^{2} + \frac{1}{16}(3068x^{2} - 3068x + 1277)\right] - \frac{2}{3}(132x^{2} - 132x + 71)\zeta_{3}\right] + \left[\frac{1}{4}(x^{2} - x + 1)\pi^{4} + (13x^{2} - 13x - 1)\pi^{2} + \frac{1}{12}(-5367x^{2} + 5367x + (2720x^{2} - 2720x + 2272)\zeta_{3} - 3831)\right]\right\}
$$

$$
+\frac{1}{m_s} \left[\frac{7}{9} \left(4x^2 - 4x + 3 \right) \pi^2 + \frac{4085}{162} \left(4x^2 - 4x + 3 \right) - \frac{2}{9} \left(4x^2 - 4x + 3 \right) \zeta_3 - \frac{32}{3} \left(4x^2 - 4x + 3 \right) \mathbf{L}_s \right] + \left[-\frac{28}{3} \left(x^2 - x + 1 \right) \pi^2 + \frac{2}{27} \left(-4085x^2 + 4085x + \left(36x^2 - 36x + 36 \right) \zeta_3 - 4085 \right) + 128 \left(x^2 - x + 1 \right) \mathbf{L}_s \right] \right\},\tag{39}
$$

$$
f^{4}(m_{s},x) =
$$

\n
$$
n_{f}T_{F}C_{F} \frac{1}{2} \left\{ \frac{44}{45}(x+1)\pi^{4} - \frac{4}{3}\left(-2x+\frac{9}{1-x}+1-\frac{9}{x}\right)\pi^{2} - 16 \text{Li}_{2}(x)\pi^{2} - 4(2x-1)\text{L}_{m}\pi^{2} + \frac{4}{3}\left(2x^{2}-2x-\frac{4}{1-x}+\frac{3}{(x-1)^{2}}+1\right)\text{L}_{x}^{3} - \frac{4}{3}\left(2x^{2}-2x+1-\frac{4}{x}+\frac{3}{x^{2}}\right)\text{L}_{y}^{3}
$$

\n
$$
-4\left(10x-\frac{16}{1-x}+\frac{6}{(x-1)^{2}}+7\right)\text{L}_{x}^{2} - 4\left(\frac{3}{(x-1)^{2}}+1-\frac{4}{1-x}\right)\text{L}_{m}\text{L}_{x}^{2} - 8(x-2)\text{L}_{x}^{2}\text{L}_{y}^{2} + 4\left(-10x+17-\frac{16}{x}+\frac{6}{x^{2}}\right)\text{L}_{y}^{2} + 4\left(1-\frac{4}{x}+\frac{3}{x^{2}}\right)\text{L}_{m}\text{L}_{y}^{2} - 4(2x-1)\text{L}_{x}\text{L}_{y}^{2} + \frac{4}{x^{2}}
$$

\n
$$
-8\left(2x^{2}-16x+\frac{4}{1-x}-\frac{3}{(x-1)^{2}}+2\right)\xi_{3} + 8\left(2x^{2}-12x+\frac{4}{1-x}-\frac{3}{(x-1)^{2}}\right)\text{Li}_{3}(x)-16\left(x^{2}-x\right)\text{L}_{m}^{2}\text{L}_{x} + \left(24\left(-4x^{2}+2x-\frac{1}{1-x}+2\right)-\frac{4}{3}\left(4x^{2}-8x-\frac{12}{1-x}+\frac{9}{(x-1)^{2}}+9\right)\pi^{2}\right)\text{L}_{x}
$$

\n
$$
-8\left(2x^{2}-12x+\frac{4}{1-x}-\frac{3}{(x-1)^{2}}\right)\text{Li}_{2}(x)\text{L}_{x} - 8\left(16x^{2
$$

where L_m , L_s , L_x and L_y are defined as

$$
L_m = \log(m_s), \quad L_s = \log\left(\frac{s}{\mu^2}\right), \quad L_x = \log(x), \quad L_y = \log(1-x). \tag{41}
$$

5 Conclusions

In this work we have calculated the NNLO QCD virtual corrections for the process $q\bar{q} \rightarrow W^{+}W^{-}$ in the limit of small vector boson mass. The $\overline{\text{MS}}$ renormalised amplitude is still infrared divergent and contains poles up to $O(1/\epsilon^4)$. We checked that the infrared structure of our result agrees with the prediction of Catani's formalism for the infrared structure of two-loop QCD amplitudes.

The main result of our paper has been given as the finite remainder of the NNLO two-loop virtual corrections after subtraction of the structure predicted by Catani's formalism. This is a first step towards the complete evaluation of the virtual corrections. In a forthcoming publication, we

will derive a series expansion in the mass and integrate the result numerically. This will require the present result as a starting point.

Acknowledgments:

This work was supported by the Sofja Kovalevskaja Award of the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation and by the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) under contract number 05HT1WWA2.

References

- [1] CDF Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005) 211801
- [2] D0 Collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94** (2005) 151801
- [3] M. Dittmar and H. K. Dreiner, Phys. Rev. D **55** (1997) 167
- [4] R. W. Brown and K. O. Mikaelian, Phys. Rev. D **19** (1979) 922
- [5] J. Ohnemus, Phys. Rev. D **44** (1991) 1403
- [6] S. Frixione, Nucl. Phys. B **410** (1993) 280
- [7] L. J. Dixon, Z. Kunszt and A. Signer, Nucl. Phys. B **531** (1998) 3
- [8] L. J. Dixon, Z. Kunszt and A. Signer, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 114037
- [9] J. M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, Phys. Rev. D **60** (1999) 113006
- [10] M. Spira, A. Djouadi, D. Graudenz and P. M. Zerwas, Nucl. Phys. B **453** (1995) 17
- [11] S. Dawson, Nucl. Phys. B **359** (1991) 283
- [12] R. V. Harlander and W. B. Kilgore, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002) 201801
- [13] C. Anastasiou and K. Melnikov, Nucl. Phys. B **646** (2002) 220
- [14] V. Ravindran, J. Smith and W. L. van Neerven, Nucl. Phys. B **665** (2003) 325
- [15] S. Catani, D. de Florian and M. Grazzini, JHEP **0201** (2002) 015
- [16] G. Davatz, G. Dissertori, M. Dittmar, M. Grazzini and F. Pauss, JHEP **0405** (2004) 009
- [17] C. Anastasiou, K. Melnikov and F. Petriello, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 262002
- [18] C. Anastasiou, G. Dissertori and F. Stockli, [arXiv:0707.2373](http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.2373) [hep-ph]
- [19] A. Bredenstein, A. Denner, S. Dittmaier and M. M. Weber, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006) 013004
- [20] T. Binoth, M. Ciccolini, N. Kauer and M. Kramer, JHEP **0503** (2005) 065
- [21] T. Binoth, M. Ciccolini, N. Kauer and M. Kramer, JHEP **0612** (2006) 046
- [22] C. Anastasiou, E. W. N. Glover and M. E. Tejeda-Yeomans, Nucl. Phys. B **629** (2002) 255
- [23] M. Czakon, A. Mitov and S. Moch, Phys. Lett. B **651** (2007) 147
- [24] M. Czakon, A. Mitov and S. Moch, [arXiv:0707.4139](http://arxiv.org/abs/0707.4139) [hep-ph]
- [25] M. Czakon, J. Gluza and T. Riemann, Phys. Rev. D **71** (2005) 073009
- [26] M. Czakon, J. Gluza and T. Riemann, Nucl. Phys. B **751** (2006) 1
- [27] S. Actis, M. Czakon, J. Gluza and T. Riemann, Nucl. Phys. B **786** (2007) 26
- [28] S. Laporta, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15** (2000) 5087
- [29] V.A. Smirnov, Phys. Lett. B **460**, 397 (1999)
- [30] J.B. Tausk, Phys. Lett. B **469**, 225 (1999)
- [31] G. Chachamis and M. Czakon, MBrepresentation.m, Unpublished
- [32] M. Czakon, Comput. Phys. Commun. **175** (2006) 559
- [33] S. Moch and P. Uwer, Comput. Phys. Commun. **174** (2006) 759
- [34] H.R.P. Ferguson and D.H. Bailey, (1992), (see e.g. [http://mathworld.wolfram.com/PSLQAlgorithm.html\)](http://mathworld.wolfram.com/PSLQAlgorithm.html)
- [35] S. Catani, Phys. Lett. B **427** (1998) 161
- [36] T. van Ritbergen, J.A.M. Vermaseren and S.A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **400** (1997) 379
- [37] M. Czakon, Nucl. Phys. B **710** (2005) 485
- [38] S. Catani and M. H. Seymour, Nucl. Phys. B **485** (1997) 291 [Erratum-ibid. B **510** (1998) 503]
- [39] G. Chachamis, Acta Phys. Polon. B **38** (2007) 3563