

# MHV One-Loop Amplitudes in Yang-Mills from Generalised Unitarity

Andreas Brandhuber and Massimiliano Vincon <sup>♣</sup>

*Centre for Research in String Theory  
Department of Physics  
Queen Mary, University of London  
Mile End Road, London, E1 4NS  
United Kingdom*

## ABSTRACT

In this letter, we exploit generalised unitarity in order to calculate the cut-constructible part of one-loop amplitudes in non-supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory. In particular, we rederive the  $n$ -gluon MHV amplitudes for both the adjacent and non-adjacent gluon helicity configurations from 3- and 4-particle cuts alone.

---

<sup>♣</sup>{a.brandhuber, m.vincon}@qmul.ac.uk

# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>2</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>MHV one-loop amplitudes: adjacent negative-helicity gluons</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>MHV one-loop amplitudes: the general negative-helicity gluons case</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>11</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Tensor Integrals</b>	<b>13</b>
A.1	Bubble Integrals . . . . .	13
A.2	Triangle Integrals . . . . .	14
A.3	Box Integrals . . . . .	14
<b>B</b>	<b>Passarino-Veltman reduction</b>	<b>14</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Spinor Identities</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>References</b>	<b>18</b>

# 1 Introduction

It is common knowledge that the unitarity method, introduced in [1, 2] and further developed in [3], proved itself to be a powerful as well as elegant tool for computing loop scattering amplitudes (see [4] and references therein for a comprehensive review). In fact, recent years have witnessed impressive achievements in the calculation of two- and higher-loop scattering amplitudes with much of the effort mostly focused on the maximally supersymmetric  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  Yang-Mills theory (MSYM) [5, 6, 7, 8]. This is primarily due to the simplicity of the perturbative expansion in the 't Hooft (planar) limit of MYSM suggested by an intriguing duality that relates MSYM at strong coupling to weakly-coupled gravity on  $AdS_5 \times S^5$  [9]. A short while ago, this duality was exploited in a different manner to compute amplitudes in MSYM [10] and in the case of four gluon amplitudes agreement was found with an all-loop order ansatz put forward in [6].

In this letter, we focus on one-loop maximally helicity violating (MHV) amplitudes in pure Yang-Mills theory. These amplitudes are of particular interest as they constitute an example of one-loop  $n$ -point scattering amplitudes in QCD, where both external and internal particles are gluons. In pure Yang-Mills the  $n$ -gluon one-loop amplitudes may be decomposed as

$$\mathcal{A}_{gluon}^n = \mathcal{A}_{\mathcal{N}=4}^n - 4\mathcal{A}_{chiral\mathcal{N}=1}^n + \mathcal{A}_{scalar}^n. \quad (1.1)$$

Although each contribution of (1.1) has been computed for the case of MHV amplitudes via application of the unitarity method [1, 2], MHV diagram approach [11, 12, 13, 14] and, to some extent, generalised unitarity [15, 16], an explicit double-check of the last term of (1.1), namely the contribution arising from a complex scalar particle running in the loop, is still lacking for the general negative-helicity gluon case<sup>1</sup>. As we felt obliged to do so, we aim in this letter to rederive the scalar contribution to the  $n$ -gluon MHV amplitude by means of the generalised unitarity method [17, 18, 3, 15].

At one-loop, generalised unitarity tells us to cut the amplitude in as many on-shell tree amplitudes as possible and to replace the propagators connecting the sub-amplitudes by  $\delta$ -functions, which put the internal particles on-shell. Explicitly, we have for the triple cuts considered in this letter the following expression for the  $n$ -gluon scalar amplitude in terms of MHV tree-amplitudes (see Figure 2):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{scalar}^n \Big|_{cut} &= \sum_{m_1, m_2, \pm} \int d^4\ell_1 d^4\ell_2 d^4\ell_3 \delta^{(+)}(\ell_1^2) \delta^{(+)}(\ell_2^2) \delta^{(+)}(\ell_3^2) \delta^4(\ell_3 - \ell_1 - Q) \delta^4(\ell_1 - \ell_2 - P) \\ &\times \mathcal{A}_{tree}(\ell_1, \dots, j^-, \dots, -\ell_2) \mathcal{A}_{tree}(\ell_2, m_1, -\ell_3) \mathcal{A}_{tree}(\ell_3, \dots, i^-, \dots, -\ell_1) \Big|_{cut}, \end{aligned} \quad (1.2)$$

where the ranges of summation of  $m_1$  and  $m_2$  are

$$j + 1 \leq m_1 \leq i - 1, \quad i + 1 \leq m_2 \leq j - 1. \quad (1.3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup>So far that term has only been calculated using MHV diagrams in [13], while the special case of adjacent negative helicity gluons was found in [2].

The  $\pm$  in (1.2) refers to the fact that we have a complex scalar running in the loop. Thus, there are two possible helicity configurations, each of which gives rise to the same integrand. In general, both triangle integrals and box integrals contribute to this triple cut. However, unlike the quadruple cut case, the three  $\delta$ -functions do not completely freeze the loop integration, so one has to carry out algebraic manipulations in order to obtain the triple cut.

On general grounds, at one-loop, four-dimensional cuts alone suffice to reconstruct the full amplitude in supersymmetric theories. However, in theories not protected by supersymmetry, there are additional rational terms which cannot be detected by cuts, unless one decides to work in  $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$  dimensions and keep higher orders in  $\epsilon$ , so that even rational terms develop discontinuities which can be detected by the unitarity method. An example of such an amplitude is the one-loop four-gluon  $++++$  with a complex scalar running in the loop. This amplitude consists of purely rational terms and a computation of it using two-particle cuts in  $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$  dimensions was carried out in [19] and confirmed in [20] using the generalised unitarity method. Recently, there has been a proposal [21] in which it is argued that certain Lorentz-violating counterterms provide these missing rational terms. We wish to make it clear that in this letter we shall only keep  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$  terms, that is we shall only work in  $D = 4$  dimensions, thus considering only the cut-constructible part of the  $n$ -gluon MHV amplitude. Hence, all the loop momenta in this letter are four-dimensional. Nevertheless, the infrared-divergent terms still require regularization and, for this purpose, we shall write them in terms of the dimensional regularization parameter  $\epsilon$ .

The amplitude (1.2) for the special case of adjacent negative helicity gluons has already been calculated in [2] using unitarity whereas the general helicity configuration was dealt with in [13] by means of the MHV diagram method. Note that the rational parts of these amplitudes have been computed analytically in [22, 23] using on-shell recursion relations. The purpose of this letter is to show how generalised unitarity correctly reproduces the cut-constructible parts of the  $n$ -gluon amplitudes with less effort than conventional two-particle cuts or the MHV diagram method. We discuss the adjacent negative-helicity case in the next section and the general case in section 3. In section 4 we present our conclusions.

## 2 MHV one-loop amplitudes: adjacent negative-helicity gluons

In this section we show how generalised unitarity may be used to compute the  $n$ -point pure Yang-Mills amplitude for the case of adjacent negative-helicity gluons.

Let us consider the triple-cut diagram depicted in Figure 1, where we choose the momenta to be outgoing. There are two such diagrams, which are obtained by flipping all the internal helicities of the scalar particles running in the loop. Note that in the adjacent case all quadruple cuts vanish and, hence, in this case no box functions appear in the amplitude.




Figure 1: *The three-particle cut diagram contributing to the  $n$ -gluon amplitude in the case of adjacent negative-helicity gluons.*

The triple cut<sup>2</sup> of the  $n$ -point amplitude is obtained by sewing three tree-level amplitudes and now (1.2) becomes

$$\mathcal{A}_{scalar}^n \Big|_{cut} = -2i A_{tree} \sum_{m=j}^{i-1} \int \frac{d^4 \ell_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{2^5 (1 \cdot 2)^3 (\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2)^2} \frac{\langle 2 | \ell_2^\mu | m \rangle \langle 1 m \rangle \langle 1 | P \ell_2^\nu | 2 \rangle \langle 2 | P \ell_2^\rho | 1 \rangle [1 2]^3}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2} \Big|_{cut}, \quad (2.1)$$

where we have already summed over the two possible helicity configurations and the  $\delta$ -functions have been replaced by unrestricted loop momenta.

Let us clarify some notations. We define the general external momenta  $k_p$  as  $k_p := p$ . Also, we define

$$P := q_{j, m-1}, \quad Q := q_{m+1, i}, \quad (2.2)$$

where  $q_{p_i, p_j} := \sum_{l=p_i}^{p_j} k_l$ . We set  $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$  for the adjacent case.

Converting (2.1) into Dirac traces yields the following integrand:

$$\frac{\text{tr}(\not{\chi} \not{\mathcal{Z}} \not{P} \not{\ell}_2) \text{tr}(\not{\chi} \not{\mathcal{Z}} \not{\ell}_2 \not{P}) \text{tr}(\not{\chi} \not{\mathcal{Z}} \not{\ell}_2 \not{P})}{2^5 (1 \cdot 2)^3 (\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2)^2}. \quad (2.3)$$

Thus, the task reduces to computing the three-index tensor integral

$$\mathcal{I}^{\mu\nu\rho}(m, P, Q) = \int \frac{d^4 \ell_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\ell_2^\mu \ell_2^\nu \ell_2^\rho}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2}, \quad (2.4)$$

which may be done by standard Passarino-Veltman (PV) integral reduction [24], the calculation of which is showed in detail in Appendix B.

<sup>2</sup>For the adopted convention, see Appendix A.

The result of the PV has to be inserted into (2.1). Doing so yields a series of terms of which, after some manipulations, only the following remain:

$$A_1 = -\frac{A_{tree}}{(t_1^{[2]})^2} \frac{1}{6} \frac{[I_2(P^2) - I_2(Q^2)]}{(Q^2 - P^2)^2} (1 \ 2 \ Q \ m)^2, \quad (2.5)$$

$$A_2 = \frac{A_{tree}}{(t_1^{[3]})^3} \frac{1}{3} \frac{[I_2(P^2) - I_2(Q^2)]}{(Q^2 - P^2)^3} (1 \ 2 \ Q \ m)^2 (1 \ 2 \ m \ Q), \quad (2.6)$$

where  $t_i^{[k]} := (p_i + p_{i+1} + \dots + p_{i+k-1})^2$  and the  $I_2$  functions are the scalar bubble functions as defined in Appendix A. In obtaining (2.5) and (2.6), we made use of the fact that momentum conservation dictates that on the triple-cut  $(\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2)^2 = 4/P^4$  and  $(m \cdot Q) = -(m \cdot P) = -(1/2)(Q^2 - P^2)$ . Also, to simplify our notation, we set  $(a_1 \ a_2 \ a_3 \ a_4) := \text{tr}(\not{a}_1 \ \not{a}_2 \ \not{a}_3 \ \not{a}_4)$  from now on.

In (2.5) and (2.6) the combinations  $[I_2(P^2) - I_2(Q^2)] / ((Q^2 - P^2)^r)$  appear, which are  $\epsilon$ -dependent triangle functions expressed as differences of two bubble functions. For convenience we choose to write them as

$$T_\epsilon^{(r)}(m, P, Q) := \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{(-P^2)^{-\epsilon} - (-Q^2)^{-\epsilon}}{(Q^2 - P^2)^r}, \quad (2.7)$$

where  $r$  is a positive integer and the momenta  $T^{(r)}$  depends on satisfy  $m + P + Q = 0$ .

As we mentioned in the Introduction, we are working in  $D = 4$  dimensions so that we really should take the  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  limit of (2.7). If  $P^2 \neq 0$  and  $Q^2 \neq 0$  we find the  $\epsilon$ -independent triangle function, which is defined by

$$T^{(r)}(m, P, Q) := \frac{\log(Q^2/P^2)}{(Q^2 - P^2)^r}. \quad (2.8)$$

In the event of the vanishing of either of the kinematic invariants, (2.7) gives rise to infrared-divergent terms since one of the numerator terms in (2.7) vanishes. We have the two following possibilities:

- $P = k_2$  when  $P^2 = 0$  ,
- $Q = k_1$  when  $Q^2 = 0$  .

Thus, the amplitude takes the following form:

$$\mathcal{A}_n^{scalar} = \mathcal{A}_{poles} + \mathcal{A}_1 + \mathcal{A}_2, \quad (2.9)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}_{poles} &= -\frac{2i}{6} \mathcal{A}_{tree} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[ (-t_2^{[2]})^{-\epsilon} + (-t_n^{[2]})^{-\epsilon} \right], \\
\mathcal{A}_1 &= -\frac{2i}{6} \mathcal{A}_{tree} \frac{1}{(t_1^{[2]})^2} \sum_{m=4}^{n-1} [(1\ 2\ P\ m)^2] T^{(2)}(m, P, Q), \\
\mathcal{A}_2 &= -\frac{2i}{3} \mathcal{A}_{tree} \frac{1}{(t_1^{[2]})^3} \sum_{m=4}^{n-1} [\text{tr}(1\ 2\ P\ m)^2 \text{tr}(1\ 2\ m\ P)] T^{(3)}(m, P, Q),
\end{aligned} \tag{2.10}$$

where we made use of the triangle functions introduced in (2.7). Equation (2.10)<sup>3</sup>, which gives the cut-constructible part of the  $n$ -point one-loop scattering amplitudes with two adjacent gluons of negative-helicity, agrees with the amplitudes found in [2] using conventional unitarity and with the amplitude found in [13] using the MHV diagrams.

### 3 MHV one-loop amplitudes: the general negative-helicity gluons case

The case in which the two negative-helicity gluons are non-adjacent is more involved. Fortunately, the calculation turns out to be more tamed than expected, since some of the algebraic manipulations involved can be related to manipulations appearing in the MHV diagram calculation of the same amplitudes [13].

As for the adjacent case, our starting expression is (1.2). A direct, brute force calculation yields rather unpleasant four-tensor box integrals. However, we do not follow this approach as it would spoil our goal to show the simplicity of the generalised unitarity method. Instead, by using momentum conservation arguments to eliminate  $\ell_3$  from (1.2), we arrive at a more elegant and manageable expression for the amplitude given by

$$\mathcal{A}_{scalar}^n \Big|_{cut} = -\frac{2i A_{tree}}{\langle i\ j \rangle^4} \sum_{m_1, m_2} \int \frac{d^4 \ell_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\langle j\ \ell_1 \rangle^2 \langle j\ \ell_2 \rangle^2 \langle i\ \ell_1 \rangle^2 \langle i\ \ell_2 \rangle^2 \langle m_2\ (m_2 + 1) \rangle \langle (m_1 - 1)\ m_1 \rangle [\ell_2\ m_1]}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2 \langle \ell_1\ (m_2 + 1) \rangle \langle (m_1 - 1)\ \ell_2 \rangle \langle m_2\ \ell_1 \rangle \langle \ell_1\ \ell_2 \rangle^2} \Big|_{cut}, \tag{3.1}$$

where in deriving (3.1) we made use of the fact that

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda_{\ell_2} &= \alpha m_1, \\
\lambda_{\ell_3} &= \beta m_1, \\
\tilde{\lambda}_{\ell_2} &= \frac{1}{\alpha} \tilde{\lambda}_{m_1} + \frac{\beta}{\alpha} \tilde{\lambda}_{\ell_3},
\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Notify that in the notation of [2, 13]  $q_{m,1} = -P$ . Also, we did not make use of the symmetry properties of the amplitude under the exchange of the gluons  $1 \leftrightarrow 2$ , thus explaining the factor of 2.




Figure 2: One of the two possible triple cut diagrams contributing to the  $n$ -gluon amplitude in the general case. The other triple cut diagram is obtained by swapping  $i$  and  $j$  through the replacements  $m_1 - 1 \rightarrow m_1$  and  $m_2 \leftrightarrow m_1$ .

with  $\lambda$  and  $\tilde{\lambda}$  holomorphic and antiholomorphic spinors of negative and positive helicity respectively.

In order to reduce the hexagon integral (3.1) to a linear combination of box and triangle integrals, we notice that multiplying and dividing (3.1) by  $\langle \ell_2 m_1 \rangle$  allows us to write the integrands<sup>4</sup>, after applying the Schouten identity twice, as a sum of four terms

$$\mathcal{C}(m_2+1, m_1) - \mathcal{C}(m_2+1, m_1-1) - \mathcal{C}(m_2, m_1) + \mathcal{C}(m_2, m_1-1), \quad (3.3)$$

where

$$\mathcal{C}(a, b) := \frac{\langle j \ell_1 \rangle^2 \langle j \ell_2 \rangle \langle i \ell_1 \rangle \langle i \ell_2 \rangle^2}{\langle \ell_1 \ell_2 \rangle^2 \langle i j \rangle^4} \cdot \frac{\langle i a \rangle \langle j b \rangle}{\langle \ell_1 a \rangle \langle \ell_2 b \rangle}. \quad (3.4)$$

Therefore, we find

$$\mathcal{A}_{\text{scalar}}^n \Big|_{\text{cut}} = 2i A_{\text{tree}} \sum_{a,b} \left[ \int \frac{d^4 \ell_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2} - \int \frac{d^4 \ell_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{\ell_1^2 \ell_3^2} \right] \mathcal{C}(a, b) \Big|_{\text{cut}}, \quad (3.5)$$

which may be compared with (4.1) of [13].

One of the triple cuts contributing to the amplitude may be seen in Figure 2 where we defined  $P := q_{m_2+1, m_1-1}$  and  $Q := q_{m_1+1, m_2}$ . Our choice for the momentum flow explains why we find the  $\mathcal{C}$  coefficients with  $a \leftrightarrow b$  compared to what was found in [13].

<sup>4</sup>The reader might argue, in view of (3.2), that  $\langle \ell_2 m_1 \rangle$  is zero which entails that we are effectively multiplying (3.1) by  $\frac{0}{0}$ . However, at this point we are off-shell as we have *uplifted* the cut integral to a Feynman integral by replacing on-shell  $\delta$ -functions by full Feynman propagators.



Although the calculation carried out in [13] is conceptually different from the one we are performing here, we can nevertheless make use of formula (B.16) in that paper, which gives a rather convenient expression for  $\mathcal{C}$ . This is

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{C}(a,b) &= \frac{(ij\ell_1\ell_2)(ij\ell_2\ell_1)(ij\ell_1a)(ijb\ell_2)}{2^8(i\cdot j)^4(\ell_1\cdot\ell_2)^2(\ell_1\cdot a)(\ell_2\cdot b)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2^8(i\cdot j)^4}(\mathcal{H}_1 + \dots + \mathcal{H}_4), \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

where we write the  $\mathcal{H}$  terms as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_1 &:= \frac{(ijba)(ij\ell_1P)(ijP\ell_1)(ij\ell_1a)}{(\ell_1\cdot\ell_2)^2(a\cdot b)(\ell_1\cdot a)} \\ &\quad - \frac{(ijba)(ijP\ell_2)(ij\ell_2P)(ij\ell_2b)}{(\ell_1\cdot\ell_2)^2(a\cdot b)(\ell_2\cdot b)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.7)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_2 &:= -\frac{(ijab)(ijba)(ijP\ell_1)(ij\ell_1a)}{(\ell_1\cdot\ell_2)(a\cdot b)^2(\ell_1\cdot a)} \\ &\quad - \frac{(ijab)(ijba)(ij\ell_2P)(ij\ell_2b)}{(\ell_1\cdot\ell_2)(a\cdot b)^2(\ell_2\cdot b)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{H}_3 &:= -\frac{(ijab)^2(ijba)(ij\ell_1a)}{(a\cdot b)^3(\ell_1\cdot a)} \\ &\quad + \frac{(ijab)^2(ijba)(ij\ell_2b)}{(a\cdot b)^3(\ell_2\cdot b)}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.9)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_4 := -\frac{(ijab)^2(ijba)^2(bP\ell_1a)}{4(a\cdot b)^4(\ell_1\cdot a)(\ell_2\cdot b)}. \quad (3.10)$$

Thus, we produce, in ascending order, linear box integrals and linear, two-tensor and three-tensor triangle integrals. We focus first on the triangle integral contributions.

Substituting for  $a$  and  $b$  in the expressions for  $\mathcal{H}$  and keeping only those terms that actually contribute to the particular triple cut depicted in Figure 2 yields combinations of differences of traces. In order to express our result in a more compact fashion, we find it useful to define the following quantities:

$$A_{m_1m_2}^{ij} := \frac{(ijm_1m_2+1)}{(m_1\cdot(m_2+1))} - \frac{(ijm_1m_2)}{(m_1\cdot m_2)}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$S_{m_1m_2}^{ij} := \frac{(ijm_1m_2+1)(ijm_2+1m_1)}{(m_1\cdot(m_2+1))^2} - \frac{(ijm_1m_2)(ijm_2m_1)}{(m_1\cdot m_2)}, \quad (3.12)$$

$$I_{m_1m_2}^{ij} := \frac{(ijm_1m_2+1)(ijm_2+1m_1)^2}{(m_1\cdot(m_2+1))^3} - \frac{(ijm_1m_2)(ijm_2m_1)^2}{(m_1\cdot m_2)^3}, \quad (3.13)$$

which exhibit the following symmetry properties

$$A_{m_1m_2}^{ij} = -A_{m_1m_2}^{ji}, \quad S_{m_1m_2}^{ij} = S_{m_1m_2}^{ji}. \quad (3.14)$$




Figure 3: A quadruple cut diagram contributing to the  $n$ -gluon amplitude in the general case.

The only integrals that survive from (3.5) are the ones with the correct triple cut, i.e. those integrals that have all three propagators that are cut in Figure 2. Hence, many of the triangle integrals can be neglected<sup>5</sup> and we are left with:

$$\mathcal{H}_1 = A_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} \frac{(i j P \ell_2)(i j \ell_2 P)(i j \ell_2 m_1)}{2^8 (i \cdot j)^4 (\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2)^2 (\ell_2 \cdot m_1)}, \quad (3.15)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_2 = S_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} \frac{(i j \ell_2 P)(i j \ell_2 m_1)}{2^8 (i \cdot j)^4 (\ell_1 \cdot \ell_2) (\ell_2 \cdot m_1)}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\mathcal{H}_3 = I_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} \frac{(i j \ell_2 m_1)}{2^8 (i \cdot j)^4 (\ell_2 \cdot m_1)}. \quad (3.17)$$

As a consistency check, we wish to inspect the quadruple cut which is depicted in Figure 3 for which we find the following:

$$\mathcal{H}_4 = \left[ \frac{(i j m_2 m_1)^2 (i j m_1 m_2)^2}{2^8 (i \cdot j)^4 (m_2 \cdot m_1)^4} \right] \frac{(m_1 P \ell_1 m_2)}{4 (l_1 \cdot m_2) (l_2 \cdot m_1)}, \quad (3.18)$$

which may be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_4 = \frac{1}{4} [b_{m_1 m_2}^{ij}]^2 \frac{(m_1 P \ell_1 m_2)}{(l_1 \cdot m_2) (l_2 \cdot m_1)}, \quad (3.19)$$

in terms of the coefficient of the box integral function appearing in the one-loop  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  MHV

<sup>5</sup>One consequence of these considerations is that the first integral on the right hand side of (3.5) can be ignored altogether.

amplitude with the same helicity configuration computed in [2]

$$b_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} := -\frac{1}{8} \frac{(i j m_2 m_1)(i j m_1 m_2)}{(i \cdot j)^2 (m_1 \cdot m_2)^2}. \quad (3.20)$$

We can now present the complete result<sup>6</sup> for the one-loop  $n$ -gluon MHV amplitude (1.2) reconstructed using the generalised unitarity method:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{scalar}^n &= 2i \mathcal{A}_{tree} \left\{ \sum_{m_1=j+1}^{i-1} \sum_{m_2=i}^{j-1} \frac{1}{2} [b_{m_1 m_2}^{ij}]^2 F \left( t_{m_1}^{[m_2-m_1]}, t_{m_1+1}^{[m_2-m_1-1]}, P, Q \right) \right. \\ &\quad + \left( \frac{8}{3} \sum_{m_1=j+1}^{i-1} \sum_{m_2=i}^{j-1} \left[ \mathcal{A}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} T^{(3)}(m_1, P, Q) + (i \cdot j) \tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} T^{(2)}(m_1, P, Q) \right] \right. \\ &\quad + 2 \sum_{m_1=j+1}^{i-1} \sum_{m_2=i}^{j-1} \left[ \mathcal{S}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} T^{(2)}(m_1, P, Q) - \mathcal{I}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} T(m_1, P, Q) \right] \\ &\quad \left. \left. + (i \leftrightarrow j) \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

where we have introduced for convenience the following quantities:

$$\mathcal{A}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} := -2^{-8} (i \cdot j)^{-4} A_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} [(i j m_1 Q)(i j Q m_1)^2], \quad (3.22)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{A}}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} := -2^{-8} (i \cdot j)^{-4} A_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} [(i j Q m_1)^2], \quad (3.23)$$

$$\mathcal{S}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} := 2^{-8} (i \cdot j)^{-4} S_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} [(i j Q m_1)^2], \quad (3.24)$$

$$\mathcal{I}_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} := 2^{-8} (i \cdot j)^{-4} I_{m_1 m_2}^{ij} [(i j Q m_1)]. \quad (3.25)$$

The amplitude (3.21) agrees precisely with the result found in [13]. Once again, in deriving (3.21) we did not make use of the symmetry properties of the amplitude under exchange of the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th gluon.

Similarly to the adjacent case, the infrared divergent terms may be extracted from the cases when  $P^2$  or  $Q^2$  vanish (see Figure 2). When that is the case we have  $m_1 = i-1$  and  $m_2 = i$  for  $Q^2 = 0$ . Conversely, we have  $m_1 = j+1$  and  $m_2 = j-1$  for  $P^2 = 0$ . Hence,

$$T^{(r)}(p, P, Q) \rightarrow (-)^r \frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{(-t_{i-1}^{[2]})^{-\epsilon}}{(t_{i-1}^{[2]})^r}, \quad Q^2 \rightarrow 0, \quad (3.26)$$

$$T^{(r)}(p, P, Q) \rightarrow -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{(-t_j^{[2]})^{-\epsilon}}{(t_j^{[2]})^r}, \quad P^2 \rightarrow 0. \quad (3.27)$$

---

<sup>6</sup>We have already multiplied by a factor of 2 due to the two scalar helicity configurations running in the loop

Thus, we find the following infrared-divergent terms for  $Q^2 = 0$ :

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \cdot (-t_{i-1}^{[2]})^{-\epsilon} 4(i \cdot j) \frac{(i j i-1 i+1)}{((i+1) \cdot (i-1))} \\
& \cdot \left[ \frac{8}{3}(i \cdot j)^2 - 2 \frac{(i j i+1 i-1)}{((i+1) \cdot (i-1))(i \cdot j)} + \frac{(i j i+1 i-1)(i j i-1 i+1)}{((i+1) \cdot (i-1))^2} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.28}$$

Similarly, we find for  $P^2 = 0$  the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{1}{2\epsilon} \cdot (-t_j^{[2]})^{-\epsilon} 4(i \cdot j) \frac{(i j j-1 j+1)}{((j+1) \cdot (j-1))} \\
& \cdot \left[ \frac{8}{3}(i \cdot j)^2 - 2 \frac{(i j j+1 j-1)}{((j+1) \cdot (j-1))(i \cdot j)} + \frac{(i j j+1 j-1)(i j j-1 j+1)}{((j+1) \cdot (j-1))^2} \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

## 4 Conclusions

We have shown how generalised unitarity correctly reproduces the cut-constructible part of the  $n$ -gluon one-loop MHV scattering amplitudes in pure Yang-Mills, both for the adjacent and for the general case. In deriving our result we did not make use of any two-particle cuts, which provides further evidence to the proposal, put forward in [21], that cut-constructible parts of one-loop amplitudes can be obtained from triple and quadruple cuts alone. Clearly, it would be interesting to check this for more general amplitudes.

A first, important step would be to gain knowledge of the one-loop  $n$ -gluon next-to maximally helicity violating amplitudes (NMHV), that is amplitudes with three negative helicities. While the purely gluonic 6-, 7- and  $n$ -point one-loop  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  NMHV amplitudes were computed in [2, 15, 25, 26] using generalised unitarity, 6- and  $n$ -point one-loop amplitudes involving adjoint fermions and scalars in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  gauge theory were found in [27, 28]. A different approach was employed in [29] for the 7-gluon amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  NMHV, whereby the authors managed to exploit the holomorphic anomaly of unitarity cuts to reconstruct the amplitude by evaluating the action of a certain differential operator on the cut. Furthermore, the holomorphic anomaly was also utilised in [30] to compute the 6-point one-loop  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  NMHV amplitude, while generalised unitarity provided the  $n$ -gluon one-loop  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  NMHV amplitude in [16] for the case that the three negative helicity gluons are adjacent. This latter amplitude has been calculated in pure Yang-Mills in [31] using an iterative approach. Finally, the coefficients of bubble and triangle integral functions for non-supersymmetric six-gluon amplitudes were computed in [32].

Let us conclude with some remarks on preliminary investigations of the NMHV case. We have started to investigate a particular class of non-supersymmetric NMHV amplitudes, namely  $\mathcal{A}_{scalar}^n(1^+, \dots, i^-, j^-, \dots, k^-, \dots, n^+)$ , i.e. amplitudes where the  $i$ -th and  $j$ -th negative helicity gluons are adjacent and the  $k$ -th one is in an arbitrary position. In order to tackle the problem, we start by identifying all possible triple cuts contributing to the amplitude, which may be seen




Figure 4: *The triple-cut diagrams contributing to the  $n$ -gluon one-loop NMHV amplitude.*

in Figure 4. The triple cut drawn in Figure 4a poses no new problems (we found structures similar to those appearing in the calculation of the MHV amplitude we investigated in this letter). For the remaining triple cuts in Figure 4b, 4c and 4d an additional difficulty arises, since the tree amplitudes appearing in the triple cut (1.2) may be NMHV. Thus, we cannot employ the Parke-Taylor formula for the standard MHV tree amplitudes. In [33], it was shown how tree amplitudes in Yang-Mills theories may be derived by sewing together MHV vertices, suitably continued off-shell (CSW prescription), and connected by scalar bosonic propagators  $1/p^2$  (see [34] for a review). This novel diagrammatic approach stemmed from an insight which relates the perturbative expansion of  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  super Yang-Mills theory to D-instanton expansion in the topological B model on super twistor space  $CP^{3|4}$  [35]. By applying manipulations similar to those used in this letter, we mostly obtain three-tensor triangle integrals although some more complicated three-tensor pentagon integrals still appear<sup>7</sup>. In a straightforward application of the CSW rules spurious poles arise and it is necessary to use improved formulas for the NMHV tree amplitudes [37] that have only physical poles. We plan to study this case in more detail in the future.

<sup>7</sup>In dealing with the NMHV tree amplitudes, we heavily used the results of [36, 37, 38].

# Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Gabriele Travaglini for numerous discussions. AB would like to thank STFC/PPARC for support under the grants PP/D507323/1 and PP/C50426X/1.

## A Tensor Integrals

In this Appendix we define the one-loop integrals<sup>8</sup> encountered in this paper, which were used in performing the PV reductions. Furthermore, we present formulas for the PV reductions of all tensor bubble, triangle and box integrals appearing in our letter. The more complicated three-tensor triangle integral is dealt with separately in Appendix B.

### A.1 Bubble Integrals

The bubble integral is defined by

$$I_2[P(\ell^\mu)] = -i(4\pi)^2 \int \frac{d^4\ell}{(2\pi)^{4-2\epsilon}} \frac{P(\ell^\mu)}{\ell^2(\ell - K)^2}, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where  $K$  is the total outgoing momentum at one side of the bubble and, in the rest of this Appendix,  $P(\ell^\mu)$  is some polynomial in the loop momentum  $\ell^\mu$ . Evaluation of the scalar bubble integral yields

$$I_2[1] = r_\Gamma \frac{(-Q^2)^{-\epsilon}}{\epsilon(1-2\epsilon)} = r_\Gamma \left[ \left( \frac{1}{\epsilon} + 2 - \ln(-Q^2) \right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon) \right], \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where

$$r_\Gamma = \frac{\Gamma(1+\epsilon)\Gamma^2(1-\epsilon)}{\Gamma(1-2\epsilon)}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Thus, we see that the difference of two scalar bubbles gives rise to (2.8) to  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$ .

The PV reduction of the linear and two-tensor bubble integrals are given by

$$I_2[\ell_2^\mu] = -\frac{1}{2}I_2(P^2)P^\mu, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

$$I_2[\ell_2^\mu \ell_2^\nu] = \frac{1}{3}I_2(P^2)P^\mu P^\nu - \frac{1}{12}I_2(P^2)P^2 \eta^{\mu\nu}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

---

<sup>8</sup>We followed the convention as given in [2]. Notice that, although here the integrals are not given in a dimensionally regularised manner, there is not difference up to  $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$  with the ones found in [2].

## A.2 Triangle Integrals

A general tensor triangle integral is defined by

$$I_3[P(\ell^\mu)] = i(4\pi)^2 \int \frac{d^4\ell}{(2\pi)^{4-2\epsilon}} \frac{P(\ell^\mu)}{\ell^2(\ell - K_1)^2(\ell + K_3)^2}, \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where the  $K_i$  are sums of the momenta  $k_i$  of the external gluons at each vertex. We found that the linear and two-tensor triangle integrals are given by

$$I_3[\ell_2^\mu] = -T^{(1)}P^\mu, \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$I_3[\ell_2^\mu \ell_2^\nu] = \frac{1}{2}T^{(1)}P^\mu P^\nu - \frac{1}{2}P^2 T^{(2)}(P^\mu m^\nu + P^\nu m^\mu), \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$(\text{A.9})$$

where only the contributing terms have been written.

## A.3 Box Integrals

The box integral is defined by

$$I_4[P(\ell^\mu)] = -i(4\pi)^2 \int \frac{d^4\ell}{(2\pi)^{4-2\epsilon}} \frac{P(\ell^\mu)}{\ell^2(\ell - K_1)^2(p - K_1 - K_2)^2(\ell + K_4)^2} \quad (\text{A.10})$$

For the linear box integral we found

$$\begin{aligned} I_4[\ell_1^\mu] &= \frac{(m_1 \cdot m_2) P^2 I_4 - (m_1 \cdot P) [I_3 + 2 I_4] (m_2 \cdot P)}{2 [(m_1 \cdot m_2) P^2 - 2 (m_2 \cdot P)(m_1 \cdot P)]} P^\mu \\ &+ \frac{(m_1 \cdot m_2) P^2 [I_3 - (m_2 \cdot P) I_4] + (m_1 \cdot P)(m_2 \cdot P) [2 I_4(m_2 \cdot P) - I_3]}{2 [(m_1 \cdot m_2) P^2 - 2 (m_2 \cdot P)(m_1 \cdot P)]} m_1^\mu, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.11})$$

where we are omitting the  $m_2$  term since it drops out when inserted in (3.19). The interested reader is referred to the very helpful Appendices I and II of [2] for a more complete discussion of bubble, triangle and box integrals.

## B Passarino-Veltman reduction

In this section we carry out the reduction of the three-index tensor integral found in (2.3) and (3.15)

$$\mathcal{I}^{\mu\nu\rho}(m_1, P, Q) = \int d^4\ell_2 \frac{\ell_2^\mu \ell_2^\nu \ell_2^\rho}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2}. \quad (\text{B.1})$$

(B.1) may be decomposed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}^{\mu\nu\rho} = & a(P^\mu P^\nu P^\rho) + b(P^\mu m^\nu m^\rho + P^\nu m^\mu m^\rho + P^\rho m^\nu m^\mu) + \\ & c(P^\mu P^\nu m^\rho + P^\mu P^\rho m^\nu + P^\nu P^\rho m^\mu) + d(P^\mu \eta^{\rho\nu} + P^\nu \eta^{\mu\rho} + P^\rho \eta^{\mu\nu}) + \\ & e(m^\mu \eta^{\nu\rho} + m^\nu \eta^{\mu\rho} + m^\rho \eta^{\nu\mu}) + f(m^\mu m^\nu m^\rho). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Taking contractions with all possible momenta then yields

•  $P_\mu P_\nu P_\rho$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 = \int \frac{(\ell_2 \cdot P)^3}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2} = & aP^8 + 3b[P^2(m \cdot P)^2] + 3c[(m \cdot P)P^4] + \\ & + 3dP^4 + 3e[(m \cdot P)P^2] + f(m \cdot P)^3, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.3})$$

•  $P_\mu m_\nu m_\rho$

$$\mathcal{I}_2 = \int \frac{(\ell_2 \cdot P)(m \cdot \ell_2)^2}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2} = a[P^2(m \cdot P)^2] + c(m \cdot P)^3 + 2d(m \cdot P)^2, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

•  $P_\mu P_\nu m_\rho$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_3 = \int \frac{(m \cdot \ell_2)(\ell_2 \cdot P)^2}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2} = & a[(m \cdot P)P^4] + b(m \cdot P)^3 + 2c[P^2(m \cdot P)^2] + \\ & 3d[P^2(m \cdot P)] + 2e(m \cdot P)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

•  $P_\mu \eta_{\nu\rho}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_4 = \int \frac{(P \cdot \ell_2)}{\ell_1^2 \ell_3^2} = & aP^4 + 2b[(m \cdot P)^2] + 3c[P^2(m \cdot P)] + \\ & 6dP^2 + 6e(m \cdot P), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.6})$$

•  $m_\mu \eta_{\nu\rho}$

$$\mathcal{I}_5 = \int \frac{(\ell_2 \cdot m)}{\ell_1^2 \ell_3^2} = a[(m \cdot P)P^2] + 2c(m \cdot P)^2 + 6d(m \cdot P), \quad (\text{B.7})$$

•  $m_\mu m_\nu m_\rho$

$$\mathcal{I}_6 = \int \frac{(\ell_2 \cdot m)^3}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2} = a(m \cdot P)^3. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

The integrals take the following values:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_1 = & -\frac{1}{2}(m \cdot P)^2 I_2(Q^2) - \frac{1}{8}P^2 I_3 \\ & -\frac{1}{6}(P \cdot Q)^2 I_2(Q^2) + \frac{1}{24}Q^2 P^2 I_2(Q^2) \\ & -\frac{1}{2}(m \cdot P)(P \cdot Q) I_2(Q^2) + \frac{1}{4}(m \cdot P) I_2(Q^2) \\ & + \frac{1}{8}P^2 (P \cdot Q) I_2(Q^2) - \frac{1}{8}P^4 I_2(Q^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.9})$$



$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{I}_2 &= -\frac{1}{6}(m \cdot Q)^2 I_2(Q^2) - \frac{1}{8}P^2(m \cdot Q)I_2(Q^2) - \frac{1}{8}P^2(m \cdot P)I_2(P^2), \\
\mathcal{I}_3 &= \frac{1}{2}(m \cdot P)^2 I_2(Q^2) + \frac{1}{6}(P \cdot Q)^2 I_2(Q^2) + \frac{1}{2}(m \cdot P)(P \cdot Q)I_2(Q^2) \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{24}Q^2 P^2 I_2(Q^2) - \frac{1}{6}P^4 I_2(P^2) + \frac{1}{24}P^4 I_2(P^2), \\
\mathcal{I}_4 &= (m \cdot P)I_2(Q^2) + \frac{1}{2}(P \cdot Q)I_2(Q^2), \\
\mathcal{I}_5 &= \frac{1}{2}(m \cdot Q)I_2(Q^2), \\
\mathcal{I}_6 &= \frac{1}{6}(m \cdot Q)^2 I_2(Q^2) - \frac{1}{6}(m \cdot P)^2 I_2(P^2),
\end{aligned}$$

Finally, using Mathematica to carry out the algebraic manipulations, we retrieve the coefficients of the expansion (B.2)

$$\begin{aligned}
a &= \frac{I_2(Q^2) - I_2(P^2)}{3Q^2 - 3P^2}, \\
b &= \frac{P^4(I_2(P^2) - I_2(Q^2))}{3(P^2 - Q^2)^3}, \\
c &= \frac{P^2(I_2(Q^2) - I_2(P^2))}{6(P^2 - Q^2)^2}, \\
d &= \frac{Q^2 I_2(Q^2) - P^2 I_2(P^2)}{12(P^2 - Q^2)}, \\
e &= \frac{(Q^4 - 2P^2 Q^2)I_2(Q^2) + P^4 I_2(P^2)}{12(P^2 - Q^2)^2},
\end{aligned} \tag{B.10}$$

where we chose not to write the  $f$  coefficient as one can easily check that the  $m_\mu m_\nu m_\rho$  term vanishes once inserted into the appropriate Dirac trace formulas appearing in our calculations. Incidentally, the  $f$  coefficient is the only place where the  $I_3$  scalar triangle function appears.

Thus, (B.1) takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}
\int d^4 \ell_2 \frac{\ell_2^\mu \ell_2^\nu \ell_2^\rho}{\ell_1^2 \ell_2^2 \ell_3^2} &= \frac{I_2(Q^2) - I_2(P^2)}{3Q^2 - 3P^2} (P^\mu P^\nu P^\rho) + \frac{P^4(I_2(P^2) - I_2(Q^2))}{3(P^2 - Q^2)^3} (P^\mu m^\nu m^\rho) \\
&+ \frac{P^2(I_2(Q^2) - I_2(P^2))}{6(P^2 - Q^2)^2} (P^\mu P^\nu m^\rho) + \frac{Q^2 I_2(Q^2) - P^2 I_2(P^2)}{12(P^2 - Q^2)} (P^\mu \eta^{\nu\rho}) \\
&+ \frac{(Q^4 - 2P^2 Q^2)I_2(Q^2) + P^4 I_2(P^2)}{12(P^2 - Q^2)^2} (m^\mu \eta^{\nu\rho}).
\end{aligned} \tag{B.11}$$

## C Spinor Identities

We list here some spinor identities which were useful throughout the calculations. The Schouten identity is given by

$$\langle i j \rangle \langle k l \rangle = \langle i l \rangle \langle k j \rangle + \langle i k \rangle \langle j l \rangle. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

Also, other identities are

$$[i j] \langle j i \rangle = \text{tr}_+(\not{k}_i \not{k}_j) = 2(k_i \cdot k_j), \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$[i j] \langle j l \rangle [l m] \langle m i \rangle = \text{tr}_+(\not{k}_i \not{k}_j \not{k}_l \not{k}_m). \quad (\text{C.3})$$

In dealing with Dirac traces, we found useful the following identities:

$$\text{tr}_+(\not{k}_i \not{k}_j \not{k}_l \not{k}_m) = \text{tr}_+(\not{k}_m \not{k}_l \not{k}_j \not{k}_i) = \text{tr}_+(\not{k}_l \not{k}_m \not{k}_i \not{k}_j), \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$\text{tr}_+(\not{k}_i \not{k}_j \not{k}_l \not{k}_m) = 4(k_i \cdot k_j)(k_l \cdot k_m) - \text{tr}_+(\not{k}_j \not{k}_i \not{k}_l \not{k}_m). \quad (\text{C.5})$$

## References

- [1] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, *One-Loop  $n$ -point Gauge Theory Amplitudes, Unitarity and Collinear Limits*, Nucl. Phys. B **425**, 217 (1994), [hep-ph/9403226](#).
- [2] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, *Fusing Gauge Theory Tree Amplitudes into Loop Amplitudes*, Nucl. Phys. B **435**, 59 (1995), [hep-ph/9409265](#).
- [3] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, *One-loop Amplitudes for  $e^+ e^-$  to Four Partons*, Nucl. Phys. B **513**, 3 (1998), [hep-ph/9708239](#).
- [4] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, *On-Shell Methods in Perturbative QCD*, Annals Phys. **322**, 1587 (2007), [0704.2798](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [5] C. Anastasiou, Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, *Planar Amplitudes in Maximally Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 251602 (2003), [hep-th/0309040](#).
- [6] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and V. A. Smirnov, *Iteration of Planar Amplitudes in Maximally Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory at Three Loops and Beyond*, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 085001 (2005), [hep-th/0505205](#).
- [7] Z. Bern, M. Czakon, L. J. Dixon, D. A. Kosower and V. A. Smirnov, *The Four-Loop Amplitude and Cusp Anomalous Dimension in Maximally Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory*, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 085010 (2007), [hep-th/0610248](#).
- [8] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, H. Johansson and D. A. Kosower, *Maximally Supersymmetric Planar Yang-Mills Amplitudes at Five Loops*, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 125020 (2007), [0705.1864](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [9] J. M. Maldacena, *The Large  $N$  Limit of Superconformal Field Theories and Supergravity*, Adv. Theor. Math. Phys. **2**, 231 (1998) [[Int. J. Theor. Phys.](#) **38**, 1113 (1999)], [hep-th/9711200](#).
- [10] L. F. Alday and J. M. Maldacena, *Gluon Scattering Amplitudes at Strong Coupling*, JHEP **0706**, 064 (2007), [0705.0303](#) [[hep-th](#)].
- [11] A. Brandhuber, B. Spence and G. Travaglini, *One-Loop Gauge Theory Amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  Super Yang-Mills from MHV Vertices*, Nucl. Phys. B **706**, 150 (2005), [hep-th/0407214](#).
- [12] J. Bedford, A. Brandhuber, B. Spence and G. Travaglini, *A Twistor Approach to One-Loop Amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory*, Nucl. Phys. B **706**, 100 (2005), [hep-th/0410280](#).
- [13] J. Bedford, A. Brandhuber, B. Spence and G. Travaglini, *Non-Supersymmetric Loop Amplitudes and MHV Vertices*, Nucl. Phys. B **712**, 59 (2005), [hep-th/0412108](#).

- [14] C. Quigley and M. Rozali, *One-Loop MHV Amplitudes in Supersymmetric Gauge Theories*, JHEP **0501**, 053 (2005), [hep-th/0410278](#).
- [15] R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, *Generalised Unitarity and One-Loop Amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  Super Yang-Mills*, Nucl. Phys. B **725**, 275 (2005), [hep-th/0412103](#).
- [16] S. J. Bidder, N. E. J. Bjerrum-Bohr, D. C. Dunbar and W. B. Perkins, *One-Loop Gluon Scattering Amplitudes in Theories with  $\mathcal{N} < 4$* , Phys. Lett. B **612**, 75 (2005), [hep-th/0502028](#).
- [17] R. E. Cutkosky, *Singularities and Discontinuities of Feynman Amplitudes*, J. Math. Phys. **1**, 429 (1960).
- [18] R. J. Eden, P. V. Landshoff, D. I. Olive and J. C. Polkinghorne, *The Analytic S-Matrix* (Cambridge University Press, 1966).
- [19] Z. Bern and A. G. Morgan, *Massive Loop Amplitudes from Unitarity*, Nucl. Phys. B **467**, 479 (1996), [hep-ph/9511336](#).
- [20] A. Brandhuber, S. McNamara, B. Spence and G. Travaglini, *Loop Amplitudes in Pure Yang-Mills from Generalised Unitarity*, JHEP **0510**, 011 (2005), [hep-th/0506068](#).
- [21] A. Brandhuber, B. Spence, G. Travaglini and K. Zoubos, *One-Loop MHV Rules and Pure Yang-Mills*, JHEP **0707**, 002 (2007), 0704.0245 [[hep-th](#)].
- [22] D. Forde and D. A. Kosower, *All-Multiplicity One-loop Corrections to MHV Amplitudes in QCD*, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 061701 (2006), [hep-ph/0509358](#).
- [23] Carola F. Berger, Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. Forde and D. A. Kosower, *All One-Loop Maximally Helicity Violating Gluonic Amplitudes in QCD*, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 016006 (2007), [hep-ph/0607014](#).
- [24] G. Passarino and M. J. G. Veltman, *One-Loop Corrections for  $e^+ e^-$  Annihilation into  $\mu^+ \mu^-$  in the Weinberg Model*, Nucl. Phys. B **160**, 151 (1979).
- [25] Z. Bern, V. Del Duca, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, *All Non-Maximally-Helicity-Violating One-Loop Seven-Gluon Amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  Super Yang-Mills Theory*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 045006 (2005), [hep-th/0410224](#).
- [26] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, *All Next-to-Maximally-Helicity-Violating One-Loop Amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  Super Yang-Mills Theory*, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 045014 (2005), [hep-th/0412210](#).
- [27] S. J. Bidder, D. C. Dunbar and W. B. Perkins, *Supersymmetric Ward Identities and NMHV Amplitudes Involving Gluinos*, JHEP **0508**, 055 (2005), [hep-th/0505249](#).
- [28] S. J. Bidder, W. B. Perkins and K. Risager, *One-Loop NMHV Amplitudes Involving Gluinos and Scalars in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  Gauge Theory*, JHEP **0510**, 003 (2005), [hep-th/0507170](#).

- [29] R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, *Computing One-Loop Amplitudes from the Holomorphic Anomaly of Unitarity Cuts*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 025012 (2005), [hep-th/0410179](#).
- [30] S. J. Bidder, N. E. J. Bjerrum-Bohr, L. J. Dixon and D. C. Dunbar,  *$\mathcal{N} = 1$  Supersymmetric One-Loop Amplitudes and the Holomorphic Anomaly of Unitarity Cuts*, Phys. Lett. B **606**, 189 (2005), [hep-th/0410296](#).
- [31] Z. Bern, N. E. J. Bjerrum-Bohr, D. C. Dunbar and H. Ita, *Recursive Calculation of One-Loop QCD Integral Coefficients*, JHEP **0511**, 027 (2005), [hep-ph/0507019](#).
- [32] R. Britto, B. Feng and P. Mastrolia, *The Cut-Constructible Part of QCD Amplitudes*, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 105004 (2006), [hep-th/0602178](#).
- [33] F. Cachazo, P. Svrček and E. Witten, *MHV Vertices and Tree Amplitudes in Gauge Theory*, JHEP **0409**, 006 (2004), [hep-th/0403047](#).
- [34] A. Brandhuber and G. Travaglini, *Quantum MHV Diagrams*, [hep-th/0609011](#).
- [35] E. Witten, *Perturbative Gauge Theory as a String Theory in Twistor Space*, Commun. Math. Phys. **252**, 189 (2004), [hep-th/0312171](#).
- [36] G. Georgiou and V. V. Khoze, *Tree Amplitudes in Gauge Theory as Scalar MHV Diagrams*, JHEP **0405**, 070 (2004), [hep-th/0404072](#).
- [37] D. A. Kosower, *Next-to-Maximal Helicity Violating Amplitudes in Gauge Theory*, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 045007 (2005), [hep-th/0406175](#).
- [38] G. Georgiou, E. W. N. Glover and V. V. Khoze, *Non-MHV Tree Amplitudes in Gauge Theory*, JHEP **0407**, 048 (2004), [hep-th/0407027](#).