

# MHV amplitudes, Wilson loops and the BDS ansatz in the superconformal $\mathcal{N} = 2$ QCD

---

**Valentin V. Khoze**

*Department of Physics and IPPP, University of Durham, Durham, DH1 3LE, UK*

valya.khoze@durham.ac.uk

ABSTRACT: We consider planar amplitudes and Wilson loops in theories with  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetry. Using loop-level MHV-rules we argue that when  $N_f = 2N_c$  (where the theory is superconformal) the entire structure of planar MHV amplitudes of the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  gauge theory carries over to the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD. Specifically, we claim that the infra-red finite parts (evaluated at  $\epsilon = 0$ ) of the colour-ordered MHV amplitudes coincide in these two superconformal theories to all loop orders in planar perturbation theory. We then use the underlying conformal symmetry to argue that a similar matching also occurs for the light-like polygon Wilson loops. This correspondence implies a very high degree of similarity between the two distinct superconformal theories. It also suggests that the relative simplicity of planar MHV amplitudes observed previously in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  is likely to be a consequence of conformal invariance and may also hold in other (super)conformal settings in four dimensions.

## 1. Introduction

In the maximally supersymmetric  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  gauge theory, Bern, Dixon and Smirnov have written down the by now seminal expression [1] for the MHV scattering amplitudes (see also Ref. [2]),

$$\begin{aligned} A_n^{\text{BDS}}(\{k_i, h_i\}) &= A_n^{\text{tree}}(\{k_i, h_i\}) \cdot \mathcal{M}_n(\{k_i\}; \varepsilon) \\ &= A_n^{\text{tree}}(\{k_i, h_i\}) \cdot \exp \left[ \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} a^l \left( f^{(l)}(\varepsilon) M_n^{(1)}(\{k_i\}; l\varepsilon) + C^{(l)} + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon) \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (1.1)$$

This formula was conjectured to be valid to all orders in planar perturbation theory. Here  $A_n^{\text{tree}}$  is the tree-level amplitude,  $a = \frac{N_c \alpha_s}{2\pi} (4\pi e^{-\gamma})^\varepsilon$  is the effective 't Hooft coupling constant in  $D = 4 - 2\varepsilon$  dimensions, and  $M_n^{(1)}$  is a one-loop expression<sup>1</sup> which depends on the kinematic invariants, but not on helicities and types of the external particles [1]. Apart from  $M_n^{(1)}$  the rest of the exponent in (1.1) does not depend on the kinematics of the process, and as such the entire amplitude is *essentially* determined by the exponentiation of a one-loop result  $M_n^{(1)}$  appropriately weighted with constants, see also (1.4) below. The quantities  $f^{(l)}(\varepsilon)$  and  $C^{(l)}$  are constants, with  $f^{(l)}(\varepsilon)$  given by

$$f^{(l)}(\varepsilon) := \frac{1}{4} \hat{\gamma}_K^{(l)} + \varepsilon \frac{l}{2} \hat{G}_0^{(l)} + \varepsilon^2 f_2^{(l)}, \quad (1.2)$$

in terms of the  $l$ -loop coefficients  $\hat{\gamma}_K^{(l)}$  of the cusp anomalous dimension  $\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(a)$  and two other quantities [1]. It is often convenient to express  $\mathcal{M}_n$  in (1.1) as a product of the  $IR$ -singular  $Z_n^{\text{Div}}$  term (which was known previously) and the finite  $F_n$  contribution,

$$\mathcal{M}_n(\{k_i\}; \varepsilon) = \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{8} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} a^l \left( \frac{\hat{\gamma}_K^{(l)}}{(l\varepsilon)^2} + \frac{G_0^{(l)}}{l\varepsilon} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n \left( \frac{\mu^2}{-s_{i,i+1}} \right)^{l\varepsilon} \right] \cdot F_n(\{k_i\}; \varepsilon). \quad (1.3)$$

Then the BDS proposal amounts to the prediction for the finite part at  $\varepsilon = 0$ ,

$$F_n^{\text{BDS}}(\{k_i\}; 0) = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{4} \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(a) F_n^{(1)}(\{k_i\}; 0) + \text{const} \right] \quad (1.4)$$

where  $F_n^{(1)}$  is the finite part of the one-loop expression  $M_n^{(1)}$  evaluated at  $\varepsilon = 0$ .

In section 3 we will review another remarkable and ultimately related to BDS development [4–8] which concerns light-like polygon Wilson loops in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theory.

The expression (1.1) has been confirmed for  $n = 4$  at three loops [1, 2], and for  $n = 5$  at two loops in [9]. However, for higher-point amplitudes with  $n \geq 6$  the validity of the BDS formula was questioned from different perspectives in Refs. [8, 10, 11].

It is now known [12, 13] that the BDS conjecture (1.1) does not agree with the explicit two-loop calculation of a 6-point MHV amplitude [12], and has to be corrected. However,

---

<sup>1</sup>It is the sum of the so-called 2-mass-easy boxes [3].

if one assumes that there is a duality relation [4–8] between the planar MHV amplitudes and the light-like Wilson loops which holds at weak coupling then the situation improves. We will return to this duality conjecture and the calculational evidence [12, 13], [4–8] in its favour in section 3. In all likelihood, [6, 7] the BDS expression (1.1) gives the correct result for  $n = 4$  and  $n = 5$  point amplitudes to all orders in perturbation theory. At the same time, for 6- and higher-point amplitudes starting from two loops, the exponent in (1.1) will need to be corrected by an as yet unknown remainder function of the three dual-space-conformally-invariant ratios of kinematic invariants [7, 8, 12, 13]. A recent review can be found in [14].

There is also another route to verify the exponentiated structure of the gauge theory amplitudes. In a very insightful paper [15] Alday and Maldacena gave a string theory prescription for computing planar  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  amplitudes at strong coupling using the AdS/CFT correspondence. These amplitudes are determined by a certain classical string solution and contain a universal exponential factor involving the action of the classical string. For 4-point amplitudes this classical string action was calculated in [15] and matched with the exponent of the BDS prediction (1.1). More generally there is now a string theory explanation for why planar amplitudes exponentiate. Remarkably, the same exponentiation must hold not only for the MHV, but also for the non-MHV amplitudes [16] – though for the latter case the exponentiation can only occur in the strong coupling limit (and does not hold in the weakly coupled perturbation theory).

$\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM in the conformal phase is in many respects a special theory: as a field theory it is maximally supersymmetric, conformal and  $SL(2, Z)$  self-dual. The main goal of this paper is to investigate planar amplitudes and Wilson loops in different conformal theory with  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetry and with fundamental quark flavours. Gauge theories with  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetry have been studied in great detail and especially over the last decade and a half in the context of the Seiberg-Witten theory [17] (albeit on non-conformal branches where scalar fields develop VEVs). The scattering amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$ , however have not been analysed in detail so far. We will argue that the entire structure of planar MHV amplitudes and of the light-like polygon Wilson loops of the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  gauge theory carries over to the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD, but only if the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  theory is superconformal. This is an interesting fact on its own right as it essentially implies a very high degree of similarity between the two distinct theories. It also shows that the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  QCD is nearly solvable, at least for the MHV-type scattering amplitudes in the planar limit.

We interpret the results of this paper and of its companion [18] as a calculational evidence that the relative simplicity and the highly constrained form of the MHV amplitudes and of the light-like Wilson loops in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM is likely a consequence of conformal invariance. It is tempting to speculate that the original conformal invariance of the theory (which is difficult to use directly to constrain the amplitudes) is intrinsically linked with the as yet mysterious dual-space conformal symmetry which was first proposed for the MHV amplitudes in [19] in the context of the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM. We can treat the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  case as a family of theories characterised by a parameter,  $N_f/(2N_c)$ , which for values different

from 1 is not conformal. When the conformal invariance is lost in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$ , the matching to the previously known  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  results is lost as well, as can be seen immediately from the results of [18] where MHV amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD were calculated at one loop for generic values of  $N_f$ . Note that few other superconformal theories with  $\mathcal{N} = 0, 1, 2$ , obtained from  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  by either marginal deformations, or by orientifolding (or orbifolding), were shown in Ref. [20] to completely reproduce the structure of the MHV amplitudes of the original  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM.

We note that the method of [15] has been adapted in Ref. [21] to initiate a study of planar  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetric amplitudes in the probe approximation, i.e. when the back reaction of the flavours is negligible. Because of this,  $N_f/N_c \rightarrow 0$  in the considerations of [21] and they cannot be applied directly to the superconformal case  $N_f = 2N_c$  which is the subject of this paper. However in Ref. [22] the Alday-Maldacena approach was applied to other conformal (with a symplectic gauge group) or almost conformal (i.e. conformal in the planar limit) versions of  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetric gauge theory, obtaining the same result for the exponential factor in the amplitudes as in Ref. [15] for the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  case.

Another string theory implementation for  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM amplitudes, which appears to be unrelated to the subsequent the AdS/CFT approach of [15], is the Witten's twistor string approach of [23]. Interestingly, in Ref. [24] this twistor string formulation was modified to be able to address superconformal theories with  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetry, including tree-level calculations of amplitudes in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD – which is the theory we consider in the present paper.

## 2. Planar MHV amplitudes

In order to compare scattering amplitudes in different theories (especially with fields transforming in different representations of the gauge group as is the case for the the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD vs the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM) we will always employ the colour decomposition of the amplitudes. The full n-point amplitude  $M_n$  is represented as a sum of products of colour factors  $T_n$  and purely kinematic partial amplitudes  $A_n$ ,

$$M_n(\{k_i, h_i, c_i\}) = \sum_{\sigma} T_n(\{c_{\sigma(i)}\}) A_n(\{k_{\sigma(i)}, h_{\sigma(i)}\}). \quad (2.1)$$

Here  $\{c_i\}$  are colour labels of external legs  $i = 1 \dots n$ , and the kinematic variables  $\{k_i, h_i\}$  are on-shell external momenta and helicities: all  $k_i^2 = 0$ , and  $h_i = \pm 1$  for gluons,  $h_i = \pm \frac{1}{2}$  for fermions, and  $h_i = \pm 0$  for scalars. The sum in (2.1) is over appropriate simultaneous permutations  $\sigma$  of colour labels  $\{c_{\sigma(i)}\}$  and kinematic variables  $\{k_{\sigma(i)}, h_{\sigma(i)}\}$ . The colour factors  $T_n$  are determined by the representations of the external fields in the amplitude. In the planar large  $N_c$  limit the relevant colour factors for SQCD case are as follows. When all external fields in a given amplitude are in the adjoint representation, the (planar) colour factor is the single trace of the generators,  $T_n = \text{tr}(T^{a_1} \dots T^{a_n})$ . When one fundamental-antifundamental pair of fields is present in the external states one has a string,  $T_n =$

$(T^{a_1} \dots T^{a_{n-2}})_j^i$ , and for a few external (anti)fundamental pairs one has a product of such strings.

Without any loss of generality we can concentrate on the purely kinematic partial amplitudes  $A_n$ . They contain all the non-trivial information about the amplitude, and more importantly, they can be directly compared in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM and in the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD with fundamental flavours. If needed, the full amplitude  $M_n$  can always be determined from (2.1).

In many respects the simplest partial amplitudes are the maximally helicity violating (MHV) ones with only gluons in the external state, two of which have negative helicity and the remaining  $n - 2$  are the positive-helicity gluons. At tree-level these are the Parke-Taylor-Berends-Giele amplitudes [25, 26],

$$A_n(g_r^-, g_s^-) = \frac{\langle r s \rangle^4}{\prod_{i=1}^n \langle i i+1 \rangle}, \quad (2.2)$$

This is of course an  $n$ -gluon amplitude; to avoid the clutter we do not show the  $n - 2$  positive helicity gluons  $g_i^+$  on the left hand side and drop the momentum conserving delta function and the coupling on the right hand side in (2.2).

The full set of  $n$ -point MHV amplitudes in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  supersymmetric gauge theory is formed by all the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  superpartners of the MHV gluon amplitude  $A_n(g_r^-, g_s^-)$ . It reads [27, 28]<sup>2</sup>,

$$\begin{aligned} & A_n(g^-, g^-), \quad A_n(g^-, \lambda_A^-, \lambda^{A+}), \quad A_n(\lambda_A^-, \lambda_B^-, \lambda^{A+}, \lambda^{B+}), \\ & A_n(g^-, \lambda^{1+}, \lambda^{2+}, \lambda^{3+}, \lambda^{4+}), \quad A_n(\lambda_A^-, \lambda^{A+}, \lambda^{1+}, \lambda^{2+}, \lambda^{3+}, \lambda^{4+}), \\ & A_n(\lambda^{1+}, \lambda^{2+}, \lambda^{3+}, \lambda^{4+}, \lambda^{1+}, \lambda^{2+}, \lambda^{3+}, \lambda^{4+}), \\ & A_n(\bar{\phi}_{AB}, \lambda^{A+}, \lambda^{B+}, \lambda^{1+}, \lambda^{2+}, \lambda^{3+}, \lambda^{4+}), \\ & A_n(g^-, \bar{\phi}_{AB}, \phi^{AB}), \quad A_n(g^-, \bar{\phi}_{AB}, \lambda^{A+}, \lambda^{B+}), \quad A_n(\lambda_A^-, \lambda_B^-, \phi^{AB}), \\ & A_n(\lambda_A^-, \phi^{BC}, \bar{\phi}_{BC}, \lambda^{A+}), \quad A_n(\lambda_A^-, \phi^{AB}, \bar{\phi}_{BC}, \lambda^{C+}), \quad A_n(\lambda_A^-, \bar{\phi}_{BC}, \lambda^{A+}, \lambda^{B+}, \lambda^{C+}), \\ & A_n(\bar{\phi}, \phi, \bar{\phi}, \phi), \quad A_n(\bar{\phi}, \phi, \bar{\phi}, \lambda^+, \lambda^+), \quad A_n(\bar{\phi}, \bar{\phi}, \lambda^+, \lambda^+, \lambda^+, \lambda^+), \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where we used the  $SU(4)_R$  labelling conventions for scalars,  $\bar{\phi}_{AB} = \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ABCD} \phi^{CD} = (\phi^{AB})^\dagger$ .

In order to relate the MHV amplitudes above to those in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD, it is more appropriate to use  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supermultiplets. In terms of those, the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theory contains one vector,  $V$ , plus three adjoint chiral multiplets,  $\Phi_1$ ,  $\Phi_2$  and  $\Phi_3$  with components,

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} g^\pm \\ \lambda_1^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{12} \\ \lambda_2^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{31} \\ \lambda_3^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{23} \\ \lambda_4^\pm \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.4)$$

---

<sup>2</sup>In Eqs. (2.3) we do not distinguish between the different particle orderings in the amplitudes. There is no summation over the repeated indices  $A, B, C = 1, \dots, 4$ . In the last line, for brevity we suppressed these indices altogether.

In the above equations the first  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetry acts vertically within each column, while the second, third and fourth susy interchanges bosons of the first column with fermions of the second, third and fourth ones and so on. The  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM is characterised by the superpotential,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{N}=4} = igTr(\Phi_1\Phi_2\Phi_3 - \Phi_1\Phi_3\Phi_2). \quad (2.5)$$

We now compare this to the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD, which is described in terms of  $V$ , an adjoint  $\Phi$ , and  $N_f$  pairs of chiral fundamental  $Q_f$  and anti-fundamental  $\tilde{Q}_f$ . The superpotential which defines this theory is usually written as  $g\sqrt{2}\sum_f\tilde{Q}_f\Phi Q_f - m_f\tilde{Q}_fQ_f$ . When the generators are normalised via  $Tr(T^aT^b) = 1\delta^{ab}$ , (which is what we have assumed in (2.5) and in the rest of the paper) and furthermore, all flavour masses are set to zero, the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  superpotential becomes,

$$\mathcal{W}_{\mathcal{N}=2} = g\sum_{f=1}^{N_f}\tilde{Q}_f\Phi Q_f. \quad (2.6)$$

By comparing the two superpotentials in Eqs. (2.5),(2.6) we can relate degrees of freedom in the two theories via,


$$V \leftrightarrow V = \begin{pmatrix} g^\pm \\ \lambda_1^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi \leftrightarrow \Phi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{12} \\ \lambda_2^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad Q_f \leftrightarrow \Phi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{31} \\ \lambda_3^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{Q}_f \leftrightarrow \Phi_3 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi^{23} \\ \lambda_4^\pm \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.7)$$

Clearly, for  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  supersymmetry is broken to  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  since (anti)-fundamental fields cannot be exchanged with adjoint ones. Nevertheless, when working with primitive parts of the colour-ordered amplitudes, the list of MHV amplitudes is the same as in (2.3) with the substitutions (2.7).

Furthermore, at *tree*-level the results for the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  MHV's turn out to be the same as in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  (since at tree-level the colour-stripped  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD with any number of flavours is effectively  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  supersymmetric). One would expect, however that this is not the case for loops. For example, at one loop level in the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD triangle contributions should appear in addition to box integrals present in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$ . Also the loop-level  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  MHV amplitudes do not have to be simply proportional to the tree-level ones.

However, simplifications can occur for particular fixed values of  $N_f$ . In a companion paper [18] written in collaboration with Nigel Glover and Cairan Williams, we calculated all one-loop MHV amplitudes in the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD for arbitrary numbers of flavours. It turns out that if (and only if)  $N_f = 2N_c$  where the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  theory becomes superconformal, the full set of the component MHV amplitudes of the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  theory completely matches those in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM.

This result may at first sound surprising. Indeed the MHV amplitudes (2.3) of the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM form a single equivalence class under the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  susy Ward identities (SWI) [27–30]. The  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SWI guarantee that all MHV amplitudes for all types of external



**Figure 1:** The MHV diagrams contributing to one-loop gluonic MHV amplitudes. In (a) only gluons circulate in the loop, while in (b) there are loop contributions from gluons, fermions and scalars.

particles are given by the corresponding tree-level result times a universal helicity- and particle-type-independent contribution – the fact which is an essential initial step for the BDS conjecture. However, in the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD a priori there are a few distinct classes of MHV amplitudes closed under the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SWI. Each of these classes is a subset from the list (2.3) with a fixed number of pairs of (anti)-fundamental fields present in the external states. There can be none, one or two such pairs for MHV amplitudes, and in addition in the latter case one needs to distinguish between the two pairs being of the same or of different flavours.  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  supersymmetry relates the MHV amplitudes within each class, but in the absence of additional supercharges, the different classes are not related. The result of [18] implies that both: the distinction between different classes and the triangle integrals must disappear for  $N_f = 2N_c$  in the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD (at least to one-loop order).

The calculation of [18] employs the four-dimensional unitarity approach of Bern, Dixon, Dunbar and Kosower [3] applied to the one-loop MHV-rules formulation of Brandhuber, Spence and Travaglini [31]. For example the one-loop MHV-diagrams contributing to gluonic MHV amplitudes  $A_n^{(1)}(g_1^-, \dots, g_m^-, \dots, n^+)$  are shown in Fig. 1. For the tree-level vertices appearing in Fig. 1 (and for all other MHV processes) one uses the tree-level MHV component amplitudes from the list (2.3) – as dictated by the original MHV-rules [32].

Ref. [18] determined all component MHV amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD extending the all-gluons calculation of [31] to include external matter fields and in different representations. The main result of [18] is that for  $N_f = 2N_c$  the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD MHV amplitudes coincide with those of the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM and as such are given by the tree-level amplitude  $A_n^{\text{tree}}$  times the helicity-blind and particle-type-independent function  $M_n^{(1)}$  (the sum of 2-mass-easy boxes),

$$\mathcal{N} = 2 \text{ CFT} : \quad A_n^{(1) \text{ MHV}}(\{k_i, h_i\}) = A_n^{\text{tree}}(\{k_i, h_i\}) \cdot a M_n^{(1)}(\{k_i\}; \varepsilon). \quad (2.8)$$

Here, as before,  $a = \frac{N_c \alpha_s}{2\pi} (4\pi e^{-\gamma})^\varepsilon$  is the effective ‘t Hooft coupling constant in  $D = 4 - 2\varepsilon$  dimensions. The arguments of the one-loop function  $M_n^{(1)}$  indicate that it depends only on the kinematic invariants and on the Dimensional Reduction parameter  $\varepsilon$  (with the amplitude being finite in the UV and containing the usual double and single poles in  $\varepsilon$  in the IR).

A fast way to see where the above matching to  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  is coming from is to count the

relative factors of  $N_c$  and  $N_f$  in both theories in a generic one-loop diagram. For example, consider any generic one-loop diagram with all external legs in the adjoint representation, and the particle in the loop being also adjoint. This is equal to  $2N_c$  times the process with the fundamental particle in the loop. The factor of  $N_c$  arises since for the adjoint loop in the double-line 't Hooft notation there is an extra closed colour-index loop. The factor of 2 comes from the fact that there are two different vertices in the theory with adjoints (due to commutators in the covariant derivatives and also in (2.5)) relative to a single vertex of each type for the fundamental fields couple to the adjoint. But then we need to sum over all  $N_f$  flavours of  $Q_f$  and  $N_f$  flavours of  $\tilde{Q}_f$  in the loop. When  $N_f = 2N_c$  the two contributions (with the loop in the fundamental and with the loop in the adjoint) agree.<sup>3</sup> When external lines include matter fields which for  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  can be in the fundamental representation, the flavour and colour-flow counting works differently, see [18] for more detail, but the matching to  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  and consequentially Eq. (2.8) still hold.

We now want to go beyond the one-loop considerations of [18] and consider higher loop (planar) contributions to the MHV amplitudes (2.8).

In the maximally supersymmetric  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  case, the 4-point and the 5-point amplitudes are now under control to all orders in planar perturbation theory. As was already mentioned in the Introduction, for these amplitudes the BDS expression (1.1) is expected to be exact. For higher-point MHV amplitudes the ansatz (1.1) requires a fix in the form of a conformally-invariant remainder function [8, 12, 13], which one hopes can be determined in near future.


Having established that the MHV amplitudes in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  and  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theories are identical through one-loop order, we can ask what should happen at two loops. In the same spirit as the one-loop calculation in [18] we can use MHV-rules to represent in Fig. 2 the two-loop MHV amplitudes in terms of one-loop graphs with constituent one-loop and tree-level MHV vertices (cf. Fig. 1). We then consider all possible double cuts of the loop momenta (in Fig. 2 we show one such cut which generalises Fig. 1a) in four dimensions which ensure that even the internal lines are on mass-shell (so that the constituent MHV-vertices are known). We then appeal to the four-dimensional cut-constructibility to claim that the entire two-loop amplitude can be reconstructed from these cuts.<sup>4</sup> Of course, this use of MHV-rules beyond the one-loop level is not a very practical tool for doing the actual two-loop calculations. What it is instead, is a very powerful book-keeping device for the contributing diagrams. Within the formalism of MHV-rules [27, 31–33] the entire  $l$ -loop contribution to the MHV-amplitude is expressed as a one-loop diagram involving the lower-loop MHV-vertices. There are always two MHV-vertices calculated at loop-level  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  and assembled into an MHV diagram of one-loop topology, as in Figs. 1, 2 . The  $l$ -loop

---

<sup>3</sup>This is of course the same reason for why the  $\beta$  functions in both superconformal theories are the same (i.e. vanishing).

<sup>4</sup>If the 4D cut-constructibility does not apply at two loops even in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM, then the two-loop amplitudes will also contain additional rational terms missed by the 4D cuts. We think that this, however, is not likely for the the finite part of the amplitude at  $\varepsilon = 0$  in (1.4) (i.e. when we have first factored out the known IR divergent factor as in (1.3), and then have set  $\varepsilon = 0$ ) – which is what we are after.





**Figure 2:** MHV-rules diagrams generalising Fig. 1(a) to two-loops. The diagrams still have a one-loop topology, but the constituent MHV vertices are one-loop and tree-level MHV amplitudes. Similar generalisations can be immediately drawn for all other MHV amplitudes.

result is obtained by summing over all distributions of  $l_1$  and  $l_2$  such that  $l_1 + l_2 + 1 = l$ . The MHV class of amplitudes is closed, no non-MHV amplitudes can enter a calculation of a higher order MHV amplitude.

The main point which makes the  $l$ -loop calculation work is the fact that we have seen that all one-loop MHV amplitudes in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2, 4$  cases are simply proportional to the tree-level amplitude. The two tree-level amplitudes one the left and on the right hand side of the cut after summing over all relevant cuts will assemble themselves again into a tree-level MHV amplitude times a (new) universal loop-level contribution – precisely as it had happened at one-loop level in [18, 31]. So, the factorisation structure of the MHV amplitudes is not violated at higher loops in the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  superconformal case, and the amplitudes in both superconformal theories are calculated in the same way – giving identical results.

In other words, we are discovering that because in both superconformal cases, the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD and the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM:

1. at tree-level and at one loop, MHV amplitudes agreed between the two theories;
2. that each one-loop MHV diagram is factorised to the tree-level MHV result times the universal loop factor;
3. the higher-loop MHV amplitudes are constructed in terms of the lower-loop MHV amplitudes entering always the same MHV-rules diagrams as in Fig. 1, and
4. that no non-MHV vertices can appear in the loop,

the equivalence between the MHV amplitudes in these two different superconformal theories will hold to all higher loops.

In the following section we will examine the perturbative structure of the light-like Wilson loops.

### 3. Polygon Wilson loops in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ and in $\mathcal{N} = 2$

In the Alday and Maldacena construction the contribution of the semiclassical string which dominates scattering amplitudes in the strong coupling limit is mathematically equivalent [15] to a calculation of a Wilson loop in the T-dual formulation of the IIB string theory. In the boundary  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  gauge theory language, this Wilson loop is

$$W(C_n) = \frac{1}{N_c} \langle 0 | \text{Tr P exp} \left( i \oint_{C_n} dx^\mu A_\mu(x) \right) | 0 \rangle \quad (3.1)$$

The contour  $C_n$  is a polygon made out of  $n$  light-like segments with cusps at points  $x_i^\mu$  chosen such that

$$x_{i,i+1}^\mu \equiv x_i^\mu - x_{i+1}^\mu = p_i^\mu, \quad p_i^2 = 0 \quad (3.2)$$

where  $p_i$  are the external on-shell momenta of the  $n$ -gluon scattering amplitude. This definition of the contour and its expression in terms of momenta follow from the fact that the Wilson loop in [15] emerged after the T-duality transformation was performed on the AdS<sub>5</sub> string coordinates,  $X^\mu(\sigma, \tau)$ ,  $Z(\sigma, \tau)$ .

With this strong coupling connection between scattering amplitudes and the light-like Wilson loops (3.1) in mind Drummond, Korchemsky and Sokatchev [4] proposed that there might exist a relation between the MHV amplitudes (normalised by the tree amplitude) and the Wilson loops (3.1), (3.2) also at weak coupling in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM. This proposal is automatically in agreement with the fact that IR-divergent parts of planar amplitudes were known to be related to the UV divergencies in the cusps of the Wilson loop [34]. Indeed, following [6, 7, 35], Wilson loop (3.1) can be factorised in a way analogous to MHV amplitudes (1.3),

$$W(C_n) = Z_n^{\text{UV-Div}} F_n^W = \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{8} \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} a^l \left( \frac{\hat{\gamma}_K^{(l)}}{(l\epsilon)^2} + \frac{2\Gamma^{(l)}}{l\epsilon} \right) \sum_{i=1}^n (-x_{i-1,i+1}^2 \mu^2)^{l\epsilon} \right] \cdot F_n. \quad (3.3)$$

it follows that the divergent parts for the Wilson loop and for the amplitude (1.3) are the same, up to a mismatch between  $\Gamma^{(l)}$  and  $\hat{G}_0^{(l)}$  attributed to dictionary issues [6] due to the use of a different regulator for Wilson loops in the UV from the one used for the amplitudes in the IR. Here as before  $\hat{\gamma}_K^{(l)}$  are the expansion coefficients of the cusp anomalous dimension  $\frac{1}{2}\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}$  and  $\Gamma^{(l)}$  corresponds to the so-called collinear anomalous dimension which determines subleading IR poles. Very recently the universal structure of subleading soft and collinear poles was further investigated in generic conformal gauge theories in Ref. [36] from the scattering amplitudes perspective.

Over the last ten months a sequence of interesting perturbative Wilson-loop computations appeared, starting with the calculation of one-loop expectation value of a quadrilateral  $n = 4$  Wilson loop in [4]. Up to the constants coming from dictionary issues mentioned above, the Wilson loop agreed with the one-loop four-gluon amplitude. Next, Ref. [5] showed that the same agreement also holds for the  $n$ -sided polygon Wilson loop and  $n$ -point MHV amplitudes for any  $n$ . DHKS collaboration then carried out a two-loop

calculation of the Wilson loop for the  $n = 4$  case in [6] and for the  $n = 5$  case in [7]. Their results were again in precise agreement with the full two-loop expressions for scattering amplitudes [9].

We can now adapt the two-loop calculations of Wilson loops [6–8, 13] to the case of our interest – the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  superconformal QCD. In fact, this is completely straightforward. To one-loop level, one needs to take into account only the insertions of tree-level gluon propagators connecting various segments of the polygon contour  $C_n$ . There are no vertices, and the result for  $n$ -sided polygons in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  case at one loop [5] matches the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  result (or in fact the result in any gauge theory). At two loops, in addition to pairs of propagators, there are also insertions of three-gluon vertices and the one-loop gluon self-energy contributions between the segments of the contour (specific diagrams can be found in [6, 7], but it is obvious, that to two-loop level there can be no other insertions, since the Wilson loop did not contain explicitly any other fields but gluons). Since the three-gluon vertex is a tree-level one, and since the gluon self-energies are the same thanks to  $N_f = 2N_c$ , it follows that the contributions to the polygon Wilson loop (and as such the MHV-amplitudes/Wilson-loop relations) match precisely between the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  and  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theories through two loops. What about higher loops?

An important feature of the Wilson loop (3.1) is that it inherits superconformal properties of the underlying  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theory. The conformal symmetry is only broken by the cusps of the contour  $C_n$ . In the cusps the Wilson loop VEV is divergent and a regularisation of these UV-divergences leads to a breakdown of the conformal invariance. DHKS first proposed [6] and then proved [7] an anomalous conformal Ward identity for Wilson loops (3.1). For the finite part  $F_n^W$  of the Wilson loop (3.3) in the limit  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  it reads [6, 7],

$$\sum_{i=1}^n (2x_i^\nu x_i \cdot \partial_i - x_i^2 \partial_i^\nu) \ln F_n = \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(a) \sum_{i=1}^n \ln \frac{x_{i,i+2}^2}{x_{i-1,i+1}^2} x_{i,i+1}^\nu, \quad (3.4)$$

where the operator on the left hand side is the generator of special conformal transformations. Very similarly to the logarithm of the BDS formula, the right hand side of this anomaly equation is a one loop result, multiplied by  $\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(a)$ .

DHKS also showed that the finite part of the BDS ansatz (1.1) obeys the same equation (3.4) after the substitution (3.2). This is not surprising since after all the purely kinematic dependence in  $\ln F_n$  is one-loop exact, and the matching between Wilson loops and MHV-amplitudes has already been established for any  $n$  in [5]. On the other hand, purely from the perspective of perturbative MHV amplitudes, the origin of the anomaly equation (3.4) is not clear. In the strong coupling limit [15] MHV amplitudes<sup>5</sup> agree with Wilson loops (3.1), and the latter are governed by the conformal symmetry of the theory. For amplitudes at present it is not known how to deduce appropriate conformal Ward identities directly. Instead if we assume that there is a relation between MHV amplitudes and Wilson loops even at weak coupling, then the conformal symmetry of the Wilson loops becomes a ‘dual-

---

<sup>5</sup>and according to [16] probably all amplitudes (normalised by the corresponding tree level ones).

space conformal symmetry' of the amplitudes. As already mentioned, in the strong coupling limit, the meaning of this symmetry is clear, but away from it, it is a conjecture.

The solution to the Ward identity is unique for  $n = 4$  and  $5$ . Beyond  $n = 5$ , there are multiple solutions [6, 7], due to the existence of nontrivial conformally-invariant cross ratios  $x_{ij}^2 x_{kl}^2 / (x_{ik}^2 x_{jl}^2)$ . For example, for  $n = 6$  there are three non-trivial cross ratios [8]

$$u_1 = \frac{x_{13}^2 x_{46}^2}{x_{14}^2 x_{36}^2} = \frac{s_{12}^2 s_{45}^2}{x_{123}^2 x_{345}^2}, \quad u_2 = \frac{x_{24}^2 x_{15}^2}{x_{25}^2 x_{14}^2} = \frac{s_{23}^2 s_{56}^2}{x_{234}^2 x_{123}^2}, \quad u_3 = \frac{x_{35}^2 x_{26}^2}{x_{36}^2 x_{25}^2} = \frac{s_{34}^2 s_{61}^2}{x_{345}^2 x_{234}^2} \quad (3.5)$$

(The appearance of  $x_{i,i+1}^2 = k_i^2$  in a cross ratio is forbidden by the on-shell constraint  $k_i^2 = 0$ .) Since the BDS expression is a unique solution to (3.4), it must give the exact all-orders results for  $n = 4$  and  $n = 5$  Wilson loops.

We can now ask if these results for  $n = 4, 5$  Wilson loops are reproduced also in our superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  QCD. First we note that the derivation of the anomaly (3.4) in [7] also holds in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  QCD. At the end, this is essentially a one-loop-exact result weighted with the cusp anomalous dimension. Thus, the anomaly equation and its unique solution – the BDS ansatz – carry over to  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  albeit expressed in terms of  $\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(a)$  of the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  CFT. We know that  $\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}(a)$  do match to two loops in perturbation theory, and also to the leading order in the opposite strong coupling limit (since the AdS<sub>5</sub> parts of the string target space are the same). The conclusion we reached in section 2, that the MHV amplitudes match in both superconformal theories to all orders in planar perturbation theory, necessarily mean that  $\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}$ 's also have to match to all orders (since  $\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}$  governs the IR properties of the amplitudes).

We would also like to supplement the argument above with the following observation about the three-loop contribution  $\hat{\gamma}_K^{(3)}$  in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD. In Ref. [37, 38] Moch, Vermaseren and Vogt have computed the anomalous dimension of leading twist operators of spin  $j$  in (non-supersymmetric) QCD. The cusp anomalous dimension of QCD is related to these results by taking the large- $j$  limit,

$$\lim_{j \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\gamma_{gg}^{(l)}(j)}{\ln(j) + \Gamma_E} = \frac{1}{2} \hat{\gamma}_K^{(l)} \quad (3.6)$$

Then the authors of [39] have made a very interesting observation that the cusp anomalous dimensions in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM can be extracted directly from the QCD result by keeping terms of highest ‘‘transcendental weight’’. The two highest weights (weight-4 and weight-3) contributing at three-loops to the cusp anomalous dimension in QCD can be extracted from the results of [37, 38] in the following form

$$\hat{\gamma}_K^{(3)} = \frac{2}{N_c} \left( \frac{22}{5} N_c \zeta_2^2 + \left[ \frac{11}{3} N_c - \frac{2}{3} N_f \right] \zeta_3 \right) \quad (3.7)$$

The weight-4 contribution gives  $\hat{\gamma}_K^{(3)}$  in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theory. One might ask if the result for the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD should be given by also including the subleading weight-3 as in (3.7). It is interesting to note that the subleading weight contribution above is actually proportional

to the  $b_0$  coefficient of the  $\beta$ -function of QCD  $\frac{11}{3}N_c - \frac{2}{3}N_f$ . It is then natural to expect that the 3-loop coefficient of the cusp anomalous dimension in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD is given by the sum of the highest weight and the subleading weight, but with  $b_0$  being replaced with the  $\beta$ -function of  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD,  $b_0 = 2N_c - N_f$ . If this is indeed the case, then in the conformal case of  $N_f = 2N_c$  the subleading weight will disappear and the full 3-loop expression will coincide with the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  result.

As already mentioned, recently a computation of the “parity even” part of the six-gluon MHV amplitude [12] in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  has shown that the BDS ansatz (1.1) for MHV amplitudes does fail for  $n = 6$ . However, a numerical comparison [12, 13] with the corresponding hexagonal Wilson loop shows that the MHV-amplitude/Wilson-loop duality is correct at two loops and  $n = 6$ . This is a remarkable result. It will also hold in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  QCD, if the remainder function of the conformal ratios is the same in both theories.

## 4. Conclusions

We have considered the colour-ordered MHV scattering amplitudes and the light-like polygon Wilson loops in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  QCD with  $N_f = 2N_c$  (anti)fundamental flavours.

First, using the MHV-rules perturbation theory, we have argued that the MHV amplitudes (or more precisely their finite parts evaluated at  $\varepsilon = 0$ ) in the  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD match the amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  to all loop orders in planar perturbation theory. We then used the superconformal anomalous Ward identities to argue that a similar matching also occurs for the polygon Wilson loops. The agreement between Wilson loops in two theories holds to all orders in perturbation theory for  $n = 4, 5$ ;<sup>6</sup> and for  $n \geq 6$  up to the presently unknown remainder function of the conformal ratios. If it is the same in both theories, the general light-like polygon Wilson loops will also match.

This correspondence implies a very high degree of similarity between the two distinct superconformal theories and complements non-trivially earlier results of [20]. There it was shown that there is a planar equivalence between all perturbative amplitudes in the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  theory and

- (i) for theories obtained from  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  by orbifold projections [40];
- (ii) for a one parameter family of marginal real- $\beta$  deformations of [41] to all orders and
- (iii) for more general marginal deformations [41] studied for up to five loops.

It would be instructive to know if there are examples of conformal 4D gauge theories in which the finite parts of MHV amplitudes and/or light-like polygon Wilson loops are significantly different from the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  case. Another future direction can be to test the general arguments presented in this paper against an explicit calculation of 4-point and

---

<sup>6</sup> Assuming the cusp anomalous dimensions are the same beyond two loops as is required by the matching of MHV amplitudes alone.

maybe 5-point amplitudes at two loops in the superconformal  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD by adapting the calculations of Refs. [42–44].

### Acknowledgements

I am grateful to Steve Abel, Nigel Glover, Cesar Gomez, Radu Roiban and Ciaran Williams for useful discussions and comments on amplitudes and Wilson loops in gauge and string theory. I thank the organisers and the participants of the Galileo Galilei Institute programme on Non-Perturbative Methods in Strongly Coupled Gauge Theories for discussions and hospitality.

### References

- [1] 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].
- [2] 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].
- [3] 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** (1994) 217 hep-ph/9403226;  
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;  
Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, “Unitarity-based techniques for one-loop calculations in QCD,” *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **51C**:243 (1996) hep-ph/9606378.
- [4] J. M. Drummond, G. P. Korchemsky and E. Sokatchev, “Conformal properties of four-gluon planar amplitudes and Wilson loops,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **795**, 385 (2008) [0707.0243 [hep-th]].
- [5] A. Brandhuber, P. Heslop and G. Travaglini, “MHV Amplitudes in N=4 Super Yang-Mills and Wilson Loops,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **794**, 231 (2008) [0707.1153 [hep-th]].
- [6] J. M. Drummond, J. Henn, G. P. Korchemsky and E. Sokatchev, “On planar gluon amplitudes/Wilson loops duality, *Nucl. Phys. B* **795**, 52 (2008) [0709.2368 [hep-th]].
- [7] J. M. Drummond, J. Henn, G. P. Korchemsky and E. Sokatchev, “Conformal Ward identities for Wilson loops and a test of the duality with gluon amplitudes,” 0712.1223 [hep-th].
- [8] J. M. Drummond, J. Henn, G. P. Korchemsky and E. Sokatchev, “The hexagon Wilson loop and the BDS ansatz for the six-gluon amplitude,” 0712.4138 [hep-th].

- [9] F. Cachazo, M. Spradlin and A. Volovich, “Iterative structure within the five-particle two-loop amplitude,” *Phys. Rev. D* **74**, 045020 (2006) [hep-th/0602228];  
Z. Bern, M. Czakon, D. A. Kosower, R. Roiban and V. A. Smirnov, “Two-loop iteration of five-point  $N = 4$  super-Yang-Mills amplitudes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 181601 (2006) [hep-th/0604074].
- [10] L. F. Alday and J. Maldacena, “Comments on gluon scattering amplitudes via AdS/CFT,” *JHEP* **0711** (2007) 068 [arXiv:0710.1060 [hep-th]].
- [11] J. Bartels, L. N. Lipatov and A. S. Vera, “BFKL Pomeron, Reggeized gluons and Bern-Dixon-Smirnov amplitudes,” arXiv:0802.2065 [hep-th].
- [12] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. A. Kosower, R. Roiban, M. Spradlin, C. Vergu and A. Volovich, “The Two-Loop Six-Gluon MHV Amplitude in Maximally Supersymmetric Yang-Mills Theory,” 0803.1465 [hep-th].
- [13] J. M. Drummond, J. Henn, G. P. Korchemsky and E. Sokatchev, “Hexagon Wilson loop = six-gluon MHV amplitude,” arXiv:0803.1466 [hep-th].
- [14] L. J. Dixon, “Gluon scattering in  $N=4$  super-Yang-Mills theory from weak to strong coupling,” arXiv:0803.2475 [hep-th].
- [15] L. F. Alday and J. M. Maldacena, “Gluon scattering amplitudes at strong coupling,” *JHEP* **0706**, 064 (2007) [arXiv:0705.0303 [hep-th]].
- [16] S. Abel, S. Forste and V. V. Khoze, “Scattering amplitudes in strongly coupled  $N=4$  SYM from semiclassical strings in AdS,” *JHEP* **0802** (2008) 042 [arXiv:0705.2113 [hep-th]].
- [17] N. Seiberg and E. Witten, “Monopoles, duality and chiral symmetry breaking in  $N=2$  supersymmetric QCD,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **431** (1994) 484 [arXiv:hep-th/9408099].
- [18] N. Glover, V. V. Khoze and C. Williams, “Component MHV amplitudes in  $\mathcal{N} = 2$  SQCD and in  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  SYM at one loop,” [arXiv:0805.4190 [hep-th]].
- [19] J. M. Drummond, J. Henn, V. A. Smirnov and E. Sokatchev, “Magic identities for conformal four-point integrals,” *JHEP* **0701** (2007) 064 [arXiv:hep-th/0607160].
- [20] V. V. Khoze, “Amplitudes in the beta-deformed conformal Yang-Mills,” *JHEP* **0602** (2006) 040 [arXiv:hep-th/0512194].
- [21] J. McGreevy and A. Sever, “Quark scattering amplitudes at strong coupling,” *JHEP* **0802** (2008) 015 [arXiv:0710.0393 [hep-th]].
- [22] Z. Komargodski and S. S. Razamat, “Planar quark scattering at strong coupling and universality,” *JHEP* **0801** (2008) 044 [arXiv:0707.4367 [hep-th]].
- [23] E. Witten, “Perturbative gauge theory as a string theory in twistor space,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **252** (2004) 189 [arXiv:hep-th/0312171].

- [24] J. Bedford, C. Papageorgakis and K. Zoubos, “Twistor Strings with Flavour,” *JHEP* **0711** (2007) 088 [arXiv:0708.1248 [hep-th]].
- [25] S. J. Parke and T. R. Taylor, “An Amplitude For N Gluon Scattering,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56** (1986) 2459.
- [26] F. A. Berends and W. T. Giele, “Recursive Calculations For Processes With N Gluons,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **306** (1988) 759.
- [27] G. Georgiou, E. W. N. Glover and V. V. Khoze, “Non-MHV tree amplitudes in gauge theory,” *JHEP* **0407** (2004) 048 [arXiv:hep-th/0407027].
- [28] V. V. Khoze, “Gauge theory amplitudes, scalar graphs and twistor space,” arXiv:hep-th/0408233.
- [29] M. T. Grisaru, H. N. Pendleton and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, “Supergravity And The S Matrix,” *Phys. Rev. D* **15** (1977) 996;  
M. T. Grisaru and H. N. Pendleton, “Some Properties Of Scattering Amplitudes In Supersymmetric Theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **124** (1977) 81.
- [30] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar, M. Perelstein and J. S. Rozowsky, “On the relationship between Yang-Mills theory and gravity and its implication for ultraviolet divergences,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **530** (1998) 401 [arXiv:hep-th/9802162].
- [31] A. Brandhuber, B. J. Spence and G. Travaglini, “One-loop gauge theory amplitudes in N = 4 super Yang-Mills from MHV vertices,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **706** (2005) 150 [arXiv:hep-th/0407214].
- [32] F. Cachazo, P. Svrcek and E. Witten, “MHV vertices and tree amplitudes in gauge theory,” *JHEP* **0409** (2004) 006 [arXiv:hep-th/0403047].
- [33] G. Georgiou and V. V. Khoze, “Tree amplitudes in gauge theory as scalar MHV diagrams,” *JHEP* **0405** (2004) 070 [arXiv:hep-th/0404072].
- [34] G. P. Korchemsky and A. V. Radyushkin, “Loop Space Formalism And Renormalization Group For The Infrared Asymptotics Of QCD,” *Phys. Lett. B* **171** (1986) 459;  
S. V. Ivanov, G. P. Korchemsky and A. V. Radyushkin, *Yad. Fiz.* **44** (1986) 230 [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **44** (1986) 145];  
G. P. Korchemsky and A. V. Radyushkin, “Renormalization of the Wilson Loops Beyond the Leading Order,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **283** (1987) 342.
- [35] I. A. Korchemskaya and G. P. Korchemsky, “On lightlike Wilson loops,” *Phys. Lett. B* **287** (1992) 169;  
A. Bassetto, I. A. Korchemskaya, G. P. Korchemsky and G. Nardelli, “Gauge invariance and anomalous dimensions of a light cone Wilson loop in lightlike axial gauge,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **408** (1993) 62 [arXiv:hep-ph/9303314].



- [36] L. J. Dixon, L. Magnea and G. Sterman, “Universal structure of subleading infrared poles in gauge theory amplitudes,” arXiv:0805.3515 [hep-ph].
- [37] S. Moch, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, “The three-loop splitting functions in QCD: The non-singlet case,” Nucl. Phys. B **688** (2004) 101 [arXiv:hep-ph/0403192].
- [38] A. Vogt, S. Moch and J. A. M. Vermaseren, “The three-loop splitting functions in QCD: The singlet case,” Nucl. Phys. B **691** (2004) 129 [arXiv:hep-ph/0404111].
- [39] A. V. Kotikov, L. N. Lipatov, A. I. Onishchenko and V. N. Velizhanin, “Three-loop universal anomalous dimension of the Wilson operators in  $N = 4$  SUSY Yang-Mills model,” Phys. Lett. B **595** (2004) 521 [Erratum-ibid. B **632** (2006) 754] [arXiv:hep-th/0404092].
- [40] M. Bershadsky, Z. Kakushadze and C. Vafa, “String expansion as large  $N$  expansion of gauge theories,” Nucl. Phys. B **523** (1998) 59 [hep-th/9803076]  
M. Bershadsky and A. Johansen, “Large  $N$  limit of orbifold field theories,” Nucl. Phys. B **536** (1998) 141 [hep-th/9803249].
- [41] R. G. Leigh and M. J. Strassler, “Exactly marginal operators and duality in four-dimensional  $N=1$  supersymmetric gauge theory,” Nucl. Phys. B **447**, 95 (1995) [hep-th/9503121].
- [42] Z. Bern, A. De Freitas and L. J. Dixon, “Two-loop helicity amplitudes for gluon gluon scattering in QCD and supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory,” JHEP **0203** (2002) 018 [arXiv:hep-ph/0201161].
- [43] T. Binoth, E. W. N. Glover, P. Marquard and J. J. van der Bij, “Two-loop corrections to light-by-light scattering in supersymmetric QED,” JHEP **0205** (2002) 060 [arXiv:hep-ph/0202266].
- [44] Z. Bern, A. De Freitas and L. J. Dixon, “Two-loop helicity amplitudes for quark gluon scattering in QCD and gluino gluon scattering in supersymmetric Yang-Mills theory,” JHEP **0306** (2003) 028 [arXiv:hep-ph/0304168].