

# Hidden zeros = secret ultraviolet scaling, and a new path to uniqueness

Laurentiu Rodina\*

*Beijing Institute of Mathematical Sciences and Applications (BIMSA), Beijing, 101408, China*

We investigate the hidden amplitude zeros discovered by Arkani-Hamed et al, which describe a non-trivial vanishing of scattering amplitudes on special external kinematics. We prove the conjecture that amplitude zeros uniquely fix  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , by first showing that any amplitude can be divided into special subsets, which independently satisfy the zero condition. We further prove that this condition is in fact equivalent to a novel enhancement under Britto-Cachazo-Feng-Witten shifts of the same subsets. More generally, for one particular zero type, this equivalence can be extended to arbitrary rational functions built from planar variables (such as the non-linear sigma model). In the case of Yang-Mills theory, we conjecture the zeros, combined with color-kinematic duality, uniquely fix the  $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor$  different tensor structures of  $n$ -point gluon amplitudes. Our approach suggests a straightforward avenue for understanding previous similar uniqueness results, in which unitarity appears as an emergent property, and naively independent physical principles contain identical (amplitude) information.

## INTRODUCTION

In the modern on-shell bootstrap program, scattering amplitudes of various QFT were shown to be constructible via completely new methods, including recursion relations [1, 2], Pfaffians [3], geometrical/combinatorial objects like the Amplituhedron, associahedron, or permutahedron [4–6], Hopf algebras [7, 8], the double copy procedure [9], transmutation operators [10], ansatz based methods [11, 12], and most recently from curve counting [13], among many others. These novel perspectives have revealed surprising new structures, even in the simplest theories and already at tree level. It is therefore especially shocking that the latest discovery is perhaps even the simplest one yet: termed hidden zeros, or amplitude zeroes, these imply that amplitudes vanish for particular kinematic configurations of the external data, and that behavior near these zeros leads to a novel factorization type property, called splitting [14] (see also [15–20], as well as [21] for very early work on zeros in string theory). Furthermore, it was conjectured that this property is sufficient to uniquely determine amplitudes in  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$  and non-linear sigma model (NLSM) theories.

This latter observation ties in with a different set of uniqueness results which showed that scattering amplitudes in scalar, gauge, and gravity theories are fully determined by various sets of principles (ranging from gauge invariance to IR or UV scaling), with unitarity (and in some cases locality) an emergent property [22–27]. A striking corollary of the uniqueness theorems is that apparently disjoint information is in fact somehow equivalent: for instance, both the infrared (IR) and ultraviolet (UV) regimes seem to contain sufficient information to independently fix a wide range of amplitudes. It is highly surprising there is still room for yet new defining properties that lead to uniqueness in this already very crowded space. NLSM amplitudes can now be uniquely defined in no less than five ways: via Adler zero, dou-

ble soft theorems, UV scaling, Bern-Carrasco-Johansson (BCJ) relations, and now amplitude zeros - and in all cases unitarity is an emergent property! This raises the obvious question whether some of these principles are secretly equivalent to each other. In this spirit, it was already shown that for instance amplitude zero implies the Adler zero, and that BCJ relations imply both Adler zero [23, 28] and amplitude zero [29, 30].

Besides proving the uniqueness conjecture from amplitude zeros for  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , in this Letter we will also prove an even closer connection with the UV scaling under Britto-Cachazo-Feng-Witten shifts [1]. The existence of enhanced BCFW (or UV) scalings was initially only a technical requirement for the unitarity-based BCFW recursion in Yang-Mills and gravity, which revolutionized the computation of scattering amplitudes. Later, it was shown that scalar EFT also enjoy an enhanced scaling, and that simply demanding such improved scaling is sufficient to determine amplitudes, even without using the recursion or assuming unitarity [23, 24].

A surprising result we find is that the hidden zeros further reveal yet another previously unnoticed property: in scalar theories, all amplitudes contain further "secret" UV enhancements, whereby each subset defined above also enjoys an enhanced UV scaling, potentially beyond the leading behavior of the amplitude. This secret enhanced scaling of each subset turns out to be directly equivalent to the amplitude zero acting on the same subsets. The novel splitting behavior akin to factorization makes this close connection between BCFW scaling and hidden zeros even more intriguing, hinting towards a completely new way to construct amplitudes, not based on unitarity and the usual spacetime approaches.

Moving on to even more complicated theories which contain vector particles, the zeros are no longer sufficient to uniquely constrain amplitudes. However, we make another non-trivial observation that, coupled with the BCJ color-kinematic duality [31], which enforces linear relations between amplitudes of different external ordering,

the zeros do uniquely determine all different tensor structures, as classified by the number of dot products of the type  $e\cdot e$  and  $e\cdot p$  (this amounts to just two independent solutions at 4- and 5-points, three at 6- and 7-points, and so on). Although we do not provide a proof, we have checked this result up to 6-point, where the constraints uniquely fix ansatz containing on the order of  $10^5$  terms.

In summary we prove the following, first for  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , assuming locality

- Any amplitude zero is equivalent to a "subset zero", where the sum of diagrams in particular subsets satisfies the zero
- This separation into subsets can be used to directly prove uniqueness when imposing several amplitude zeros
- Any amplitude zero is equivalent to an improved UV scaling of all subsets under a corresponding BCFW shift

Additionally, we show that when dropping locality, or when considering NLSM amplitudes, only a particular amplitude zero is equivalent to subset enhanced scaling. Finally, for YM we conjecture that zero plus BCJ relations uniquely fixes the independent tensor structures.

## REVIEW OF AMPLITUDE ZEROS

In [14], it was proposed that partial (or ordered) amplitudes for  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , NLSM, and YM vanish when a particular subset of kinematic invariants  $s_{123\dots}=(p_1+p_2+\dots)^2$  are set to zero, where  $p_i$  the  $D$ -dimensional momenta of external particle  $i$ . For example, the ordered 4-point  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$  amplitude is simply

$$A_4(1234) = \frac{1}{s_{12}} - \frac{1}{s_{12} + s_{13}}, \quad (1)$$

and clearly vanishes when  $s_{13}=0$ . Similarly, though less obvious, the 5-point amplitude

$$A_5(12345) = \frac{1}{s_{12}s_{34}} + \text{cyclic}, \quad (2)$$

vanishes when  $s_{13}=s_{14}=0$ , or for cyclic permutations of these conditions. Starting at 6-point, a new pattern appears as a possibility: setting  $s_{14}=s_{15}=s_{24}=s_{25}=0$  also makes the amplitude vanish. These zeroes generalize to arbitrary number of points, and identical facts hold for NLSM, which unlike  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$  also contains non-trivial numerators, as well as for YM after suitably including polarization vectors.

Reference [14] further conjectured that  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$  amplitudes are in fact uniquely fixed by demanding this property in a sufficient number of legs. Consider again the

simple 4-point example from above, but now let the two terms have arbitrary coefficients

$$B_4(1234) = \frac{x_1}{s_{12}} - \frac{x_2}{s_{12} + s_{13}}. \quad (3)$$

This is the most general local and planar function we could write down at 4-point, and we refer to it as a local ansatz. Here we take local and planar to mean that any singularities must be compatible with ordered trivalent graphs, with all poles sums of consecutive momenta squared.

Now we impose the zero condition  $A|_{s_{13}=0}=0$ , which requires  $x_2=x_1$ , leading back to the actual amplitude in eq.(1), up to some overall rescaling. The same process can be carried out at 5-point, where now there would be five arbitrary coefficients. Imposing two different zero conditions, say  $s_{13}=s_{14}=0$ , and  $s_{24}=s_{25}=0$  would again uniquely fix the ansatz to match the actual amplitude. In general, one needs to impose  $n-3$  zero conditions of this type to fix an  $n$ -point amplitude. This was the observation made in [14] which we will prove.

## SUBSET ZEROS

The key idea is that amplitude zeros (and as we will see later, also UV scalings) operate on a level of particular and easy to identify subsets of diagrams. Let us focus on the simplest case of a skinny zero,  $s_{1i}=0$ , for  $i$  non-adjacent to 1.

To generate the relevant subsets at  $n$ -point, start with an  $(n-1)$ -point diagram, with leg 1 missing. Then the subset corresponding to this  $(n-1)$ -point diagram is formed by adding leg 1 in all possible ways (that respect ordering and trivalent interactions). This is shown in Figure 1. All  $n$ -point diagrams can be uniquely obtained via this procedure by starting from all  $(n-1)$ -point diagrams. For instance, some of the 5- or 6-point diagrams are shown in Figure 2.




FIG. 1: Obtaining higher point diagrams from lower point. Leg 1 can be attached in any position marked by the red lines.

For example, the 5-point amplitude splits into two sub-




FIG. 2: Generating some of the subsets at 5- and 6-point from 4 and 5 point respectively, by attaching leg 1 in all possible ways.

sets, starting from the two 4-point diagrams:

$$\begin{aligned} S_1 &= \frac{x_1}{s_{12}s_{123}} + \frac{x_2}{s_{23}s_{123}} + \frac{x_3}{s_{23}s_{234}}, \\ S_2 &= \frac{x_4}{s_{12}s_{34}} + \frac{x_5}{s_{34}s_{234}}, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

with the correct amplitude corresponding to a specific choice for  $x_i$  (in this case  $x_i=x$ ). With such subsets in mind, there are four main claims to prove for  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , for a zero of type  $s_{1i}=0$ :

1. Amplitude zero  $\Leftrightarrow$  "subset zero" (each subset independently satisfies the zero).

Example:  $A_5|_{\text{zero}}=0 \Leftrightarrow S_1|_{\text{zero}}=S_2|_{\text{zero}}=0$ .

2. A subset zero uniquely fixes the coefficients of all diagrams in the subset.

Example:  $S_1|_{\text{zero}}=0 \Leftrightarrow x_1=x_2=x_3$ ,  $S_2|_{\text{zero}} \Leftrightarrow x_4=x_5$ .

3. A sufficient number of amplitude zeros uniquely fix the amplitude.

Example:  $A_5|_{\text{zero}_1}=A_5|_{\text{zero}_2}=0 \Leftrightarrow x_i=x$ , where  $\text{zero}_1$  is  $p_{1i}=0$  and  $\text{zero}_2$  is e.g.  $p_{2i}=0$ .

4. A single amplitude zero is equivalent to enhanced UV scaling of each subset under a particular BCFW shift.

Example:  $A_5|_{\text{zero}}=0 \Leftrightarrow S_1 \sim \frac{1}{z^3}$  and  $S_2 \sim \frac{1}{z^4}$  under a rescaling  $p_2 \rightarrow zp_2$ , if the zero is  $p_{1i}=0$ .

For other zero types equivalent statements hold, as we explain later.

### Subsets must vanish independently

We will prove the first two claims by considering a series of cuts. As shown in Figure 1, a seed  $(n-1)$ -point diagram, which we label by  $(m)$ , has a general form

$$D_{\sigma_1} D_{\sigma_2} \dots D_{\sigma_k} \times \frac{1}{P_{2\sigma_1} P_{2\sigma_1\sigma_2} \dots} \equiv \mathcal{D}_m \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_m}, \quad (5)$$

where  $D_{\sigma_i}$  is some tree level sub-diagram with external legs  $\sigma_i = \{i_1, i_2, \dots\}$ , and we take it to include the connecting propagator. The product of all such sub-diagrams,  $\mathcal{D}$ ,

can be treated as a prefactor, as all diagrams in a particular subset share it. The other propagators  $P$ , which are necessarily functions of  $p_2$ , live on the boundary of the region labelled by 1, and we call them boundary propagators. Leg 1 can then be attached either directly to legs 2 or  $n$ , or to one of the boundary propagators. Since these propagators carry the relevant dependence on  $p_1$ , cancellations between them are what leads to the zero property.

First we wish to prove that imposing a single amplitude zero condition implies that each subset vanishes independently under that zero. Then we will show this further implies all diagrams in a given subset have equal coefficient.

The idea is to use cuts to isolate different subsets, starting with the subsets with a maximal number of propagators in  $\mathcal{D}$  (and no boundary propagators), and moving down to the subset containing only boundary propagators.

Let us exemplify the steps on a 6-point subset. The  $n$ -point proof requires only trivial generalizations, which we leave to Appendix A. Since at 5-point there are five diagrams, there will be five subsets at 6-point, which we label  $S_i$ . There are two subsets, call them  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , with no boundary propagators, consider the first one

$$S_1 = \frac{x_1}{s_{12}s_{34}s_{345}} + \frac{x_2}{s_{2345}s_{34}s_{345}}. \quad (6)$$

We impose the zero condition  $s_{13}=s_{14}=s_{15}=0$  on the amplitude, requiring  $\sum S_i=0$ , and then cut the two propagators  $s_{34}=s_{345}=0$ , leading to

$$\left( \frac{x_1}{s_{12}} + \frac{x_2}{s_{2345}} \right) \Big|_{\text{zero}} \Big|_{s_{34}=s_{345}=0} = 0, \quad (7)$$

since only the above diagrams survive the cut. The above holds only for  $x_1=x_2$ , but crucially, the same holds even away from the cut, as in both cases  $s_{2345}|_{\text{zero}} = -s_{12}$ . This simple fact that different boundary propagators become linearly dependent under the zero, both on and away from non-boundary cuts, is the crucial piece of the proof. We will encounter another example shortly, and a general proof is written in Appendix A.

We have therefore shown that the subset  $S_1$  vanishes independently on the zero, and an identical argument shows the same for the second subset  $S_2$ , which can be isolated by cutting  $s_{45}=s_{345}=0$ . This finally gives us access to subsets with one boundary propagator, for example the subset obtained from the middle diagram in Figure 2, containing three diagrams

$$S_3 = \frac{y_1}{s_{12}s_{34}s_{1234}} + \frac{y_2}{s_{34}s_{234}s_{1234}} + \frac{y_3}{s_{34}s_{234}s_{2345}}. \quad (8)$$

As before, we first impose the zero condition  $s_{13}=s_{14}=s_{15}=0$ , which implies  $\sum_{i=3}^5 S_i|_{\text{zero}} = 0$ , since we have already shown that  $S_1=S_2=0$  under the zero.

Now we cut the propagator  $s_{34}=0$ , appearing only in  $S_3$ , and we obtain

$$S_3|_{\text{zero}}|_{s_{34}=0} = 0. \quad (9)$$

The above can only hold if the zero+cut create linear relations between the previously independent boundary propagators  $s_{12}$ ,  $s_{234}$ ,  $s_{1234}$ , and  $s_{2345}$  that appear in the subset in eq.(8). Indeed at 6-point the zero+cut induce three identities  $L_i=0$  between boundary propagators

$$\begin{aligned} L_1 &= s_{123} - s_{23} - s_{12}, & L_2 &= s_{1234} - s_{234} - s_{12}, \\ L_3 &= s_{2345} - s_{12}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

which follow from a general pattern

$$L_{j-2} = s_{12\dots j} - s_{2\dots j} + s_{12}, \quad j = 3, \dots, n-1. \quad (11)$$

Then eq.(9) implies the subset must be expressible as

$$S_3 = L_1 C_1 + L_2 C_2 + L_3 C_3, \quad (12)$$

where  $C_i$  are functions of mandelstams whose exact form is irrelevant. This form ensures  $S_3$  vanishes on the locus of zero+cut. But crucially, the identities in eq.(10) clearly hold even away from the cut, so eq.(12) implies

$$S_3|_{\text{zero}} = 0. \quad (13)$$

This can be repeated for all subsets, and we have therefore proven that

### 1. Amplitude zero $\Leftrightarrow$ subset zero

#### Subsets are uniquely fixed

The above argument directly proves that all two-element subsets are uniquely fixed, and we must show the same holds for the remaining subsets. This is achieved by isolating two neighbor diagrams within such subsets (neighbor diagrams differ by at most one propagator) with further cuts. Consider the last two diagrams in the set  $S_3$ , and cut their common propagator  $s_{234}$ , implying

$$S_3|_{\text{zero}}|_{s_{234}=0} = \frac{y_2}{s_{1234}} + \frac{y_3}{s_{2345}} = 0. \quad (14)$$

We can write the two propagators as

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1234} &= s_{12} + s_{13} + s_{14} + s_{234}, \\ s_{2345} &= -(s_{12} + s_{13} + s_{14} + s_{15}), \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

so, under the zero condition and the additional cut we find  $s_{1234} = -s_{2345} = s_{12}$ , and eq.(14) can only vanish if  $y_2 = y_3$ . Repeating this for the first pair of diagrams we obtain  $y_1 = y_2$ , proving that all terms in this subset have equal coefficients. The whole process can be carried out for each subset, so we conclude that

### 2. Amplitude zero uniquely fixes all subsets

## Amplitude uniqueness

We can illustrate full amplitude uniqueness by considering a graph whose vertices are represented by the diagrams. Let two diagrams be connected in the graph if there exists a zero condition which places them in the same subset, implying the two "adjacent" diagrams have equal coefficient. If we can prove the graph of all diagrams is connected, this implies any two diagrams have equal coefficient, i.e. the amplitude is fixed up to an overall number. This is obviously true, as any two diagrams can be related by a (finite) series of steps that remove one leg, and then re-attach it somewhere else. This proves that

### 3. Amplitude zeros uniquely fix the $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ amplitude

An interesting question is what is the minimal number of such steps - this would provide the minimal number of amplitude zeros needed to fully fix the amplitude. Experimentally, this number is  $n-3$  and can easily be proven by induction: consider two distinct  $n$ -point diagrams. If they are not already part of the same subset for some zero, remove a leg, repeating this until they become diagrams part of some subset. This can go on at most until reaching the 3-point diagram, so no two diagrams may be more than  $n-3$  steps away from each other.

## Generalizations to $n$ -point and other zeros

The above results at 6-point generalize trivially to arbitrary number of points. We leave the details to Appendix A. Finally, all the above results can be repeated for other types of zero, not just the "skinny" zero  $s_{1i}=0$ ,  $i \neq 1, 2, n$ . For instance, for a zero  $s_{1i}=s_{2i}=0$ ,  $i \neq 1, 2, 3, n$  the relevant subsets are obtained in a similar way, as all possible ways to add both legs 1 and 2 to an  $n-2$  point diagram. Note that adding the two legs can be done in two different ways - either as separate legs, or as a two-particle pole  $1/s_{12}$ . So, for instance, by starting with the 3-point vertex, one will obtain the five 5-point diagrams as two disjoint subsets.

Finally, we comment that this approach not only proves uniqueness, but also existence, and naturally suggests how to build  $n$ -point amplitudes (by adding  $k$  legs to the  $n-k$  amplitude), unlike the other uniqueness theorems, which do not have an associated amplitude construction. In this sense we find the current proof much more powerful than previous results, which will likely benefit from adapting this novel subset/cut-based approach. This possibility is further strengthened by the close relation of amplitude zeros to UV scaling, to which we turn next.

(SECRET) SUBSET UV SCALING

For  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , it was found that demanding a BCFW, or UV, scaling of  $1/z^3$  ( $1/z^2$  at 4-points) in  $n-3$  legs is sufficient to uniquely determine the amplitude, with similar statements for other scalar theories, such as NLSM [23]. The novel property we discover is that beyond these enhanced amplitude-level UV scalings, there exists a further hidden enhancement, for each individual subset defined earlier. Furthermore, this extra enhancement is completely equivalent to the amplitude zero.

For scalars, the BCFW shift is given by deforming  $p_i \rightarrow p_i + zq$  and  $p_j \rightarrow p_j - zq$ , with  $q$  a null vector that satisfies  $p_{i,j} \cdot q = 0$  and taking the limit  $z \rightarrow \infty$ . However, for the purposes of determining enhancements, one can use a much simpler rescaling  $p_i \rightarrow zp_i$ , instead of the full shift, if  $p_j$  is eliminated via momentum conservation, as explained in [23]. We will call this the UV rescaling.

First, let us explain which zero and which UV scaling are matched. Each type of zero has a natural corresponding scaling, or shift. For instance, for a skinny zero like  $s_{1i}=0$ ,  $i \neq 2, n$ , the shift is on  $p_2$  and  $p_n$ , precisely the legs not involved in this zero. Since  $p_n$  is always eliminated, we can simply use the rescaling of  $p_2 \rightarrow zp_2$ . Similarly, for a zero  $s_{1i}=p_{2i}=0$ ,  $i \neq 3, n$ , the corresponding rescaling is in  $p_3$ , and so on. Finally, it is important to note that the equivalence we claim is not a trivial kinematic feature: the UV and zero can have different effects for the kinematic invariants. Take for instance  $s_{123}$ . Under each condition, we get

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1234} &\xrightarrow{\text{zero}} s_{1234}^{(0)} = s_{12} + s_{23} + s_{24} + s_{34}, \\ s_{1234} &\xrightarrow{\text{UV}} s_{1234}^{(\infty)} = z(s_{12} + s_{23} + s_{24}) + \mathcal{O}(z^0). \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Demanding an amplitude zero obviously amounts to requiring  $A(s^{(0)})=0$ . Meanwhile, for the UV scaling, taking the  $z \rightarrow \infty$  limit we obtain a general expansion

$$A(s(z)) = z^k A(s^{(\infty)}) + \mathcal{O}(z^{k-1}), \quad (17)$$

so, if require an enhancement in the scaling we must impose  $A(s^{(\infty)})=0$ . The zero condition implies the UV scaling on a purely kinematic level, since all  $s^{(\infty)}$  can be obtained from  $s^{(0)}$  by setting some extra invariants to zero. However, for  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$  the converse is also true for any zero types, as a consequence of locality.

First, it easy to show that all diagrams in a given subset have the same UV scaling. The scaling is given by the number of boundary propagators, plus optionally the number of poles in sub-diagrams  $\mathcal{D}$  that contain both the labels  $n-2$  and  $n-1$  (since momentum conservation gives such terms explicit dependence on  $p_2$ ). Permuting leg 1 does not change the number of such propagators, so all diagrams in the subset have the same scaling. If this scaling is  $\mathcal{O}(1/z^k)$ , then we will show that if and only if the subset satisfies the zero, the subset in fact scales as

$\mathcal{O}(1/z^{k+1})$ . For instance, the sum of diagrams in subset  $S_3$ , given in eq.(8), scales as  $1/z^3$  even though each diagram scales as  $1/z^2$  under  $p_2 \rightarrow zp_2$ .

This can be proven using the same arguments as in previous section. We start again from the subset  $S_3$  as an example, which on the locus of zero must vanish, and must be expressible as

$$S_3 = L_1 C_1 + L_2 C_2 + L_3 C_3, \quad (18)$$

where  $L_i$  are the linear relations induced by the zero condition given in eq.(10), i.e.. the linear relations satisfied by the  $s^{(0)}$ . We can immediately prove that the boundary  $s^{(\infty)}$  satisfy the same linear relations. Boundary propagators are of three types, and under the UV limit they become

$$\begin{aligned} s_{12\dots j}^{(\infty)} &\rightarrow s_{12} + \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i}, \quad j \leq n-2, \\ s_{2\dots j}^{(\infty)} &\rightarrow \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i}, \quad j \leq n-2 \\ s_{2\dots n-1}^{(\infty)} &\rightarrow -s_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

It is obvious that the only linear relations induced by UV scaling are

$$L_j = s_{12\dots j} - s_{2\dots j} + s_{12}, \quad j = 3, \dots, n-1, \quad (20)$$

so, we see that UV scaling and amplitude zero lead to identical linear relations between the basis elements (for boundary propagators). From eq.(18) this implies

$$S_3|_{\text{UV}} = 0, \quad (21)$$

so, subsets indeed have an enhanced scaling. Furthermore, since both the zero condition and UV scaling require the subset to be expressible in the form of eq.(18), this implies they lead to identical constraints. We have therefore proven that for  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$

4. amplitude zero  $\Leftrightarrow$  subset-enhanced UV scaling

NON-LOCALITY AND NON-LINEAR SIGMA MODEL

The previous arguments fail in the case of NLSM, or when dropping the locality assumption for  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$  (which means singularities are no longer associated to graphs). The reason is that for general non-boundary kinematic invariants, the  $s^{(\infty)}$  satisfy more linear constraints than the  $s^{(0)}$ . However, if we restrict to functions built purely out of planar variables (which does not restrict the space of functions, as the planar basis is complete [13]), there are still two claims we can prove.

First, it is still true that amplitude zero implies subset enhanced scaling. This is true because any linear relation

satisfied by  $s^{(0)}$  is also satisfied by  $s^{(\infty)}$ , as mentioned above. Therefore, if some function satisfies a zero, its UV scaling must be enhanced beyond that of individual terms in the function.

Second, for a particular zero, that we call the "fattest zero", the one which maximizes the number of kinematic invariants set to zero, complete equivalence still holds between the zero and enhanced subset UV scaling. The reason is that only for this zero, the planar  $s^{(0)}$  and  $s^{(\infty)}$  satisfy identical linear constraints. We conclude that for any rational function built from planar variables (including ansatz of non-local  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$  or non-local NLSM)

$$\text{Fattest zero} \Leftrightarrow \text{subset-enhanced UV scaling}$$

which more concretely means that if in a given function any individual term has a UV scaling of  $\mathcal{O}(z^k)$ , it must combine with other terms such that together they scale as  $\mathcal{O}(z^{k-1})$ , or the zero cannot be satisfied. We remark this observation is curiously similar to how permutation invariance automatically improves any BCFW scaling  $z^{\text{odd}}$  by one power to  $z^{\text{even}}$  [32].

## BEYOND SCALARS

It is natural to ask how constraining the amplitude zero is for YM amplitudes. In this case, the zero condition needs to set to zero dot products involving polarization vectors as well. For instance, the simplest zero at 4-point requires  $p_1 \cdot p_3 = e_1 \cdot p_3 = e_3 \cdot p_1 = e_1 \cdot e_3 = 0$ . From the nature of the constraint, it is immediately clear the zero cannot fix the full amplitude: terms containing different tensor structures, such as  $(e \cdot e \cdot e \cdot p \cdot p)$  and  $(e \cdot e \cdot p \cdot e \cdot p)$ , cannot be related. One can ask how much of these tensor structures can be fixed.

Up to 6-point explicit checks, we find that combined with the BCJ color-kinematic duality requirement (which similarly only acts within these tensor structures) [31], the amplitude zero uniquely fixes these objects! The extra requirement simply demands that amplitudes satisfy the so-called BCJ relations

$$\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} k_{1i} A(2, \dots, i, 1, i+1, \dots, n) = 0, \quad (22)$$

where  $k_{1i} = \sum_{j=2}^i s_{1j}$ . This new uniqueness observation is highly non-trivial and unexpected, as at 6-points the ansatz for each tensor structure contains around  $10^4 - 10^5$  terms, but remains completely mysterious.

## OUTLOOK

In this work we explored the newly discovered property of amplitude zeros, which are part of a radical new

picture of amplitudes, where the physical factorization (a consequence of unitarity) is replaced by splitting, a property still lacking a physical meaning, but natural from new "surface geometry" approach to amplitudes [18]. Our results show the property provides important insight in several directions: it can be used as a new definition of amplitudes (at least in  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , NLSM, and partially in YM), reveals the true extent of previous observations (a secret UV scaling of independent subsets), and also points the way towards a sharper proof of a long list of uniqueness observations [22–27], which still lack a completely satisfactory understanding, that truly explains how unitarity emerges as a by-product.

The close connection we found between amplitude zeros and BCFW recursion (from UV scaling to factorization/splitting) strongly suggests a new constructive approach may exist for general amplitudes, or even some picture in which the two are completely unified. This relationship can potentially also lead to a physical reason for the zeros and splitting behavior, or instead may offer an understanding of the still unexplained improved (and amplitude-defining) UV scaling of various EFT [23].

Finally, the fact that zeros plus color-kinematic duality uniquely fix YM tensor structures is perhaps the most surprising finding, as it is remarkable tree level YM can still contain such hidden structures almost in plain sight. This suggests there may exist a completely new structure centered on these unique YM building blocks (these objects are also relevant for 4D helicity amplitudes and were recently considered in [33]). Combining the composition rule [34, 35] with the amplitude zero requirement may provide further insight into such objects, using polarization vectors as building blocks in the composition.

Obtaining similar uniqueness results at loop level, as well as without assuming locality, starting with  $\text{Tr}(\phi^3)$ , are other fascinating possibilities we leave for future work.

*Acknowledgments:* The author would like to thank Jeffrey Backus, Carolina Figueiredo, Nima-Arkani Hamed, and Song He for valuable discussions.

## Appendix A: $N$ -point proof

In this Appendix we generalize the proof that each amplitude zero uniquely fixes the different corresponding subsets. Most of the steps are identical and do not require any further discussion, but we repeat them here nonetheless for the sake of clarity. First, we write the  $n$ -point amplitude as a sum of subsets (as defined in the main text) and impose the zero condition  $s_{1i} = 0$ ,  $i \neq 2, n$ , which gives

$$A_n|_{\text{zero}} = \sum S_i \Big|_{\text{zero}} = \sum \mathcal{D}_i \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_i} \Big|_{\text{zero}} = 0. \quad (23)$$

Then, we choose a subset ( $m$ ), which can extract from the above relation by cutting all (non-boundary) corresponding propagators in  $\mathcal{D}_m$ , starting with diagrams that have only non-boundary propagators (so they can be uniquely selected by cuts), and working down from there. It is easy to show that the zero does not induce extra degeneracies for such propagators. The fact that the zero only involves non-planar invariants  $s_{1i}$ , ensures the propagators remain one-to-one. We obtain

$$\mathcal{P}_m|_{\text{zero}}|_{\mathcal{D}_m\text{-cut}} = 0. \quad (24)$$

We must show the above holds even away from the cut. First, the fact that the above vanishes implies it must be expressible in a form

$$\mathcal{P}_m = \sum L_i C_i, \quad (25)$$

where  $L_i$  are the linear relation induced between the basis elements on the locus of zero+cut. We must show that the zero alone induces the same relations as zero+cut. First, all the boundary propagators are given by

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1,2,\dots,j} &= s_{12} + \sum_{i=2}^j s_{1i} + \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i} + s_{3\dots j}, \quad j \leq n-2, \\ s_{2,\dots,j} &= \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i} + s_{3\dots j}, \quad j \leq n-2, \\ s_{2,\dots,n-1} &= -s_{12} - \sum_{i=3}^{n-1} s_{1i}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Since the only dependence on the cut non-boundary propagators in  $\mathcal{D}$  is through the identical terms in  $s_{3\dots j}$ , it is clear one obtains the same linear relations with or without this cut. These relations are the same as those given in eq.(20), namely

$$L_j = s_{12\dots j} - s_{2\dots j} + s_{12}, \quad j = 3, \dots, n-1. \quad (27)$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{P}_m|_{\text{zero}} = 0, \quad (28)$$

proving that subset ( $m$ ) vanishes independently on the zero, and this can be repeated for all subsets.

Next we must prove that subset zero implies any two neighbor diagrams in the subset have equal coefficient. As before, we consider two diagrams in this subset which differ by exactly one boundary propagator, as shown in Figure 3.

These have a form

$$\frac{1}{P_L P_R} \left( \frac{x_i}{P_A} + \frac{x_{i+1}}{P_B} \right). \quad (29)$$

We need to prove  $P_A = -P_B$  on the amplitude zero plus




FIG. 3: Two neighbor diagrams differ only by the blue propagator.

( $P_L, P_R$ )-cut locus. We can write

$$P_A = s_{12} + \sum_{k=3}^i s_{1k} + P_L, \quad (30)$$

$$P_R = s_{12} + \sum_{k=3}^{j-1} s_{1k} + P_B, \quad (31)$$

so, under the zero condition, and on the cut  $P_L = P_R = 0$ , we find  $P_A = -P_B$  and conclude the two diagrams cancel if they have equal coefficients,  $x_i = x_{i+1}$ . This can be repeated for all pairs in the subset, and then for all subsets, proving that one amplitude zero uniquely fixes all subsets. The final step is to combine this result with constraints from distinct zero conditions on other legs, which as discussed in the main text implies the full amplitude is indeed uniquely fixed after imposing some sufficient number of zeros.

\* laurentiu.rodina@gmail.com

- [1] R. Britto, F. Cachazo, B. Feng, and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 181602 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0501052.
- [2] C. Cheung, C.-H. Shen, and J. Trnka, JHEP **06**, 118 (2015), arXiv:1502.05057 [hep-th].
- [3] F. Cachazo, S. He, and E. Y. Yuan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 171601 (2014), arXiv:1307.2199 [hep-th].
- [4] N. Arkani-Hamed and J. Trnka, JHEP **10**, 030 (2014), arXiv:1312.2007 [hep-th].
- [5] N. Arkani-Hamed, Y. Bai, S. He, and G. Yan, JHEP **05**, 096 (2018), arXiv:1711.09102 [hep-th].
- [6] Q. Cao, J. Dong, S. He, and Y.-Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 026022 (2023), arXiv:2211.05404 [hep-th].
- [7] A. Brandhuber, G. Chen, H. Johansson, G. Travaglini, and C. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 121601 (2022), arXiv:2111.15649 [hep-th].
- [8] G. Chen, L. Rodina, and C. Wen, (2024), arXiv:2403.04614 [hep-th].
- [9] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 061602 (2010), arXiv:1004.0476 [hep-th].
- [10] C. Cheung, C.-H. Shen, and C. Wen, JHEP **02**, 095 (2018), arXiv:1705.03025 [hep-th].
- [11] C. Cheung, K. Kampf, J. Novotny, and J. Trnka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 221602 (2015), arXiv:1412.4095 [hep-th].
- [12] C. Cheung, K. Kampf, J. Novotny, C.-H. Shen, and

- J. Trnka, *JHEP* **02**, 020 (2017), arXiv:1611.03137 [hep-th].
- [13] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. Frost, G. Salvatori, P.-G. Plamondon, and H. Thomas, (2023), arXiv:2309.15913 [hep-th].
- [14] N. Arkani-Hamed, Q. Cao, J. Dong, C. Figueiredo, and S. He, (2023), arXiv:2312.16282 [hep-th].
- [15] N. Arkani-Hamed, Q. Cao, J. Dong, C. Figueiredo, and S. He, (2024), arXiv:2401.05483 [hep-th].
- [16] N. Arkani-Hamed and C. Figueiredo, (2024), arXiv:2403.04826 [hep-th].
- [17] Q. Cao, J. Dong, S. He, and C. Shi, (2024), arXiv:2403.08855 [hep-th].
- [18] N. Arkani-Hamed and C. Figueiredo, (2024), arXiv:2405.09608 [hep-th].
- [19] Q. Cao, J. Dong, S. He, C. Shi, and F. Zhu, (2024), arXiv:2406.03838 [hep-th].
- [20] S. De, A. Pokraka, M. Skowronek, M. Spradlin, and A. Volovich, (2024), arXiv:2406.04411 [hep-th].
- [21] A. D'Adda, S. Sciuto, R. D'Auria, and F. Gliozzi, *Nuovo Cim.* 5A: No. 3, 421-32(1 Oct 1971). (1971), 10.1007/BF02723465.
- [22] N. Arkani-Hamed, L. Rodina, and J. Trnka, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 231602 (2018), arXiv:1612.02797 [hep-th].
- [23] J. J. M. Carrasco and L. Rodina, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 125007 (2019), arXiv:1908.08033 [hep-th].
- [24] L. Rodina, *JHEP* **09**, 078 (2019), arXiv:1612.03885 [hep-th].
- [25] L. Rodina, *JHEP* **09**, 084 (2019), arXiv:1612.06342 [hep-th].
- [26] L. Rodina, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 071601 (2019), arXiv:1807.09738 [hep-th].
- [27] L. Rodina, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 045012 (2020), arXiv:2005.06446 [hep-th].
- [28] T. V. Brown, K. Kampf, U. Oktem, S. Paranjape, and J. Trnka, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 105008 (2023), arXiv:2305.05688 [hep-th].
- [29] C. Bartsch, T. V. Brown, K. Kampf, U. Oktem, S. Paranjape, and J. Trnka, (2024), arXiv:2403.10594 [hep-th].
- [30] Y. Li, D. Roest, and T. ter Veldhuis, (2024), arXiv:2403.12939 [hep-th].
- [31] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 085011 (2008), arXiv:0805.3993 [hep-ph].
- [32] D. A. McGady and L. Rodina, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 105010 (2015), arXiv:1408.5125 [hep-th].
- [33] N. H. Pavao, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 065020 (2023), arXiv:2210.12800 [hep-th].
- [34] J. J. M. Carrasco, L. Rodina, Z. Yin, and S. Zekioglu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 251602 (2020), arXiv:1910.12850 [hep-th].
- [35] J. J. M. Carrasco, L. Rodina, and S. Zekioglu, *JHEP* **06**, 169 (2021), arXiv:2104.08370 [hep-th].