

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

Laurentiu Rodina*

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

We explore several features related to the newly discovered hidden amplitude zero [1], which describes the vanishing of scattering amplitudes on special external kinematics. We prove the conjecture that amplitude zeros uniquely fix $\text{Tr } \phi^3$, by showing that any amplitude can be divided into special subsets, which independently satisfy the zero condition. We further prove that the same subsets satisfy a previously unknown secret enhancement under Britto-Cachazo-Feng-Witten shifts, which turns out to be equivalent to the amplitude zero condition. Similar but weaker statements also hold for non-linear sigma model, while for Yang-Mills, when imposed together with color-kinematic duality, amplitude zeros uniquely fix the different tensor components of gluon amplitudes. This direction suggests a straightforward avenue for understanding previous uniqueness results, as well as the connections between naively independent properties of scattering amplitudes.

INTRODUCTION

In the modern on-shell bootstrap program, scattering amplitudes of various QFT were shown to be constructible via completely new methods, ranging from recursion relations [2, 3], Pfaffians [4], geometrical/combinatorial objects like the Amplituhedron, associahedron, or permutahedron [5–7], Hopf algebras [8, 9], the double copy procedure [10], transmutation operators [11], and most recently from curve counting [12], 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 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 [1] (see also [13–15]). 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, whereby scattering amplitudes were shown or conjectured to be fully determined by various minimal sets of principles, with unitarity (and in some cases locality) an emergent property [16–21], after it was shown that enhanced soft limits together with unitarity uniquely determine a periodic table of special effective field theories [22, 23]. 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, double soft theorems, UV scaling, Bern-Carrasco-Johansson (BCJ) relations, and now amplitude zero - 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 can imply Adler zero, or that BCJ relations imply both Adler zero [17, 24] and amplitude zero [25].

In this Letter we demonstrate this novel zero property is even more closely related to the UV scaling under Britto-Cachazo-Feng-Witten shifts [2]. The existence of enhanced BCFW (or UV) scalings was initially a requirement for the unitarity-based BCFW recursion in Yang-Mills and gravity (extended to a "soft" bootstrap for scalar theories [26]). Later, it was shown that simply demanding this improved scaling is sufficient to determine amplitudes, even without using the recursion or assuming unitarity [17, 18].

In the process we also identify a simple mechanism explaining why amplitude zeros implies uniqueness. Proofs for the previously mentioned uniqueness theorems are all based on induction, and so these results remain mysterious both in scope and origin, and cannot be used to directly construct amplitudes. We overcome this limitation with a new powerful approach that more sharply explains the emerging uniqueness, revealing further hidden structure within the simplest of theories.

We first show that for $\text{Tr } \phi^3$, the amplitude may be divided into uniquely specified sums of diagrams, which independently satisfy a particular zero condition. Each such sum, or subset, can be constructed by starting with one of the $(n-1)$ point diagrams and adding the n -th leg in all possible ways. The proof of this observation relies on a very simple but quite remarkable fact: typically, starting with a full amplitude and cutting all propagators of a given diagram results in only that particular diagram surviving - but under the zero condition, exactly two diagrams contribute. These two diagrams are precisely "closest neighbors" in the subset, i.e.. they differ by exactly one propagator, where the n th leg is attached. The statement of uniqueness is then reduced to showing that any two diagrams are a series of leg deletions/insertions away from each other.

Furthermore, based on this decomposition into special subsets, we make two new observations related to

UV/BCFW scaling. First, each subset actually enjoys an enhanced UV scaling, potentially beyond the leading behavior of the amplitude. For instance, at 5-point, the five diagrams can be organized in two subsets, each starting from the two 4-point diagrams. Under a UV scaling $p \rightarrow zp$, all terms in the first subset of diagrams individually scale as $1/z^2$ while others as $1/z^3$. However, summed together with the right coefficients, the first subset scales as $1/z^3$ (leading to the usual enhanced behavior of the amplitude), while the second as $1/z^4$. This secret enhanced scaling of each subset turns out to in fact be directly equivalent to the amplitude zero acting on the same subsets. We conclude that

$$\text{amplitude zero} \Leftrightarrow \text{subset enhanced UV scaling!} \quad (1)$$

This statement holds for $\text{Tr } \phi^3$, where any type of zero (skinny or fat) has a corresponding UV scaling. For NLSM, or when not assuming locality, this only holds for the "fattest" zero. For the other types of zeros, the amplitude zero is strictly stronger than this enhanced subset UV scaling.

Moving on to even more complicated theories which contain vector particles, the zeros (which still hold when appropriately extended to include polarization vectors) are no longer sufficient to uniquely constrain amplitudes. However, we make another non-trivial observation that, coupled with the Bern-Carrasco-Johansson (BCJ) color-kinematic duality [27], which implies linear relations between amplitudes, the zeros do uniquely determine these tensor structures.

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 from amplitude zeros
- Any amplitude zero is equivalent to an improved UV scaling of all subsets under a corresponding BCFW shift, or UV scaling

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

REVIEW OF AMPLITUDE ZEROS

In [1], it was proposed that amplitudes for $\text{Tr } \phi^3$ and NLSM vanish when a particular subset of kinematic invariants s_{ij} are set to zero, where we use the notation

$s_{123\dots}=(p_1+p_2+\dots)^2$. For example, the 4-point amplitude

$$A_4 = \frac{1}{s_{12}} - \frac{1}{s_{12} + s_{13}}, \quad (2)$$

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

$$A_5 = \frac{1}{s_{12}s_{34}} + \text{cyclic}, \quad (3)$$

vanishes when $s_{13}=s_{14}=0$, or for cyclic permutations of these conditions. Starting at six point, besides similar constraints, a new pattern also 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 [1] 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

$$A_4 = \frac{x_1}{s_{12}} - \frac{x_2}{s_{12} + s_{13}}. \quad (4)$$

This is the most general local function we could write down at 4-point, and we refer to it as a local ansatz. Here we take local to mean that any singularities must be compatible with ordered trivalent graphs. Now we impose the zero condition, that is $A|_{s_{13}=0}=0$, which requires $x_2=-x_1$, leading back to the actual amplitude in eq.(2), 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.

In the next section we delve deeper into patterns that enable these zero properties, and how they leads to uniqueness.

SUBSET ZEROS

The key idea is that amplitude zeros (and as we will see later, also UV scalings) operate on a level of particular 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 particular $(n-1)$ -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.




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.

With these subsets in mind, there are four main claims to prove for $\text{Tr } \phi^3$:

1. Amplitude zero \Leftrightarrow "subset zero" (the sum of all diagrams in each subset is independently zero).
2. A subset zero uniquely fixes the coefficients of all diagrams in the subset.
3. A sufficient number of amplitude zeros uniquely fix the amplitude.
4. A single amplitude zero is equivalent to enhanced UV scaling of each subset under a particular BCFW shift

Subsets must vanish independently

We will prove the first two steps by considering a series of cuts. As shown in Figure 1, a seed $(n-1)$ -point diagram, which 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_{σ_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 , on the boundary of the region labelled by 1, are called 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, or in other words, that a single amplitude zero uniquely fixes all subsets corresponding to that zero.

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 there are five 5-point diagrams, there will be five such subsets, which we label S_i . Start for example with the subset obtained from the middle diagram in Figure 2, containing three diagrams

$$S_1 = \frac{x_1}{s_{12}s_{34}s_{1234}} + \frac{x_2}{s_{34}s_{234}s_{1234}} + \frac{x_3}{s_{34}s_{234}s_{2345}}. \quad (6)$$

We first impose the zero condition $s_{13}=s_{14}=s_{15}=0$, which implies

$$A_6|_{\text{zero}} = \sum_{i=1}^5 S_i \Big|_{\text{zero}} = 0. \quad (7)$$

Now we cut the propagator $s_{34}=0$, common to the subset we are interested in, and we obtain

$$S_1|_{\text{zero, cut}} = 0. \quad (8)$$

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.(6). Indeed at 6-point the zero+cut induce three identities $L_i=0$ between boundary propagators

$$\begin{aligned} L_5 &= s_{2345} - s_{12}, & L_3 &= s_{123} - s_{23} - s_{12} \\ L_4 &= s_{1234} - s_{234} - s_{12}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

which follow from a general pattern

$$L_j = s_{12\dots j} - s_{2\dots j} + s_{12}, \quad j = 3, \dots, n-1. \quad (10)$$

Then eq.(8) implies the subset must be expressible as

$$S_1 = L_1 C_1 + L_2 C_2 + L_3 C_3, \quad (11)$$

ensuring it vanishes on the locus of zero+cut. But crucially, the identities in eq.(9) clearly hold even away from the cut, so eq.(11) implies

$$S_1|_{\text{zero}} = 0. \quad (12)$$

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

1. Amplitude zero \Leftrightarrow subset zero

Subsets are uniquely fixed

The next step is to isolate two neighbor diagrams within this subset (that is, diagrams which differ by at most one propagator) with further cuts. Consider the last two diagrams, and cut their common propagator s_{234} , implying

$$S_1|_{\text{zero}}|_{s_{234}=0} = \frac{x_2}{s_{1234}} + \frac{x_3}{s_{2345}} = 0, \quad (13)$$

we can write the two propagators as

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

and under the zero condition and the additional cut we find $s_{1234} = -s_{2345}$, and so eq.(13) can only vanish if $x_2 = x_3$. This can be repeated for the first pair, giving $x_1 = x_2$, proving that all terms in this subset have equal coefficient, and the whole process can be repeated for each subset. We conclude that

2. Amplitude zero uniquely fixes all subsets

We can now use this result to find a straightforward proof that several amplitude zeros relate all the different subsets, and uniquely fix the $\text{Tr } \phi^3$ amplitude.

Amplitude uniqueness

We can prove 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 we suspect there should exist a straightforward combinatorial proof. One less direct proof involves the same inductive arguments of the other uniqueness theorems. We can take a soft limit, and then impose the amplitude zero order by order in the soft expansion. This can be easily shown to uniquely fix each order, and via induction it follows that $n-3$ zeros are sufficient, since at 4-point only 1 zero is required.

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 an identical way, namely 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. Adapting this novel subset/cut-based approach may provide insight in the other uniqueness theorems as well. This possibility is further strengthened by the close relation of amplitude zeros to UV scaling, to which we turn next.

(SUBSET) UV SCALING

In this section we show that beyond the usual overall enhanced scaling that $\text{Tr } \phi^3$ enjoys, from a naive $1/z^2$ to $1/z^3$, secretly even further enhancements exist.

In Reference [17] it was shown that various theories can be uniquely fixed by demanding some improved UV scaling under BCFW shifts. This uniqueness does not utilize any recursion, or even unitarity. The scaling alone is sufficient to determine the amplitude. For scalars, the shift is given by $p_i \rightarrow p_i + zq$ 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. We will call this the UV rescaling. For consistency of this scheme, one must also eliminate $p_{n-2} p_{n-1}$ via momentum conservation. As explained in [17], the UV rescaling depends on how momentum conservation is solved, so it is crucial to do it consistently, as described above.

For $\text{Tr } \phi^3$, it was found that demanding a scaling of $1/z^3$ ($1/z^2$ at 4-point) in $n-3$ legs is sufficient to uniquely determine the amplitude, with similar statements for other scalar theories, such as NLSM. The novel property we discover in this Letter, is that in fact not only do these scalar amplitudes have enhanced UV scalings, but they also have a further hidden enhancement, for each individual subset defined earlier. Furthermore, this secret enhancement is completely equivalent to the amplitude

zero.

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 . 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

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1234} &\xrightarrow{\text{zero}} s_{1234}^{(0)} = s_{12} + s_{23} + s_{24} + s_{34}, \\ s_{1234} &\xrightarrow{\text{UV}} s_{1234}^{(\infty)} = z(s_{12} + s_{23} + s_{24}) + \mathcal{O}(z^0). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Demanding an amplitude zero obviously amounts to requiring

$$A(s^{(0)}) = 0. \quad (16)$$

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

$$A(s^{(\infty)}) = 0, \quad (18)$$

Now obviously eq.(16) implies eq.(18) on a purely kinematic level, since all $s^{(\infty)}$ can be obtained from $s^{(0)}$ by setting some extra invariants to zero. However, we will see that for $\text{Tr } \phi^3$ the converse is also true for any zero type, as a consequence of locality.

First, it is 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 $n-1$ but not n (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 the sum of all amplitudes in the subset scales as $\mathcal{O}(1/z^{k+1})$. For instance, the sum of diagrams in subset S_1 , given in eq.(6), scales as $1/z^3$ even though each diagram scales as $1/z^2$ under $p_2 \rightarrow zp_2$.

What is perhaps even more remarkable, is that the subset zero condition is equivalent to this improved subset scaling. Using the above example, we found that S_1 satisfies the zero if and only if $x_1=x_2=x_3$. Now we are saying that the same subset enjoys an enhanced scaling also if and only if all coefficients are equal.

This can be proven using the same arguments as in previous section. We start again from this chosen subset

as an example, which on the locus of zero must vanish, and must be expressible as

$$S_1 = L_1 C_1 + L_2 C_2 + L_3 C_3, \quad (19)$$

where L_i are the linear relations induced by the zero condition, ie the 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

$$\begin{aligned} s_{12\dots j}^{(\infty)} &\rightarrow s_{12} + \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i}, \quad j \leq n-2, \\ s_{2\dots j}^{(\infty)} &\rightarrow \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i}, \quad j \leq n-2 \\ s_{2\dots n-1}^{(\infty)} &\rightarrow -s_{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

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

$$L_j = s_{12\dots j} - s_{2\dots j} + s_{12}, \quad j = 3, \dots, n-1, \quad (21)$$

so, we see that UV scaling and amplitude zero lead to identical linear relations between the basis elements (at least for boundary propagators). From eq.(19) this implies

$$S_1|_{\text{UV}} = 0, \quad (22)$$

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.(19), 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

It is also interesting to note that the action of the UV scaling in eqs.(20) is exactly what one obtains from imposing the zero condition and further setting all non-boundary propagators to zero, as can be seen from eqs.(29) in Appendix A. This suggests it may be possible to even more directly relate zeros with 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 $\text{Tr } \phi^3$. Besides the obvious problem that without locality, or when numerators are present, it is no longer clear how to define subsets, it is not possible to always isolate only two diagrams at a time via cuts, and so in general the constraints on the ansatz coefficients are much more complicated.

Nevertheless, the amplitude zero is conjectured to uniquely determine both $\text{Tr } \phi^3$ and NLSM amplitudes

even without assuming locality, so clearly some non-trivial structure responsible for this must still exist. Indeed, we can prove this equivalence between amplitude zero and enhanced UV scaling does survive but only for the "fattest" zero, ie. the one which maximizes the number of kinematic invariants set to zero. A general implication of this fact is that for all amplitudes that satisfy a "fattest zero" condition, any term that individually scales as z^k , will in fact combine with other similar terms in the amplitude such that their sum scales as z^{k-1} . If we continue to assume the amplitude is expressed purely in terms of planar variables, ie. sums of consecutive momenta squared, then this zero induces the same linear relations as its corresponding UV scaling, which can be proven as before. In this case, we can write that, for any subset satisfying the zero

$$S = \sum L_i C_i, \quad (23)$$

where the L_i are the linear relations which vanish for both fattest zero and the corresponding UV scaling. Therefore, both conditions imply equivalent constraints, and we conclude that for any rational function built from planar variables

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

where now we define subsets in the looser sense mentioned in the above paragraph. We leave a further exploration of this direction to future work, but note it is strangely similar to how permutation invariance was found to automatically improve any scaling z^{odd} by one power to z^{even} [28].

BEYOND SCALARS

It is natural to ask how constraining the amplitude zero is for YM amplitude. In this case, the zero condition needs to set dot products of polarization vectors to 0 as well. For instance, the simplest zero at 4-point requires

$$p_1 \cdot p_3 = e_1 \cdot p_3 = e_3 \cdot p_1 = e_1 \cdot e_3 = 0. \quad (24)$$

From the nature of the constraint, it is immediately clear there is no hope for the zero to 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 still 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), the amplitude zero uniquely fixes these objects! This extra requirement simply demands that amplitudes satisfy relations of the type

$$\sum_{i=2}^{n-1} s_{1i} A(2, \dots, i, 1, i+1, \dots, n) = 0. \quad (25)$$

Therefore, the combination of these two properties contains the maximal amount of information one could hope for, suggesting a new structure based on these unique objects (which are also relevant for 4D helicity amplitudes, and were recently considered in [29]). Combining the composition rule or higher derivative bootstrap approaches [30–32], with the amplitude zero requirement may provide further insight into these objects.

OUTLOOK

We proved a series of results related to the newly discovered property of amplitude zeros, including how uniqueness of $\text{Tr } \phi^3$ follows from this property, and that in some cases it is exactly equivalent to a new type of enhanced UV/BCFW scaling. Amplitude zeros then somehow seem to act as a lynchpin between IR and UV information, offering a new path towards understanding how different physical principles contain amplitude information. For instance, the novel secret scaling uncovered may perhaps be exploitable, similar to bonus relations, which have both surprising origins and applications [28, 33, 34].

The method used in this work also demonstrates a strikingly simple motivation for how amplitudes can be uniquely fixed by various principles. Fully understanding the remaining uniqueness results via similar methods remains an interesting possibility.

Acknowledgments: The author would like to thank Song He for valuable discussions.

* laurentiu.rodina@gmail.com

- [1] N. Arkani-Hamed, Q. Cao, J. Dong, C. Figueiredo, and S. He, (2023), arXiv:2312.16282 [hep-th].
- [2] R. Britto, F. Cachazo, B. Feng, and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 181602 (2005), arXiv:hep-th/0501052.
- [3] C. Cheung, C.-H. Shen, and J. Trnka, JHEP **06**, 118 (2015), arXiv:1502.05057 [hep-th].
- [4] F. Cachazo, S. He, and E. Y. Yuan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 171601 (2014), arXiv:1307.2199 [hep-th].
- [5] N. Arkani-Hamed and J. Trnka, JHEP **10**, 030 (2014), arXiv:1312.2007 [hep-th].
- [6] N. Arkani-Hamed, Y. Bai, S. He, and G. Yan, JHEP **05**, 096 (2018), arXiv:1711.09102 [hep-th].
- [7] Q. Cao, J. Dong, S. He, and Y.-Q. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 026022 (2023), arXiv:2211.05404 [hep-th].
- [8] A. Brandhuber, G. Chen, H. Johansson, G. Travaglini, and C. Wen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 121601 (2022), arXiv:2111.15649 [hep-th].
- [9] G. Chen, L. Rodina, and C. Wen, (2024), arXiv:2403.04614 [hep-th].
- [10] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 061602 (2010), arXiv:1004.0476 [hep-th].
- [11] C. Cheung, C.-H. Shen, and C. Wen, JHEP **02**, 095 (2018), arXiv:1705.03025 [hep-th].

- [12] N. Arkani-Hamed, H. Frost, G. Salvatori, P.-G. Plamondon, and H. Thomas, (2023), arXiv:2309.15913 [hep-th].
- [13] N. Arkani-Hamed, Q. Cao, J. Dong, C. Figueiredo, and S. He, (2024), arXiv:2401.05483 [hep-th].
- [14] N. Arkani-Hamed and C. Figueiredo, (2024), arXiv:2403.04826 [hep-th].
- [15] Q. Cao, J. Dong, S. He, and C. Shi, (2024), arXiv:2403.08855 [hep-th].
- [16] N. Arkani-Hamed, L. Rodina, and J. Trnka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 231602 (2018), arXiv:1612.02797 [hep-th].
- [17] J. J. M. Carrasco and L. Rodina, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 125007 (2019), arXiv:1908.08033 [hep-th].
- [18] L. Rodina, JHEP **09**, 078 (2019), arXiv:1612.03885 [hep-th].
- [19] L. Rodina, JHEP **09**, 084 (2019), arXiv:1612.06342 [hep-th].
- [20] L. Rodina, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 071601 (2019), arXiv:1807.09738 [hep-th].
- [21] L. Rodina, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 045012 (2020), arXiv:2005.06446 [hep-th].
- [22] C. Cheung, K. Kampf, J. Novotny, and J. Trnka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 221602 (2015), arXiv:1412.4095 [hep-th].
- [23] C. Cheung, K. Kampf, J. Novotny, C.-H. Shen, and J. Trnka, JHEP **02**, 020 (2017), arXiv:1611.03137 [hep-th].
- [24] T. V. Brown, K. Kampf, U. Oktem, S. Paranjape, and J. Trnka, Phys. Rev. D **108**, 105008 (2023), arXiv:2305.05688 [hep-th].
- [25] C. Bartsch, T. V. Brown, K. Kampf, U. Oktem, S. Paranjape, and J. Trnka, (2024), arXiv:2403.10594 [hep-th].
- [26] C. Cheung, K. Kampf, J. Novotny, C.-H. Shen, and J. Trnka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 041601 (2016), arXiv:1509.03309 [hep-th].
- [27] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 085011 (2008), arXiv:0805.3993 [hep-ph].
- [28] D. A. McGady and L. Rodina, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 105010 (2015), arXiv:1408.5125 [hep-th].
- [29] N. H. Pavao, Phys. Rev. D **107**, 065020 (2023), arXiv:2210.12800 [hep-th].
- [30] J. J. M. Carrasco, L. Rodina, Z. Yin, and S. Zekioglu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 251602 (2020), arXiv:1910.12850 [hep-th].
- [31] J. J. M. Carrasco, L. Rodina, and S. Zekioglu, JHEP **06**, 169 (2021), arXiv:2104.08370 [hep-th].
- [32] J. J. M. Carrasco, M. Lewandowski, and N. H. Pavao, JHEP **02**, 015 (2023), arXiv:2211.04441 [hep-th].
- [33] N. Arkani-Hamed and J. Kaplan, JHEP **04**, 076 (2008), arXiv:0801.2385 [hep-th].
- [34] S. Paranjape and J. Trnka, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 251601 (2023), arXiv:2309.05710 [hep-th].

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

$$A_n|_{\text{zero}} = \sum S_i \Big|_{\text{zero}} = \sum \mathcal{D}_i \frac{1}{\mathcal{P}_i} \Big|_{\text{zero}} = 0. \quad (26)$$

Then, we choose a subset (m), which can extract from the above relation by cutting all (non-boundary) corresponding propagators in \mathcal{D}_m . 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

$$\mathcal{P}_m|_{\text{zero}}|_{\mathcal{D}_m\text{-cut}} = 0. \quad (27)$$

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

$$\mathcal{P}_m = \sum L_i C_i, \quad (28)$$

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

$$\begin{aligned} s_{1,2,\dots,j} &= s_{12} + \sum_{i=2}^j s_{1i} + \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i} + s_{3\dots j}, \quad j \leq n-2, \\ s_{2,\dots,j} &= \sum_{i=3}^j s_{2i} + s_{3\dots j}, \quad j \leq n-2, \\ s_{2,\dots,n-1} &= -s_{12} - \sum_{i=3}^{n-1} s_{1i}. \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

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.(21), namely

$$L_j = s_{12\dots j} - s_{2\dots j} + s_{12}, \quad j = 3, \dots, n-1. \quad (30)$$

This implies

$$\mathcal{P}_m|_{\text{zero}} = 0, \quad (31)$$

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.




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

These have a form

$$\frac{1}{P_L P_R} \left\{ \frac{x_i}{P_A}, \frac{x_{i+1}}{P_B} \right\}. \quad (32)$$

We need to prove $P_A = -P_B$ on the amplitude zero plus (P_L, P_R) -cut locus. We can write

$$P_A = s_{12} + \sum_{k=3}^i s_{1k} + P_L, \quad (33)$$

$$P_R = s_{12} + \sum_{k=3}^{j-1} s_{1k} + P_B, \quad (34)$$

so under the zero condition, and on the cut $P_L = P_R = 0$, we find $P_A = -P_B$ so we conclude the two diagrams can 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.