

Planar Six-Point Feynman Integrals for Four-Dimensional Gauge Theories

Samuel Abreu,^{1,2} Pier Francesco Monni,¹ Ben Page,³ Johann Usovitsch^{1,4}

¹*Theoretical Physics Department, CERN, 1211 Geneva, Switzerland*

²*Higgs Centre for Theoretical Physics, School of Physics and Astronomy,
The University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh EH9 3FD, Scotland, UK*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ghent University, 9000 Ghent, Belgium*

⁴*Institut für Physik und IRIS Adlershof, Humboldt-Universität zu Berlin, 10099 Berlin, Germany*

ABSTRACT: We compute all planar two-loop six-point Feynman integrals entering scattering observables in massless gauge theories such as QCD. A central result of this paper is the formulation of the differential-equations method under the algebraic constraints stemming from four-dimensional kinematics, which in this case leaves only 8 independent scales. We show that these constraints imply that one must compute topologies with only up to 8 propagators, instead of the expected 9. This leads to the decoupling of entire classes of integrals that do not contribute to scattering amplitudes in four dimensional gauge theories. We construct a pure basis and derive their canonical differential equations, of which we discuss the numerical solution. This work marks an important step towards the calculation of massless $2 \rightarrow 4$ scattering processes at two loops.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Six-point Kinematics in Four Dimensions	3
2.1	Differential Operators	5
3	Integral Topologies	7
3.1	Decoupling of Topologies with 9 Propagators in the $D \rightarrow 4$ Limit	9
4	Canonical Differential Equation and Pure Basis	12
4.1	Approach to Canonicalization	13
4.2	Transformation to canonical basis by analytic reconstruction	16
5	Analytic Differential Equation and Numerical Checks	21
5.1	Differential Equation and Alphabet	22
5.2	Numerical Checks	23
6	Conclusions	26
A	Twistor variables representation of Mandelstam invariants	28

1 Introduction

With the upcoming high-luminosity phase of the LHC physics program only a few years away, demands for precise theoretical predictions naturally increase. In recent years, with improvements in both our ability to compute scattering amplitudes as well as the corresponding real-radiation contributions, computations at next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) precision are becoming commonplace. On the side of the scattering amplitude, one major bottleneck to the computation of new two-loop results is the availability of the associated Feynman integrals. Currently, the multiplicity frontier is firmly established at five points, with the complete computations of five-point massless [1–8] and one-mass integrals [1, 9–14], as well as first results for two-mass planar integrals [15]. Some new results have also recently appeared for topologies with internal masses, such as planar integrals for $t\bar{t}j$ -production [16, 17] as well as a number of results for integrals for $t\bar{t}H$ production [18, 19]. Beyond five-points, initial results for two-loop planar six-point Feynman integrals are also available, such as the numerical evaluation of the “hexa-box” family [20], the differential equation for all planar integrals on the maximal-cut [21], as well as the complete calculation of a subset of the integral topologies [22]. Indeed, the computation of two-loop six-point Feynman integrals is a necessary ingredient for

a number of investigations of phenomenological relevance for hadron colliders, such as obtaining more precise predictions for the production of four jets or for final states involving jets and photons. Importantly, six-point Feynman integrals present new theoretical properties, and in order to be able to tackle such complicated processes these must be thoroughly understood.

The first property is related to the number of external momenta. At six points, we have for the first time more than four independent momenta after applying momentum conservation. Since in collider physics applications the external momenta are 4-dimensional, starting with six-point problems the external momenta become linearly dependent. This not only means that there is a constraint on the kinematics of such processes, but it also leads to new relations between Feynman integrals. At one loop, it is well known that this implies that six-point integrals can be reduced directly to lower multiplicity integrals with techniques that are now textbook (see e.g. [23]). While in general it is not true that two-loop six-point integrals can be reduced to lower multiplicity integrals, it is still true that the four-dimensionality of the external kinematics introduces a new class of relations between these integrals. The second property is related to the number of propagators that two-loop six-point topologies can have. Indeed, for the first time we find two-loop topologies with more than eight propagators, and the number of integration variables in the four-dimensional limit (that is, when the loop momenta are taken to be four dimensional) is fewer than the number of propagators. At the one-loop level, this occurs for the pentagon, and signals a reduction identity that is valid up to $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ corrections in the dimensional regulator [24]. It is thus natural to ask if the same happens at two-loops, that is if nine-propagator integrals can be arranged to decouple in the four-dimensional limit at two loops (see also [25] for related work).

In this work, we consider the question of how to tackle the subtleties of six-point processes in the calculation of Feynman integrals within the differential equations method [24, 26–29], and compute the full collection of master integrals for fully massless planar two-loop six-point processes, such as 4-jet production. Firstly, we tackle the problem of manifesting Lorentz-invariance in our differential equation. To this end, we naturally work in terms of an independent set of Mandelstam variables. However, at six-point, the set of linearly-independent Mandelstam invariants themselves satisfy a high-degree polynomial relation, which we discuss how to treat. Secondly, we discuss how the linear dependence of the external momenta induces extra classes of linear relations between the Feynman integrals, and how we take these into account in the computation. Thirdly, we adapt standard techniques for the construction of a basis of master integrals that satisfies a so-called “canonical” differential equation [30] to the case of six-point kinematics. An important step in this construction is to find the general solution of the differential equation in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit, which can be used to change basis to a canonical form. Two problems arise in this case. First, we must determine the differential equation itself in the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit, which is a highly non-trivial task due to the large number of variables in the problem. Second, we must then solve this multivariate differential equation subject to the constraint that the external momenta are linearly dependent. To tackle these difficulties we work with finite-field techniques [31, 32] for the construction of the differential equations. We propose to exploit the analytic structure of the change of basis matrix to

construct an ansatz for the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit of the differential equation, which we constrain using finite-field reductions from KIRA [33]. Our ansatz both has a dramatically limited number of free parameters and also trivializes the solution of the $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$ limit of the differential equation, allowing us to efficiently construct a pure basis for our space of six-point master integrals. Finally, we show that it is indeed possible to choose a basis of integrals such that the nine-propagator topologies decouple in the four-dimensional limit. We therefore conclude that, for physical applications where external momenta are four dimensional, we can side-step the computation of the most complicated six-point topologies.

The paper is structured as follows: in section 2, we discuss four-dimensional six-point kinematics and how to construct differential operators which respect the four-dimensionality of the external momenta. In section 3, we define the six-point integral families that we study, and show that it is sufficient to study only eight-propagator topologies. In section 4, we discuss our construction of a canonical basis, highlighting our analytic reconstruction method for the canonicalization. In section 5, we solve the differential equations numerically with the AMFLOW [20, 34] and DIFFEXP [35] codes, highlighting the subtleties of their applications to four-dimensional kinematics.

2 Six-point Kinematics in Four Dimensions

We consider the scattering of six massless particles, with momenta p_i , $i = 1, \dots, 6$, which satisfy momentum conservation $\sum_{i=1}^6 p_i = 0$ and the on-shell conditions $p_i^2 = 0$. A set of 9 Mandelstam invariants which solve the momentum conservation and the on-shell constraints can be chosen as

$$\vec{s} = \{s_{12}, s_{23}, s_{34}, s_{45}, s_{56}, s_{16}, s_{123}, s_{234}, s_{345}\}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $s_{ij} = (p_i + p_j)^2$ and $s_{ijk} = (p_i + p_j + p_k)^2$.

An important fact that underlies many of the novel features of the calculation in this paper is that we impose that the p_i are strictly four-dimensional vectors. Given that the integrals we compute are Lorentz invariant functions, it is convenient to consider them as functions of the Mandelstam invariants, which in turn implies that we must translate the four-dimensionality constraints to the Mandelstam variables. This can be achieved by using the Gram determinant of a set of momenta, defined as

$$G \begin{pmatrix} u_1 \cdots u_n \\ v_1 \cdots v_n \end{pmatrix} = \det(2u_i \cdot v_j), \quad (2.2)$$

where, in this paper, the u_i and v_i are vectors in Minkowski space. We will frequently make use of the case where $u_i = v_i = p_i$, and for convenience we define the short-hand notation

$$G(p_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_3} p_{i_4}) = G \begin{pmatrix} p_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_3} p_{i_4} \\ p_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_3} p_{i_4} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.3)$$

Furthermore, to keep the notation light, we will often simply indicate the indices of the vectors entering the Gram determinant and write

$$G \begin{pmatrix} i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 \\ j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4 \end{pmatrix} = G \begin{pmatrix} p_{i_1} p_{i_2} p_{i_3} p_{i_4} \\ p_{j_1} p_{j_2} p_{j_3} p_{j_4} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.4)$$

and analogously for Eq. (2.3).

The consequences of the four dimensionality of the external momenta on the Lorentz-invariant Mandelstam variables in \vec{s} (see Eq. (2.1)) can be expressed neatly in terms of Gram determinants. Specifically, as any five four-dimensional momenta are linearly dependent, one has that

$$\Delta_6 = G(12345) = 0. \quad (2.5)$$

That is, the four-dimensionality of the external momenta induces a single constraint on the 9 Mandelstam variables, which in practice means that there are only 8 independent Mandelstam variables. While $G(12345)$ is a degree-five polynomial in the variables in \vec{s} , it is quadratic in each of them. This implies that describing the phase space in terms of an independent set of Mandelstams requires the introduction of a square root to solve Eq. (2.5). As there is no manifestly symmetric way to solve the six-point Gram constraint, we arbitrarily choose to solve $\Delta_6 = 0$ with respect to s_{16} . Given this choice, an important quantity that will feature in our calculation is the discriminant of the quadratic equation $\Delta_6 = 0$ with respect to s_{16} . This is given by

$$\text{Discriminant}_{s_{16}}(\Delta_6) = 4 G(1234)G(3456), \quad (2.6)$$

where we made explicit the interesting fact that the discriminant factorizes into a product of (five-point) Gram determinants. We note nevertheless that throughout this paper we will strive to avoid explicitly solving the constraint of Eq. (2.5) and instead present expressions that depend on the 9 invariants in \vec{s} . These expressions are valid modulo $G(12345) = 0$ and are thus not unique, but have the advantage of keeping a square root implicit. When evaluated in four-dimensional kinematics this constraint is automatically satisfied and the result is therefore unique.

The four dimensionality of the external momenta also has consequences on the five-point Gram determinants $G(i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4)$. Indeed, taking into account trivial determinant relations, there are five different $G(i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4)$ one can consider, but the four-dimensionality of the external kinematics implies that these five determinants are dependent on each other. The Lorentz invariant consequences of this observation can be made explicit using $\Delta_6 = 0$ together with Sylvester's determinant identity, which leads to

$$G(i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4)G(j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4) = G \begin{pmatrix} i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 \\ j_1 j_2 j_3 j_4 \end{pmatrix}^2. \quad (2.7)$$

While this relation might seem unremarkable, it has subtle consequences when taking square-roots of Gram determinants. Indeed, the latter are ubiquitous in parametrising phase space or

in defining pure bases of master integrals and are thus natural quantities to consider. Taking the square-root of the relation in Eq. (2.7) implies that the use of multiple such square roots leads to a multiple cover of phase space. While this is not problematic in principle, the multiple cover is entirely unnecessary and can be avoided. Specifically, we define a canonical Gram determinant square root as

$$\sqrt{\Delta_5} = \sqrt{G(1234)}. \quad (2.8)$$

We then define all other five-point square roots in terms of this canonical choice as

$$\sqrt{\Delta_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4}^{(5)}} = \frac{G\left(\begin{array}{cccc} i_1 & i_2 & i_3 & i_4 \\ 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \end{array}\right)}{\sqrt{\Delta_5}}, \quad (2.9)$$

which is a rational relation without any branch ambiguities. Given the relation (2.7) between Gram determinants, one has that

$$\left(\sqrt{\Delta_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4}^{(5)}}\right)^2 = G(i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4), \quad (2.10)$$

but importantly only a single algebraic branch cut has been introduced.

Besides five-point Gram determinants, we will also encounter the (square-roots of) three-point Gram determinants

$$G(p_{i_1 i_2}, p_{i_3 i_4}) = -\lambda(p_{i_1 i_2}^2, p_{i_3 i_4}^2, p_{i_5 i_6}^2) \quad (2.11)$$

where all i_k are distinct, we defined $p_{ab} = p_a + p_b$, and $\lambda(a, b, c) = a^2 + b^2 + c^2 - 2ab - 2ac - 2bc$ is the Källén function.

2.1 Differential Operators

Our goal is to compute six-point Feynman integrals by solving the differential equations they satisfy. In order to obtain the differential equations, we must first construct a set of differential operators which respect the $\Delta_6 = 0$ constraint. We treat this constraint as any other constraint that is imposed on the kinematics (such as momentum conservation or the on-shell condition), and note that the various conditions that are placed on the kinematics impose linear constraints on the basic differentials that we use to express the total differential. We note that we apply this approach in a fully numerical determination of the differential equation. Therefore, the constraints can be solved numerically, phase-space point by phase-space point, which greatly simplifies the approach.

We begin by considering a large, redundant set of variables: both the components of the external momenta p_i^μ , and the cyclic Mandelstams \vec{s} . As an operator, we can express the total derivative as

$$d = \sum_i ds_{i,i+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{i,i+1}} + \sum_i ds_{i,i+1,i+2} \frac{\partial}{\partial s_{i,i+1,i+2}} + \sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{\mu=0}^3 dp_i^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i^\mu}, \quad (2.12)$$

where we have explicitly implemented the four-dimensionality of the momenta in that the sum over μ runs only over four components. For practical reasons it is more convenient if all differential operators are Lorentz invariant, so we introduce

$$v_i = \sum_{j=1}^4 \mathcal{G}(1234)_{ij}^{-1} p_j, \quad (2.13)$$

which satisfies

$$g^{\mu\nu} = \sum_{j=1}^4 v_j^\mu v_j^\nu, \quad (2.14)$$

where $g^{\mu\nu}$ is the four-dimensional metric. This allows us to write

$$\sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{\mu=0}^3 dp_i^\mu \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i^\mu} = \sum_{i=1}^6 \sum_{j=1}^4 (v_j \cdot dp_i) \left(p_j \cdot \frac{\partial}{\partial p_i} \right). \quad (2.15)$$

Substituting this relation into Eq. (2.12), the total derivative is written in terms of manifestly Lorentz invariant operators. We can then impose that the total differential is consistent with the definition of the Mandelstam invariants,

$$d[s_{i,i+1} - (p_i + p_{i+1})^2] = 0, \quad d[s_{i,i+1,i+2} - (p_i + p_{i+1} + p_{i+2})^2] = 0, \quad (2.16)$$

and with the on-shell condition and momentum conservation constraints

$$d[p_i^2] = 0 \quad i = 1, \dots, 6, \quad p_j \cdot d \left[\sum_{i=1}^6 p_i \right] = 0 \quad j = 1, \dots, 4. \quad (2.17)$$

Each of these constraints can be interpreted as a (linear) constraint on the $ds_{i,i+1}$, $ds_{i,i+1,i+2}$ and $v_j \cdot dp_i$, whose coefficients are rational in Mandelstam invariants. Therefore, for each phase-space point, we sample Eqs. (2.16) and (2.17) and solve for a basis of the differentials. This solution is not unique, but we find that the degrees of freedom correspond to differential operators which annihilate Lorentz invariant functions and we are therefore allowed to set their associated unknowns to zero. Having done this, we find, as expected, that only 8 such differentials are independent, and we choose them to be the differentials corresponding to our independent set of Mandelstam invariants (to be consistent with the discussion below Eq. (2.5), all Mandelstam invariants in \vec{s} apart from s_{16}). This provides a practical solution to computing the total derivatives of Feynman integrals while imposing all constraints, including the four-dimensionality of the external kinematics.

The analytic form of the total differential is not particularly simple, but this is easily bypassed by constructing the operator numerically at each phase-space point. A key element of this setup is to be able to generate a configuration of 9 Mandelstam variables which satisfy the constraint $\Delta_6 = 0$. As noted above, this constraint is quadratic. It is therefore simple to apply the finite-field veto strategy introduced in [9], where random values of 8 of the Mandelstams are chosen until a solution to $\Delta_6 = 0$ is found within the finite field.

3 Integral Topologies

It is well known that Feynman integrals form a vector space under so-called “integration by parts” (IBP) relations [36, 37]. In this work, we construct a basis of this vector space, the so called “master integrals” (MIs). Many of the integrals under consideration here have already been treated in earlier works. See, for example, the set of five-point one-mass planar integrals [9]. The two-loop six-point topologies that have a non-zero number of master integrals are depicted in Fig. 1. As we will discuss in section 3.1, for four-dimensional gauge theories, the computation of the double-pentagon topology is unnecessary (as well as, as we will show, the hexa-box integral itself). It is therefore clear that all such two-loop six-point integrals can be organized into a single top topology, the hexa-box in Fig. 2. Consequently, we can write all the integrals we will consider in terms of the topology

$$I[\vec{\nu}] = \int \frac{d^D \ell_1}{i\pi^{D/2}} \frac{d^D \ell_2}{i\pi^{D/2}} \frac{\rho_{10}^{-\nu_{10}} \cdots \rho_{10}^{-\nu_{13}}}{\rho_1^{\nu_1} \cdots \rho_9^{\nu_9}}, \quad (3.1)$$

where the ν_i are integers, with $\nu_{10}, \dots, \nu_{13} < 0$, and the ρ_i are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \ell_1^2, \rho_2 = (\ell_1 - p_1)^2, \rho_3 = (\ell_1 - p_{12})^2, \rho_4 = (\ell_1 - p_{123})^2, \rho_5 = (\ell_1 - p_{1234})^2 \\ \rho_6 &= \ell_2^2, \rho_7 = (\ell_2 - p_6)^2, \rho_8 = (\ell_2 - p_{56})^2, \rho_9 = (\ell_1 + \ell_2)^2, \rho_{10} = (\ell_1 - p_{12345})^2, \\ \rho_{11} &= (\ell_2 - p_{456})^2, \rho_{12} = (\ell_2 - p_{3456})^2, \rho_{13} = (\ell_2 - p_{23456})^2, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where the external momenta are outgoing and $p_{i\dots j} = p_i + \dots + p_j$. For convenience, Fig. 2 displays a hexa-box with these conventions.

The use of four-dimensional external kinematics leads to additional non-trivial consequences on the number of MIs in the problem. In particular, further simplifications are observed at the integrand level, when expressed in terms of Mandelstam invariants. The constraint on four-dimensional kinematics can be expressed as

$$G \begin{pmatrix} \ell_1 & p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 \\ p_5 & p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 \end{pmatrix} = G \begin{pmatrix} \ell_2 & p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 \\ p_5 & p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 \end{pmatrix} = 0, \quad (3.3)$$

which follows from the linear dependence of the momenta on the bottom line of the Gram determinant. Naturally, one could consider different choices of the external momenta in the top line, but these give the same constraint given $\Delta_6 = 0$. When expressed in terms of the propagator variables and ISPs, Eqs. (3.3) can be used to eliminate two of the ISPs, reducing the total number of propagators and ISPs to 11, as expected for a two-loop integral in the four-dimensional limit. In practice, we implement (3.3) by first performing a numerical IBP reduction of all the Feynman integrals in the problem at a finite-field point that satisfies $\Delta_6 = 0$ but using the full D -dimensional kinematics with KIRA [33]. We then insert Eqs. (3.3) in the numerator of each of the MIs returned by KIRA, resulting in additional linear relations between them. We organise the latter set of equations in the same format used by KIRA for the IBP system and add them to the system of equations. We then solve the new system of linear




Figure 1: The two-loop six-point integral topologies considered in this work. All two-loop six-point planar integrals can be reduced to these topologies by integration by parts relations.




Figure 2: Hexa-box topology. The blue labels give the index of the propagators according to the conventions of Eq. (3.2).

equations (now containing also the extra relations) and count the number of master integrals associated to each of the six-point topologies. The on-shell number of master integrals for each of the six-point topologies is recorded in Table 1, and agrees with the results of [21].

Diagram	(b)	(c)	(d)	(e)	(f)
Name	Hexa-box	Penta-triangle	Hexa-bubble	Penta-box	Double-box
Master Count	1	1	1	3	7

Table 1: Master integral count for each of the topologies in Fig. 1 apart from the double-pentagon. We exclude the double-pentagon, as it does not contribute to four-dimensional gauge theory amplitudes, as well as all the known integrals related to five-point one-mass planar topologies.

3.1 Decoupling of Topologies with 9 Propagators in the $D \rightarrow 4$ Limit

One important consideration when computing high-multiplicity Feynman integrals that are to be applied in the computation of scattering amplitudes, is to understand which such integrals contribute to the four-dimensional limit. Indeed, at one-loop it is well known that a basis of Feynman integrals can be chosen which manifests the fact that the pentagon topology does not contribute [24]. Moreover, in computations of five-point two-loop integrals it is frequently observed that certain master integrals can be chosen to only contribute at $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ (see e.g. [4]). Nevertheless, these integrals always formed part of a topology that contained integrals which did contribute to the finite part of amplitudes, so their full differential equation was still necessary.

In this section, we argue that at six-point, for the first time, entire topologies of Feynman integrals decouple in the four-dimensional limit of gauge theories and therefore do not need to be computed for applications to, say, collider physics. Specifically, we consider both the so-called “double-pentagon” topology and the “hexa-box” topology (see Figs. 1a and 1b) (note that the other topologies can be embedded in these two).

Double-Pentagon Topology Our aim is to build insertions which span the space of possible numerators, are irreducible modulo lower topologies and correspond to Feynman integrals that are manifestly $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. In the case of the double-pentagon topology, we rely on constraints imposed by renormalizable power counting. This argumentation is therefore only valid for a theory that obeys such power counting (such as gauge theories), and would need to be reconsidered for theories of gravity. While the power-counting constraints are simple to implement, the irreducibility and manifestly $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ constraints require more work. To implement the irreducibility constraint, we will work on the maximal cut, setting all propagators to zero. To implement the manifest $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ integral constraints, we will make use of a class of numerators which give rise to what has recently been dubbed “evanescent integrals” [38].

We begin with the double-pentagon topology. Renormalizable power counting tells us that our numerators should have at most power 5 in each loop momenta, and total power 8. Note that all such numerators are ultra-violet finite. In the left and right loop power-counting, the integral scales as a renormalizable power-counting pentagon which is ultra-violet finite. In the limit where all loop momenta are large, the scaling of the numerator and measure

factor are beaten by that of the 9 denominators. Therefore, we only need to consider infra-red regions in the construction of evanescent integrals.

In order to define infra-red finite numerators, we employ two functions of loop momenta α_i given by

$$\alpha_1 = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \ell_1^\mu p_1^\nu p_2^\rho p_3^\sigma, \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_2 = \varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \ell_2^\mu p_4^\nu p_5^\rho p_6^\sigma, \quad (3.4)$$

where $\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$ is the totally antisymmetric Levi-Civita tensor. The importance of the α_i arises as they vanish in one-loop-like infra-red regions. Let us consider the dangerous infra-red regions associated to the ℓ_1 loop. The soft regions are given by

$$\ell_1 \rightarrow p_1, \quad \ell_1 \rightarrow p_1 + p_2, \quad (3.5)$$

while the collinear regions are given by

$$\ell_1 \rightarrow xp_1, \quad \ell_1 \rightarrow p_1 + xp_2, \quad \ell_1 \rightarrow p_1 + p_2 + xp_3. \quad (3.6)$$

In each region, the loop momentum becomes a linear combination of p_1, p_2 and p_3 . Therefore, in each region, α_1 vanishes. Similar argumentation leads us to conclude that α_2 vanishes in the infra-red regions associated to ℓ_2 . Therefore, we see that the α_i are useful functions to include in numerators in order to control infra-red behavior.

The next ingredient in our construction of evanescent integrals are numerator functions which vanish for four-dimensional loop momenta. These are given by

$$\mu_{ij} = \ell_i^\epsilon \cdot \ell_j^\epsilon = \frac{G \left(\begin{matrix} \ell_i p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 \\ \ell_j p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4 \end{matrix} \right)}{2G(1234)}. \quad (3.7)$$

where ℓ_i^ϵ are the $(D - 4)$ -dimensional piece of loop-momentum i , transverse to the four-dimensional plane. Note that, by similar argumentation as above, the μ_{ij} also vanish in infra-red regions and therefore can also be used to control the infra-red behavior of the numerator.

Let us now discuss how we systematically construct a basis of evanescent numerators that are independent modulo lower topologies. To begin, we consider monomials of the α_i and μ_{jk} , of the form

$$m_\beta = \alpha_1^{\beta_1} \alpha_2^{\beta_2} \mu_{11}^{\beta_3} \mu_{22}^{\beta_4} \mu_{12}^{\beta_5}. \quad (3.8)$$

We then construct the full set of monomials that satisfy renormalizable power counting, vanishing in all infra-red regions and at least one factor of some μ_{ij} , thus resulting in an evanescent integral. Altogether, we find 165 such monomials.

Finally, we impose the irreducibility constraint modulo lower topologies. To do this, we work on the maximal cut in a numerical fashion. We randomly sample the full set of m_β over loop momenta which set the propagators in Fig. 1a to zero. Linear-dependencies of the monomials on the maximum cut can be determined from linear dependencies of the set of

evaluations via linear algebra. Altogether, we find that a set of numerators that is evanescent and independent on the maximal cut is

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} &\mu_{12}, \alpha_2\mu_{12}, \alpha_2\mu_{11}, \alpha_1\mu_{12}, \alpha_1\mu_{22}, \mu_{12}^2, \mu_{12}\mu_{22}, \mu_{11}\mu_{12}, \mu_{11}\mu_{22}, \alpha_2^2\mu_{11}, \alpha_1\alpha_2\mu_{22}, \\ &\alpha_1\alpha_2\mu_{11}, \alpha_1^2\mu_{22}, \alpha_2\mu_{12}^2, \alpha_2\mu_{12}\mu_{22}, \alpha_2\mu_{11}\mu_{12}, \alpha_2\mu_{11}^2, \alpha_1\mu_{22}^2, \alpha_1\mu_{11}\mu_{12}, \mu_{12}^3, \\ &\mu_{12}^2\mu_{22}, \mu_{12}\mu_{22}^2, \mu_{11}\mu_{12}^2, \mu_{11}^2\mu_{12}, \alpha_1\alpha_2\mu_{22}^2, \alpha_1\alpha_2\mu_{11}^2, \alpha_2\mu_{12}^3, \alpha_2\mu_{12}^2\mu_{22}, \\ &\alpha_2\mu_{11}\mu_{12}^2, \alpha_2\mu_{11}^2\mu_{12}, \mu_{12}^4, \mu_{12}^3\mu_{22}, \mu_{11}\mu_{12}^3 \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (3.9)$$

Importantly, it is possible to show that these numerators actually span power-counting space. Note that monomials of the α_i which satisfy renormalizable power counting are linearly independent and span a basis. It is easy to count that there are 33 such monomials. As there are also 33 functions in (3.9), we therefore find that the monomials in (3.9) can be used to express any double-pentagon numerator which satisfies renormalizable power counting.

In summary, if the integrand basis in (3.9) is used for the double-pentagon topology, then all the associated integrals contribute at $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$. It is therefore unnecessary to compute the double-pentagon topology in computations of the finite parts of gauge theory amplitudes.

Hexa-box Topology In the case of the hexa-box topology, similar logic to the above can be used. Nevertheless, a direct application of the above argumentation leaves a single element of the integrand basis which does not decouple in the $D \rightarrow 4$ limit. Therefore, we find that it is necessary to work at the level of master integrals (and not at the integrand level). Specifically, we search for a choice of the master integral which is $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, uniformly transcendent and of maximal weight. If we can find such an integral, as it is maximal weight, its coefficient in the amplitude cannot contain a factor of $1/\epsilon$. Therefore we do not need to compute the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$ part of the integral and thus we can discard it. This search is greatly aided by the fact that there is only a single master integral associated to the hexa-box topology, see Table 1. One such choice can be taken to be the hexa-box integral with the numerator

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{hb}}^{\epsilon, \text{UT}} = \epsilon^4 \mu_{11} G \begin{pmatrix} \ell_2 p_5 p_6 \\ p_1 p_5 p_6 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.10)$$

This numerator is a product of μ_{11} and a judiciously chosen Gram determinant. Specifically, the Gram determinant vanishes in all infra-red regions associated to the ℓ_2 loop. Moreover, the numerator has sufficiently low power-counting such that we do not encounter a double pole at infinity. Therefore, we expect this integral to be both $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)$, and of uniform and maximal transcendent weight. In order to validate that the integral is indeed of uniform and maximal transcendent weight, we use KIRA to numerically check that it can be written as a linear combination of pure integrals, with coefficients that are independent of the dimensional regulator. This proves that the corresponding hexa-box topology can be ignored when working with four dimensional external kinematics. Nevertheless, since the inclusion of this integral topology in our computation does not entail additional technical challenges, we keep it in the

following analysis as it allows us to embed all the remaining integral topologies into it. We refer to section 4 for discussion of a pure basis for the hexa-box topology.

4 Canonical Differential Equation and Pure Basis

Let J be a vector of Feynman integrals associated with a given topology. It is well known that the integrals satisfy a coupled first order differential equation

$$dJ = \overline{\mathbf{M}} J, \quad (4.1)$$

where $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ is a matrix of differential one-forms that depend rationally on the kinematics and the dimensional regulator $\epsilon = (4 - D)/2$. The construction of this system of differential equations is a non-trivial task due both to the complexity of the algebra required to obtain $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ as well as to the complexity of the form of $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ itself. In order to avoid simplify these two problems, it is useful to change to a basis I of so-called “pure” [30] Feynman integrals, which satisfies a differential equation of the form

$$dI = \epsilon \mathbf{M} I, \quad \mathbf{M} = M_\alpha d \log W_\alpha. \quad (4.2)$$

The M_α are matrices of rational numbers and the W_α are algebraic functions of the kinematic invariants, often called letters. The identification of such a pure basis reduces the computation of the differential equation to the identification of the W_α , alongside the determination of the set of rational-number matrices M_α . Both of these components can then be determined via finite-field reconstruction methods (see e.g. Refs. [4, 9, 10] for a detailed discussion in the context of five-point integrals), drastically simplifying the computation of the differential equation.

Let I be related to J through $I = U^{-1} J$. The change-of-basis matrix U is invertible and rational in ϵ , but potentially algebraic in the kinematic invariants. The matrices \mathbf{M} and $\overline{\mathbf{M}}$ are related by the following change-of-basis relation

$$\mathbf{M} = U^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{M}} U - U^{-1} dU. \quad (4.3)$$

In this section, we discuss the details of the construction of the differential equation and the pure basis for the set of topologies embedded in the hexa-box topology defined in section 3, see Fig. 2. In particular, we focus on novel difficulties in construction the differential equation itself due to the four-dimensional nature of the external kinematics. The hexa-box topology contains a total of 202 master integrals. While the hexa-box integral itself is not necessarily needed for four-dimensional gauge theories, as argued in the previous section, we nevertheless include it also in our basis since it is trivial to find a pure representative and this will allow us to explicitly test the argument given in section 3.1 for the decoupling of this nine-propagator integral.

4.1 Approach to Canonicalization

In order to determine a pure basis of six-point massless Feynman integrals, we follow the general two-step strategy of first constructing a basis of integrals that is nearly pure, and then using the structure of the differential equation to construct a change of basis matrix to a pure basis. This strategy is not new, and we summarise it here mainly to establish our notation.

We begin by identifying the integrals that already appear in the five-point one-mass case. For those, we take the pure masters integrals identified in [9]. For the genuine six-point topologies, it is simple to identify candidate pure master integrals for the hexa-box, penta-triangle, hexa-bubble and penta-box topologies, following ideas similar to those used in e.g. [4, 6, 9]. Explicitly, we take the following candidate master integrals for these topologies:

- For the hexa-box topology:

$$\mathcal{N}_1^{(\text{hb})} = \epsilon^4 \mu_{11}[1234] \sqrt{\Delta_{1234}^{(5)}} (\ell_1 + p_6)^2 s_{56}. \quad (4.4)$$

- For the penta-triangle topology:

$$\mathcal{N}_1^{(\text{pt})} = \epsilon^4 \mu_{11}[2346] \sqrt{\Delta_{2346}^{(5)}}. \quad (4.5)$$

- For the penta-box topology:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{N}_1^{(\text{pb})} &= \epsilon^4 s_{12} s_{23} s_{56} (\ell_1 + p_6)^2, \\ \mathcal{N}_2^{(\text{pb})} &= \epsilon^4 s_{56} \mu_{11}[3216] \sqrt{\Delta_{3216}^{(5)}}, \\ \mathcal{N}_3^{(\text{pb})} &= -\epsilon^4 \left(\frac{1-2\epsilon}{1+2\epsilon} \right) (\mu_{11}[3216] \mu_{22}[3216] - \mu_{12}^2[3216]) \sqrt{\Delta_{3216}^{(5)}}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

- For the hexa-bubble topology:

$$\mathcal{N}_1^{(\text{hbab})} = \epsilon^3 \mu_{11}[1234] \sqrt{\Delta_{1234}^{(5)}} \frac{(\ell_1 + p_6)^2}{(\ell_1 + \ell_2)^2}. \quad (4.7)$$

In these expressions, we have used

$$\mu_{ij}[k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4] = \frac{G \left(\begin{matrix} \ell_i p_{k_1} p_{k_2} p_{k_3} p_{k_4} \\ \ell_j p_{k_1} p_{k_2} p_{k_3} p_{k_4} \end{matrix} \right)}{2G(k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4)}. \quad (4.8)$$

We remark that in the case that the external momenta are four-dimensional, the $\mu_{ij}[k_1 k_2 k_3 k_4]$ do not depend on the choice of k_1, k_2, k_3, k_4 . While the explicit expressions might look different, they are equivalent modulo the constraints of Eq. (3.3) and $\Delta_6 = 0$.

Given the number of masters integrals, the double-box topology of Fig. 1f is the most complicated topology we need to address. Some pure integrals are easy to identify by standard

techniques, and we complete this set with masters related to the on-shell pure basis of [21]. Explicitly, we take as candidate master integrals the following insertions

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{N}_1^{(\text{db})} &= \epsilon^4 s_{23} s_{345} s_{56}, \\
\mathcal{N}_2^{(\text{db})} &= \epsilon^4 s_{23} s_{56} (\ell_1 + p_6)^2, \\
\mathcal{N}_3^{(\text{db})} &= \epsilon^4 \frac{s_{56}}{s_{25} s_{35}} \text{tr}_5(p_3, \ell_1 - p_{12}, \ell_1 - p_{12} - p_2, p_5, p_3, p_5, p_2, p_{16}), \\
\mathcal{N}_4^{(\text{db})} &= \epsilon^4 \frac{s_{23}}{s_{35} s_{36}} \text{tr}_5(p_5, \ell_2 - p_6, \ell_2 - 2p_6, p_3, p_5, p_3, p_6, p_{12}), \\
\mathcal{N}_5^{(\text{db})} &= \epsilon^4 \frac{1}{s_{25} s_{35} s_{36}} \text{tr}_5(p_3, \ell_1 - p_{12}, \ell_1 - p_{12} - p_2, p_5, p_3, \ell_2 - 2p_6, \ell_2 - p_6, p_5, p_3, p_5, p_2, p_6), \\
\mathcal{N}_6^{(\text{db})} &= \epsilon^3 (1 - 2\epsilon) \mu_{11} [1234], \\
\mathcal{N}_7^{(\text{db})} &= \epsilon^4 \mu_{12} [2356] \Delta_{2356}^{(5)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.9}$$

Here we used the γ_5 prescription of Ref. [39], so that

$$\text{tr}_5(k_1 \cdots k_n) = \frac{1}{96} \text{tr}(k'_1 \cdots k'_n \gamma^{\mu_{n+1}} \gamma^{\mu_{n+2}} \gamma^{\mu_{n+3}} \gamma^{\mu_{n+4}}) \varepsilon_{\mu_{n+1} \mu_{n+2} \mu_{n+3} \mu_{n+4}}. \tag{4.10}$$

To convert this into a Lorentz-invariant expression, we perform the trace of the chain of Dirac matrices, and make the replacement $\epsilon(p_i p_j p_k p_l) \rightarrow \sqrt{\Delta_{ijkl}^{(5)}}$.

With the choice of basis described above, the differential equation (4.1) takes the following form

$$dJ = \left(\overline{\mathbf{M}}^{(0)} + \epsilon \overline{\mathbf{M}}^{(1)} \right) J. \tag{4.11}$$

That is, the entries of J are in general not pure, but satisfy differential equations that are linear in ϵ . This is already a good starting point, and we now discuss how to construct a change of basis $I = U^{-1} J$ such that I satisfies a canonical differential equation of the form (4.2). In the new basis, the differential equation matrix \mathbf{M} is related to the one in Eq. (4.11) by Eq. (4.3), namely

$$\mathbf{M} = \epsilon U^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{M}}^{(1)} U + U^{-1} \left(\overline{\mathbf{M}}^{(0)} U - dU \right). \tag{4.12}$$

In other words, for the system to be in canonical form, U should satisfy the equation

$$dU = \overline{\mathbf{M}}^{(0)} U. \tag{4.13}$$

We observe that the $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$ term in Eq. (4.11) is a lower-triangular matrix. We then find it convenient to write it as

$$\overline{\mathbf{M}}^{(0)} = \overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)} + \overline{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)}, \tag{4.14}$$

where the matrix $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}$ is diagonal while $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)}$ is strictly lower triangular, and to parametrise U as the product

$$U = U_D U_L. \tag{4.15}$$

It is easy to show that a solution to Eq. (4.13) is given by

$$dU_D = \overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)} U_D, \quad (4.16)$$

$$dU_L = \left(U_D^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)} U_D \right) U_L. \quad (4.17)$$

The above equations clarify the role of the two matrices U_D and U_L . The former is a diagonal matrix that fixes the normalisation of the integrals ensuring that the diagonal entries of \mathbf{M} are ϵ factorised. The latter fixes the non-diagonal entries and is given by the sum of the identity matrix and a strictly lower-triangular matrix.

The above decomposition allows us to proceed in two steps. We first determine U_D by solving Eq. (4.16), and then we determine U_L by solving Eq. (4.17). Given that $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}$ is diagonal, a particular solution to Eq. (4.16) is

$$U_D = \Lambda_D \exp \left(\int \overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)} \right), \quad (4.18)$$

where Λ_D is a constant matrix and the integral is defined such that

$$d \int \overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)} = \overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}, \quad (4.19)$$

and we set all corresponding integration constants to zero. Since $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}$ is diagonal, the exponential in Eq. (4.18) amounts to the diagonal matrix whose entries are the exponentials of the entries of $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}$. The choice of Λ_D is arbitrary, and we choose it to be the identity matrix so that U_D simply acts as a normalisation on the integrals and does not rotate the basis. We will discuss how to evaluate the integral in Eq. (4.18) later on.

We now switch to Eq. (4.17). Given that now the matrix $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)}$ is not diagonal, a particular solution to Eq. (4.17) can be obtained by means of a Magnus expansion (see e.g. [40]). By inspection of $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)}$, we observe that the corresponding Magnus exponential does not truncate at first order. To simplify the procedure, we can further express the matrix $U_D^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)} U_D$ as

$$\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)} \equiv U_D^{-1} \overline{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0)} U_D = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{on}} + \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{off}}, \quad (4.20)$$

where the two matrices in the r.h.s. are derived from the corresponding on-shell and off-shell differential equations, $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{on}}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{off}}$ respectively. Accordingly, we can express the matrix U_L as

$$U_L = U_L^{\text{on}} U_L^{\text{off}}. \quad (4.21)$$

The differential equation (4.17) can then be solve by requiring that

$$dU_L^{\text{on}} = \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{on}} U_L^{\text{on}}, \quad (4.22)$$

$$dU_L^{\text{off}} = \left((U_L^{\text{on}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{off}} U_L^{\text{on}} \right) U_L^{\text{off}}. \quad (4.23)$$

The main advantage of the decomposition in Eq. (4.21) is that the Magnus expansion that solves each of Eqs. (4.22) and (4.23) now truncates at first order. That is,

$$U_L^{\text{on}} = \Lambda_L^{\text{on}} \exp \left(\int \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{on}} \right), \quad (4.24)$$

$$U_L^{\text{off}} = \Lambda_L^{\text{off}} \exp \left(\int (U_L^{\text{on}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{off}} U_L^{\text{on}} \right), \quad (4.25)$$

where the integration in the exponent is defined analogously to Eq. (4.19). As before, without loss of generality, we set the matrices of integration constants Λ_L^{on} and Λ_L^{off} to the identity matrix.

This procedure simplifies the computation of the change-of-basis matrix U , in that we can proceed in stages by computing each of the factors U_D , U_L^{on} and U_L^{off} . To this end, we pursue an analytic reconstruction approach to this determination, that we describe in the next section. We apply this procedure on a sector-by-sector basis, for each of the six-point sectors.

4.2 Transformation to canonical basis by analytic reconstruction

In order to use Eqs. (4.18), (4.24) and (4.25), we need to determine the matrices $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}$, $\tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{on}}$ and $(U_L^{\text{on}})^{-1} \tilde{\mathbf{M}}_L^{(0), \text{off}} U_L^{\text{on}}$. We will do this via analytic reconstruction. For simplicity, we shall denote any of these matrices by \mathbf{m} . To achieve this, we will exploit the expectation that the matrices U_D , U_L^{on} and U_L^{off} have algebraic entries. This puts strong constraints on the analytic structure of \mathbf{m} . In this section, we will use these constraints to construct compact ansatz for the matrices \mathbf{m} , leading to a highly efficient analytic reconstruction procedure for the change of basis matrix U that will allow us to obtain a pure basis.

Singularity Structure of the Pre-Canonical Differential Equation We begin by determining the singularity structure of the entries of the matrices \mathbf{m} . By construction, the entries of \mathbf{m} are algebraic functions of the external kinematics. Similar to the strategy commonly used for master integral coefficients in amplitudes (see e.g. [41]), we make an ansatz that these functions can be written in a form where the denominator is given by a product of even letters.¹ That is,

$$\mathbf{m}_{ij} = \frac{\mathbf{n}_{ij}}{\prod_{k \in \text{Even}} W_k^{q_{ijk}}}, \quad (4.26)$$

where \mathbf{n}_{ij} is a polynomial one form that potentially also has overall factors of the square roots. These square root factors arise from the form of the basis J in (4.11) and can be read off by inspection. We note that this ansatz places non-trivial constraints on the analytic structure of the \mathbf{m}_{ij} , but nevertheless we find it to be true via numerical experimentation. We construct the set of even letters that we use in (4.26) in two steps. Firstly, we take the set of planar five-point one-mass letters from Ref. [9]. We rewrite them in six-particle kinematics, maintaining

¹Roughly speaking, even letters are those that do not involve a square root. We will return to this topic below, but we stress that this is not a restriction as the odd letters themselves (those involving roots) can be rewritten in a form with algebraic numerators and a denominator that is a product of even letters.

planarity and considering all possible identifications of the off-shell leg with a consecutive pair of massless legs. We then complete this set using the even letters found on the maximal cut in Ref. [21]. Importantly, we enforce that all W_k are (parity-invariant) polynomials in Mandelstam variables. In a number of cases, even letters of Ref. [9] have been chosen to be square roots of polynomials in Mandelstams and so we simply choose to take our W_k as the polynomial under the square root. A more delicate subtlety arises when considering even letters of Ref. [21], which makes use of chiral objects such as spinor brackets or the Levi-Civita tensor. We therefore need to translate the expressions of Ref. [21] to our conventions. In two cases, this requires non-trivial analysis. The first is

$$\tilde{W}_{145} = \langle 12 \rangle [23] \langle 34 \rangle [45] \langle 56 \rangle [61] - [12] \langle 23 \rangle [34] \langle 45 \rangle [56] \langle 61 \rangle, \quad (4.27)$$

which is the leading singularity of the massless one-loop hexagon integral. Notably, \tilde{W}_{145} is written in terms of spinor-helicity variables (we refer to Ref. [21] for their definitions). As \tilde{W}_{145} is chiral, it is not expressible in terms of Mandelstam variables. To make use of this letter, we simply work with its square which is parity invariant. That is, we define

$$W_{145} = (s_{12}s_{234}s_{45} + s_{23}s_{345}s_{56} + s_{34}s_{123}s_{16} - s_{123}s_{234}s_{345})^2 - 4s_{12}s_{23}s_{34}s_{45}s_{56}s_{16}. \quad (4.28)$$

which satisfies $W_{145} = \tilde{W}_{145}^2$. The second case requiring non-trivial analysis is the collection of letters given by Levi-Civita symbols. Once again, we rewrite them in terms of expressions that only depend on Mandelstam invariants by working with their square. That is, we make use of the identity

$$d \log[\epsilon(ijkl)] = \frac{1}{2} d \log[G(ijkl)]. \quad (4.29)$$

In this way, we trade parity odd letters from Ref. [21] for equivalent expressions at the level of d logs.

In order to determine the exponents q_{ijk} , we use a univariate-slice strategy [41]. To this end, we must construct a univariate slice in the space of the Mandelstam invariants, parametrised by a variable t . In principle, this is a non-trivial problem, as the slice of phase-space must be four-dimensional, i.e. every point on the slice must satisfy Eq. (2.5). In order to solve this problem, we make use of the univariate-slice generation strategy of Ref. [42]. Here, a set of Mandelstams of the form

$$\vec{s}(t) = \vec{a} + \vec{b}t, \quad (4.30)$$

is generated by starting from a multi-line BCFW shift [43] in spinor space. As spinors are inherently four-dimensional, this approach results in numerical values of \vec{a} and \vec{b} such that $\vec{s}(t)$ satisfies Eq. (2.5) for all values of t .

Given the information on the denominators of the letters, we now combine it with constraints that arise from the structure of the change of basis matrices. Specifically, we assume that U_D , U_L^{on} and U_L^{off} are all algebraic functions of the Mandelstam variables. Given the discussion in the previous section, they are all expressed as exponentials of integrals of the

matrices which we wish to reconstruct. It is therefore important to consider how one computes the exponential of a matrix. In practice, we have two distinct cases: either the exponent matrix is diagonal, or strictly lower triangular. We will consider each case in turn.

Ansätze for The Diagonal Case We consider first the diagonal case. Here, the matrix exponential is calculated by taking the exponential of the entries along the diagonal. This implies that the entries of $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}$ must be given by derivatives of logarithms. Given that we have validated and determined the denominator structure of Eq. (4.26) using a univariate slice, we therefore use an ansatz of the form

$$\mathbf{m}_{ij} = \sum_{k \in \text{even}} c_{ijk} d \log(W_k). \quad (4.31)$$

In practice, only a single entry is non-zero and is easily reconstructed with this strategy. Importantly, by using such an ansatz, we bypass the much more complicated numerator reconstruction of the ansatz in Eq. (4.26). Moreover, the $d \log$ ansatz of Eq. (4.31) greatly facilitates the computation of the integral in Eq. (4.18), as it is explicitly written in the form of a total derivative. Nevertheless a subtlety arises when computing the integral, as we find that some c_{ijk} associated to $d \log$ of Gram determinants and W_{145} are half integer. In order to avoid introducing square-root branch cuts associated to these letters into our basis definitions, we rewrite the $d \log$ expression by making use of the identities

$$\frac{1}{2} d \log [G(abcd)] = d \log \left[G \begin{pmatrix} abcd \\ 1234 \end{pmatrix} \right] - \frac{1}{2} d \log [G(1234)], \quad (4.32)$$

$$\frac{1}{2} d \log [W_{145}] = d \log [W_{145}^{ijkl}] - \frac{1}{2} d \log [G(ijkl)], \quad (4.33)$$

where we define

$$W_{145}^{ijkl} = \epsilon(p_i p_j p_k p_l) \tilde{W}_{145}, \quad (4.34)$$

which is again a polynomial in Mandelstam variables as it is explicitly parity invariant. Using these identities, we are able to rewrite the entries of $\overline{\mathbf{M}}_D^{(0)}$ such that the only half integer in the $d \log$ representation is associated to $d \log [G(1234)]$, and therefore no extra branch cuts are introduced.

Ansätze for the Lower Triangular Case Let us now consider the strictly lower triangular case. Here, the matrix exponential can be calculated using the power series form, as strictly lower-triangular matrices are nilpotent and the series truncates. We therefore conclude that the argument of the exponential is an algebraic function, and so our target matrices must be derivatives of algebraic functions. That is, we will write that

$$\mathbf{m}_{ij} = d \left[\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}}{\prod_{k \in \text{even}} W_k^{\tilde{q}_{ijk}}} \right], \quad (4.35)$$

where the \tilde{q}_{ijk} are integers, and $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}$ is a polynomial function of both the Mandelstams and the roots in the problem. In this context, we must again consider how to treat W_{145} . An

important subtlety arises from the fact that $W_{145} = \tilde{W}_{145}^2$ and hence, when \tilde{W}_{145} vanishes, W_{145} will vanish quadratically. Therefore, an ansatz which makes use of the expression W_{145} in Eq. (4.28), does not allow for the possibility of the argument blowing up linearly when $W_{145} = 0$. To rectify this, we instead use W_{145}^{1234} in place of W_{145} in Eq. (4.35), a fact that we will suppress for notational convenience. A further subtlety in using Eq. (4.35) as an ansatz is that the argument of the derivative can be shifted by a constant function, and not change \mathbf{m}_{ij} . However, such a constant can be absorbed into the integration constant matrices Λ_L^{on} and Λ_L^{off} , so we are free to set this degree of freedom in the ansatz to zero.

In order to determine the \tilde{q}_{ijk} we will again make use of a univariate-slice procedure. As we are working with algebraic functions satisfying constraints, it turns out that the action of the total derivative can introduce denominator factors that are not simply higher powers of the W_k , and so determining the \tilde{q}_{ijk} requires a careful analysis. A simple first observation is that, if $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}$ depends on a square-root, then the action of the derivative naturally introduces a factor of this root as, for any function Δ

$$d\sqrt{\Delta} = \frac{d\Delta}{2\sqrt{\Delta}}. \quad (4.36)$$

We therefore see that, if the $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}$ depend on a root, upon acting with the total derivative, we will find this root in the denominator. Next, we consider a consequence of working under the constraint $\Delta_6 = 0$. Note that, as we work with this constraint we also have that $d\Delta_6 = 0$. We therefore have a constraint on the differentials with respect to the 9 Mandelstam invariants. By writing these in terms of an independent set of 8, we introduce an extra denominator factor. Specifically, we use this constraint to eliminate ds_{16} , finding

$$ds_{16} = -\frac{1}{\frac{\partial \Delta_6}{\partial s_{16}}} \left[\sum_{i=1}^5 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{ii+1}} \Delta_6 \right) ds_{ii+1} + \sum_{i=1}^3 \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{ii+1i+2}} \Delta_6 \right) ds_{ii+1i+2} \right]. \quad (4.37)$$

We therefore see that by solving this equation, expressions for the total derivative of a given function will involve a denominator factor of

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial s_{16}} \Delta_6 = 2G \begin{pmatrix} 1234 \\ 3456 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.38)$$

Indeed, this is not so surprising as we are essentially taking s_{16} to be a solution of a quadratic equation. This implicitly makes use of a root and so we similarly end up with an expression in the denominator.²

A much more subtle complication lies in the interaction of the previous two points. If we consider the case where the square root is $\sqrt{\Delta_5}$, then it turns out that this is not the only algebraic object that $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}$ can depend on which can generate these denominators. Specifically,

²It is perhaps more unexpected that the expression is again a Gram determinant. However, we note that all derivatives of Δ_6 with respect to planar Mandelstam variables are proportional to two-line Gram determinants.

one can show that

$$d\sqrt{\Delta_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4}^{(5)}} = \frac{G\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1234 \\ 3456 \end{smallmatrix}\right) dG\left(\begin{smallmatrix} i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 \\ 1\ 2\ 3\ 4 \end{smallmatrix}\right) - \frac{1}{2} G\left(\begin{smallmatrix} i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4 \\ 3\ 4\ 5\ 6 \end{smallmatrix}\right) dG(1234)}{\sqrt{\Delta_5} G\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1234 \\ 3456 \end{smallmatrix}\right)}. \quad (4.39)$$

Here, we see that the numerator of this fraction is a polynomial one form, as the first term explicitly contains a factor to cancel the denominator in the derivative, while in the second term, the derivative acts on $G(1234)$, which is independent of s_{16} . For this reason, in cases where $\sqrt{\Delta_5}$ is involved, we are led to consider an ansatz for the $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}$ which is polynomial not just in the Mandelstams, but also in the independent variables $\sqrt{\Delta_{ijkl}^{(5)}}$. A perhaps surprising conclusion is that such a ‘‘polynomial’’, given Eq. (2.9), can be expressed as a rational function. We expect this to be a general complication that arises when working with such complex algebraic functions.

In summary, assuming that the differential equation entry \mathbf{m}_{ij} depends on two square roots $\sqrt{\Delta_1}$ and $\sqrt{\Delta_2}$, we see that we can expand the derivative in Eq. (4.35) to read

$$d\left[\frac{\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}}{\prod_{k \in \text{even}} W_k^{\tilde{q}_{ijk}}}\right] = \frac{\bar{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}}{G\left(\begin{smallmatrix} 1234 \\ 3456 \end{smallmatrix}\right) \sqrt{\Delta_1} \sqrt{\Delta_2} \prod_{k \in \text{even}} W_k^{\tilde{q}_{ijk}+1}}. \quad (4.40)$$

Naturally, in cases where Δ_1 or Δ_2 are not present, their roots can be omitted from the denominator. Given this result, the \tilde{q}_{ijk} can easily be determined from a univariate slice procedure. Furthermore, we take an ansatz for the $\tilde{\mathbf{n}}_{ij}$ which is polynomial in the Mandelstam variables and the square roots in the problem. If the square root is $\sqrt{\Delta_5}$, we also allow it to be polynomial in the independent $\sqrt{\Delta_{i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4}^{(5)}}$.

A non-trivial step is constructing a linearly independent ansatz for a polynomial when working under the six-point Gram constraint, Eq. (2.5). It is clear that, for a polynomial of degree P , the constraint will introduce linear relations between the $\vec{s}^{\vec{\alpha}}$ monomials of dimension P . However, it turns out that we can efficiently find a subset of these monomials which are linearly independent. We make use of a procedure introduced in Ref. [44, Section 2.2], which we review here and adapt to the case of a single constraint. We refer the reader to the aforementioned reference for further details and proofs. First, we introduce a monomial ordering \succ , such as the degree-reverse-lexicographic ordering, on the set of monomials in \vec{s} . This allows us to rewrite Δ_6 as

$$\Delta_6 = \text{LT}(\Delta_6) + \tau(\Delta_6), \quad (4.41)$$

where $\text{LT}(\Delta_6)$ is the so-called ‘‘lead term’’ of Δ_6 , and $\tau(\Delta_6)$ is a linear combination of monomials that are all lower in the monomial ordering. For any polynomial p , we can now systematically apply the $\Delta_6 = 0$ relation by repeatedly replacing any instances of $\text{LT}(\Delta_6)$ with

$-\tau(\Delta_6)$. This procedure eventually terminates due to properties of the monomial ordering and results in a representation of p which is a linear combination of monomials, none of which has a factor of $\text{LT}(\Delta_6)$. In conclusion, a unique representation of any polynomial p can be taken to be

$$p(\vec{s}) = \sum_{\substack{\text{LT}(\Delta_6) \nmid \vec{s}^{\vec{\alpha}} \\ \sum_i \alpha_i = P}} c_{\vec{\alpha}} \vec{s}^{\vec{\alpha}}, \quad (4.42)$$

where the $c_{\vec{\alpha}}$ are unknown rational numbers and the sum is over all monomials of degree P which do not have a factor of $\text{LT}(\Delta_6)$. Let us comment that at higher multiplicities, there are multiple gram constraints that one must consider. The above procedure is easily generalized to such cases, where one must compute a Groebner basis associated to the Gram constraints. We refer the reader to Ref. [44] for more details in the context of polynomials in spinor brackets.

Reconstruction and Summary Given this procedure to construct a non-redundant ansatz for our unknown polynomials, it remains to determine the $c_{\vec{\alpha}}$. To this end, we constrain them using finite-field evaluations of the differential equation. In summary, our procedure for the reconstruction of the change of basis proceeds as follows:

1. We determine the singularity structure of the \mathfrak{m} .
2. We use this information to build two classes of ansaetze for the \mathfrak{m} , either d log form ansaetze or total derivatives of algebraic functions. Due to the presence of the six-point Gram constraint, Eq. (2.5), this presents new theoretical subtleties.
3. We constrain the ansatz with finite-field evaluations of the differential equation.
4. We perform the integrals in Eqs. (4.18), (4.24) and (4.25), by exploiting that our ansaetze are total derivatives and compute the exponential by using that the argument is a nilpotent matrix.

In practice, we find that it is fruitful to build constraints by sequentially gathering constraints from the differential equation matrix with respect to each variable in \vec{s} , and that it is not necessary to examine all variables. We close by stressing that ansaetze of the form of Eq. (4.31) or Eq. (4.35) have orders of magnitude fewer unknowns than that of Eq. (4.26), greatly decreasing the number of numerical evaluations of the differential equation that one must perform.

5 Analytic Differential Equation and Numerical Checks

Using the strategy discussed in the previous section, we obtain a differential equation in canonical form for the hexa-box topology of Fig. 2. In this section we discuss some properties of the basis and of the differential equation, as well as the numerical checks we have performed.

5.1 Differential Equation and Alphabet

The vector of master integrals contains 202 integrals, corresponding to insertions on 126 different propagator structures. We organise our basis so that the simpler topologies (the sunrise topologies, with 3 propagators) appear in the first entries, and the topology with most propagators (the hexa-box) appears in the last entry.

Out of the 202 master integrals, 185 correspond to master integrals that appear in five-point one-mass topologies. The remaining 17 integrals are genuine 6-point massless integrals, and they appear as follows (the indices given below correspond to the position of the integrals as they appear in our ancillary files [45]):

- Penta-triangle (Fig. 1c and permutation): a single master integral for each permutation, at positions {149} and {150}. The insertion in Eq. (4.5) gives a pure integral.
- Hexa-bubble (Fig. 1d): a single master integral at position {154}. The insertion in Eq. (4.7) gives a pure integral.
- Double-box (Fig. 1f): seven master integrals at positions {180,181,182,183,184,185,186}. Insertions $\mathcal{N}_3^{(\text{db})}$, $\mathcal{N}_4^{(\text{db})}$, $\mathcal{N}_5^{(\text{db})}$ and $\mathcal{N}_6^{(\text{db})}$ in Eq. (4.9) had to be corrected with the procedure outlined in the previous section. The other insertions give pure integrals.
- Penta-box (Fig. 1e and permutation): three master integrals for each permutation, at positions {187,188,189} and {190,191,192}. Insertion $\mathcal{N}_3^{(\text{pb})}$ in Eq. (4.6) had to be corrected with the procedure outlined in the previous section. The other insertions give pure integrals.
- Hexa-box (Fig. 1b): a single master integral at position {202}. The insertion in Eq. (4.4) gives a pure integral.

Explicit expressions for all master integrals can be found in our ancillary files [45]. We stress once more that although the hexa-box decouples for gauge-theory amplitudes in four dimensions, we included it in our basis because it is particularly simple to find a pure integral from leading singularity analysis, and doing so allowed us to explicitly check the argument given in section 3.1.

The other important quantity for the canonical differential equation is the set of dlog forms that appear, also known as the alphabet. We find that the dimension of the alphabet is 128, out of which only 11 letters are associated with genuine six-point integrals. The new letters appear in the genuine six-point master integrals as follows:

- Penta-triangle (Fig. 1c and permutation): The letters corresponding to each permutation appear at positions {118,123,125,127} and {119,123,126,128}. The letter at position {127} and its permutation, at position {128}, do not contribute to the on-shell block of the differential equation.

- Hexa-bubble (Fig. 1d): The only genuine six-point letter appears at position $\{123\}$, and contributes to the on-shell differential equation.
- Double-box (Fig. 1f): The only genuine six-point letters appear at positions $\{120\}$ and $\{123\}$, and they both contribute to the on-shell differential equation.
- Penta-box (Fig. 1e and permutation): The letters corresponding to each permutation appear at positions $\{118,120,121,123,125,127\}$ and $\{119,120,122,123,126,128\}$. The letter at position $\{121\}$ and its permutation, at position $\{122\}$, contribute to the on-shell differential equation.
- Hexa-box (Fig. 1b): The only genuine six-point letters appear at positions $\{123\}$ and $\{124\}$, and they both contribute to the on-shell differential equation..

In summary, we see that most of the genuine six-point letters can be determined from the on-shell differential equations of the genuine six-point topologies [21]. The only exceptions are the pair of letters at position $\{127,128\}$, which are related by permutation, and only appear in off-shell parts of the penta-triangle and penta-box differential equations.

The various letters of the alphabet can be classified with respect to their parity with respect to the square-roots appearing in the definition of the pure basis. There are three square roots associated with three-point Gram determinants,

$$\begin{aligned}
\lambda(p_{12}^2, p_{34}^2, p_{56}^2) &= s_{12}^2 + (s_{34} - s_{56})^2 - 2s_{12}(s_{34} + s_{56}), \\
\lambda(p_{16}^2, p_{23}^2, p_{45}^2) &= s_{16}^2 + (s_{23} - s_{45})^2 - 2s_{16}(s_{23} + s_{45}), \\
\lambda(p_{14}^2, p_{23}^2, p_{56}^2) &= s_{123}^2 + 2s_{123}s_{234} + s_{234}^2 - 4s_{23}s_{56},
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.1}$$

see the definition of $\lambda(a, b, c)$ below Eq. (2.11), and the square root in Eq. (2.8) associated with the five-point Gram determinant. Out of the new genuine six-point letters only the ones at positions $\{127,128\}$ are odd under changing the sign of the five-point Gram square root. As is already known, the alphabet corresponding to five-point one-mass topologies includes letters that are odd under the change of sign of the roots of Eq. (5.1) as well as the five-point Gram square root. There are also letters that are odd under the change of sign of either the three-point and five-point Gram roots, and even under a simultaneous change of both signs. Explicit expressions for our alphabet can be found in our ancillary files [45].

Finally, we note that we can close the alphabet under cyclic permutations of the external legs, which gives the full alphabet for planar six-point processes at two loops. We find that this alphabet closure contains 245 independent letters, and we also include them in our ancillary files [45].

5.2 Numerical Checks

The differential equations we have discussed in the previous sections can be used to obtain numerical evaluations of the corresponding master integrals. In order to do so one needs to determine a boundary condition. If the phase-space point corresponding to this boundary

condition is well chosen the integrals will evaluate to known numbers and the boundary condition can be obtained analytically (see e.g. [22] for such a point for six-point integrals). In practice, however, in order to efficiently solve the integrals numerically there is no particular advantage in having an analytic boundary condition [11]. Instead, high-precision numerical evaluations of the integrals can be obtained with the AMFLOW approach. These can then be used as numerical boundary condition to solve the differential equations with generalised power series expansions [46] or in terms of Chen iterated integrals [8, 11, 14].

In this section we describe how we obtained numerical results from AMFLOW, and how we compared them to the numerical solution of our differential equations. This provides an important and completely independent check of the correctness of our differential equations. We leave the construction of a solution in terms of Chen iterated integrals that can be efficiently evaluated throughout phase-space for future work. Such a construction will be important for phenomenological applications of our results.

Boundary conditions with AMFlow: We start by discussing the evaluation of our pure basis at two benchmark points with AMFLOW. In order to construct rational four-dimensional points we start from a twistor parametrisation of six-point kinematics (we use the twistor variables x_i , $i = 1, \dots, 8$ given in [21], and reported in appendix A). We choose a point in Euclidean kinematics, whose representation in Mandelstam variables does not require too large rational numbers to avoid the proliferation of large intermediate expressions in AMFLOW. Explicitly, we choose the point P_1 to be

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \{x_1 = -1, x_2 = -24, x_3 = 9, x_4 = 54, x_5 = 38, x_6 = -97, x_7 = 3, x_8 = 95\} \\ &= \left\{s_{12} = -1, s_{23} = -38, s_{34} = -\frac{1039}{6}, s_{45} = -2712776, s_{56} = -50409, \right. \\ &\quad \left. s_{16} = -1662120, s_{123} = -95, s_{234} = -19926, s_{345} = -2752175\right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

and the point P_2 ,

$$\begin{aligned} P_2 &= \{x_1 = -1, x_2 = -74, x_3 = 7, x_4 = 53, x_5 = 34, x_6 = -68, x_7 = -91, x_8 = 76\} \\ &= \left\{s_{12} = -1, s_{23} = -34, s_{34} = -\frac{827628}{37}, s_{45} = -7995952, s_{56} = -147756, \right. \\ &\quad \left. s_{16} = -4804450, s_{123} = -76, s_{234} = -56882, s_{345} = -6669452\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.3)$$

To evaluate our pure basis with AMFLOW, we collect all integrals of the form of Eq. (3.1) that appear in our pure basis before IBP reduction. We then use AMFLOW for the numerical evaluation of this set of integrals, and during the auxiliary-mass-flow procedure we explicitly instruct KIRA to express the IBPs in a basis obtained using the algorithms outlined in [47, 48]. This choice guarantees to obtain IBP relations whose coefficients are rational, and have denominators with a factorised dependence on ϵ and the Mandelstam invariants. This reduces the complexity of the rational coefficients and in turn allows KIRA to analytically reconstruct the auxiliary-mass-flow differential equation with a small number of finite fields of 64-bit prime numbers.

We perform two simple consistency checks on the AMFLOW results. As a first check, we verify that the numerical calculation for the pure basis starts at $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^0)$, consistently with the normalisation we chose for the master integrals. Secondly, by imposing the so-called first-entry condition we can solve the integrals up to order ϵ^1 analytically and we verify that the resulting solution agrees with that of AMFLOW. Both numerical checks are passed at the two benchmark points P_1 and P_2 . We report the numerical evaluations in the ancillary files [45] with 20 significant digits.

Before turning to the solution of our four-dimensional differential equation, we close with a comment on the AMFLOW evaluations. In this procedure, we did not impose that the external kinematics should be four dimensional, and the AMFLOW calculation is thus done with a full D -dimensional setup. The four-dimensionality constraint only enters by requiring the numerical evaluations to be performed at four-dimensional phase-space points. Since the four-dimensional limit for the external kinematics is smooth (see e.g. [22] for a discussion precisely in the context of six-point kinematics), this procedure is well defined.

Numerical solution with DIFFEXP: The two numerical evaluations we obtained with AMFLOW can be used as a stringent independent check of the analytic differential equation we constructed in previous sections. Indeed, we can take the numerical result at P_1 as an initial condition, use the differential equation to transport it to P_2 , and verify that we find agreement with the AMFLOW result.

When using our differential equations, care must be taken to preserve the four dimensionality constraint of the external kinematics, which is not explicit in our expressions. More precisely, if one takes a straight line connecting the points P_1 and P_2 in Mandelstam space, it is not clear that all points along this line will satisfy $\Delta_6 = 0$. However, our differential equations are only valid on that surface. A simple way to ensure that we do not leave the $\Delta_6 = 0$ surface is to rewrite the differential equation in terms of twistor variables (cf. appendix A) and use the differential equation to evolve between two points in twistor space.³ This transformation is trivial to perform on a differential equation written in terms of $d \log$ -forms, and we can then solve it in terms of generalised power series using the automated code DIFFEXP.

When comparing the DIFFEXP results to those of AMFLOW, one needs to account for a technical subtlety. Specifically, we must be sure that we choose the branches of the square roots in a consistent way. This is not guaranteed because in one case the evolution is done in twistor space and in the other the evolution is done in Mandelstam space. In particular, since the twistor variables rationalise $\sqrt{\Delta_5}$ this quantity might change sign along the evolution path and become inconsistent with the branch chosen in Mandelstam space. Pure integrals that are normalised by such roots will be sensitive to this branch choice through an overall sign change, so we must keep track of such signs when comparing the two numerical evaluations.

³Alternatively, one can solve the $\Delta_6 = 0$ condition for s_{16} at the cost of introducing an explicit square root in the differential equation. This would introduce nested square roots in the letters of the differential equation, and so this route cannot be handled by DIFFEXP. Hence we proceed with the differential equation in twistor space.

Starting from P_1 as a boundary condition, we find perfect agreement between the DIFFEXP and AMFLOW results at P_2 . This is a highly non-trivial check, given that while DIFFEXP is performing the evolution directly on the four-dimensional hyper-surface, the evaluation of AMFLOW at the four-dimensional point P_2 is obtained via the auxiliary-mass-flow procedure in a full D -dimensional setup. As already argued above, the agreement between the two solutions is compatible with the fact that the limit where the external kinematics are taken to be in four dimensions is smooth [22].

6 Conclusions

In this work, we have constructed and solved the differential equations for the collection of planar two-loop massless six-point master integrals entering scattering amplitudes in four-dimensional gauge theories. As the external momenta of the problem are linearly dependent, this introduces novel challenges for the differential equation strategy. We choose to tackle them head on, avoiding the complications introduced by four-dimensional parametrizations such as those constructed from momentum twistors. Instead, we work directly in Mandelstam space where the invariants satisfy a high-degree polynomial constraint given by the vanishing of the 6-point Gram determinant.

Before going into the details of the calculation of the differential equations for six-point two-loop planar integrals, an important result of this paper is that we show that we do not actually need to compute all the six-point topologies if we are interested in applications to four-dimensional gauge theories, such as e.g. the calculation of four-jet production at hadron colliders. We reduced the number of six-point topologies that we need to investigate by arguing that the six-point topologies with 9 propagators do not need to be computed. Indeed, we showed that they can be related to evanescent integrals plus a linear combination of integrals with a lower number of propagators, analogous to the pentagon at one loop.

To tackle the calculation of the topologies that do need to be computed, we started by discussing how we construct differential operators which naturally take into account the four-dimensionality constraint of the external kinematics. Next, we introduced a novel analytic reconstruction technique for the canonicalization of the differential equation. Specifically, we use numerical evaluations of the ϵ^0 part of the pre-canonical differential equation to directly reconstruct the change of basis matrix, by exploiting the expectation that the change of basis matrix is algebraic. This allows to both dramatically decrease the number of samples required, as well as bypass the integration step. This setup is generic, and we believe applicable to other multi-scale problems. In our application, it had to be implemented taking into account the constraint following from the vanishing of the 6-point Gram determinant, and we explained how we handled the subtleties associated with this extra complication. Once a pure basis had been obtained, determining the associated differential equations proved to be trivial using techniques that are now standard. Finally, we compute a benchmark evaluations using AMFLOW, and discussed how to solve the differential equation using public tools such

as DIFFEXP. The fact that these two approaches agree provides a non-trivial check of our results.

We expect that the analytic reconstruction technology that we have introduced for obtaining a canonical basis will be readily applicable to other six-point integrals, and to be a valuable tool for problems of higher multiplicity or with more scales. Beyond such applications, we also expect that the observed decoupling of the 9-propagator topologies in the $D \rightarrow 4$ limit is a specific example of a much more general phenomenon. It would be of great interest to understand if the decoupling could be argued for in full generality.

While we leave the implementation of an efficient code for the numerical evaluation of these integrals for future work, this study of the complete set of two-loop six-point planar integrals relevant for four-dimensional gauge theories provides a crucial step towards the calculation of important scattering processes, such as the production of four jets at hadron colliders at NNLO accuracy.

Acknowledgments

P.F.M is funded by the European Union (ERC, grant agreement No. 101044599). B.P. received funding from the European's Union Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme LoopAnsatz (grant agreement number 896690) and by the European Union (ERC, Multi-ScaleAmp, Grant Agreement No. 101078449). J.U. is funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) Projektnummer 417533893/GRK2575 “Rethinking Quantum Field Theory” and by the European Union through the European Research Council under grant ERC Advanced Grant 101097219 (GraWFTy). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

A Twistor variables representation of Mandelstam invariants

In this appendix we provide a parametrisation of the Mandelstam invariants featuring in the six-point problem in terms of twistor variables. We use this representation in the numerical solution of the differential equation in four-dimensional external kinematics using the DIFFEXP code (see Sec. 5.2). The following parametrisation is taken from Ref. [21]

$$\begin{aligned}
s_{12} &= x_1, \\
s_{23} &= x_1 x_5, \\
s_{34} &= -((x_1(x_2 x_3 x_6 + x_5(-1 + x_3(-1 + x_2(-1 + x_7)))))/x_2), \\
s_{45} &= x_1(-((1 + x_4 + x_3 x_4)x_5(-1 + x_7)) \\
&\quad - (1 + x_3)x_4 x_8 + (x_2 x_3 x_4(x_5(-1 + x_7) + x_6 x_8))/x_5), \\
s_{56} &= (x_1 x_3(-x_5(x_5(-1 + x_7) + x_8) + x_2(x_5(-1 + x_7) + x_6 x_8)))/x_5, \\
s_{16} &= -((x_1 x_2 x_3 x_4(x_5(x_6 - x_7) - x_6 x_8))/x_5), \\
s_{123} &= x_1 x_8, \\
s_{234} &= x_1 x_3(x_2 x_6 - x_5 x_7), \\
s_{345} &= x_1(x_6 + x_4(-1 + x_6 + x_3(-1 + x_6 + x_2(-1 + x_7 + (x_6 x_8)/x_5))).
\end{aligned} \tag{A.1}$$

References

- [1] C. G. Papadopoulos, D. Tommasini, and C. Wever, *The Pentabox Master Integrals with the Simplified Differential Equations approach*, *JHEP* **04** (2016) 078, [[arXiv:1511.09404](#)].
- [2] T. Gehrmann, J. M. Henn, and N. A. Lo Presti, *Analytic form of the two-loop planar five-gluon all-plus-helicity amplitude in QCD*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116** (2016), no. 6 062001, [[arXiv:1511.05409](#)]. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 116, 189903 (2016)].
- [3] T. Gehrmann, J. M. Henn, and N. A. Lo Presti, *Pentagon functions for massless planar scattering amplitudes*, *JHEP* **10** (2018) 103, [[arXiv:1807.09812](#)].
- [4] S. Abreu, B. Page, and M. Zeng, *Differential equations from unitarity cuts: nonplanar hexa-box integrals*, *JHEP* **01** (2019) 006, [[arXiv:1807.11522](#)].
- [5] D. Chicherin, T. Gehrmann, J. M. Henn, N. A. Lo Presti, V. Mitev, and P. Wasser, *Analytic result for the nonplanar hexa-box integrals*, *JHEP* **03** (2019) 042, [[arXiv:1809.06240](#)].
- [6] S. Abreu, L. J. Dixon, E. Herrmann, B. Page, and M. Zeng, *The two-loop five-point amplitude in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super-Yang-Mills theory*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019), no. 12 121603, [[arXiv:1812.08941](#)].
- [7] D. Chicherin, T. Gehrmann, J. M. Henn, P. Wasser, Y. Zhang, and S. Zoia, *All Master Integrals for Three-Jet Production at Next-to-Next-to-Leading Order*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123** (2019), no. 4 041603, [[arXiv:1812.11160](#)].
- [8] D. Chicherin and V. Sotnikov, *Pentagon Functions for Scattering of Five Massless Particles*, *JHEP* **20** (2020) 167, [[arXiv:2009.07803](#)].

- [9] S. Abreu, H. Ita, F. Moriello, B. Page, W. Tschernow, and M. Zeng, *Two-Loop Integrals for Planar Five-Point One-Mass Processes*, *JHEP* **11** (2020) 117, [[arXiv:2005.04195](#)].
- [10] S. Abreu, H. Ita, B. Page, and W. Tschernow, *Two-loop hexa-box integrals for non-planar five-point one-mass processes*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 182, [[arXiv:2107.14180](#)].
- [11] S. Abreu, D. Chicherin, H. Ita, B. Page, V. Sotnikov, W. Tschernow, and S. Zoia, *All Two-Loop Feynman Integrals for Five-Point One-Mass Scattering*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132** (2024), no. 14 141601, [[arXiv:2306.15431](#)].
- [12] A. Kardos, C. G. Papadopoulos, A. V. Smirnov, N. Syrrakos, and C. Wever, *Two-loop non-planar hexa-box integrals with one massive leg*, *JHEP* **05** (2022) 033, [[arXiv:2201.07509](#)].
- [13] D. D. Canko, C. G. Papadopoulos, and N. Syrrakos, *Analytic representation of all planar two-loop five-point Master Integrals with one off-shell leg*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 199, [[arXiv:2009.13917](#)].
- [14] D. Chicherin, V. Sotnikov, and S. Zoia, *Pentagon functions for one-mass planar scattering amplitudes*, *JHEP* **01** (2022) 096, [[arXiv:2110.10111](#)].
- [15] S. Abreu, D. Chicherin, V. Sotnikov, and S. Zoia, *Two-loop five-point two-mass planar integrals and double Lagrangian insertions in a Wilson loop*, *JHEP* **10** (2024) 167, [[arXiv:2408.05201](#)].
- [16] S. Badger, M. Becchetti, E. Chaubey, and R. Marzucca, *Two-loop master integrals for a planar topology contributing to $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}j$* , *JHEP* **01** (2023) 156, [[arXiv:2210.17477](#)].
- [17] S. Badger, M. Becchetti, N. Giraudo, and S. Zoia, *Two-loop integrals for $t\bar{t}$ +jet production at hadron colliders in the leading colour approximation*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 073, [[arXiv:2404.12325](#)].
- [18] F. Febres Cordero, G. Figueiredo, M. Kraus, B. Page, and L. Reina, *Two-loop master integrals for leading-color $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ amplitudes with a light-quark loop*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 084, [[arXiv:2312.08131](#)].
- [19] B. Agarwal, G. Heinrich, S. P. Jones, M. Kerner, S. Y. Klein, J. Lang, V. Magerya, and A. Olsson, *Two-loop amplitudes for $t\bar{t}H$ production: the quark-initiated N_f -part*, *JHEP* **05** (2024) 013, [[arXiv:2402.03301](#)]. [Erratum: *JHEP* 06, 142 (2024)].
- [20] X. Liu and Y.-Q. Ma, *Multiloop corrections for collider processes using auxiliary mass flow*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022), no. 5 L051503, [[arXiv:2107.01864](#)].
- [21] J. Henn, T. Peraro, Y. Xu, and Y. Zhang, *A first look at the function space for planar two-loop six-particle Feynman integrals*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 056, [[arXiv:2112.10605](#)].
- [22] J. M. Henn, A. Matijašić, J. Miczajka, T. Peraro, Y. Xu, and Y. Zhang, *A computation of two-loop six-point Feynman integrals in dimensional regularization*, [[arXiv:2403.19742](#)].
- [23] J. M. Henn and J. C. Plefka, *Scattering Amplitudes in Gauge Theories*, vol. 883. Springer, Berlin, 2014.
- [24] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, and D. A. Kosower, *Dimensionally regulated pentagon integrals*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **412** (1994) 751–816, [[hep-ph/9306240](#)].
- [25] P. Bargiela and T.-Z. Yang, *Finite basis topologies for multiloop high-multiplicity Feynman integrals*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024), no. 9 096019, [[arXiv:2408.06325](#)].
- [26] A. V. Kotikov, *Differential equations method: New technique for massive Feynman diagrams calculation*, *Phys. Lett. B* **254** (1991) 158–164.

- [27] A. V. Kotikov, *Differential equation method: The Calculation of N point Feynman diagrams*, *Phys. Lett. B* **267** (1991) 123–127. [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 295, 409–409 (1992)].
- [28] E. Remiddi, *Differential equations for Feynman graph amplitudes*, *Nuovo Cim. A* **110** (1997) 1435–1452, [[hep-th/9711188](#)].
- [29] T. Gehrmann and E. Remiddi, *Differential equations for two-loop four-point functions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **580** (2000) 485–518, [[hep-ph/9912329](#)].
- [30] J. M. Henn, *Multiloop integrals in dimensional regularization made simple*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** (2013) 251601, [[arXiv:1304.1806](#)].
- [31] A. von Manteuffel and R. M. Schabinger, *A novel approach to integration by parts reduction*, *Phys. Lett. B* **744** (2015) 101–104, [[arXiv:1406.4513](#)].
- [32] T. Peraro, *Scattering amplitudes over finite fields and multivariate functional reconstruction*, *JHEP* **12** (2016) 030, [[arXiv:1608.01902](#)].
- [33] J. Klappert, F. Lange, P. Maierhöfer, and J. Usovitsch, *Integral reduction with Kira 2.0 and finite field methods*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **266** (2021) 108024, [[arXiv:2008.06494](#)].
- [34] X. Liu, Y.-Q. Ma, and C.-Y. Wang, *A Systematic and Efficient Method to Compute Multi-loop Master Integrals*, *Phys. Lett. B* **779** (2018) 353–357, [[arXiv:1711.09572](#)].
- [35] M. Hidding, *DiffExp, a Mathematica package for computing Feynman integrals in terms of one-dimensional series expansions*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **269** (2021) 108125, [[arXiv:2006.05510](#)].
- [36] F. V. Tkachov, *A theorem on analytical calculability of 4-loop renormalization group functions*, *Phys. Lett. B* **100** (1981) 65–68.
- [37] K. G. Chetyrkin and F. V. Tkachov, *Integration by parts: The algorithm to calculate β -functions in 4 loops*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **192** (1981) 159–204.
- [38] G. Gambuti, D. A. Kosower, P. P. Novichkov, and L. Tancredi, *Finite Feynman Integrals*, [[arXiv:2311.16907](#)].
- [39] J. G. Korner, D. Kreimer, and K. Schilcher, *A Practicable $\gamma(5)$ scheme in dimensional regularization*, *Z. Phys. C* **54** (1992) 503–512.
- [40] M. Argeri, S. Di Vita, P. Mastrolia, E. Mirabella, J. Schlenk, U. Schubert, and L. Tancredi, *Magnus and Dyson Series for Master Integrals*, *JHEP* **03** (2014) 082, [[arXiv:1401.2979](#)].
- [41] S. Abreu, J. Dormans, F. Febres Cordero, H. Ita, and B. Page, *Analytic Form of Planar Two-Loop Five-Gluon Scattering Amplitudes in QCD*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122** (2019), no. 8 082002, [[arXiv:1812.04586](#)].
- [42] S. Abreu, F. Febres Cordero, H. Ita, M. Klinkert, B. Page, and V. Sotnikov, *Leading-color two-loop amplitudes for four partons and a W boson in QCD*, *JHEP* **04** (2022) 042, [[arXiv:2110.07541](#)].
- [43] H. Elvang, D. Z. Freedman, and M. Kiermaier, *Proof of the MHV vertex expansion for all tree amplitudes in $N=4$ SYM theory*, *JHEP* **06** (2009) 068, [[arXiv:0811.3624](#)].
- [44] G. De Laurentis and B. Page, *Ansätze for scattering amplitudes from p -adic numbers and algebraic geometry*, *JHEP* **12** (2022) 140, [[arXiv:2203.04269](#)].

- [45] S. Abreu, P. F. Monni, B. Page, and J. Usovitsch, *Planar Six-Point Feynman Integrals for Four-Dimensional Gauge Theories*, 2024. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.14525306>.
- [46] F. Moriello, *Generalised power series expansions for the elliptic planar families of Higgs + jet production at two loops*, *JHEP* **01** (2020) 150, [[arXiv:1907.13234](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.13234)].
- [47] A. V. Smirnov and V. A. Smirnov, *How to choose master integrals*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **960** (2020) 115213, [[arXiv:2002.08042](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08042)].
- [48] J. Usovitsch, *Factorization of denominators in integration-by-parts reductions*, [[arXiv:2002.08173](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08173)].