

THE MANY COLOURS OF AMPLITUDES

JACOB L. BOURJAILY, MICHAEL PLESSER, CRISTIAN VERGU

*Institute for Gravitation and the Cosmos, Department of Physics,
Pennsylvania State University, University Park, PA 16802, USA*

bourjaily@psu.edu, mkp5771@psu.edu, cfv5175@psu.edu

We study the colour-dependence of scattering amplitudes in Yang-Mills theory with arbitrary (but fixed) gauge group and various representations of charged matter. When the rank of the gauge theory is taken arbitrarily large compared to the number of particles involved in an amplitude, it is well known that the number of independent colour-structure tensors grows *factorially* with multiplicity; however, for any fixed gauge group, this number grows at most *exponentially* with multiplicity. We review how this counting arises in representation theory and survey its implications for a wide variety of specific gauge groups with various representations of charged matter, uncovering several surprising structures along the way.

Contents

1	Introduction and Overview	1
1.1	Representation-Theoretic Counting of Independent Colour-Tensors . .	2
1.2	Organization and Outline	4
2	Review: Lie Algebras and Their Representations	5
2.1	Generators, Structure Constants, and (Adjoint) Representations . . .	5
2.2	The Classification of Lie Algebras	7
2.3	The Classification of Lie Algebras' Representations	7
2.3.1	Irreducible Representations Simple Lie Algebras	8
2.3.2	Conjugate Representations of Irreducible Representations . . .	9
2.4	Decomposition of Tensor Products into Irreducible Representations .	11
3	Counting Colours for n Adjoint-Charged Particles	12
3.1	<i>Saturation</i> : Counting Colours in the Limit of Large-Ranks	13
3.1.1	Saturation in the Case of \mathfrak{a} -Type Gauge Theory	13
3.1.2	Saturation in the Cases of $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}$ -Type Gauge Theory	17
3.2	Origins of Identities Among (and the Appearance of New) Tensors . .	18
3.2.1	Explaining Identities Among Colour-Tensors: Cayley Hamilton	19
3.2.2	There be dragons: Origins of non-Monotonicity for \mathfrak{d} -Theories	21
3.3	Counting in the Limit of Large Multiplicity (for a Fixed Lie Algebra)	22
3.3.1	Surveys of Asymptotic Growth at Moderately Large Multiplicity	23
4	Scattering of Gluons and Various Charged Matter	26
4.1	Counting the Colours of Gluons with <i>Fundamental</i> -Charged Matter .	26
4.1.1	Scattering of Gluons and <i>Fundamental</i> Matter in \mathfrak{a} -Theories .	27
4.1.2	Scattering of Gluons and <i>Fundamental</i> Matter in $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}$ -Theories	28
4.1.3	Scattering of Gluons and <i>Fundamental</i> Matter in $\mathfrak{e}, \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}$ -Theories	30
4.2	The Breakdown of the Large- N_c Limit for Some Charges of Matter .	33
5	Open Problems for Future Work	35
5.1	Colour-Tensors Required in Perturbation Theory	35
5.2	Construction of Explicit Bases of Colour-Tensors	35
A	Multiplicities of Tensor Products' Decompositions	37
B	Decomposition of Tensor Products into Irreducible Representations	39
C	Numbers of Colour-Factors for Low Multiplicity/Ranks	41
D	Asymptotic Growth of Colour-Factors for Large Multiplicity	46
D.1	\mathfrak{a} -Type Gauge Theory	48
D.2	\mathfrak{b} -Type Gauge Theory	49
D.3	\mathfrak{c} -Type Gauge Theory	49
D.4	\mathfrak{d} -Type Gauge Theory	50
D.5	Exceptional Gauge Theories	50

1 Introduction and Overview

Yang-Mills is the unique (unitary, local, Lorentz-invariant) quantum field theory of massless spin-one particles [1]. This follows from the rigidity of the S -matrix for three massless particles, which can depend on any non-dynamic quantum numbers $\{a, b, \dots, c\}$ (‘colours’) used to distinguish particles only through some rank-three tensor f^{abc} ; Bose symmetry requires that this tensor be fully *antisymmetric* in colour labels, and locality and unitarity require [1] (via consistency among four-particle factorization channels) that these tensors satisfy the Jacobi relation:

$$\kappa_{ef} (f^{abe} f^{fcd} + f^{bce} f^{fad} + f^{cae} f^{fbd}) = 0, \quad (1.1)$$

where κ_{ef} is the (inverse of the)¹ *Cartan-Killing form* which encodes the overlap between these particles’ labels in the propagator. Due to (1.1), the tensors f^{abc} form the *structure constants* of some Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} ; and the labels assigned to distinguishable gluons *necessarily* furnish the *adjoint representation* ‘ad’ of \mathfrak{g} .

Similarly, the interactions between gluons and any set of distinguishable spin-1/2 Fermions labelled by $\{i, j, \dots, k\}$ (also called ‘colours’) must involve a constant rank-three tensor T^{ai}_{j}, constrained by locality and unitarity to satisfy

$$T^{ai}_{j} T^{bj}_{k} - T^{bi}_{j} T^{aj}_{k} =: [\underline{T}^a, \underline{T}^b]_{k}^i = \kappa_{cd} f^{abc} T^{di}_{k} =: f^{ab}_{c} T^{ci}_{k} =: f^{ab}_{c} \underline{T}^c; \quad (1.2)$$

that is, the ‘colour-charges’ $T^{ai}_{j} =: \underline{T}^a$ of any matter must furnish a *representation*, denoted ‘ \mathbf{R} ’, of the Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} . The dimension of this representation is that of the span of the indices i, j , the possible values of which are far from arbitrary: they must adhere to the restriction following from the theory of Lie algebra representations. As with gluons, which must come in distinguishable sets of possible colours according to the adjoint representation of some Lie algebra, any matter which interacts with gluons must come in sets according to some particular representation of that Lie algebra. Although these facts are well known, it is worth appreciating that they follow from locality and unitarity alone, independent of any Lagrangian description.

In this work, we will be interested in how scattering amplitudes involving colour-charged particles depend on the colours of particles involved. In general, the S -matrix will depend on both the kinematic data describing each of the particles (their masses, momenta, and spins/helicities) and also all their distinguishable quantum numbers (their ‘colours’, species, etc.). These dependencies factorize separately in the Feynman rules, and so it is obvious that an amplitude involving coloured particles can be written as a sum over the product of colour-dependent tensors and kinematic-dependent functions:

$$\mathcal{A}(\{p, \epsilon, c(\mathbf{R})\}_{\text{in}}, \{p, \epsilon, c(\mathbf{R})\}_{\text{out}}) = \sum_{\Gamma} \Gamma[\{c(\mathbf{R})\}_{\text{in}}, \{c(\mathbf{R})\}_{\text{out}}] A_{\Gamma}(\{p, \epsilon\}_{\text{in}}, \{p, \epsilon\}_{\text{out}}).$$

¹Non-interacting ‘gluons’ do not participate in this identity, and so the non-degeneracy of the Killing form (and the semi-simplicity of the algebra) are tautologically ensured.

Each colour-dependent factor can be viewed as a tensor whose indices span the possible colours of all the various particles involved. The individual colour-tensors that arise from the Feynman rules for gauge theory are rarely independent: minimally, they satisfy the relations (1.1) and (1.2). It is natural to wonder: how many linearly independent colour-tensors exist for a given process?

The decomposition of amplitudes into such tensors has a rich history of study (see *e.g.* [2–9]), and the interplay between colour- and kinematic-dependence of amplitudes has led to remarkable new insights connecting gauge theories and gravitational theory (see *e.g.* [10–16]). Most of this work has been done in the context of perturbation theory, either making no assumptions about the particular gauge theory algebra \mathfrak{g} beyond generic identities such as (1.1) or upon restricting to the particular case of \mathfrak{su}_{N_c} gauge theories (especially in the limit of large- N_c) (see *e.g.* [17]). The colour-structure of amplitudes for *particular* gauge theories (beyond those relevant to the Standard Model) especially in the limit of large multiplicity of particles (relative to the number of distinguishable gluons) has been largely unexplored to date.

Obviously, the number of independent colour-tensors relevant to a given process depends on the gauge theory’s Lie algebra and the representations and multiplicities of the particles involved. Our goal is to describe how representation theory can be used to assess this number, survey a wide range of particular cases, and describe some of the general features that arise.

1.1 Representation-Theoretic Counting of Independent Colour-Tensors

Although the question of how many independent colour-tensors actually arise from the Feynman expansion at a given order of perturbation theory appears rather difficult to answer in general, it turns out that representation theory provides a way to directly answer this question *non-perturbatively*. As described in more detail in section 2 below, the problem is straight-forward from the perspective of representation theory.

Without loss of generality (via crossing), we may assume that all the particles are incoming; it is clear that the S -matrix for coloured particles must correspond to a mapping from the tensor product of all the particles’ representations into the un-coloured vacuum, which itself must transform as the trivial representation, denoted ‘ $\mathbf{1}$ ’. The number of such mappings counts the rank of linearly-independent tensors, and is therefore determined by the *multiplicity* of the representation $\mathbf{1}$ in the decomposition of this tensor product into *irreducible* representations:

$$\mathcal{C}[\{\mathbf{R}_i\}] := \text{rank} \left[\Gamma[\{\mathbf{c}_i(\mathbf{R}_i)\}, \{\mathbf{1}\}] \right] = m \left(\bigotimes_i \mathbf{R}_i \rightarrow \mathbf{1} \right), \quad (1.3)$$

where $m(\mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{R})$ counts the *multiplicity* of the *irreducible* representation \mathbf{R} in the decomposition of the *arbitrary* representation \mathbf{T} :

$$\mathbf{T} \simeq \mathbf{R}^{\oplus m(\mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{R})} \oplus \dots. \quad (1.4)$$

For example, consider the case of scattering n particles whose colours are all grouped into the adjoint representation, denoted ‘ \mathbf{ad} ’ of \mathfrak{g} . Then the number of independent colour-tensors $\mathcal{C}[\mathbf{ad}^n] =: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n$ would be given by $m(\mathbf{ad}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathbf{1})$. To be clear, this is not necessarily the same as the number of independent tensors that actually *arise* via the Feynman expansion: for example, this number also counts those colour-factor tensors which could arise only through anomalies. Similarly, for the scattering of n gluons with q matter lines transforming under the representation \mathbf{R} , the number of independent colour-tensors would be given by

$$\mathcal{C}[\mathbf{ad}^n, (\mathbf{R}\overline{\mathbf{R}})^q] =: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{n,q}(\mathbf{R}) = m(\mathbf{ad}^{\otimes n} \otimes (\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}})^{\otimes q} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}). \quad (1.5)$$

As reviewed in section 2 below, the theory of Lie algebras and their representations readily allows us to determine this number for any particular case of interest. A survey of results uncovers a number of surprising features and some general patterns in the limits of large rank or multiplicity.

Consider again the case of scattering n adjoint-coloured (particles such as gluons). Although it is broadly true that the number of independent colour-structures grows with the number of distinguishable gluons, many exceptions arise at low multiplicity. For example, for fewer than 10 particles, \mathfrak{e}_8 gauge theory admits *fewer* independent colour-tensors than *any other gauge group* besides $\mathfrak{a}_1 \sim \mathfrak{su}_2$. In Figure 1, we list the gauge theories with the fewest independent colour-tensors for $n \leq 20$ adjoint-charged particles.




Figure 1. Gauge theories with fewest numbers of independent colour-tensors required for low-multiplicity scattering. The scale of the vertical axis is arbitrary: this plot merely shows the relative ordering of the Lie algebras with the fewest numbers of independent colour-tensors for each multiplicity n .

1.2 Organization and Outline

This paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we review in some generality the necessary ingredients from the theory of simple Lie algebras and their representations. In section 3 we discuss the counting of colour-structures for processes involving only particles charged under the adjoint representation for all simple Lie algebras. In particular, we investigate the limit of large number of particles and, when applicable, the large-rank limit. Here we encounter a few surprises, such as an excess for orthogonal groups in even dimensions, which we explain in section 4.2. Surprisingly, the number of invariants for \mathfrak{e}_8 at low multiplicity of gluons turns out to be remarkably small when compared to other algebras of much smaller dimension and rank.

In section 4 we discuss scattering of gluons (or other adjoints) with charged matter in various representations and the saturation of the number of independent colour-structures when the rank increases. It turns out that in some cases, such as for orthogonal groups and matter charged in the spinor representation, the number of independent colour-structures increases with the rank, which forbids any coherent notion of a large-rank limit to exist. In section 5 we conclude with a discussion of some open problems and future work.

We have also included a number of appendices which detail many results and the methods used to obtain them. In Appendix A we describe structurally how counting the number of independent tensors can be recursively constructed from answering this question for arbitrary triples of representations, and in Appendix B we discuss the Racah-Speiser method for decomposing tensor products to compute these numbers concretely. In Appendix C we present tables for the counting of adjoints scattering for a range of lie algebras and multiplicities, and in Appendix D we describe the asymptotics of this counting as the number of adjoint-charged particles grows arbitrarily large.

Finally, we have included with our submission an ancillary file (accessible from the right-panel of this work’s abstract page on arXiv) ‘`adjoint_tensor_ranks.tex`’ which enumerates the numbers of independent colour-tensors for adjoint scattering for various multiplicities for all rank $k \leq 8$ gauge theories. This data is formatted as a list of entries of the form $\{\mathfrak{g}, \{n_1, n_2, \dots\}\}$ where the first integer listed denotes the number of colours for 1-particle scattering, and so on.

2 Review: Lie Algebras and Their Representations

We begin with a cursory review of the essential ideas we require from the study of Lie algebras and their representations mostly in order to establish notation and ideas that will prove useful to us in what follows. This is of course a vast subject in mathematics; we refer the reader to *e.g.* [18–20] for more thorough discussions and background.

2.1 Generators, Structure Constants, and (Adjoint) Representations

Physicists often encounter the theory of Lie algebras and their representations through particular examples (often motivated by Lie *groups*). In this spirit, let us start with the view that one has some particular representation of some particular Lie algebra on hand. Such a *representation*, denoted ‘**R**’ consists of a collection of $k \times k$ matrices $\{T_{\mathbf{R}}^a\}$ indexed by a which commute into themselves according to (1.2):

$$[T_{\mathbf{R}}^a, T_{\mathbf{R}}^b] = f^{ab}{}_c T_{\mathbf{R}}^c. \quad (2.1)$$

These matrices are called the *generators* of the representation, their size k is the representation’s *dimension*; and they come in a collection indexed by a which spans the *algebra*’s dimension. As $k \times k$ matrices, they may be viewed as encoding particular linear maps that act upon a vector space (or ‘module’) of dimension k .

For many Lie algebras, there is a *defining* or ‘*fundamental*’² representation ‘**F**’. For example, the space of antisymmetric $k \times k$ matrices is spanned by the set $T_{\mathbf{F}}^{(ij)}{}_{rs} := \delta_r^i \delta_s^j - \delta_s^i \delta_r^j$ indexed by $(ij) \in \binom{[k]}{2}$ furnish a k -dimensional representation of the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{so}(k)$ —the *fundamental* representation. In this case, it is not hard to see that these matrices satisfy (2.1); the structure constants are given (in terms of the metric η)

$$f^{(ab)(cd)}{}_{(ef)} = -\frac{1}{2} \eta^{ac} \delta_e^b \delta_f^d + \text{symmetries} \quad (2.2)$$

where the omitted terms can be obtained by anti-symmetrizing in $\{(ab), (cd), (ef)\}$. Although in this case the structure constants are fully antisymmetric, this need not be true in general: from the definition in (2.1), it is only necessary that $f^{ab}{}_c$ be antisymmetric in its first two indices. The fully anti-symmetric tensor f^{abc} is related to the those appearing in (2.1) via

$$f^{abc} := f^{ab}{}_d \kappa^{cd} \quad (2.3)$$

where κ^{ab} is the symmetric *Cartan-Killing* form, given by³

²This is the physicists’ language; more commonly, any representation whose Dynkin labels sum to 1 would be called fundamental. We use the more restrictive meaning here for reasons discussed below in section 4.2.

³As defined this way, ‘ κ^{ab} ’ depends on the representation **R**. However, it turns out that the κ s for different irreducible representations are always proportional. It is more conventionally defined by the trace in the representation **ad** and dividing by twice the dual Coxeter number of the algebra. For other representations, the proportionality factor is called the *Dynkin index* of the representation.

$$\kappa^{ab} := \text{tr}(\underline{T}_{\mathbf{R}}^a \underline{T}_{\mathbf{R}}^b) := \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(a b) := T_{\mathbf{R} j}^{a i} T_{\mathbf{R} i}^{b j}. \quad (2.4)$$

A Lie algebra is *semi-simple* iff κ is non-degenerate, in which case it can be used as a metric to raise/lower adjoint indices by defining $\kappa_{ab} := (\kappa^{ab})^{-1}$. Also, using our definitions here it is not hard to show that the antisymmetric f^{abc} is related to the generators via

$$f^{abc} = \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(a b c) - \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(b a c). \quad (2.5)$$

(We apologize for what might appear to be an excessive degree of caution in our discussion above. Physicists often choose linear combinations of generators in order to diagonalize $\kappa_{ab} \mapsto \kappa_{a'b'} = \delta_{a'b'}$, in which case there would be no difference between raised/lowered indices. But such a choice frequently requires that generators involve algebraic numbers such as $\sqrt{2}$ or i , and such numbers *dramatically* encumber most computer algebra software. For (mostly) this reason, we have been careful to avoid such (often implicit) choices in our discussions here.)

Regardless of what particular representation is used to define an algebra, there are *infinitely many other* sets of other matrices—different sets of generators furnishing *different* representations—which all satisfy (2.1) *with the same coefficients* $f_{\mathbf{c}}^{ab}$. We will soon have more to say about the range of possible representations, but for now it is worth noting that given *any* generators which satisfy (2.1), there is another important representation defined directly in terms of the coefficients $f_{\mathbf{c}}^{ab}$: the ‘adjoint’ representation denoted ‘**ad**’ and defined via:

$$T_{\mathbf{ad} \mathbf{c}}^{a b} := -f_{\mathbf{c}}^{ab}. \quad (2.6)$$

It is easy to see that these matrices satisfy exactly the same commutation relations with the same coefficients as in (2.1). Moreover, when applied to these matrices, the identity in (2.1) can be seen as nothing but the Jacobi relation (1.1). Expressed the other way, given any rank-three tensor which satisfies the Jacobi relation, there exists a set of generators which commute into themselves according to (2.1) and thereby define a Lie algebra.

It is natural to wonder about the scope of possibilities for objects that satisfy (1.1) or (2.1). Indeed, the classification of Lie algebras and their possible representations is one of the great achievements of mathematics (see refs. [21–23]). We will not have time to do justice to the vast body of research on this subject, but it will prove helpful later on to summarize a few basic facts and ideas, starting with the classification of Lie algebras.

Table 1. The simple Lie algebras’ ranks, dimensions, and *fundamental* representations.

algebra	ranks	dim(ad)	dim(F)
$\mathfrak{a}_k \sim \mathfrak{su}_{k+1}$	$k \geq 1$	$k(k+2)$	$k+1$
$\mathfrak{b}_k \sim \mathfrak{so}_{2k+1}$	$k \geq 2$	$k(2k+1)$	$2k+1$
$\mathfrak{c}_k \sim \mathfrak{sp}_k$	$k \geq 3$	$k(2k+1)$	$2k$
$\mathfrak{d}_k \sim \mathfrak{so}_{2k}$	$k \geq 4$	$k(2k-1)$	$2k$
\mathfrak{e}_k	$k = 6$	78	27
	$k = 7$	133	56
	$k = 8$	248	248
\mathfrak{f}_k	$k = 4$	52	26
\mathfrak{g}_k	$k = 2$	14	7

2.2 The Classification of Lie Algebras

Suppose one is given a set of generators satisfying (2.1) for some set of coefficients $f^a{}_b{}_c$. If the Cartan-Killing form is non-degenerate, then the algebra is said to be *semi-simple*. (If not, there exists a subspace of generators—of dimension equal to the degeneracy of the Cartan-Killing form—which form a commuting sub-algebra; these can always be projected out to yield a semi-simple sub-algebra.) A general theorem is that any semi-simple Lie algebra can be written as a product of *simple* Lie algebras, whose classification we now review.

There are four infinite families of ‘classical’ Lie algebras indexed by their *rank* k and five *exceptional* algebras. These are listed in Table 1. Notice that the restriction in ranges of allowed ranks enforces non-redundancy and simplicity: although some authors may speak of ‘ \mathfrak{sp}_2 ’, it would be isomorphic to \mathfrak{b}_2 ; similarly, ‘ \mathfrak{d}_3 ’ would be isomorphic to \mathfrak{a}_3 , and ‘ \mathfrak{d}_2 ’ would not in fact be simple: $\mathfrak{d}_2 \sim \mathfrak{a}_1 \times \mathfrak{a}_1$.

Among the possible Lie algebras for gauge theory, a great deal of attention has been paid to the case of $\mathfrak{su}_{N_c} \sim \mathfrak{a}_{N_c-1}$. Beyond the obvious phenomenological motivations, there are important simplicities afforded by the ‘large- N_c ’ limit of such gauge theories. By comparison, relatively little attention has been paid to gauge theories involving other Lie algebras (at least insofar as *particular* gauge theories are considered).⁴

2.3 The Classification of Lie Algebras’ Representations

Any interactions between massless spin-one particles (‘gluons’) and matter must be dictated by some *representation* of the Lie algebra encoded by the gluons’ self-interactions. The scope of distinct representations of a given Lie algebra begins—as with the classification of Lie algebras—with a mention of *reducibility*, as it is a general theorem that any finite-dimensional representation of a Lie algebra may be expressed

⁴There are important outliers, however—most notably, \mathfrak{d}_5 , \mathfrak{e}_6 , and \mathfrak{e}_8 , which have played important roles in unified model building and string theory.

as a sum over *irreducible representations* with various multiplicities. And so, let us first review the classification of the *irreducible* representations of simple Lie algebras.

2.3.1 Irreducible Representations Simple Lie Algebras

When considering a particular representation of some Lie algebra, physicist often use the size of its generators (equivalently, the *dimension* of the vector space on which these matrices are taken to act) as a convenient label. This works well in the case of $\mathfrak{a}_1 \sim \mathfrak{su}_2$, for which all irreducible representations are uniquely identified by a single positive integer $2\mathbf{j}+1$, where $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}$ is called the ‘spin’ of the representation. In this language, $\mathbf{ad}(\mathfrak{a}_1)$ would be denoted ‘ $\mathbf{3}$ ’, a spin-1/2 representation a ‘ $\mathbf{2}$ ’, and so-on.

This works reasonably well and is often sufficient, but there are many cases where inequivalent representations of a Lie algebra have the same dimension. For example, there are 9 inequivalent **672**-dimensional irreducible representations of \mathfrak{d}_4 , and distinguishing between them can require considerable notational complications.

Nevertheless, the simplicity of the case of \mathfrak{a}_1 is not entirely spurious. Physicists first learn to identify representations of \mathfrak{su}_2 by their ‘spin’, which we can think of as the largest possible eigenvalue of spin in the ‘ z -direction’. What is so special about the ‘ z -direction’? In the standard presentation of the generators of \mathfrak{su}_2 due to Pauli [24],

$$\underline{T}^x := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \underline{T}^y := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \underline{T}^z := \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.7)$$

The generator \underline{T}^z is diagonal, and can be viewed as the generator of the 1-dimensional *Cartan* sub-algebra of \mathfrak{su}_2 . Its eigenvalues are $\pm\frac{1}{2}$. For any other representation, one may consider the eigenvalues of the generator $\underline{T}^z_{\mathbf{R}}$ and thereby construct a ‘*lattice*’ (in this case, simply a list) of its eigenvalues or ‘weights’. The weights of an irreducible representation of \mathfrak{su}_2 are $\{j, j-1, \dots, 1-j, -j\}$ for some $j \in \frac{1}{2}\mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$. As most physicists learn early on, we may label representations by their ‘highest-weight’ ‘ j ’ or by their dimension ‘ $(2\mathbf{j}+1)$ ’.

Thinking of lattices of weights encoding eigenvalues (of some special generators) and labelling representations by their ‘highest’ weights turns out to be quite general and powerful. For every representation, we can describe a set of weights corresponding to the eigenvalues of the generators of the Cartan sub-algebra (generated by the maximal subspace of mutually commuting generators). Moreover, *irreducible* representations are uniquely characterized by their *highest-weights*—those vectors from which an associated set of weights may be obtained by iteratively subtracting some number of so-called positive simple roots (corresponding to the rows of the Cartan matrix).

Labelling irreducible representations by their highest-weights is closely related to a simple but deep theorem: the irreducible representations of any rank- k Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} are uniquely characterized by a k -tuple of non-negative integers called its

‘Dynkin label’ and every such k -tuple labels an irreducible representation of \mathfrak{g} . Given the Dynkin label for any irreducible representation of a Lie algebra, one can readily determine the representation’s dimension and construct its system of weights. Both these labels and their associated weights prove extremely useful computationally—especially in the decomposition of tensor products into irreducible representations. We refer the reader to more thorough treatments elsewhere (e.g. [21–23]).

2.3.2 Conjugate Representations of Irreducible Representations

An important tool we will use is *Schur’s lemma*. To state it, we first introduce the notion of intertwiners. Given representations \mathbf{R}_i acting on complex vector spaces V_i , then a linear map $f: V_1 \rightarrow V_2$ which commutes with the action of the representations (in the sense that $f(\mathbf{R}_1(T)) = \mathbf{R}_2(f(T))$ for all $T \in \mathfrak{g}$) is called an *intertwiner*. The same definition can be made for group representations and the condition for Lie algebra representations can be obtained by expanding around the identity and using the linearity of f .

The intertwiners form a complex vector space, $\text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2)$. Schur’s lemma in this language is the statement that if \mathbf{R}_1 and \mathbf{R}_2 are irreducible and isomorphic, then the space $\text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2)$ is one dimensional, generated by the identity intertwiner. Otherwise, $\text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}_1, \mathbf{R}_2)$ is the trivial vector space containing only the zero intertwiner.

We will use Schur’s lemma together with the following properties

$$\begin{aligned}\text{Hom}(\oplus_i \mathbf{R}_i, \mathbf{R}) &= \oplus_i \text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}_i, \mathbf{R}), \\ \text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}, \oplus_i \mathbf{R}_i) &= \oplus_i \text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}, \mathbf{R}_i), \\ \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}) &= \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{1}),\end{aligned}\tag{2.8}$$

where $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$ is the *dual* representation of a given representation \mathbf{R} .⁵

For $f \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B})$ we have $f: \mathbf{A} \rightarrow \mathbf{B}$, an intertwiner. Hence for $a \in \mathbf{A}$ we obtain $f(a) \in \mathbf{B}$. Similarly, for $g \in \text{Hom}(\mathbf{A} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{B}}, \mathbf{1})$, we have $g: \mathbf{A} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{B}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, where we identify the trivial representation $\mathbf{1}$ with the base field \mathbb{C} . In this case, for $a \in \mathbf{A}$ and $\bar{b} \in \bar{\mathbf{B}}$, we obtain $g(a \otimes \bar{b}) \in \mathbb{C}$. We can establish a correspondence between f and g by taking $g(a \otimes \bar{b}) = \bar{b}(f(a))$. One can check that this is well-defined, that is it yields the same answer for $\alpha(a \otimes \bar{b}) = (\alpha a) \otimes \bar{b} = a \otimes (\alpha \bar{b})$ for $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ and also for $a_1 \otimes \bar{b} + a_2 \otimes \bar{b} = (a_1 + a_2) \otimes \bar{b}$, etc.

If $\mathbf{B} = \bar{\mathbf{C}}$ we have, by the bi-dual theorem, since all these spaces are finite-dimensional, that $\bar{\bar{\mathbf{B}}} = \mathbf{B}$. Taking $c \in \mathbf{C}$, we can define f in terms of g via $f(a)(c) = g(a \otimes c)$. It can be checked as above that this is well-defined.

The dual (sometimes called contragredient) representation is defined as follows. Consider a vector space V , then its dual space \bar{V} is the set (actually a vector space as well) of linear functionals on V . In other words, $f \in \bar{V}$ if $f(v) \in \mathbb{C}$ for all $v \in V$ and $f(v_1 + v_2) = f(v_1) + f(v_2)$ and $f(\alpha v) = \alpha f(v)$.

⁵In the mathematics literature, this is often denoted ‘ \mathbf{R}^* ’.

Next, consider a left action of a group G on v . In other words, we have a map $G \times V \rightarrow V$ such that $(g_1 g_2)v = g_1(g_2 v)$ and $g(v_1 + v_2) = gv_1 + gv_2$ (that is, V is a right module for G). From this we can build a dual action on \bar{V} by taking

$$(gf)(v) = f(g^{-1}v), \quad \forall f \in \bar{V}, \quad v \in V, \quad g \in G. \quad (2.9)$$

The g^{-1} can be understood by requiring that $(g_1 g_2)f = g_1(g_2 f)$. Alternatively, we could take G to be a *left* action on \bar{V} and in that case we can take

$$(fg)(v) = f(gv), \quad \forall f \in \bar{V}, \quad v \in V, \quad g \in G. \quad (2.10)$$

Let us look at this in a given basis. We take e_i to be a basis of V and e^i to be the dual basis in \bar{V} . Therefore $e^i(e_j) = \delta_j^i$. Then we can decompose $f = f_i e^i$, $v = v^i e_i$. Taking $g^{-1}e_i = (g^{-1})_i^j e_j$ and $ge^i = (\bar{g})^i_j e^j$ and plugging into the definition of the definition of the dual action, we find

$$(\bar{g})^i_j = (g^{-1})_j^i. \quad (2.11)$$

This derivation was done for Lie groups; the analogous statement for Lie algebras can be obtained by expanding around identity, as usual.

Using Schur's lemma we can say that the multiplicity of the trivial representation in $\mathbf{R}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{R}_p$ is given by

$$\dim(\text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{R}_p, \mathbf{1})). \quad (2.12)$$

This is the same as the number of invariant tensors or the number of independent colour-structures. The same argument holds if we take some of the particles to be incoming and others to be outgoing. In that case the number of independent colour-structures is

$$\begin{aligned} & \dim(\text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{R}_p, \mathbf{R}_{p+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{R}_{p+q})) \\ &= \dim(\text{Hom}(\mathbf{R}_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbf{R}_p \otimes \bar{\mathbf{R}}_{p+1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \bar{\mathbf{R}}_{p+q}, \mathbf{1})). \end{aligned} \quad (2.13)$$

A consequence of Schur's Lemma is that for any irreducible representation \mathbf{R} of simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} , there is a unique *dual* or 'conjugate' representation $\bar{\mathbf{R}}$ such that

$$\mathbf{R} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \dots \quad (2.14)$$

Representations for which $\bar{\mathbf{R}} \simeq \mathbf{R}$ are called *real* (or pseudoreal⁶), and those for which $\bar{\mathbf{R}} \not\simeq \mathbf{R}$ are called *complex*. It is not hard to see that the only algebras which admit complex representations are $\mathfrak{a}_{k>1}$, \mathfrak{d}_{2k+1} and \mathfrak{e}_6 ; examples of such include the fundamental representations of $\mathfrak{a}_{k>1}$ and \mathfrak{e}_6 , or the spinor representations of \mathfrak{d}_{2k+1} for which spinor representations satisfy $\bar{\mathbf{S}}_{\pm} \simeq \mathbf{S}_{\mp}$.

⁶The distinction between real and pseudoreal does not matter for us here; but if $\mathbf{R} \otimes_{\text{sym}} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \dots$ then the representation is called real and if $\mathbf{R} \otimes_{\text{anti-sym}} \mathbf{R} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \dots$ then it would be called pseudoreal.

The conservation of charge along the propagator for a charged matter particle implies that if it is charged under the representation \mathbf{R} , its antiparticle must be charged under the conjugate representation $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$. Moreover, because the adjoint representation is real for all simple Lie algebras, in order for there to be non-vanishing interactions between incoming particles are charged under the representations \mathbf{R} and $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$ to exist, we must have that $\mathbf{ad} \otimes \mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}} \simeq \mathbf{1} \oplus \dots$. The invariant tensor corresponding to this interaction is $\mathbf{R}(T^a)^i_j$ where a is an index that runs over a basis of \mathfrak{g} , j runs over a basis of the representation space of \mathbf{R} and i over a basis of the representation space of $\overline{\mathbf{R}}$. This construction works except when $\mathbf{R}=\mathbf{1}$.

Using the duality transformation and the reality of \mathbf{ad} we can move \mathbf{ad} to the right hand side to obtain $\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}} \simeq \mathbf{ad} \oplus \dots$.

2.4 Decomposition of Tensor Products into Irreducible Representations

As outlined above, the number of independent colour-tensors for a given process involving n gluons and some numbers of matter charged under various representations is computed by the multiplicity of the trivial representation $\mathbf{1}$ in the tensor product

$$\mathbf{ad}^{\otimes n} \bigotimes_i (\mathbf{R}_i \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}}_i)^{\otimes q_i}. \quad (2.15)$$

We will not review in much detail how this number can be computed, but we mention that it is relatively straightforward in terms of the weights of the various representations involved. Roughly speaking, if $\text{wt}(\mathbf{a})$ and $\text{wt}(\mathbf{b})$ are the sets of weights (with multiplicities) for representations \mathbf{a}, \mathbf{b} , then the set of weights for $\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}$ is given by

$$\text{wt}(\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}) = \{w_a + w_b \mid w_a \in \text{wt}(\mathbf{a}), w_b \in \text{wt}(\mathbf{b})\}. \quad (2.16)$$

These weights can be written as a union of the weights of irreducible representations by successively removing those encoded by their highest weights. The standard procedure for doing this is the Racah-Speiser algorithm.

We give a description of this algorithm in Appendix B where we present also a few worked out examples.

3 Counting Colours for n Adjoint-Charged Particles

Let us begin our survey of colour-structures in the case of n particles (such as gluons) charged under the adjoint representation \mathbf{ad} of some Lie algebra. We've seen that the number of independent colour-tensors would be given by

$$\mathcal{C}[\mathbf{ad}(\mathfrak{g})^n] =: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n = m(\mathbf{ad}^{\otimes n} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}) . \quad (3.1)$$

This multiplicity is easy to study in any particular case using the tools of representation theory as outlined above.

Consider for example the simplest possible gauge theory: the case of $\mathfrak{a}_1 \sim \mathfrak{su}_2$. Recall that for \mathfrak{a}_1 , irreducible representations are uniquely characterized by their dimension, suggesting that we describe $\mathbf{ad}(\mathfrak{a}_1)$ as the ‘ $\mathbf{3}$ ’ representation; tensor products involving the irreducible representation $\mathbf{d} \neq \mathbf{1}$ always take the form:

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{d} \simeq (\mathbf{d}-1) \oplus \mathbf{d} \oplus (\mathbf{d}+1) . \quad (3.2)$$

From this, we may recursively compute the decomposition of all $\mathbf{3}^{\otimes n}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 1} &= \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 2} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 1} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{5} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 3} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 1} \oplus \mathbf{3}^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathbf{5}^{\oplus 2} \oplus \mathbf{7} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 4} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathbf{3}^{\oplus 6} \oplus \mathbf{5}^{\oplus 6} \oplus \mathbf{7}^{\oplus 3} \oplus \mathbf{9} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 5} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 6} \oplus \mathbf{3}^{\oplus 15} \oplus \mathbf{5}^{\oplus 15} \oplus \mathbf{7}^{\oplus 10} \oplus \mathbf{9}^{\oplus 4} \oplus \mathbf{11} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 6} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 15} \oplus \mathbf{3}^{\oplus 36} \oplus \mathbf{5}^{\oplus 40} \oplus \mathbf{7}^{\oplus 29} \oplus \mathbf{9}^{\oplus 15} \oplus \mathbf{11}^{\oplus 5} \oplus \mathbf{13} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 7} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 36} \oplus \mathbf{3}^{\oplus 91} \oplus \mathbf{5}^{\oplus 105} \oplus \mathbf{7}^{\oplus 84} \oplus \mathbf{9}^{\oplus 49} \oplus \mathbf{11}^{\oplus 21} \oplus \mathbf{13}^{\oplus 6} \oplus \mathbf{15} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 8} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 91} \oplus \mathbf{3}^{\oplus 232} \oplus \mathbf{5}^{\oplus 280} \oplus \mathbf{7}^{\oplus 238} \oplus \mathbf{9}^{\oplus 154} \oplus \mathbf{11}^{\oplus 76} \oplus \mathbf{13}^{\oplus 28} \oplus \mathbf{15}^{\oplus 7} \oplus \mathbf{17} \\ \mathbf{3}^{\otimes 9} &= \mathbf{1}^{\oplus 232} \oplus \mathbf{3}^{\oplus 603} \oplus \mathbf{5}^{\oplus 750} \oplus \mathbf{7}^{\oplus 672} \oplus \mathbf{9}^{\oplus 468} \oplus \mathbf{11}^{\oplus 258} \oplus \mathbf{13}^{\oplus 111} \oplus \mathbf{15}^{\oplus 36} \oplus \mathbf{17}^{\oplus 8} \oplus \mathbf{19} \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

and so on. Thus, the number of independent colour-tensors required for scattering n adjoints in \mathfrak{a}_1 gauge theory would be given by the sequence $\{0, 1, 1, 3, 6, 15, 36, 91, 232, \dots\}$. This sequence is recognizable as the *Riordan numbers*, and is given in the Online Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences (‘OEIS’) as sequence [\[A005043\]](#) [25]. In particular, we have that

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^n = \sum_{r=0}^n (-1)^r \binom{n}{r} \binom{r}{\lfloor r/2 \rfloor} , \quad (3.4)$$

and satisfies the recurrence relation

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^n = \frac{n-1}{n+1} (2\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^{n-1} + 3\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^{n-2}) \quad \text{with} \quad \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^0 = 1, \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^1 = 0 . \quad (3.5)$$

What is especially interesting is that for $n > 5$ -particle scattering, this number is *fewer* than the $(n-2)!$ of independent colour-tensors for gluon scattering *at tree-level* described by del Duca, Dixon and Maltoni (see ref. [26]); and yet, these numbers are valid to *all-orders of perturbation*. Thus, the all-orders colour-structure of \mathfrak{a}_1

gauge theory will be considerably simpler than even that of *tree-level* scattering in an algebra-agnostic approach.

To be fair, the basis of tree- or loop-level colour-tensors described by DDM and others were derived using only generic identities among colour-tensors such as Jacobi (1.1), and therefore should represent a *spanning set* of tensors which lose their independence for particular Lie algebras. (For example, of the 24 colour-tensors appearing in the DDM basis at 6-particles, only 14 are independent for \mathfrak{a}_1 gauge theory.)

Although analyses such as that of ref. [26] have been done order-by-order in perturbation theory (and typically include the contributions exclusively arising via Feynman diagrams), they suggest that perhaps we may discover certain universal behavior among the number of independent colour-tensors in the limit of large numbers of independent gluons. This turns out to be the case.

3.1 Saturation: Counting Colours in the Limit of Large-Ranks

For the classical Lie algebras it is interesting to consider how the number of independent colour-tensors involving adjoints grows with the rank of the algebra. The number of distinguishable gluons, $\dim(\mathfrak{g})$, grows quadratically with the rank; intuitively, when the number of distinguishable gluons vastly exceeds the number involved in a scattering process, the details of so many other states should cease to affect the answer.

We can check this intuition by direct computation. Consider the scattering of $n=40$ adjoint-charged particles in each of the classical Lie algebras, for which the number of independent colour-tensors (relative to their asymptotic values) are plotted in Figure 2 as a function of rank. It is easy to see that these numbers *saturate* in the large-rank limit, and to different values in the case of \mathfrak{a} -theory than the other algebras. Let us begin there.

3.1.1 Saturation in the Case of \mathfrak{a} -Type Gauge Theory

Empirically, it is easily seen that the number of independent colour-tensors grows uniformly as a function of k until some saturation number is reached for each of the classical Lie algebras—beyond which all algebras of higher rank share the same number of independent tensors. In the case of \mathfrak{a}_k -theory, we find these saturation numbers to be reached when $k \geq n-1$; for $n \in \{1, \dots, 10\}$, we find these numbers to be given by $\{0, 1, 2, 9, 44, 265, 1\,854, 14\,833, 133\,496, 1\,334\,961\}$. This sequence is easily identified in the OEIS [27] as the number of *derangements*, denoted ‘ $!n$ ’:

$$!n := n! \sum_{r=0}^n \frac{(-1)^r}{r!}. \quad (3.6)$$

More values are given in Table 2. Somewhat surprisingly, there exists an even simpler closed formula for $!n$ given by:

$$!n = \text{Round}[n!/e] \quad (3.7)$$




Figure 2. The numbers of independent colour-tensors for 40-adjoint scattering for gluons defined by each of the classical Lie algebras $\mathfrak{a}_k, \mathfrak{b}_k, \mathfrak{c}_k, \mathfrak{d}_k$ as a function of rank k .

(Here, ‘Round’ means what you think it means: the integer nearest to the argument.)

In the study of integer sequences, an important concept is that of a generating or exponential generating function. Specifically, for any sequence $a(n)$ defined for $n \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}$, we may associate with it the *Exponential Generating Function* as follows:

$$a(n) \Leftrightarrow \text{EGF}(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{a(n)}{n!} x^n. \quad (3.8)$$

It will be useful to note that $!n$ is encoded by the exponential generating function:

$$!n \Leftrightarrow \text{EGF}(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{!n}{n!} x^n = \frac{e^{-x}}{1-x}. \quad (3.9)$$

At any rate, we have found that for any fixed multiplicity n , $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} C_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^n = !n$:

$$C_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^n = !n \quad \forall k \geq n-1. \quad (3.10)$$

This number is easy to understand for most physicists (if difficult to justify). Combinatorially, the number of derangements $!n$ is equal to the number of permutations $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}([n])$ which are free of fixed-points; this number is equivalent to the number of ‘multi-trace’ tensors that any physicist would write down immediately as a (possibly degenerate) basis of tensors.

To see this, we simply note that any permutation can be represented by a collection of *cycles*, and that any fixed point would correspond to a length-1 cycle.⁷ For $n=4$, we have that $!4 = 9$; this is easy to see directly:

⁷Tracelessness of the fundamental generators follows from semi-simplicity of the Lie algebra, so we may discard any tensor involving the trace over a single generator of any representation.

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{permutation: } & \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 2 & 3 & 1 & 4 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 2 & 4 & 1 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 3 & 4 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 3 & 1 & 4 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 4 & 3 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 4 & 1 & 2 & 3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\text{cycles: } & (1\,2\,3\,4) \quad (1\,2\,4\,3) \quad (1\,3\,2\,4) \quad (1\,3\,4\,2) \quad (1\,4\,2\,3) \quad (1\,4\,3\,2) \\
& \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 2 & 1 & 4 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 3 & 4 & 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 & 3 & 4 \\ \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow & \downarrow \\ 4 & 3 & 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \\
& (1\,2)(3\,4) \quad (1\,3)(2\,4) \quad (1\,4)(2\,3)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.11}$$

This association leads to a set of colour-tensors for the scattering of 4 adjoint-charged particles of the form

$$\left\{ \begin{aligned} & \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,2\,3\,4), \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,2\,4\,3), \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,3\,2\,4), \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,3\,4\,2), \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,4\,2\,3), \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,4\,3\,2), \\ & \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,2)\text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(3\,4), \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,3)\text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(2\,4), \text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(1\,4)\text{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(2\,3) \end{aligned} \right\} \tag{3.12}$$

for any (complex) representation \mathbf{R} . (As discussed below, when $\mathbf{R} \simeq \overline{\mathbf{R}}$, these traces enjoy a dihedral/reflection symmetry among their arguments, leading to a shorter list of only 6 distinct tensors.)

The reason these numbers may seem somewhat unsurprising to many physicists is that it is common to decompose colour-tensors of \mathfrak{a}_k gauge theory into sums of products of traces over *fundamental*-representation generators via (2.5), then to use the ‘Fierz identity’ to eliminate all reference to internal adjoint-labels. The Fierz identity for \mathfrak{a}_k tensors is often expressed in a form that requires a specific choice of basis for the fundamental generators (and their scaling); but it can be stated without reference to any such basis as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\kappa_{ab} \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(a, x_{\text{—}}, y_{\text{—}}) \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(b, y_{\text{—}}, x_{\text{—}}) &= \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(x, y) - \frac{1}{k+1} \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(x) \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(y) \\
\kappa_{ab} \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(a, x_{\text{—}}, b, y_{\text{—}}) &= \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(x) \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(y) - \frac{1}{k+1} \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(x, y)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.13}$$

where $x_{\text{—}}, y_{\text{—}}$ denote any ordered sequence of indices (including an empty range—for which it should be understood that $\text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}() = \dim(\mathbf{F}) = k+1$). Such trace tensors are especially useful in the context of the large- k limit, as many of the multi-trace tensors will be strongly suppressed by orders of k , leading to a notion of planarity [28].

Although it may have been easy to have guessed the fact that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^n$ saturates to the number of multi-trace tensors, it should be surprising—and in *both* directions. On the one hand, these numbers would seem to be too small: the Fierz decomposition can be applied only to the tensors arising from Feynman diagrams *involving adjoint- or internal fundamental-coloured particles*. In the case of \mathfrak{a}_k the fact that this reasoning should extend to internal loops of particles charged under *arbitrary* representations is due to the fact that all irreducible representations of \mathfrak{a}_k can be generated through tensor products of \mathbf{F} —a fact not universal to other algebras’ fundamental representations (as we have defined them in Table 1).

On the other hand, it would appear that this number *over counts* the number of actual tensors that would arise from the Feynman expansion. For $n=3$ (and $k \geq 2$ —as required to reach saturation), $!3=2$, reflecting the fact that, for $\mathfrak{a}_{k \geq 2}$ the tensors

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(a b c) \quad \text{and} \quad \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(c b a) \quad (3.14)$$

are generally distinct—that is, linearly-independent. Recall that the structure constants f^{abc} are defined as the difference between these tensors, (2.5); the sum defines a distinct and generally non-vanishing rank-3 tensor via:

$$d^{abc} := \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(a b c) + \mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(c b a). \quad (3.15)$$

(This tensor vanishes for *all* other Lie algebras and representations.) Recall that Bose symmetry required that the constants appearing in gluon interactions must involve only the fully *antisymmetric* f^{abc} —and *not* this symmetric tensor. How then can we understand a *need* for such new tensors in our counting?

The argument leading to the uniqueness of Yang-Mills theory applied only to the interactions of *massless* spin-one particles. For the scattering of such particles, the appearance of a new, symmetric tensor for the scattering of gluons would be equivalent to the appearance of an anomaly in the gauge theory—in conflict with our premise of masslessness for the particles. This is certainly not excluded on general principles: it is of course possible for anomalies to arise in \mathfrak{a}_k gauge theory (if there exists ‘anomalous’ contents of charged matter which can contribute to loops).

If we insisted on only *non-anomalous* gauge theory, we would expect $!n$ to overcount the number of independent tensors that would arise for the scattering of gluons. To see this, consider *pure* gauge theory—where all Feynman diagrams involve only gluons and all colour-tensors are constructed directly from the antisymmetric tensor f^{abc} defining the theory; as such, only the differences between reflected traces can arise via (2.5).

In general, traces over the generators of conjugate representations are related by

$$\mathrm{tr}_{\mathbf{R}}(a b \cdots c d) = (-1)^{|a b \cdots c d|} \mathrm{tr}_{\overline{\mathbf{R}}}(d c \cdots b a). \quad (3.16)$$

Because the fundamental representation of $\mathfrak{a}_{k \geq 2}$ is *complex*, reality of f^{abc} requires that only dihedrally-symmetrized combinations of trace tensors would be required. (We will soon return to the question of how many dihedrally-symmetric traces exist.)

All that being said, there is in fact another context in which even for *non-anomalous* gauge theory the complete basis of $!n$ tensors may be relevant: the scattering of gluons and *adjoint-charged matter*. The argument leading to the uniqueness of the tensor f^{abc} for gluon scattering is predicated on Bose symmetry, which would not apply to the interactions of gluons and charged particles of other spins. And so, in the more general context of scattering n ‘adjoint-charged’ particles (of arbitrary spin), we expect that $!n$ reflects the right number of independent tensors that would be relevant in the large-rank limit.

Of course, the number of independent colour-dependent tensors which can exist non-perturbatively is not necessarily the same as the number which *actually appear*

at some order of perturbation theory. Even within the context of pure gauge theory, it remains an important, open question as to how many independent tensors arise order-by-order in perturbation theory; it is a question we must leave to future work.

3.1.2 Saturation in the Cases of $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}$ -Type Gauge Theory

By comparison to the case of the adjoints of \mathfrak{a} , we expect that $!n$ should substantially over-count the number of tensors, as *all* representations are real and therefore dihedrally-related trace tensors cannot be independent. Indeed, from (3.16) we expect that only dihedrally-related traces (over any representation’s generators) should suffice. Also for \mathfrak{d} -type theories, the fundamental representation at least is real—and so only dihedrally-related traces over fundamental generators would be independent.

We choose to denote this number of ‘*dihedral* derangements’ (the number of multi-trace symbols equivalent under a reversal of their indices) by ‘ $!!n$ ’. Counting these for the cases $n \in \{1, \dots, 10, \dots\}$, we find these to be given by the sequence $\{0, 1, 1, 6, 22, 130, 822, 6\,202, 52\,552, 499\,194, \dots\}$, which can be identified in the OEIS as the sequence [A002137] [29], which we list in Table 2. Although we know of no closed formula for $!!n$ analogous to (3.6) or (3.7), the sequence $!!n$ corresponds to the exponential generating function:

$$!!n \Leftrightarrow \text{EGF}(x) := \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(!n)}{n!} x^n = \frac{e^{x^2/4-x/2}}{\sqrt{1-x}}. \quad (3.17)$$

This number exactly agrees with the empirical numbers of tensors computed using the decomposition of tensor products into irreducible representations for each of the $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}$ -type gauge theories in the limit of large rank (see Tables 13, 15, 15). Specifically, we find that saturation occurs for

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_k}^n &= !!n & \forall k \geq \frac{1}{2}(n-1); \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_k}^n &= !!n & \forall k \geq \frac{1}{2}(n-1); \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}^n &= !!n & \forall k \geq (n+1). \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

One obvious feature of how saturation is reached as k is increased (see Figure 2) is that while the limit is approached monotonically for $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}$ theories, there is more structure for the \mathfrak{d} -type algebras: fixing the multiplicity n , we see that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}^n < !!n$ for low-rank algebras, then *exceeds* this ‘limit’ for some range of ranks, before reaching saturation *from above* when $k > n$. Consulting Table 15, it is curious to note that when $k=n$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}^{n=k} = (!n) + 1$.

Notice that $!!n < !n$ for all $n \geq 3$; and thus, the number of independent colour-tensors for adjoint scattering for *all* classical Lie algebras in the limit of large rank

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13
$!n$	2	9	44	265	1,854	14,833	133,496	1,334,961	14,684,570	176,214,841	2,290,792,932
$!!n$	1	6	22	130	822	6,202	52,552	499,194	5,238,370	60,222,844	752,587,764

Table 2. Numbers of *derangements* $!n$ and *dihedral* derangements $!!n$.

is consistent with a saturation basis consisting of the products of the traces over the generators of the algebra's *fundamental* representation. Below saturation for \mathfrak{a} , \mathfrak{b} , \mathfrak{c} -theories and for all the exceptional algebras, any difference between $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n$ and $!n$ or $!!n$ (as appropriate) can be understood as reflecting *identities* among the tensors arising at low rank. In the case of \mathfrak{d} -theories, we need to explain the appearance of *new* tensors relative to the basis valid in the large-rank limit.

3.2 Origins of Identities Among (and the Appearance of New) Tensors

The counting described above is consistent with the notion that a natural, large-rank basis of colour-structures for $\mathbf{ad}^{\otimes n}$ may consist of the products of traces over the generators of the fundamental representation in each case: $!n$ counts the number of multi-trace ‘symbols’, and $!!n$ counts the number of multi-trace symbols where a dihedral symmetry is enforced (valid for multi-trace tensors involving the generators of any *real* representation according to (3.16)). Indeed, we have checked that traces over the fundamental representation \mathbf{F} ’s generators do indeed provide an independent set of colour-tensors at large-rank for each of the classical Lie algebras.

But why must we choose the *fundamental* representation’s generators and not some other? After all, the relationship between the structure constants and traces over the generators (2.5) applies to *any* representation of the algebra (even the reducible ones)! In the case of \mathfrak{a}_k -theory, the traces of the generators of any *real* representation (the adjoint, say) would enjoy dihedral symmetry, leading to $(!n - !!n)$ relations among the multi-trace tensors; as such, they would not prove sufficient to span all independent tensors that exist; but we do expect that the traces of any complex representation should also work.

Saturation for the \mathfrak{b} , \mathfrak{c} , \mathfrak{d} series is given by the number of dihedrally distinct multi-trace tensors. As this is justified for any real representation, it is natural suppose that multi-traces involving *any* choice of representation should suffice.

Interestingly, although the fundamental⁸ representation of \mathfrak{d}_k is real, complex representations do exist when k is odd. It is highly non-trivial that no more than $!!n$ independent multi-trace tensors exist above saturation even when considering traces involving complex representations, as no simple symmetries such as (3.16) are expected. But of course, the numbers $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}^n$ are computed entirely independently of how such tensors are represented, and so we can rest assured that such relations among these objects *must* exist.

At least for the \mathfrak{a} , \mathfrak{b} , \mathfrak{c} -type algebras, we may detect the fact that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n$ is strictly bounded above by its saturation value through new relations being satisfied among the tensors in this naïve basis. Indeed, this turns out to be a simple consequence of linear algebra in the case of their fundamental representations.

⁸Recall that we are *defining* the fundamental representation to be the *defining* representation for each algebra. Equivalently, the representation of smallest dimension (with the exception of \mathfrak{b}_2).

3.2.1 Explaining Identities Among Colour-Tensors: Cayley Hamilton

Let us begin our analysis with the case of \mathfrak{a} -type theories. As described above,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^n &= (!n) \text{ for } k > n-2 \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^n &< (!n) \text{ for } k \leq n-2 \end{aligned} \quad (3.19)$$

Consider the first case *below* saturation: $(n+1)$ -particle scattering for $\mathfrak{a}_{k=n-1}$ gauge theory. We should find the difference between $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_{n-1}}^n$ and $!n$ to be explained by some new linear relation(s) among the multi-trace tensors constructed out of any (complex) representation. Indeed, we can identify these easily enough for multi-traces over the fundamental representation: which would be of dimension n .

For any $n \times n$ matrix A , the successive matrix-powers of A cannot all be linearly independent. They are constrained by the *Cayley-Hamilton* theorem, which states:

$$A^n + c_1(A)A^{n-1} + \dots + c_{n-1}(A)A^1 + c_n(A)\mathbb{I}_{n \times n} = 0, \quad (3.20)$$

where the coefficients are given by

$$c_m(A) := \frac{(-1)^m}{m!} \begin{vmatrix} \text{tr}(A) & 1 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ \text{tr}(A^2) & \text{tr}(A) & 2 & \ddots & \vdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & 0 \\ \text{tr}(A^{m-1}) & \ddots & \ddots & \text{tr}(A) & m-1 \\ \text{tr}(A^m) & \text{tr}(A^{m-1}) & \dots & \text{tr}(A^2) & \text{tr}(A) \end{vmatrix}. \quad (3.21)$$

This identity does not immediately suggest anything about traces built from ordered products of generators; but we may apply this identity to the matrix $A \mapsto \sum_{a=1}^n T_{\mathbf{F}}^{\sigma(a)}$, which would then involve the symmetrized products of subsets of generators chosen from the list indexed by $\sigma(a)$.

Because we are interested in $(n+1)$ -particle scattering, we may contract this identity with any additional generator and take its trace, resulting in a new identity among the traces involving the $(n+1)$ generators.

Consider the case of \mathfrak{a}_2 . We'd like to find an identity among the 4-particle multi-traces of the $\mathbf{3}$ -dimensional generators of the fundamental representation. In this case, and using the fact that the generator matrices are traceless (true for any representation of any semi-simple Lie algebra), the identity (3.20) takes the form:

$$A^3 + c_1(A)A^2 + c_2(A)A^1 + c_3(A)A^0 = 0, \quad (3.22)$$

with coefficients given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_1(A) &= -\text{tr}(A) = 0; \\ c_2(A) &= \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(A^1)^2 - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(A^2) = -\frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(A^2); \\ c_3(A) &= \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(A^1)\text{tr}(A^2) - \frac{1}{6}\text{tr}(A^1)^3 - \frac{1}{3}\text{tr}(A^3) = -\frac{1}{3}\text{tr}(A^3). \end{aligned} \quad (3.23)$$

Relative to the general case, the only simplification arising here is due to the vanishing of $\text{tr}(A)$.

Contracting the identity (3.22) on the left with any *other* (traceless) matrix B , and taking the trace of the result leads to the identity

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= \text{tr}[B.(A^3 + c_1(A)A^2 + c_2(A)A^1 + c_3(A)A^0)] \\
&= \text{tr}(B.A^3) + c_1(A)\text{tr}(B.A^2) + c_2(A)\text{tr}(B.A^1) + c_3(A)\text{tr}(B) \\
&= \text{tr}(B.A^3) + c_2(A)\text{tr}(B.A^1) \\
&= \text{tr}(B.A^3) - \frac{1}{2}\text{tr}(A^2)\text{tr}(B.A^1).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.24}$$

Replacing A with the sum over any subset of the $\dim(\mathfrak{a}_2)=8$ generators and $B \mapsto T_{\mathbf{F}}^a$ any other will result in an identity

$$\sum_{\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}(\{2,3,4\})} \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \sigma_3) = \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \sigma_1) \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(\sigma_2 \sigma_3) + \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \sigma_2) \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(\sigma_1 \sigma_3) + \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \sigma_3) \text{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(\sigma_1 \sigma_2). \tag{3.25}$$

This generalizes in a nice way to all n : for $(n+1)$ -point scattering of adjoints in \mathfrak{a}_{n-1} gauge theory, there exists a single identity:

$$\sum_{\substack{\text{distinct} \\ \text{multi-traces}}} (-1)^{|\text{tr}_i|} \text{tr}_i = 0. \tag{3.26}$$

This agrees with the empirical observation that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_{n-1}}^{n+1} = !(n+1)+1$ for all $n \geq 2$ (see Table 12).

When the rank is lower and the size of the generators of the fundamental representation is substantially smaller than a multiplicity in question, there will be additional identities arising from replacing ‘ B ’ in the argument above with products over more generators. Choosing different (non-symmetrized) sets of generators chosen for B gives rise to many (not necessarily independent) identities.

The same logic applies to the cases of $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}$ -type gauge theory below saturation. The main distinction is that for these algebras saturation always occurs when the dimension of the fundamental representation is farther from the multiplicity than the marginal case encountered for \mathfrak{a} -series:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_k, \mathfrak{c}_k}^n &= (!!n) \text{ for } k > \frac{1}{2}(n+1) \\
\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_k, \mathfrak{c}_k}^n &< (!!n) \text{ for } k \leq \frac{1}{2}(n+1)
\end{aligned} \tag{3.27}$$

This explains a greater number of identities among the tensors away from saturation.

The above discussion helps to explain the decrease in the counting of independent tensors only because we considered multi-traces over the fundamental representation—which involves matrices small enough for Cayley-Hamilton’s relation to apply. But what if we had chosen another representation? For example, although we have identified an identity among the $n=6$ -particle multi-traces over the generators of the

5-dimensional representation of \mathfrak{su}_5 , what if we had instead chosen a basis of multi-traces over the generators of the 10-dimensional representation? Of course, the number of independent colour-tensors has nothing to do with the basis in which we choose to represent them; but it is clear that the logic above seems strongly sensitive to the *smallest*-dimensional representation that exists for a given algebra. It would be worthwhile to better understand how this story changes if other representations are used.

3.2.2 There be dragons: Origins of non-Monotonicity for \mathfrak{d} -Theories

The \mathfrak{d}_k series is remarkable because for *low rank* there are *extra* colour-tensors relative to the large- k limit; as k increases, these additional tensors must become dependent (or cease to exist).

This should not be entirely surprising, however, as the \mathfrak{d} -type algebras (for odd rank) admit *complex* representations; as such, even if multi-traces over (real) fundamental generators should saturate to $!!n$ (reflecting the dihedral symmetry of traces over any real representation), surely we'd expect fewer relations (and a larger basis) to be spanned by multi-traces over *complex* representations such as spinors. This argument is a red-herring: for one thing, not all \mathfrak{d} admit complex representations. Indeed, although no such simple pairwise relations as in (3.16) exist for multi-traces over the spinors of \mathfrak{d}_{2k+1} , we have checked explicitly that they span a space of rank $!!n$ above the saturation limit.

We can understand the origin of these ‘new’ tensors looking just below the marginal limit. Consider, for example, 4-adjoint scattering in \mathfrak{d}_4 -type gauge theory. As described in section 2.1, the generators of the fundamental representation can be represented by the collection of matrices $T_{\mathbf{F}}^{(ij)} := \delta_r^i \delta_s^j - \delta_s^i \delta_r^j$ indexed by $(ij) \in \binom{[2k]}{2}$. For $k=4$, we will have 28 generators of size 8×8 . We can think of each as a two-form, and consider the antisymmetric product of any 4 of them to obtain an 8-form; dividing this by the volume form (that is, contracting the representation indices with a determinant) results in a completely symmetric tensor in the adjoint indices related to the *Pfaffian* of the generators.

This object ceases to exist for $k > n$, and surely accounts for the *one* excess that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_{k=n}}^n = (!!n) + 1$. Moreover, such a construction requires that the representation be even-dimensional, and therefore does not apply to the algebras $\mathfrak{b}_k \sim \mathfrak{so}_{2k+1}$.

Further below saturation, for $k < n$, there are even more possibilities. Indeed, such Pfaffian-like tensors can be constructed using subsets of generators according to the above. Consider the case of n -adjoint scattering in \mathfrak{d}_{n-1} theory. In this case, we could construct Pfaffians using $n-1$ of the generators, but there are no single-particle invariants available from which we may build an n -adjoint tensor. There is, however, an invariant 2-adjoint tensor (namely the Cartan-Killing form), and we could construct an n -adjoint tensor using the Pfaffian built from any choice of $n-2$ of them wedged with the commutator.

Let us try to be a bit more concrete. To describe the generators, let us denote the colour-tensor in the fundamental representation for the particle a by \underline{T}_a . We can think of these \underline{T}_a as two-forms on the $2(n-1)$ -dimensional space on which the representation acts. In addition to these two-forms, there is a two-form associated with the commutator $[\underline{T}_a, \underline{T}_b]$. We can form Pfaffian-like invariants using the commutator as in $[\underline{T}_a, \underline{T}_b] \wedge \underline{T}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\underline{T}}_a \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\underline{T}}_b \wedge \cdots \wedge \underline{T}_n$, where hats denote generators not appearing in the wedge-product. These tensors are not all independent, however: for every $a \in [n]$, we have an identity $\sum_b [\underline{T}_a, \underline{T}_b] \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\underline{T}}_a \cdots \wedge \hat{\underline{T}}_b \cdots \wedge \underline{T}_n = 0$, which is simply the invariance condition of $\underline{T}_1 \wedge \cdots \wedge \hat{\underline{T}}_a \wedge \cdots \wedge \underline{T}_n$ under a gauge transformation; but these relations are not themselves independent: they have one syzygy (their sum vanishes identically).

Thus, for every $\binom{n}{2}$ pair of indices we can construct a new invariant tensor; these satisfy n identities of which only $n-1$ are independent. Thus, from this construction we expect to be able to build $\binom{n}{2} - n + 1 = \binom{n-1}{2}$ independent objects. Moreover, since these new invariants involve the Levi-Civita tensor they are invariants for the *special* orthogonal group; the other invariants which do not involve the Levi-Civita tensor are invariants for the *orthogonal* group and therefore they should be independent.

Indeed, this agrees with our explicit calculations. Consulting Table 15, one can check that 8 adjoints, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{so}_9}^8 = 6202 = !8$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{so}_8}^8 = 6203 = !8 + 1$ and for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{o}_7}^8 = 6223 = !8 + \binom{7}{2}$.

3.3 Counting in the Limit of Large Multiplicity (for a Fixed Lie Algebra)

For any Lie algebra of fixed rank k , however, there will be an unbounded range of *multiplicities* which are *outside*/above the saturation condition for k ; and for the exceptional algebras, no notion of a ‘large rank limit’ exists. For any algebra at sufficiently low rank, even relatively low-multiplicity scattering will be outside saturation, and it is interesting to see how $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n$ compares with saturation in these instances. We have tabulated many of these numbers in Appendix C and provided them also as an ancillary file attached to this work.

On general grounds, as we review in Appendix D, it turns out that for any fixed Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} ,

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n \stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \# d^n n^{-d/2} \exp\left\{-\frac{d^2}{48n}\right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n)\right) \quad (3.28)$$

where $d = \dim(\mathfrak{g})$ and ‘ $\#$ ’ is some fixed constant that can be computed for any algebra. (These constants have been tabulated for all algebras of rank $k \leq 8$ in Appendix D.) This is steep growth indeed, but dramatically slower than the *factorial* growth of $!n$ or $!!n$.

In some cases, the $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ corrections are known or can be deduced from the data directly. For example,




Figure 3. Comparison of \mathcal{C}_g^n with the asymptotic formulae (3.29) with and without the $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ correction terms through reasonably high multiplicity.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{a}_1: \quad \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{a}_1}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} = \frac{1}{8\sqrt{3}\pi} 3^n \exp\left\{-\frac{3^2}{48n}\right\} \left(1 - \frac{9}{8n} + \mathcal{O}(1/n^2)\right); \\
\mathbf{a}_2: \quad \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{a}_2}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} = \frac{4}{81\sqrt{3}\pi} 8^{n+2} n^{-\frac{8}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{8^2}{48n}\right\} \left(1 - \frac{14}{3n} + \mathcal{O}(1/n^2)\right); \\
\mathbf{b}_2: \quad \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{b}_2}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} = \frac{125}{1296\pi} 10^{n+2} n^{-\frac{10}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{10^2}{48n}\right\} \left(1 - \frac{20}{3n} + \mathcal{O}(1/n^2)\right); \\
\mathbf{g}_2: \quad \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{g}_2}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} = \frac{84035}{442368\sqrt{3}\pi} 14^{n+2} n^{-\frac{14}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{14^2}{48n}\right\} \left(1 - \frac{35}{3n} + \mathcal{O}(1/n^2)\right); \\
\mathbf{a}_3: \quad \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{a}_3}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} = \frac{3}{2^{21}\pi^{3/2}} 15^{n+15/2} n^{-\frac{15}{2}} \exp\left\{-\frac{15^2}{48n}\right\} \left(1 - \frac{105}{8n} + \mathcal{O}(1/n^2)\right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.29}$$

In Figure 3, we show how direct computation of \mathcal{C}_g^n compares with the asymptotic formulae both with and without the $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ corrections.

3.3.1 Surveys of Asymptotic Growth at Moderately Large Multiplicity

For any modest-rank Lie algebra \mathcal{C}_g^n can be computed reasonably efficiently through $n \sim \mathcal{O}(100)$ (and in some instances, much higher) using readily available computer algebra packages (such as [30, 31] or the MATHEMATICA package of [32]). We have tabulated many of these results in Appendix C, and included precise ranks to reasonably-high multiplicity for all rank $k \leq 8$ algebras in the ancillary file attached to this work. We plot these numbers relative to their saturated values for a given multiplicity in Figure 5.

The similarity between the counting for \mathbf{b}_k and \mathbf{c}_k gauge theories is striking. Although the counting in both cases saturate to $!!n$, below saturation (at higher n for fixed rank) there are slightly fewer colour-tensors for \mathbf{c}_k gauge theories than \mathbf{b}_k theories. In fact, our analysis above suggests that the ratio $\mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{c}_k}^n / \mathcal{C}_{\mathbf{b}_k}^n$ goes to a constant as $n \rightarrow \infty$ for any fixed k . This is indeed seen in the explicit data, as indicated in Figure 4, with the asymptotic ratios predicted by the asymptotic formulae given in

Appendix D indicated on the right for $k=3, 4, 5$.

Although there is no large-rank limit for Lie algebras of type $\mathfrak{e}, \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}$, we have plotted the counting $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n$ against $!!n$ as only \mathfrak{e}_6 admits complex representations. The sequences that arise for $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_6}^n$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_7}^n$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_8}^n$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}_4}^n$, and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}_2}^n$ are quite interesting—indeed, they are enshrined in the OEIS [33] as [34–38], respectively.

Because \mathfrak{e}_6 ’s fundamental representation is not self-conjugate, it should not be terribly surprising that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_6}^n/(!!n)$ exceeds 1 for a limited range of multiplicities (with a maximum occurring, suggestively, at $n=27$); to be clear $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^n/(!n) < 1$ for all n , which is consistent with an always over-complete basis consisting of multi-traces over the fundamental representation’s generators. However, we have not been able to construct explicit these for $n=19$, say, to directly verify that multi-traces over the fundamental representation **27** truly span the space of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_6}^{19}=12\,702\,789\,216\,958\,134$ independent tensors.

At low multiplicity, these algebras have among the fewest independent colour-tensors. In particular, \mathfrak{e}_8 gauge theory requires the fewest of any algebra other than \mathfrak{a}_1 for $n < 10$. For $n=4$, this is true for all the exceptional algebras, each of which have only $5 = (!!4) - 1$ independent tensors, which we can understand through the relations (which we have checked directly):

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{e}_6: \quad & 12 \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2 \, 3 \, 4) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2) \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(3 \, 4) & \mathfrak{f}_4: \quad & 12 \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2 \, 3 \, 4) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2) \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(3 \, 4) \\ \mathfrak{e}_7: \quad & 24 \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2 \, 3 \, 4) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2) \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(3 \, 4) & \mathfrak{g}_2: \quad & 4 \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2 \, 3 \, 4) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2) \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(3 \, 4) \\ \mathfrak{e}_8: \quad & 100 \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2 \, 3 \, 4) = \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(1 \, 2) \operatorname{tr}_{\mathbf{F}}(3 \, 4); \end{aligned} \quad (3.30)$$

here, indices coloured red should be cyclically-symmetrized. Notice that applying this logic to the case of \mathfrak{e}_6 only works because, although its fundamental representation is *not* real, it is nevertheless true that its traces enjoy reflection symmetry through length 5 (and not beyond)—a fact which accounts for the absence of a d^{abc} tensor for \mathfrak{e}_6 [4].




Figure 4. Relative numbers of independent colour-tensors for \mathbf{ad}^n scattering in \mathfrak{c}_k vs. \mathfrak{b}_k .




Figure 5. \mathcal{C}_g^n relative to saturation numbers for all Lie algebras through rank 8.

4 Scattering of Gluons and Various Charged Matter

As soon as we turn our attention beyond the adjoint representation, there are never-ending combinations to be analyzed. It would be impossible to concisely describe all the combinations we have explored, and we do not even claim to have exhausted the ‘interesting’ cases. Part of the purpose of what we describe here is to invite the reader to play these games themselves. Besides any particular relevance to physics these surveys may have, we find a wealth of connections to interesting combinatoric structure, and it is reasonable to expect some of the sequences we have not yet identified may have an interesting and rich structure.

4.1 Counting the Colours of Gluons with *Fundamental*-Charged Matter

Let us begin our studies with the case of a single type of matter particle charged under the representation \mathbf{R} of \mathfrak{g} . For the scattering of q fermion lines and n gluons, the number of independent colour-tensors would be computed by

$$\mathcal{C}[\mathbf{ad}^n, (\mathbf{R}\overline{\mathbf{R}})^q] =: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{n,q}(\mathbf{R}) = m(\mathbf{ad}^{\otimes n} \otimes (\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}})^{\otimes q} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}). \quad (4.1)$$

It is a general fact that for any (non-trivial) irreducible representation, the tensor product $\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ decomposes into irreducible representations according to

$$\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus (\dots). \quad (4.2)$$

If we denote the combinations of irreducible representations (possibly with multiplicity) encoded by the ‘ (\dots) ’ above by ‘ \mathbf{Q} ’, we see on general grounds (by the associativity of the tensor product) that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{n,q}(\mathbf{R}) &= \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{n,q-1}(\mathbf{R}) + \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{n+1,q-1}(\mathbf{R}) + m(\mathbf{ad}^{\otimes n} \otimes (\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}})^{\otimes q-1} \otimes \mathbf{Q} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}) \\ &\geq \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{n,q-1}(\mathbf{R}) + \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}}^{n+1,q-1}(\mathbf{R}). \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

In particular, for the fundamental representations (defined in Table 1), we have⁹

$$\begin{aligned} \mathfrak{a}_k: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \\ \mathfrak{b}_k: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [\mathbf{k}(2\mathbf{k}+3)] \\ \mathfrak{c}_k: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [(\mathbf{k}-1)(2\mathbf{k}+1)] \\ \mathfrak{d}_k: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [(\mathbf{k}+1)(2\mathbf{k}-1)] \\ \mathfrak{e}_6: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [\mathbf{650}] \\ \mathfrak{e}_7: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [\mathbf{1463} \oplus \mathbf{1539}] \\ \mathfrak{e}_8: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [\mathbf{3875} \oplus \mathbf{27000} \oplus \mathbf{30380}] \\ \mathfrak{f}_4: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [\mathbf{F} \oplus \mathbf{273} \oplus \mathbf{324}] \\ \mathfrak{g}_2: \mathbf{F} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{F}} &= \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{ad} \oplus [\mathbf{F} \oplus \mathbf{27}] \end{aligned} \quad (4.4)$$

⁹Although one should generally avoid naming irreducible representations by their dimension alone, there are no ambiguities among those that appear here.

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
0	1	0	1	1	3	6	15	36	91
1	1	1	2	4	9	21	51	127	323
2	2	3	6	13	30	72	178	450	1,158
3	5	9	19	43	102	250	628	1,608	4,181
4	14	28	62	145	352	878	2,236	5,789	15,190
5	42	90	207	497	1,230	3,114	8,025	20,979	55,494
6	132	297	704	1,727	4,344	11,139	29,004	76,473	203,748
7	429	1,001	2,431	6,071	15,483	40,143	105,477	280,221	751,422
8	1,430	3,432	8,502	21,554	55,626	145,620	385,698	1,031,643	2,782,476
9	4,862	11,934	30,056	77,180	201,246	531,318	1,417,341	3,814,119	10,341,280
10	16,796	41,990	107,236	278,426	732,564	1,948,659	5,231,460	14,155,399	38,563,064

Table 3. $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$: Scattering $q \times \mathbf{2}$ -charged lines and $n \times \text{Adjoins}(\mathbf{3s})$ in \mathfrak{a}_1 gauge theory.

4.1.1 Scattering of Gluons and *Fundamental* Matter in \mathfrak{a} -Theories

Notice in particular that for the fundamental representation of \mathfrak{a}_k , the remainder ‘ \mathbf{Q} ’ does not exist. This is in fact the only irreducible representation of any Lie algebra which has this property, and leads to a very simple recurrence:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F}) = \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^{n,q-1}(\mathbf{F}) + \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^{n+1,q-1}(\mathbf{F}), \quad (4.5)$$

which is easily solved:

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F}) = \sum_{m=0}^q \binom{q}{m} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^{n+m}. \quad (4.6)$$

Let us consider the simplest example of charged matter in any non-abelian gauge theory: the fundamental (‘ $\mathbf{2}$ ’) of \mathfrak{su}_2 . The resulting numbers of independent colour-tensors are given in Table 3.

Notice that for $n=0$, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^{0,q}(\mathbf{F})$ is simply the q th *Catalan* number [39]! The second row is easily identified as the Motzkin numbers [40]. Each column of Table 3 is obtained by subtracting successive entries of the previous column. As such, we may call this a ‘*Catalan difference table*’.

The recursive structure obviously holds for all cases of fundamental matter in \mathfrak{a} -type gauge theories. In particular, it holds for the saturated case obtained in the limit of large rank. Defining

$$!(r, q) := \sum_{m=0}^q \binom{q}{m} !(n+m), \quad (4.7)$$

we may tabulate the large- k limit of $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_k}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$ directly. These numbers are given in Table 4. We already knew that in the large- k limit, $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_\infty}^{n,0}(\mathbf{F}) = !n$, but we can further read off from the table that $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_\infty}^{0,q}(\mathbf{F}) = q!$. Indeed, starting from either of these one may recursively fill in the rest of the table, leading to what is sometimes called *Euler’s difference table*, as given in Table 4.

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	1	2	9	44	265
1	1	1	3	11	53	309	2,119
2	2	4	14	64	362	2,428	18,806
3	6	18	78	426	2,790	21,234	183,822
4	24	96	504	3,216	24,024	205,056	1,965,624
5	120	600	3,720	27,240	229,080	2,170,680	22,852,200
6	720	4,320	30,960	256,320	2,399,760	25,022,880	287,250,480
7	5,040	35,280	287,280	2,656,080	27,422,640	312,273,360	3,884,393,520
8	40,320	322,560	2,943,360	30,078,720	339,696,000	4,196,666,880	56,255,149,440

Table 4. $!(n, q)$: large- k limit of scattering $q \times \mathbf{F}$ -charged lines and $n \times$ adjoints in \mathfrak{a}_k -theory.

These saturation numbers $!(n, q)$ provide a convenient reference-point in plotting the numbers of colour-tensors away from saturation (or for the exceptional algebras, where no notion of saturation exists). They are associated with the following exponential generating function in two variables:

$$!(n, q) \Leftrightarrow \text{EGF}(x, y) := \sum_{n, q} \frac{!(n, q)}{(n!)(q!)} x^n y^q = \frac{e^{-x}}{1-x-y}. \quad (4.8)$$

Also note that $!(1, q) = q(q!)$ and $!(2, q) = (q^2 + q + 1)(q!)$.

4.1.2 Scattering of Gluons and *Fundamental* Matter in $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}$ -Theories

Outside of the case of the fundamental representation of \mathfrak{a}_k , there is always some contribution(s) to $\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}}$ besides $\mathbf{1}$ and \mathbf{ad} . This prevents us from repeating the simple recursive construction of the \mathfrak{a}_k case: generally speaking, knowledge of the number of independent adjoint tensors is not sufficient to recursively construct the numbers for some alternative particle content. Nevertheless, we may calculate these numbers directly in the large-rank limit (where $\mathfrak{b}_k, \mathfrak{c}_k, \mathfrak{d}_k$ are again found to saturate identically) and collect the results in Table 5. We will again generalize the adjoint notation $!!n$ to $!!(n, q)$ in the obvious way (*defined* as the entries in Table 5). Amusingly, $\mathcal{C}_{(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d})_\infty}^{n, 0}(\mathbf{F}) = !!n$ and $\mathcal{C}_{(\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d})_\infty}^{0, q}(\mathbf{F}) = (2q - 1)!!$, justifying the notation.¹⁰

In spite of the lack of a recurrence and the diverse nature of the $\mathfrak{b}_k/\mathfrak{c}_k/\mathfrak{d}_k$ algebras, remarkably it turns out these numbers are *again* captured by a simple exponential generating function:

$$!!(n, q) \Leftrightarrow \text{EGF}(x, y) := \sum_{n, q} \frac{!!(n, q)}{(n!)(q!)} x^n y^q = \frac{e^{x^2/4 - x/2}}{\sqrt{1 - x - 2y}}. \quad (4.9)$$

Impressively, equations (4.8) and (4.9) compactly encode the number of independent colour-tensors involving *any* number of fundamental matter lines and adjoints at saturation for *any* of the classical Lie algebras in the limit of large-rank. The specific criteria for saturation for each of the classical Lie algebras is given in Table 6 below.

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	1	1	6	22	130
1	1	1	3	10	46	252	1,642
2	3	6	21	93	510	3,306	24,762
3	15	45	195	1,050	6,750	50,280	425,490
4	105	420	2,205	13,965	103,110	867,510	8,183,490
5	945	4,725	29,295	213,570	1,782,270	16,718,940	173,965,050
6	10,395	62,370	446,985	3,690,225	34,365,870	355,737,690	4,048,041,690
7	135,135	945,945	7,702,695	71,081,010	731,080,350	8,279,991,720	102,304,492,290

Table 5. $!!(n, q)$: large- k limit of scattering $q \times \mathbf{F}$ -lines and $n \times$ adjoints in $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}, \mathfrak{d}$ -theories.

algebra	saturates for:	$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathcal{C}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$
\mathfrak{a}_k	$k > n+q-2$	$!(n, q)$
\mathfrak{b}_k	$k > \frac{1}{2}(n+q)-1$	$!!(n, q)$
\mathfrak{c}_k	$k > \frac{1}{2}n+q-1$	$!!(n, q)$
\mathfrak{d}_k	$k > n+q$	$!!(n, q)$

Table 6. Saturation points for scattering of \mathbf{F} -matter and adjoints for classical algebras.

It is important to note that while $!!n < !n$, it is *not* true that $!!(n, q) < !(n, q)$ for all n and q . This is perhaps startling: in \mathfrak{a}_k -type gauge theory the expectation would be that multi-traces over fundamental generators (which are counted combinatorially) should suffice to describe colour-structures involving fundamental matter and adjoints, but *this can't be the whole story for the other classical Lie algebras*. If there were a combinatorial construction in terms of fundamental generators we would expect the same to apply to the other classical algebras: too many tensors due to (e.g.) dihedral symmetry amongst the traces is one thing, but not enough tensors is quite another. Since we may (for sufficiently large q) have an excess, $!!(n, q) > !(n, q)$, *multi-traces over fundamental generators alone can not be sufficient*. Analogous to the sub-saturation adjoint case for \mathfrak{d}_k discussed in section 3.2.2, there are necessarily tensors which can not be expressed in terms of multi-traces of the type familiar from \mathfrak{a}_k . It is not clear whether or not these additional tensors are generated at the perturbative level in specific theories, nor how they fit into the particular-charge-representation-agnostic colour-tensors described by [7–9] (albeit, limited to tree-level). We must postpone such explorations to future work.

Below saturation, little can be said without wading into algebra-specific analyses. Broadly speaking though, the deviation from saturation mirrors the adjoint case: $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$ exceeds $!!(n, q)$ with the excess reducing (eventually to 0) as rank increases, and $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_k}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F}) < \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_k}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$, both of which then saturate monotonically as rank increases, as may be seen from Figures 6 and 7 shown below. In Figure 7, we also show how increasing the number of fundamental particles has an effect very similar to shifting the counting in multiplicity.

¹⁰Also note that $(-1)!!=1$ is well-defined due to the recurrence $n!!=n(n-2)!!$




Figure 6. $C_g^{n,1}(\mathbf{F})$ for each of the Lie algebras $\mathfrak{b}, \mathfrak{c}$.




Figure 7. $C_{\mathfrak{d}_k}^{n,1}(\mathbf{F})$ for Lie algebras \mathfrak{d}_k through rank $k=8$, and for $q \leq 15$ for \mathfrak{d}_5 .

4.1.3 Scattering of Gluons and *Fundamental* Matter in $\mathfrak{e}, \mathfrak{f}, \mathfrak{g}$ -Theories

It is not *a priori* clear that comparing the exceptional algebras to the classical ones at large rank is at all well motivated. In the case of scattering only adjoint matter, there was some expectation that an (over-)complete basis should exist of multi-trace tensors built from their fundamental representation's generators, which would be of size $!n$ for \mathfrak{e}_6 and $!!n$ for all the others. But when considering multiple numbers of charged matter, it is not at all clear there should exist a simple (over-)complete basis of symbols that make sense for all algebras. Nevertheless, in plotting these numbers, say, it is useful to compare to *something* which grows (nearly) as rapidly. For this reason, in Figure 8 we have plotted $C_g^{n,1}(\mathbf{F})/(!!(n,1))$ to get some sense of their relative sizes.




Figure 8. $C_g^{n,1}(\mathbf{F})$ for each of the exceptional Lie algebras \mathfrak{e} , \mathfrak{f} , \mathfrak{g} .

One of the unique things about \mathfrak{e}_8 is that the fundamental *is* the adjoint, **248**. Nevertheless, if we are considering adjoint *matter* this is different from the pure-adjoint analysis due to the breaking of Bose-symmetry. In Figure 8 we see familiar features: the exceptionals have an ‘excess’ at low-multiplicities (they exceed the expectation from the classical algebras) and then fall off at higher multiplicity, just as in Figure 5. However, whereas in the adjoint case only \mathfrak{e}_6 exceeded $!n$, all exceptional algebras with one fundamental-charged line exceed $!(n, 1)$ for some range of n *except* the case of \mathfrak{g}_2 . On the subject of \mathfrak{g}_2 , it is interesting to note that for $n=100$ gluons, scattering with one fundamental-charged line involves *56 orders of magnitude fewer* colour tensors than the large-rank-saturated number $!(100, 1)$ (which is itself merely 4 times fewer than the case of $!(100, 1)$). It is perhaps unfair to read too deeply into this, however; after all, it is not clear that this is even close to an apples-to-apples comparison; but it suggests that is a dearth of interesting and ‘exceptional’ behaviour to be seen in the case of scattering matter in these gauge theories.

The above Figures are limited in that they only make the comparison for $q=1$. A more holistic comparison can be made from the data collected in Tables 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, which give the specific values of $C_g^{n,q}$ over modest ranges of adjoints and fundamental multiplicities.

Interestingly, $C_{\mathfrak{f}_4}^{0,q}(\mathbf{F})$ has *far* more colour-tensors than any other algebra (besides \mathfrak{e}_8). In particular, it is smaller than $C_{\mathfrak{e}_7}^{0,q}$ for all $q \leq 22$. Despite this low- q behavior, we expect on general grounds that all counting grows like a power of the dimension of the representation at large multiplicity; as such, we should not be surprised that the number of colours in $(\mathbf{56} \otimes \mathbf{56})^q$ for \mathfrak{e}_7 eventually exceeds that of $(\mathbf{52} \otimes \mathbf{52})^q$ for \mathfrak{f}_4 .

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	1	1	5	17	90
1	1	1	3	10	46	257	1,732
2	3	7	27	133	810	5,865	49,295
3	20	78	413	2,687	20,691	183,760	1,847,238
4	241	1,342	9,259	75,319	703,303	7,398,154	86,425,818
5	4,523	32,885	281,433	2,753,618	30,226,701	367,078,180	4,877,668,495
6	119,858	1,075,893	11,002,721	125,764,739	1,584,806,313	21,782,379,160	323,719,876,855

Table 7. $C_{\mathfrak{e}_6}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$: scattering $q \times \mathbf{F}$ -lines and $n \times$ adjoints in \mathfrak{e}_6 gauge theory.

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	1	1	5	16	80
1	1	1	3	10	45	242	1,547
2	4	9	34	163	958	6,645	53,236
3	35	130	665	4,180	31,045	265,590	2,571,732
4	546	2,912	19,446	153,572	1,394,422	14,288,220	162,987,390
5	13,467	94,995	794,682	7,630,080	82,445,844	988,740,710	13,021,697,870
6	483,340	4,272,070	43,265,320	491,758,550	6,185,350,940	85,192,166,432	1,274,173,103,012

Table 8. $C_{\mathfrak{e}_7}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$: scattering $q \times \mathbf{F}$ -lines and $n \times$ adjoints in \mathfrak{e}_7 gauge theory.

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	1	1	5	16	79
1	1	1	5	16	79	421	2,674
2	5	16	79	421	2,674	19,244	156,612
3	79	421	2,674	19,244	156,612	1,423,028	14,320,350
4	2,674	19,244	156,612	1,423,028	14,320,350	158,390,872	1,912,977,222
5	156,612	1,423,028	14,320,350	158,390,872	1,912,977,222	25,083,283,995	355,246,037,162

Table 9. $C_{\mathfrak{e}_8}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$: scattering $q \times \mathbf{F}$ -lines and $n \times$ adjoints in \mathfrak{e}_8 gauge theory.

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	1	1	5	16	80
1	1	1	3	10	46	256	1,721
2	5	12	47	236	1,466	10,816	92,358
3	70	280	1,505	9,920	77,163	689,300	6,930,735
4	1,820	10,192	70,301	569,681	5,276,607	54,772,326	627,593,687
5	70,875	508,305	4,273,773	40,920,243	437,523,898	5,147,588,746	65,870,361,350

Table 10. $C_{\mathfrak{f}_4}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$: scattering $q \times \mathbf{F}$ -lines and $n \times$ adjoints in \mathfrak{f}_4 gauge theory.

$q \backslash n$	0	1	2	3	4	5	6
0	1	0	1	1	5	16	80
1	1	1	3	10	45	236	1,421
2	4	9	33	151	817	4,984	33,357
3	35	120	545	2,932	17,827	118,945	854,135
4	455	2,002	10,626	64,078	425,194	3,041,241	23,115,050
5	7,413	38,640	230,720	1,521,300	10,833,879	82,083,517	654,527,565
6	140,833	831,600	5,446,078	38,606,096	291,542,694	2,319,076,187	19,268,675,895

Table 11. $C_{\mathfrak{g}_2}^{n,q}(\mathbf{F})$: scattering $q \times \mathbf{F}$ -lines and $n \times$ adjoints in \mathfrak{g}_2 gauge theory.

4.2 The Breakdown of the Large- N_c Limit for Some Charges of Matter

From the discussion thus far one may conclude that saturation is an inevitable feature for the large-rank limit of the classical algebras. This is however *not* the case. In the \mathfrak{a}_k case the saturation of gluons and fundamental matter follows simply from the recursive construction of the difference tables and the fact that the pure-adjoint case (empirically) saturates, but already this is somewhat mysterious and a perhaps spurious explanation, as for the other classical algebras saturation *does* occur despite the *lack* of a recursive construction.

A very simple prerequisite for ‘saturation’ of colour tensors to make sense in a theory with charged matter would be that

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} m_{\mathfrak{g}_k}((\mathbf{R} \otimes \overline{\mathbf{R}})^q \rightarrow \mathbf{1}) < \infty \quad (4.10)$$

for all q . If this limit did not exist, then taking the rank to be arbitrarily-large would require an unbounded number of *new* independent colour-tensors for amplitudes involving q matter lines charged in the representation \mathbf{R} .

From this point of view, it should be surprising that saturation exists for the fundamental representations of the classical Lie algebras. But as we have seen, these limits do empirically exist.

We suspect that a meaningful large-rank limit exists for all classical Lie algebras with matter charged under representations constructed from tensor-products of fundamental representations. But what about those representations *not* obtainable through tensor products of (what we have defined to be) the fundamental representations? There is only one kind of exception: the spinor representations of $\mathfrak{so}(n)$. It turns out that these *do not* saturate: we will see that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_k}^{0,2}(\mathbf{S}) &= k+1 \\ \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}^{0,2}(\mathbf{S}_{\pm}) &= \lceil (k+1)/2 \rceil ; \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

as such, no ‘large- N_c ’ limit should exist for $\mathfrak{so}(k)$ gauge theories for scattering amplitudes involving matter charged under spin-representations.

Amplitudes Involving Spinor Representations of \mathfrak{b}_k or \mathfrak{d}_k

In \mathfrak{d}_k there are two 2^{k-1} -dimensional representations which are the two spinor representations \mathbf{S}_{\pm} . We can consider spinors of similar or different chirality coupled to adjoints. Specifically, we will consider $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}[\mathbf{ad}^n, (\mathbf{S}_{\pm} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{\pm})^q]$. There is, however, a distinction for even and odd ranks we must address first. For $q=1$ and k even there is one $\mathbf{1}$ in \mathbf{S}_{\pm}^2 and none in $\mathbf{S}_{+} \otimes \mathbf{S}_{-}$, while for k odd there is one $\mathbf{1}$ in $\mathbf{S}_{+} \otimes \mathbf{S}_{-}$ and none in \mathbf{S}_{\pm}^2 . This is reflecting the fact that $\overline{\mathbf{S}}_{\pm} \simeq \mathbf{S}_{\pm}$ for k even and $\overline{\mathbf{S}}_{\pm} \simeq \mathbf{S}_{\mp}$ for k odd: spinor representations are real for k even and complex for k odd. For two spinors and n gluons one saturates to [A000985], *regardless* of rank.

Next, consider $q=2$. Empirically, we find $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_k}[(\mathbf{S}_{\pm} \overline{\mathbf{S}}_{\pm})^2] = \lceil (k+1)/2 \rceil$, which evidently grows *linearly* with rank and will never saturate. We can understand this

behaviour as follows (see *e.g.* [41] for the required background). We denote $\psi_\alpha \in \mathbf{S}_+$, $\psi_{\alpha'} \in \mathbf{S}_-$, $\psi^\alpha \in \overline{\mathbf{S}}_+$ and $\psi^{\alpha'} \in \overline{\mathbf{S}}_-$. For k even $\overline{\mathbf{S}}_\pm \simeq \mathbf{S}_\pm$ and therefore $C_{\alpha\beta}: \overline{\mathbf{S}}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_+$, which is sometimes called a *charge conjugation matrix*. We also have $C_{\alpha'\beta'}: \overline{\mathbf{S}}_- \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_-$. The Pauli matrices act as $(\sigma^\mu)_{\alpha'}^{\alpha}: \mathbf{S}_- \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_+$ and $(\bar{\sigma}^\mu)_{\alpha'}^{\alpha}: \mathbf{S}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_-$. A tensor product in $\mathbf{S}_+ \otimes \mathbf{S}_+$ has the tensor structure $M_{\alpha\beta}$ and can be decomposed in a basis consisting of

$$C_{\alpha\beta}, (\sigma^{[\mu_1} \bar{\sigma}^{\mu_2]} C)_{\alpha\beta}, \dots, (\sigma^{[\mu_1} \dots \bar{\sigma}^{\mu_k]} C)_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (4.12)$$

These representations have dimensions $1, \binom{2k}{2}, \dots, \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k}$. The last representation above, the rank k form, has dimension $\frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k}$ since a rank k form in a $2k$ -dimensional space is reducible and can be decomposed in a self-dual and anti-self-dual irreducibles.

Since $\dim(\mathbf{S}_\pm) = 2^{k-1}$, we have

$$(2^{k-1})^2 = 1 + \binom{2k}{2} + \dots + \binom{2k}{2k-2} + \frac{1}{2} \binom{2k}{k}.$$

Indeed, this identity follows from $(1+1)^{2k} = \sum_{n=0}^{2k} \binom{2k}{n}$, $(1-1)^{2k} = \sum_{n=0}^{2k} (-1)^n \binom{2k}{n}$ and $\binom{2k}{n} = \binom{2k}{2k-n}$. Note that there are $\frac{k}{2}+1$ terms in the decomposition of $\mathbf{S}_+ \otimes \mathbf{S}_+$. We can obtain all the invariants (number of independent tensors) of \mathbf{S}_+^4 by taking the decomposition of \mathbf{S}_+^2 and contracting it with the decomposition of \mathbf{S}_+^2 (there is only one way to do so). There are $\frac{k}{2}+1$ terms in the decomposition which yield the same number of tensors.

If k is odd then we have $C_{\alpha\alpha'}: \overline{\mathbf{S}}_- \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_+$ and $C_{\alpha'\alpha}: \overline{\mathbf{S}}_+ \rightarrow \mathbf{S}_-$. Then, a tensor product $\mathbf{S}_+ \otimes \mathbf{S}_+$ with index structure $M_{\alpha\beta}$ can be decomposed in a basis

$$(\sigma^{\mu_1} C)_{\alpha\beta}, (\sigma^{[\mu_1} \bar{\sigma}^{\mu_2} \sigma^{\mu_3]} C)_{\alpha\beta}, \dots, (\sigma^{[\mu_1} \bar{\sigma}^{\mu_2} \dots \sigma^{\mu_k]} C)_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (4.13)$$

There are $\frac{k+1}{2}$ terms in the decomposition. A similar counting holds for $\mathbf{S}_- \otimes \mathbf{S}_-$ with the tensor structure $M'_{\alpha'\beta'}$. It follows analogously that there are $\frac{k+1}{2}$ invariants in $\mathbf{S}_+^2 \mathbf{S}_-^2$. In this case we can also do the calculation by decomposing $(\mathbf{S}_+ \otimes \mathbf{S}_-)^2$ by using the associativity of the tensor product. The tensor product $\mathbf{S}_+ \otimes \mathbf{S}_-$ can be decomposed in a basis of

$$C_{\alpha\alpha'}, (\sigma^{[\mu_1} \bar{\sigma}^{\mu_2]} C)_{\alpha\alpha'}, \dots, (\sigma^{[\mu_1} \dots \bar{\sigma}^{\mu_{k-1}}] C)_{\alpha\alpha'}. \quad (4.14)$$

We again have $\frac{k+1}{2}$ independent tensors.

The above analysis was for \mathfrak{d}_k spinor representations, but a similar story holds for the $\mathbf{2}^k$ (real) spinor representation of \mathfrak{b}_k . In this case we find $\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_k}[\mathbf{S}^2] = k+1$, which again grows linearly with rank.

5 Open Problems for Future Work

In this work we have shown how representation theory algorithmically answers the question of how many colour-tensors appear in generic \mathfrak{g} -type gauge theory to all orders in perturbation theory. There are a number of refinements to the question which are deserving of follow-up.

5.1 Colour-Tensors Required in Perturbation Theory

We’ve already seen that for pure \mathfrak{su}_N gauge theory (and any other non-anomalous \mathfrak{a} -type gauge theory), this paper’s methodology over counts the number of independent colour-tensors. The kinematic coefficient to the d^{abc} tensor in pure Yang-Mills theory is zero to all loop-orders, and so despite there being two independent colour-tensors for \mathfrak{a}_k $n=3$ only one appears in the theory. This mirrors the discussion of the deranged traces vs. dihedrally-deranged traces at 4-points in section 3.1. One may wonder how many colour-tensors *actually appear* in a particular theory with specific matter content, where the counting herein should serve as an upper bound.

In the same vein, it would be extremely interesting to examine the *loop-dependence* on the number of colour-factors in a theory. At tree-level the DDM-basis is widely used and of size $(n-2)!$ but because the asymptotics of our counting are *exponential* and not factorial, at some point the number of colour-tensors *to all-orders* will be fewer than the number in the DDM basis at *tree-level*! We expect that low loop-orders will carve out subsets of the number of possible tensors and at a certain loop-order one will have generated all of the allowed colour-tensors, matching the counting in this work. We have already confirmed that this is the case in \mathfrak{su}_2 -type gauge theories, but more systematic study is needed. Studying that loop-dependence for different algebras, theories, and particle content is extremely interesting and will be a major part of our follow-up work.

5.2 Construction of Explicit Bases of Colour-Tensors

Bases of colour-tensors (perhaps over-complete) may be constructed in any number of ways: from traces of some single representation’s generators, from traces of multiple representations’ generators, from structure constants, etc. Each approach has its own advantages and disadvantages, but some of the weaknesses of the existing approaches motivate us to seek an alternative. First, the over-completeness of the bases should be remedied. The fact that the true size of the basis is unknown seems a remarkable gap in our understanding. Second, an orthogonalization of the tensors would prove immensely (and practically) useful. This would allow one to ‘project out’ gauge-invariant pieces of the amplitude trivially, amongst other desirable features. From a computational complexity perspective it reduces the calculation of colour-summed cross-sections substantially since there is no ‘colour-screening’, which for large multiplicity becomes significant; one need only consider the diagonal terms. Many of our methods are amenable to very high-multiplicity calculations, and it would be interesting to pursue this.

So far we have simply stated the benefits of an orthogonal and minimal basis, but a more representation theoretic critique is that it is not always obvious what objects should be used to construct the tensors. This is especially true when considering exotic matter. In the case of a trace basis, there is the perennial question of which representation's generators we are using. And when is it possible to write all tensors in terms of traces of a *single* representation? These are not straightforward questions to answer and we wish to sidestep them entirely by having some more canonical way of generating tensors, something more inherent to the algebras and representations involved in a process.

A new basis is only as good as it is usable, so there will be a few challenges to address: we will have to detail how to construct the tensors in a way that is adaptable to any algebra and representation, we will have to describe how to project between the new and existing bases, and we will have to describe any interesting structure or relations satisfied by the tensors so-constructed (of which there will be an abundance!). That story goes well beyond the bounds of this present work, and so we delay further discussion of these interesting topics to [42].

Acknowledgments

The authors gratefully acknowledge fruitful conversations with JJ Carrasco and Mark Spradlin. This work was supported in part by a grant from the US Department of Energy (No. DE-SC00019066).

A Multiplicities of Tensor Products' Decompositions

Consider any simple Lie algebra \mathfrak{g} of rank k with irreducible representations labelled by Dynkin indices $\vec{w} \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 0}^k$. For any three irreducible representations labelled by $\{\vec{w}_a, \vec{w}_b, \vec{w}_c\}$, let m^{ab}_c denote the *multiplicity* of the irreducible representation \mathbf{c} in the decomposition of the tensor product $\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}$. That is,

$$\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b} =: \mathbf{c}^{\oplus m^{ab}_c} \oplus \dots =: (m^{ab}_c) \mathbf{c} \oplus \dots \quad (\text{A.1})$$

(Note that we have allowed ourselves the (very slight) abuse of notation: $r \mathbf{c} := \mathbf{c}^{\oplus r}$.) In terms of this, the complete tensor product decomposition of $\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}$ could be written

$$\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b} = \bigoplus_c m^{ab}_c \mathbf{c}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

It is worth noting that this sum involves at most a finite number of terms.

Associativity of the tensor product allows us to write

$$\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b} \otimes \mathbf{c} = (\mathbf{a} \otimes \mathbf{b}) \otimes \mathbf{c} = \bigoplus_{\mathbf{d}} \left[\sum_* m^{ab}_* m^{*c}_d \right] \mathbf{d} =: \bigoplus_{\mathbf{d}} m^{abc}_d \mathbf{d} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with the obvious generalization to an arbitrary number of indices.

The numbers $m^{a \cdots b}_c$ is fully symmetric (by the definition of the tensor product) in $\{a, \dots, b\}$ but not generally symmetric under permutations involving the final index c . Let us define fully symmetric tensors

$$m^{a \cdots b} := m^{a \cdots b}_1, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

where we have used $\vec{w}_1 = [0, \dots, 0]$ to denote the trivial representation. The two-index tensor is especially interesting:

$$m^{ab} := m^{ab}_1 = \begin{cases} 1 & \mathbf{a} = \bar{\mathbf{b}} \\ 0 & \text{else.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

as it defines a non-degenerate bilinear form (a ‘*metric*’) on the space of irreducible representations, and can be used (in the physicists’ vernacular) to ‘raise/lower’ indices. Indeed, using (A.3) we see that

$$m^{abc} = m^{ab}_* m^{*c} := \sum_* m^{ab}_* m^{*c}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

where we have now made use of the summation convention: repeated indices should always be summed (unless stated otherwise).

In this work, we have primarily been interested in the multiplicity of $\mathbf{1}$ in the tensor products of representations relevant to coloured scattering amplitudes—namely, $\mathbf{ad}(\mathfrak{g})^{\otimes n} \bigotimes_i (\mathbf{R}_i \otimes \bar{\mathbf{R}}_i)^{\otimes m_i}$ which would encode the colour-dependence of amplitudes involving n gluons and m_i lines of Fermions transforming in the representation \mathbf{R}_i .

The analysis above naturally suggests that the ways in which these numbers can be recursively computed in terms of just the fundamental three index objects m^{ab}_c —and in many different ways. However one chooses to recursively compute them, we end up with terms being counted by products of m ’s, and summing over all the possible irreducible representations that connect them.

Such a sum is extremely reminiscent of the colour tensors generated by products of structure constants arising from the scattering of gluons. However, in our counting game, we always end with a trivalent *tree* graph—with the edges labeling irreducible representations of the algebra.

Associating these with tensors constructed from the actual representations involved turns out to immediately translate this counting exercise into an *explicit construction of independent tensors*. These tensors turn out to have many remarkable properties (such as orthogonality), as we describe in the forthcoming work [42].

B Decomposing Tensor Products into Irreducible Reps

To decompose the tensor products into irreducible representations we can use the Racah-Speiser algorithm¹¹ (see ref. [44, 45]), which works as follows. Consider two representations R_{Λ_1} and R_{Λ_2} with highest weights Λ_1, Λ_2 . Then we have

$$R_{\Lambda_1} \otimes R_{\Lambda_2} = \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \text{wt } R_{\Lambda_2}} R_{\Lambda_1 + \lambda} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

and the sum is over the weights of the representation R_{Λ_2} including multiplicities; the same construction can be done by swapping R_{Λ_1} and R_{Λ_2} .

Sometimes when adding $\Lambda_1 + \lambda$ we do not obtain a valid highest weight since some of the entries of the weight vector become negative. In that case the algorithm instructs us to reflect by an element of the Weyl group such that the entries are positive. For such representations we have

$$R_{\Lambda} = \text{sign}(w) R_{w \cdot \Lambda}, \quad (\text{B.2})$$

for w in the Weyl group of the Lie algebra. The dot action is defined by

$$w \cdot \Lambda = w(\Lambda + \rho) - \rho, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where ρ is the Weyl vector

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha > 0} \alpha, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

which is the sum of positive roots.

We illustrate the procedure on a few examples. \mathfrak{su}_3 has Cartan matrix

$$C := \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

and a reflection w_i acts via

$$w_i[\dots, \lambda_j, \dots] = [\dots, \lambda_j - \lambda_i C_{ij}, \dots]. \quad (\text{B.6})$$

For the adjoint we have

$$\text{wt}(\mathbf{ad}) = \{[1, 1], [-1, 2], [2, -1], [0, 0]^2, [1, -2], [-2, 1], [-1, -1]\}, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where the weight $[0, 0]$ occurs with multiplicity 2.

So the calculation we need to do is to start with some dots in the positive Weyl chamber (which are the vectors with positive Dynkin labels) and start with initial condition that the weight at $[1, 1]$ has multiplicity one and the rest zero. Then add all the weights of the adjoint to it and reflect (or fold over) in the hyperplanes orthogonal

¹¹Sometimes also attributed to Brauer, Klimyk and Steinberg (see ref. [43]).

to α_1 and α_2 and passing through $-\rho$ where ρ is the Weyl vector. If we do an odd number of reflections, subtract the multiplicities otherwise add. Repeat as many times as necessary.

We have $\mathbf{ad} = R_{[1,1]}$. Let us apply the Racah-Speiser algorithm to decomposing $\mathbf{ad} \otimes \mathbf{ad}$. We need to compute $R_{[1,1]} \otimes R_{[1,1]}$. Adding all the weights of $R_{[1,1]}$ we find

$$R_{[1,1]} \otimes R_{[1,1]} = R_{[2,2]} \oplus R_{[0,3]} \oplus R_{[3,0]} \oplus R_{[1,1]}^{\oplus 2} \oplus R_{[-1,2]} \oplus R_{[2,-1]} \oplus R_{[0,0]}. \quad (\text{B.8})$$

The weights $[-1, 2]$ and $[2, -1]$ are outside the positive Weyl chamber so we need to reflect them. Since $s_1 \cdot [-1, 2] = [-1, 2]$ so we have $R_{[-1,2]} = -R_{[-1,2]}$ which implies that $R_{[-1,2]} = 0$. Similarly, $R_{[2,-1]} = 0$. In the end, we have

$$R_{[1,1]} \otimes R_{[1,1]} = R_{[2,2]} \oplus R_{[0,3]} \oplus R_{[3,0]} \oplus R_{[1,1]}^{\oplus 2} \oplus R_{[0,0]}. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

The root system of \mathfrak{g}_2 can be conveniently described inside \mathbb{R}^3 . We have the following roots $\pm(e_i - e_j)$ for $i < j$ (short roots) and $\pm(2e_i - e_j - e_k)$ for i, j, k all different (long roots).

The simple roots are $\alpha_1 = e_1 - e_2$ and $\alpha_2 = -2e_1 + e_2 + e_3$. We have $\alpha_1^2 = 2$, $\alpha_2^2 = 6$ and $\alpha_1 \cdot \alpha_2 = -3$. The Cartan matrix is

$$C_{ij} = \alpha_i \cdot \alpha_j^\vee = \begin{pmatrix} 2 & -1 \\ -3 & 2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{B.10})$$

The six positive roots can be written in terms of the simple roots as follows

$$e_1 - e_2 = \alpha_1, \quad (\text{B.11})$$

$$e_3 - e_1 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \quad (\text{B.12})$$

$$e_3 - e_2 = 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \quad (\text{B.13})$$

$$2e_1 - e_2 - e_3 = \alpha_2, \quad (\text{B.14})$$

$$-(2e_2 - e_1 - e_3) = 3\alpha_1 + \alpha_2, \quad (\text{B.15})$$

$$2e_3 - e_1 - e_2 = 3\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2. \quad (\text{B.16})$$

In terms of fundamental weights we have

$$\alpha_1 = 2\omega_1 - \omega_2, \alpha_2 = -3\omega_1 + 2\omega_2. \quad (\text{B.17})$$

The highest root is

$$\theta = 3\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 = \omega_2. \quad (\text{B.18})$$

In this basis the positive roots above read

$$e_1 - e_2 = \alpha_1 = 2\omega_1 - \omega_2, \quad (\text{B.19})$$

$$e_3 - e_1 = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = -\omega_1 + \omega_2, \quad (\text{B.20})$$

$$e_3 - e_2 = 2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = \omega_1, \quad (\text{B.21})$$

$$2e_1 - e_2 - e_3 = \alpha_2 = -3\omega_1 + 2\omega_2, \quad (\text{B.22})$$

$$-(2e_2 - e_1 - e_3) = 3\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 = 3\omega_1 - \omega_2, \quad (\text{B.23})$$

$$2e_3 - e_1 - e_2 = 3\alpha_1 + 2\alpha_2 = \omega_2. \quad (\text{B.24})$$

The weights in the adjoint representation are therefore $[2, -1]$, $[-1, 1]$, $[1, 0]$, $[-3, 2]$, $[3, -1]$, $[0, 1]$, $[0, 0]$ twice and then the negatives of the above.

Then, the Racah-Speiser theorem implies that

$$[0, 1] \otimes [0, 1] = [2, 0] \oplus [-1, 2] \oplus [1, 1] \oplus [-3, 3] \oplus [3, 0] \oplus [0, 2] \oplus [0, 1]^{\oplus 2} \oplus [-2, 2] \oplus [1, 0] \oplus [-1, 1] \oplus [3, -1] \oplus [-3, 2] \oplus [0, 0]. \quad (\text{B.25})$$

We can immediately drop the terms $[-1, 2]$, $[-1, 1]$ and $[3, -1]$. Next, we need to reflect $[-3, 3]$, $[-2, 2]$ and $[-3, 2]$. We have

$$s_1 \cdot [-3, 3] = s_1([-2, 4]) - [1, 1] = [2, 2] - [1, 1] = [1, 1], \quad (\text{B.26})$$

$$s_1 \cdot [-2, 2] = s_1([-1, 3]) - [1, 1] = [1, 2] - [1, 1] = [0, 1], \quad (\text{B.27})$$

$$s_1 \cdot [-3, 2] = s_1([-2, 3]) - [1, 1] = [2, 1] - [1, 1] = [1, 0]. \quad (\text{B.28})$$

Here we have used the fact that

$$s_1([\lambda_1, \lambda_2]) = [-\lambda_1, \lambda_1 + \lambda_2], \quad (\text{B.29})$$

$$s_2([\lambda_1, \lambda_2]) = [\lambda_1 + 3\lambda_2, -\lambda_2]. \quad (\text{B.30})$$

In the end we have

$$[0, 1] \otimes [0, 1] = [2, 0] \oplus [1, 1] \oplus [1, 1] \oplus [3, 0] \oplus [0, 2] \oplus [0, 1]^{\oplus 2} \oplus [0, 1] \oplus [1, 0] \oplus [1, 0] \oplus [0, 0] \quad (\text{B.31})$$

which simplifies to

$$[0, 1] \otimes [0, 1] = [2, 0] \oplus [3, 0] \oplus [0, 2] \oplus [0, 1] \oplus [0, 0]. \quad (\text{B.32})$$

C Numbers of Colour-Factors for Low Multiplicity/Ranks

In the tables below we list the number of colour-structures for pure glue, for a given algebra and a given number of external lines (see Tables 12, 13, 14, 15). We list several numbers for each such combination. The number of colour-structures is in black with the digits which coincide with the saturation value at high rank in red. In parentheses and in light blue we list the difference between the saturation value (at high rank) and the actual number of colour-structures. When saturation is reached we colour the number in grey and the difference is zero (denoted by (0)). For the \mathfrak{d} -type algebras (see Table 15), where these differences are negative for low ranks, we denote the excess using bared numbers.

Table 12. Number of independent colour-tensors for scattering n adjoints for \mathfrak{a}_k gauge theory.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
\mathfrak{a}_1	1 (1)	3 (6)	6 (38)	15 (250)	36 (1 818)	91 (14 742)	232 (133 264)	603 (1 334 358)	1 585 (14 682 985)	4 213 (176 210 628)	11 298 (2 290 781 634)	30 537 (32 071 070 512)	83 097 (481 066 432 637)	227 475 (7 697 064 024 270)
\mathfrak{a}_2	2 (0)	8 (1)	32 (12)	145 (120)	702 (1 152)	3 598 (11 235)	19 280 (114 216)	107 160 (1 227 801)	614 000 (14 070 570)	3 609 760 (172 605 081)	21 695 104 (2 269 097 828)	132 904 369 (31 938 196 680)	827 888 726 (480 238 627 008)	5 233 650 530 (7 691 830 601 215)
\mathfrak{a}_3	2 (0)	9 (0)	43 (1)	245 (20)	1 557 (297)	10 829 (4 004)	80 958 (52 538)	642 501 (692 460)	5 361 480 (9 323 090)	46 696 221 (129 518 620)	422 007 732 (1 868 785 200)	3 938 661 909 (28 132 439 140)	37 816 969 778 (443 249 545 956)	372 341 406 885 (7 324 722 844 860)
\mathfrak{a}_4	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	264 (1)	1 824 (30)	14 210 (623)	122 224 (11 272)	1 142 316 (192 645)	11 455 096 (3 229 474)	122 026 091 (54 188 750)	1 369 847 340 (920 945 592)	16 100 473 012 (15 970 628 037)	197 077 161 064 (283 989 354 670)	2 501 141 736 192 (5 195 922 515 553)
\mathfrak{a}_5	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 853 (1)	14 791 (42)	132 332 (1 164)	1 307 727 (27 234)	14 096 615 (587 955)	163 991 773 (12 223 068)	2 040 284 966 (250 507 966)	26 938 206 217 (5 132 894 832)	374 983 490 861 (106 083 024 873)	5 472 765 013 375 (2 224 299 238 370)
\mathfrak{a}_6	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 832 (1)	133 440 (56)	1 332 963 (1 998)	14 625 870 (58 700)	174 653 633 (1 561 208)	2 251 415 172 (39 377 760)	31 104 217 222 (966 883 827)	457 582 452 788 (23 484 062 946)	7 127 003 506 050 (570 060 745 695)
\mathfrak{a}_7	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 495 (1)	1 334 889 (72)	14 681 355 (3 215)	176 098 989 (115 852)	2 287 073 367 (3 719 565)	31 959 308 901 (111 792 148)	477 830 881 535 (3 235 634 199)	7 605 276 269 865 (91 787 981 880)
\mathfrak{a}_8	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 960 (1)	14 684 480 (90)	176 209 924 (4 917)	2 290 579 728 (213 204)	32 062 974 541 (8 126 508)	480 779 776 862 (286 738 872)	7 687 412 829 190 (9 651 422 555)
\mathfrak{a}_9	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 961 (0)	14 684 569 (1)	176 214 731 (110)	2 290 785 714 (7 218)	32 070 730 367 (370 682)	481 049 973 894 (16 541 840)	7 696 387 525 299 (676 726 446)
\mathfrak{a}_{10}	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 961 (0)	14 684 570 (0)	176 214 840 (1)	2 290 792 800 (132)	32 071 090 805 (10 244)	481 065 900 910 (614 824)	7 697 032 506 000 (31 745 745)
\mathfrak{a}_{11}	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 961 (0)	14 684 570 (0)	176 214 841 (0)	2 290 792 931 (1)	32 071 100 893 (156)	481 066 501 601 (14 133)	7 697 063 271 645 (980 100)
\mathfrak{a}_{12}	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 961 (0)	14 684 570 (0)	176 214 841 (0)	2 290 792 932 (0)	32 071 101 048 (1)	481 066 515 552 (182)	7 697 064 232 710 (19 035)
\mathfrak{a}_{13}	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 961 (0)	14 684 570 (0)	176 214 841 (0)	2 290 792 932 (0)	32 071 101 049 (0)	481 066 515 733 (1)	7 697 064 251 535 (210)
\mathfrak{a}_{14}	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 961 (0)	14 684 570 (0)	176 214 841 (0)	2 290 792 932 (0)	32 071 101 049 (0)	481 066 515 734 (0)	7 697 064 251 744 (1)
\mathfrak{a}_{15}	2 (0)	9 (0)	44 (0)	265 (0)	1 854 (0)	14 833 (0)	133 496 (0)	1 334 961 (0)	14 684 570 (0)	176 214 841 (0)	2 290 792 932 (0)	32 071 101 049 (0)	481 066 515 734 (0)	7 697 064 251 745 (0)

Table 13. Number of independent colour-tensors for scattering n adjoints for \mathfrak{b}_k gauge theory.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
\mathfrak{b}_2	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	115 (15)	611 (211)	3 556 (2 646)	21 716 (30 836)	138 882 (360 312)	921 230 (4 317 140)	6 305 684 (53 917 160)	44 334 006 (708 253 758)	319 045 025 (9 838 900 019)	2 343 236 105 (144 923 944 403)	17 522 447 360 (2 264 832 720 700)
\mathfrak{b}_3	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 111 (91)	50 052 (2 500)	447 183 (52 011)	4 279 707 (958 663)	43 399 323 (16 823 521)	462 212 754 (290 375 010)	5 135 616 863 (5 022 328 181)	59 215 620 779 (88 051 559 729)	705 541 112 331 (1 576 814 055 729)
\mathfrak{b}_4	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	498 591 (603)	5 210 715 (27 655)	59 344 098 (878 746)	728 810 658 (23 777 106)	9 564 530 430 (593 414 614)	133 066 760 584 (14 200 419 924)	1 949 272 050 600 (333 083 117 460)
\mathfrak{b}_5	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 218 631 (4 213)	752 295 328 (292 436)	10 144 664 127 (13 280 917)	146 769 394 114 (497 786 394)	2 265 547 792 695 (16 807 375 365)
\mathfrak{b}_6	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 222 844 (0)	752 587 764 (0)	10 157 914 507 (30 537)	147 264 181 771 (2 998 737)	2 282 170 099 110 (185 068 950)
\mathfrak{b}_7	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 222 844 (0)	752 587 764 (0)	10 157 945 044 (0)	147 267 180 508 (0)	2 282 354 940 585 (227 475)
\mathfrak{b}_8	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 222 844 (0)	752 587 764 (0)	10 157 945 044 (0)	147 267 180 508 (0)	2 282 355 168 060 (0)

Table 14. Number of independent colour-tensors for scattering n adjoints for \mathfrak{c}_k gauge theory.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
\mathfrak{c}_2	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	115 (15)	611 (211)	3 556 (2 646)	21 716 (30 836)	138 882 (360 312)	921 230 (4 317 140)	6 305 684 (53 917 160)	44 334 006 (708 253 758)	319 045 025 (9 838 900 019)	2 343 236 105 (144 923 944 403)	17 522 447 360 (2 264 832 720 700)
\mathfrak{c}_3	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 097 (105)	49 716 (2 836)	441 513 (57 681)	4 197 240 (1 041 130)	42 279 897 (17 942 947)	447 494 622 (305 093 142)	4 944 379 817 (5 213 565 227)	56 731 920 560 (90 535 259 948)	673 084 351 995 (1 609 270 816 065)
\mathfrak{c}_4	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	498 249 (945)	5 196 789 (41 581)	58 964 994 (1 257 850)	720 151 722 (32 436 042)	9 383 818 899 (774 126 145)	129 474 626 610 (17 792 553 898)	1 879 661 849 940 (402 693 318 120)
\mathfrak{c}_5	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 212 449 (10 395)	751 912 088 (675 676)	10 129 431 481 (28 513 563)	146 273 931 146 (993 249 362)	2 251 095 856 625 (31 259 311 435)
\mathfrak{c}_6	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 222 844 (0)	752 587 764 (0)	10 157 809 909 (135 135)	147 255 018 357 (12 162 151)	2 281 672 060 530 (683 107 530)
\mathfrak{c}_7	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 222 844 (0)	752 587 764 (0)	10 157 945 044 (0)	147 267 180 508 (0)	2 282 353 141 035 (2 027 025)
\mathfrak{c}_8	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6 202 (0)	52 552 (0)	499 194 (0)	5 238 370 (0)	60 222 844 (0)	752 587 764 (0)	10 157 945 044 (0)	147 267 180 508 (0)	2 282 355 168 060 (0)

Table 15. Number of independent colour-tensors for scattering n adjoints for \mathfrak{d}_k gauge theory.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
\mathfrak{d}_4	1 (0)	7 (1)	28 (6)	185 (55)	1278 (456)	10388 (4186)	92704 (40152)	905964 (406770)	9534595 (4296225)	107083669 (46860825)	1272659964 (520072200)	15899798941 (5741853897)	207654466894 (60387286386)	2821860438960 (539505270900)
\mathfrak{d}_5	1 (0)	6 (0)	23 (1)	140 (10)	942 (120)	7553 (1351)	68555 (16003)	696357 (197163)	7786135 (2547765)	94703257 (34480413)	1240514709 (487926945)	17356139333 (7198194289)	257584751585 (110317571077)	4031527438905 (1749172270845)
\mathfrak{d}_6	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	131 (1)	837 (15)	6433 (231)	55892 (3340)	548370 (49176)	5980772 (742402)	71826590 (11603746)	940910184 (188322420)	13335581935 (3177636891)	203007925568 (55740745060)	3298059152784 (1015703984724)
\mathfrak{d}_7	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	823 (1)	6223 (21)	52958 (406)	506475 (7281)	5368160 (129790)	62561972 (2339128)	795709272 (43121508)	10975604822 (817659778)	163263086525 (15995906017)	2605674726375 (323319558315)
\mathfrak{d}_8	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6203 (1)	52580 (28)	499860 (666)	5252825 (14455)	60528710 (305866)	759046932 (6459168)	10295977016 (138031972)	150274817102 (3007636594)	2349474292770 (67119124710)
\mathfrak{d}_9	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52553 (1)	499230 (36)	5239405 (1035)	60249530 (26686)	753247710 (659946)	10174043204 (16098160)	147660752792 (393572284)	2292088552215 (9733384155)
\mathfrak{d}_{10}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499195 (1)	5238415 (45)	60224384 (1540)	752634240 (46476)	10159271447 (1326403)	147304127432 (36946924)	2283377761815 (1022593755)
\mathfrak{d}_{11}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499194 (0)	5238371 (1)	60222899 (55)	752589975 (2211)	10158022199 (77155)	147269695034 (2514526)	2282434392843 (79224783)
\mathfrak{d}_{12}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499194 (0)	5238370 (0)	60222845 (1)	752587830 (66)	10157948125 (3081)	147267303554 (123046)	2282359706595 (4538535)
\mathfrak{d}_{13}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499194 (0)	5238370 (0)	60222844 (0)	752587765 (1)	10157945122 (78)	147267184694 (4186)	2282355357705 (189645)
\mathfrak{d}_{14}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499194 (0)	5238370 (0)	60222844 (0)	752587764 (0)	10157945045 (1)	147267180599 (91)	2282355173625 (5565)
\mathfrak{d}_{15}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499194 (0)	5238370 (0)	60222844 (0)	752587764 (0)	10157945044 (0)	147267180509 (1)	2282355168165 (105)
\mathfrak{d}_{16}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499194 (0)	5238370 (0)	60222844 (0)	752587764 (0)	10157945044 (0)	147267180508 (0)	2282355168061 (1)
\mathfrak{d}_{17}	1 (0)	6 (0)	22 (0)	130 (0)	822 (0)	6202 (0)	52552 (0)	499194 (0)	5238370 (0)	60222844 (0)	752587764 (0)	10157945044 (0)	147267180508 (0)	2282355168060 (0)

Table 16. Number of independent colour-tensors for scattering n adjoints for \mathfrak{e}_k , \mathfrak{f}_4 or \mathfrak{g}_2 gauge theory.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16
\mathfrak{e}_6	1 (0)	5 (1)	17 (5)	90 (40)	542 (280)	3 962 (2 240)	33 554 (18 998)	324 489 (174 705)	3 520 885 (1 717 485)	42 300 709 (17 922 135)	556 530 474 (196 057 290)	7 945 317 484 (2 212 627 560)	122 145 525 208 (25 121 655 300)	2 008 827 010 000 (273 528 158 060)
\mathfrak{e}_7	1 (0)	5 (1)	16 (6)	80 (50)	436 (386)	2 877 (3 325)	21 828 (30 724)	189 877 (309 317)	1 865 175 (3 373 195)	20 468 437 (39 754 407)	248 376 198 (504 211 566)	3 303 397 123 (6 854 547 921)	47 785 692 843 (99 481 487 665)	746 841 034 620 (1 535 514 133 440)
\mathfrak{e}_8	1 (0)	5 (1)	16 (6)	79 (51)	421 (401)	2 674 (3 528)	19 244 (33 308)	156 612 (342 582)	1 423 028 (3 815 342)	14 320 350 (45 902 494)	158 390 872 (594 196 892)	1 912 977 222 (8 244 967 822)	25 083 283 995 (122 183 896 513)	355 246 037 162 (1 927 109 130 898)
\mathfrak{g}_2	1 (0)	5 (1)	16 (6)	80 (50)	436 (386)	2 786 (3 416)	19 538 (33 014)	147 771 (351 423)	1 182 095 (4 056 275)	9 890 463 (50 332 381)	85 866 068 (666 721 696)	769 212 600 (9 388 732 444)	7 080 642 324 (140 186 538 184)	66 754 295 740 (2 215 600 872 320)
\mathfrak{f}_4	1 (0)	5 (1)	16 (6)	80 (50)	436 (386)	2 891 (3 311)	22 248 (30 304)	198 774 (300 420)	2 029 140 (3 209 230)	23 310 386 (36 912 458)	296 407 466 (456 180 298)	4 109 654 354 (6 048 290 690)	61 348 443 380 (85 918 737 128)	976 111 067 870 (1 306 244 100 190)

D Asymptotic Growth of Colour-Factors for Large n

In ref. [46], Biane has computed the asymptotic expansion in n of the multiplicity of R_μ in the decomposition of $R_\lambda^{\otimes n}$. In ref. [47], theorem 8, a more detailed explanation of the terms in Biane's formula is given. Ref. [47] uses the notation A for the Biane's quadratic form q . We adopt their notation below. We have

$$A_\lambda = \frac{1}{\dim R_\lambda} \sum_{\mu \in \text{wt}(R_\lambda)} m_\mu \mu \otimes \mu, \quad (\text{D.1})$$

where R_λ is the irreducible representation with highest weight λ , $\text{wt}(R_\lambda)$ is the set of weights of the representation R_λ , m_μ is the multiplicity of the weight μ . We denote by P the weight lattice. Since $\mu \in P \subset \mathfrak{h}^*$, we can think of it as a map $\mathfrak{h}^* \otimes \mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ or, in matrix form, as a linear map $\mathfrak{h}^* \rightarrow \mathfrak{h}$. We can express the weights in a basis of fundamental weights ω with integer coefficients:

$$A_\lambda = \sum_{i,j} (A_\lambda)_{ij} \omega_i \otimes \omega_j \quad (\text{D.2})$$

where

$$(A_\lambda)_{ij} = \frac{1}{\dim R_\lambda} \sum_{\mu \in \text{wt}(R_\lambda)} m_\mu \mu(\alpha_i^\vee) \mu(\alpha_j^\vee). \quad (\text{D.3})$$

For the inverse we have

$$A_\lambda^{-1} = \sum_{k,l} (A_\lambda^{-1})_{kl} \alpha_k^\vee \otimes \alpha_l^\vee. \quad (\text{D.4})$$

Then, we have

$$\text{mult}(R_\mu, R_\lambda^{\otimes n}) = \frac{|\Pi(G)| (\dim R_\lambda)^n (\dim R_\mu) \prod_{\alpha > 0} \langle A_\lambda^{-1} \alpha, \rho \rangle}{\sqrt{\det A_\lambda} (2\pi)^{\text{rank } G/2} n^{\dim G/2}} \left(\exp(-\langle A_\lambda^{-1}(\mu + \rho), \mu + \rho \rangle / (2n)) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}) \right), \quad (\text{D.5})$$

where $\Pi(G)$ is the determinant of the Cartan matrix of the Lie algebra of G .

For $\lambda = \theta$, when we are dealing with the adjoint representation, we have

$$(A_\theta)_{ij} = \frac{1}{\dim \mathfrak{g}} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} \alpha(\alpha_i^\vee) \alpha(\alpha_j^\vee). \quad (\text{D.6})$$

We know that (see ref. [20, eqs. 13.174, 13.184])

$$(\lambda, \mu) = \frac{1}{2g^\vee} \sum_{\alpha \in \Delta} (\lambda, \alpha)(\alpha, \mu), \quad (\text{D.7})$$

where g^\vee is the dual Coxeter number.¹² Using this we find

¹²The dual Coxeter number is defined as follows. If θ is the highest root, then decompose it as $\theta = \sum_i a_i^\vee \alpha_i^\vee$ and $g^\vee := 1 + \sum_i a_i^\vee$. The Coxeter number is $g := 1 + \sum_i a_i$ where $\theta = \sum_i a_i \alpha_i$.

$$(A_\theta)_{ij} = \frac{2g^\vee}{\dim \mathfrak{g}} (\alpha_i^\vee, \alpha_j^\vee). \quad (\text{D.8})$$

Since ω_i is the dual basis to α_j^\vee , we have that

$$(A_\theta^{-1})_{ij} = \frac{\dim \mathfrak{g}}{2g^\vee} (\omega_i, \omega_j). \quad (\text{D.9})$$

If $\lambda=\theta$ and $\mu=0$ we have for the quantity in the exponent

$$\langle A_\lambda^{-1}(\mu+\rho), \mu+\rho \rangle = (A_\theta^{-1})_{ij} \rho_i \rho_j = \frac{\dim \mathfrak{g}}{2g^\vee} |\rho|^2. \quad (\text{D.10})$$

Next, we can use the Freudenthal-de Vries strange formula (see refs. [48], [20, eq. 13.179])

$$|\rho|^2 = \frac{g^\vee}{12} \dim \mathfrak{g}. \quad (\text{D.11})$$

It follows that the quantity in the exponent is

$$\frac{(\dim \mathfrak{g})^2}{48n}. \quad (\text{D.12})$$

From Biane's formula the asymptotic behavior have two terms,

$$\exp\left(-\frac{\dim(\mathfrak{g})^2}{48n}\right) + \mathcal{O}(n^{-1}). \quad (\text{D.13})$$

The leading term (the exponential) will then dominate the sub-leading terms for

$$n \log(n) \gg \frac{\dim(\mathfrak{g})^2}{48}. \quad (\text{D.14})$$

Algebras of smaller dimensions will evidently converge to the (leading term in the) asymptotic formulae for lower n than for algebras of larger dimension.

D.1 \mathfrak{a} -Type Gauge Theory

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{a}_1: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{1}{2^3} \sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}} \right) 3^{n+1} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{3}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{3^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right); \\
\mathfrak{a}_2: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_2}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{2^2}{3^4 \pi} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \right) 8^{n+2} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{8}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{8^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right); \\
\mathfrak{a}_3: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_3}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^5 \cdot 5^4}{2^{21} \pi} \sqrt{\frac{3 \cdot 5}{\pi}} \right) 15^{n+3} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{15}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{15^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right); \\
\mathfrak{a}_4: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_4}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{2^9 \cdot 3^8}{5^{12} \pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{5}} \right) 24^{n+6} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{24}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{24^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right); \\
\mathfrak{a}_5: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_5}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^9 \cdot 7^8}{2^{29} \cdot 3^{14} \pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{5 \cdot 7}{\pi}} \right) 35^{n+9} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{35}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{35^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right); \\
\mathfrak{a}_6: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_6}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{2^{33} \cdot 3^{17} \cdot 5^2}{7^{24} \pi^3} \sqrt{\frac{1}{7}} \right) 48^{n+12} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{48}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{48^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right); \\
\mathfrak{a}_7: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_7}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{36} \cdot 5^3 \cdot 7^{15}}{2^{112} \pi^3} \sqrt{\frac{1}{\pi}} \right) 63^{n+17} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{63}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{63^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right); \\
\mathfrak{a}_8: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_8}^{\mathfrak{n}} &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{2^{51} \cdot 5^{22} \cdot 7^2}{3^{70} \pi^4} \right) 80^{n+22} \mathfrak{n}^{-\frac{80}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{80^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.15}$$

In the case of \mathfrak{a}_1 an extra sub-leading term is known if we also expand the exponential in the limit $n \rightarrow \infty$. Indeed, we have (see refs. [25, 49])

$$\mathcal{C}[\mathbf{ad}(\mathfrak{a}_1)^{\mathfrak{n}}] \stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{3^{n+2}}{\sqrt{3 \mathfrak{n} \pi 8 \mathfrak{n}}} \left(1 - \frac{21}{16 \mathfrak{n}} + \mathcal{O}(\mathfrak{n}^{-2}) \right). \tag{D.16}$$

To the same order in \mathfrak{n}^{-1} this can be rewritten as

$$\mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{a}_1}^{\mathfrak{n}} \stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{8} \sqrt{\frac{3}{\pi}} 3^{n+1} \exp \left\{ -\frac{3^2}{48 \mathfrak{n}} \right\} \left(1 - \frac{9}{8 \mathfrak{n}} \right) \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n}^2) \right). \tag{D.17}$$

While the leading order formula matches the data well for \mathfrak{a}_1 for other algebras (of larger dimension) the convergence of data to the asymptotic formula will happen at some (potentially large) multiplicity. Other examples of $\mathcal{O}(1/\mathfrak{n})$ obtained by direct comparison with ‘data’ at large multiplicity were given in (3.29).

D.2 b-Type Gauge Theory

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{b}_2: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_2}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^3}{24 \cdot 3^4 \pi} \right) 10^{n+2} n^{-\frac{10}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{10^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{b}_3: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_3}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^8 \cdot 7^6}{2^{11} \cdot 5^{10} \pi} \sqrt{\frac{3 \cdot 7}{5 \pi}} \right) 21^{n+4} n^{-\frac{21}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{21^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{b}_4: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_4}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{2^4 \cdot 3^{24} \cdot 5^2}{7^{17} \pi^2} \right) 36^{n+8} n^{-\frac{36}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{36^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{b}_5: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_5}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^{16} \cdot 7^2 \cdot 11^{13}}{2^{20} \cdot 3^{47} \pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{5 \cdot 11}{\pi}} \right) 55^{n+14} n^{-\frac{55}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{55^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{b}_6: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_6}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{30} \cdot 5^5 \cdot 7^3 \cdot 13^{18}}{2^7 \cdot 11^{38} \pi^3} \right) 78^{n+21} n^{-\frac{78}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{78^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{b}_7: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_7}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{40} \cdot 5^{30} \cdot 7^{27} \cdot 11^2}{2^{30} \cdot 13^{52} \pi^3} \sqrt{\frac{3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7}{13 \pi}} \right) 105^{n+29} n^{-\frac{105}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{105^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{b}_8: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{b}_8}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{2^{51} \cdot 7^6 \cdot 11^3 \cdot 13^2 \cdot 17^{29}}{3^{45} \cdot 5^{58} \pi^4} \right) 136^{n+39} n^{-\frac{136}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{136^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.18}$$

D.3 c-Type Gauge Theory

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{c}_3: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_3}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^8 \cdot 5 \cdot 7^6}{2^{36} \pi} \sqrt{\frac{3 \cdot 7}{2 \pi}} \right) 21^{n+4} n^{-\frac{21}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{21^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{c}_4: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_4}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{24} \cdot 7}{2^5 \cdot 5^{16} \pi^2} \right) 36^{n+8} n^{-\frac{36}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{36^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{c}_5: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_5}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^{16} \cdot 7^2 \cdot 11^{13}}{2^{64} \cdot 3^{20} \pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{5 \cdot 11}{3 \pi}} \right) 55^{n+14} n^{-\frac{55}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{55^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{c}_6: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_6}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{30} \cdot 5^5 \cdot 11 \cdot 13^{18}}{2^{33} \cdot 7^{36} \pi^3} \right) 78^{n+21} n^{-\frac{78}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{78^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{c}_7: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_7}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{40} \cdot 5^{30} \cdot 7^{27} \cdot 11^2 \cdot 13}{2^{225} \pi^3} \sqrt{\frac{3 \cdot 5 \cdot 7}{\pi}} \right) 105^{n+29} n^{-\frac{105}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{105^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{c}_8: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{c}_8}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^{10} \cdot 7^6 \cdot 11^3 \cdot 13^2 \cdot 17^{29}}{3^{113} \pi^4} \right) 136^{n+39} n^{-\frac{136}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{136^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.19}$$

D.4 \mathfrak{d} -Type Gauge Theory

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{d}_4: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_4}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5 \cdot 7^7}{2^{10} 3^{11} \pi^2} \right) 28^{n+7} n^{-\frac{28}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{28^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{d}_5: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_5}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{28} 5^{13} 7}{2^{81} \pi^2} \sqrt{\frac{5}{2\pi}} \right) 45^{n+11} n^{-\frac{45}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{45^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{d}_6: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_6}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{24} 7^2 11^{15}}{2^{35} 5^{29} \pi^3} \right) 66^{n+18} n^{-\frac{66}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{66^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{d}_7: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_7}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^6 7^{23} 11 \cdot 13^{20}}{2^{112} 3^{32} \pi^3} \sqrt{\frac{7 \cdot 13}{3\pi}} \right) 91^{n+25} n^{-\frac{91}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{91^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{d}_8: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{d}_8}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{3^{45} 5^{34} 11^2 \cdot 13}{2^8 7^{55} \pi^4} \right) 120^{n+34} n^{-\frac{120}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{120^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.20}$$

D.5 Exceptional Gauge Theories

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathfrak{e}_6: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_6}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^5 7^3 11 \cdot 13^{18}}{2^{77} 3^{11} \pi^3} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \right) 78^{n+21} n^{-\frac{78}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{78^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{e}_7: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_7}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^{10} 7^{34} 11^3 \cdot 13^2 \cdot 17 \cdot 19^{28}}{2^{89} 3^{111} \pi^3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \right) 133^{n+38} n^{-\frac{133}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{133^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{e}_8: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{e}_8}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{7^{14} 11^8 \cdot 13^6 \cdot 17^4 \cdot 19^3 \cdot 23^2 \cdot 29 \cdot 31^{48}}{2^{11} 3^{77} 5^{103} \pi^4} \right) 248^{n+76} n^{-\frac{248}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{248^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{f}_4: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{f}_4}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5^4 7^2 11 \cdot 13^{13}}{3^{45} \pi^2} \right) 52^{n+13} n^{-\frac{52}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{52^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right); \\
\mathfrak{g}_2: \mathcal{C}_{\mathfrak{g}_2}^n &\stackrel{n \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \left(\frac{5 \cdot 7^5}{2^{14} 3^3 \pi} \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \right) 14^{n+2} n^{-\frac{14}{2}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{14^2}{48n} \right\} \left(1 + \mathcal{O}(1/n) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{D.21}$$

The numerical prefactors are complicated, but their factorization has some interesting features. For example, for \mathfrak{e}_8 it contains 1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29 which are the exponents of \mathfrak{e}_8 . The exponents are the integers n_i such that the Cartan matrix has $4 \cos^2 \frac{\pi n_i}{2g^\vee}$ as eigenvalues, where g^\vee is the dual Coxeter number. For \mathfrak{e}_8 the Coxeter number is 30 and we also have the prime number $g+1=31$ in the prefactor (see Table 17). For the non-simply-laced algebras the Coxeter number and the dual Coxeter numbers are different.

algebra	exponents	g^\vee	g
\mathfrak{a}_k	$1, 2, \dots, k$	$k+1$	$k+1$
\mathfrak{b}_k	$1, 3, \dots, 2k-1$	$2k-1$	$2k$
\mathfrak{c}_k	$1, 3, \dots, 2k-1$	$k+1$	$2k$
\mathfrak{d}_k	$1, 3, \dots, 2k-3, k-1$	$2k-2$	$2k-2$
\mathfrak{e}_6	$1, 4, 5, 7, 8, 11$	12	12
\mathfrak{e}_7	$1, 5, 7, 9, 11, 13, 17$	18	18
\mathfrak{e}_8	$1, 7, 11, 13, 17, 19, 23, 29$	30	30
\mathfrak{f}_4	$1, 5, 7, 11$	9	12
\mathfrak{g}_2	$1, 5$	4	6

Table 17. Indices, Coxeter number g and dual Coxeter number g^\vee for simple Lie algebras.

References

- [1] P. Benincasa and F. Cachazo, “Consistency Conditions on the S -Matrix of Massless Particles,” [arXiv:0705.4305 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [2] M. L. Mangano, “The Color Structure of Gluon Emission,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **309** (1988) 461–475.
- [3] M. L. Mangano and S. J. Parke, “Multiparton Amplitudes in Gauge Theories,” *Phys. Rept.* **200** (1991) 301–367, [arXiv:hep-th/0509223](#).
- [4] P. Cvitanović, *Group Theory*. Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 2008. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9781400837670>. Birdtracks, Lie’s, and exceptional groups.
- [5] V. Del Duca, L. J. Dixon, and F. Maltoni, “New Color Decompositions for Gauge Amplitudes at Tree and Loop Level,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **571** (2000) 51–70, [arXiv:hep-ph/9910563 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [6] L. J. Dixon, “A Brief Introduction to Modern Amplitude Methods,” in *Proceedings, 2012 European School of High-Energy Physics (ESHEP 2012): La Pommeraye, Anjou, France, June 06-19, 2012*, pp. 31–67. 2014. [arXiv:1310.5353 \[hep-ph\]](#). <http://inspirehep.net/record/1261436/files/arXiv:1310.5353.pdf>.
- [7] T. Melia, “Proof of a New Colour Decomposition for QCD Amplitudes,” *JHEP* **12** (2015) 107, [arXiv:1509.03297 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [8] H. Johansson and A. Ochirov, “Color-Kinematics Duality for QCD Amplitudes,” *JHEP* **01** (2016) 170, [arXiv:1507.00332 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [9] A. Ochirov and B. Page, “Multi-Quark Colour Decompositions from Unitarity,” *JHEP* **10** (2019) 058, [arXiv:1908.02695 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [10] Z. Bern, J. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, “New Relations for Gauge-Theory Amplitudes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78** (2008) 085011, [arXiv:0805.3993 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [11] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, “Perturbative Quantum Gravity as a Double Copy of Gauge Theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 061602, [arXiv:1004.0476 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [12] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, M. Chiodaroli, H. Johansson, and R. Roiban, “The Duality Between Color and Kinematics and its Applications,” [arXiv:1909.01358 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [13] T. Adamo, J. J. M. Carrasco, M. Carrillo-González, M. Chiodaroli, H. Elvang, H. Johansson, D. O’Connell, R. Roiban, and O. Schlotterer, “Snowmass White Paper: the Double Copy and its Applications,” in *Snowmass 2021*. 4, 2022. [arXiv:2204.06547 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, M. Chiodaroli, H. Johansson, and R. Roiban, “Supergravity Amplitudes, the Double Copy and Ultraviolet Behavior,” [arXiv:2304.07392 \[hep-th\]](#).

- [15] J. L. Bourjaily, N. Kalyanapuram, K. Patatoukos, M. Plesser, and Y. Zhang, “Gauge-Invariant Double Copies via Recursion,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** (2023) no. 19, 191601, [arXiv:2307.02542 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [16] J. L. Bourjaily, “Computational Tools for Trees in Gauge Theory and Gravity,” [arXiv:2312.17745 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [17] S. G. Naculich, “Color-Factor Symmetry of the Amplitudes of Yang-Mills and Biadjoint Scalar Theory using Perturbative Methods,” *JHEP* **06** (2023) 084, [arXiv:2304.01287 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [18] R. Slansky, “Group Theory for Unified Model Building,” *Phys. Rept.* **79** (1981) 1–128.
- [19] W. Fulton and J. Harris, *Representation Theory*, vol. 129 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1991. A first course, Readings in Mathematics.
- [20] P. Di Francesco, P. Mathieu, and D. Sénéchal, *Conformal Field Theory*. Graduate Texts in Contemporary Physics. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1997. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4612-2256-9>.
- [21] W. Killing, “Die Zusammensetzung der Stetigen Endlichen Transformationsgruppen,” *Math. Ann.* **33** (1888) no. 1, 1–48. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01444109>.
- [22] E. Cartan, “Sur la Structure des Groupes Infinis de Transformation,” *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)* **21** (1904) 153–206. http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1904_3_21__153_0.
- [23] E. Cartan, “Sur la Structure des Groupes Infinis de Transformation (suite),” *Ann. Sci. École Norm. Sup. (3)* **22** (1905) 219–308. http://www.numdam.org/item?id=ASENS_1905_3_22__219_0.
- [24] W. Pauli, “Zur Quantenmechanik des Magnetischen Elektrons,” *Zeitschrift für Physik* **43** (1927) no. 9-10, 601–623.
- [25] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A005043 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A005043>.
- [26] V. del Duca, L. J. Dixon, and F. Maltoni, “New Color Decompositions for Gauge Amplitudes at Tree and Loop Level,” *Nuclear Physics* **571** (1999) 51–70. <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:1602861>.
- [27] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A000166 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A000166>.
- [28] G. ’t Hooft, “A Planar Diagram Theory for Strong Interactions,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B72** (1974) 461.
- [29] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A002137 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A002137>.

- [30] W. Stein *et al.*, *Sage Mathematics Software (Version 9.5.0)*. The Sage Development Team, 2022. <http://www.sagemath.org>.
- [31] W. Bosma, J. Cannon, and C. Playoust, “The Magma Algebra System. I. The User Language,” *J. Symbolic Comput.* **24** (1997) no. 3-4, 235–265.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1006/jsc.1996.0125>. Computational algebra and number theory (London, 1993).
- [32] R. Feger, T. W. Kephart, and R. J. Saskowski, “LieART 2.0 – A Mathematica application for Lie Algebras and Representation Theory,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **257** (2020) 107490, [arXiv:1912.10969 \[hep-th\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.10969).
- [33] OEIS Foundation Inc., “The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences,” 2024. Published electronically at <http://oeis.org>.
- [34] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A179684 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A179684>.
- [35] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A179683 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A179683>.
- [36] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A179663 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A179663>.
- [37] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A179685 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A179685>.
- [38] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A227292 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A227292>.
- [39] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A000108 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A000108>.
- [40] OEIS Foundation Inc. (2024), “Entry A001006 in The On-Line Encyclopedia of Integer Sequences.” <https://oeis.org/A001006>.
- [41] J. Polchinski, *Spinors and SUSY in Various Dimensions*, pp. 430–466. Cambridge Monographs on Mathematical Physics. Cambridge University Press, 1998.
- [42] J. L. Bourjaily, M. Plesser, and C. Vergu, “Bases for Color Structures.” To Appear.
- [43] R. Steinberg, “A General Clebsch-Gordan Theorem,” *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc.* **67** (1961) 406–407. <https://doi.org/10.1090/S0002-9904-1961-10644-7>.
- [44] G. Racah, “Lectures on Lie Groups,” vol. Vol. I of *Quantum Physics and its Applications*, pp. 1–36. Gordon and Breach, New York-London, 1964.
- [45] D. Speiser, “Theory of Compact Lie Groups and Some Applications to Elementary Particle Physics,” in *Group Theoretical Concepts and Methods in Elementary Particle Physics: (Lectures Istanbul Summer School Theoret. Phys., 1962)*, vol. Vol. I of *Quantum Physics and its Applications*, pp. 201–276. Gordon and Breach, New York-London, 1964.

- [46] P. Biane, “Estimation Asymptotique des Multiplicités dans les Puissances Tensorielles d’un \mathfrak{g} -Module,” *C. R. Acad. Sci. Paris Sér. I Math.* **316** (1993) no. 8, 849–852.
- [47] T. Tate and S. Zelditch, “Lattice Path Combinatorics and Asymptotics of Multiplicities of Weights in Tensor Powers,” *Journal of Functional Analysis* **217** (2004) no. 2, 402–447.
- [48] H. Freudenthal and H. de Vries, *Linear Lie Groups*, vol. Vol. 35 of *Pure and Applied Mathematics*. Academic Press, New York-London, 1969.
- [49] M. Riedel, “Proof that $\sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \binom{n}{i+1} \binom{n-i-1}{i} < \sum_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{2}-1} \binom{n}{i} \binom{n-i}{i}$.” Mathematics Stack Exchange. <https://math.stackexchange.com/q/4977010>.