

# All-Multiplicity One-Loop Corrections to MHV Amplitudes in QCD

Darren Forde and David A. Kosower  
*Service de Physique Théorique, CEA-Saclay*  
*F-91191 Gif-sur-Yvette cedex, France*  
 (Dated: September 2005)

We compute the complete one-loop corrections to the simplest class of QCD gluon amplitudes, those with two color-adjacent opposite-helicity external particles. We present results for an arbitrary number of external legs. The computation uses the recently-developed on-shell recursion relations for the rational parts, along with older unitarity-based results for the cut-containing terms.

PACS numbers: 11.15.Bt, 11.55.Bq, 12.38.Bx

The upcoming experimental program at CERN's Large Hadron Collider will require many new calculations of one-loop corrections to QCD and QCD-associated processes such as  $W +$  multi-jet production. The development of new tools for such computations is thus an important topic for theorists.

Recently, Bern, Dixon, and one of the authors presented a new approach [1] to computing complete one-loop scattering amplitudes in non-supersymmetric gauge theories such as QCD. The approach makes use of on-shell recursion relations to systematize a unitarity-factorization bootstrap earlier applied to the computation of the one-loop scattering amplitudes needed for  $Z \rightarrow 4$  jets and  $pp \rightarrow W + 2$  jets at next-to-leading order in the QCD coupling [2]. In the combined approach, the cut-containing terms (logarithms and polylogarithms) are computed using the unitarity-based method [3, 4, 5, 6, 7], with four-dimensional tree-level amplitudes as input. The remaining rational-function pieces are then computed via a factorization bootstrap, here in the form of an on-shell recursion relation [1, 8, 9, 10, 11]. (The use of recursion relations supersedes the use of ansätze [2] for constructing the purely rational terms.)

The unitarity-based method has proven to be a powerful method for computing the logarithmic and polylogarithmic terms in gauge theory amplitudes at one and two loops. Indeed, in massless supersymmetric theories the complete one-loop amplitudes may be determined from the four-dimensional cuts [4]. The method has been used to produce a variety of all-multiplicity results. One can also use the unitarity-based method to determine complete amplitudes, including all rational pieces [5, 12, 13, 14] by applying full  $D$ -dimensional unitarity, within dimensional regularization [15] ( $D = 4 - 2\epsilon$ ). In order to do so at one loop, one must compute tree amplitudes where two of the momenta are in  $D$  dimensions. In the case at hand, one-loop amplitudes containing only external gluons, these tree amplitudes can be interpreted as four-dimensional amplitudes with two massive scalar legs. The analytic computation of these scalar amplitudes (even with recent advances [16, 17]) and their use in cuts is more complicated than that of massless four-dimensional amplitudes.

The on-shell recursion relations [8] have their origins in alternate representations of tree amplitudes emerging from one-loop calculations [18, 19, 20]. The proof in ref. [9] made it clear, however, that their applicability is much wider. The only ingredients which are needed are complex analysis, along with a knowledge of the factorization properties of amplitudes in *complex* momenta. These properties are more subtle at loop level than at tree level [10, 11], but this does not affect the amplitudes we compute here.

We follow the notation of ref. [1], and compute the color-ordered on-shell one-loop amplitude  $A_n(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, \dots, n^+)$ , that is the configuration with adjacent negative-helicity gluons. The corresponding tree-level amplitudes were conjectured by Parke and Taylor [21, 22] and proven by Berends and Giele using off-shell recursion relations [23, 24]. As explained in ref. [3], this amplitude (along with related amplitudes with non-adjacent negative-helicity gluons) would suffice to obtain the full color-dressed amplitude with two negative-helicity gluons. Because the tree-level amplitude for this configuration does not vanish, the one-loop amplitude has both ultraviolet and infrared divergences, for which we use dimensional regularization. The color-ordered amplitude can be written in terms of functions which have an interpretation in terms of supersymmetric and non-supersymmetric contributions [3],

$$A_{n;1}^{\text{QCD}} = \text{cr} \left[ (V_n^g + 4V_n^f + V_n^s) A_n^{\text{tree}} + i(4F_n^f + F_n^s) - \frac{n_f}{N_c} \left( A_n^{\text{tree}}(V_n^s + V_n^f) + i(F_n^s + F_n^f) \right) \right], \quad (1)$$

where  $N_c$  is the number of colors and  $n_f$  the number of quark flavors. All functions in this expression except for  $F^s$  have been computed previously, in refs. [3, 4]. The  $X^g$  contributions correspond to the  $\mathcal{N} = 4$  supersymmetric amplitude, and  $-X^f$  to the  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetric amplitude.

The branch cut-containing contributions to  $F^s$  were also computed in ref. [4], and serve as the basis for the present

computation of the purely-rational terms. (The corresponding contributions to amplitudes with non-adjacent negative helicities were computed in ref. [7].) The computation proceeds along the lines of ref. [1]. The pure cut terms have spurious singularities not present in the amplitude as a whole. These can be removed in the case at hand by replacing, for example,  $\ln(s_1/s_2)/(s_2 - s_1)^3$  by  $L_2(s_1/s_2)/s_2^3$ , where  $L_2(r) = (\ln r - (r - 1/r)/2)/(1 - r)^3$ . This removal was carried out in the form given in ref. [4]. To set up a recursion relation, one picks two spinors to shift; we take these to be the two negative helicities (1, 2), so that

$$|1^- \rangle \rightarrow |1^- \rangle - z|2^- \rangle, \quad |2^+ \rangle \rightarrow |2^+ \rangle + z|1^+ \rangle, \quad (2)$$

and other spinors are unaffected. We can verify that  $\hat{C}_n(z)$ , given below in eq. 5, vanishes as required when  $z \rightarrow \infty$ . There are two separate rational contributions that we must compute: the ‘direct-recursive’ or ‘diagrammatic’ terms, similar to the recursive terms in a tree-level computation, but here using loop vertices in addition to tree ones; and ‘overlap’ contributions. The latter contributions remove the double-counting due to the presence of rational terms in  $\hat{C}_n$ , and are computed by taking the residues of those rational terms. With our choice of shift, the diagrammatic contributions themselves are of two types. The first type consists of all contributions with multiparticle poles, as well as the contribution in the  $\langle 23 \rangle$  channel. These involve vertices whose all- $n$  form is known, either tree-level MHV amplitudes, or  $A_n^{1\text{-loop}}(1^-, 2^+, \dots, n^+)$  (whose form we take from ref. [11] in preference to the original calculation [25]). The second type is the contribution in the  $[1n]$  channel, containing a three-point vertex,  $A_3^{\text{tree}}(\hat{1}^-, \hat{P}^+, n^+)$  multiplied by all rational terms from our desired amplitude —  $A_{n-1}^{1\text{-loop}}(-\hat{P}^-, \hat{2}^-, 3^+, \dots, (n-1)^+)|_{\text{rational}}$  — with one *fewer* positive-helicity external legs. The structure of this term is the same as one of the terms in the recursion for the all-multiplicity amplitude with a massive scalar pair and an adjacent negative-helicity gluon [17]. We can proceed here using the same approach, repeatedly inserting the recursion relation into itself, at each step reducing the number of positive-helicity legs in the unknown amplitude. We thereby ‘unwind’ the recursion, rewriting it in the form,

$$\sum_{j=1}^{n-3} \prod_{r=2}^j \frac{A_{3r}^{\text{tree}}}{K_{2 \dots (j+1)}^2} \times T_{n-j+1}(\hat{1}^-, \dots, n^+), \quad (3)$$

in which  $T_j$  now contains only known functions — tree amplitudes, loop vertices, rational terms from  $\hat{C}_j$ , and terms from overlap contributions.

We can then write the result for the unrenormalized amplitude  $A_{n,s}^{1\text{-loop}} = V^s A_n^{\text{tree}} + iF^s$  in the following form,

$$V_n^s A_n^{\text{tree}} + iF_n^s = c_\Gamma [\hat{C}_n + \hat{R}_n] + \frac{1}{3} A_n^{\mathcal{N}=1 \text{ chiral}} + \frac{2}{9} A_n^{\text{tree}} \quad (4)$$

where  $\hat{C}_n$  are the cut-containing contributions computed in ref. [4], completed so as to remove  $s_1 \rightarrow s_2$  spurious singularities,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{C}_n &= -\frac{1}{3s_{12}^3} A^{\text{tree}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, \dots, n^+) \\ &\times \sum_{j=4}^{n-1} \frac{L_2((-s_{2 \dots (m-1)})/(-s_{2 \dots m}))}{s_{2 \dots m}^3} \text{tr}_+ [k_1 k_2 k_m K_{m \dots 1}] \text{tr}_+ [k_1 k_2 K_{m \dots 1} k_m] \text{tr}_+ [k_1 k_2 (k_m K_{m \dots 1} - K_{m \dots 1} k_m)] \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

The computations then yield,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{R}_n(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, \dots, n^+) &= \frac{1}{3} A^{\text{tree}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, \dots, n^+) \\ &\times \sum_{i_1=1}^{n-4} \left( \sum_{i_2=i_1+3}^{n-1} \left[ C_1(n; i_1, i_2) \left( T_1(n; i_1, i_2, i_2) + T_1(n; i_1, i_2, i_2 + 1) \right) \right. \right. \\ &\quad + C_2(n; i_1, i_2) \left( T_{2a}(n; i_1, i_2) + T_{2b}(n; i_1, i_2) \right) \\ &\quad \left. \left. + C_3(n; i_1, i_2) \left( T_{3a}(n; i_1, i_2) + T_{3b}(n; i_1, i_2) + T_{3c}(n; i_1, i_2) \right) \right] + T_4(n; i_1) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

In this equation,

$$C_1(n; i_1, i_2) = \frac{\langle (i_1 + 1)(i_1 + 2) \rangle}{\langle 1^- | K_{(i_2+1) \dots n} K_{(i_1+2) \dots i_2} | (i_1 + 1)^+ \rangle \langle 1^- | K_{(i_2+1) \dots n} K_{(i_1+3) \dots i_2} | (i_1 + 2)^+ \rangle},$$

$$C_2(n; i_1, i_2) = \frac{\langle i_2 (i_2 + 1) \rangle C_1(n; i_1, i_2)}{s_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} | (i_2 + 1)^+ \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(i_2-1)} | i_2^+ \rangle}, \quad (7)$$

$$C_3(n; i_1, i_2) = s_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2}^4 C_2(n; i_1, i_2).$$

The terms  $T_i$  are given by,

$$T_1(n; i_1, i_2, j) = \frac{s_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \langle 1 j \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} | j^+ \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} (\mathbb{K}_j \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(j-1)} - \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(j-1)} \mathbb{K}_j) | 1^+ \rangle}{2 \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} | j^+ \rangle^2}, \quad (8)$$

(Note that  $T_1(n; i_1, n-1, n) = 0$ .)

$$T_{2a}(n; i_1, i_2) = \sum_{l=(i_1+2)}^{i_2} \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} | l^+ \rangle f_1(n; l, i_1, i_2); \quad (9)$$

$$T_{2b}(n; i_1, i_2) = - \sum_{l=(i_1+3)}^{i_2-1} \sum_{p=l+1}^{i_2} \frac{f_2(n; l, p; i_1, i_2)}{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(l-1)} \mathbb{K}_{l\dots(p-1)} | p^+ \rangle} \times \frac{\langle (l-1) l \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{l\dots p} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots p} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} | 1^+ \rangle^3}{s_{l\dots p} \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots p} \mathbb{K}_{l\dots p} | (l-1)^+ \rangle} \times \frac{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(l-1)} [\mathcal{F}(l, p)]^2 \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots p} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} | 1^+ \rangle}{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots p} \mathbb{K}_{(l+1)\dots p} | l^+ \rangle}; \quad (10)$$

$$T_{3a}(n; i_1, i_2) = \sum_{l=i_2+1}^{n-1} \frac{\langle 1 l \rangle \langle 1 (l+1) \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{l(l+1)} \mathbb{K}_{(l+1)\dots n} | 1^+ \rangle}{\langle l (l+1) \rangle}; \quad (11)$$

$$T_{3b}(n; i_1, i_2) = \frac{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} | (i_2 + 1)^- \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} | 1^+ \rangle \langle 1 (i_2 + 1) \rangle^2}{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} | (i_2 + 1)^+ \rangle}; \quad (12)$$

$$T_{3c}(n; i_1, i_2) = \sum_{l=i_2+1}^{n-2} \sum_{p=l+1}^{n-1} \frac{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{l\dots p} \mathbb{K}_{(p+1)\dots n} | 1^+ \rangle^3}{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(p+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(l+1)\dots p} | l^+ \rangle} \times \frac{\langle p (p+1) \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(l-1)} [\mathcal{F}(l, p)]^2 \mathbb{K}_{(p+1)\dots n} | 1^+ \rangle f_3(n; l, p, i_1, i_2)}{s_{l\dots p} \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(l-1)} \mathbb{K}_{l\dots(p-1)} | p^+ \rangle \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(l-1)} \mathbb{K}_{l\dots p} | (p+1)^+ \rangle}; \quad (13)$$

$$T_4(n; i_1) = - \frac{[(i_1 + 2) (i_1 + 3)] \langle (i_1 + 3) 1 \rangle}{2 \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} | (i_1 + 2)^- \rangle}. \quad (14)$$

The  $f_i$  appearing in the above equations are given by,

$$f_1(n; l, i_1, i_2) = \begin{cases} -s_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2}^2 \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} | 1^+ \rangle \times \frac{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(i_2-1)} | i_2^+ \rangle \langle i_2^+ | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_2-1)} | 1^+ \rangle}{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(i_2-1)} | i_2^+ \rangle}, & l = i_2 \\ \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} | (l+1)^+ \rangle \times \frac{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{l(l+1)} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots l} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{2\dots i_2} | 1^+ \rangle}{\langle l (l+1) \rangle}, & (i_1 + 2) \leq l < i_2 \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

$$f_2(n; l, p, i_1, i_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{\langle i_2^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} | 1^+ \rangle}{s_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{l\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(l-1)} \mathbb{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} | 1^+ \rangle}, & p = i_2 \\ \frac{\langle p (p+1) \rangle}{\langle 1^- | \mathbb{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots n} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \mathbb{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots(l-1)} \mathbb{K}_{l\dots p} | (p+1)^+ \rangle}, & l+1 \leq p < i_2 \end{cases} \quad (16)$$

$$f_3(n; l, p, i_1, i_2) = \begin{cases} \frac{\langle 1^- | \not{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} \not{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} | (i_2+1)^+ \rangle}{\langle 1^- | \not{K}_{(p+1)\dots n} \not{K}_{(i_2+1)\dots p} \not{K}_{(i_1+2)\dots i_2} \not{K}_{2\dots(i_1+1)} | 1^+ \rangle}, & l = i_2 + 1 \\ \frac{\langle (l-1) l \rangle}{\langle 1^- | \not{K}_{(p+1)\dots n} \not{K}_{l\dots p} | (l-1)^+ \rangle}, & l > i_2 + 1 \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

and [11],

$$\mathcal{F}(l, p) = \sum_{i=l}^{p-1} \sum_{m=i+1}^p \not{k}_i \not{k}_m. \quad (18)$$

In addition to spinorial collinear and multiparticle singularities, which are genuine physical singularities of the amplitude, the various functions given above also contain spurious singularities. These are of four kinds: (a) ‘planar’ or ‘back-to-back’ singularities arising from the vanishing of spinor sandwiches like  $\langle 1^- | \not{K} | j^- \rangle$ ; (b) ‘cubic’ singularities from the vanishing of forms like  $\langle 1^- | \not{K} \not{K}' | j^+ \rangle$ ; (c) ‘open’ and ‘closed quintic’ singularities from the vanishing of forms like  $\langle 1^- | \not{K}_1 \not{K}_2 \not{K}_3 \not{K}_4 | j^+ \rangle$ . (Closed quintics correspond to  $j = 1$ , and the sum of all momenta vanishing.) While individual terms contain these singularities, they cancel in the amplitude as a whole. We have verified this cancellation numerically through  $n = 12$ . We have also verified the collinear and multiparticle factorization numerically, and compared with fixed-order calculations of the amplitude through  $n = 8$ .

We thank Zvi Bern and Lance Dixon for extensive discussions and for providing code for fixed-point amplitudes used as cross checks. We also thank Academic Technology Services at UCLA for computer support.

- 
- [1] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, hep-ph/0507005.
  - [2] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B513:3 (1998) [hep-ph/9708239].
  - [3] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B425:217 (1994) [hep-ph/9403226].
  - [4] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B435:59 (1995) [hep-ph/9409265].
  - [5] Z. Bern and A. G. Morgan, Nucl. Phys. B467:479 (1996) [hep-ph/9511336];
  - [6] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. 46:109 (1996) [hep-ph/9602280]; Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. 51C:243 (1996) [hep-ph/9606378]; R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, Nucl. Phys. B725:275 (2005) [hep-th/0412103];
  - [7] J. Bedford, A. Brandhuber, B. Spence and G. Travaglini, Nucl. Phys. B712:59 (2005) [hep-th/0412108].
  - [8] R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, Nucl. Phys. B715:499 (2005) [hep-th/0412308].
  - [9] R. Britto, F. Cachazo, B. Feng and E. Witten, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94:181602 (2005) [hep-th/0501052].
  - [10] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Phys. Rev. D71:105013 (2005) [hep-th/0501240].
  - [11] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, hep-ph/0505055.
  - [12] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar and D. A. Kosower, Phys. Lett. B394:105 (1997) [hep-th/9611127].
  - [13] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, JHEP 0001:027 (2000) [hep-ph/0001001]; Z. Bern, A. De Freitas and L. J. Dixon, JHEP 0109:037 (2001) [hep-ph/0109078]; Z. Bern, A. De Freitas and L. J. Dixon, JHEP 0203:018 (2002) [hep-ph/0201161].
  - [14] A. Brandhuber, S. McNamara, B. Spence and G. Travaglini, hep-th/0506068.
  - [15] G. 't Hooft and M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B44:189 (1972).
  - [16] S. D. Badger, E. W. N. Glover, V. V. Khoze and P. Svrček, hep-th/0504159.
  - [17] D. Forde and D. A. Kosower, hep-th/0507292.
  - [18] Z. Bern, V. Del Duca, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Phys. Rev. D71:045006 (2005) [hep-th/0410224]. Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, hep-th/0412210.
  - [19] R. Britto, F. Cachazo and B. Feng, Phys. Rev. D71:025012 (2005) [hep-th/0410179].
  - [20] R. Roiban, M. Spradlin and A. Volovich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94:102002 (2005) [hep-th/0412265].
  - [21] M. L. Mangano, S. J. Parke and Z. Xu, Nucl. Phys. B298:653 (1988).
  - [22] S. J. Parke and T. R. Taylor, Phys. Rev. Lett. 56:2459 (1986).
  - [23] F. A. Berends and W. T. Giele, Nucl. Phys. B306:759 (1988).
  - [24] D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B335:23 (1990).
  - [25] G. Mahlon, Phys. Rev. D49:4438 (1994) [hep-ph/9312276].