

TWO-LOOP AMPLITUDES FOR $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$: THE n_f -CONTRIBUTION

SVEN MOCH^a, PETER UWER^a AND STEFAN WEINZIERL^b

^aInstitut für Theoretische Teilchenphysik, Universität Karlsruhe
76128 Karlsruhe, Germany

^bDipartimento di Fisica, Università di Parma
INFN Gruppo Collegato di Parma, 43100 Parma, Italy

We discuss the calculation of the n_f -contributions to the two-loop amplitude for $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$. The calculation uses an efficient method based on nested sums. The result is presented in terms of multiple polylogarithms with simple arguments, which allow for analytic continuation in a straightforward manner.

1. Introduction

Searches for new physics in particle physics rely to a large extent on our ability to constrain the parameters of the standard model. For instance, the strong coupling constant α_s can be measured by using the data for $e^+e^- \rightarrow 3$ -jets. At present, the error on the extraction of α_s from this measurement is dominated by theoretical uncertainties [1], most prominently, by the truncation of the perturbative expansion at a fixed order.

The perturbative QCD calculation of $e^+e^- \rightarrow 3$ -jets at next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) requires the tree-level amplitudes for $e^+e^- \rightarrow 5$ partons [2], the one-loop amplitudes for $e^+e^- \rightarrow 4$ partons [3, 4] as well as the two-loop amplitude for $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$ together with the one-loop amplitude $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$ to order ε^2 in the parameter of dimensional regularization.

The helicity averaged squared matrix elements at the two-loop level for $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$ have recently been given [5]. In contrast, having the two-loop amplitude available, one keeps the full correlation between the incoming e^+e^- and the outgoing parton's spins and momenta. Thus, one can study oriented event-shape observables. In addition, one has the option to investigate event-shape observables in polarized e^+e^- -annihilation at a future linear e^+e^- -collider TESLA.

2. Calculation

We are interested in the following reaction

$$e^+ + e^- \rightarrow q + g + \bar{q}, \quad (1)$$

which we consider in the form, $0 \rightarrow q(p_1) + g(p_2) + \bar{q}(p_3) + e^-(p_4) + e^+(p_5)$, with all particles in the final state, to be consistent with earlier work [3]. The kinematical invariants for this reaction are denoted by

$$s_{ij} = (p_i + p_j)^2, \quad s_{ijk} = (p_i + p_j + p_k)^2, \quad s = s_{123}, \quad (2)$$

and it is convenient to introduce the dimensionless quantities

$$x_1 = \frac{s_{12}}{s_{123}}, \quad x_2 = \frac{s_{23}}{s_{123}}. \quad (3)$$

Working in a helicity basis, it suffices to consider the pure photon exchange amplitude \mathcal{A}_γ as it allows the reconstruction of the full amplitude with Z -boson exchange by adjusting the couplings. Furthermore, the complete information about \mathcal{A}_γ is given by just one independent helicity amplitude, which we take to be $A_\gamma(1^+, 2^+, 3^-, 4^+, 5^-)$. All other helicity configurations can be obtained from parity and charge conjugation.

We can write $A_\gamma(1^+, 2^+, 3^-, 4^+, 5^-)$ in terms of coefficients c_2, c_4, c_6 and c_{12} for the various independent spinor structure as

$$\begin{aligned} A_\gamma(1^+, 2^+, 3^-, 4^+, 5^-) &= \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{[12]}{s^3} \quad (4) \\ &\times \left\{ s\langle 35 \rangle [42] \left[(1-x_1) \left(c_2 + \frac{2}{x_2} c_6 - c_{12} \right) + (1-x_2) (c_4 - c_{12}) + 2c_{12} \right] \right. \\ &\left. - \langle 31 \rangle [12] \left[[43] \langle 35 \rangle \left(c_2 + \frac{2}{x_2} c_6 - c_{12} \right) + [41] \langle 15 \rangle (c_4 - c_{12}) \right] \right\}, \end{aligned}$$

where we have introduced the short-hand notation for spinors of definite helicity, $|i\pm\rangle = |p_i\pm\rangle = u_\pm(p_i) = v_\mp(p_i)$, $\langle i\pm| = \langle p_i\pm| = \bar{u}_\pm(p_i) = \bar{v}_\mp(p_i)$, and for the spinor products $\langle pq\rangle = \langle p-|q+\rangle$ and $[pq] = \langle p+|q-\rangle$.

The coefficients c_i depend on the x_1 and x_2 of eq.(3) and can be calculated in conventional dimensional regularization. To that end, we proceed as follows [6]-[8]. In a first step, with the help of Schwinger parameters [9], we map the tensor integrals to combinations of scalar integrals in various dimensions and with various powers ν_i of the propagators. For every basic topology, these scalar integrals can be written as nested sums involving Γ -functions. The evaluation of the nested sums proceeds systematically with

the help of the algorithms of [6], which rely on the algebraic properties of the so called Z -sums,

$$Z(n; m_1, \dots, m_k; x_1, \dots, x_k) = \sum_{n \geq i_1 > i_2 > \dots > i_k > 0} \frac{x_1^{i_1}}{i_1^{m_1}} \dots \frac{x_k^{i_k}}{i_k^{m_k}}. \quad (5)$$

By means of recursion the algorithms allow to solve the nested sums in terms of a given basis in Z -sums to any order in ε . Z -sums can be viewed as generalizations of harmonic sums [10] and an important subset of Z -sums are multiple polylogarithms [11],

$$\text{Li}_{m_k, \dots, m_1}(x_k, \dots, x_1) = Z(\infty; m_1, \dots, m_k; x_1, \dots, x_k). \quad (6)$$

All algorithms for this procedure have been implemented in FORM [12] and in the GiNaC framework [13, 14]. In this way, we could calculate all loop integrals contributing to the one- and two-loop virtual amplitudes very efficiently in terms of multiple polylogarithms.

The perturbative expansion in α_s of the functions c_i is defined through

$$c_i = \sqrt{4\pi\alpha_s} \left(c_i^{(0)} + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right) c_i^{(1)} + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right)^2 c_i^{(2)} + O(\alpha_s^3) \right). \quad (7)$$

Then, after ultraviolet renormalization, the infrared pole structure of the renormalized coefficients c_i^{ren} agrees with the prediction made by Catani [15] using an infrared factorization formula. We use this formula to organize the finite part into terms arising from the expansion of the pole coefficients and a finite remainder,

$$c_i^{(2),\text{fin}} = c_i^{(1),\text{ren}} - \mathbf{I}^{(1)}(\varepsilon) c_i^{(1),\text{ren}} - \mathbf{I}^{(2)}(\varepsilon) c_i^{(0)}, \quad (8)$$

for $i = \{2, 4, 6, 12\}$, and with the one- and two-loop insertion operators $\mathbf{I}^{(1)}(\varepsilon)$ and $\mathbf{I}^{(2)}(\varepsilon)$ given in [15].

As an example, we present our result for $n_f N$ -contribution to the finite part $c_{12}^{(2),\text{fin}}$ at two loops,

$$\begin{aligned} c_{12}^{(2),\text{fin}}(x_1, x_2) = & n_f N \left(3 \frac{\ln(x_1)}{(x_1+x_2)^2} + \frac{1}{4} \frac{\ln(x_2)^2 - 2\text{Li}_2(1-x_2)}{x_1(1-x_2)} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{12} \frac{\zeta(2)}{(1-x_2)x_1} - \frac{1}{18} \frac{13x_1^2 + 36x_1 - 10x_1x_2 - 18x_2 + 31x_2^2}{(x_1+x_2)^2 x_1(1-x_2)} \ln(x_2) \\ & + \frac{x_1^2 - x_2^2 - 2x_1 + 4x_2}{(x_1+x_2)^4} \mathbf{R}_1(x_1, x_2) - \frac{1}{12} \frac{\mathbf{R}(x_1, x_2)}{x_1(x_1+x_2)^2} \left[5x_2 + 42x_1 + 5 \right] \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{(1+x_1)^2}{1-x_2} - 4\frac{1-3x_1+3x_1^2}{1-x_1-x_2} - 72\frac{x_1^2}{x_1+x_2} \Big] + \left[\frac{1}{12} \frac{1}{x_1(1-x_2)} + \frac{6}{(x_1+x_2)^3} \right. \\
& \left. - \frac{1+2x_1}{x_1(x_1+x_2)^2} \right] (\text{Li}_2(1-x_2) - \text{Li}_2(1-x_1)) - \frac{1}{(x_1+x_2)x_1} \Big) \\
& - \frac{1}{2} I\pi n_f N \frac{\ln(x_2)}{x_1(1-x_2)}.
\end{aligned}$$

We have introduced the function $R(x_1, x_2)$, which is well known from [16],

$$\begin{aligned}
R(x_1, x_2) = & \hspace{15em} (10) \\
& \left(\frac{1}{2} \ln(x_1) \ln(x_2) - \ln(x_1) \ln(1-x_1) + \frac{1}{2} \zeta(2) - \text{Li}_2(x_1) \right) + (x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2).
\end{aligned}$$

In addition, it is convenient, to define the symmetric function $R_1(x_1, x_2)$, which contains a particular combination of multiple polylogarithms [11],

$$\begin{aligned}
R_1(x_1, x_2) = & \left(\ln(x_1) \text{Li}_{1,1} \left(\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2}, x_1+x_2 \right) - \frac{1}{2} \zeta(2) \ln(1-x_1-x_2) \right) (11) \\
& + \text{Li}_3(x_1+x_2) - \ln(x_1) \text{Li}_2(x_1+x_2) - \frac{1}{2} \ln(x_1) \ln(x_2) \ln(1-x_1-x_2) \\
& - \text{Li}_{1,2} \left(\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2}, x_1+x_2 \right) - \text{Li}_{2,1} \left(\frac{x_1}{x_1+x_2}, x_1+x_2 \right) \Big) + (x_1 \leftrightarrow x_2).
\end{aligned}$$

We have made the following checks on our result. As remarked, the infrared poles agree with the structure predicted by Catani [15]. This provides a strong check of the complete pole structure of our result. In addition, we have tested various relations between the c_i . For instance, the combination $x_1 c_6$ is symmetric under exchange of x_1 with x_2 . Finally, we could compare with the result for the squared matrix elements, i.e. the interference of the two-loop amplitude with the Born amplitude, and the interference of the one-loop amplitude with itself. The results of [5] are given in terms of one- and two-dimensional harmonic polylogarithms, which form a subset of the multiple polylogarithms [11]. Thus, we have performed the comparison analytically and we agree with the results of [5].

3. Conclusions

Our result represents one contribution to the full next-to-next-to-leading order calculation of $e^+e^- \rightarrow 3$ -jets. It has been obtained by means of an efficient method based on nested sums and is expressed in terms of multiple polylogarithms with simple arguments. As a consequence, our result can be continued analytically and applies also to $(2+1)$ -jet production in deep-inelastic scattering or to the production of a massive vector boson in

hadron-hadron collisions. At the same time, it provides an important cross check on the results for the squared matrix elements [5] with a completely independent method.

After the results of section 2 had been presented at this conference, Garland et al. published results for the complete two-loop amplitude for $e^+e^- \rightarrow q\bar{q}g$. Our results are in agreement with ref. [17].

REFERENCES

- [1] G. Dissertori, (2001), hep-ex/0105070.
- [2] F. A. Berends, W. T. Giele, and H. Kuijf, Nucl. Phys. **B321**, 39 (1989); K. Hagiwara and D. Zeppenfeld, Nucl. Phys. **B313**, 560 (1989).
- [3] Z. Bern, L. Dixon, D. A. Kosower, and S. Weinzierl, Nucl. Phys. **B489**, 3 (1997), hep-ph/9610370; Z. Bern, L. Dixon, and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. **B513**, 3 (1998), hep-ph/9708239.
- [4] E. W. N. Glover and D. J. Miller, Phys. Lett. **B396**, 257 (1997), hep-ph/9609474; J. M. Campbell, E. W. N. Glover, and D. J. Miller, Phys. Lett. **B409**, 503 (1997), hep-ph/9706297.
- [5] L. W. Garland, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, A. Koukoutsakis, and E. Remiddi, Nucl. Phys. **B627**, 107 (2002), hep-ph/0112081.
- [6] S. Moch, P. Uwer, and S. Weinzierl, J. Math. Phys. **43**, 3363 (2002), hep-ph/0110083.
- [7] S. Moch, P. Uwer, and S. Weinzierl, published in Budapest 2001, hep2001/004, hep-ph/0110407.
- [8] S. Moch, P. Uwer, and S. Weinzierl, hep-ph/0207043.
- [9] O. V. Tarasov, Phys. Rev. **D54**, 6479 (1996), hep-th/9606018 ; Nucl. Phys. **B502**, 455 (1997), hep-ph/9703319; C. Anastasiou, E. W. N. Glover, and C. Oleari, Nucl. Phys. **B575**, 416 (2000), hep-ph/9912251.
- [10] J. A. M. Vermaseren, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A14**, 2037 (1999), hep-ph/9806280; J. Blümlein and S. Kurth, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 014018 (1999), hep-ph/9810241.
- [11] A. B. Goncharov, Math. Res. Lett. **5**, 497 (1998); J. M. Borwein, D. M. Bradley, D. J. Broadhurst, and P. Lisonek, math.CA/9910045; E. Remiddi and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A15**, 725 (2000), hep-ph/9905237.
- [12] J. A. M. Vermaseren, (2000), math-ph/0010025.
- [13] C. Bauer, A. Frink, and R. Kreckel, (2000), cs/0004015.
- [14] S. Weinzierl, Comput. Phys. Commun. **145**, 357 (2002), math-ph/0201011.
- [15] S. Catani, Phys. Lett. **B427**, 161 (1998), hep-ph/9802439.
- [16] R. K. Ellis, D. A. Ross, and A. E. Terrano, Nucl. Phys. **B178**, 421 (1981).
- [17] L. W. Garland, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, A. Koukoutsakis, and E. Remiddi, (2002), hep-ph/0206067.