

# Towards $Wb\bar{b} + j$ at NLO with an automatized approach to one-loop computations

---

Laura Reina,<sup>a,b</sup> Thomas Schutzmeier<sup>a</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Physics Department, Florida State University  
Tallahassee, FL, 32306-4350, USA*

*E-mail:* [reina@hep.fsu.edu](mailto:reina@hep.fsu.edu), [tschutzmeier@hep.fsu.edu](mailto:tschutzmeier@hep.fsu.edu)

**ABSTRACT:** We present results for the  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  virtual corrections to  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$  obtained with a new automatized approach to the evaluation of one-loop amplitudes in terms of Feynman diagrams. Together with the  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  corrections to  $q\bar{q}' \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}g$ , which can be obtained from our results by crossing symmetry, this represents the bulk of the next-to-leading order virtual QCD corrections to  $Wb\bar{b} + j$  and  $Wb + j$  hadronic production, calculated in a fixed-flavor scheme with four light flavors. Furthermore, these corrections represent a well defined and independent subset of the 1-loop amplitudes needed for the NNLO calculation of  $Wb\bar{b}$ . Our approach was tested against several existing results for NLO amplitudes including selected  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  one-loop corrections to  $W + 3j$  hadronic production. We discuss the efficiency of our method both with respect to evaluation time and numerical stability.

---

## Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>General strategy</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Reduction of tensor integrals</b>	<b>6</b>
<b>4</b>	<b>Characteristics of the automatized approach</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>5</b>	<b>Result for <math>d\bar{g} \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}u</math></b>	<b>9</b>
<b>6</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>10</b>

---

## 1 Introduction

One of the most important background processes to single-top production as well as searches for a light Higgs boson is the associated production of a  $W$  boson with a pair of massive bottom quarks, contributing to both the  $W + b$ -jet and  $W + 2b$ -jet signatures. The precise theoretical knowledge of these processes provides moreover an excellent probe of our current understanding of QCD when confronted with measurements in various kinematic regimes at high-energy hadron colliders.

At the Tevatron  $p\bar{p}$  collider at Fermilab, the cross sections for  $W$  boson +  $b$  jets production have been measured in different forms by both the CDF [1] and D0 [2] collaborations and the Large Hadron  $pp$  Collider (LHC) at CERN is expected to provide additional experimental insight with increased precision. A first measurement from the ATLAS collaboration has recently been published [3] and new measurements with better statistics are expected by the end of the year.

On the theory side, next-to-leading order (NLO) QCD corrections to  $W$  production with up to two jets containing at most one heavy  $b$  jet are known [4] and cross sections for  $W + 2b$ -jets were determined both in the massless  $b$ -quark approximation [5–9] and including  $b$ -quark mass effects [10–13] at the same level of precision. From existing NLO QCD calculations, the theoretical prediction for the production of  $W + 2$  jets with at least one  $b$  jet has been provided in Ref. [14] and compared to the CDF [1] and ATLAS [3] measurements in Refs. [15] and [16] respectively. Recently, the NLO calculation of  $Wb\bar{b}$  has been interfaced with shower Monte Carlo generators using both POWHEG [17] and MC@NLO [18]. The study of the NLO corrections to  $Wb\bar{b}$  shows, however, that the NLO theoretical prediction for  $Wb\bar{b}$  production is plagued by large renormalization and factorization scale uncertainties in particular at the LHC [12]. In fact, at this order of perturbative QCD, a new  $qg$  initiated channel with an additional parton in the final state ( $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$ ) opens up and, being a tree level process, introduces a strong scale dependence. This effect is particularly pronounced

at the LHC, where the NLO  $qg$  channel competes with the  $q\bar{q}'$  channel due to the substantial initial state gluon density. Only a complete NNLO calculation of  $pp(p\bar{p}) \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}$  can be expected to reduce this spurious scale dependence and give a theoretical prediction consistent at this order of QCD. However, this requires the evaluation of two-loop virtual corrections to a massive  $2 \rightarrow 3$  process as well as one-loop corrections to  $2 \rightarrow 4$  massive processes, and single and double particle emissions through real corrections: a truly difficult task. In this paper we focus on and present results for one of the many contributions to  $pp(p\bar{p}) \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}$  at NNLO: the  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  virtual corrections to the  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$  channel, keeping the full bottom-quark mass dependence. Results for the  $\bar{q}g \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}\bar{q}'$  channel are identical at the partonic level and in the following it will be understood that  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$  refers to both channels.

Our choice is motivated by the following considerations. First of all, the  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  virtual corrections to the  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$  channel are a well-defined independent piece of the overall NNLO calculation of  $Wb\bar{b}$  hadroproduction. It can be directly translated into the analogous  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  virtual corrections to  $q\bar{q}' \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}g$  by partial crossing of initial and final states. Once interfered with the corresponding tree level amplitudes, they provide a self-standing and well-defined part of the one-loop contributions to the full NNLO  $Wb\bar{b}$  cross section, namely the one-loop virtual contributions from  $2 \rightarrow 4$  processes. The remaining one-loop corrections come from the interference of the one-loop amplitude for the  $2 \rightarrow 3$  process ( $q\bar{q}' \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}$ ) with itself, and is not part of this study. Furthermore, when complemented with the corresponding real corrections to  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$  and  $q\bar{q}' \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}g$ , our calculation completely determine the NLO cross sections for both  $Wb\bar{b}+j$  and, within a fully consistent four-flavor-number scheme,  $Wb+j$  production, i.e. for the production of a  $W$  boson with one or two  $b$  jets plus a light jet, where the difference between the two processes is just the number of  $b$  jets tagged in the final state (the parton level processes being the same in the four-flavor-number scheme). Since NLO real-emission contributions nowadays can be determined in a mostly automatized fashion with the help of existing packages, for instance SHERPA [19], as well as NLO Monte Carlo frameworks as POWHEG [20, 21] and MC@NLO [22], the virtual one-loop corrections that we present in this paper constitute the only missing piece for the NLO QCD cross section prediction of the above processes and are therefore highly desirable. Both in this and the previous case, our calculation should contribute to reduce the theoretical uncertainty from the unphysical scale dependence that plague the prediction of  $W+b$ -jets cross sections.

The computation of QCD one-loop corrections to  $2 \rightarrow n$  processes with  $n \geq 4$  is, even in the massless limit, a challenging task and retaining the mass dependence on internal and external particles increases the complexity even further. Therefore, only a few full NLO cross section computations of  $2 \rightarrow 4$  and  $2 \rightarrow 5$  processes have been carried out to date, among them the productions of  $W+4j$  [23],  $Z+4j$  [24],  $4j$  [25],  $Z/\gamma+3j$  [26],  $W+3j$  [27–31],  $W+2\gamma+j$  [32],  $t\bar{t}jj$  [34, 35],  $t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$  [36–39],  $b\bar{b}b\bar{b}$  [40],  $W^+W^\pm jj$  [41, 42] and  $W^+W^-b\bar{b}$  [43, 44]. A particularly difficult component of this kind of high-multiplicity processes is the calculation of virtual one-loop QCD corrections. The prospect of increasingly accurate measurements at the LHC triggered a lot of interest in the improvement and automatization of NLO cross section predictions. Primarily two different strategies

have been developed for the evaluation of one-loop corrections: the traditional Feynman-diagram-based approach as well as unitarity techniques [45, 46]. Powerful packages like BlackHat [27, 47], CutTools [48], Helac-nlo [49], Rocket [29, 50] and MadLoop [51] exist that provide automatization and efficient numerical implementations of unitarity methods and that have been successfully applied to the calculation of cutting-edge one-loop processes. Recently, the automatized package GoSam [52] has been developed and applied to the automatized computation of a wide range of NLO cross sections. Moreover, several fast and efficient private codes exist that follow the traditional approach of Feynman diagrams and tensor-integral reduction.


In this work, we develop and describe a new automatized approach to one-loop calculations based on Feynman diagrams. We test our techniques against several  $2 \rightarrow 3$  and  $2 \rightarrow 4$  processes for which results are available. For instance, we are able to reproduce the  $\bar{u}d \rightarrow Wd\bar{d}g$  results for  $W + 3j$  production at NLO [26, 28]. Finally, we apply them to the novel computation of one-loop corrections to the cross section of  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$  with a massive  $b$  quark.

The paper is organized as follows: In section 2, we present the anatomy of the parton-level processes and discuss the general strategy to generate and simplify amplitude-specific expressions. Our numerically stable approach to the evaluation of one-loop tensor integrals is explained in section 3. Section 4 is devoted to the analysis of the achieved accuracy and computation times. Finally, we conclude by presenting a numerical result for  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}u$  at NLO for a single phase-space point in section 5. Section 6 contains some brief conclusions.


## 2 General strategy

At leading order in the strong coupling, the  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}q'$  process, with the choice  $q = d$  and  $q' = u$  which we consider in the following, consists of 12 tree level diagrams. Examples of these diagrams are depicted in fig. 1 and one-loop QCD corrections are obtained by adding virtual gluons and fermions, yielding 308 Feynman diagrams. Ultra-violet (UV) and infrared (IR) divergences are regularized with dimensional regularization in  $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$  dimensions and we keep the full bottom-quark mass dependence while lighter quarks are treated as massless. We enforce transversality of external bosons through  $p_W \cdot \epsilon_W = 0$  and  $p_g \cdot \epsilon_g = 0$ , with  $\epsilon_{W/g}^\mu$  and  $p_{W/g}^\mu$  being the polarization vectors and momenta of the  $W$  boson and gluon, respectively. While this choice is obvious for gluons, it is justified for the  $W$  boson only for weak couplings to massless fermions, which is the case in the amplitude at hand.

In the limit of a vanishing bottom-quark mass, the  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}u$  transition also contributes to  $W + 3j$  production at NLO. To verify the correctness of our approach we choose the  $W + 3j$  subprocess  $\bar{u}d \rightarrow Wd\bar{d}g$ , parts of which can be obtained by crossing of the  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}u$  diagrams and setting the bottom-quark mass to zero. Because  $d$  quarks appear both in the initial and final state, however, the number of diagrams is doubled both at LO and at NLO due to contributions like the ones depicted in fig. 2 and their one-loop corrections. We checked our results against Ref. [28] and found agreement.



**Figure 1.** Example of LO diagrams for  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}u$ .



**Figure 2.** Examples of additional LO diagrams required for  $\bar{u}d \rightarrow Wd\bar{d}g$  which can not be obtained through crossing of the massless limit of  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}u$ .

In the traditional Feynman diagram based approach to the evaluation of one-loop corrections, a given NLO amplitude  $\mathcal{M}^{(1)}$  is commonly decomposed as

$$\mathcal{M}^{(1)} = \sum_i C_i \sum_j c_{ij} I_j \hat{\mathcal{M}}_j^{(1)} \quad (2.1)$$

with color structures  $C_i$  and polarization/spin information  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_j^{(1)}$ .  $I_j$  denotes tensor one-loop integrals after decomposition into tensor structures of external momenta and contraction of all Lorentz indices. The sum over  $j$  in eqn. (2.1) for a given term  $C_i$  runs over all one-loop sub-diagrams with the same color structure.

The color- and spin-summed and/or -averaged squared amplitude is given by

$$\Gamma = \text{Re} \left( \sum_{\text{colors}} \sum_{\text{pol}} \mathcal{M}^{(1)} \mathcal{M}^{(0)*} \right) = \text{Re} \left( \sum_n I_n \Lambda_n \right) \quad (2.2)$$

with

$$\Lambda_n = \sum_{ij} \sum_{\text{colors}} C_i C_j^* \sum_{\text{pol}} c_{in} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_n^{(1)} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_j^{(0)*} \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}$  is the leading-order amplitude

$$\mathcal{M}^{(0)} = \sum_i C_i \hat{\mathcal{M}}_i^{(0)}, \quad (2.4)$$

decomposed in color space on the same basis of color structures  $C_i$ .

After organizing the NLO amplitude by color factor, standard  $SU(3)$  relations are applied to simplify the color structures and the resulting set of color coefficients is extracted.

Summing/averaging over final/initial color indices, after contraction with the LO color components, yielding the  $C_i C_j^*$  term in eqn. (2.3), is performed at this point. In the next step, tensor integrals are decomposed into Lorentz invariant tensor coefficients and a standard ordering of Dirac and spinor structures is achieved with the help of anti-commutation relations of Dirac matrices and the application of the equations of motion. The amplitude is subsequently expanded in  $(d - 4)$  and UV/IR divergences are separated such that four-dimensional identities can be safely used without introducing the need for rational terms of either IR or UV origin [36]. Moreover, this approach also avoids ambiguities in the definition of the  $\gamma_5$  matrix, which we treat in naive dimensional regularization. The complete polarization information of the amplitude is contained in Dirac chains and polarization vectors of external bosons, commonly called standard matrix elements (SME),  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_k$ . At this stage, the number of SME is of the order of several thousand for both  $2 \rightarrow 4$  processes. Reducing the set of SME to linear combinations in a smaller basis  $\{\tilde{\mathcal{M}}_k\}$  is crucial since the size of final expressions, and therefore the computational complexity, scales with the number of SME. Algebraic relations based on four-dimensional identities tailored for the specific process and SME at hand have been described in [36–38, 53, 54] and successfully applied in several calculations. However, a reduction to a sufficiently small basis is not straightforward, requires careful inspection of the individual contributions on a case by case basis, and is also dependent on the order of the application of different relations. To automatize this procedure, we have developed a graph based approach to the SME reduction that allows for an efficient implementation and performs a brute-force search for a small SME basis. Products of Dirac chains are translated to directed graphs where the various structures, like gamma matrices, projection operators, and spinors are represented by nodes, and directed edges describe contractions of Lorentz indices and the ordering of structures. Algebraic relations then translate to operations on graphs, for instance shrinking of edges, exchanging or adding of nodes, and result in general in disconnected graphs. Since this method can be expressed very efficiently within the framework of graph theory without the need for computationally expensive algebraic manipulations of lengthy expressions, our implementation is capable of testing a huge number of combinations of transformations. Typically, the original set of SME is reduced to a basis of several hundred elements this way. Our variant of the SME reduction will be discussed in more detail elsewhere [55].

As a last step, the products  $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_n^{(1)} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_k^{(0)*}$  of the NLO SME with the leading-order color amplitudes are evaluated, Dirac chains properly contracted, and summations over spins and polarizations as well as traces are performed. We translate the resulting expressions into C code for an efficient numerical evaluation.

Altogether, the structure of the final evaluation routines is as follows: each NLO diagram/color amplitude contracted with the tree level diagrams is expressed through linear combinations of tensor integral coefficients, products of SME, and kinematic invariants. The evaluation of tensor coefficients is done as presented in sec. 3, while products of SME are computed once per phase-space point and reused. Finally, the sum over squared color amplitudes is evaluated.

It is important to note that, after specifying the desired process and kinematics, no

user interaction is required from the point of diagram generation to the final numerical code for the cross section evaluation at single phase-space points. All algebraic manipulations are performed using `FORM` while other components like SME and tensor reductions are developed in `C++`. Transparent interfaces, using `Python`, process input and output between the different stages and allow for extensive intermediate checks. The final cross section evaluation is made accessible through an automatically generated and flexible `C++` interface that allows, for instance, the evaluation of single diagrams or color amplitudes interfered with the LO contributions, the extraction of divergences, different reduction methods or a direct connection with a phase-space generator.

### 3 Reduction of tensor integrals

The integration over the loop momentum in NLO one-loop amplitudes involves  $N$ -point tensor integrals  $T_{\mu_1\mu_2\ldots\mu_p}^N$  that are commonly decomposed into linear combinations of tensor structures (products of external momenta and metric tensors) with Lorentz invariant so-called tensor coefficients  $T_{\{j\}}^N$ . The indices  $\{j\}$  encode the rank and composition of the corresponding tensor structure. The general strategy for the evaluation of  $T_{\{j\}}^N$  is their reduction to master integrals, usually scalar  $N$ -point functions  $T_0^N$ . In the case of  $N$ -point tensors with  $N \leq 4$  the well-known Passarino-Veltman (PV) algorithm [56] can be used, while  $N > 4$  coefficients are reduced to linear combinations of four-point tensor integrals. Due to numerical instabilities in the vicinity of phase-space points where Gram determinants become small, alternative reduction techniques exist to produce reliable results.

**Applied methods** Our tensor reduction approach combines different methods, allows for cross checks between them and ensures numerical stability in an automatized way. For  $N$ -point functions with  $N \leq 4$  the following reduction schemes are used:

- PV reduction [56],
- reduction with modified Cayley determinants as introduced by Denner and Dittmaier (DD) in [57], and
- expansions around small quantities, like Gram/Cayley determinants and kinematic invariants (DDx) developed by the same authors of Ref. [57].

In addition, our software is capable of producing multiple precision (MP) reductions with help of the `qd` library [58], that turn out to be numerically stable already in the framework of the PV reduction (MP PV). Tensor coefficients with five and six external legs are evaluated following an approach by Diakonidis et al. [59, 60] that is free of inverse Gram determinants (GDF) and therefore numerically stable.

Our implementation is inspired by [57] and performs the reduction numerically. However, the original recursive algorithm is unrolled into an iterative procedure by arranging the tensor coefficients in a tree-like structure, which provides fine-grained control over different aspects of the reduction. We choose the PV reduction for  $N \leq 4$  in the absence of numerical instabilities and the GDF reduction for  $N > 4$  as our standard methods.



Based on these reductions, the evaluation tree is constructed for the required set of tensor coefficients  $T_{\{j\}}^N$  in such a way that the minimal number of evaluations is guaranteed. For optimal reuse of intermediate results, coefficients with different mass distributions on internal propagators are brought to a standard form with respect to the external momenta and internal masses and are treated together. As an example consider a completely massless 3-point function coefficient that is required for some subdiagrams in the amplitude. The same coefficient may appear as a dependency in the reduction of several 4-point functions, which can be either massless or contain one massive propagator. The nodes of the evaluation tree are assigned the default reduction strategy and after initial creation the tree is reused for the majority of phase-space points. As already mentioned, this strategy works well in large regions of phase space, but becomes numerically unstable if small Gram determinants in  $N \leq 4$  point coefficients are encountered. In this case, the evaluation tree is extended with subtrees for the unstable tensor functions and their dependencies only. These newly created subtrees are computed with one of the alternative methods, either DD or DDx as needed, or with MP PV, to ensure numerical stability, while all other nodes are reduced with the default procedures. While both approaches provide numerically stable results, we use the former techniques mainly for cross checks in critical phase-space regions while we employ the latter in computations of squared amplitudes. As subtrees are added, the reduction program keeps track of the conditions that lead to inconsistencies such that the newly created evaluation paths can be reused in future evaluations.

**Numerical stability** Detecting numerical instabilities at a single phase-space point is in general a non-trivial task without examining the surrounding phase-space domain or additional external information. Performing the tensor reduction in  $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$  dimensions and regulating both ultraviolet and infrared divergences dimensionally, however, offers a direct handle on the achieved accuracy. Firstly, the scalar one-loop integrals in terms of which the tensor-integral coefficients are reduced have to be known retaining the full pole structure. For this task, we use a custom implementation based on `QCDLoop` [61] for the IR poles together with a modified version of `LoopTools` [62] that allows for multiple precision evaluations. During the reduction which is performed on the divergent and finite parts separately, UV/IR poles are affected by the same numerical instabilities as the finite part. Provided the divergences can be computed for a given tensor coefficient independently in a reliable way, a direct comparison can be used to detect a loss of precision<sup>1</sup>. UV poles of tensor coefficients in the minimal subtraction scheme are mass independent and can either be obtained with a single analytic reduction or can be taken from the appendix of [57]. In contrast, IR divergences occur in certain limits of vanishing kinematic invariants and have to be studied in all these cases individually. To this end, we have reduced 3- and 4-point tensor coefficients up to rank 4 analytically in the various IR divergent limits. Using these results a numerically stable library for their computation was carefully established and thoroughly cross-checked with the full analytical results for a wide range of input parameters. In our reduction, the UV and IR poles of each tensor coefficient are

---

<sup>1</sup>At the cross section level, the same approach to identify numerical instabilities has been successfully used in [28, 47, 63].



then checked against this library for every phase-space point and, in case of inconsistencies, alternative reduction methods are employed as described above. Of course, this procedure comes with a computational cost, that is mainly due to the multiple reductions for pole and finite parts and the evaluation of scalar integrals, while the contribution from the IR pole evaluation routines are negligible. However, thanks to the efficient design of the reduction algorithm and extensive caching, the run times are competitive with what is reported in the literature: computation times in the numerically stable case for all tensor integrals required in a mixed massive and massless  $2 \rightarrow 4$  process average at around 20 ms per phase-space point on an Intel i7 950 CPU at 3.07GHz.

## 4 Characteristics of the automatized approach

In its current state, our automatized approach is tested for QCD NLO one-loop corrections to amplitudes with up to six external particles, of which at least one and at most three are (weak or strong) gauge bosons. We have cross checked several  $2 \rightarrow 3$  and  $2 \rightarrow 4$  processes with the literature. For instance we have reproduced full results for  $Wb\bar{b}/Zb\bar{b}$  hadroproduction [10–12] and we have checked individual parts of the NLO calculation of hard-photon production with heavy quarks ( $Q\bar{Q}\gamma$  for  $Q = b, t$ ) against an independent internal calculation [64]. The  $2 \rightarrow 4$  process  $\bar{u}d \rightarrow Wd\bar{d}g$  was checked at one benchmark point against a result obtained in [28].

Apart from instabilities in the reduction of tensor coefficients, cancellations in intermediate expressions of the unrenormalized squared amplitude  $\Gamma$  in eqn. (2.3) may also induce a loss of accuracy in some phase-space regions. In this case, we extend the numerical precision for both the complete tensor reduction as well as the evaluation of the whole contribution to  $\Gamma$ . Again, the loss of precision is detected by comparison with the expected UV divergence structure of  $\Gamma$ , which is independent of the used renormalization scheme and can be obtained with high precision from counterterm contributions. This step is computationally most expensive, as a huge number of operations has to be performed in slow multiple precision mode both in the tensor reduction and in the evaluation of  $\Gamma$ . Fortunately, the proportion of this type of evaluations is in general relatively small. Compared to the naive approach where no analysis of instabilities is performed on the tensor reduction level, the necessary number of this kind of evaluations is substantially reduced.

Table 1 gives an overview of the obtained efficiency for the evaluation at  $5 \cdot 10^4$  random phase-space points with reasonable cuts, requesting a maximal relative error of  $10^{-5}$ . As expected, the evaluation time scales with the number of external particles. Moreover, due to a larger basis of SME, amplitudes containing weak couplings compared to for example  $t\bar{t}\gamma$  production are computationally more expensive. An interesting observation, however, is the fact that the number of switches to multiple precision evaluations, both within the reduction and at the amplitude squared level, do not vary much between processes of comparable complexity. Although evaluations in quadruple precision take significantly more time with increasing number of external states, the overall evaluation time is governed by the numerically stable bulk of phase space.

Process	$r_s$	$r_q$	$r_{dq}$	$t_m/\text{ms}$	$t_s/\text{ms}$	$t_q/\text{ms}$	$t_{dq}/\text{ms}$	$t_q^{\text{full}}/\text{ms}$
$q\bar{q} \rightarrow \gamma t\bar{t}$	99.6%	0.4%	0	9.5	8.9	153	0	1069
$gg \rightarrow \gamma t\bar{t}$	98.9%	1.1%	0	12.0	10.1	182	0	1972
$q\bar{q}' \rightarrow W b\bar{b}$	99.7%	0.3%	0	10.9	10.4	167	0	1264
$q\bar{q} \rightarrow Z b\bar{b}$	99.8%	0.1%	0.1%	17.7	14.4	217	3161	2290
$gg \rightarrow Z b\bar{b}$	98.3%	1.6%	0.1%	22.5	15.7	233	3314	2706
$\bar{u}d \rightarrow d\bar{d}gW$	95.4%	3.6%	1.0%	90.3	37.5	306	4358	5503
$ug \rightarrow b\bar{b}dW$	93.1%	5.6%	1.3%	95.4	29.7	311	3870	5192

**Table 1.** Benchmarks of the numerically stabilized method applied to various NLO amplitudes for the evaluation of  $5 \cdot 10^4$  phase-space points.  $r_s$ ,  $r_q$  and  $r_{dq}$  give the ratios of phase-space points that required either only standard (double) or also some additional quadruple/double-quadruple precision evaluations at the reduction or amplitude-squared level for reliable numerical results.  $t_m$  gives the mean evaluation time per phase-space point while  $t_s$ ,  $t_q$  and  $t_{dq}$  denote separate mean timings for the respective numerical precision. Finally, the mean computation time of both the amplitude and tensor reduction in full quadruple precision is given in  $t_q^{\text{full}}$ . The above numbers were obtained on an Intel i7 950 CPU at 3.07GHz.

It is instructive to study the effect of both our approach and different choices of reduction algorithms on the obtained accuracy in the final result. First, the unrenormalized squared NLO amplitude of  $dg \rightarrow W b\bar{b}u$  is sampled in multiple precision for  $5 \cdot 10^4$  different phase-space points and the UV divergent parts are verified to cancel with counterterm contributions. The so-obtained results serve as high-precision reference points  $\Gamma_{\text{ref},i}$ . Subsequently, we compute the squared amplitude for the same set of points using two different strategies:

1. standard reduction of 5- and 6-point tensor coefficients,
2. GDF reduction of 5- and 6-point tensor coefficients with switches to multiple precision both at the  $n$ -point tensor integral reduction and amplitude squared level when required, requesting a maximal relative error of  $10^{-5}$


and  $N \leq 4$ -point functions are treated with the PV reduction algorithm. Fig. 3 shows the distribution of the logarithmic error,

$$\Delta_i = \log_{10} \left( \frac{|\Gamma_i - \Gamma_{\text{ref},i}|}{|\Gamma_{\text{ref},i}|} \right), \quad (4.1)$$

of the squared amplitude  $\Gamma$  relative to the reference points  $\Gamma_{\text{ref}}$  for the two different cases. Without special handling of numerical instabilities, strategy 1, as expected shows a wide distribution of the obtained relative error. Our approach, strategy 2, gives a considerably better relative error distribution by reevaluating low precision points.

## 5 Result for $dg \rightarrow W b\bar{b}u$

For future reference, we provide our new result for the unrenormalized squared amplitude of  $dg \rightarrow W b\bar{b}u$  at NLO at a single phase-space point. The result is normalized to the LO



**Figure 3.** Comparison of the obtained numerical precision for the finite part of the process  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{u}$  at  $5 \times 10^4$  phase-space points using standard double precision PV tensor reductions and our numerically stable approach.

cross section in the following way

$$\hat{\Gamma} = \frac{(4\pi)^{2-\epsilon}}{8\pi\alpha_s} \frac{\Gamma(1-2\epsilon)}{\Gamma(1+\epsilon)\Gamma^2(1-\epsilon)} \frac{\Gamma}{|\mathcal{M}^{(0)}|^2}, \quad (5.1)$$

such that the final result is independent of the strong and weak couplings as well as CKM matrix elements. Furthermore, we use

$$m_W = 80.41 \text{ GeV and} \quad (5.2)$$

$$m_b = 4.62 \text{ GeV}. \quad (5.3)$$

for the weak-boson and bottom-quark masses and set all external particles on-shell.

For  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{u}$  our result with  $n_l = 4$  light and  $n_h = 1$  heavy-quark flavors at the phase-space point of tab. 2 with renormalization scale  $\mu^2 = (p_d + p_g)^2$  reads

$$\hat{\Gamma}(dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{u}) = -5.6666667 \epsilon^{-2} + 39.342424 \epsilon^{-1} + 292.92493 \quad (5.4)$$

## 6 Conclusions

We have developed a new automatized approach to the evaluation of one-loop amplitudes in terms of Feynman diagrams and applied it to the calculation of the  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s)$  virtual corrections to  $qg \rightarrow Wb\bar{q}'$  (and  $q\bar{q}' \rightarrow Wb\bar{q}$ ). These corrections enter the NNLO calculation of  $Wb\bar{b}$  hadroproduction as well as the NLO calculation of both  $Wb\bar{b} + j$  and  $Wb + j$  production in a fully consistent four-flavor-number scheme. A thorough study of the impact of these

	$E$	$p^1$	$p^2$	$p^3$
$p_d$	100.000000000000	0	0	100.000000000000
$p_g$	100.000000000000	0	0	-100.000000000000
$p_u$	14.4169546267975	-3.59819144566031	6.52544251406004	-12.3418069595668
$p_b$	53.6542637065835	-16.9076522158373	-49.1575349754512	12.4540622120327
$p_{\bar{b}}$	25.2318438952597	-17.2383739318242	-15.9080092164594	8.06692341047065
$p_W$	106.696937771359	37.7442175933219	58.5401016778506	-8.17917866293656

**Table 2.** Phase-space point used for  $dg \rightarrow Wb\bar{b}u$

corrections in both previous cases as well as the application of the method developed in this paper to other processes will be the subject of future publications.

## Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Thomas Reiter for providing results that confirmed the main result of this work. This work is supported in part by the U.S. Department of Energy under grant DE-FG02-97IR41022 and by the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF PHY05-51164. L.R. would like to thank the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics (KITP) for the kind hospitality while this work was being completed.

## References

- [1] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 131801 (2010) [arXiv:0909.1505 [hep-ex]].
- [2] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 091802 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0410062].
- [3] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], arXiv:1109.1470 [hep-ex].
- [4] J. M. Campbell, R. K. Ellis, F. Maltoni and S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 054015 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0611348].
- [5] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Nucl. Phys. B **513**, 3 (1998) [arXiv:hep-ph/9708239].
- [6] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, D. A. Kosower and S. Weinzierl, Nucl. Phys. B **489**, 3 (1997) [arXiv:hep-ph/9610370].
- [7] R. K. Ellis and S. Veseli, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 011501 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9810489].
- [8] J. M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 113007 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0202176].
- [9] J. M. Campbell, R. K. Ellis and D. L. Rainwater, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 094021 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0308195].
- [10] F. Febres Cordero, L. Reina and D. Wackeroth, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 034007 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0606102].
- [11] F. Febres Cordero, arXiv:0809.3829 [hep-ph].
- [12] F. Febres Cordero, L. Reina and D. Wackeroth, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 034015 (2009) [arXiv:0906.1923 [hep-ph]].

- [13] S. Badger, J. M. Campbell and R. K. Ellis, JHEP **1103**, 027 (2011) [arXiv:1011.6647 [hep-ph]].
- [14] J. M. Campbell, R. K. Ellis, F. Febres Cordero, F. Maltoni, L. Reina, D. Wackeroth, S. Willenbrock, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 034023 (2009). [arXiv:0809.3003 [hep-ph]].
- [15] F. F. Cordero, L. Reina and D. Wackeroth, PoS **RADCOR2009**, 055 (2010) [arXiv:1001.3362 [hep-ph]].
- [16] F. Caola, J. M. Campbell, F. Febres Cordero, L. Reina and D. Wackeroth, arXiv:1107.3714 [hep-ph].
- [17] C. Oleari and L. Reina, JHEP **1108**, 061 (2011) arXiv:1105.4488 [hep-ph].
- [18] R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, R. Pittau and P. Torrielli, JHEP **1109**, 061 (2011) [arXiv:1106.6019 [hep-ph]].
- [19] T. Gleisberg, S. Hoeche, F. Krauss, M. Schonherr, S. Schumann, F. Siegert and J. Winter, JHEP **0902**, 007 (2009) [arXiv:0811.4622 [hep-ph]].
- [20] P. Nason, JHEP **0411**, 040 (2004). [arXiv:hep-ph/0409146 [hep-ph]].
- [21] S. Frixione, P. Nason, C. Oleari, JHEP **0711**, 070 (2007). [arXiv:0709.2092 [hep-ph]].
- [22] S. Frixione, B. R. Webber, JHEP **0206**, 029 (2002). [hep-ph/0204244].
- [23] C.F. Berger, Z. Bern, Lance J. Dixon, F. Febres Cordero, D. Forde, T. Gleisberg, H. Ita, D.A. Kosower, D. Maitre Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 092001 (2011) [arXiv:1009.2338 [hep-ph]].
- [24] H. Ita, Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, F. F. Cordero, D. A. Kosower and D. Maitre, arXiv:1108.2229 [hep-ph].
- [25] Z. Bern, G. Diana, L. J. Dixon, F. Febres Cordero, S. Hoeche, D. A. Kosower, H. Ita and D. Maitre *et al.*, arXiv:1112.3940 [hep-ph].
- [26] C.F. Berger, Z. Bern, Lance J. Dixon, F. Febres Cordero, D. Forde, T. Gleisberg, H. Ita, D.A. Kosower, D. Maitre Phys. Rev. D **82**, 074002 (2010) [arXiv:1004.1659 [hep-ph]].
- [27] C.F. Berger, Z. Bern, Lance J. Dixon, F. Febres Cordero, D. Forde, T. Gleisberg, H. Ita, D.A. Kosower, D. Maitre Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 222001 (2009) [arXiv:0902.2760 [hep-ph]].
- [28] C.F. Berger, Z. Bern, Lance J. Dixon, F. Febres Cordero, D. Forde, T. Gleisberg, H. Ita, D.A. Kosower, D. Maitre Phys. Rev. D **80**, 074036 (2009) [arXiv:0907.1984 [hep-ph]].
- [29] R. K. Ellis, W. T. Giele, Z. Kunszt, K. Melnikov and G. Zanderighi, JHEP **0901**, 012 (2009) [arXiv:0810.2762 [hep-ph]].
- [30] R. K. Ellis, K. Melnikov and G. Zanderighi, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 094002 (2009) [arXiv:0906.1445 [hep-ph]].
- [31] K. Melnikov and G. Zanderighi, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 074025 (2010) [arXiv:0910.3671 [hep-ph]].
- [32] F. Campanario, C. Englert, M. Rauch and D. Zeppenfeld, Phys. Lett. B **704**, 515 (2011) [arXiv:1106.4009 [hep-ph]].
- [33] F. Campanario, JHEP **1110** (2011) 070 [arXiv:1105.0920 [hep-ph]].
- [34] G. Bevilacqua, M. Czakon, C. G. Papadopoulos and M. Worek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104** (2010) 162002 [arXiv:1002.4009 [hep-ph]].
- [35] G. Bevilacqua, M. Czakon, C. G. Papadopoulos and M. Worek, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011) 114017 [arXiv:1108.2851 [hep-ph]].

- [36] A. Bredenstein, A. Denner, S. Dittmaier and S. Pozzorini, JHEP **0808**, 108 (2008) [arXiv:0807.1248 [hep-ph]].
- [37] A. Bredenstein, A. Denner, S. Dittmaier and S. Pozzorini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 012002 (2009) [arXiv:0905.0110 [hep-ph]].
- [38] A. Bredenstein, A. Denner, S. Dittmaier and S. Pozzorini, JHEP **1003**, 021 (2010) [arXiv:1001.4006 [hep-ph]].
- [39] G. Bevilacqua, M. Czakon, C. G. Papadopoulos, R. Pittau and M. Worek, JHEP **0909** (2009) 109 [arXiv:0907.4723 [hep-ph]].
- [40] T. Binoth, N. Greiner, A. Guffanti, J. Reuter, J. P. Guillet and T. Reiter, Phys. Lett. B **685**, 293 (2010) [arXiv:0910.4379 [hep-ph]].
- [41] T. Melia, K. Melnikov, R. Rontsch and G. Zanderighi, JHEP **1012**, 053 (2010) [arXiv:1007.5313 [hep-ph]].
- [42] T. Melia, K. Melnikov, R. Rontsch and G. Zanderighi, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 114043 (2011) [arXiv:1104.2327 [hep-ph]].
- [43] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, S. Kallweit and S. Pozzorini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 052001 (2011) [arXiv:1012.3975 [hep-ph]].
- [44] G. Bevilacqua, M. Czakon, A. van Hameren, C. G. Papadopoulos and M. Worek, JHEP **1102** (2011) 083 [arXiv:1012.4230 [hep-ph]].  
[45]
- [45] Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon and D. A. Kosower, Annals Phys. **322**, 1587 (2007) [arXiv:0704.2798 [hep-ph]].
- [46] R. K. Ellis, Z. Kunszt, K. Melnikov and G. Zanderighi, arXiv:1105.4319 [hep-ph].
- [47] C. F. Berger *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 036003 (2008) [arXiv:0803.4180 [hep-ph]].
- [48] G. Ossola, C. G. Papadopoulos and R. Pittau, JHEP **0803**, 042 (2008) [arXiv:0711.3596 [hep-ph]].
- [49] G. Bevilacqua, M. Czakon, M. V. Garzelli, A. van Hameren, A. Kardos, C. G. Papadopoulos, R. Pittau and M. Worek, arXiv:1110.1499 [hep-ph].
- [50] W. T. Giele and G. Zanderighi, JHEP **0806**, 038 (2008) [arXiv:0805.2152 [hep-ph]].
- [51] V. Hirschi, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, M. V. Garzelli, F. Maltoni and R. Pittau, JHEP **1105**, 044 (2011) [arXiv:1103.0621 [hep-ph]].
- [52] G. Cullen, N. Greiner, G. Heinrich, G. Luisoni, P. Mastrolia, G. Ossola, T. Reiter and F. Tramontano, arXiv:1111.2034 [hep-ph].
- [53] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, M. Roth and L. H. Wieders, Nucl. Phys. B **724**, 247 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0505042].
- [54] A. Denner, S. Dittmaier, M. Roth and L. H. Wieders, Phys. Lett. B **612**, 223 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0502063].
- [55] T. Schutzmeier, in preparation.
- [56] G. Passarino and M. J. G. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **160**, 151 (1979).
- [57] A. Denner and S. Dittmaier, Nucl. Phys. B **734**, 62 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0509141].
- [58] D. H. Bailey, <http://crd.lbl.gov/~dhbailey/mpdist/>

- [59] T. Diakonidis, J. Fleischer, J. Gluza, K. Kajda, T. Riemann and J. B. Tausk, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 036003 (2009) [arXiv:0812.2134 [hep-ph]].
- [60] T. Diakonidis, J. Fleischer, J. Gluza, K. Kajda, T. Riemann and J. B. Tausk, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **183**, 109 (2008) [arXiv:0807.2984 [hep-ph]].
- [61] R. K. Ellis and G. Zanderighi, JHEP **0802**, 002 (2008) [arXiv:0712.1851 [hep-ph]].
- [62] T. Hahn and M. Perez-Victoria, Comput. Phys. Commun. **118**, 153 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9807565].
- [63] C. F. Berger *et al.*, [arXiv:0808.0941 [hep-ph]].
- [64] H. Hartanto, L. Reina and T. Schutzmeier, in preparation
- [65] A. Denner and S. Dittmaier, Nucl. Phys. B **658** (2003) 175 [arXiv:hep-ph/0212259].