Prepared for submission to JHEP

arXiv:2003.05487v2 [hep-ph] 27 Mar 2020

Lorentz and permutation invariants of particles I

Ben Gripaios,[a] **Ward Haddadin,**[b] **and Christopher G. Lester**[a]

[a] *Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, J.J. Thomson Avenue, Cambridge, CB3 0HE, United Kingdom*

[b] *DAMTP, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

E-mail: gripaios@hep.phy.cam.ac.uk, w.haddadin@damtp.cam.ac.uk

Abstract: A theorem of Weyl tells us that the Lorentz (and parity) invariant polynomials in the momenta of n particles are generated by the dot products. We extend this result to include the action of an arbitrary permutation group $P \subset S_n$ on the particles, to take account of the quantum-field-theoretic fact that particles can be indistinguishable. Doing so provides a convenient set of variables for describing scattering processes involving identical particles, such as $pp \to jjj$, for which we provide an explicit set of Lorentz and permutation invariant generators.

Contents

1 Introduction **1**
- 1.1 Non-technical statement of results 3
- 1.2 Technical statement of results 4

2 General arguments **5**
- 2.1 Generators for Lorentz and permutation invariants 5
- 2.2 Generators for permutation invariants 6
- 2.3 Removing invariant masses 7

3 Generators of permutation invariants **9**

4 Redundancies **12**

5 Examples **13**
- 5.1 $pp \to jj$ 13
- 5.2 $pp \to jjj$ 14

6 Parity **15**

7 Discussion **16**

Appendix **16**

1 Introduction

Given the momentum vectors p_i of n particles in d spacetime dimensions, an old theorem of Weyl [1] tells us that the Lorentz- and parity-invariant polynomials are generated by the dot products $p_i \cdot p_j$.[1]

This theorem (or rather its obvious generalization from polynomials to the field of rational functions, the ring of formal power series, and thence to the whole gamut of functions typically considered in physics) has become so ubiquitous that it is, by and large, taken for granted nowadays. But it is perhaps in need of a makeover, given what we know about quantum field theory, namely that the particles that correspond to excitations of a single quantum field are indistinguishable.

[1] If parity is not a symmetry, we must also include the polynomials obtained by contracting d momenta with the Levi-Civita tensor, a complication whose discussion we postpone until §6.

Thus, supposing that some subsets of our n particles are identical (e.g. in a process in which two protons at the LHC collide to produce three jets), it is apposite to consider not just arbitrary Lorentz-invariant polynomials, but rather to restrict to those that are, in addition, invariant under the group of permutations of the identical particles (e.g. $S_2 \times S_3$ in our $pp \to jjj$ example).

To give a first explicit example of why this might be helpful in phenomenological analyses, it is useful to consider the situation in which the analysis is carried out, as is increasingly the case, by a supremely *un*intelligent being, namely via machine learning. There, experience has shown that, rather than let the machine learn about Lorentz invariance for itself, it is far more efficient to feed event data to the machine in a Lorentz-invariant form[2]. There is no reason to expect that permutation invariance should be any different. Symmetrizing in this way has the related benefit of preventing the machine chasing wild geese, in the sense of looking for spurious Lorentz- or permutation-violating signals.[3] Symmetrizing may even be an astute tactic in situations where the particles in question are known to be *not* identical, but where one wishes to deliberately blind oneself to the difference between them, because the associated physics is not under control. A good (though politically incorrect) example from the LHC might be a Swiss proton and a French proton (or rather beams thereof), where one can be fairly sure that there are observable differences between them, but one can be equally sure that such differences are not due to fundamental new physics, but have a rather more mundane, to wit intermural, origin.

We hope that symmetrizing with respect to permutations in this way will also be of use in analyses carried out by rather more intelligent beings. To give just one example, a common method for computing multi-loop amplitudes in quantum field theory is to first relate them using integration-by-parts identities [3, 4]. These are linear equations whose coefficients may be written as Lorentz- and permutation-invariant polynomials in the momenta of external particles. Thus, in setting up and carrying out such calculations, it would presumably be useful to know a set of generators of such polynomials.[4]

Our goal then in this work will be to generalize Weyl's theorem (namely supplying an explicit set of generators) to the situation where an arbitrary subgroup $P \subset S_n$ of the permutation group acts on the n-particles. It would be an insult to Weyl's memory not to do so in a rigorous fashion, which requires the mathematical machinery of commutative algebra, the pertinent parts of which we review in Appendix 7. But, not least for the benefit of readers who wish to avoid such unpleasantries, let us first give a more vernacular statement of the results (such readers may wish to skip directly thereafter to the examples giving explicit sets of generators in §5.)

[2]Indeed, as far as we are aware, no computer has yet discovered Lorentz invariance by itself. But, given an arbitrary symmetric metric, a neural network can be trained to converge on the Minkowski metric [2].

[3]Of course, this 'benefit' will be considered a disbenefit by readers who are interested in the possibility that Lorentz invariance is violated, or that, say, 2 protons are not identical; we tactfully suggest that it would be better for all concerned if they were not to read any further.

[4]Such permutation invariant polynomials may also be of use in analysing correlation functions in cosmology, but we will not consider this possibility further here.

Similar ideas were explored in [5], in the context of classifying higher-dimensional operators in effective scalar field theories. A significant difference there is that one studies the action of permutations on quotient rings with respect to an ideal which features the relation $\sum_i p_i = 0$ (corresponding to an integration-by-parts identity) in addition to the relations $p_i^2 = 0$ studied here (corresponding there to the leading order equations of motion). These additional relations make it difficult to compare our results directly with those in [5], though we hope that some of the results obtained here could nevertheless be usefully applied to the study of that problem. For a rather different approach, see [6], which studies permutation invariance directly at the level of quantum field theory amplitudes.

1.1 Non-technical statement of results

In layman's terms, Weyl's result is the statement that every Lorentz invariant polynomial can be obtained by taking an arbitrary polynomial in variables y_{ij} (where $i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}$ and $i \leq j$), and replacing $y_{ij} \mapsto p_i \cdot p_j$. Our first result is that every Lorentz and permutation invariant polynomial can be obtained by taking a permutation invariant polynomial in y_{ij} (where the permutation group P acts on the indices i, j in the obvious way) and making the same replacement.

In a sense, this result *is* the generalization of Weyl's result, but not only is it apparently completely trivial (though the proof will show it to be not quite so), but also it is completely useless as it stands, because of the difficulty of describing the permutation invariant polynomials in y_{ij}. Indeed, while permutations act in the natural way on the subset $\{y_{ii}\}$ and lead to a simple description of the invariant polynomials (going back, in the case $P = S_n$, to Gauss [7]), the action of permutations on $\{y_{ij} | i < j\}$ is non-standard and a description of the invariants (for the case $P = S_n$) is unknown for $n \geq 5$ [8]! Fortunately, such high multiplicities of identical particles are relatively rare in applications. Our second 'result', then, is to describe and carry out a strategy for finding a set of generators of the permutation invariant polynomials in y_{ij} for specific cases of n and P, with at most 4 identical particles (such as for the $pp \to jjj$ example). The strategy uses well-known methods in invariant theory, relying crucially on the somewhat arcane Cohen-Macaulay property.[5]

The list of generators obtained in this way is somewhat lengthy in practice and so we turn to ways of shortening it. Again, there are standard ways in invariant theory of doing so, which we describe.[6] We also describe a more *ad hoc* method: the observables $p_i \cdot p_i$ for a particle are somewhat redundant, since they return the mass of the particle (for a jet, we assume that all jet masses are negligible, since to do otherwise would invalidate the assumption that jets are identical). As such, we are less interested in invariant polynomials involving $p_i \cdot p_i$. Unfortunately, one cannot simply throw them away, because when $n > d$ there are relations between $p_i \cdot p_j$ which mix pairs with $i = j$ and $i \neq j$ (with $n = 2$ and $d = 1$, for example, we have that $(p_1 \cdot p_1)(p_2 \cdot p_2) = (p_1 \cdot p_2)^2$). Our third 'result' is to replace this by a kosher

[5] For readers who are not *au courant*, it is perhaps consoling to note that even Macaulay himself professed to being ignorant of this property.

[6] There is a price to be paid for doing so, which we describe shortly.

procedure (which is essentially to form a quotient with respect to the ideal generated by the polynomials $p_i \cdot p_i - m_i^2$, or rather the permutation invariant combinations thereof) and to provide a set of generators thereof.

As we will see, these results eventually lead to a manageable set of generators describing the Lorentz and permutation invariant polynomials. In the example of $pp \to 3j$, for example, we end up with a set of 26 generators, given explicitly in Table 3. In fact, this set of generators is minimal in number, so one can do no better.

1.2 Technical statement of results

Let us now give a more technical statement of the results. Firstly, it is convenient to regard the momenta as taking values in a vector space $V \cong \mathbb{C}^{nd}$ over the algebraically-closed field of complex numbers. Doing so not only leads to simplifications on the commutative algebra side, but also allows us to replace the Lorentz group by its complexification $O(d)$. The polynomials in the momenta then form an algebra,[7] which we denote $\mathbb{C}[V]$ and the Lorentz-invariant polynomials form a subalgebra $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)} \subset \mathbb{C}[V]$. A 'set of generators' of $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}$ is equivalent to a surjective algebra map from some polynomial algebra to $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}$. Phrased in these terms, Weyl's theorem is that there exists such a map $W : \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}$, where $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]$ is the polynomial algebra in variables $y_{ij}, i, j \in \{1, \ldots, n\}, i \leq j$, given explicitly on the generators by $W : y_{ij} \mapsto p_i \cdot p_j$ and extended to an arbitrary polynomial in the obvious way.

Our first result, which follows almost immediately from Weyl's, is that W restricts to a surjective map between $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P \subset \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]$ and $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P} \subset \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P}$, the subalgebras that are invariant under $P \subset S_n$. Thus a set of generators of $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P$ provides us with a set of generators of the object of interest, $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P}$. Finding a set of generators of $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P$ is where the real hard work begins. Indeed, while the action of P on the subalgebra $C[y_{ii}]$ is via the natural permutation representation group, whose invariant algebra is well-understood (a result due to Gauss in the 'worst-case scenario' $P = S_n$ tells us, for example, that $C[y_{ii}]^{S_n}$ is isomorphic to the polynomial algebra in n variables with degrees $1, \ldots, n$), the invariants of the action of P on the subalgebra $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}|i < j]$ are rather harder to describe, with a known description of $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}|i < j]^{S_n}$ only known for $n < 5$, even though an algorithm is available [8].

Thus, we content ourselves with finding generators for n particle events in which at most 4 particles are identical, using the fact that the ring of invariants is Cohen-Macaulay and therefore possesses a Hironaka decomposition. That is, it can be expressed as a free, finitely-generated module over a polynomial subalgebra. Thus we may write $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P = \bigoplus_k \eta_k \mathbb{C}[\theta_l]$, where η_k and θ_l are polynomials in y_{ij}. Evidently, η_k and θ_l collectively generate $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P$ and we refer to them as secondary and primary generators, respectively.

There exist algorithms for computing η_k and θ_l, though even modern computers quickly run out of steam (hence the difficulties when $n \geq 5$). In this way, we are able to find a set of generators, whose number is typically rather large (for $pp \to 3j$, for example, we have 10 primaries and 360 secondaries for $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^{S_2\times S_3}$). To pare it down to a more manageable

[7] In this work, 'algebra' will always be understood to mean 'graded algebra over $\mathbb{C}$', unless stated otherwise.

number, we employ two further strategies. Firstly, the form of the Hironaka decomposition implies that the ring multiplication is encoded in the relations $\eta_k \eta_m = \sum_j f^j_{km} \eta_j, f^n_{km} \in \mathbb{C}[\theta_l]$, and these can often be used to remove some generators, which are redundant in the sense that they can be obtained as algebraic combinations of other generators. (The price to pay is that the description of the algebra in terms of the remaining generators becomes more complicated.) Secondly, since the dot product $p_i \cdot p_i$ does not vary from event to event, being fixed equal to the invariant mass m_i^2, we repeat our construction starting from the quotient ring $\mathbb{C}[V]/\langle p_i^2 - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle$, showing that there is a surjection of algebras (which is now no longer graded, since the ideal is not homogeneous) $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij} | i < j]^P \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^P / (\langle p_k^2 - m_k^2 | \forall k \rangle \cap \mathbb{C}[V]^P)$.

We describe the effects of removing parity (which after complexification amounts to replacing $O(d)$ by its subgroup $SO(d)$) in §6. This is conceptually straightforward, in that it can be achieved by adding further objects $z_{i_1 \ldots i_d}$ to the y_{ij}, which map under W to contractions of the epsilon tensor in d dimensions with d momenta. But in practice, elucidating the structure of the corresponding ring of permutation invariants quickly becomes complicated.

Even without permutation invariance, the map to $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d) \times P}$ does not inject for $d > n$ (as the example given earlier with $d = 1$ and $n = 2$ illustrates). This means that there are yet further relations between the generators of $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d) \times P}$ (beyond those in $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P$), which may be rather obscure[8] and which may yet further frustrate phenomenological analyses. In a follow-up paper, we exploit the fact that the algebras $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d) \times P}$ are themselves Cohen-Macaulay, meaning that they too admit a Hironaka decomposition, to describe them directly and give some explicit examples. Thus each element can be written uniquely in terms of given primaries θ_l and secondaries η_k with a simple multiplication structure $\eta_k \eta_m = \sum_j f^j_{km} \eta_j$, which may, for example, be straightforward to implement on a computer. Unfortunately, we are unable to make much progress beyond the first non-trivial case, $n = d + 1$, but we hope that our results there may inspire others to try to go further.

2 General arguments

2.1 Generators for Lorentz and permutation invariants

Let a subgroup $P \subset S_n$ of the permutation group act in the standard way on the indices $i \in \{1, \ldots n\}$. This action induces, in an obvious way, actions on $\{p_i\}$ and $\{y_{ij}\}$ (with the obvious rule that we we replace y_{ij} by y_{ji} if $i > j$) and thence on $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]$, $\mathbb{C}[V]$, and (since the action of permutations commutes with that of Lorentz transformations) on $C[V]^{O(d)}$. Moreover, it is easily checked that the Weyl map $W : \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}] \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}$ is equivariant with

[8] In the case without permutation invariance, the kernel of the map is generated by the $d+1$-minors of the matrix y_{ij} (the second fundamental theorem of invariant theory for the orthogonal group).

respect to P. That is, given $p \in P$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}] & \xrightarrow{W} & \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)} \\ \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} & & \downarrow{\scriptstyle p} \\ \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}] & \xrightarrow{W} & \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)} \end{array}$$

commutes.

From here, we wish to show that W restricts to a surjective map $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P}$, so that a set of generators of $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P$ furnishes us with a set of generators of $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P}$ via evaluating $y_{ij} \mapsto p_i \cdot p_j$.

To do so, we first note that W sends a P-invariant polynomial to a P-invariant polynomial; in other words $W(\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P) \subset \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P}$ and so there is a well-defined restriction map $W| : \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P \to \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P}$. It remains to show that the $W|$ map surjects. To do so, let $q \in \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P} \subset \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}$. Since W is onto, there exists $r \in \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]$ such that $W(r) = q$. But r is not necessarily P-invariant, so consider instead $\overline{r} = \frac{1}{p}\sum_{p\in P} r^p$, where r^p denotes the result of acting on r with $p \in P$. This is P-invariant and moreover, we have that $W|(\overline{r}) = W\left(\frac{1}{p}\sum_{p\in P} r^p\right) = \frac{1}{p}\sum W(r^p) = \frac{1}{p}\sum (W(r))^p = \frac{1}{p}\sum q^p = q$, where we used the facts that W is an algebra map, that W is P-equivariant, that $P \subset S_n$ is a finite group, and that q is P-invariant by assumption. Thus $W|$ is onto.

2.2 Generators for permutation invariants

Our next goal is to find a set of generators of the ring $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P$, which will in turn provide us with a set of generators for $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)\times P}$. In the case considered by Weyl, where P is the trivial group, this is a triviality, since $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]$ is a polynomial algebra and so a set of generators (which is moreover a minimal set of generators) is given by $\{y_{ij}\}$. In cases where P is not the trivial group, finding a set of generators is rather harder than it may first appear. To see why this is the case, consider the 'worst case scenario' $P = S_n$. The group S_n acts reducibly on the subspaces with bases $\{y_{ii}\}$ and $\{y_{ij}\}$, so there is a well-defined action (for any $P \subset S_n$, in fact) on the polynomial subalgebras $\mathbb{C}_= := \mathbb{C}[y_{ii}]$ and $\mathbb{C}_< := \mathbb{C}[y_{ij}|i < j]$; to begin with, it is helpful to consider these separately.

The action of S_n on $\{y_{ii}\}$ is via the natural permutation representation (in terms of irreducible representations in partition notation it is $1 \oplus (n-1, 1)$) and a complete description of the invariant algebra $\mathbb{C}_=^{S_n}$ was given by Gauss: it is isomorphic (as a graded $\mathbb{C}$-algebra) to the polynomial ring in n variables with degrees $1, \ldots, n$. For an explicit isomorphism, one can take *e.g.* the symmetric polynomials $\sum_i y_{ii}, \sum_{i<j} y_{ii}y_{jj}, \ldots, \prod_i y_{ii}$ or the power sum polynomials $\sum_i y_{ii}^k$ with $k \in \{1, \ldots n\}$.

The action of S_n on $\{y_{ij}\}$ is non-standard (in terms of irreducible representations it is $1 \oplus (n-1, 1) \oplus (n-2, 2)$ [9]). A description of the invariant algebra is trivial in $n = 2, 3$, being given by polynomial algebras in 1 and 3 variables, respectively, but was only determined relatively recently for $n = 4$ [10] and is unknown for $n \geq 5$. It is important to note that the

invariant algebra is not a polynomial algebra for $n \geq 4$. Rather, like any ring of invariants under the action of a finite group, it has the more general structure of a Cohen-Macaulay ring [11]. Such rings admit [12] a Hironaka decomposition as a free, finitely-generated module over a polynomial subalgebra. Thus we may write $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P = \bigoplus_k \eta_k \mathbb{C}[\theta_l]$, where η_k and θ_l are polynomials in y_{ij}. Evidently, η_k and θ_l collectively generate $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^P$ (of course, we may safely discard the secondary 1) and we refer to them as secondary and primary generators, respectively. Moreover, we must have that the product of η_k and $\eta_{k'}$ is some linear combination of η_ms with coefficients in $\mathbb{C}[\theta_l]$, so we see that the structure of the algebra is encoded in a simple way.

Before going further, it is perhaps helpful to give a simple example of such a ring. One is easily at hand in the form on the ring of Lorentz and parity invariants of 2 particles in 1 dimension. The Lorentz and parity transformations reduce to the finite group $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ acting on momenta via $p_i \mapsto -p_i$ and so we see that the ring of invariants admits the Hironaka decomposition $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(1)} = 1 \cdot \mathbb{C}[p_1^2, p_2^2] \oplus p_1 p_2 \cdot \mathbb{C}[p_1^2, p_2^2]$, with primaries $\theta_1 := p_1^2, \theta_2 := p_2^2$, secondaries $\eta_1 := 1, \eta_2 := p_1 p_2$ and algebra encoded by $\eta_2^2 = \eta_1 \cdot (\theta_1 \theta_2)$.

Since an explicit description of $\mathbb{C}_<^{S_n}$ is, in general, unavailable, it is unrealistic to expect one to be available for the full invariant algebra $\mathbb{C}_\leq^P$ (where we use $\mathbb{C}_\leq$ as a shorthand to denote the full $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}|i \leq j]$). But, since it too has the Cohen-Macaulay property, we can use the available algorithms to find a Hironaka decomposition in simple cases. As we will see, the number of primaries and secondaries that arise in such cases is rather large, so before describing the algorithms and their outputs explicitly, we first describe a way of reducing the number of generators, by 'removing' the invariant masses $p_i \cdot p_i$. To do so in a rigorous way requires us to form quotients of the algebras with respect to the ideal generated by $p_i^2 - m_i^2$, for all i, (or rather its intersection with the invariant ring) which we do in the next Subsection.

2.3 Removing invariant masses

Without permutations

Let us warm up by returning to the case considered by Weyl, without permutation symmetry. Consider the ring formed by taking the quotient of $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}$ with respect to the ideal I generated by the $O(d)$-invariant elements $p_i^2 - m_i^2$, for all i, $\langle p_i^2 - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle$ (where we allow the particle mass-squareds m_i^2 to be arbitrary complex numbers). We wish to show that there is a surjective algebra map[9] $\mathbb{C}_< \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}/I$, such that we can use the y_{ij} with $i < j$ as a set of generators. Of course, this result will hardly come as a surprise to readers, but making a careful proof in this case will help us to avoid potential pitfalls once we add the requirement permutation invariance.

The proof has two parts. One part is to show that the Weyl map W induces a surjective algebra map $\mathbb{C}_\leq/\langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}/I$. The other part is to exhibit an algebra isomorphism $\mathbb{C}_\leq/\langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}_<$.

[9] It is important to note that, unless $m_i^2 = 0$ for all i, such that I is homogeneous, $\mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d)}/I$ is not graded, and so nor is the map.

For the first part, it is enough to note that the map is well-defined on equivalence classes, because any element in $\langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle$ lands in I. (Surjectivity follows automatically from the surjectivity of W.)

For the other part, consider the polynomial algebra $R[x]$ in one variable over an arbitrary ring R. Let $f(x) \in R[x]$, let $r \in R$, and let $\mathrm{ev} : R[x] \twoheadrightarrow R$ be the evaluation map, *viz.* the R-algebra map defined by $x \mapsto r$. Since $(x-r)$ is a monic polynomial, by the division algorithm we have that $f(x) = g(x) \cdot (x-r) + s$, with $g(x) \in R[x]$ and $s \in R$. Thus $\mathrm{ev}(f(x)) = s$ and $\ker \mathrm{ev} = \langle x - r \rangle$. By the first isomorphism theorem, $R[x]/\langle x-r \rangle \xrightarrow{\sim} R$. Now apply this successively to $\mathbb{C}_{\leq} \cong \mathbb{C}[y_{ij} | (i,j) \neq (1,1)][y_{11}]$, $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij} | (i,j) \neq (1,1)] \cong \mathbb{C}[y_{ij} | (i,j) \neq (1,1), (2,2)][y_{22}]$, &c. to get the desired result. Equivalently, an explicit isomorphism $\mathbb{C}_{\leq}/\langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}_{<}$ can be obtained from the evaluation map (which is ungraded, except in the $m_i^2 = 0$ case) from $\mathbb{C}_{\leq}$ to $\mathbb{C}_{<}$ given by

$$\mathrm{ev} : \mathbb{C}_{\leq} \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}_{<} : y_{ii}, y_{ij} \mapsto m_i^2, y_{ij} \tag{2.1}$$

whose kernel is indeed $\ker \mathrm{ev} = \langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle$.

With permutations

Now that we have tackled the case without permutations, we turn to address the cases with permutation symmetry. Our goal is to show that there exists a surjective algebra map [10] $\mathbb{C}_{<}^P \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d) \times P}/J$ where $J = \langle p_i^2 - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle \cap \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d) \times P}$. Again, the proof has two parts. One is to show that the restricted Weyl map $W|$ induces a surjective algebra map $\mathbb{C}_{\leq}^P/J' \twoheadrightarrow \mathbb{C}[V]^{O(d) \times P}/J$, where $J' = \langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle \cap \mathbb{C}_{\leq}^P$, and the other is to exhibit an algebra isomorphism $\mathbb{C}_{\leq}^P/J' \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}_{<}^P$.

For the first part, we begin by showing that the image $W(J') \subset J$. For an element $j' \in J'$, $j' \in \langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle$ and $j' \in \mathbb{C}_{\leq}^P$ by definition. But since the image $W(\langle y_{ii} - m_i^2 | \forall i \rangle) \subset I$, the image $W(j') \in I$. Furthermore, the element j' is P-invariant by assumption and as the map W is P-equivariant, the image $W(j')$ is also P-invariant. So, $W(j') \in J$ and hence $W(J') \subset J$.[11] It is then enough to note that the map is well-defined on the equivalence classes because any element of J' lands in J. (Surjectivity again follows from the surjectivity of W.)

For the second part, it turns out that the required result follows from a more general theorem. Suppose that a finite group G acts reducibly on a vector space $V = X \oplus Z$ and suppose that the representation carried by X is further reducible, containing the trivial representation. Let $\{x_i\}$ and $\{z_i\}$, respectively, be bases of the dual spaces $\mathrm{Hom}(X, \mathbb{C})$ and $\mathrm{Hom}(Z, \mathbb{C})$, respectively, and let $a \in X$ denote a G-invariant vector with components $a_i = x_i(a) \in \mathbb{C}$. Further, consider the algebras $R = \mathbb{C}[x_1, \ldots, x_m, z_1, \ldots, z_n]$ and $S = \mathbb{C}[z_1, \ldots, z_n]$ along with the evaluation map $\mathrm{ev} : R \twoheadrightarrow S$, $x_i \mapsto a_i$, with kernel $\langle x_i - a_i | \forall i \rangle$. We wish to show that there exists an isomorphism of (ungraded if $a_i \neq 0$) algebras $R^G/J \xrightarrow{\sim} S^G$, where R^G, S^G are the G-invariant subalgebras of R, S respectively and $J = \langle x_i - a_i | \forall i \rangle \cap R^G$ is an ideal of R^G.

[10] Again, ungraded unless $m_i^2 = 0$.

[11] Actually, $W(J') = J$, but equality is unnecessary for our purposes.

To do so, we start by explicitly defining the action of $g \in G$ on $h \in R^G$ and $f \in S$ via the reducible representation $\rho : G \to GL(V) : g \mapsto \rho_X(g) \oplus \rho_Z(g)$ to be as follows

$$h \mapsto h^g = h(\rho_X(g)x_i, \rho_Z(g)z_i) = h(x_i, z_i) = h, \tag{2.2}$$

$$f \mapsto f^g = f(\rho_Z(g)z_i). \tag{2.3}$$

Next, we define the inclusion map $i : R^G \hookrightarrow R$ and compose it with the evaluation map to get the restricted algebra map $\mathrm{ev}| := \mathrm{ev} \circ i : R^G \to S$. It can then be checked that the evaluation map $\mathrm{ev}|$ is equivariant with respect to G. That is, given $g \in G$, the diagram

$$\begin{array}{ccc} R^G & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}|} & S \\ \downarrow g & & \downarrow g \\ R^G & \xrightarrow{\mathrm{ev}|} & S \end{array}$$

commutes. Now as the map $\mathrm{ev}|$ is G-equivariant, it sends a G-invariant polynomial to a G-invariant polynomial; in other words $\mathrm{ev}|(R^G) \subset S^G$ and so we have a well-defined restriction map $\mathrm{ev}| : R^G \to S^G$. It remains to show that $\mathrm{ev}|$ is surjective. To do so, let $s \in S^G \subset S$. Since ev is onto, there exists $r \in R$ such that $\mathrm{ev}(r) = s$. But r is not necessarily G-invariant, so consider instead $\bar{r} = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G} r^g$, where again r^g denotes the result of acting on r with $g \in G$. This is G-invariant and we have, furthermore, that $\mathrm{ev}|(\bar{r}) = \mathrm{ev}|\left(\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G} r^g\right) = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\mathrm{ev}|(r^g) = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}(\mathrm{ev}|(r))^g = \frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G} s^g = s$, where we have used the fact that $\mathrm{ev}|$ is an (ungraded for $a_i \neq 0$) algebra map, that $\mathrm{ev}|$ is G-equivariant, that G is a finite group, and that s is G-invariant by assumption. Thus, $\mathrm{ev}|$ is onto. The last ingredient of the proof is to note that the kernel of the map $\ker \mathrm{ev}|$ is the restriction of the ideal $\langle x_i - a_i | \forall i\rangle$ to the G-invariant subalgebra $J = \langle x_i - a_i|\forall i\rangle \cap R^G$. Finally, by the first isomorphism theorem, $R^G/J \xrightarrow{\sim} S^G$.

In our specific case, the variables y_{ii}, y_{ij} transform under reducible representations of the permutation group P with the representation of y_{ii}, $(1 \oplus (n-1, 1))$, being further reducible containing the trivial representation. Furthermore, the masses m_i^2 clearly form an invariant vector when the particles (and hence the masses) are identical. Hence, the previous theorem applies and we have an isomorphism of (ungraded, except in the massless case) algebras $\mathbb{C}^P_{\leq}/J' \xrightarrow{\sim} \mathbb{C}^P_{<}$.

3 Generators of permutation invariants

We now describe various results from the theory of invariants which together may be used to find sets of generators for the algebras of permutation invariants, such as $\mathbb{C}^P_{<}$. For more details, see *e.g.* [8, 12].

Let K be an algebraically-closed field, V a finite-dimensional vector space over K carrying a representation of a finite group G, and $K[V]$ the polynomial algebra on V. The algebra

$K[V]$ carries a grading with $(K[V])_0 = K$, which is inherited by the invariant subalgebra $K[V]^G = \{f \in K[V] |\ f^g = f\ \forall g \in G\}$. A result of Hilbert is that $K[V]^G$ is finitely-generated, while a result of Noether is that any finitely-generated graded algebra R with $R_0 = K$ admits a (not necessarily unique) homogeneous system of parameters (HSOP). Thus we have that $K[V]^G$ is a finitely-generated module over $K[\theta_1 \ldots, \theta_l]$, where the θ_i are algebraically-independent. We call the θ_i *primary invariants*. In particular, we may write $K[V]^G = \sum_k \eta_k K[\theta_1 \ldots, \theta_l]$, where we call the η_j *secondary invariants*.

Now comes perhaps the most significant result, namely that $K[V]^G$ is Cohen-Macaulay, which implies that $K[V]^G$ is a *free* (and as we have already seen, finitely-generated) module over any HSOP. Thus, we in fact have a *Hironaka decomposition* $K[V]^G = \bigoplus_k \eta_k K[\theta_1 \ldots, \theta_l]$ and we are able to use the full power of linear algebra. In particular, each element in $K[V]^G$ can be written uniquely as $\sum_j \eta_j f^j$, where $f^j \in K[\theta_1 \ldots, \theta_l]$, and the product of any two secondaries is uniquely given by $\eta_k \eta_m = \sum_j \eta_j f^j_{km}$, where $f^j_{km} \in K[\theta_1 \ldots, \theta_l]$. This specifies the multiplication in $K[V]^G$ unambiguously.

Some simple examples will perhaps be illuminating. When G is the trivial group acting on a basis vector $x \in \mathbb{C}$, we may set $\eta_1 = 1$ and $\theta_1 = x$, such that $K[V]^G = 1 \cdot \mathbb{C}[x]$. But we may also set $\eta_1 = 1, \eta_2 = x$, and $\theta_1 = x^2$, such that $K[V]^G = 1 \cdot \mathbb{C}[x^2] + x \cdot \mathbb{C}[x^2]$. This already shows that a Hironaka decomposition is not unique. For a slightly less trivial example, let G be the group $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ whose non-trivial element sends basis vectors $x, y \in \mathbb{C}^2$ to minus themselves. Then we may set $\eta_1 = 1, \eta_2 = xy$ and $\theta_1 = x^2, \theta_2 = y^2$.

Clearly, given a Hironaka decomposition, the set containing the primary and secondary invariants forms a set of generators of $K[V]^G$, which is what we seek. A Hironaka decomposition can be found by a two-step process. The first step is to find an HSOP. It turns out that necessary and sufficient conditions for a set of homogeneous elements in $K[V]^G$ to form such a system are that they be algebraically independent and that the locus of points where all elements of strictly positive degree simultaneously vanish is given by the zero vector in V.

Finding an HSOP has been reduced to an (unwieldy) algorithm [13, 14], but we will not need it here. Indeed, the group P acts on $\mathbb{C}^P_<$, say (an analogous result holds for $\mathbb{C}^P_\leq$), by permuting the y_{ij} amongst themselves; but it is easily shown (*cf.* [8], Example 2.4.9) that for any permutation subgroup of $S_{n(n-1)/2}$, a HSOP is given by the $n(n-1)/2$ elementary symmetric polynomials in y_{ij}.

For our purposes, this HSOP is sometimes less than optimal, because it introduces primary invariants of unnecessarily high degrees, leading to more secondary invariants (as can easily be seen by considering the case where P is the trivial group, such that $\{y_{ij}\}$ is a HSOP, with primary invariants all of degree 1). An HSOP with primary invariants of lower degrees can be found by partitioning the y_{ij} into their orbits under P and forming the respective sets of elementary symmetric polynomials. Again, one may easily show that the union of these forms an HSOP.

Let us make this explicit in our $pp \to 3j$ example. Labelling the protons by $4, 5$ and the jets by $1, 2, 3$, we have the following orbits: $\{y_{45}\}, \{y_{12}, y_{13}, y_{23}\}, \{y_{14}, y_{15}, y_{24}, y_{25}, y_{34}, y_{35}\}$.

	$\mathbb{C}^P_<$
$n=4,$ with S_1	$\frac{1}{(1-t)^6}$
$n=4,$ with $S_2\times S_2$	$\frac{1+t^3}{(1-t)^3(1-t^2)^3}$
$n=5,$ with S_1	$\frac{1}{(1-t)^{10}}$
$n=5,$ with $S_2\times S_3$	$\frac{1+t^2+6t^3+8t^4+6t^5+12t^6+14t^7+9t^8+8t^9+5t^{10}+2t^{11}}{(1-t)^3(1-t^2)^4(1-t^3)^2(1-t^6)}$

Table 1. The Hilbert series of some relevant invariant algebras.

Following our prescription, the HSOP will be

$$\begin{array}{llll} e_1(y_{45}), & e_1(y_{12},y_{13},y_{23}), & e_1(y_{14},y_{24},y_{34},y_{15},y_{25},y_{35}), & e_4(y_{14},y_{24},y_{34},y_{15},y_{25},y_{35}), \\ & e_2(y_{12},y_{13},y_{23}), & e_2(y_{14},y_{24},y_{34},y_{15},y_{25},y_{35}), & e_5(y_{14},y_{24},y_{34},y_{15},y_{25},y_{35}), \\ & e_3(y_{12},y_{13},y_{23}), & e_3(y_{14},y_{24},y_{34},y_{15},y_{25},y_{35}), & e_6(y_{14},y_{24},y_{34},y_{15},y_{25},y_{35}). \end{array} \tag{3.1}$$

Having found an HSOP, we turn to the second step in finding a Hironaka decomposition, which is to find the corresponding secondary invariants. A first observation is that one can read off the degrees of the secondary invariants by comparing the Hilbert series computed using Molien's formula

$$H(K[V]^G,t)=\frac{1}{|G|}\sum_{g\in G}\frac{1}{\det(1-t\cdot\rho_g)} \tag{3.2}$$

(where ρ_g is the linear operator representing $g\in G$) to the form corresponding to the Hironaka decomposition, *viz.*

$$H\left(\bigoplus \eta K[\theta],t\right)=\frac{1+\sum_k S_k t^k}{\prod_l (1-t^l)^{P_l}}. \tag{3.3}$$

where there are S_k secondaries at degree k and P_l primaries at degree l. By way of illustration, Table 1 lists the Hilbert series for a few of the algebras that we are interested in.

The secondaries may now be found via the following algorithm [8], employing a Groebner basis[12] $\mathcal{G}$ for the ideal $\langle\theta_1,\ldots,\theta_l\rangle\subset K[V]^G$ generated by the primary invariants:

- Read off the degrees of secondaries $d_1,\ldots d_m$ from the Hilbert series.
- For $i=1,\ldots,m$ perform the following two steps:

  - Calculate a basis of the homogeneous component $K[V]^G_{d_i}$ (invariant polynomials of degree d_i).

[12]Readers unfamiliar with these may wish to consult [14] for a gentle introduction.

- Select an element η_i from this basis such that the normal form $\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{G}}(\eta_i)$ (remainder on division by the Groebner basis) is non-zero and is not in the K-vector space generated by the polynomials $\mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{G}}(\eta_1), \ldots, \mathrm{NF}_{\mathcal{G}}(\eta_{i-1})$.

- The invariants $\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_k$ are the required secondary invariants.

A version of this algorithm is implemented in `Macaulay2` [15] (and other computer packages).

4 Redundancies

In the previous Section, we described a systematic construction of a Hironaka decomposition, and *ergo* a set of generators, for $\mathbb{C}^P_<$ (an analogous construction applies for $\mathbb{C}^P_\leq$). Unfortunately, the number of generators is rather large in all but the simplest cases. For the purpose of carrying out phenomenological analyses, one would like to have a set of generators that is as minimal as possible, in the sense of reducing both the number of generators and their degrees. In this Section, we will see that such a reduction is indeed possible, and leads to a set of generators whose cardinality is minimal (the degrees of the generators in such a set is moreover fixed). Unfortunately, the number of generators in such a set is still rather large. But this is the best one can do.

The reduction may be achieved (at the cost of destroying the neat encoding of the algebraic structure in the Hironaka decomposition, which may in itself be useful for phenomenological analyses) via the following algorithm: For a set of generators S, choose an element $f \in S$ and set up a general element of the same degree as f in the algebra generated by $S \setminus f$ with unknown coefficients. Equate it to f and extract the corresponding system of linear equations by comparison of coefficients. The system is solvable if and only if f can be omitted from S. It turns out [8], though we will not show it here, that this procedure leads to a set of algebra generators whose cardinality is minimal; the degrees of the resulting generators are, moreover, uniquely determined.

It seems that we are home and dry, but there is one remaining issue: although the problem of finding the secondary generators is solved algorithmically, in most non-trivial cases, it is highly inefficient. Even modern computers using state-of-the-art algorithms start struggling with Hironaka decompositions containing more than a few hundred secondaries. Our only hope is if we can somehow get away with finding some, but not all, of the secondaries before using the elimination procedure just described. This hope can be realised by use of arguments going back to Noether, who showed that the maximal degree of an algebra generator in a minimal set is $\leq |G|$. When G is non-cyclic (so $P \neq S_1, S_2$ in the case at hand), Noether's bound can be improved to $\frac{3}{4}|G|$ if $|G|$ is even and $\frac{5}{8}|G|$ if $|G|$ is odd [16].[13] Therefore, we only need to find the secondaries up to these bounds before discarding the redundant generators using the process outlined above. Of course, in many cases these bounds are practically

[13] In our $pp \to 3j$ example, we have $3|G|/4 = 9$, which comfortably exceeds our highest degree primary, of degree 6; we will see in the next Section that in fact the highest degree in a minimal set of generators is in fact 6.

useless; the order of S_n is $n!$. But for physically relevant examples such as $S_2 \times S_3$, they reduce the computation time significantly.

5 Examples

In this Section, we will apply the aforementioned techniques to find sets of generators for common examples of phenomenological interest.

5.1 $pp \to jj$

A common scattering problem is the two protons to two jets, $pp \to jj$, though of course jj could be any two objects that we do not want to or cannot distinguish, which corresponds to the $n = 4$ with $S_2 \times S_2$ case.

First, we find the primaries using our prescription. The invariant subspaces are $\{y_{12}\}, \{y_{34}\}$, $\{y_{13}, y_{14}, y_{23}, y_{24}\}$, and therefore we take the primaries to be

$$\begin{aligned} &e_1(y_{12}), \quad && e_1(y_{13}, y_{14}, y_{23}, y_{24}), \quad && e_3(y_{13}, y_{14}, y_{23}, y_{24}), \\ &e_1(y_{34}), \quad && e_2(y_{13}, y_{14}, y_{23}, y_{24}), \quad && e_4(y_{13}, y_{14}, y_{23}, y_{24}). \end{aligned}$$

We can already see directly from the improved Noether bound (which is $\frac{3}{4}(2!)(2!) = 3$ in this case) that these generators cannot be part of a minimal set. To read off the degrees of secondaries, we write the Hilbert series in Table 1 in the form

$$H(\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^{S_2 \times S_2}, t) = \frac{1 + 2t^2 + 2t^4 + t^6}{(1-t)^3(1-t^2)(1-t^3)(1-t^4)}.$$

Next, we use the algorithm to compute the secondaries. Using the bound, we only need to find the secondaries up to degree 3. Once found, we can start eliminating redundancies from the union of primaries and secondaries in the fashion described in Section §4. Once this is done, we are left with a set of 7 minimal algebra generators given in Table 2.

Degree = 1
$g_{11} = y_{12}$,
$g_{12} = y_{34}$,
$g_{13} = y_{13} + y_{14} + y_{23} + y_{24}$,
Degree = 2
$g_{21} = y_{13}y_{23} + y_{14}y_{24}$,
$g_{22} = y_{13}y_{14} + y_{23}y_{24}$,
$g_{23} = y_{13}y_{14} + y_{13}y_{23} + y_{14}y_{23} + y_{13}y_{24} + y_{14}y_{24} + y_{23}y_{24}$,
Degree = 3
$g_{31} = y_{13}y_{14}y_{23} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{14}y_{23}y_{24}$

Table 2: Table of generators for $n = 4$ with $S_2 \times S_2$.

5.2 $pp \to jjj$

We now ramp up the level of complexity, by considering $pp \to jjj$, which corresponds to the $n = 5$ with $P = S_2 \times S_3$ case.

The set of primaries was already given in equation 3.1 of Section §3. Comparing to the Hilbert series in Table 1, we see that they are again non-optimal and we need to write the Hilbert series in the modified form

$$H(\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}]^{S_2\times S_3}, t) = \frac{1 + 3t^2 + 6t^3 + 12t^4 + 17t^5 + 32t^6 + 35t^7 + 47t^8 + 48t^9 + 49t^{10} + 38t^{11} + 34t^{12} + 19t^{13} + 12t^{14} + 5t^{15} + 2t^{16}}{(1-t)^3(1-t^2)^2(1-t^3)^2(1-t^4)(1-t^5)(1-t^6)}.$$

Using the algorithm to find the secondaries up to degree $\frac{3}{4}(2!)(3!) = 9$ and eliminating redundancies, we are left with a set of 26 minimal algebra generators. Table 3 contains the explicit list.

Degree = 1
$g_{11} = y_{12}$,
$g_{12} = y_{34} + y_{35} + y_{45}$,
$g_{13} = y_{13} + y_{14} + y_{15} + y_{23} + y_{24} + y_{25}$,
Degree = 2
$g_{21} = y_{13}y_{23} + y_{14}y_{24} + y_{15}y_{25}$,
$g_{22} = y_{34}y_{35} + y_{34}y_{45} + y_{35}y_{45}$,
$g_{23} = y_{13}y_{14} + y_{13}y_{15} + y_{14}y_{15} + y_{23}y_{24} + y_{23}y_{25} + y_{24}y_{25}$,
$g_{24} = y_{13}y_{34} + y_{14}y_{34} + y_{23}y_{34} + y_{24}y_{34} + y_{13}y_{35} + y_{15}y_{35} + y_{23}y_{35} + y_{25}y_{35} + y_{14}y_{45} + y_{15}y_{45} + y_{24}y_{45} + y_{25}y_{45}$,
$g_{25} = y_{13}y_{14} + y_{13}y_{15} + y_{14}y_{15} + y_{13}y_{23} + y_{14}y_{23} + y_{15}y_{23} + y_{13}y_{24} + y_{14}y_{24} + y_{15}y_{24} + y_{23}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{25} + y_{15}y_{25} + y_{23}y_{25} + y_{24}y_{25}$,
Degree = 3
$g_{31} = y_{34}y_{35}y_{45}$,
$g_{32} = y_{13}y_{23}y_{34} + y_{14}y_{24}y_{34} + y_{13}y_{23}y_{35} + y_{15}y_{25}y_{35} + y_{14}y_{24}y_{45} + y_{15}y_{25}y_{45}$,
$g_{33} = y_{13}y_{14}y_{34} + y_{23}y_{24}y_{34} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{35} + y_{23}y_{25}y_{35} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{45} + y_{24}y_{25}y_{45}$,
$g_{34} = y_{13}y_{34}^2 + y_{14}y_{34}^2 + y_{23}y_{34}^2 + y_{24}y_{34}^2 + y_{13}y_{35}^2 + y_{15}y_{35}^2 + y_{23}y_{35}^2 + y_{25}y_{35}^2 + y_{14}y_{45}^2 + y_{15}y_{45}^2 + y_{24}y_{45}^2 + y_{25}y_{45}^2$,
$g_{35} = y_{13}^2y_{34} + y_{14}^2y_{34} + y_{23}^2y_{34} + y_{24}^2y_{34} + y_{13}^2y_{35} + y_{15}^2y_{35} + y_{23}^2y_{35} + y_{25}^2y_{35} + y_{14}^2y_{45} + y_{15}^2y_{45} + y_{24}^2y_{45} + y_{25}^2y_{45}$,
$g_{36} = y_{13}^2y_{23} + y_{13}y_{23}^2 + y_{14}^2y_{24} + y_{14}y_{24}^2 + y_{15}^2y_{25} + y_{15}y_{25}^2$,
$g_{37} = y_{13}^2y_{14} + y_{13}y_{14}^2 + y_{13}^2y_{15} + y_{14}^2y_{15} + y_{13}y_{15}^2 + y_{14}y_{15}^2 + y_{23}^2y_{24} + y_{23}y_{24}^2 + y_{23}^2y_{25} + y_{24}^2y_{25} + y_{23}y_{25}^2 + y_{24}y_{25}^2$,

$g_{38} = y_{13}y_{14}y_{15} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{23} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{23} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{23} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{24} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{14}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{15}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{23}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{23}y_{25} + y_{15}y_{23}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{15}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{23}y_{24}y_{25},$
Degree = 4
$g_{41} = y_{13}^2y_{23}^2 + y_{14}^2y_{24}^2 + y_{15}^2y_{25}^2,$ $g_{42} = y_{13}y_{23}y_{34}^2 + y_{14}y_{24}y_{34}^2 + y_{13}y_{23}y_{35}^2 + y_{15}y_{25}y_{35}^2 + y_{14}y_{24}y_{45}^2 + y_{15}y_{25}y_{45}^2,$ $g_{43} = y_{13}y_{14}y_{34}^2 + y_{23}y_{24}y_{34}^2 + y_{13}y_{15}y_{35}^2 + y_{23}y_{25}y_{35}^2 + y_{14}y_{15}y_{45}^2 + y_{24}y_{25}y_{45}^2,$ $g_{44} = y_{13}^2y_{23}y_{34} + y_{13}y_{23}^2y_{34} + y_{14}^2y_{24}y_{34} + y_{14}y_{24}^2y_{34} + y_{13}^2y_{23}y_{35} + y_{13}y_{23}^2y_{35} + y_{15}^2y_{25}y_{35} + y_{15}y_{25}^2y_{35} + y_{14}^2y_{24}y_{45} + y_{14}y_{24}^2y_{45} + y_{15}^2y_{25}y_{45} + y_{15}y_{25}^2y_{45},$ $g_{45} = y_{13}^2y_{15}y_{34} + y_{14}^2y_{15}y_{34} + y_{23}^2y_{25}y_{34} + y_{24}^2y_{25}y_{34} + y_{13}^2y_{14}y_{35} + y_{14}y_{15}^2y_{35} + y_{23}^2y_{24}y_{35} + y_{24}y_{25}^2y_{35} + y_{13}y_{14}^2y_{45} + y_{13}y_{15}^2y_{45} + y_{23}y_{24}^2y_{45} + y_{23}y_{25}^2y_{45},$ $g_{46} = y_{13}^2y_{14}y_{23} + y_{13}^2y_{15}y_{23} + y_{13}y_{14}^2y_{24} + y_{14}^2y_{15}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{23}^2y_{24} + y_{14}y_{23}y_{24}^2 + y_{13}y_{15}^2y_{25} + y_{14}y_{15}^2y_{25} + y_{13}y_{23}^2y_{25} + y_{14}y_{24}^2y_{25} + y_{15}y_{23}y_{25}^2 + y_{15}y_{24}y_{25}^2,$ $g_{47} = y_{13}y_{14}y_{15}y_{23} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{15}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{15}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{23}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{23}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{23}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{23}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{23}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{15}y_{23}y_{24}y_{25},$
Degree = 5
$g_{51} = y_{13}^2y_{23}^2y_{34} + y_{14}^2y_{24}^2y_{34} + y_{13}^2y_{23}^2y_{35} + y_{15}^2y_{25}^2y_{35} + y_{14}^2y_{24}^2y_{45} + y_{15}^2y_{25}^2y_{45}$ $g_{52} = y_{13}y_{14}y_{15}y_{23}y_{24} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{15}y_{23}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{15}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{14}y_{23}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{13}y_{15}y_{23}y_{24}y_{25} + y_{14}y_{15}y_{23}y_{24}y_{25},$
Degree = 6
$g_{61} = y_{13}y_{14}y_{15}y_{23}y_{24}y_{25},$

Table 3: Table of generators for $n = 5$ with $S_2 \times S_3$.

6 Parity

Finally, we briefly discuss the more general case where parity is not a symmetry. Weyl showed that a generating set of Lorentz invariants in d dimensions is given by the dot products, along with all the possible contractions of momenta with the anti-symmetric d dimensional Levi-Civita epsilon tensor[14]. To include these extra generators in our discussion, one could add some extra variables $z_{i_1,\cdots,i_d}$ which transform in a similar (anti-symmetric) manner to the epsilons under the action of the permutation group and are mapped to the epsilons in the

[14]There are, of course, relations between the Levi-Civita tensors and the dot products, namely the product of two epsilon tensors contracted with some momenta p_i is equal to the corresponding minor of the $p_i \cdot p_j$ matrix.

appropriate way under the Weyl map. One then needs to study the algebra $\mathbb{C}[y_{ij}, z_{i_1,\cdots,i_d}]^P$ and find its Hironaka decomposition and consequently a set of minimal algebra generators. The first challenge one runs into in trying to do so is the difficulty in finding a suitable HSOP. Since the elements in P act on $z_{i_1,\cdots,i_d}$ by permutation, an HSOP is given by the elementary symmetric polynomials in $z_{i_1,\cdots,i_d}$, but the degrees of the resulting generators are prohibitively large, with a consequent slew of secondaries. Given the inefficiencies of current algorithms, which already struggle with the simpler case of $\mathbb{C}^P_<$, it seems unlikely that one will be able to find a minimal set of generators in this way, in all but the simplest cases. Most likely, a more sophisticated approach that takes into account the relations between dot products and epsilons is needed. We leave this for future work.

7 Discussion

In this work, we have developed a systematic method which produces sets of minimal algebra generators for the Lorentz and permutation invariant polynomials using tools of invariant theory, generalising results obtained by Weyl in the absence of permutation invariance. Our method results in manageable sets of generators for phenomenologically-relevant examples, at least when the number of particles is sufficiently small, and we hope that the results will prove to be useful in future phenomenological analyses.

Our work has several shortcomings. One is that it does not address redundancies that occur in sufficiently low spacetime dimensions. Another is that we have failed to make substantial progress in the case where parity is not a symmetry. A third problem is that our generators are not able to fully separate the orbits[15], which is certainly a useful thing to do from a physicist's point of view (for example in searching for parity violating LHC signals, as explored in [17]). We hope to address all of these deficits in future work [18, 19].

Appendix

Here we recall some relevant definitions (of terms in italics) and results from commutative algebra (see, *e.g.* [20, 21], for more details). The most important concepts are those of a *ring* and an *algebra*, and the corresponding structure-preserving *maps* between them.

A *ring* R (which for our purposes will always be a commutative ring with unit) is an Abelian group (with addition $+$, identity 0, and element $r \in R$ having inverse $-r$) that is also a commutative monoid (with multiplication $\cdot$, which we often omit, and identity 1), such that $\cdot$ is distributive over $+$. An example is the ring $\mathbb{Z}$ of integers.

A *ring map* $f : R \to S$ (which we sometimes write less explicitly as $R \to S$) is a map that preserves sums, products, and 1. A *ring isomorphism* $R \xrightarrow{\sim} S$ is a bijective ring map.

An *R-algebra* (or *algebra* for short) is a ring S equipped with a ring map $f : R \to S$. An example is the polynomials in one variable $R[x]$ over a ring R (where the ring map is

[15] To give a somewhat trivial example, the invariant $p \cdot p$ is unable to separate the orbits with $p \cdot p = 0$ and with either $p = 0$ or $p \neq 0$.

$r \mapsto rx^0$). Given R-algebras S and T with structure maps f, g (respectively), an *R-algebra map* is a ring map $h : S \to T$ such that $h \circ f = g$.

Given an R-algebra S, the subalgebra $R[\{s_\lambda | \lambda \in \Lambda\}]$ *generated* by $s_\lambda \in S$ is the smallest R-subalgebra that contains them. It consists of all polynomial combinations of the s_λ with coefficients in R. If there exist $s_1, \ldots, s_n \in S$ such that $S = R[s_1, \ldots, s_n]$, we say that S is *finitely-generated* (as an R-algebra).

The *kernel* $\ker f$ of a ring map f is $f^{-1}(0)$. An *ideal* $I \subset R$ is the kernel of a ring map. Equivalently, an ideal contains 0 and is such that given $a, b \in I$ and $r \in R$, $a + b \in I$ and $ar \in I$ (indeed, this is the kernel of the map $R \to R/I$ that sends r to the equivalence class $r + I$, the set of which forms the *quotient ring* R/I). The *first isomorphism theorem* states that $R/\ker f \xrightarrow{\sim} \operatorname{im} f$.

The ideal $\langle r_\lambda | \forall \lambda \in \Lambda \rangle$ generated by $r_\lambda \in R$ for some set Λ, is the smallest ideal in R that contains the r_λ. A *field* is a ring in which $\langle 0 \rangle$ is a *maximal ideal*, that is, is not contained in any proper ideal. Equivalently, $1 \neq 0$ and every non-zero element is a *unit*, that is has a multiplicative inverse.

An *R-module* (or just *module*) M is an Abelian group (written additively) together with a *scalar multiplication* $R \times M \to M : (r, m) \mapsto rm$ that is distributive over the addition in both R and M, is associative, and is such that $1m \mapsto m$. An ideal in R and an R-algebra are both examples of R-modules.

We say that a subset $\{m_\lambda | \lambda \in \Lambda\} \subset M$ *generates* M (as a module) if M is the smallest submodule of M that contains $\{m_\lambda\}$. We say that M is *finitely-generated* if there exists a finite set of generators. We say that the m_λ are *free* if $\sum_\lambda r_\lambda m_\lambda = 0 \implies r_\lambda = 0$, for all λ and that they are a *basis* if they also generate M. A *free module* is one that has a basis.

A ring R is *graded* if we can write it as a direct sum $R = \bigoplus_{n \in \mathbb{N}} R_n$ of subgroups R_n (in fact R_0 is always a subring) such that $R_n R_m \subset R_{n+m}$. A *homogeneous element (of degree n)* is an element belonging to some factor (or specifically to the factor R_n). An algebra is graded if it is graded as a ring.

Given a graded algebra R over a field K with $R_0 = K$, a *homogeneous system of parameters* is a set of homogeneous elements $\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m \in R$ which are algebraically independent and are such that R is a finitely-generated module over $K[\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_m]$.

For a finitely-generated graded K-algebra $R = \bigoplus_{i=0}^{\infty} R_i$, we define the Hilbert series $H(R, t)$ as the formal power series

$$H(R, t) = \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} \dim(R_i) t^i$$

where $\dim(R_i)$ is the dimension of the (homogeneous) vector space R_i.

Acknowledgements

We thank Scott Melville and other members of the Cambridge Pheno Working Group for helpful advice and comments. This work has been partially supported by STFC consolidated grants ST/P000681/1 and ST/S505316/1. WH is supported by the Cambridge Trust. BG thanks King's College, Cambridge, and the University of Canterbury, New Zealand, where part of this work was carried out.

References

[1] H. Weyl, *The classical groups: their invariants and representations*. Princeton University Press, 1966.

[2] A. Butter, G. Kasieczka, T. Plehn and M. Russell, *Deep-learned top tagging with a lorentz layer*, *SciPost Physics* (2018).

[3] F. Tkachov, *A theorem on analytical calculability of 4-loop renormalization group functions*, *Physics Letters B* (1981).

[4] A. Kotikov, *Differential equations method. new technique for massive Feynman diagram calculation*, *Physics Letters B* (1991).

[5] B. Henning, X. Lu, T. Melia and H. Murayama, *Operator bases, S-matrices, and their partition functions*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* (2017).

[6] P. T. Komiske, E. M. Metodiev and J. Thaler, *Cutting multiparticle correlators down to size*, *Physical Review D* (2020).

[7] C. F. Gauss, *Carl Friedrich Gauss Werke V3 (1876) (German Edition)*. Kessinger Publishing, LLC, 2010.

[8] H. Derksen and G. Kemper, *Computational invariant theory*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2002.

[9] W. Fulton, W. Harris and J. Harris, *Representation theory: a first course*. Springer New York, 1991.

[10] H. Aslaksen, S. P. Chan and T. Gulliksen, *Invariants of S_4 and the shape of sets of vectors*, *Applicable Algebra in Engineering, Communication and Computing* (1996).

[11] W. Bruns and H. J. Herzog, *Cohen-Macaulay rings*. Cambridge University Press, 1998.

[12] P. Paule and B. Sturmfels, *Algorithms in invariant theory*. Springer Vienna, 2008.

[13] B. Buchberger, *A theoretical basis for the reduction of polynomials to canonical forms*, *ACM SIGSAM Bulletin* (1976).

[14] D. Cox, J. Little and D. O'Shea, *Ideals, varieties, and algorithms: an introduction to computational algebraic geometry and commutative algebra*. Springer New York, 2008.

[15] D. R. Grayson and M. E. Stillman, "Macaulay2, a software system for research in algebraic geometry." Available at http://www.math.uiuc.edu/Macaulay2/.

[16] M. Domokos and P. Hegedus, *Noether's bound for polynomial invariants of finite groups*, *Archiv der Mathematik* (2000).

[17] C. G. Lester and M. Schott, *Testing non-standard sources of parity violation in jets at the lhc, trialled with cms open data*, *Journal of High Energy Physics* (2019).

[18] B. Gripaios, W. Haddadin and C. Lester, *Lorentz and permutation invariants of particles II*, . To appear.

[19] B. Gripaios, W. Haddadin and C. Lester, *Lorentz and permutation invariants of particles III*, . To appear.

[20] M. Atiyah and I. MacDonald, *Introduction to commutative algebra*. Avalon Publishing, 1994.

[21] S. Kleiman and A. Altman, *A term of commutative algebra*. Worldwide Center of Mathematics, LLC, 2013.