

Progress Towards Two-loop QCD Corrections to $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}j$

Simon Badger

*Dipartimento di Fisica and Arnold-Regge Center, Università di Torino, and INFN, Sezione di Torino,
Via P. Giuria 1, I-10125 Torino, Italy*

We present the status of on-going efforts to compute the two-loop virtual corrections to $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}j$ in the leading colour approximation. We review the recent study of the master integrals and their differential equations and present some ideas on modern techniques that can be applied to provide complete evaluation of helicity amplitudes containing information on top quark decays in the narrow width approximation.

1 Introduction

Top quark pair production in association with an additional jet is a high priority process with current and future LHC experiments. This signal forms a significant fraction, around 50%, of all top-quark pair events and has been studied extensively by both ATLAS and CMS.^{1,2,3,4} The normalized distributions for $t\bar{t}j$ have been shown to be highly sensitive to the top-quark mass⁵ and therefore precision predictions are in high demand.

While next-to-leading order (NLO) QCD corrections have been known for many years,⁶ the next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) QCD corrections are currently unavailable due to the missing two-loop virtual contributions. The computational complexity of these amplitudes presents a formidable challenge to current theoretical methods and new techniques are required. New methods using finite field arithmetic,^{7,8} highly optimized integration-by-parts reduction^{9,10,11,12} and improved analytic understanding of multi-scale Feynman integrals^{13,14,15,16,17} have made considerable impact on $2 \rightarrow 3$ scattering processes. Recent highlights have been the completion of full colour corrections to $pp \rightarrow 3j$ and $pp \rightarrow \gamma + 2j$ at NNLO.^{18,19,20,21} The first steps have been taken to develop these ideas for applications to $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}j$ amplitudes^{22,23} where promising results have been obtained. Here we report on the status of the leading colour two-loop amplitudes where differential equations for the master integrals have recently been derived.²⁴

2 Amplitudes in the leading colour limit

Since the amplitudes are of an extremely high complexity, we start by considering the limit of a large number of colour charges $N_c \rightarrow \infty$. There is evidence to suggest that such an approximation to the two-loop virtual correction would be sufficient for next-to-next-to-leading order since the size with respect to double-real and real-virtual contributions is often small using standard infra-red subtraction schemes.

Helicity amplitude techniques have been extremely successful for predictions with massless particles. For massive particles helicity is not well defined since one can always boost to a frame in which helicity is flipped. We can therefore only define helicity with respect to a reference

direction. Helicity amplitude techniques can be extremely useful in the case of top-quark pair production since it is simple to include decays in the narrow width approximation.²⁵

The leading colour decomposition of the loop amplitudes, $\mathcal{A}^{(L)}$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{A}^{(L)}(1_{\bar{t}}, 2_t, 3_g, 4_g, 5_g) = g_s^{3+2L} N_c^L \sum_{\sigma \in S_3} (t^{a_{\sigma(3)}} t^{a_{\sigma(4)}} t^{a_{\sigma(5)}})_{i_2}^{\bar{i}_1} A_1^{(L)}(1_{\bar{t}}, 2_t, \sigma(3)_g, \sigma(4)_g, \sigma(5)_g) \quad (1)$$

in the gluon channel and

$$\mathcal{A}^{(L)}(1_{\bar{t}}, 2_t, 3_q, 4_{\bar{q}}, 5_g) = g_s^{3+2L} N_c^L \left\{ \delta_{i_1}^{\bar{i}_4} (t^{a_5})_{i_3}^{\bar{i}_2} A_1^{(L)}(1_{\bar{t}}, 2_t, 3_{\bar{q}}, 4_q, 5_g) + \delta_{i_2}^{\bar{i}_3} (t^{a_5})_{i_1}^{\bar{i}_4} A_2^{(L)}(1_{\bar{t}}, 2_t, 3_{\bar{q}}, 4_q, 5_g) \right\} \quad (2)$$

in the (light) quark channel. Here we have used g_s as the strong coupling, N_c as the number of colours and t^a are the $SU(N_c)$ generators. Due to the high gluon luminosity at the LHC, the gluon channel will dominate the contributions. At leading colour the external particles always appear with a cyclic ordering and so the top-quark pairs remain adjacent. This has the effect of minimising the number of massive internal propagators and therefore leads to considerably simpler Feynman integrals. Feynman integrals with internal masses can give rise to elliptic integrals from two-loops onwards. These structures are currently of great interest to mathematicians and there is an active field of research aiming to obtain an understanding suitable for collider physics applications. Unfortunately, for complicated kinematics such as $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}j$, the technology for numerical evaluation of such functions is not available at the same level as it is for more standard situations that can be written in terms of multiple polylogarithms.

From analysis of the Feynman diagrams of the two-loop leading colour amplitudes, one can find nine different integral families. Three topologies are formed from bubble insertions into one-loop pentagon graphs and can be trivially mapped into the three ‘hexagon-triangle’ topologies. After solving integration-by-parts identities to determine the master integrals, one can determine that there are no master integrals in the top sector of the hexagon-triangles and so these master integrals can also be mapped into the ‘pentagon-box’ families. The families are shown in Figure 1.

3 Evaluation of the pentagon-box master integrals

In the recent preprint article²⁴, differential equations (DEs) for all pentagon-box master integrals have been presented. Bases of master integrals were found for topologies PB_A and PB_C where the DEs can be written in terms of logarithmic one-forms. Contrary to all other pentagon-box configurations considered so far, topology PB_B was shown to have two problematic sectors. One could only be rotated in to ϵ -factorized form by introducing a nested square-root while another was shown to contain elliptic structures. As a result the strategy of expanding the integrals into a basis of stable pentagon functions which can be evaluated efficiently is not straightforward. As an alternative, we demonstrated that numerical values could be obtained in a reasonable time from generalized series expansions of the DEs.^{26,27} Topology PB_B was not obtained in ϵ -factorized form but as a quadratic polynomial in ϵ which could be represented compactly in terms of linearly independent one-forms.

We find that topologies PB_A and PB_C have 71 and 79 independent one-forms respectively, all of which can be written as dlog forms. Topology PB_B has 135 independent one-forms of which 72 can be written as dlog forms. Evaluation times per segment of the path between points in the generalized series expansion are around 5 times longer for PB_B than for PB_A and PB_C but, at around 1 minute per point, feasible for phenomenological applications. Considerations such as numerical stability and efficient algorithms for spanning the phasespace while




Figure 1: The six integral families appearing in the tensor integral representation of $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}j$ at two-loops in the leading colour limit. Black lines denote massless particles and red double-lines denote massive particles. The master integrals of all three hexagon-triangle topologies can be mapped to the pentagon-box topologies.

minimizing the number of segments remain for further study. For the two topologies admitting $d \log$ representations, it is straightforward to derive analytic representations in terms of multiple polylogarithms or pentagon functions that would provide fast and stable numerics.

4 Outlook

Having established a set of master integrals suitable for the complete amplitude in the planar limit that can be reliably evaluated numerically, the next step is to obtain their rational coefficients for each amplitude. This could be attempted through analytic reconstruction from finite field evaluations (modulo a prime number), for example using the **FiniteFlow** package,²⁸ as has been successful for other $2 \rightarrow 3$ scattering processes. Analytic forms for rational coefficients may well be extremely complicated and it may be useful to also consider numerical approaches. While this step will require the reduction of high rank tensor integrals, the finite field strategy combined with optimized IBP systems does appear to be viable. The unknown aspect of the evaluations is the average time per phase-space point which will certainly be considerably more expensive than massless $2 \rightarrow 3$ processes. There are many unexplored optimizations for efficient evaluation of the integrals and numerical interpolation techniques that lead us to believe the two-loop virtual corrections can be obtained via this strategy in the not too distant future.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank my collaborators Matteo Becchetti, Colomba Brannaccio, Nicolò Giraudo, Heribertus Bayu Hartanto and Simone Zoia. This project has received funding from the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No. 101105486, and ERC Starting Grant No. 101040760 *FFHiggsTop*. This work has received funding from the Italian Ministry of Universities and Research through FARE grant R207777C4R. This research was supported in part by the Swiss National Science

Foundation (SNF) under contract 200021_212729. SB has been partially supported by the Italian Ministry of Universities and Research (MUR) through grant PRIN 2022BCXSW9.

References

1. V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS], Phys. Rev. D **95** (2017) no.9, 092001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.092001
2. M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS], JHEP **10** (2018), 159 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2018)159
3. A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], JHEP **07** (2020), 125 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2020)125
4. [CMS], [arXiv:2402.08486 [hep-ex]].
5. S. Alioli, P. Fernandez, J. Fuster, A. Irles, S. O. Moch, P. Uwer and M. Vos, Eur. Phys. J. C **73** (2013), 2438 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2438-2
6. S. Dittmaier, P. Uwer and S. Weinzierl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007), 262002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.262002
7. A. von Manteuffel and R. M. Schabinger, Phys. Lett. B **744** (2015), 101-104 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.03.029
8. T. Peraro, JHEP **12** (2016), 030 doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2016)030
9. J. Gluza, K. Kajda and D. A. Kosower, Phys. Rev. D **83** (2011), 045012 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.045012
10. H. Ita, Phys. Rev. D **94** (2016) no.11, 116015 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.116015
11. K. J. Larsen and Y. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.4, 041701 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.041701
12. Z. Wu, J. Boehm, R. Ma, H. Xu and Y. Zhang, Comput. Phys. Commun. **295** (2024), 108999 doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2023.108999
13. T. Gehrmann, J. M. Henn and N. A. Lo Presti, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116** (2016) no.6, 062001 [erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **116** (2016) no.18, 189903] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.116.062001
14. T. Gehrmann, J. M. Henn and N. A. Lo Presti, JHEP **10** (2018), 103 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2018)103
15. D. Chicherin and V. Sotnikov, JHEP **20** (2020), 167 doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2020)167
16. D. Chicherin, V. Sotnikov and S. Zoia, JHEP **01** (2022), 096 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2022)096
17. S. Abreu, D. Chicherin, H. Ita, B. Page, V. Sotnikov, W. Tschernow and S. Zoia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132** (2024) no.14, 141601 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.141601
18. S. Badger, M. Czakon, H. B. Hartanto, R. Moodie, T. Peraro, R. Poncelet and S. Zoia, JHEP **10** (2023), 071 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2023)071
19. B. Agarwal, F. Buccioni, F. Devoto, G. Gambuti, A. von Manteuffel and L. Tancredi, Phys. Rev. D **109** (2024) no.9, 094025 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.094025
20. G. De Laurentis, H. Ita, M. Klinkert and V. Sotnikov, Phys. Rev. D **109** (2024) no.9, 094023 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.094023
21. G. De Laurentis, H. Ita and V. Sotnikov, Phys. Rev. D **109** (2024) no.9, 094024 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.094024
22. S. Badger, M. Becchetti, E. Chaubey, R. Marzucca and F. Sarandrea, JHEP **06** (2022), 066 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2022)066
23. S. Badger, M. Becchetti, E. Chaubey and R. Marzucca, JHEP **01** (2023), 156 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2023)156
24. S. Badger, M. Becchetti, N. Giraudo and S. Zoia, [arXiv:2404.12325 [hep-ph]].
25. K. Melnikov and M. Schulze, Nucl. Phys. B **840** (2010), 129-159 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2010.07.003
26. F. Moriello, JHEP **01** (2020), 150 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2020)150
27. M. Hidding, Comput. Phys. Commun. **269** (2021), 108125 doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2021.108125
28. T. Peraro, JHEP **07** (2019), 031 doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2019)031