

# Dynamics of Binary Systems to Fourth Post-Minkowskian Order from the Effective Field Theory Approach

Christoph Dlapa,<sup>1</sup> Gregor Kälin,<sup>2</sup> Zhengwen Liu,<sup>2</sup> and Rafael A. Porto<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Max-Planck-Institut für Physik, Werner-Heisenberg-Institute, 80805 Munich, Germany*

<sup>2</sup>*Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, Notkestrasse 85, 22607 Hamburg, Germany*

We present the contribution from potential interactions to the dynamics of non-spinning binaries to fourth Post-Minkowskian (4PM) order. This is achieved by computing the scattering angle to  $\mathcal{O}(G^4)$  using the effective field theory approach and deriving the bound radial action through analytic continuation. We reconstruct the Hamiltonian and center-of-mass momentum in an isotropic gauge. The (three-loop) integrals involved in our calculation are computed via differential equations, including a sector yielding elliptic integrals. As a prelude of radiation-reaction effects, using the universal link between potential and tail terms, we also report: *i*) The instantaneous energy flux at  $\mathcal{O}(G^3)$ ; *ii*) The contribution to the 4PM unbound/bound radial action(s) depending on logarithms of the binding energy; *iii*) The (scheme-independent) logarithmic contribution to the 4PM non-local tail Hamiltonian for circular orbits. Our results in the potential region are in agreement with the recent derivation from scattering amplitudes. We also find perfect agreement in the overlap with the state-of-the-art in Post-Newtonian theory.

*Introduction.* Motivated by the success of current gravitational wave (GW) detectors and the planned empirical reach [1, 2] and scientific output [3–7] of future GW observatories, there has been a significant amount of progress in applying ideas from particle physics — such as the worldline effective field theory (EFT) approach in the Post-Newtonian (PN) [8–45] and Post-Minkowskian (PM) regimes [46–52], as well as other tools from quantum field theory and scattering amplitudes, e.g. [53–76] — to the study of the inspiral problem with compact objects in general relativity. Most of these developments have impacted our knowledge of the conservative dynamics of the two-body problem in gravity, reaching the next-to-next-to-next-to-next-to leading order ( $N^4\text{LO}$ ) [22–26] for spin-independent contributions in the PN regime, complementing traditional methodologies [77–82]. The hunt for higher accuracy continues, with the state-of-the-art in PN theory approaching the  $N^5\text{LO}$  at 5PN [28–31], with partial results also at 6PN [33, 34], in addition to the well-established breakthrough at  $N^2\text{LO}$  (3PM) [47, 63, 64] in the PM counter-part.

In this letter, we present the contribution from potential modes to the dynamics of non-spinning binary systems at  $\mathcal{O}(G^4)$  using the EFT formalism [46, 47], in conjunction with the Boundary-to-Bound (B2B) dictionary [65, 66, 83]. Our derivation proceeds through the scattering angle, which we compute via Feynman diagrams. Using several powerful multi-loop integration tools from particle physics [84–100], the calculation is reduced to a series of ‘three-loop’ (massless) integrals. The latter are obtained to all orders in velocities through differential equations, yielding *multiple polylogarithms* (MPLs) [101–105], as well as elliptic integrals. The resulting deflection angle agrees with the one reported recently in [73], confirming its validity with an independent calculation entirely within the classical domain.

Armed with the solution of the scattering problem, observables for bound orbits follow from the B2B correspondence, after analytic continuation in the binding energy and angular momentum [65, 66]. We also reconstruct the Hamiltonian and center-of-mass momentum in an isotropic gauge. However, because of the separation into regions, we encounter spurious infrared(IR)/ultraviolet(UV) divergences [22, 23], similar to what occurs in the Lamb shift [24]. As expected, these IR/UV poles ultimately cancel out in observables [26]. Yet, it makes the result from potential modes dependent on the regularization scheme, featuring for instance logarithms of the renormalization scale in dimensional regularization, as well as spurious finite pieces [23, 26].

Nonetheless, the split into regions turns out to be useful for several reasons. First of all, after removing some spurious contributions, it serves as proxy to the full answer. In addition, due to the universal link between potential and tail terms [27, 83], together with the nature of the integrals involving (on-shell) radiation modes, e.g. [76], it allows us to immediately read off several new results involving radiative effects. In particular, we report the leading logarithms (depending on the binding energy) in the unbound/bound radial action(s), to all orders in velocities. Moreover, we also present the instantaneous flux at  $\mathcal{O}(G^3)$ . The latter will allow us, in combination with the conservative part, to derive the GW phase entirely within a PM scheme for the first time. From the flux we can also derive the logarithmic contribution to the (non-local) tail Hamiltonian, which we compute for the case of circular orbits. We have checked that the results presented here involving PM radiation-reaction effects are consistent with the known state-of-the-art in PN theory [106]. The remaining (local) corrections from tail terms will be discussed elsewhere.

*The EFT formalism.* The effective action,  $S_{\text{eff}}[x_a^\alpha(\tau_a)]$  ( $a = 1, 2$ ), is obtained in the weak-field regime,  $g_{\mu\nu} = \eta_{\mu\nu} + h_{\mu\nu}$ , by *integrating out* the metric perturbation in the (classical) saddle-point approximation via Feynman diagrams. The compact bodies are described by a worldline theory, which may be taken linear in the metric for non-spinning structureless bodies [46]. As usual, integration in  $d = 4 - 2\epsilon$  dimensions is used to handle divergent integrals. The equations of motion (EoM) follow by extremizing  $S_{\text{eff}}[x_a^\alpha(\tau_a)]$ . The scattering problem is then tackled by solving for the total impulse,  $\Delta p_a^\mu$ , and subsequently the deflection angle,

$$\sin(\chi/2) = \sqrt{-\Delta p_a^2}/p_\infty, \quad (1)$$

with  $p_\infty$  the incoming Center-of-Mass (CoM) momentum. Due to the presence of intermediate divergences we will use the PM expansion, with  $\bar{\mu}^2 \equiv 4\pi\mu^2 e^{\gamma_E}$  in dimensional regularization,

$$\frac{\chi}{2} = \sum_n \left( (4\bar{\mu}^2 b^2)^\epsilon \frac{GM}{b} \right)^n \chi_b^{(n)}(\gamma). \quad (2)$$

We restrict to the impulse in the direction of the impact parameter,  $b = \sqrt{-b^\mu b_\mu}$ , which is sufficient to reconstruct the answer using momentum conservation [46].

In principle, we may tackle the entire (classical) *soft* region at once, without splitting into potential and radiation modes. However, even though it introduces spurious divergences [23], mode factorization remains a convenient tool to compute the integrals and isolate various contributions. In fact, the cancelation of intermediate poles not only becomes a non-trivial consistency check, it also allows us to extract various new results including radiation modes, using the universal character of the answer [83]. We discuss the full radiation-reaction conservative sector in a forthcoming paper.

*Potential region.* The Feynman topologies needed at 4PM are shown in Fig. 1. We must also include *iterations* of the deflected trajectories into lower order contributions to the effective action. The additional Feynman topologies are shown in [47]. After tensor decomposition, and prior to Fourier transforming from transfer-momentum,  $q$ , onto impact-parameter space [46, 47], the impulse becomes a linear combination of scalar (three-loop) massless relativistic integrals of the type

$$\prod_{i=1}^3 \int \frac{d^d \ell_i}{\pi^{d/2}} \frac{\delta(\ell_i \cdot u_{a_i})}{(\pm \ell_i \cdot u_{q_i} - i0^+)^{n_i}} \frac{1}{\prod_{j=1}^9 D_j^{\nu_j}}, \quad (3)$$

with  $n_i, \nu_j \in \mathbb{N}$ ,  $a_i \in \{1, 2\}$  ( $\mathcal{A} = 2, \mathcal{B} = 1$ ),  $u_a$  the incoming velocities, and  $D_j$  various sets of square propagators. The external data obeys  $q \cdot u_1 = q \cdot u_2 = 0$ ,  $u_a^2 = 1$ , such that the result depends on  $t = -q^2$  and  $\gamma \equiv u_1 \cdot u_2$ . As before [47], the  $t$  dependence follows from dimensional




Figure 1. Feynman topologies in the potential region at 4PM.

analysis. Remarkably, all our integrals can be classified into two families of square propagators. A salient aspect of the EFT integrals in (3) is that they are accompanied by delta functions,  $\delta(\ell_i \cdot u_a)$ , arising after time integration over the worldline sources. This feature, which is directly connected to the mass scalings in the total impulse [46, 47, 65], yields a natural classification into sectors. We denote as  $(abc)$  the product  $\delta(\ell_1 \cdot u_a)\delta(\ell_2 \cdot u_b)\delta(\ell_3 \cdot u_c)$ . Integrals in sector (111) (or its (222) mirror), arising from the first five diagrams in Fig. 1 and lower-order iterations, capture the test-particle limit. These can be readily obtained by resolving the delta functions in the rest-frame, leading to three-dimensional *static* integrals. The static sector may be further decomposed in a basis of seven integrals via integration by parts (IBP) identities [84, 85], using FIRE6 [98, 99] and LiteRed [89]. The associated master integrals are computed via standard tools, such as parametric representations and Cheng-Wu theorem [86]. We have also checked them numerically using pySecDec [107].

The remaining integrals involving the last seven diagrams in Fig. 1, as well as non-static iterations, can be reduced to solving the (112) sector, for which we implemented the method of differential equations [87, 88]. Following [47, 69], we derived a system of equations with respect to the parameter  $x$ , defined via the relation  $\gamma \equiv (x^2 + 1)/2x$ . When possible, we solved the differential equations by means of a canonical basis [91]. We use the algorithms described in [92, 95, 100], yielding

$$d\vec{f}(x, \epsilon) = \epsilon \left( \sum_i M_i d \log \alpha_i(x) \right) \vec{f}(x, \epsilon), \quad (4)$$

for the set of  $\mathcal{O}(10^2)$  basis integrals in  $\vec{f}$ , where  $\alpha_i \in \{x, 1+x, 1-x, 1+x^2\}$  and the  $M_i$ 's are matrices with rational numbers. The solution can then be cast in terms of MPLs [104]. This was the case in all but a  $3 \times 3$  diagonal block, for which it is not possible to achieve the  $\epsilon$ -factorized form through an algebraic transformation. This turns out to be an elliptic-type sector, which we solved as follows. Firstly, we bring the elliptic diagonal block into the form  $A_0 \epsilon^0 + A_1 \epsilon^1$ , while transforming all other diagonal blocks into a canonical representation. We use an ansatz (see e.g. [93, 94]) to make all off-diagonal blocks polynomial in  $\epsilon$ , containing *at most* simple poles in  $x$ , and then we integrate out the  $A_0$  component. The last step can be achieved by first deriv-

ing the (third-order) Picard-Fuchs equation of the corresponding scalar integral [97]. The differential equations then contain only simple poles, with the elliptic diagonal block turned into polynomials of degree four in

$$\{K(x^2), K(1-x^2), E(x^2), E(1-x^2)\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $K, E$  are the complete elliptic integrals of the first and second kind (our conventions are summarized in the ancillary file). From here it is straightforward to iteratively solve for the master integrals, order-by-order in  $\epsilon$ . This leads to iterated integrals over polylogarithmic kernels as well as elliptic integrals, which can be ultimately re-written in terms of logarithms, dilogarithms and products of  $E$  and  $K$ . Finally, we input the boundary (static) values by expanding around  $x = 1$ . It turns out the same seven master integrals used in the (111) sector are sufficient to cover the boundary conditions. Remarkably, similarly to the 3PM case [47], this means the test-particle limit carries all the needed information for the boundary terms in the entire potential region.

Garnering all the pieces together, using (1) and (2), we arrive at

$$\frac{\chi_{b(\text{pot})}^{(4)}(\gamma)}{\pi\Gamma} = \chi_s(x) + \nu \left( \frac{\chi_{2\epsilon}(x)}{2\epsilon} + \chi_p(x) \right), \quad (6)$$

where  $\Gamma \equiv E/M$ , with  $M$  and  $E$  the total mass and energy, and  $\nu$  the symmetric mass-ratio, respectively. The result depends on MPLs up to weight two as well as products of the set in (5). The values for the  $(\chi_s, \chi_{2\epsilon}, \chi_p)$  coefficients can be found in (25) and (26) below (see supplemental material and ancillary file). The scheme-dependence appears through the IR pole and renormalization scale,  $\bar{\mu}^2$ , as well as various spurious finite terms which must cancel out altogether against similar pieces in the tail contribution [23, 26]. Using various identities between MPLs and iterated elliptic integrals, we find our result in (6) is equivalent to the one obtained in [73], including also the spurious terms. We elaborate on the PM integration and implementation of the differential equations in the EFT approach in [105].

*Boundary-to-Bound correspondence.* The scattering angle allows us to derive the bound radial action via the B2B map. Unfortunately, the spurious pieces from the potential region still pollute the answer. However, as a proxy to the full local contribution, we may use the IR-finite part of  $\chi_{(\text{pot})}^{(4\text{PM})}$  to build the (local) bound radial action. Hence, following the B2B correspondence we find for the (IR-finite) correction from potential modes [83]

$$i_{r(\text{pot})}^{4\text{PM}} = \frac{2(1-\gamma^2)^2}{3(\Gamma j)^3} (\chi_s + \nu\chi_p) \quad (\text{bound}), \quad (7)$$

where  $j \equiv J/(GM^2\nu)$ , with  $J$  the angular momentum.

*Impetus & Hamiltonian.* The presence of a divergence requires a modification of the Firsov formula discussed in [65]. Introducing the PM expansion

$$\mathbf{p}^2(r) = p_\infty^2 \left[ 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} f_n(E) \left( \frac{GM}{r} \right)^n (4\bar{\mu}^2 r^2)^{n\epsilon} \right], \quad (8)$$

for the center-of-mass momentum, we can then relate the  $f_n$ 's to the  $\chi_b^{(n)}$ 's [83]. In particular, at 4PM we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_4 = & \frac{2(4\epsilon-1)^3\Gamma^4(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)}{3\pi^2\Gamma^4(1-\epsilon)} \left( \chi_b^{(1)} \right)^4 \\ & + \frac{(2-8\epsilon)^2\Gamma(1-2\epsilon)\Gamma^2(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)}{\pi^{3/2}\Gamma(\frac{3}{2}-2\epsilon)\Gamma^2(1-\epsilon)} \left( \chi_b^{(1)} \right)^2 \chi_b^{(2)} \\ & + \frac{4(4\epsilon-1)\Gamma(\frac{3}{2}-3\epsilon)\Gamma(\frac{1}{2}-\epsilon)}{\pi\Gamma(2-3\epsilon)\Gamma(1-\epsilon)} \chi_b^{(1)} \chi_b^{(3)} \\ & + \frac{(8\epsilon-2)\Gamma^2(1-2\epsilon)}{\pi\Gamma^2(\frac{3}{2}-2\epsilon)} \left( \chi_b^{(2)} \right)^2 + \frac{2\Gamma(2-4\epsilon)}{\sqrt{\pi}\Gamma(\frac{5}{2}-4\epsilon)} \chi_b^{(4)}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where the lower order coefficients can be found in [46, 47]. From here it is straightforward to extract a Hamiltonian. Once again, we write the PM expansion as (notice we use a somewhat different convention w.r.t. [73])

$$H_{(\text{pot})}(\mathbf{r}, \mathbf{p}^2) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{c_n(\mathbf{p}^2)}{n!} \left( \frac{G}{r} \right)^n (4\bar{\mu}^2 r^2)^{n\epsilon}. \quad (10)$$

The value of  $c_4(\mathbf{p}^2)$  is obtained directly from  $f_4(E)$  following the steps described in [65], which remain unaltered at this order, and using

$$\gamma = \frac{E_1 E_2 + \mathbf{p}^2}{m_1 m_2}, \quad E_a = \sqrt{m_a^2 + \mathbf{p}^2}. \quad (11)$$

Complete expressions are given in the ancillary file. (See also (28) in the supplemental material.)

Due to the presence of divergences, the 4PM coefficient of the Hamiltonian acquires the following structure

$$c_4 = -\frac{32M^5(\gamma^2-1)\nu^2}{\Gamma^2\xi} (\chi_s + \nu\chi_p) + c_4^{2\epsilon} + \dots, \quad (12)$$

where  $\xi = E_1 E_2 / E^2$ , the ellipses account for iterations from lower order terms, and

$$c_4^{2\epsilon} \equiv -\frac{32M^5(\gamma^2-1)\nu^3}{\Gamma^2\xi} \left( \frac{1}{2\epsilon} + \frac{10}{3} - 4\log(2) \right) \chi_{2\epsilon}. \quad (13)$$

The contribution due to  $c_4^{2\epsilon}$  is spurious and, similarly to (7), it should be removed prior to using potential modes as a proxy of the local Hamiltonian. Unfortunately, other spurious pieces remain in the answer. Luckily, the unambiguous logarithmic part of the full Hamiltonian can be readily computed, as we discuss below.

*A prelude for radiation modes.* The inclusion of radiation modes entails adding *self-energy* corrections to the list of Feynman diagrams in Fig. 1. This corresponds to diagrams with all the sources on the same worldline. (Notably only from tree-level and one-loop, with the others yielding scaleless integrals on unperturbed solutions.) The main difference with respect to the potential region is the need to compute integrals involving on-shell graviton modes. Given the nature of the boundary conditions in the soft region, e.g. [75], and the expected cancellation of intermediate divergences, alongside the factors of  $\log \bar{\mu}^2 b^2$ , we already anticipate the following structure

$$\frac{\chi_b^{(4)}(\gamma)}{\pi\Gamma} = \nu \left( -\frac{\chi_{2\epsilon}(x)}{2\epsilon} (1-x)^{-4\epsilon} + \chi_t(x) \right), \quad (14)$$

for the radiation-reaction part of the (conservative) scattering angle.<sup>1</sup> The final result thus takes the form

$$\frac{\chi_b^{(4)}(\text{tot})}{\pi\Gamma} = \chi_s(x) + \nu \left( \chi_p(x) + \chi_t(x) + 2\chi_{2\epsilon} \log(1-x) \right). \quad (15)$$

The value of  $\chi_t(x)$ , which includes physical as well as spurious terms similar to those appearing in  $\chi_p(x)$ , will be reported elsewhere. Nonetheless, we can already derive a series of new results from the structure revealed in (15).

*Instantaneous flux and total radiated energy.* The coefficient of the pole in the effective action due to tail terms is related to the radiated flux [22, 27, 83]. In particular, we have [83]

$$S_{\text{eff}}^{\text{rad}} = - \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt H_{(\text{tail})} = \frac{GE}{2\epsilon} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} dt \frac{dE}{dt} + \dots \quad (16)$$

From the cancelation of divergences, using (13) and (11), we can then read off the instantaneous flux in the center-of-mass frame

$$\left. \frac{dE}{dt} \right|_{3\text{PM}}(r, \mathbf{p}^2) = -\frac{4}{3} \frac{G^3 M^4}{r^4} \frac{(\gamma^2 - 1)\nu^3}{\Gamma^3 \xi} \chi_{2\epsilon}(\gamma). \quad (17)$$

It is straightforward to obtain the total radiated energy,  $\Delta E_{\text{hyp/ell}}$ , both in hyperbolic- and elliptic-like motion, by a change of variables,  $dt = dr/\dot{r}$ , and integrating between the end points of the motion. For instance,<sup>2</sup>

$$\Delta E_{\text{hyp}}^{3\text{PM}} = -\frac{2\pi\nu^2}{3} \frac{(\gamma^2 - 1)^2 M}{\Gamma^4 j^3} \chi_{2\epsilon}(\gamma) + \dots, \quad (18)$$

<sup>1</sup> The singular factor of  $(1-x)^{-4\epsilon}$  signals the existence of (two) quadratic propagators going on-shell in the tail terms. Similarly to  $\chi_p(x)$ , where intermediate singularities cancel out,  $\chi_t(x)$  is likewise devoid of logarithmic divergences in the  $x \rightarrow 1$  limit.

<sup>2</sup> We can also readily compute the missing  $\mathcal{O}(G^4 v^0)$  contribution to (17), i.e.  $G^4 M^5 \frac{22\nu^2}{15r^5}$ , needed to match the total radiated energy from the quadrupole formula. This value can also be added to  $dE/dt$  in (23), see below.

which agrees (modulo a pre-factor) with the coefficient of the pole in the (unbound) radial action. This reproduces the result obtained in [73, 74, 76]. Similarly to the link between angle and periastron advance, the relation between orbital elements discovered in [65, 66], together with the invariance of the instantaneous flux and radial momentum under  $j \rightarrow -j$ , readily implies

$$\Delta E_{\text{ell}}(j) = \Delta E_{\text{hyp}}(j) - \Delta E_{\text{hyp}}(-j), \quad (19)$$

after analytic continuation [83] (see also [106]).

*Logarithmic tail terms.* The universal structure in (15) allows us to compute the logarithmic corrections to the unbound/bound radial action(s). Using  $\log(1-x) \simeq \log v_\infty + \dots$ , with  $v_\infty \equiv \sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}$ , we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_r^{4\text{PM}} &= -\frac{E}{(2\pi)M^2\nu} \Delta E_{\text{hyp}}(j) \log v_\infty^2 \quad (\text{unbound}) \\ &= \frac{\nu}{3} \frac{(\gamma^2 - 1)^2}{(\Gamma j)^3} \chi_{2\epsilon}(\gamma) \log v_\infty^2 + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

defined here so that  $\chi/(2\pi) = -\partial_j \mathcal{I}_r$ . We checked that this expression reproduces all the known  $v_\infty^{2n} \log v_\infty^2 / j^4$  PN contributions to the non-local part of the scattering angle to 6PN reported in [106], providing an infinite series of new terms.

Remarkably, the same *local* B2B dictionary also applies to logarithmic contributions, yielding

$$\begin{aligned} i_r^{4\text{PM}} &= -\frac{E}{(2\pi)M^2\nu} \Delta E_{\text{ell}}(j) \log(-\mathcal{E}) \quad (\text{bound}) \\ &= \frac{2\nu}{3} \frac{(1-\gamma^2)^2}{(\Gamma j)^3} \chi_{2\epsilon}(\gamma) \log(-\mathcal{E}) + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

with  $\mathcal{E} \equiv (E - M)/(M\nu) < 0$ , the (reduced) binding energy. The above expression can be then added to (7) to describe bound orbits. From here we can obtain, for instance, the periastron advance via  $\Delta\Phi/(2\pi) = -\partial_j i_r$ . The bound radial action can also be used to compute the functional relationship  $\mathcal{E}(\Omega)$  for circular orbits, with  $\Omega$  the orbital frequency. We have checked that using the condition  $i_r = 0$  together with Firsov's formula [65] reproduces the known PN factors of  $\log \Omega$ , see [83].

*Universal part of the non-local Hamiltonian.* The logarithmic contribution from tail terms to the unbound radial action takes the following form [83]

$$\begin{aligned} 2\pi GM \mathcal{I}_r^{4\text{PM}} &= -\frac{GE}{M\nu} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{dE}{d\omega} \log(4\omega^2 r^2 e^{2\gamma E}) \\ &= -\int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \frac{H_{(\text{nloc})}}{M\nu} dt, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

with the factor of  $\log 4e^{2\gamma E}$  introduced following the conventions in the PN literature, e.g. [26, 106]. From here, using (17) and (11), we derive the logarithmic (non-local)

part of the full Hamiltonian at 4PM in isotropic gauge,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{1}{M\nu} H_{(\text{nloc})}^{\text{circ}}(r, \mathbf{p}^2) &= \frac{G\Gamma}{\nu} \frac{dE}{dt} \times (\log(\Omega^2 r^2) + \log(16e^{2\gamma_E})) \\ &= -\frac{4}{3} \left( \frac{GM}{r} \right)^4 \frac{(\gamma^2 - 1)\nu^2}{\Gamma^2 \xi} \chi_{2\epsilon}(\gamma) \\ &\quad \times (\log v^2 + \log(16e^{2\gamma_E})) , \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

evaluated on a circular orbit, with  $\Omega$  the orbital frequency and  $v = \Omega r$ . We have added also the constant term on the leading quadrupolar mode  $\omega \simeq 2\Omega$ .

*Conclusions.* Using the EFT formalism [46, 47] and B2B correspondence [65, 66], we have computed the contribution from potential modes to the dynamics of non-spinning binary systems to 4PM order, both for hyperbolic- and elliptic-like motion. Our result for the deflection angle agrees with the recent value reported in [73] from scattering amplitudes, thus providing an independent derivation. One of the main advantages of the EFT framework in the PM regime is that the associated *integrand* already encodes all of the relevant information from the onset, without the need of further manipulations nor matching conditions as in the amplitude’s program [63, 64, 73]. The EFT approach is therefore naturally suited, as we demonstrated here, to fully implement the method of differential equations [47, 69] to solve the integration problem, giving us full control of the master integrals to any order in  $\epsilon$ , both in the potential and radiation regions, without resorting to PN resummations.

In order to complete the knowledge of the dynamics at 4PM, and remove spurious finite terms, boundary conditions from radiation modes must be added, as well as a few self-energy diagrams. Fortunately, several contributions can be readily obtained using the universal character of the non-local tail terms [27, 83] as well as the generic properties of the boundary conditions, e.g. [76]. In particular, we derived all of the logarithmic contributions to the full bound/unbound radial action at 4PM. Through the connection with tail terms we have also obtained the instantaneous flux at  $\mathcal{O}(G^3)$ . The latter al-

lowed us to derive the logarithmic contribution to the full non-local tail Hamiltonian at 4PM. All these results are consistent with the PN values in the literature [106], while at the same time predict a series of corrections at all orders in velocities. The remaining (local) part from tail terms will be reported in forthcoming work.

In principle, the expression in (23) can be added to the (local) Hamiltonian derived from potential modes after removing the spurious part in (13). Alternatively, following the B2B paradigm, we have (for quasi-circular orbits, using  $1 - \gamma^2 \simeq 2|\mathcal{E}|$ )

$$i_{r,(\text{nloc})}^{4\text{PM}(\text{pot})} = \frac{2(1 - \gamma^2)^2}{3(\Gamma j)^3} \left[ \chi_s + \nu(\chi_p + \chi_{2\epsilon} \log(32|\mathcal{E}|e^{2\gamma_E})) \right], \quad (24)$$

which encapsulates the gauge-invariant (conservative) information for bound orbits. In combination with the instantaneous flux in (17), this provides all the ingredients to derive the GW phase evolution entirely within a PM scheme, thus continuing the quest towards high-precision modeling in the era of GW astronomy.

*Acknowledgements.* We would like to thank Ekta Chaubey, Gihyuk Cho, Stefano Foffa, Ryusuke Jinno, Julio Parra-Martinez, Henrique Rubira and Yang Zhang for useful discussions. We also thank the organizers and participants of the workshop “Gravitational scattering, inspiral, and radiation,” at the Galileo Galilei Institute for Theoretical Physics in Florence, for hospitality and fruitful exchanges. G.K., Z.L. and R.A.P. are supported by the ERC-CoG *Precision Gravity: From the LHC to LISA* provided by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s H2020 research and innovation programme (grant No. 817791). We also acknowledge the DFG under Germany’s Excellence Strategy “Quantum Universe” (No. 390833306). The research of C.D. has received funding from the ERC under the European Union’s Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme, *Novel structures in scattering amplitudes* (Grant agreement No. 725110).

### Supplemental Material

Except for the test-body limit,

$$\chi_s(x) = \frac{h_1(x)}{128(x^2-1)^6} = \frac{105(33\gamma^4 - 18\gamma^2 + 1)}{128(\gamma^2 - 1)^2}, \quad (25)$$

which can be computed at any PM order from the deflection angle in a Schwarzschild background, e.g. [48], the remaining terms in (6) at  $\mathcal{O}(\nu)$  can be written in terms of MPLs,  $G(\vec{a}; x)$  (up to weight two), times polynomials,  $h_i(x)$ , in the variable  $x$ :

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_{2\epsilon}(x) &= -\frac{h_2(x)}{64x^2(x^2-1)^4} - \frac{3h_3(x)G(0;x)}{32x(x^2-1)^5} + \frac{3h_4(x)(G(-1;x) - G(0;2))}{32x^2(x^2-1)^2} \\ &= -\frac{210\gamma^6 - 552\gamma^5 + 339\gamma^4 - 912\gamma^3 + 3148\gamma^2 - 3336\gamma + 1151}{32(\gamma^2 - 1)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{3(35\gamma^4 + 60\gamma^3 - 150\gamma^2 + 76\gamma - 5)}{16(\gamma^2 - 1)} \log\left(\frac{\gamma+1}{2}\right) - \frac{3\gamma(2\gamma^2 - 3)(35\gamma^4 - 30\gamma^2 + 11)}{32(\gamma^2 - 1)^2} \frac{\operatorname{arccosh}(\gamma)}{\sqrt{\gamma^2 - 1}} \\ \chi_p(x) &= -\frac{21h_5(x)E^2(1-x^2)}{8(x^2-1)^4} + \frac{3K(1-x^2)h_6(x)E(1-x^2)}{8(x^2-1)^4} - \frac{15K^2(1-x^2)h_7(x)}{16(x^2-1)^4} \\ &\quad + \frac{\pi^2 h_8(x)}{256x^2(x^2-1)^5} - \frac{h_9(x)}{1536x^3(x^2-1)^6(x^2+1)^7} + \frac{G(0;2)h_{10}(x)}{128x^3(x^2-1)^4} + \frac{3G(0;2)^2 h_{11}(x)}{16x^2(x^2-1)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{h_{12}(x)G(0;x)}{128x^3(x^2-1)^7} - \frac{h_{13}(x)G(-1;x)}{128x^3(x^2-1)^4} - \frac{h_{14}(x)G(-1;x^2)}{64x^3(x^2-1)^4} - \frac{3h_{15}(x)G(0;2)G(-1;x)}{64x^4(x^2-1)^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{3h_{16}(x)G(0;2)G(1;x)}{64x^4(x^2-1)^2} + \frac{3h_{17}(x)(G(0;x)G(1;x) - G(0,1;x))}{256x^4(x^2-1)^5} \\ &\quad - \frac{3h_{18}(x)(G(-1;x)G(1;x) - G(-1,1;x))}{128x^4(x^2-1)^2} + \frac{3h_{19}(x)(G(0;2)G(0;x) - G(0,-1;x))}{8(x^2-1)^5} \\ &\quad + \frac{3h_{20}(x)G(0,0;x)}{32x(x^2-1)^8} - \frac{3h_{21}(x)G(-1,0;x)}{256x^4(x^2-1)^5} + \frac{3h_{22}(x)G(-1,-1;x)}{128x^4(x^2-1)^2} \\ &\quad - \frac{3h_{23}(x)(G(-1;x^2)G(1;x) - G(-1,-i;x) - G(-1,i;x) - G(-i,1;x) - G(i,1;x))}{128x^4(x^2-1)^2} \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

with  $h_i(x)$ 's collected in the ancillary file together with the complete result.

The MPLs themselves can be expressed as follows (with  $0 < x \leq 1^-$ ):

$$\begin{aligned} G(0;x) &= \log(x), & G(-1;x) &= \log(1+x), & G(1;x) &= \log(1-x), \\ G(0,0;x) &= \frac{1}{2}\log^2(x), & G(-1,-1;x) &= \frac{1}{2}\log^2(1+x), & G(0,-1;x) &= -\operatorname{Li}_2(-x), \\ G(-i;x) + G(i;x) &= \log(1+x^2), & G(-1,0;x) &= \log(x)\log(1+x) + \operatorname{Li}_2(-x), \\ G(0,1;x) &= -\frac{\pi^2}{6} + \log(1-x)\log(x) - \frac{\log^2(x)}{2} - \operatorname{Li}_2\left(\frac{x-1}{x}\right), \\ G(-1,1;x) &= -\frac{\pi^2}{12} + \log(4-4x)\log(1+x) - \frac{1}{2}\log^2(1+x) \\ &\quad - \log(2)\log(1-x^2) - \operatorname{Li}_2\left(\frac{x-1}{x+1}\right), \\ G(-1,-i;x) + G(-1,i;x) + G(-i,1;x) + G(i,1;x) &= -\frac{\pi^2}{8} + \log(1+x)\log\left(\frac{4}{1+x^2}\right) + \log(1-x^2)\log\left(\frac{1+x^2}{2}\right) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2}\operatorname{Li}_2\left(-\frac{(x-1)^2}{(1+x)^2}\right) - 2\operatorname{Li}_2\left(\frac{x-1}{x+1}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The value of  $f_4(E)$  in the expansion of the center-of-mass momentum is given in (9). Following the steps described in [65], the (much more cumbersome) 4PM coefficient of the Hamiltonian in (10) becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
c_4 = & \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1) M^5 \nu^8 d_1(\gamma) f_1(E)^4}{16\Gamma^{27}\xi^7} + \frac{9(\gamma^2 - 1)^3 M^7 \nu^8 d_2(\gamma) f_1(E)^2 f_1'(E)^2}{2\Gamma^{17}\xi^5} \\
& - \frac{9(\gamma^2 - 1)^2 M^6 \nu^6 d_2(\gamma) f_1(E) f_2(E) f_1'(E)}{\Gamma^{14}\xi^4} - \frac{9(\gamma^2 - 1)^2 M^6 \nu^6 d_2(\gamma) f_1(E)^2 f_2'(E)}{2\Gamma^{14}\xi^4} \\
& + \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1)^3 M^7 \nu^8 d_2(\gamma) f_1(E)^3 f_1''(E)}{2\Gamma^{17}\xi^5} + \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1)^2 M^6 \nu^8 d_3(\gamma) f_1(E)^3 f_1'(E)}{4\Gamma^{22}\xi^6} \\
& + \frac{9(\gamma^2 - 1) M^5 \nu^6 d_4(\gamma) f_1(E)^2 f_2(E)}{2\Gamma^{19}\xi^5} + \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1) M^5 \nu^4 d_2(\gamma) f_2(E)^2}{\Gamma^{11}\xi^3} \\
& + \frac{6(\gamma^2 - 1) M^5 \nu^4 d_2(\gamma) f_1(E) f_3(E)}{\Gamma^{11}\xi^3} + \frac{9(\gamma^2 - 1)^4 M^8 \nu^8 f_1(E)^2 f_1'(E) f_1''(E)}{4\Gamma^{12}\xi^4} \\
& + \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1)^4 M^8 \nu^8 f_1(E) f_1'(E)^3}{2\Gamma^{12}\xi^4} - \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1)^3 M^7 \nu^6 f_2(E) f_1'(E)^2}{\Gamma^9 \xi^3} \\
& - \frac{6(\gamma^2 - 1)^3 M^7 \nu^6 f_1(E) f_1'(E) f_2'(E)}{\Gamma^9 \xi^3} + \frac{6(\gamma^2 - 1)^2 M^6 \nu^4 f_3(E) f_1'(E)}{\Gamma^6 \xi^2} \\
& + \frac{6(\gamma^2 - 1)^2 M^6 \nu^4 f_2(E) f_2'(E)}{\Gamma^6 \xi^2} + \frac{6(\gamma^2 - 1)^2 M^6 \nu^4 f_1(E) f_3'(E)}{\Gamma^6 \xi^2} \\
& - \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1)^3 M^7 \nu^6 f_1(E) f_2(E) f_1''(E)}{\Gamma^9 \xi^3} - \frac{3(\gamma^2 - 1)^3 M^7 \nu^6 f_1(E)^2 f_2''(E)}{2\Gamma^9 \xi^3} \\
& + \frac{(\gamma^2 - 1)^4 M^8 \nu^8 f_1(E)^3 f_1'''(E)}{4\Gamma^{12}\xi^4} - \frac{12(\gamma^2 - 1) M^5 \nu^2 f_4(E)}{\Gamma^3 \xi},
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

where primes denote derivatives w.r.t. to  $E$ , and the  $d_i$ 's are polynomials in  $\gamma$  given by

$$\begin{aligned}
d_1(\gamma) = & (35\gamma^3 - 135\gamma^2 + 201\gamma - 141) \nu^6 (\gamma - 1)^9 \\
& + 3(75\gamma^4 - 279\gamma^3 + 377\gamma^2 - 93\gamma + 200) \nu^5 (\gamma - 1)^7 \\
& + (603\gamma^5 - 2115\gamma^4 + 2063\gamma^3 - 1491\gamma^2 + 474\gamma - 934) \nu^4 (\gamma - 1)^5 \\
& + (855\gamma^6 - 2563\gamma^5 + 2617\gamma^4 - 1749\gamma^3 + 1076\gamma^2 - 668\gamma + 712) \nu^3 (\gamma - 1)^3 \\
& + (641\gamma^6 - 1108\gamma^5 + 811\gamma^4 - 420\gamma^3 + 419\gamma^2 - 152\gamma + 289) \nu^2 (\gamma - 1)^2 \\
& + (239\gamma^6 - 181\gamma^5 + 134\gamma^4 - 46\gamma^3 + 95\gamma^2 - 13\gamma + 60) \nu (\gamma - 1) \\
& + 35\gamma^6 + 15\gamma^4 + 9\gamma^2 + 5, \\
d_2(\gamma) = & (7\gamma^2 - 5\gamma + 4) (\gamma - 1) \nu + 3\gamma^2 + (3\gamma - 5) (\gamma - 1)^3 \nu^2 + 1 \\
d_3(\gamma) = & (29\gamma^2 - 86\gamma + 77) \nu^4 (\gamma - 1)^6 + 2(65\gamma^3 - 162\gamma^2 + 81\gamma - 76) \nu^3 (\gamma - 1)^4 \\
& + (211\gamma^4 - 382\gamma^3 + 305\gamma^2 - 136\gamma + 118) \nu^2 (\gamma - 1)^2 \\
& + 2(67\gamma^4 - 49\gamma^3 + 45\gamma^2 - 11\gamma + 20) \nu (\gamma - 1) + 29\gamma^4 + 14\gamma^2 + 5, \\
d_4(\gamma) = & -(5\gamma^2 - 14\gamma + 13) \nu^4 (\gamma - 1)^6 - 2(11\gamma^3 - 28\gamma^2 + 11\gamma - 14) \nu^3 (\gamma - 1)^4 \\
& - (36\gamma^4 - 66\gamma^3 + 47\gamma^2 - 20\gamma + 23) \nu^2 (\gamma - 1)^2 \\
& - (23\gamma^4 - 17\gamma^3 + 13\gamma^2 - 3\gamma + 8) \nu (\gamma - 1) - 5\gamma^4 - 2\gamma^2 - 1.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

---

*Italy, January 26-29, 2010*, *Class. Quant. Grav.* **27**, 194002 (2010).

[2] P. Amaro-Seoane *et al.* (LISA), (2017), arXiv:1702.00786 [astro-ph.IM].

---

[1] M. Punturo *et al.*, *Proceedings, 14th Workshop on Gravitational wave data analysis (GWDAW-14): Rome*,

- [3] A. Buonanno and B. Sathyaprakash, (2014), arXiv:1410.7832.
- [4] R. A. Porto, Fortsch. Phys. **64**, 723 (2016), arXiv:1606.08895.
- [5] R. A. Porto, (2017), arXiv:1703.06440 [physics.pop-ph].
- [6] M. Maggiore *et al.*, JCAP **03**, 050 (2020), arXiv:1912.02622 [astro-ph.CO].
- [7] E. Barausse *et al.*, Gen. Rel. Grav. **52**, 81, arXiv:2001.09793 [gr-qc].
- [8] W. D. Goldberger and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 104029 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0409156.
- [9] R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 104031 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0511061.
- [10] W. Goldberger and I. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 104030 (2006), arXiv:hep-th/0511133.
- [11] R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 064026 (2008), arXiv:0710.5150.
- [12] R. A. Porto and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 021101 (2006), arXiv:gr-qc/0604099 [gr-qc].
- [13] R. A. Porto and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 044012 (2008), arXiv:0802.0720.
- [14] R. A. Porto and I. Z. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. **D78**, 044013 (2008), arXiv:0804.0260.
- [15] W. D. Goldberger and A. Ross, Phys. Rev. **D81**, 124015 (2010), arXiv:0912.4254.
- [16] A. Ross, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 125033 (2012), arXiv:1202.4750.
- [17] R. A. Porto, A. Ross, and I. Z. Rothstein, JCAP **1209**, 028 (2012), arXiv:1203.2962 [gr-qc].
- [18] R. A. Porto, A. Ross, and I. Z. Rothstein, JCAP **1103**, 009 (2011), arXiv:1007.1312 [gr-qc].
- [19] C. R. Galley and M. Tiglio, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 124027 (2009).
- [20] N. T. Maia, C. R. Galley, A. K. Leibovich, and R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. **D96**, 084064 (2017), arXiv:1705.07934.
- [21] N. T. Maia, C. R. Galley, A. K. Leibovich, and R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. **D96**, 084065 (2017), arXiv:1705.07938.
- [22] C. Galley, A. Leibovich, R. A. Porto, and A. Ross, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 124010 (2016), arXiv:1511.07379.
- [23] R. A. Porto and I. Rothstein, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 024062 (2017), arXiv:1703.06433.
- [24] R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 024063 (2017), arXiv:1703.06434.
- [25] S. Foffa and R. Sturani, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 064011 (2013), arXiv:1206.7087 [gr-qc].
- [26] S. Foffa, R. A. Porto, I. Rothstein, and R. Sturani, Phys. Rev. **D100**, 024048 (2019), arXiv:1903.05118.
- [27] L. Blanchet, S. Foffa, F. Larrouturou, and R. Sturani, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 084045 (2020), arXiv:1912.12359.
- [28] S. Foffa, P. Mastrolia, R. Sturani, C. Sturm, and W. J. Torres Bobadilla, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 241605 (2019), arXiv:1902.10571.
- [29] J. Blümlein, A. Maier, and P. Marquard, Phys. Lett. B **800**, 135100 (2020), arXiv:1902.11180.
- [30] S. Foffa and R. Sturani, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 064033 (2020), arXiv:1907.02869 [gr-qc].
- [31] J. Blümlein, A. Maier, P. Marquard, and G. Schäfer, (2020), arXiv:2010.13672 [gr-qc].
- [32] S. Foffa and R. Sturani, (2021), arXiv:2103.03190 [gr-qc].
- [33] J. Blümlein, A. Maier, P. Marquard, and G. Schäfer, Phys. Lett. B **807**, 135496 (2020), arXiv:2003.07145 [gr-qc].
- [34] J. Blümlein, A. Maier, P. Marquard, and G. Schäfer, (2021), arXiv:2101.08630 [gr-qc].
- [35] W. D. Goldberger, J. Li, and I. Z. Rothstein, (2020), arXiv:2012.14869 [hep-th].
- [36] M. Levi, A. J. McLeod, and M. Von Hippel, (2020), arXiv:2003.07890.
- [37] M. Levi, A. J. McLeod, and M. Von Hippel, (2020), arXiv:2003.02827.
- [38] C. Galley and R. A. Porto, JHEP **11**, 096 (2013), arXiv:1302.4486.
- [39] A. K. Leibovich, N. T. Maia, I. Z. Rothstein, and Z. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 084058 (2020), arXiv:1912.12546.
- [40] B. A. Pardo and N. T. Maia, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 124020 (2020), arXiv:2009.05628 [gr-qc].
- [41] G. Cho, B. Pardo, and R. A. Porto, (2021), arXiv:2103.14612 [gr-qc].
- [42] W. D. Goldberger, in *Les Houches Summer School - Session 86* (2007) arXiv:hep-ph/0701129.
- [43] S. Foffa and R. Sturani, Class. Quant. Grav. **31**, 043001 (2014), arXiv:1309.3474.
- [44] I. Rothstein, Gen. Rel. Grav. **46**, 1726 (2014).
- [45] R. A. Porto, Phys. Rept. **633**, 1 (2016), arXiv:1601.04914.
- [46] G. Kälin and R. A. Porto, JHEP **11**, 106 (2020), arXiv:2006.01184 [hep-th].
- [47] G. Kälin, Z. Liu, and R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 261103 (2020), arXiv:2007.04977 [hep-th].
- [48] G. Kälin, Z. Liu, and R. A. Porto, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 124025 (2020), arXiv:2008.06047 [hep-th].
- [49] Z. Liu, R. A. Porto, and Z. Yang, (2021), arXiv:2102.10059 [hep-th].
- [50] G. Mogull, J. Plefka, and J. Steinhoff, (2020), arXiv:2010.02865 [hep-th].
- [51] G. U. Jakobsen, G. Mogull, J. Plefka, and J. Steinhoff, (2021), arXiv:2101.12688 [gr-qc].
- [52] S. Mougiakakos, M. M. Riva, and F. Vernizzi, (2021), arXiv:2102.08339 [gr-qc].
- [53] D. Neill and I. Z. Rothstein, Nucl. Phys. **B877**, 177 (2013), arXiv:1304.7263.
- [54] V. Vaidya, Phys. Rev. **D91**, 024017 (2015), arXiv:1410.5348.
- [55] W. D. Goldberger and A. K. Ridgway, Phys. Rev. **D97**, 085019 (2018), arXiv:1711.09493.
- [56] W. D. Goldberger and A. K. Ridgway, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 125010 (2017), arXiv:1611.03493.
- [57] C. Cheung, I. Z. Rothstein, and M. P. Solon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 251101 (2018), arXiv:1808.02489.
- [58] A. Guevara, A. Ochirov, and J. Vines, JHEP **09**, 056 (2019), arXiv:1812.06895.
- [59] D. A. Kosower, B. Maybee, and D. O’Connell, JHEP **02**, 137 (2019), arXiv:1811.10950.
- [60] B. Maybee, D. O’Connell, and J. Vines, JHEP **12**, 156 (2019), arXiv:1906.09260.
- [61] A. Cristofoli, N. E. J. Bjerrum-Bohr, P. H. Damgaard, and P. Vanhove, (2019), arXiv:1906.01579.
- [62] N. E. J. Bjerrum-Bohr, P. H. Damgaard, G. Festuccia, L. Plante, and P. Vanhove, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 171601 (2018), arXiv:1806.04920.
- [63] Z. Bern, C. Cheung, R. Roiban, C.-H. Shen, M. P. Solon, and M. Zeng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **122**, 201603 (2019), arXiv:1901.04424.
- [64] Z. Bern, C. Cheung, R. Roiban, C.-H. Shen, M. P. Solon,

- and M. Zeng, JHEP **10**, 206 (2019), arXiv:1908.01493.
- [65] G. Kälin and R. A. Porto, JHEP **01**, 072 (2020), arXiv:1910.03008.
- [66] G. Kälin and R. A. Porto, JHEP **02**, 120 (2020), arXiv:1911.09130.
- [67] K. Haddad and A. Helset, JHEP **12**, 024 (2020), arXiv:2008.04920 [hep-th].
- [68] R. Aoude, K. Haddad, and A. Helset, JHEP **05**, 051 (2020), arXiv:2001.09164 [hep-th].
- [69] J. Parra-Martinez, M. S. Ruf, and M. Zeng, (2020), arXiv:2005.04236.
- [70] Z. Bern, A. Luna, R. Roiban, C.-H. Shen, and M. Zeng, (2020), arXiv:2005.03071 [hep-th].
- [71] C. Cheung and M. P. Solon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 191601 (2020), arXiv:2006.06665 [hep-th].
- [72] D. Kosmopoulos and A. Luna, (2021), arXiv:2102.10137 [hep-th].
- [73] Z. Bern, J. Parra-Martinez, R. Roiban, M. S. Ruf, C.-H. Shen, M. P. Solon, and M. Zeng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **126**, 171601 (2021), arXiv:2101.07254 [hep-th].
- [74] E. Herrmann, J. Parra-Martinez, M. S. Ruf, and M. Zeng, (2021), arXiv:2101.07255 [hep-th].
- [75] P. Di Vecchia, C. Heissenberg, R. Russo, and G. Veneziano, (2021), arXiv:2101.05772 [hep-th].
- [76] P. Di Vecchia, C. Heissenberg, R. Russo, and G. Veneziano, (2021), arXiv:2104.03256 [hep-th].
- [77] L. Blanchet, Living Rev. Rel. **17**, 2 (2014), arXiv:1310.1528 [gr-qc].
- [78] T. Damour, P. Jaranowski, and G. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 064058 (2014), arXiv:1401.4548.
- [79] P. Jaranowski and G. Schäfer, Phys. Rev. **D92**, 124043 (2015), arXiv:1508.01016.
- [80] L. Bernard, L. Blanchet, A. Bohe, G. Faye, and S. Marsat, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 084037 (2016), arXiv:1512.02876.
- [81] L. Bernard, L. Blanchet, A. Bohe, G. Faye, and S. Marsat, Phys. Rev. **D96**, 104043 (2017), arXiv:1706.08480.
- [82] T. Marchand, L. Bernard, L. Blanchet, and G. Faye, Phys. Rev. D **97**, 044023 (2018), arXiv:1707.09289.
- [83] G. Cho, G. Kälin, and R. A. Porto, *In preparation*.
- [84] K. Chetyrkin and F. Tkachov, Nucl. Phys. B **192**, 159 (1981).
- [85] F. Tkachov, Phys. Lett. B **100**, 65 (1981).
- [86] H. Cheng and T. T. Wu, *Expanding Protons: Scattering at High Energies* (1987).
- [87] A. Kotikov, Phys. Lett. B **267**, 123 (1991), [Erratum: Phys.Lett.B 295, 409–409 (1992)].
- [88] E. Remiddi, Nuovo Cim. A **110**, 1435 (1997), arXiv:hep-th/9711188.
- [89] R. Lee, (2012), arXiv:1212.2685.
- [90] V. A. Smirnov, *Analytic tools for Feynman integrals*, Vol. 250 (2012).
- [91] J. M. Henn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 251601 (2013), arXiv:1304.1806.
- [92] R. N. Lee, JHEP **04**, 108 (2015), arXiv:1411.0911 [hep-ph].
- [93] C. Meyer, PoS **LL2016**, 028 (2016).
- [94] C. Meyer, JHEP **04**, 006 (2017), arXiv:1611.01087 [hep-ph].
- [95] M. Prausa, Comput. Phys. Commun. **219**, 361 (2017), arXiv:1701.00725 [hep-ph].
- [96] J. Broedel, C. Duhr, F. Dulat, R. Marzucca, B. Penante, and L. Tancredi, JHEP **09**, 112 (2019), arXiv:1907.03787 [hep-th].
- [97] A. Primo and L. Tancredi, Nucl. Phys. B **921**, 316 (2017), arXiv:1704.05465 [hep-ph].
- [98] A. Smirnov and F. Chuharev, (2019), arXiv:1901.07808.
- [99] A. Smirnov and V. Smirnov, Nucl. Phys. B **960**, 115213 (2020), arXiv:2002.08042 [hep-ph].
- [100] R. N. Lee, (2020), arXiv:2012.00279 [hep-ph].
- [101] K.-T. Chen, Bull. Am. Math. Soc. **83**, 831 (1977).
- [102] A. Goncharov, (2001), arXiv:math/0103059.
- [103] C. Duhr, in *Theoretical Advanced Study Institute in Elementary Particle Physics: Journeys Through the Precision Frontier: Amplitudes for Colliders* (2014) arXiv:1411.7538 [hep-ph].
- [104] C. Duhr and F. Dulat, JHEP **08**, 135 (2019), arXiv:1904.07279 [hep-th].
- [105] C. Dlapa, G. Kälin, Z. Liu, and R. A. Porto, *In preparation*.
- [106] D. Bini, T. Damour, and A. Geralico, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 084047 (2020), arXiv:2007.11239 [gr-qc].
- [107] S. Borowka, G. Heinrich, S. Jahn, S. P. Jones, M. Kerner, J. Schlenk, and T. Zirke, Comput. Phys. Commun. **222**, 313 (2018), arXiv:1703.09692 [hep-ph].