Four-loop quark form factor with quartic fundamental colour factor

Vladimir A. Smirnov

Skobeltsyn Institute of Nuclear Physics of Moscow State University

Mainz, March 18, 2019

in collaboration with Roman Lee, Alexander Smirnov and Matthias Steinhauser

[R.N. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'19]

in collaboration with Roman Lee, Alexander Smirnov and Matthias Steinhauser

[R.N. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'19]

The quark-anti-quark-photon form factor with massless quarks which is obtained from the corresponding vertex function Γ_q^μ via

$$F_q(q^2) = -\frac{1}{4(1-\epsilon)q^2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\not{q}_2 \, \Gamma_q^\mu \, \not{q}_1 \, \gamma_\mu \right) ,$$

where $q = q_1 + q_2$, and q_1 (q_2) is the incoming quark (anti-quark) momentum.

in collaboration with Roman Lee, Alexander Smirnov and Matthias Steinhauser

[R.N. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'19]

The quark-anti-quark-photon form factor with massless quarks which is obtained from the corresponding vertex function Γ_q^μ via

$$F_q(q^2) = -\frac{1}{4(1-\epsilon)q^2} \mathrm{Tr}\left(\not{q}_2 \, \Gamma_q^\mu \, \not{q}_1 \, \gamma_\mu \right) ,$$

where $q = q_1 + q_2$, and q_1 (q_2) is the incoming quark (anti-quark) momentum.

The analytic evaluation of the contribution with the colour factor $(d_F^{abcd})^2$ which for a SU(N_c) group is given by

$$\frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_A} = \frac{N_c^4 - 6N_c^2 + 18}{96 N_c^2}$$

$$F_q = 1 + \sum_{n\geq 1} \left(\frac{\alpha_s^0}{4\pi} \right)^n \left(\frac{\mu^2}{-q^2 - i0} \right)^{n\epsilon} F_q^{(n)} ,$$

$$F_q = 1 + \sum_{n\geq 1} \left(\frac{\alpha_s^0}{4\pi} \right)^n \left(\frac{\mu^2}{-q^2 - i0} \right)^{n\epsilon} F_q^{(n)} \,,$$

The cusp and collinear anomalous dimensions $\gamma_{\rm cusp}$ and γ_q are extracted from the pole part of $\log(F_q)$ after renormalization of α_s The corresponding n-loop coefficients are defined by

$$\gamma_x = \sum_{n\geq 0} \left(\frac{\alpha_s(\mu^2)}{4\pi} \right)^n \gamma_x^n \,,$$

with $x = $ cusp or $x = q$.

Two-loop corrections were evaluated in the end of eighties.

Two-loop corrections were evaluated in the end of eighties.

Three-loop results
[P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, A.V. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'09,
T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, T. Huber, N. Ikizlerli & C. Studerus'10]

Two-loop corrections were evaluated in the end of eighties.

Three-loop results
[P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, A.V. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'09,
T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, T. Huber, N. Ikizlerli & C. Studerus'10]
Analytic results for the three missing coefficients
[R. N. Lee, A. Smirnov & V.S.'10]

Two-loop corrections were evaluated in the end of eighties.

Three-loop results
[P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, A.V. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'09,
T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, T. Huber, N. Ikizlerli & C. Studerus'10]
Analytic results for the three missing coefficients
[R. N. Lee, A. Smirnov & V.S.'10]
Analytic results for the three-loop master integrals up to weight 8
[R. N. Lee, A. Smirnov & V.S.'10]
motivated by a future four-loop calculation.

The photon-quark form factor in the large-N_c limit.
[J. Henn, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16;
J. Henn, R. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16]

The photon-quark form factor in the large-N_c limit.
[J. Henn, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16;
J. Henn, R. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16]

Fermionic corrections with three closed quark loops, i.e. n_f^3
[A. von Manteuffel & R. Schabinger'16]

The photon-quark form factor in the large-N_c limit.
[J. Henn, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16;
J. Henn, R. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16]

Fermionic corrections with three closed quark loops, i.e. n_f^3
[A. von Manteuffel & R. Schabinger'16]

The n_f^2 contributions to fermionic form factors
[R.N. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'17]

The photon-quark form factor in the large-N_c limit.
[J. Henn, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16;
J. Henn, R. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'16]

Fermionic corrections with three closed quark loops, i.e. n_f^3
[A. von Manteuffel & R. Schabinger'16]

The n_f^2 contributions to fermionic form factors
[R.N. Lee, A. Smirnov, V.S. & M. Steinhauser'17]

The n_f^2 and $n_{q\gamma} n_f$ contributions to the quark and gluon QCD form factors
[A. von Manteuffel & R. Schabinger'19]

Our calculation:

Our calculation:

- Generation of diagrams. Tensor reduction. Expressing all the Feynman integrals as integrals of several families.

Our calculation:

- Generation of diagrams. Tensor reduction. Expressing all the Feynman integrals as integrals of several families.
- IBP reduction to master integrals using `FIRE` combined with `LiteRed`.

Our calculation:

- Generation of diagrams. Tensor reduction. Expressing all the Feynman integrals as integrals of several families.
- IBP reduction to master integrals using `FIRE` combined with `LiteRed`.
- Evaluation of the master integrals with differential equations using a canonical basis.



6



25



df2-2



df2-3



df2-5



df2-6

We introduce a second mass scale $q_2^2 = xq^2$ in order to use the powerful method of differential equations.

We introduce a second mass scale $q_2^2 = xq^2$ in order to use the powerful method of differential equations.

non-planar family	# 1-scale MIs	# 2-scale MIs	number of integrals	size of tables (MB) (1-scale)
df2-2	71	337	14156	98
df2-3	45	244	15278	50
df2-5	41	92	11620	23
df2-6	35	78	11531	18

We need an IBP reduction of input 1-scale integrals appearing in the calculation and an IBP reduction of 2-scale integrals needed to derive differential equations.

We need an IBP reduction of input 1-scale integrals appearing in the calculation and an IBP reduction of 2-scale integrals needed to derive differential equations.

The IBP reduction of both 2-scale and 1-scale integrals is complicated.

We need an IBP reduction of input 1-scale integrals appearing in the calculation and an IBP reduction of 2-scale integrals needed to derive differential equations.

The IBP reduction of both 2-scale and 1-scale integrals is complicated.
Complexity can be defined as the deviation of a given integral $G_{a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_{18}}$ considered as a function of 18 integer indices a_i from the corner point of the corresponding sector, i.e. with indices 1 and 0.

We need an IBP reduction of input 1-scale integrals appearing in the calculation and an IBP reduction of 2-scale integrals needed to derive differential equations.

The IBP reduction of both 2-scale and 1-scale integrals is complicated.
Complexity can be defined as the deviation of a given integral $G_{a_1,a_2,\ldots,a_{18}}$ considered as a function of 18 integer indices a_i from the corner point of the corresponding sector, i.e. with indices 1 and 0.
In our calculation, we had in the top sector complexity up to 5 for 1-scale integrals and complexity up to 3 for 2-scale integrals.

The standard version of FIRE provided an IBP reduction of all the 1-scale input integrals and almost all the 2-scale integrals.

The standard version of FIRE provided an IBP reduction of all the 1-scale input integrals and almost all the 2-scale integrals.

It failed for 2-scale integrals needed to derive DE in the top sector of family df2-2.

The standard version of FIRE provided an IBP reduction of all the 1-scale input integrals and almost all the 2-scale integrals.

It failed for 2-scale integrals needed to derive DE in the top sector of family df2-2.

Then modular arithmetic was introduced into FIRE using ideas on which Finred [A. von Manteuffel'16] is based.

The standard version of FIRE provided an IBP reduction of all the 1-scale input integrals and almost all the 2-scale integrals.

It failed for 2-scale integrals needed to derive DE in the top sector of family df2-2.

Then modular arithmetic was introduced into FIRE using ideas on which Finred [A. von Manteuffel'16] is based.

Then the missing reduction became feasible ;)

Some practical recipes

Some practical recipes

- Get rid of spurious denominators using a transition to a better basis of master integrals.

Some practical recipes

- Get rid of spurious denominators using a transition to a better basis of master integrals.
- Choose numerators as propagators, i.e. as squares of some momenta.

Some practical recipes

- Get rid of spurious denominators using a transition to a better basis of master integrals.
- Choose numerators as propagators, i.e. as squares of some momenta.
- Choose loop momenta in such a way that the total ‘length’ of the propagators and numerators will be minimal.

Differential equations as a method to evaluate Feynman integrals [A.V. Kotikov'91]

Differential equations as a method to evaluate Feynman integrals [A.V. Kotikov'91]

Evaluating master integrals by differential equations [E. Remiddi'97, T. Gehrmann & E. Remiddi'00]

Differential equations as a method to evaluate Feynman integrals [A.V. Kotikov'91]

Evaluating master integrals by differential equations [E. Remiddi'97, T. Gehrmann & E. Remiddi'00]

Canonical bases [J. Henn'13]

$$f'(\epsilon, x) = \epsilon\, A(x)\, f(x, \epsilon)$$

where $\varepsilon = (4-d)/2$ and f is a vector of master integrals.

Differential equations as a method to evaluate Feynman integrals [A.V. Kotikov'91]

Evaluating master integrals by differential equations [E. Remiddi'97, T. Gehrmann & E. Remiddi'00]

Canonical bases [J. Henn'13]

$$f'(\epsilon, x) = \epsilon\, A(x)\, f(x, \epsilon)$$

where $\varepsilon = (4-d)/2$ and f is a vector of master integrals. In our case, $x = q_2^2/q^2$ and

$$A(x) = \sum_{k=0,1} \frac{a_k}{x - x^{(k)}}$$

with $x^{(0)} = 0, x^{(1)} = 1$.

To turn to canonical bases we use the private implementation of the algorithm of Lee [R.N. Lee'14].

To turn to canonical bases we use the private implementation of the algorithm of Lee [R.N. Lee'14].

Canonical differential equations are solved order by order in ϵ and results are expressed in terms of harmonic polylogarithms (HPL) by E. Remiddi and J. Vermaseren.

To turn to canonical bases we use the private implementation of the algorithm of Lee [R.N. Lee'14].

Canonical differential equations are solved order by order in ϵ and results are expressed in terms of harmonic polylogarithms (HPL) by E. Remiddi and J. Vermaseren.

We choose the point $x = 1$ in order to fix the boundary conditions, where our integrals are expressed in terms of 28 master propagator integrals
[P.A. Baikov & K.G. Chetyrkin'10; R.N. Lee, A. Smirnov & V.S.'11]

To turn to canonical bases we use the private implementation of the algorithm of Lee [R.N. Lee'14].

Canonical differential equations are solved order by order in ϵ and results are expressed in terms of harmonic polylogarithms (HPL) by E. Remiddi and J. Vermaseren.

We choose the point $x = 1$ in order to fix the boundary conditions, where our integrals are expressed in terms of 28 master propagator integrals
[P.A. Baikov & K.G. Chetyrkin'10; R.N. Lee, A. Smirnov & V.S.'11]

The differential equations are then used to transport the information to the point $x = 0$.

We solve our differential equations asymptotically near the point $x = 0$, where terms with $x^{-k\epsilon}$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 8$ are present, and fix these solutions by matching them to our solution at general x using HPL [D. Maitre'05].

We solve our differential equations asymptotically near the point $x = 0$, where terms with $x^{-k\epsilon}$, $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 8$ are present, and fix these solutions by matching them to our solution at general x using HPL [D. Maitre'05].

The asymptotic solutions are linear combinations of powers $x^{k\epsilon}$ with $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 8$. We pick up asymptotic terms with $k = 0$ and obtain the so-called naive values of the canonical master integrals at $x = 0$.

We solve our differential equations asymptotically near the point $x = 0$, where terms with $x^{-k\epsilon}, k = 0, 1, \ldots, 8$ are present, and fix these solutions by matching them to our solution at general x using HPL [D. Maitre'05].

The asymptotic solutions are linear combinations of powers $x^{k\epsilon}$ with $k = 0, 1, \ldots, 8$. We pick up asymptotic terms with $k = 0$ and obtain the so-called naive values of the canonical master integrals at $x = 0$.

From the analytic results for the naive part we obtain analytical results for the required one-scale master integrals after changing back to the primary basis.

In this calculation, we proceeded by constructing an *associator* which is a matrix that transforms the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 1$ into the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 0$.

In this calculation, we proceeded by constructing an *associator* which is a matrix that transforms the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 1$ into the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 0$.

This approach is more algorithmic and can be applied to more complicated non-planar diagrams.

In this calculation, we proceeded by constructing an *associator* which is a matrix that transforms the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 1$ into the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 0$.

This approach is more algorithmic and can be applied to more complicated non-planar diagrams.

We had to expand the associator up to ϵ^9 (weight 9) for df2-2 and df2-3 since the property of uniform weight is destroyed when mapping the two-scale master integrals to one-scale master integrals in the limit $x \to 0$. In the final result for the form factor all weight-nine constants drop out.

In this calculation, we proceeded by constructing an *associator* which is a matrix that transforms the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 1$ into the vector composed of terms of asymptotic expansion near $x = 0$.

This approach is more algorithmic and can be applied to more complicated non-planar diagrams.

We had to expand the associator up to ϵ^9 (weight 9) for df2-2 and df2-3 since the property of uniform weight is destroyed when mapping the two-scale master integrals to one-scale master integrals in the limit $x \to 0$. In the final result for the form factor all weight-nine constants drop out.

Checks: by `FIESTA` [A. Smirnov] and by comparison with some partial numerical results [R.H. Boels, T. Huber & G. Yang'11].

$$
\begin{aligned}
G^{(\mathrm{df2\text{-}2})}_{\mathbf{111111111111}} &= \\
&+\frac{1}{\epsilon^8}\left[\frac{1}{144}\right]+\frac{1}{\epsilon^7}\left[\frac{73}{576}\right]+\frac{1}{\epsilon^6}\left[\frac{331}{1152}-\frac{7\pi^2}{216}\right]+\frac{1}{\epsilon^5}\left[-\frac{311\zeta_3}{216}-\frac{245\pi^2}{576}-\frac{1765}{1152}\right] \\
&+\frac{1}{\epsilon^4}\left[-\frac{1103\zeta_3}{54}-\frac{37\pi^4}{1440}-\frac{917\pi^2}{1728}+\frac{2297}{576}\right]+\frac{1}{\epsilon^3}\left[\frac{4021\pi^2\zeta_3}{648}-\frac{42053\zeta_3}{1728}-\frac{22667\zeta_5}{360}\right. \\
&\left.-\frac{31327\pi^4}{51840}+\frac{2615\pi^2}{864}-\frac{59}{36}\right]+\frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\left[\frac{10784\zeta_3^2}{81}+\frac{13595\pi^2\zeta_3}{216}+\frac{293837\zeta_3}{1728}-\frac{268139\zeta_5}{360}\right. \\
&\left.-\frac{4901\pi^6}{38880}-\frac{40973\pi^4}{103680}-\frac{347\pi^2}{96}-\frac{21161}{288}\right]+\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left[\frac{1960259\zeta_3^2}{1296}+\frac{1037\pi^4\zeta_3}{160}+\frac{117521\pi^2\zeta_3}{1296}\right. \\
&-\frac{490831\zeta_3}{864}+\frac{508661\pi^2\zeta_5}{2160}-\frac{2028557\zeta_5}{2880}-\frac{10749139\zeta_7}{4032}-\frac{3561371\pi^6}{2177280}+\frac{110171\pi^4}{34560} \\
&\left.-\frac{20797\pi^2}{432}+\frac{222407}{288}\right]-\frac{4937s_{8a}}{6}-\frac{582209\pi^2\zeta_3^2}{1944}+\frac{8605981\zeta_3^2}{5184}+\frac{2064401\zeta_5\zeta_3}{270} \\
&+\frac{3543269\pi^4\zeta_3}{77760}-\frac{876841\pi^2\zeta_3}{1296}+\frac{325039\zeta_3}{216}+\frac{87229\pi^2\zeta_5}{48}+\frac{2528065\zeta_5}{576}-\frac{8894555\zeta_7}{504} \\
&-\frac{17509\pi^8}{1088640}+\frac{579329\pi^6}{2177280}-\frac{547763\pi^4}{51840}+\frac{126427\pi^2}{216}-\frac{1754951}{288}+\mathcal{O}(\epsilon)
\end{aligned}
$$

Our results:

$$
\begin{aligned}
F_q^{(n)}\Big|_{(d_F^{abcd})^2} = \; & n_f \frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_F} \Bigg\{ \frac{1}{\epsilon^2}\left[\frac{40\zeta_5}{3} + \frac{8\zeta_3}{3} - \frac{4\pi^2}{3}\right] + \frac{1}{\epsilon}\Bigg[-\frac{148\pi^6}{8505} - \frac{152\zeta_3^2}{3} - \frac{8\pi^2\zeta_3}{3} \\
& + \frac{2720\zeta_5}{9} + \frac{10\pi^4}{27} + \frac{664\zeta_3}{9} - \frac{284\pi^2}{9} + 48 \Bigg] - 1240\zeta_7 - \frac{988\pi^4\zeta_3}{135} \\
& + \frac{496\pi^2\zeta_5}{9} + \frac{10405\pi^6}{10206} + \frac{680\zeta_3^2}{9} + \frac{95098\zeta_5}{27} + \frac{46\pi^2\zeta_3}{9} + \frac{1888\pi^4}{405} \\
& - \frac{13414\zeta_3}{27} - \frac{10783\pi^2}{27} + \frac{3190}{3} \Bigg\},
\end{aligned}
$$

where $N_F = N_c = 3$.

The cusp and collinear anomalous dimensions

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_F \gamma^3_{\rm cusp}\Big|_{(d_F^{abcd})^2} &= n_f \frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_F}\left(-\frac{1280}{3}\zeta_5 - \frac{256}{3}\zeta_3 + \frac{128}{3}\pi^2 \right) \\
&\approx n_f \frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_F} \left(-123.894910\ldots\right) , \\
\gamma^3_q\Big|_{(d_F^{abcd})^2} &= n_f \frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_F}\left(-\frac{592\pi^6}{8505} - \frac{608\zeta_3^2}{3} + \frac{10880\zeta_5}{9} - \frac{32\pi^2\zeta_3}{3} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{40\pi^4}{27} + \frac{2656\zeta_3}{9} - \frac{1136\pi^2}{9} + 192 \right) .
\end{aligned}
$$

Agreement with known partial results [S. Moch, B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J.A.M. Vermaseren & A. Vogt'17,18]

The cusp and collinear anomalous dimensions

$$
\begin{aligned}
C_F \gamma^3_{\rm cusp}\Big|_{(d_F^{abcd})^2} &= n_f \frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_F}\left(-\frac{1280}{3}\zeta_5 - \frac{256}{3}\zeta_3 + \frac{128}{3}\pi^2 \right) \\
&\approx n_f \frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_F}\left(-123.894910\ldots\right), \\
\gamma^3_q\Big|_{(d_F^{abcd})^2} &= n_f \frac{(d_F^{abcd})^2}{N_F}\left(-\frac{592\pi^6}{8505} - \frac{608\zeta_3^2}{3} + \frac{10880\zeta_5}{9} - \frac{32\pi^2\zeta_3}{3} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \frac{40\pi^4}{27} + \frac{2656\zeta_3}{9} - \frac{1136\pi^2}{9} + 192 \right).
\end{aligned}
$$

Agreement with known partial results [S. Moch, B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J.A.M. Vermaseren & A. Vogt'17,18]
The results for γ_q^3 and the finite part of the form factor are new.

- Essential improvements of the methods of evaluating Feynman integrals were crucial in our project: improvements of IBP reductions, constructing a technique to build up associators.

- Essential improvements of the methods of evaluating Feynman integrals were crucial in our project: improvements of IBP reductions, constructing a technique to build up associators.
- For the first time, master integrals with twelve propagators corresponding to non-planar graphs were analytically evaluated.

- Essential improvements of the methods of evaluating Feynman integrals were crucial in our project: improvements of IBP reductions, constructing a technique to build up associators.
- For the first time, master integrals with twelve propagators corresponding to non-planar graphs were analytically evaluated.

to be continued