

Parton form-factors for heavy-light decays at three loops in leading-color

Sudeepan Datta

Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore

Three loop QCD corrections to the heavy-light form factors in the color-planar limit

[2308.12169 \[hep-ph\]](#)

S. Datta, N. Rana, V. Ravindran, R. Sarkar

Journal of High Energy Physics, 2023(12), Dec-2023



QCD MASTER CLASS
SAINT-JACUT-DE-LA-MER, FRANCE



1. The physics context

- Top physics frontier
- B physics frontier
- Formal aspects

2. Three loop results for the UV renormalised HLFF

- UV renormalisation
- Universal IR structure

3. Asymptotic behavior of the HLFF

Top physics frontier

A key object of study at the LHC: m_t

Top physics frontier

A key object of study at the LHC: m_t

Direct measurements

Use pp-collision decay products to reconstruct the top



Indirect measurements

Obtain top's mass from cross-section measurements

Top physics frontier

A key object of study at the LHC: m_t

Direct measurements

Use pp-collision decay products to reconstruct the top

$$m_t = 171.77 \pm 0.37 \text{ GeV}$$

[arXiv:2302.01967v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.01967v2)



Indirect measurements

Obtain top's mass from cross-section measurements

$$m_t^{pole} = 170.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ GeV}$$

[arXiv:1904.05237v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.05237v2)

Top physics frontier

A key object of study at the LHC: m_t

Direct measurements

Use pp-collision decay products to reconstruct the top

$$m_t = 171.77 \pm 0.37 \text{ GeV}$$

[arXiv:2302.01967v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.01967v2)



Important problem

Systematic interpretation of direct measurements

See - [Corella \(2019\)](#), [Hoang \(2020\)](#), [Myllymäki \(2024\)](#)

Indirect measurements

Obtain top's mass from cross-section measurements

$$m_t^{\text{pole}} = 170.5 \pm 0.8 \text{ GeV}$$

[arXiv:1904.05237v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.05237v2)

Top physics frontier

Another important object for LHC: Γ_t

Top physics frontier

Another important object for LHC: Γ_t

- Computed through the *optical-theorem*: $t \rightarrow Wb \rightarrow t$
One loop higher due to ‘stitching’ results in a self-energy (also called ‘propagator-type’) graph.
- Γ_t suppressed by 9 % at NLO (QCD)
 - Jezabek, Kuhn (1989), Czarnecki (1990), Li, Oakes, Yuan (1991)and by a further 2 % at NNLO (QCD)
 - Gao, Li, Zhu (2013), Brucherseifer, Caola, Melnikov (2013), Chen, Li, Wang, Wang (2022)

Top physics frontier

Another important object for LHC: Γ_t

- Computed through the *optical-theorem*: $t \rightarrow Wb \rightarrow t$
One loop higher due to ‘stitching’ results in a self-energy (also called ‘propagator-type’) graph.
- Γ_t suppressed by 9 % at NLO (QCD)
 - Jezabek, Kuhn (1989), Czarnecki (1990), Li, Oakes, Yuan (1991)and by a further 2 % at NNLO (QCD)
 - Gao, Li, Zhu (2013), Brucherseifer, Caola, Melnikov (2013), Chen, Li, Wang, Wang (2022)
- **State-of-the-art:**
Analytic results for N³LO (QCD) leading-color corrections, with numerical estimates of the sub-leading color-factors
 - [Chen, Li, Li, Wang, Wang, Wu \(2023\)](#)High-precision numerical results for N³LO (QCD) full-color corrections
 - [Chen, Chen, Guan, Ma \(2023\)](#)

B physics frontier

At LHCb: $B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_c l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$...

B physics frontier

At LHCb: $B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_c l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$...

B physics frontier

At LHCb: $B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_c l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$...

Local OPE



Non-Local OPE

B physics frontier

At LHCb: $B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_c l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$...

Local OPE

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l) = \Gamma_0 \left[1 + C_F \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right)^n X_n \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}{m_b^2}\right)$$



Non-Local OPE

$$d\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l) \sim H \cdot J \otimes S + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m_b}\right)$$

B physics frontier

At LHCb: $B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_c l \bar{\nu}_l$, $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$...

Local OPE

$$\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l) = \Gamma_0 \left[1 + C_F \sum_{n \geq 1} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} \right)^n X_n \right] + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2}{m_b^2}\right)$$

State of the art:

Fermionic contributions to X_3

Fael, Usovitsch (2023)



Non-Local OPE

$$d\Gamma(B \rightarrow X_u l \bar{\nu}_l) \sim H \cdot J \otimes S + \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{m_b}\right)$$

State of the art:

Three-loop hard coefficients recently calculated for QCD-SCET matching for S, PS, V, AV & T currents

Fael, Huber, Lange, Müller, Schönwald, Steinhauser (2024)

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons



**Massive partons
(small-mass limit)**

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons

Soft and collinear divergences exponentiate order-by-order and exhibit universal behavior.



Massive partons (small-mass limit)

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons

Soft and collinear divergences exponentiate order-by-order and exhibit universal behavior.

Catani (1998)

Sterman, Tejeda-Yeomans (2003)

Ravindran (2006)

Becher, Neubert (2009)

Gardi, Magnea (2009)

...



Massive partons (small-mass limit)

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons

Soft and collinear divergences exponentiate order-by-order and exhibit universal behavior.

Catani (1998)

Sterman, Tejeda-Yeomans (2003)

Ravindran (2006)

Becher, Neubert (2009)

Gardi, Magnea (2009)

...



Massive partons (small-mass limit)

Massless QCD corrections do exponentiate. Use factorisation theorems in this limit to obtain massive amplitudes from massless ones.

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons

Soft and collinear divergences exponentiate order-by-order and exhibit universal behavior.

Catani (1998)

Sterman, Tejeda-Yeomans (2003)

Ravindran (2006)

Becher, Neubert (2009)

Gardi, Magnea (2009)

...



Massive partons (small-mass limit)

Massless QCD corrections do exponentiate. Use factorisation theorems in this limit to obtain massive amplitudes from massless ones.

Penin (2005)

Mitov, Moch (2006)

Becher, Melnikov (2007)

...

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons

Soft and collinear divergences exponentiate order-by-order and exhibit universal behavior.

Catani (1998)

Sterman, Tejeda-Yeomans (2003)

Ravindran (2006)

Becher, Neubert (2009)

Gardi, Magnea (2009)

...



Massive partons (general scenario)

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons

Soft and collinear divergences exponentiate order-by-order and exhibit universal behavior.

Catani (1998)

Sterman, Tejeda-Yeomans (2003)

Ravindran (2006)

Becher, Neubert (2009)

Gardi, Magnea (2009)

...



Massive partons (general scenario)

Use SCET and non-Abelian exponentiation to show that IR poles do factorise.

Formal aspects

Factorisation \rightarrow Exponentiation \rightarrow Resummation

Massless partons

Soft and collinear divergences exponentiate order-by-order and exhibit universal behavior.

Catani (1998)

Sterman, Tejeda-Yeomans (2003)

Ravindran (2006)

Becher, Neubert (2009)

Gardi, Magnea (2009)

...



Massive partons (general scenario)

Use SCET and non-Abelian exponentiation to show that IR poles do factorise.

Becher, Neubert (2009)

- On the structure of infrared singularities of gauge-theory amplitudes (0903.1126 [hep-ph])

- Infrared singularities of QCD amplitudes with massive partons (0904.1021 [hep-ph])

Formal aspects

Asymptotic behavior

Massless partons



Massive partons

Formal aspects

Asymptotic behavior

Massless partons

Integro-differential (K-G) equation:

$$\mu^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \ln \hat{F}_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[K_I \left(\frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) + G_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) \right]$$



Massive partons

Formal aspects

Asymptotic behavior

Massless partons

Integro-differential (K-G) equation:

$$\mu^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \ln \hat{F}_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[K_I \left(\frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) + G_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) \right]$$



Massive partons

Integro-differential (K-G) equation:

$$\mu^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \ln \hat{F}_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{m_i^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[K_I \left(\frac{m_i^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) + G_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) \right]$$

Formal aspects

Asymptotic behavior

Massless partons

Integro-differential (K-G) equation:

$$\mu^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \ln \hat{F}_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[K_I \left(\frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) + G_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) \right]$$



Massive partons

Integro-differential (K-G) equation:

$$\mu^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \ln \hat{F}_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{m_i^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[K_I \left(\frac{m_i^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) + G_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) \right]$$

1. The physics context

- Top physics frontier
- B physics frontier
- Amplitudes and formal studies

2. Three loop results for the UV renormalised HLFF

- UV renormalisation, Ward id
- IR subtraction

3. Asymptotic behavior of the HLFF

- **External currents:** vector, axial-vector, scalar, pseudo-scalar
- **Process:** top-decay dominant channel, ie. $t(P) \rightarrow b(p) + W^*(q)$, $q = P - p$
- **Amplitude:** $\bar{b}_c(p) \Gamma_{cd}^\mu t_d(P)$
- Express Γ_{cd}^μ in terms of 3 independent **form factors**
- $\Gamma_{cd}^\mu = -i \delta_{cd} \left[G_1 \gamma^\mu (1 - \gamma^5) + \frac{G_2}{2m_t} (1 + \gamma_5) (P^\mu + p^\mu) + \frac{G_3}{2m_t} (1 + \gamma_5) (P^\mu - p^\mu) \right]$
- **Goal:** Compute G_1 , G_2 and G_3

One-loop diagram	Two-loop diagrams (6 out of a total of 13 shown)		Three-loop diagrams (6 out of a total of 263 shown)	
	<p>1</p>	<p>2</p>		
<p>1</p>	<p>6</p>	<p>8</p>		
	<p>9</p>	<p>12</p>		

Diagram generation

QGRAF, FeynArts

Color/Dirac/Lorentz algebra

FORM, FeynCalc

IBP reduction

LiteRed, Kira

- Only a single integral-family suffices:

$$I_\nu(d, x) = \int \prod_{i=1}^3 \frac{d^d k_i}{(2\pi)^d} \prod_{j=1}^{12} \frac{1}{D_j^{\nu_j}}; \quad \nu = \prod_{j=1}^{12} \nu_j, \quad x = \frac{q^2}{m_t^2}$$

- D_j - s are defined as follows:

$$\{\mathcal{D}_1 - m_t^2, \mathcal{D}_2 - m_t^2, \mathcal{D}_3 - m_t^2, \mathcal{D}_{12}, \mathcal{D}_{23}, \mathcal{D}_{13}, \mathcal{D}_{1;1}, \mathcal{D}_{2;1}, \mathcal{D}_{3;1}, \mathcal{D}_{1;12}, \mathcal{D}_{2;12}, \mathcal{D}_{3;12}\}$$

where,

$$\mathcal{D}_i = k_i^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_{ij} = (k_i - k_j)^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_{i;1} = (k_i - P)^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_{i;12} = (k_i - P + p)^2$$

- After reduction to MIs - **70 MIs** obtained.

#	sector	master integrals	#	sector	master integrals
3	7	$I_{111000000000}$	6	655	$I_{111100010100}, I_{111100(-1)0100}$
4	29	$I_{101110000000}$	669		$I_{101110010100}, I_{1(-1)1110010100},$ $I_{10111(-1)010100}, I_{101110(-1)0100},$ $I_{1011100101(-1)0}$
	78	$I_{011100100000}$	686		$I_{011101010100}, I_{(-1)11101010100},$ $I_{0111(-1)010100}, I_{011101(-1)0100}$
	92	$I_{001110100000}$	691		$I_{110011010100}, I_{11(-1)011010100}$
	519	$I_{111000000100}$	693		$I_{101011010100}, I_{1(-1)1011010100}$
	526	$I_{011100000100}, I_{(-1)11100000100}$	694		$I_{011011010100}, I_{(-1)11011010100}$
	540	$I_{001110000100}, I_{(-1)01110000100}$	700		$I_{001111010100}, I_{(-1)01111010100}$
5	110	$I_{011101100000}$	937		$I_{100101011100}$
	244	$I_{001011110000}$	1587		$I_{110011000110}$
	247	$I_{111011110000}$	1811		$I_{110010001110}$
	541	$I_{101110000100}$	1841		$I_{100011001110}$
	558	$I_{011101000100}, I_{(-1)11101000100}$	3591		$I_{111000000111}$
	653	$I_{101100010100}$	7	695	$I_{111011010100}, I_{111(-1)11010100},$ $I_{111011(-1)0100}, I_{1110110101(-1)0}$
	661	$I_{101010010100}$	939		$I_{110101011100}, I_{11(-1)101011100}$
	668	$I_{001110010100}$	1591		$I_{111011000110}, I_{111(-1)11000110}$
	684	$I_{001101010100}, I_{(-1)01101010100}$	1654		$I_{011011100110}, I_{011(-1)11100110}$
	689	$I_{100011010100}$	1815		$I_{111010001110}, I_{11101(-1)001110}$
	692	$I_{001011010100}, I_{(-1)01011010100}$	1821		$I_{101110001110}, I_{10111(-1)001110}$
	1543	$I_{111000000110}$	1845		$I_{101011001110}, I_{1(-1)1011001110}$
	1557	$I_{101010000110}, I_{1(-1)1010000110}$			
	1588	$I_{001011000110}, I_{(-1)01011000110}$			
8					
9	1918	$I_{011111101110}, I_{(-1)11111101110}$			

Table 1. List of the master integrals. # indicates the number of propagators.

JHEP12(2023)001

- Canonical bases not used - make use of factorisation to first order for the univariate system to solve analytically
- $\partial_x \vec{I} = M_{70 \times 70} \vec{I}$, arrange M in upper block-triangular form.
- Compute MIs block-wise starting from the last (easiest) one. Successive order-by-order solution in ϵ for each block starting with the leading singular term.
- The spanning alphabet: $\left\{ \frac{1}{x}, \frac{1}{1-x}, \frac{1}{1+x}, \frac{1}{2-x} \right\}$
- Function space: HPLs and generalised HPLs

Differential Equations

Sigma, OreSys, HarmonicSums,
PolyLogTools

Boundary Conditions

Analytic: AMBRE2.1.1,
MBConicHulls, HypExp2

Numeric: AMFlow, FIESTA, PSLQ



$$\partial_x J_n(x, \epsilon) = \mathcal{C}_{nm}(x, \epsilon) J_m(x, \epsilon) + \mathcal{R}_n(x, \epsilon)$$

Let the leading singularity be at ϵ^{-p} ,
then, expanding in ϵ :

$$J_n(x, \epsilon) = \sum_{k=-p}^{\infty} J_n^{(k)}(x) \epsilon^k$$

$$\mathcal{C}_n(x, \epsilon) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{C}_n^{(k)}(x) \epsilon^k$$

$$\mathcal{R}_n(x, \epsilon) = \sum_{k=-p}^{\infty} \mathcal{R}_n^{(k)}(x) \epsilon^k$$

$$\partial_x J_n^{(k)}(x) = \mathcal{C}_{nm}^{(0)}(x) J_m^{(k)}(x) + \sum_{j=1}^{k+p} \mathcal{C}_{nm}^{(j)}(x) J_m^{(k-j)}(x) + \mathcal{R}_n^{(k)}(x)$$

- [Ablinger, Blümlein, Marquard, Rana, Schneider \(2018\)](#)
- [Blümlein, Marquard, Rana, Schneider \(2019\)](#)

- No canonical bases used - **no** *uniform transcendentality*.
- But since the DE system is first-order factorisable, no complicated higher transcendental constants such as eMZVs.
- PSLQ needs the full set of transcendental constants **till** weight $2L + k$ to obtain the ϵ^k -coefficient for the boundary integrals in terms of these constants. However, watch out for *ugly* fractions, and prune the set if necessary.
- Also watch out for unstable behaviour relative to the numerical precision used for the fitting.
- Else, require higher precision for the numerical result.

UV renormalisation

- Dim-reg to regularise the bare form factors - γ_5 treated using **CDR-scheme**, ie. $\{\gamma_\mu, \gamma_5\} = 0$ and $\gamma_5^2 = 1$.
- UV renormalisation in mixed scheme: $Z_m, Z_{2,t}, Z_{2,b}$ in **OS** scheme; Z_{α_s} in **\overline{MS}** scheme ($n_h \neq 0$). All Z_i -s can be expanded in α_s :
$$Z_i = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{4\pi} \right)^n Z_i^{(n)}.$$
- Relevant results for Z_i -s mostly available in literature.
- Relate renormalised form factors G_i to bare \hat{G}_i -s:
$$G_i = Z_{2,t}^{\frac{1}{2}} Z_{2,b}^{\frac{1}{2}} (\hat{G}_i + \hat{G}_{ct,i});$$
 $\hat{G}_{ct,i}$ denotes appropriate CT-contributions from lower orders in α_s .

Ward id

- The following Ward-identity holds: $q_\mu \Gamma^\mu - m_W \Gamma_{PS} = \mathbf{0}$; Γ_{PS} denotes the scattering amplitude for $t \rightarrow b\omega^-$, ω^- is the negatively charged pseudo-Goldstone boson.
- Can further express Γ_{PS} using a form factor S : $\Gamma_{PS} = \frac{m_t}{m_W} S (1 + \gamma_5)$.
- S is computed till 3-loops and renormalised as well.
- At the level of form factors, the Ward identity takes the following form:
 $2G_1^{(n)} + G_2^{(n)} + x G_3^{(n)} - 2S^{(n)} = \mathbf{0}$.
- Our results for $n = 3$ satisfy the above identity - very important self-consistency check!

IR subtraction

The IR divergences factorise. [Becher, Neubert \(2009\)](#)

$$G_i(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon) = Z(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon, \bar{\mu}) G_i^{\text{fin}}(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon, \bar{\mu})$$

where, $G_i^{\text{fin}}(\bar{\mu})$ is finite as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$; $\bar{\mu}$: scale for this IR factorisation. Z is process-independent.

IR subtraction

The IR divergences factorise. [Becher, Neubert \(2009\)](#)

$$G_i(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon) = Z(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon, \bar{\mu}) G_i^{\text{fin}}(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon, \bar{\mu})$$

where, $G_i^{\text{fin}}(\bar{\mu})$ is finite as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$; $\bar{\mu}$: scale for this IR factorisation. Z is process-independent.

1. We need an RGE governing $Z(\bar{\mu})$.
2. The anomalous dimensions are computed in massless QCD (n_f flavors).

IR subtraction

The IR divergences factorise. [Becher, Neubert \(2009\)](#)

$$G_i(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon) = Z(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon, \bar{\mu}) G_i^{\text{fin}}(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon, \bar{\mu})$$

where, $G_i^{\text{fin}}(\bar{\mu})$ is finite as $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$; $\bar{\mu}$: scale for this IR factorisation. Z is process-independent.

1. We need an RGE governing $Z(\bar{\mu})$.
2. The anomalous dimensions are computed in massless QCD (n_l flavors).

Problem: The form-factors are considered in full-QCD ($n_f = n_l + n_h = n_l + 1$ flavors).

IR subtraction

Problem: The form-factors are considered in full-QCD ($n_f = n_l + n_h = n_l + 1$ flavors).

Solution: Use **QCD decoupling relations**.

Now let's put everything together.

1. Write an RGE for \bar{Z} , the n_l - counterpart for what Z in the full (n_f) - theory:

$$\frac{d}{d \ln \bar{\mu}} \ln \bar{Z}(\alpha_s, x, \epsilon, \bar{\mu}) = -\Gamma(\alpha_s, x, \bar{\mu})$$

2. Expand both \bar{Z} and Γ in α_s :

$$\bar{Z} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{4\pi} \right)^n \bar{Z}^{(n)}, \quad \Gamma = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{4\pi} \right)^{n+1} \Gamma_n$$

IR subtraction

The anomalous dimension for the HLFF:

$$\Gamma = \gamma^t(\bar{\alpha}_s) + \gamma^b(\bar{\alpha}_s) - \gamma^{\text{cusp}}(\bar{\alpha}_s) \ln \left(\frac{\bar{\mu}}{m_t(1-x)} \right)$$

1. γ^t known till 3-loops: Korchemsky, Radyushkin ('87, '92); Kidonakis ('09); Grozin et al.('15); ...
2. γ^b known till 4-loops: Moch et al.('05); Baikov et al.('09); Manteuffel et al. ('20); Agarwal et al. ('21) ...
3. γ^{cusp} known till 4-loops: Henn et al. ('20); ...

IR subtraction

Finally,

$$\ln \bar{Z} = \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{4\pi} \right) \left[\frac{\Gamma'_0}{4\epsilon^2} + \frac{\Gamma_0}{2\epsilon} \right] + \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{4\pi} \right)^2 \left[-\frac{3\beta_0\Gamma'_0}{16\epsilon^3} + \frac{\Gamma'_1 - 4\beta_0\Gamma_0}{16\epsilon^2} + \frac{\Gamma_1}{4\epsilon} \right]$$

$$+ \left(\frac{\bar{\alpha}_s}{4\pi} \right)^3 \left[\frac{11\beta_0^2\Gamma'_0}{72\epsilon^4} - \frac{5\beta_0\Gamma'_1 + 8\beta_1\Gamma'_0 - 12\beta_0^2\Gamma_0}{72\epsilon^3} + \frac{\Gamma'_2 - 6\beta_0\Gamma_1 - 6\beta_1\Gamma_0}{36\epsilon^2} + \frac{\Gamma_2}{6\epsilon} \right] + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$$

where, $\Gamma'_n = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{\mu}} \Gamma_n$

Now, use the decoupling relation to obtain Z from \bar{Z} : $\bar{\alpha}_s = \zeta_{\alpha_s} \alpha_s$

where, the decoupling constant ζ_{α_s} is known till 4-loops. Schröder, Steinhauser ('05)

1. The physics context

- Top physics frontier
- B physics frontier
- Amplitudes and formal studies

2. Three loop results for the UV renormalised HLFF

- UV renormalisation, Ward id
- Universal IR behavior

3. Asymptotic behavior of the HLFF

Typically, factorisation theorems \rightarrow evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of *something*

eg.,

1. factorisation of singular cutoff dependence into universal Z -factors \rightarrow Callan-Symanzik evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of logs in μ_R ,
2. collinear factorisation for hadronic collisions \rightarrow DGLAP evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of collinear logs, ...
 - generalisable to a *soft-collinear* factorisation of scattering amplitudes
 - leads to the K-G evolution equations shown earlier
 - resummation of Sudakov logs and IR divergences

Typically, factorisation theorems \rightarrow evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of *something*

eg.,

1. factorisation of singular cutoff dependence into universal Z -factors \rightarrow Callan-Symanzik evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of logs in μ_R ,
2. collinear factorisation for hadronic collisions \rightarrow DGLAP evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of collinear logs, ...
 - generalisable to a *soft-collinear* factorisation of scattering amplitudes
 - leads to the K-G evolution equations shown earlier
 - resummation of Sudakov logs and IR divergences

Typically, factorisation theorems \rightarrow evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of *something*

eg.,

1. factorisation of singular cutoff dependence into universal Z -factors \rightarrow Callan-Symanzik evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of logs in μ_R ,
2. collinear factorisation for hadronic collisions \rightarrow DGLAP evolution equations \rightarrow resummation of collinear logs, ...
 - generalisable to a *soft-collinear* factorisation of scattering amplitudes
 - leads to the K-G evolution equations shown earlier
 - resummation of Sudakov logs and IR divergences

The K-G equation for form-factors with massive-partons:

$$\mu^2 \frac{\partial}{\partial \mu^2} \ln \hat{F}_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{m_t^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = \frac{1}{2} \left[K_I \left(\frac{m_t^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) + G_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{\mu_R^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) \right]$$

- I labels the external current coupling to the heavy-light fermion pair
- \hat{F}_I has contributions from universal logs and IR structures
- K_I is process-independent; has mass-dependence
- G_I has the process-dependence through the hard-scale Q^2

$$\mu^2 \frac{d}{d\mu^2} G_I \left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = - \lim_{m_t \rightarrow 0} \mu^2 \frac{d}{d\mu^2} K_I \left(\frac{m_t^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon \right) = \gamma^{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s)$$

- where we have set the soft-collinear factorisation scale $\mu = \mu_R$
- with boundary conditions set at $K_I(\alpha_s(m_t^2), 1, \epsilon) \equiv \mathcal{K}_I$ and $G_I(\alpha_s(Q^2), 1, \epsilon) \equiv \mathcal{G}_I$

$$K_I = \mathcal{K}_I - \int_{\frac{m_t^2}{\mu^2}}^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \gamma^{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s(\lambda\mu^2)); \quad G_I = \mathcal{G}_I + \int_{\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}}^1 \frac{d\lambda}{\lambda} \gamma^{\text{cusp}}(\alpha_s(\lambda\mu^2))$$

For the HQFF@ $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$, the solutions for \hat{F}_I have been computed. [Blümlein, Marquard, Rana \('18\)](#)

NOTE: these solutions are devoid of massive internal fermion-loops.

Solutions for the HLFF@ $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ should be same as the HQFF@ $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$, upto a reinterpretation of \mathcal{K}_I

Solutions for the HLFF@ $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ should be same as the HQFF@ $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$, upto a reinterpretation of \mathcal{K}_I

Since \mathcal{K}_I encodes the universality of the IR singularities, we expect it to have **equal** contributions from its counterparts for the purely massless and massive form-factors:

$$\mathcal{K}_I = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{K}_{I,0} + \mathcal{K}_{I,m_t})$$

\hat{F}_I -s are related to \tilde{F}_I -s (asymptotic limits of F_I -s) through matching-coefficients \mathcal{C}_I -s

$$\tilde{F}_I\left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{m_t^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon\right) = \mathcal{C}_I \hat{F}_I\left(\frac{Q^2}{\mu^2}, \frac{m_t^2}{\mu^2}, \alpha_s, \epsilon\right)$$

- In summary, everything available in literature to compute the HLFF matching coefficients \mathcal{C}_I -s

With all these, we have successfully predicted the following quantities:

1. For the 3-loop HLFF, complete log-contributions (series in $L = \ln \left(-\frac{q^2}{m_t^2} \right)$) to the finite part, in the asymptotic limit (eg., $\tilde{G}_1^{(3,0)}$ and $S^{(3,0)}$).
2. For the 4-loop HLFF:
 - ϵ^{-3} at full-color
 - ϵ^{-2} for full- n_l
 - ϵ^{-1} with all orders in L
 - Finite term till L^2

1. As discussed earlier, the matching coefficients \mathcal{C}_l are known only partially - the full n_l and color-planar contributions. Non-log contributions to the finite HLFF-s in the asymptotic limit have been obtained for these color-structures.
2. We have found perfect agreement between the color-planar predictions and our results, after expanding our results in the large- x limit.

Thus, yet another strong **consistency-check!**

Summary

1. Computed HLFF@ $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ in the color-planar limit.
2. Multiple consistency checks - analytic vs numeric, Ward, asymptotic limit ...
3. Essential for phenomenology, particularly B-physics.
4. Results have been independently confirmed in [Fael, Huber, Lange, Müller, Schönwald, Steinhauser \(2024\)](#).
5. Next steps: completing calculations for other color-structures (in-progress)...

Thanks !

Backup material

PSLQ tips

- **Example 1:**

ϵ -coefficient for boundary integral J_2 : number with 100 digits precision.

For this case, the naive choice for the PSLQ basis works -

$$\{1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_2^2, \zeta_2\zeta_3, \zeta_5, \zeta_2^3, \zeta_3^2, \zeta_2^2\zeta_3, \zeta_2\zeta_5, \zeta_7\}$$

result -

$$\frac{48}{5}\zeta_2^2 + \frac{2122}{35}\zeta_2^3 + 32\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{681}{10}\zeta_2^2\zeta_3 + 12\zeta_3^2 + 8\zeta_5 - \frac{67}{2}\zeta_2\zeta_5 + \frac{8529}{16}\zeta_7$$

PSLQ tips

- **Example 2:**

ϵ -coefficient for boundary integral J_1 : number with 100 digits precision.

For this case, the naive choice for the PSLQ basis does not work.

incorrect result (at 83 to 94 digits of fitting-precision) -

$$\frac{169638071}{2242112} + \frac{3794333 \pi^2}{4484224} + \frac{35759009 \pi^4}{40358016} - \frac{3328583 \pi^6}{242148096} + \frac{4080315 \zeta_3}{2242112} + \dots$$

incorrect result (at 98 and 99 digits of fitting-precision) -

$$-\frac{157188793}{53038334} + \frac{4722082655 \pi^2}{318230004} - \frac{477444277 \pi^4}{1909380024} + \frac{1100756927 \pi^6}{3818760048} - \frac{572414197 \zeta_3}{53038334} + \dots$$

PSLQ tips

- **Example 2:**

ϵ -coefficient for boundary integral J_1 : number with 100 digits precision.

Prune the PSLQ basis -

$$\{1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3, \zeta_2^2, \zeta_2\zeta_3, \zeta_5, \zeta_2^3, \zeta_3^2, \zeta_2^2\zeta_3, \zeta_2\zeta_5, \zeta_7\}$$

correct result -

$$\frac{39151}{90} + \frac{1211}{10}\zeta_2 + \frac{80939}{1440}\zeta_2^2 + \frac{71737}{720}\zeta_3 + \frac{20587}{1440}\zeta_2\zeta_3 + \frac{93589}{1200}\zeta_5$$