UCLA Physics | Amplitudes

Subtleties in Nonsupersymmetric Gravity at Two Loops

Josh Nohle, UCLA

[Zvi Bern, Clifford Cheung, Huan-Hang Chi, Scott Davies, Lance Dixon, JN – to appear] [Zvi Bern, Scott Davies, JN – to appear] 18 June, 2015 Radcor/Loopfest

UCLA Physics | Amplitudes



• Initial goal: Reproduce and expand on (eg. adding different fields) the two-loop pure gravity calculation of Goroff & Sagnotti (1986) using modern methods



- Initial goal: Reproduce and expand on (eg. adding different fields) the two-loop pure gravity calculation of Goroff & Sagnotti (1986) using modern methods
- We found many surprises along the way
 - Contribution of evanescent operators vanish in D=4



- Initial goal: Reproduce and expand on (eg. adding different fields) the two-loop pure gravity calculation of Goroff & Sagnotti (1986) using modern methods
- We found many surprises along the way
 - Contribution of evanescent operators vanish in D=4
 - Quantum (in)equivalence of dilaton and anti-symmetric tensor fields



- Initial goal: Reproduce and expand on (eg. adding different fields) the two-loop pure gravity calculation of Goroff & Sagnotti (1986) using modern methods
- We found many surprises along the way
 - Contribution of evanescent operators vanish in D=4
 - Quantum (in)equivalence of dilaton and anti-symmetric tensor fields
 - Contribution of three-form field zero degrees of freedom in D=4



- Initial goal: Reproduce and expand on (eg. adding different fields) the two-loop pure gravity calculation of Goroff & Sagnotti (1986) using modern methods
- We found many surprises along the way
 - Contribution of evanescent operators vanish in D=4
 - Quantum (in)equivalence of dilaton and anti-symmetric tensor fields
 - Contribution of three-form field zero degrees of freedom in D=4
 - [Color-kinematics duality constraints only on spanning set of cuts]

UCLA Physics | Amplitudes

Outline

1 Layout of Pertinent NonSUSY Gravity Theories

• Graviton, dilaton, antisymmetric tensor, three-form

1 Layout of Pertinent NonSUSY Gravity Theories

- Graviton, dilaton, antisymmetric tensor, three-form
- ② Methods
 - Unitarity, spinor-helicity, [color-kinematics duality]

- 1 Layout of Pertinent NonSUSY Gravity Theories
 - Graviton, dilaton, antisymmetric tensor, three-form
- 2 Methods
 - Unitarity, spinor-helicity, [color-kinematics duality]
- ③ One-Loop Gravity → Gauss-Bonnet
 - Review of finiteness argument / trace anomaly
 - Quantum inequivalence?

- 1 Layout of Pertinent NonSUSY Gravity Theories
 - Graviton, dilaton, antisymmetric tensor, three-form
- 2 Methods
 - Unitarity, spinor-helicity, [color-kinematics duality]
- ③ One-Loop Gravity → Gauss-Bonnet
 - Review of finiteness argument / trace anomaly
 - Quantum inequivalence?
- (4) Two-Loop Gravity $\rightarrow R^3$ divergence
 - Reproduce Goroff & Sagnotti, computing identical-helicity amplitude
 - Contribution of evanescent operators
 - Quantum equivalence?

- 1 Layout of Pertinent NonSUSY Gravity Theories
 - Graviton, dilaton, antisymmetric tensor, three-form
- 2 Methods
 - Unitarity, spinor-helicity, [color-kinematics duality]
- ③ One-Loop Gravity → Gauss-Bonnet
 - Review of finiteness argument / trace anomaly
 - Quantum inequivalence?
- (4) Two-Loop Gravity $\rightarrow R^3$ divergence
 - Reproduce Goroff & Sagnotti, computing identical-helicity amplitude
 - Contribution of evanescent operators
 - Quantum equivalence?
- **5** [Color-Kinematics Duality at Two-Loops]

Radcor/Loopfest

UCLA Physics | Amplitudes

Nonsupersymmetric Gravity Theories

NonSUSY Gravity Theories

• Pure Gravity Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{G}} = \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{2}{\kappa^2} R \right)$$

• Graviton, Three-Form Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm G3} = \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{2}{\kappa^2} R + \frac{1}{8} H_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} H^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \right)$$

 $H_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} \equiv \partial_{\mu}A_{\nu\rho\sigma} - \partial_{\nu}A_{\rho\sigma\mu} + \partial_{\rho}A_{\sigma\mu\nu} - \partial_{\sigma}A_{\mu\nu\rho}$: Field strength of three-form field, $A_{\mu\nu\rho}$

• Note the *D*=4 duality transformation

$$\sqrt{\Lambda} \leftrightarrow \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} H^{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$$

Radcor/Loopfest

NonSUSY Gravity Theories

• Graviton, Dilaton Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm GD} = \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{2}{\kappa^2} R + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi \right)$$

• Graviton, Antisymmetric Tensor Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm GA} = \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{2}{\kappa^2} R + \frac{1}{6} H_{\mu\nu\rho} H^{\mu\nu\rho} \right)$$

 $H_{\mu\nu\rho} \equiv \partial_{\mu}A_{\nu\rho} + \partial_{\nu}A_{\rho\mu} + \partial_{\rho}A_{\mu\nu}$: Field strength of antisymmetric tensor field, $A_{\mu\nu}$ • Note the D=4 duality transformation between GD and GA

$$\partial_{\mu}\phi \leftrightarrow \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}H^{\nu\rho\sigma}$$

NonSUSY Gravity Theories

• Graviton, Dilaton, Antisymmetric Tensor Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{GDA}} = \sqrt{-g} \left(-\frac{2}{\kappa^2} R + \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \phi \partial^\mu \phi + \frac{1}{6} e^{-2\kappa \phi/\sqrt{D_s - 2}} H_{\mu\nu\rho} H^{\mu\nu\rho} \right)$$

- Low-energy limit of bosonic string theory
- This theory emerges from KLT or as a double-copy of nonsupersymmetric Yang-Mills theory



Radcor/Loopfest

UCLA Physics | Amplitudes

Methods

• Generalized Unitarity [Bern, Dixon, Dunbar, Kosower]

• Generalized Unitarity [Bern, Dixon, Dunbar, Kosower]

• Compute tree-level amplitudes using Feynman rules or KLT







 $A_{\mu\nu}$



• Generalized Unitarity [Bern, Dixon, Dunbar, Kosower]

- Compute tree-level amplitudes using Feynman rules or KLT
- Get cuts of loop amplitude by sewing together trees
- Make cuts into loop integrands

6/17



• Generalized Unitarity [Bern, Dixon, Dunbar, Kosower]

- Compute tree-level amplitudes using Feynman rules or KLT
- Get cuts of loop amplitude by sewing together trees
- Make cuts into loop integrands
- Spinor-Helicity Formalism
 - Used for two-loop "bare" integrands





• Generalized Unitarity [Bern, Dixon, Dunbar, Kosower]

- Compute tree-level amplitudes using Feynman rules or KLT
- Get cuts of loop amplitude by sewing together trees
- Make cuts into loop integrands
- Spinor-Helicity Formalism
 - Used for two-loop "bare" integrands
- Color-Kinematics Duality [Bern, Carrasco, Johansson]
 - Useful for GDA theory

[See talk by Scott Davies]



UCLA Physics | Amplitudes

One-Loop Gravity



• Finiteness Argument ['t Hooft and Veltman (1974)]

• Possible external graviton counterterms in *D*=4:

 $R^2, R^2_{\mu\nu}, R^2_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}$



- Finiteness Argument ['t Hooft and Veltman (1974)]
 - Possible external graviton counterterms in *D*=4:



• Ricci scalar and Ricci curvature vanish by equations of motion and can be eliminated by field redefinitions



- Finiteness Argument ['t Hooft and Veltman (1974)]
 - Possible external graviton counterterms in *D*=4:
 - Ricci scalar and Ricci curvature vanish by equations of motion and can be eliminated by field redefinitions

 R^2, R^2, R^2

- In *D*=4, Gauss-Bonnet Theorem states $\int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left(R^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}^2 + R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right) = 32\pi^2 \chi$
- In asymptotically flat space, $\chi=0 \rightarrow \text{Riemann curvature}$ vanishes



- Finiteness Argument ['t Hooft and Veltman (1974)]
 - Possible external graviton counterterms in *D*=4:
 - Ricci scalar and Ricci curvature vanish by equations of motion and can be eliminated by field redefinitions

 R^2, R^2, R^2

- In *D*=4, Gauss-Bonnet Theorem states $\int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left(R^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}^2 + R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right) = 32\pi^2 \chi$
- In asymptotically flat space, $\chi = 0 \rightarrow \text{Riemann curvature}$ vanishes

• With nontrivial topology, pure gravity counterterm is

$$\mathcal{L}^{(\text{GB})} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{53}{90} \sqrt{-g} \left(R^2 - 4R_{\mu\nu}^2 + R_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}^2 \right)$$

[Capper and Duff (1974); Tsao (1977); Critchley (1978); Gibbons, Hawking, Perry (1978); Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); Bornsen and van de Ven (2009)]



- The one-loop divergence also manifests itself in the trace/conformal/Weyl anomaly
 - Computed long ago for many different fields in the loop (ext. gravitons)

[Capper and Duff (1974); Tsao (1977); Critchley (1978); Gibbons, Hawking, Perry (1978); Duff and van Nieuwenhuizen (1980); Siegel (1980); Grisaru, Nielsen, Siegel, Zanon (1984); Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); Bornsen and van de Ven (2009); Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN; Etc.]



- The one-loop divergence also manifests itself in the trace/conformal/Weyl anomaly
 - Computed long ago for many different fields in the loop (ext. gravitons)
 - They show that the effective energy-momentum tensor is proportional to the one-loop counterterm

$$\sqrt{-g} T^{\mu}_{\ \mu} = -2\epsilon \mathcal{L}^{(\text{GB})} \text{ where } T_{\mu\nu} \equiv -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta(\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}^{(\text{GB})})}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}$$

[Capper and Duff (1974); Tsao (1977); Critchley (1978); Gibbons, Hawking, Perry (1978); Duff and van Nieuwenhuizen (1980); Siegel (1980); Grisaru, Nielsen, Siegel, Zanon (1984); Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); Bornsen and van de Ven (2009); Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN; Etc.]



- The one-loop divergence also manifests itself in the trace/conformal/Weyl anomaly
 - Computed long ago for many different fields in the loop (ext. gravitons)
 - They show that the effective energy-momentum tensor is proportional to the one-loop counterterm

$$\sqrt{-g} T^{\mu}_{\ \mu} = -2\epsilon \mathcal{L}^{(\text{GB})} \text{ where } T_{\mu\nu} \equiv -\frac{2}{\sqrt{-g}} \frac{\delta(\mathcal{L} + \mathcal{L}^{(\text{GB})})}{\delta g^{\mu\nu}}$$

• For the theories we discussed,



[Capper and Duff (1974); Tsao (1977); Critchley (1978); Gibbons, Hawking, Perry (1978); Duff and van Nieuwenhuizen (1980); Siegel (1980); Grisaru, Nielsen, Siegel, Zanon (1984); Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); Bornsen and van de Ven (2009); Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN; Etc.]



• Notice that the dilaton and antisymmetric tensor contribute differently in spite of the *D*=4 duality transformation,

$$\partial_{\mu}\phi \leftrightarrow \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}H^{\nu\rho\sigma}$$

• Quantum (in)equivalence under duality transformations?

[Duff and van Nieuwenhuizen (1980); Siegel (1980); Fradkin and Tseytlin (1984); Grisaru, Nielsen, Siegel, Zanon (1984)]



• Notice that the dilaton and antisymmetric tensor contribute differently in spite of the *D*=4 duality transformation,

 $\partial_{\mu}\phi \leftrightarrow \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}H^{\nu\rho\sigma}$

• Quantum (in)equivalence under duality transformations?

[Duff and van Nieuwenhuizen (1980); Siegel (1980); Fradkin and Tseytlin (1984); Grisaru, Nielsen, Siegel, Zanon (1984)]

• Notice that the three-form contributes despite having zero degrees of freedom in *D*=4.



• Notice that the dilaton and antisymmetric tensor contribute differently in spite of the *D*=4 duality transformation,

 $\partial_{\mu}\phi \leftrightarrow \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}H^{\nu\rho\sigma}$

• Quantum (in)equivalence under duality transformations?

[Duff and van Nieuwenhuizen (1980); Siegel (1980); Fradkin and Tseytlin (1984); Grisaru, Nielsen, Siegel, Zanon (1984)]

- Notice that the three-form contributes despite having zero degrees of freedom in *D*=4.
- Dimensional regularization introduces subtleties

[Capper and Kimber (1980)]



• Notice that the dilaton and antisymmetric tensor contribute differently in spite of the *D*=4 duality transformation,

 $\partial_{\mu}\phi \leftrightarrow \epsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma}H^{\nu\rho\sigma}$

• Quantum (in)equivalence under duality transformations?

[Duff and van Nieuwenhuizen (1980); Siegel (1980); Fradkin and Tseytlin (1984); Grisaru, Nielsen, Siegel, Zanon (1984)]

- Notice that the three-form contributes despite having zero degrees of freedom in *D*=4.
- Dimensional regularization introduces subtleties [Capper and Kimber (1980)]
- Gauss-Bonnet operator is evanescent, but could affect 2 loops
UCLA Physics | Amplitudes

Two-Loop Gravity



• There is a valid *R*³ counterterm and corresponding divergence [Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); van de Ven (1992)]

$$\mathcal{L}^{(R^3)} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4} \frac{209}{5760} \sqrt{-g} R^{\alpha\beta}_{\ \gamma\delta} R^{\gamma\delta}_{\ \mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu}_{\ \alpha\beta}$$



p

q

3



• There is a valid *R*³ counterterm and corresponding divergence [Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); van de Ven (1992)]

$$\mathcal{L}^{(R^3)} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4} \frac{209}{5760} \sqrt{-g} R^{\alpha\beta}_{\ \gamma\delta} R^{\gamma\delta}_{\ \mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu}_{\ \alpha\beta}$$

• For four plus-helicity gravitons, this corresponds to $\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+})\Big|_{\mathrm{UV\ div.}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6} \frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}} \frac{209}{24} stu\ \mathcal{T}^{2} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{T} \equiv \frac{[1\ 2]\ [3\ 4]}{\langle 1\ 2\rangle \ \langle 3\ 4\rangle}$



• There is a valid *R*³ counterterm and corresponding divergence [Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); van de Ven (1992)]

$$\mathcal{L}^{(R^3)} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4} \frac{209}{5760} \sqrt{-g} R^{\alpha\beta}_{\ \gamma\delta} R^{\gamma\delta}_{\ \mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu}_{\ \alpha\beta}$$

- For four plus-helicity gravitons, this corresponds to $\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+})\Big|_{\mathrm{UV\ div.}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6} \frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}} \frac{209}{24} stu\ \mathcal{T}^{2} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{T} \equiv \frac{[1\ 2]\ [3\ 4]}{\langle 1\ 2\rangle\ \langle 3\ 4\rangle}$
- They performed the bare integration and subtracted any subdivergences, which can appear even if artificial

p

• There is a valid *R*³ counterterm and corresponding divergence [Goroff and Sagnotti (1986); van de Ven (1992)]

$$\mathcal{L}^{(R^3)} = -\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^4} \frac{209}{5760} \sqrt{-g} R^{\alpha\beta}_{\ \gamma\delta} R^{\gamma\delta}_{\ \mu\nu} R^{\mu\nu}_{\ \alpha\beta}$$

- For four plus-helicity gravitons, this corresponds to $\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+})\Big|_{\mathrm{UV\ div.}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6} \frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}} \frac{209}{24} stu\ \mathcal{T}^{2} \quad \text{where} \quad \mathcal{T} \equiv \frac{[1\ 2]\ [3\ 4]}{\langle 1\ 2\rangle\ \langle 3\ 4\rangle}$
- They performed the bare integration and subtracted any subdivergences, which can appear even if artificial
 - Are there meaningful subdivergences even though there is no oneloop divergence in *D*=4? I.e., does the evanescent Gauss-Bonnet operator (trace anomaly) feed into the two-loop divergence?





• We aimed to reproduce this result using unitarity and spinorhelicity [Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] 3

 $\mathbf{2}$

p

- We aimed to reproduce this result using unitarity and spinorhelicity [Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]
- We constructed the four-graviton all-plus integrands

3

 $\mathbf{2}$

p

- We aimed to reproduce this result using unitarity and spinorhelicity [Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]
- We constructed the four-graviton all-plus integrands
 - e.g., the planar double-box has the simple integrand numerator

$$= \frac{D_s(D_s - 3)}{2} (\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2)^2 - \frac{D_s(D_s - 6)}{2} \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 (\lambda_p^2 + \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 12D_s((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)(\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 144((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)^2,$$

where the λ 's represent the -2 ϵ -components of the loop momenta

p

- We aimed to reproduce this result using unitarity and spinorhelicity [Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]
- We constructed the four-graviton all-plus integrands
 - e.g., the planar double-box has the simple integrand numerator

$$= \frac{D_s(D_s - 3)}{2} (\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2)^2 - \frac{D_s(D_s - 6)}{2} \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 (\lambda_p^2 + \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 12D_s((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)(\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 144((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)^2,$$

where the λ 's represent the -2 ϵ -components of the loop momenta

• Integrating, we find the "bare" UV divergence $\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+})\Big|_{\text{UV div.}}^{\text{bare}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6} \frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}} \left(-\frac{3431}{5400}\right) stu \mathcal{T}^{2}$ p

- We aimed to reproduce this result using unitarity and spinorhelicity [Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]
- We constructed the four-graviton all-plus integrands
 - e.g., the planar double-box has the simple integrand numerator

$$= \frac{D_s(D_s - 3)}{2} (\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2)^2 - \frac{D_s(D_s - 6)}{2} \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 (\lambda_p^2 + \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 12D_s((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)(\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 144((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)^2,$$

where the λ 's represent the -2 ϵ -components of the loop momenta

• Integrating, we find the "bare" UV divergence

$$\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+})\Big|_{\text{UV div.}}^{\text{bare}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6} \frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}} \left(-\frac{3431}{5400}\right) stu \mathcal{T}^{2}$$

• Does not match Goroff & Sagnotti, but if we look closely, we will see meaningful subdivergences!

p

- We aimed to reproduce this result using unitarity and spinorhelicity [Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]
- We constructed the four-graviton all-plus integrands
 - e.g., the planar double-box has the simple integrand numerator

$$= \frac{D_s(D_s - 3)}{2} (\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2)^2 - \frac{D_s(D_s - 6)}{2} \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 (\lambda_p^2 + \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 12D_s((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)(\lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2 + \lambda_p^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2 + \lambda_q^2 \lambda_{p+q}^2) + 144((\lambda_p \cdot \lambda_q)^2 - \lambda_p^2 \lambda_q^2)^2,$$

where the λ 's represent the -2 ϵ -components of the loop momenta

• Integrating, we find the "bare" UV divergence

$$\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+})\Big|_{\text{UV div.}}^{\text{bare}} = \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6} \frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}} \left(-\frac{3431}{5400}\right) stu \mathcal{T}^{2}$$

- Does not match Goroff & Sagnotti, but if we look closely, we will see meaningful subdivergences!
- We will deal with the subtractions using counterterms



p

[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]
We now consider the bare result with the single- and double-Gauss-Bonnet counterterm insertions in D=4-2E





Single GB



Double GB

3

p

[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]
We now consider the bare result with the single- and double-Gauss-Bonnet counterterm insertions in *D*=4-2ε







Double GB

$$\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(2)}\Big|_{\rm UV \ div.}^{\rm bare} = \left(-\frac{3431}{5400}\right)\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6}\frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}}stu\ \mathcal{T}^{2}$$
$$\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(1)}\Big|_{\rm UV \ div.}^{\rm GB} = \left(+\frac{689}{675}\right)\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6}\frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}}stu\ \mathcal{T}^{2}$$
$$\mathcal{M}_{4}^{(0)}\Big|_{\rm UV \ div.}^{\rm GB^{2}} = \left(+\frac{5618}{675}\right)\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^{6}\frac{i}{(4\pi)^{4}}stu\ \mathcal{T}^{2}$$

UCLA Physics | Amplitudes



3

p

[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • We now consider the bare result with the single- and double-Gauss-Bonnet counterterm insertions in $D=4-2\epsilon$ Single GB Bare Double GB $\mathcal{M}_4^{(2)}\Big|_{\rm UV\ div.}^{\rm bare} = \left(-\frac{3431}{5400}\right)\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^6\frac{i}{(4\pi)^4}stu\ \mathcal{T}^2$ $\mathcal{M}_4^{(0)}\Big|_{\rm UV \ div.}^{\rm GB^2} = \left(+\frac{5618}{675}\right)\frac{1}{\epsilon}\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^6\frac{i}{(4\pi)^4}stu\ \mathcal{T}^2$

3

p



• Matches Goroff & Sagnotti after meaningful subtractions!



p



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]

\bullet For other theories, the coefficient of $1/\epsilon$ is given by

theory	g	gd	ga	gda
bare divergence	$-\frac{3431}{5400}$	$-\frac{793}{1200}$	$\frac{2027}{1200}$	$\frac{83}{2700}$
GB c.t. in 1 loop	$\frac{4.53}{360} \cdot \frac{2.13}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-1)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91-1)}{15}$
GB^2 c.t. in tree	$24\left(\frac{4\cdot53}{360}\right)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+1}{360} ight)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+91}{360} ight)^2$	$24ig(rac{4\cdot 53+91+1}{360}ig)^2$
RHH c.t. in 1 loop	0	0	$rac{1}{4}\cdot 20$	$rac{5}{12} \cdot 20$
total	$\frac{209}{24}$	$\frac{139}{16}$	$\frac{239}{16}$	$\frac{199}{12}$

• [Not shown is graviton + n_3 3-forms: total = $209/24 - n_3 (15/2)$]



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]

\bullet For other theories, the coefficient of $1/\epsilon$ is given by

theory	g	gd	ga	gda
bare divergence	$-\frac{3431}{5400}$	$-\frac{793}{1200}$	$\frac{2027}{1200}$	$\frac{83}{2700}$
GB c.t. in 1 loop	$\frac{4.53}{360} \cdot \frac{2.13}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-1)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91-1)}{15}$
GB^2 c.t. in tree	$24\left(\frac{4\cdot53}{360}\right)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+1}{360} ight)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+91}{360} ight)^2$	$24 ig(rac{4 \cdot 53 + 91 + 1}{360} ig)^2$
RHH c.t. in 1 loop	0	0	$rac{1}{4}\cdot 20$	$rac{5}{12} \cdot 20$
total	$\frac{209}{24}$	$\frac{139}{16}$	$\frac{239}{16}$	$\frac{199}{12}$

• [Not shown is graviton + n_3 3-forms: total = $209/24 - n_3 (15/2)$]

• Again, it appears that dilatons and antisymmetric tensors are quantum-mechanically inequivalent



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]

\bullet For other theories, the coefficient of $1/\epsilon$ is given by

theory	g	gd	ga	gda
bare divergence	$-\frac{3431}{5400}$	$-\frac{793}{1200}$	$\frac{2027}{1200}$	$\frac{83}{2700}$
GB c.t. in 1 loop	$\frac{4.53}{360} \cdot \frac{2.13}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-1)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91-1)}{15}$
GB^2 c.t. in tree	$24\left(\frac{4\cdot53}{360}\right)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+1}{360} ight)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+91}{360} ight)^2$	$24 ig(rac{4 \cdot 53 + 91 + 1}{360} ig)^2$
RHH c.t. in 1 loop	0	0	$rac{1}{4}\cdot 20$	$rac{5}{12} \cdot 20$
total	$\frac{209}{24}$	$\frac{139}{16}$	$\frac{239}{16}$	$\frac{199}{12}$

• [Not shown is graviton + n_3 3-forms: total = $209/24 - n_3 (15/2)$]

- Again, it appears that dilatons and antisymmetric tensors are quantum-mechanically inequivalent
- and that the 3-form plays a nontrivial role



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)]

\bullet For other theories, the coefficient of $1/\epsilon$ is given by

theory	g	gd	ga	gda
bare divergence	$-\frac{3431}{5400}$	$-\frac{793}{1200}$	$\frac{2027}{1200}$	$\frac{83}{2700}$
GB c.t. in 1 loop	$\frac{4.53}{360} \cdot \frac{2.13}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-1)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91)}{15}$	$\frac{4\cdot53+91+1}{360}\cdot\frac{2\cdot(13-91-1)}{15}$
GB^2 c.t. in tree	$24\left(\frac{4\cdot53}{360}\right)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+1}{360} ight)^2$	$24\left(rac{4\cdot53+91}{360} ight)^2$	$24ig(rac{4\cdot 53+91+1}{360}ig)^2$
RHH c.t. in 1 loop	0	0	$rac{1}{4}\cdot 20$	$rac{5}{12} \cdot 20$
total	$\frac{209}{24}$	$\frac{139}{16}$	$\frac{239}{16}$	$\frac{199}{12}$

• [Not shown is graviton + n_3 3-forms: total = $209/24 - n_3 (15/2)$]

- Again, it appears that dilatons and antisymmetric tensors are quantum-mechanically inequivalent
- and that the 3-form plays a nontrivial role
- but...



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • ...look at the finite log pieces as well

• Pure Gravity:

• Gravity + 3-Form





[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • ...look at the finite log pieces as well

• Pure Gravity:

$$\mathcal{M}_{G}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+}) = \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{209}{24}stu + \frac{117617}{21600}stu + \left(\frac{1}{10}stu - \frac{1}{60}s^{3}\right)\log\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \frac{1}{120}\left(s^{2} + t^{2} + u^{2}\right)s\log^{2}\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \text{perms}\right]$$

• Gravity + 3-Form

$$\mathcal{M}_{G3}^{(2)}(1^+, 2^+, 3^+, 4^+) = \mathcal{N} \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} \frac{29}{24} stu + \frac{411617}{21600} stu + \left(\frac{1}{10} stu - \frac{1}{60} s^3 \right) \log \left(\frac{-s}{\mu^2} \right) + \frac{1}{120} \left(s^2 + t^2 + u^2 \right) s \log^2 \left(\frac{-s}{\mu^2} \right) + \text{perms} \right]$$

14/17



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • ...look at the finite log pieces as well

• Pure Gravity:

 $\mathcal{M}_{G}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+}) = \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{209}{24}stu + \frac{117617}{21600}stu + \left(\frac{1}{10}stu - \frac{1}{60}s^{3}\right)\log\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \frac{1}{120}\left(s^{2} + t^{2} + u^{2}\right)s\log^{2}\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \text{perms}\right]$

• Gravity + 3-Form $\mathcal{M}_{G3}^{(2)}(1^+, 2^+, 3^+, 4^+) = \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{29}{24}stu + \frac{411617}{21600}stu + \left(\frac{1}{10}stu - \frac{1}{60}s^3\right)\log\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^2}\right) + \frac{1}{120}\left(s^2 + t^2 + u^2\right)s\log^2\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^2}\right) + \text{perms}\right]$

• Can alter divergence with 3-form, but preserve logarithms!



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • ...look at the finite log pieces as well

• Pure Gravity:

 $\mathcal{M}_{G}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+}) = \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{209}{24}stu\right] + \frac{117617}{21600}stu + \left(\frac{1}{10}stu - \frac{1}{60}s^{3}\right)\log\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \frac{1}{120}\left(s^{2} + t^{2} + u^{2}\right)s\log^{2}\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \text{perms}\right]$

- Gravity + 3-Form $\mathcal{M}_{G3}^{(2)}(1^+, 2^+, 3^+, 4^+) = \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{29}{24}stu + \frac{411617}{21600}stu + \left(\frac{1}{10}stu - \frac{1}{60}s^3\right)\log\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^2}\right) + \frac{1}{120}\left(s^2 + t^2 + u^2\right)s\log^2\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^2}\right) + \text{perms}\right]$
- Can alter divergence with 3-form, but preserve logarithms!
 No physical effects "Cheshire Cat" field





[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • ...look at the finite log pieces as well

• Pure Gravity:

 $\mathcal{M}_{G}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+}) = \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{209}{24}stu + \frac{117617}{21600}stu + \frac{1}{10}\frac{1}{5}\frac{117617}{21600}stu + \frac{1}{10}\frac{1}{5}\frac{1}{10}\frac{1}{$

- Gravity + 3-Form $\mathcal{M}_{G3}^{(2)}(1^{+}, 2^{+}, 3^{+}, 4^{+}) = \mathcal{N}\left[\frac{1}{\epsilon}\frac{29}{24}stu + \frac{411617}{21600}stu + \left(\frac{1}{10}stu - \frac{1}{60}s^{3}\right)\log\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \frac{1}{120}\left(s^{2} + t^{2} + u^{2}\right)s\log^{2}\left(\frac{-s}{\mu^{2}}\right) + \text{perms}\right]$
- Can alter divergence with 3-form, but preserve logarithms!
- No physical effects "Cheshire Cat" field
- Similar story for GD vs. GA theories same logarithms
 - Quantum equivalence under duality



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • How should we interpret these results?





[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • How should we interpret these results?

• The UV divergences depend of the field representations (UV completion)!



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • How should we interpret these results?

- The UV divergences depend of the field representations (UV completion)!
- Better to look at renormalization scale: $\log(\mu^2)$



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • How should we interpret these results?

- The UV divergences depend of the field representations (UV completion)!
- Better to look at renormalization scale: $\log(\mu^2)$
 - For all of the theories that we considered, we find

$$\mathcal{M}^{(2)}(1^+, 2^+, 3^+, 4^+)\big|_{\text{finite }\log(\mu^2)} = -\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^6 \frac{i}{(4\pi)^4} \left(\frac{N_s}{8}\right) \log\left(\mu^2\right) stu \,\mathcal{T}^2$$

where $N_s = \#$ of states in the theory



[Bern, Cheung, Chi, Davies, Dixon, JN (to appear)] • How should we interpret these results?

- The UV divergences depend of the field representations (UV completion)!
- Better to look at renormalization scale: $\log(\mu^2)$
 - For all of the theories that we considered, we find

$$\mathcal{M}^{(2)}(1^+, 2^+, 3^+, 4^+)\big|_{\text{finite }\log(\mu^2)} = -\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^6 \frac{i}{(4\pi)^4} \left(\frac{N_s}{8}\right) \log\left(\mu^2\right) stu \,\mathcal{T}^2$$

where $N_s = \#$ of states in the theory

- Another angle of attack:
 - Two-loop integrands in *D*-dimensions with formal polarization



UCLA Physics | Amplitudes

BCJ at Two Loops



[Bern, Davies, JN (to appear)]

• Constructed Yang-Mills numerators at two loops that obey kinematic Jacobi identities on the spanning set of cuts







3

p

[Bern, Davies, JN (to appear)]

• Constructed Yang-Mills numerators at two loops that obey kinematic Jacobi identities on the spanning set of cuts





- Also, demanded symmetry constraints of the diagrams
- *D*-dimensional, formal polarization

3

p

[Bern, Davies, JN (to appear)]

• Constructed Yang-Mills numerators at two loops that obey kinematic Jacobi identities on the spanning set of cuts





- Also, demanded symmetry constraints of the diagrams
- *D*-dimensional, formal polarization
- Construction did not work when we demanded kinematic Jacobi identities to hold "globally" — off of the cuts

p

[Bern, Davies, JN (to appear)]

• Constructed Yang-Mills numerators at two loops that obey kinematic Jacobi identities on the spanning set of cuts





- Also, demanded symmetry constraints of the diagrams
- *D*-dimensional, formal polarization
- Construction did not work when we demanded kinematic Jacobi identities to hold "globally" — off of the cuts
- Square numerators to get GDA theory numerators

$$\mathcal{A}_m^{L ext{-loop}} = i^L g^{m-2+2L} \sum_{\mathcal{S}_m} \sum_j \int \prod_{l=1}^L rac{d^D p_l}{(2\pi)^D} \sum_{j=1}^L rac{c_j n_j}{\prod_{lpha_j} n_j}$$

 $\mathcal{M}_{m}^{L ext{-loop}}=i^{L+1}\left(rac{\kappa}{2}
ight)^{m-2+2L}\sum\sum$



p

Conclusions

• Reproduced Goroff & Sagnotti two-loop divergence



Conclusions

- Reproduced Goroff & Sagnotti two-loop divergence
- Evanescent operators play a nontrivial role
Conclusions

- Reproduced Goroff & Sagnotti two-loop divergence
- Evanescent operators play a nontrivial role
- Field representation choices alter UV divergence, but better to look at $log(\mu^2)$ terms

Conclusions

- Reproduced Goroff & Sagnotti two-loop divergence
- Evanescent operators play a nontrivial role
- Field representation choices alter UV divergence, but better to look at $log(\mu^2)$ terms
- Future work:
 - Perform two-loop calculation using formal polarization vectors
 - Closer to Goroff & Sagnotti, avoids FDH scheme and more helicity configurations
 - Already found BCJ numerators for GDA theory

