4 Unsubtractions at NNLO

Authors: J. Jesús Aguilera-Verdugo, Félix Driencourt-Mangin, Judith Plenter, Selomit Ramírez-Uribe, Germán Rodrigo, Germán F. R. Sborlini, William J. Torres Bobadilla, Szymon Tracz
Corresponding Author: Germán Rodrigo [german.rodrigo@csic.es]

4.1   Introduction

Computations in perturbative Quantum Field Theory (pQFT) feature several aspects which, although intrinsically non-physical, are traditionally successfully eluded by modifying the dimensions of the space-time. Closed loops in pQFT implicitly extrapolate the validity of the Standard Model (SM) to infinite energies – equivalent to zero distance–, much above the Planck scale. We should expect this to be a legitimate procedure if the loop scattering amplitudes that contribute to the physical observables are either suppressed at very high energies, or if there is a way to suppress / renormalise their contribution in this limit. In gauge theories like QCD, massless particles can be emitted with zero energy, and pQFT treats the quantum state with N external partons as different from the quantum state with emission of extra massless particles at zero energy, while these two states are physically identical. In addition, partons can be emitted in exactly the same direction, or in other words at zero distance. All these unphysical features have a price and lead to the emergence of infinities in the four dimensions of the space-time.

In Dimensional Regularization (DREG) [1–5], the infinities are replaced by explicit poles in $1/\varepsilon$, with $d = 4 - 2\varepsilon$, through integration of the loop momenta and the phase-space of real radiation. Then, the $1/\varepsilon$ ultraviolet (UV) singularities of the virtual contributions are removed by renormalisation, and the infrared (IR) soft and collinear singularities are subtracted. The general idea of subtraction [6–18] consists of introducing counter-terms which mimic the local IR behaviour of the real components and that can easily be integrated analytically in d-dimensions. In this way, the integrated form is combined with the virtual component whilst the unintegrated counter-term cancels the IR poles originated from the phase-space integration of the real-radiation contribution.

Although this procedure efficiently transforms the theory into a calculable and well-defined mathematical framework, a big effort needs to be invested in evaluating loop and phase-space integrals in arbitrary space-time dimensions, which are particularly difficult at higher perturbative orders. In view of the highly challenging demands imposed by the expected accuracy attainable at the LHC and future colliders, like the FCC, there has been a recent interest in the community to define perturbative methods directly in $d = 4$ space-time dimensions in order to avoid the complexity of working in a non-physical multidimensional space [19]. Examples of those methods are the four-dimensional formulation (FDF) [20] of the four-dimensional helicity scheme, the six-dimensional formalism (SDF) [21], implicit regularisation (IREG) [22,23], and four-dimensional regularisation / renormalisation (FDR) [24,25] *. In this section, we review the four-dimensional unsubtraction (FDU) [26–28] method, which is based on the loop-tree duality (LTD) [29–36]. The idea behind FDU is to exploit a suitable mapping of momenta between the virtual and real kinematics in such a way that the summation over the degenerate soft and collinear quantum states is performed locally at integrand level without the necessity to introduce IR subtractions, whereas the UV singularities are locally suppressed at very high

---

*R. Pittau, see Section 3

energies, e.g. at two loops [35]. The method should improve the efficiency of Monte Carlo event generators because it simultaneously describes real and virtual contributions.

Finally, LTD is also a powerful framework to analyse the singular structure of scattering amplitudes directly in the loop momentum space, which is particularly interesting to charaterise unitarity thresholds and anomalous thresholds for specific kinematical configurations [36].

4.2 The Loop-Tree Duality

The LTD representation of a one-loop scattering amplitude is given by

$$\mathcal{A}^{(1)}(\{p_n\}_N) = -\int_\ell \mathcal{N}(\ell, \{p_n\}_N) \otimes G_D(\alpha) , \qquad (4.93)$$

where $G_D(\alpha) = \sum_{i\in\alpha} \tilde{\delta}(q_i) \prod_{j\neq i} G_D(q_i; q_j)$, and $\mathcal{N}(\ell, \{p_n\}_N)$ the numerator of the integrand, which depends on the loop momentum ℓ and the external momenta $\{p_n\}_N$. The delta function $\tilde{\delta}(q_i) = \imath 2\pi\, \theta(q_{i,0})\, \delta(q_i^2 - m_i^2)$ sets on-shell the internal propagator with momentum $q_i = \ell + k_i$ and selects its positive energy mode, $q_{i,0} > 0$. At one-loop, $\alpha = \{1, \cdots, N\}$ labels all the internal momenta, and Eq.(4.93) is the sum of N single-cut dual amplitudes. The dual propagators,

$$G_D(q_i; q_j) = \frac{1}{q_j^2 - m_j^2 - \imath 0\, \eta \cdot k_{ji}} , \qquad (4.94)$$

differ from the usual Feynman propagators only by the imaginary prescription that now depends on $\eta \cdot k_{ji}$, with $k_{ji} = q_j - q_i$. The dual propagators are implicitly linear in the loop momentum due to the on-shell conditions. With $\eta = (1, \mathbf{0})$, which is equivalent to integrating out the energy component of the loop momentum, the remaining integration domain is Euclidean.

At two-loops the corresponding dual representation is [31, 35]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{A}^{(2)}(\{p_n\}_N) &= \int_{\ell_1}\int_{\ell_2} \mathcal{N}(\ell_1, \ell_2, \{p_n\}_N) \otimes [G_D(\alpha_1)\, G_D(\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_3) + G_D(-\alpha_2 \cup \alpha_1) G_D(\alpha_3) \\
&\quad - G_D(\alpha_1)\, G_F(\alpha_2)\, G_D(\alpha_3)] .
\end{aligned} \qquad (4.95)$$

Now, the internal momenta are $q_i = \ell_1 + k_i$, $q_j = \ell_2 + k_j$ and $q_k = \ell_1 + \ell_2 + k_k$, and are classified into three different sets, with $i \in \alpha_1$, $j \in \alpha_2$ and $k \in \alpha_3$ (see Fig. C.4). The minus sign in front of α_2 indicates that the momenta in α_2 are reversed to hold a momentum flow consistent with α_1. The dual representation in Eq. (4.95) spans over the sum of all possible double-cut contributions, with each of the two cuts belonging to a different set. In general, at higher orders, LTD transforms any loop integral or loop scattering amplitude into a sum of tree-level like objects that are constructed by setting on-shell a number of internal loop propagators equal to the number of loops.

Explicit LTD representations of the scattering amplitude describing the decay $H \to \gamma\gamma$ have been presented at one- [34] and two-loops [35].

4.3 Four-Dimensional Unsubtraction

It is interesting to note that although in Eqs. (4.93) and (4.95) the on-shell loop three-momenta are unrestricted, all the IR and physical threshold singularities of the dual amplitudes are restricted to a compact region [32, 36], as discussed in Section 4.4. This is essential to define the Four-Dimensional Unsubtraction (FDU) [26–28] algorithm, namely, to establish a mapping

Fig. C.4: Momentum flow of a two-loop Feynman diagram.

between the real and virtual kinematics in order to locally cancel the IR singularities without the need for subtraction counter-terms.

In the FDU approach, the cross-section at next-to-leading order (NLO) is constructed, as usual, from the renormalised one-loop virtual correction with N external partons and the exclusive real cross-section with $N + 1$ partons

$$\sigma^{\text{NLO}} = \int_N d\sigma_V^{(1,\text{R})} + \int_{N+1} d\sigma_R^{(1)} \ , \tag{4.96}$$

integrated over the corresponding phase-space, $\int_N$ and $\int_{N+1}$. The virtual contribution is obtained from its LTD representation

$$\int_N d\sigma_V^{(1,\text{R})} = \int_{(N,\vec{\ell})} 2\,\text{Re}\,\langle \mathcal{M}_N^{(0)}| \left(\sum_i \mathcal{M}_N^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_i)) \right) - \mathcal{M}_{\text{UV}}^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_{\text{UV}}))\rangle\, \hat{\mathcal{O}}(\{p_n\}_N) \ , \tag{4.97}$$

where $\mathcal{M}_N^{(0)}$ is the N-leg scattering amplitude at leading order (LO), and $\mathcal{M}_N^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_i))$ is the dual representation of the unrenormalised one-loop scattering amplitude with the internal momentum q_i set on-shell. The integral is weighted with the explicit observable function $\hat{\mathcal{O}}(\{p_n\}_N)$. The expression includes appropriate counter-terms, $\mathcal{M}_{\text{UV}}^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_{\text{UV}}))$, that implement renormalisation by subtracting the UV singularities locally, as discussed in Ref. [27, 28], including UV singularities of degree higher than logarithmic that integrate to zero.

By means of an appropriate mapping between the real and virtual kinematics [27, 28]:

$$\{p_r'\}_{N+1} \to (q_i, \{p_n\}_N) \ , \tag{4.98}$$

the real phase-space is rewritten in terms of the virtual phase-space and the loop three-momentum

$$\int_{N+1} = \int_{(N,\vec{\ell})} \sum_i \mathcal{J}_i(q_i)\, \mathcal{R}_i(\{p_r'\}_{N+1}) \ , \tag{4.99}$$

where $\mathcal{J}_i(q_i)$ is the Jacobian of the transformation with q_i on-shell, and $\mathcal{R}_i(\{p_j'\}_{N+1})$ defines a complete partition of the real phase-space

$$\sum_i \mathcal{R}_i(\{p_r'\}_{N+1}) = 1 \ . \tag{4.100}$$

J. J. Aguilera-Verdugo, F. Driencourt-Mangin, J. Plenter, S. Ramírez-Uribe, G. Rodrigo, G. F. R. Sborlini, W. J. Torres Bobadilla, S. Tracz

As the result, the NLO cross-section is cast into a single integral in the Born/virtual phase-space and the loop three-momentum

$$
\begin{aligned}
\sigma^{\text{NLO}} &= \int_{(N, \vec{\ell})} \left[2 \operatorname{Re} \langle \mathcal{M}_N^{(0)} | \left(\sum_i \mathcal{M}_N^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_i)) \right) - \mathcal{M}_{\text{UV}}^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_{\text{UV}})) \rangle \, \hat{\mathcal{O}}(\{p_n\}_N) \right. \\
&\quad + \left. \sum_i \mathcal{J}_i(q_i) \, \mathcal{R}_i(\{p_r'\}_{N+1}) \, |\mathcal{M}_{N+1}^{(0)}(\{p_r'\}_{N+1})|^2 \, \hat{\mathcal{O}}(\{p_r'\}_{N+1}) \right] ,
\end{aligned} \tag{4.101}
$$

and exhibits a smooth four-dimensional limit in such a way that it can be evaluated directly in four space-time dimensions. Explicit computations have been presented in Refs. [27, 28] with both massless and massive final-state quarks. More important, with suitable mappings in Eq. (4.98) conveniently describing the quasi-collinear configurations also the transition from the massive [28] to the massless configuration [27] is smooth.

The extension of FDU to next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO) is obvious, the total cross-section consists of three contributions

$$
\sigma^{\text{NNLO}} = \int_N d\sigma_{\text{VV}}^{(2,\text{R})} + \int_{N+1} d\sigma_{\text{VR}}^{(2,\text{R})} + \int_{N+2} d\sigma_{\text{RR}}^{(2)} , \tag{4.102}
$$

where the double virtual cross-section $d\sigma_{\text{VV}}^{(2,\text{R})}$ receives contributions from the interference of the two-loop with the Born scattering amplitudes, and the square of the one-loop scattering amplitude with N external partons, the virtual-real cross-section $d\sigma_{\text{VR}}^{(2,\text{R})}$ includes the contributions from the interference of one-loop and tree-level scattering amplitudes with one extra external particle, and the double real cross-section $d\sigma_{\text{RR}}^{(2)}$ are tree-level contributions with emission of two extra particles. The LTD representation of the two-loop scattering amplitude, $\langle \mathcal{M}_N^{(0)} | \mathcal{M}_N^{(2)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_i, q_j)) \rangle$, is obtained from Eq. (4.95), while the two loop momenta of the squared one-loop amplitude are independent and generate dual contributions of the type $\langle \mathcal{M}_N^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_i)) | \mathcal{M}_N^{(1)}(\tilde{\delta}(q_j)) \rangle$. In both cases, there are two independent loop three-momenta and N external momenta, with which to reconstruct the kinematics of the tree-level corrections entering $d\sigma_{\text{RR}}^{(2)}$ and the one-loop corrections in $d\sigma_{\text{VR}}^{(2,\text{R})}$:

$$
\{p_r''\}_{N+2} \to (q_i, q_j, \{p_n\}_N) , \qquad (q_k', \{p_s'\}_{N+1}) \to (q_i, q_j, \{p_n\}_N) , \tag{4.103}
$$

in such a way that all the contributions to the NNLO cross-section are cast into a single phase-space integral

$$
\sigma^{\text{NNLO}} = \int_{(N, \vec{\ell}_1, \vec{\ell}_2)} d\sigma^{\text{NNLO}} . \tag{4.104}
$$

Explicit applications of FDU at NNLO are currently under investigation.

4.4 Unitarity Thresholds and Anomalous Thresholds

An essential feature for FDU to work is to proof that all the IR singularities of the dual amplitudes are restricted to a compact region of the loop three-momenta. This has recently been proven at higher orders in Ref. [36], thus extending the one-loop analysis of Ref. [32], and also analysing the case of anomalous thresholds. The location of the singularities of the dual amplitudes in the loop three-momentum space are encoded at one-loop through the set of conditions

$$
\lambda_{ij}^{\pm\pm} = \pm q_{i,0}^{(+)} \pm q_{j,0}^{(+)} + k_{ji,0} \to 0 . \tag{4.105}
$$

where $q_{r,0}^{(+)} = \sqrt{\vec{q_r}^2 + m_r^2}$, with $r \in \{i, j\}$, are the on-shell loop energies. There are indeed only two independent solutions. The limit $\lambda_{ij}^{++} \to 0$ describes the causal unitarity threshold, and determines that $q_{r,0}^{(+)} < |k_{ji,0}|$, where $k_{ji,0}$ depends on the external momenta only and is therefore bounded. For massless partons, it also describes soft and collinear singularities. The other potential singularity occurs for $\lambda_{ij}^{+-} \to 0$, but this is a non-causal or unphysical threshold and it cancels locally in the forest defined by the sum of all the on-shell dual contributions. For this to happen, the dual prescription of the dual propagators plays a central role. Finally, anomalous thresholds are determined by overlapping causal unitarity thresholds, e.g. λ_{ij}^{++} and $\lambda_{ik}^{++} \to 0$ simultaneously.

At two loops, the location of the singularities is determined by the set of conditions

$$\lambda_{ijk}^{\pm\pm\pm} = \pm q_{i,0}^{(+)} \pm q_{j,0}^{(+)} \pm q_{k,0}^{(+)} + k_{k(ij),0} \to 0 \ , \tag{4.106}$$

where $k_{k(ij)} = q_k - q_i - q_j$ depends on external momenta only, with $i \in \alpha_1$, $j \in \alpha_2$ and $k \in \alpha_3$. Now, the unitarity threshold is defined by the limit $\lambda_{ijk}^{+++} \to 0$ (or $\lambda_{ijk}^{---} \to 0$) with $q_{r,0}^{(+)} \leq |k_{k(ij),0}|$ and $r \in \{i, j, k\}$, and the potential singularities at $\lambda_{ijk}^{++-} \to 0$ and $\lambda_{ijk}^{+--} \to 0$ cancel locally in the forest of all the dual contributions. Again, the anomalous thresholds are determined by the simultaneous contribution of unitarity thresholds. The generalization of Eq. (4.106) to higher orders is straitforward.

4.5   Conclusions

The bottleneck in higher order perturbative calculations is not only the evaluation of multiloop Feynman diagrams, but also the gathering of all the quantum corrections from different loop orders (and thus different number of final-state partons). In order to match the expected experimental accuracy at the LHC, particularly in the high luminosity phase, and at future colliders new theoretical efforts are still needed to overcome the current precision frontier. LTD is also a powerful framework to analyse comprehensively the emergence of anomalous thresholds at higher orders.

References

[1] C. G. Bollini, J. J. Giambiagi, Dimensional Renormalization: The Number of Dimensions as a Regularizing Parameter, Nuovo Cim. B12 (1972) 20–26. doi:10.1007/BF02895558.

[2] G. 't Hooft, M. J. G. Veltman, Regularization and Renormalization of Gauge Fields, Nucl. Phys. B44 (1972) 189–213. doi:10.1016/0550-3213(72)90279-9.

[3] G. M. Cicuta, E. Montaldi, Analytic renormalization via continuous space dimension, Lett. Nuovo Cim. 4 (1972) 329–332. doi:10.1007/BF02756527.

[4] J. F. Ashmore, A Method of Gauge Invariant Regularization, Lett. Nuovo Cim. 4 (1972) 289–290. doi:10.1007/BF02824407.

[5] K. G. Wilson, Quantum field theory models in less than four-dimensions, Phys. Rev. D7 (1973) 2911–2926. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.7.2911.

[6] Z. Kunszt, D. E. Soper, Calculation of jet cross-sections in hadron collisions at order α_s^3, Phys. Rev. D46 (1992) 192–221. doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.46.192.

[7] S. Frixione, Z. Kunszt, A. Signer, Three jet cross-sections to next-to-leading order, Nucl. Phys. B467 (1996) 399–442. arXiv:hep-ph/9512328, doi:10.1016/0550-3213(96)00110-1.

J. J. Aguilera-Verdugo, F. Driencourt-Mangin, J. Plenter, S. Ramírez-Uribe, G. Rodrigo,
G. F. R. Sborlini, W. J. Torres Bobadilla, S. Tracz

[8] S. Catani, M. H. Seymour, The Dipole formalism for the calculation of QCD jet cross-sections at next-to-leading order, Phys. Lett. B378 (1996) 287–301. `arXiv:hep-ph/9602277`, `doi:10.1016/0370-2693(96)00425-X`.

[9] S. Catani, M. H. Seymour, A General algorithm for calculating jet cross-sections in NLO QCD, Nucl. Phys. B485 (1997) 291–419, [Erratum: Nucl. Phys.B510,503(1998)]. `arXiv:hep-ph/9605323`, `doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(96)00589-5, 10.1016/S0550-3213(98)81022-5`.

[10] A. Gehrmann-De Ridder, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, Antenna subtraction at NNLO, JHEP 09 (2005) 056. `arXiv:hep-ph/0505111`, `doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2005/09/056`.

[11] S. Catani, M. Grazzini, An NNLO subtraction formalism in hadron collisions and its application to Higgs boson production at the LHC, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98 (2007) 222002. `arXiv:hep-ph/0703012`, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.98.222002`.

[12] M. Czakon, A novel subtraction scheme for double-real radiation at NNLO, Phys. Lett. B693 (2010) 259–268. `arXiv:1005.0274`, `doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.08.036`.

[13] P. Bolzoni, G. Somogyi, Z. Trocsanyi, A subtraction scheme for computing QCD jet cross sections at NNLO: integrating the iterated singly-unresolved subtraction terms, JHEP 01 (2011) 059. `arXiv:1011.1909`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2011)059`.

[14] R. Boughezal, C. Focke, X. Liu, F. Petriello, W-boson production in association with a jet at next-to-next-to-leading order in perturbative QCD, Phys. Rev. Lett. 115 (6) (2015) 062002. `arXiv:1504.02131`, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.062002`.

[15] J. Gaunt, M. Stahlhofen, F. J. Tackmann, J. R. Walsh, N-jettiness Subtractions for NNLO QCD Calculations, JHEP 09 (2015) 058. `arXiv:1505.04794`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2015)058`.

[16] V. Del Duca, C. Duhr, A. Kardos, G. Somogyi, Z. Szor, Z. Trocsanyi, Z. Tulipant, Jet production in the CoLoRFulNNLO method: event shapes in electron-positron collisions, Phys. Rev. D94 (7) (2016) 074019. `arXiv:1606.03453`, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.074019`.

[17] F. Caola, K. Melnikov, R. Röntsch, Nested soft-collinear subtractions in NNLO QCD computations, Eur. Phys. J. C77 (4) (2017) 248. `arXiv:1702.01352`, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4774-0`.

[18] L. Magnea, E. Maina, G. Pelliccioli, C. Signorile-Signorile, P. Torrielli, S. Uccirati, Local Analytic Sector Subtraction at NNLO, JHEP 12 (2018) 107. `arXiv:1806.09570`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2018)107`.

[19] C. Gnendiger, et al., To d, or not to d: recent developments and comparisons of regularization schemes, Eur. Phys. J. C77 (7) (2017) 471. `arXiv:1705.01827`, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5023-2`.

[20] R. A. Fazio, P. Mastrolia, E. Mirabella, W. J. Torres Bobadilla, On the Four-Dimensional Formulation of Dimensionally Regulated Amplitudes, Eur. Phys. J. C74 (12) (2014) 3197. `arXiv:1404.4783`, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-3197-4`.

[21] Z. Bern, A. De Freitas, L. J. Dixon, H. L. Wong, Supersymmetric regularization, two loop QCD amplitudes and coupling shifts, Phys. Rev. D66 (2002) 085002. `arXiv:hep-ph/0202271`, `doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.085002`.

[22] O. A. Battistel, A. L. Mota, M. C. Nemes, Consistency conditions for 4-D regularizations, Mod. Phys. Lett. A13 (1998) 1597–1610. `doi:10.1142/S0217732398001686`.

[23] H. G. Fargnoli, A. P. Baeta Scarpelli, L. C. T. Brito, B. Hiller, M. Sampaio, M. C. Nemes, A. A. Osipov, Ultraviolet and Infrared Divergences in Implicit Regularization: A

Consistent Approach, Mod. Phys. Lett. A26 (2011) 289–302. `arXiv:1001.1543`, `doi: 10.1142/S0217732311034773`.

[24] A. M. Donati, R. Pittau, FDR, an easier way to NNLO calculations: a two-loop case study, Eur. Phys. J. C74 (2014) 2864. `arXiv:1311.3551`, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-014-2864-9`.

[25] B. Page, R. Pittau, NNLO final-state quark-pair corrections in four dimensions, Eur. Phys. J. C79 (4) (2019) 361. `arXiv:1810.00234`, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-019-6865-6`.

[26] R. J. Hernández-Pinto, G. F. R. Sborlini, G. Rodrigo, Towards gauge theories in four dimensions, JHEP 02 (2016) 044. `arXiv:1506.04617`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2016)044`.

[27] G. F. R. Sborlini, F. Driencourt-Mangin, R. Hernández-Pinto, G. Rodrigo, Four-dimensional unsubtraction from the loop-tree duality, JHEP 08 (2016) 160. `arXiv:1604.06699`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2016)160`.

[28] G. F. R. Sborlini, F. Driencourt-Mangin, G. Rodrigo, Four-dimensional unsubtraction with massive particles, JHEP 10 (2016) 162. `arXiv:1608.01584`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2016)162`.

[29] S. Catani, T. Gleisberg, F. Krauss, G. Rodrigo, J.-C. Winter, From loops to trees by-passing Feynman's theorem, JHEP 09 (2008) 065. `arXiv:0804.3170`, `doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/09/065`.

[30] I. Bierenbaum, S. Catani, P. Draggiotis, G. Rodrigo, A Tree-Loop Duality Relation at Two Loops and Beyond, JHEP 10 (2010) 073. `arXiv:1007.0194`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2010)073`.

[31] I. Bierenbaum, S. Buchta, P. Draggiotis, I. Malamos, G. Rodrigo, Tree-Loop Duality Relation beyond simple poles, JHEP 03 (2013) 025. `arXiv:1211.5048`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2013)025`.

[32] S. Buchta, G. Chachamis, P. Draggiotis, I. Malamos, G. Rodrigo, On the singular behaviour of scattering amplitudes in quantum field theory, JHEP 11 (2014) 014. `arXiv:1405.7850`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2014)014`.

[33] S. Buchta, G. Chachamis, P. Draggiotis, G. Rodrigo, Numerical implementation of the loop–tree duality method, Eur. Phys. J. C77 (5) (2017) 274. `arXiv:1510.00187`, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4833-6`.

[34] F. Driencourt-Mangin, G. Rodrigo, G. F. R. Sborlini, Universal dual amplitudes and asymptotic expansions for $gg \to H$ and $H \to \gamma\gamma$ in four dimensions, Eur. Phys. J. C78 (3) (2018) 231. `arXiv:1702.07581`, `doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5692-5`.

[35] F. Driencourt-Mangin, G. Rodrigo, G. F. R. Sborlini, W. J. Torres Bobadilla, Universal four-dimensional representation of $H \to \gamma\gamma$ at two loops through the Loop-Tree Duality, JHEP 02 (2019) 143. `arXiv:1901.09853`, `doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2019)143`.

[36] J. J. Aguilera-Verdugo, F. Driencourt-Mangin, J. Plenter, S. Ramírez-Uribe, G. Rodrigo, G. F. R. Sborlini, W. J. Torres Bobadilla, S. Tracz, Causality, unitarity thresholds, anomalous thresholds and infrared singularities from the loop-tree duality at higher orders`arXiv:1904.08389`.