

Infrared Finite Observables in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity

L. V. Bork^a, D. I. Kazakov^{a,b}, G. S. Vartanov^c, and A. V. Zhiboedov^{d,e}

Received June 2010

Abstract—Using the algorithm of constructing the IR finite observables discussed in detail in our earlier papers, we study the construction of such observables in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity in the first nontrivial order of perturbation theory. In general, contrary to the amplitudes defined in the presence of some IR regulator, such observables do not reveal any “simple” structure.

DOI: 10.1134/S0081543811010056

1. INTRODUCTION

In the last decade remarkable progress in understanding the structure of the amplitudes in supersymmetric gauge theories has been achieved [1]. Due to the development of the so-called unitarity cut technique [2, 3], the three- and four-loop results for the four-point amplitudes became available for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ super Yang–Mills theory (SYM) [4, 5]. The application of the same technique in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supergravity (SUGRA), commenced in [6–8], made it possible to compute the three- [9] and four-loop [10] four-point amplitudes in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA. We want to stress that obtaining such results with the standard diagram technique (component or superspace) seems practically impossible due to extreme complexity of such computations.

These results initiated once again the discussion of possible ultraviolet (UV) finiteness of the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA [11] and motivated the search for possible constraints on the UV divergences in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA from various points of view [12–15] and for the presence of the symmetry group $E_{7(7)}$ in the theory [16–18].

The answers that can be obtained for the amplitudes from the unitarity cut technique are usually represented as a sum of the master scalar integrals, defined in D dimensions with fixed coefficients. This provides the possibility to analyze the dependence (UV behavior) of the amplitudes on the dimensionality of space–time D . Such an analysis up to four loops for the four-point amplitudes in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA revealed the same UV behavior of the amplitudes as in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM. This result, as claimed by the authors of [11, 19], does not follow from the properties of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ supersymmetry and cannot be obtained, at least in some obvious way, from the previous analysis based on different versions of superspace technique (see, however, [20]). This makes it possible, once again, to suggest that $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA amplitudes (the S -matrix) are [11, 19] UV finite as in the case of $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM.

The expressions obtained by means of the unitarity cut technique in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM and $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA usually have a very “simple” form. This, and possible UV finiteness of the $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA, allows one to make a conjecture that the amplitudes (the S -matrix) in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA are the “simplest” among all $D = 4$ dimensional QFTs with maximum spin ≤ 2 [21].

^a Institute for Theoretical and Experimental Physics, B. Cheremushkinskaya ul. 25, Moscow, 117218 Russia.

^b Bogoliubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics, Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna, Moscow region, 141980 Russia.

^c Max-Planck-Institut für Gravitationsphysik, Albert-Einstein-Institut, 14476 Golm, Germany.

^d Faculty of Physics, Moscow State University, Moscow, 119991 Russia.

^e Department of Physics, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544, USA.

E-mail addresses: BorkLeonid@yandex.ru (L.V. Bork), KazakovD@theor.jinr.ru (D.I. Kazakov), Vartanov@aei.mpg.de (G.S. Vartanov).

However, despite the compact and simple form and the UV finiteness, the amplitudes in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA (as in any $D = 4$ dimensional QFT with massless fields) are still, strictly speaking, ill-defined in $D = 4$ (without some infrared (IR) regulator) due to the presence of the IR divergences.

In the case of Yang–Mills (YM) theories (and QCD) in such cases the objects of physical interest are not the amplitudes themselves but the so-called IR finite observables which are built from the amplitudes but possess no dependence on the IR regulator. In [22, 23] the authors suggested an example of such observables for $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM. In contrast to relatively simple answers for several first orders of perturbation theory (PT) for the four- and five-point amplitudes [24], the IR finite observables considered in [22, 23] in the first nontrivial order (NLO) of PT has no simple structure and resemble the complicated (prior to properly applied simplifications) expressions for the six-point amplitudes in the second order of PT [25, 26].

It seems natural to consider the similar IR finite observables in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA. It is this kind of observable that has a clear physical meaning. In the current article we discuss the construction of such observables in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA.

2. INCLUSIVE CROSS SECTIONS AS IR FINITE OBSERVABLES

An example of IR finite observables is given by properly constructed perturbative inclusive cross sections. Such observables naturally appear in the parton model of perturbative QCD [27–31], and their construction is based on the Kinoshita–Lee–Nauenberg theorem [32, 33]. In such inclusive cross sections, if the dimensional regularization is used, the IR divergences appear as $1/\epsilon$ poles. Cancellation of this infrared divergences coming from the loops includes two main ingredients: emission of additional soft real quanta and redefinition of the asymptotic states resulting in the splitting terms governed by the Altarelli–Parisi kernels. The latter take care of the collinear divergences and are absorbed into the probability distributions of initial and final particles over the fraction of momenta $q(z)$. The appearance of such distributions can be heuristically understood in the following fashion: in massless QFT a particle with momentum p is indistinguishable from the jet of particles with the same overall momentum and quantum numbers flying parallel. In the first nontrivial order of PT in dimensional regularization the momentum distribution $q(z)$ can be represented as

$$q_i\left(z, \frac{Q_f^2}{\mu^2}\right) = \delta(1-z) + \frac{g^2}{2\pi\epsilon} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{Q_f^2}\right)^{\epsilon} \sum_j P_{ij}(z) + O(g^4), \quad (1)$$

where $P_{ij}(z)$ are the so-called splitting functions, which define the probability that the particle i emits the collinear particle j with a fraction of momentum z . Here g is the coupling constant and μ is the mass parameter of dimensional regularization; Q_f is usually called the factorization scale and can be interpreted as the width of a jet of collinear particles. The contributions from $P_{ij}(z)$ to the cross section are sometimes called the collinear counterterms.

Schematically, the class of IR finite observables discussed above, which are the inclusive cross-sections, can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} d\sigma_{\text{obs}}^{\text{incl}} &= \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \int_0^1 dz_1 q_1\left(z_1, \frac{Q_f^2}{\mu^2}\right) \int_0^1 dz_2 q_2\left(z_2, \frac{Q_f^2}{\mu^2}\right) \prod_{i=1}^n \int_0^1 dx_i q_i\left(x_i, \frac{Q_f^2}{\mu^2}\right) d\sigma^{2 \rightarrow n}(z_1 p_1, z_2 p_2, \dots) S_n(\{z\}, \{x\}) \\ &= g^4 \sum_{L=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{g^2}{16\pi^2}\right)^L d\sigma_L^{\text{fin}}(s, t, u, Q_f^2), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $S_n(\{z\}, \{x\})$ is the so-called measurement function, which defines what inclusive cross section (total, differential distribution, etc.) is considered.

3. COMPUTATION OF INCLUSIVE CROSS SECTION IN $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA

Our aim is to evaluate the inclusive differential polarized cross section in NLO in the weak coupling limit in planar $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA in an analytical form and to trace the cancellation of the IR divergences.

Consider first the cross-section of 2×2 graviton scattering with polarizations $(++, ++)$ in the Born approximation $d\sigma(g^+g^+ \rightarrow g^+g^+)/d\Omega$. We distinguish here between the incoming and outgoing particles. If one takes all the particles to be outgoing, then this process corresponds to the spiral configuration $(--, ++)$. In what follows we will use the notation in which all the particles are outgoing. Then the differential cross-section can be written as

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}}\right)_0^{(-++)} = \frac{1}{E^2} \int d\phi_2 |\mathcal{M}_4^{\text{tree}}|^2 \mathcal{S}_2, \quad (3)$$

where $d\phi_2$ is the two-particle phase space, \mathcal{S}_n is the measurement function which in this case has the form

$$\mathcal{S}_2 = \delta_{+, h_3} \delta^{D-2}(\Omega - \Omega_{13}),$$

$d\Omega_{13} = d\phi_{13} d\cos\theta_{13}$, θ_{13} being the scattering angle for a particle with momentum p_3 with respect to the one with momentum p_1 in the center of mass (CM) frame, and δ_{+, h_3} reflects the positive helicity of the particle with momentum p_3 .

Then all the tree amplitudes with helicity configurations $(+\dots+)$ or $(-\dots+)$ are identically zero. The first nonzero tree level graviton amplitudes, similar to the YM case, are those with helicity configurations $(--+\dots+)$. They are called the maximal helicity violating (MHV) (or anti-MHV in the case $(++-\dots-)$) amplitudes. We restrict ourselves in our consideration to the class of MHV amplitudes (the MHV channel) only. The anti-MHV channel can be considered in a similar fashion. Note, however, that such a restriction is possible only in the leading order. In higher orders of PT, in order to achieve the IR finiteness, one in general has to consider all types of the amplitudes since they are mixed.

Consider the process of 2×2 graviton scattering where all incoming and all outgoing gravitons have positive helicity. This amplitude is both MHV and anti-MHV. So one has to take it with the weight $1/2$ for considering the MHV channel only.

The tree amplitude under consideration written in helicity spinor formalism [34] has the form

$$\mathcal{M}_4^{\text{tree}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+) = (16\pi G_N) i \langle 1 2 \rangle^8 \frac{[1|2]}{\langle 3|4 \rangle N(4)}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$N(n) \equiv \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \prod_{j=i+1}^n \langle i j \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Here the notation, now standard, for the spinor inner product has been used:

$$\epsilon^{ab} \lambda_a^{(i)} \lambda_b^{(j)} = \langle \lambda^{(i)} \lambda^{(j)} \rangle \doteq \langle ij \rangle, \quad \epsilon^{\dot{a}\dot{b}} \bar{\lambda}_{\dot{a}}^{(i)} \bar{\lambda}_{\dot{b}}^{(j)} = [\bar{\lambda}^{(i)} \bar{\lambda}^{(j)}] \doteq [ij]. \quad (6)$$

Under the complex conjugation one has $(\langle ij \rangle)^* = [ij]$, as well as $\langle ij \rangle [ij] = s_{ij}$, where $s_{ij} = (p_i + p_j)^2$.

From now on the dimensional regularization (reduction) will be used. In the CM frame the Born contribution to the cross section can then be written as

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega}\right)_0^{(-++)} = \frac{1}{E^2} \frac{\alpha_{\text{Gr}}^2 s^6}{t^2 u^2} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{s}\right)^\epsilon = \frac{(\alpha_{\text{Gr}} E^2)^2}{E^2} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{s}\right)^\epsilon \frac{16}{(1 - c^2)^2},$$

where s , t , and u are the standard Mandelstam variables, E is the total energy of initial particles in the CM frame, $c = \cos \theta_{13}$ is the cosine of the scattering angle of the third particle, μ and ϵ are the parameters of dimensional regularization, and $\alpha_{\text{Gr}} = G_N/4\pi$. In the CM frame for the Mandelstam variables one has

$$s = E^2, \quad t = -\frac{E^2}{2}(1 - c), \quad u = -\frac{E^2}{2}(1 + c).$$

3.1. Virtual contribution. Consider now the one-loop correction to the Born contribution. The corresponding amplitude has the form

$$\mathcal{M}_4^{\mathcal{N}=8}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+) = (16\pi G_N)^2 \frac{1}{4} \langle 1 2 \rangle^8 [h(1, \{2\}, 3) h(3, \{4\}, 1) \text{Tr}^2[1234] \mathcal{I}_4 + \text{Perms}], \quad (7)$$

where $\text{Tr}[i_1 i_2 i_3 i_4] \equiv \text{Tr}[\hat{k}_{i_1} \hat{k}_{i_2} \hat{k}_{i_3} \hat{k}_{i_4}]$ and

$$h(a, \{1\}, b) = \frac{1}{\langle a 1 \rangle^2 \langle 1 b \rangle^2}. \quad (8)$$

The summation is over all possible permutations, and the scalar integral \mathcal{I}_4 is equal to

$$\mathcal{I}_4(s, t) = -\frac{2}{st} \frac{\Gamma(1+\epsilon)\Gamma(1-\epsilon)^2}{\Gamma(1-2\epsilon)} \left(\frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left(\left(\frac{\mu}{s}\right)^\epsilon + \left(\frac{\mu}{-t}\right)^\epsilon \right) + \frac{1}{2} \ln^2 \frac{s}{-t} + \frac{\pi^2}{2} \right) + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon).$$

So the contribution to the cross section in the CM frame has the form

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega} \right)_{\text{virt}}^{(-+-+)} &= \frac{(\alpha_{\text{Gr}} E^2)^3}{\pi E^2} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{s} \right)^{2\epsilon} \frac{64}{(1-c^2)^2} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left((1+c) \ln \frac{1+c}{2} + (1-c) \ln \frac{1-c}{2} \right) + 2 \ln \frac{1+c}{2} \ln \frac{1-c}{2} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

It should be stressed that in this order of PT the UV divergences in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ are absent and all the divergences have the IR nature. Note also the absence of the $1/\epsilon^2$ pole, which in this case is canceled out due to permutations in (7), contrary to the gauge theories in $D = 4$ where it is usually present. As one can see from (9), despite the extremely complicated intermediate expressions appearing in diagrammatical computations, the final result for the four-point one-loop MHV graviton amplitude in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ has a relatively “simple” form.

3.2. Real emission. Following the algorithm for constructing the IR finite observables, we consider the contribution to the cross-section from amplitudes with additional particles in the final state. For the fixed helicity of initial particles one has two types of the graviton amplitudes:

1. Three gravitons in the final state with positive helicity: $g^+ g^+ \rightarrow g^+ g^+ g^+$. This is the MHV amplitude.
2. Two gravitons in the final state with positive helicity and one with negative helicity: $g^+ g^+ \rightarrow g^+ g^+ g^-$. This is the anti-MHV amplitude.

In the MHV channel only the first amplitude contributes. In this case there are three identical particles in the final state, so we have to choose which particle we are detecting. This can be achieved, for example, by arranging the particles according to their energy and selecting the “fastest” one. It would correspond to the measurement function of the form

$$\mathcal{S}_3^{(-+-+),1} = \delta_{+,h_3} \Theta(p_3^0 > p_4^0) \Theta(p_3^0 > p_5^0) \delta^{D-2}(\Omega - \Omega_{13}). \quad (10)$$

In practice it is more convenient to work with the measurement function written as [23]

$$\mathcal{S}_3(p_3, p_4, p_5) = \Theta\left(p_3^0 - \frac{1-\delta}{2}E\right)\delta^{D-2}(\Omega - \Omega_3), \quad (11)$$

where δ is an arbitrary parameter, which can be fixed, for example, from the requirement that the detected particle is the fastest one (this corresponds to $\delta = 1/3$). We will leave the value of δ arbitrary to be convinced that the cancellation of the IR divergences occurs for arbitrary δ .

The amplitude for the process $g^+ g^+ \rightarrow g^+ g^+ g^+$ can be written as

$$\mathcal{M}_5^{\text{tree}}(1^-, 2^-, 3^+, 4^+, 5^+) = (16\pi G_N)^{3/2} i \langle 1 2 \rangle^8 \frac{\varepsilon(1, 2, 3, 4)}{N(5)}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$\varepsilon(i, j, m, n) \equiv 4i\varepsilon_{\mu\nu\rho\sigma} k_i^\mu k_j^\nu k_m^\rho k_n^\sigma = [ij]\langle jm\rangle[mn]\langle ni\rangle - \langle ij\rangle[jm]\langle mn\rangle[ni]. \quad (13)$$

Then, the cross-section is

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}}\right)_{\text{real}}^{(-+-+)} = \frac{1}{E^2} \int d\phi_3 |\mathcal{M}_5|^2 \mathcal{S}_3, \quad (14)$$

where $d\phi_3$ is the three-particle phase space. After the integration one has

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}}\right)_{\text{real}}^{(-+-+)} &= \frac{(\alpha_{\text{Gr}} E^2)^3}{\pi E^2} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{s}\right)^{2\epsilon} \frac{64}{(1-c^2)^2} \\ &\times \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left((1+c) \ln \frac{1+c}{2} + (1-c) \ln \frac{1-c}{2} \right) + \text{Finite part}(\delta, c) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The finite part is a complicated polynomial function of \ln , \ln^2 and Li_2 with the argument of the form $(1 \pm c)/2$ and in general have the same structure as in [23].

3.3. Collinear counterterms. Consider now the contributions from collinear counterterms. In the MHV channel the splitting function $P_{ij}(z)$ has the form (we use here slightly different notation for the splitting functions and indicate explicitly all three particles as $P_{\text{fin}_1, \text{fin}_2}^{\text{init}}(z)$ to avoid confusion)

$$P_{g^+ g^+}^{g^-} = \left[\frac{1}{z(1-z)_+} \right]^2 = \frac{1}{z^2} + \frac{2}{z(1-z)_+} + \frac{1}{[(1-z)^2]_+}. \quad (16)$$

Here $1/[(1-z)^2]_+$ should be understood as

$$\int dz \frac{f(z)}{[(1-z)^2]_+} = \int dz \frac{f(z) - f(1) - f'(1)(z-1)}{(1-z)^2}.$$

The splitting function $P_{g^+ g^+}^{g^-}$ can be obtained as the collinear limit of the corresponding amplitude [34]. Note also that in the case of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA the probability distribution $q(z)$ does not receive radiative corrections in α_{Gr} except for the first order [7].

The contribution to the cross section from the IR counterterms can be schematically written as

$$d\sigma_{2 \rightarrow 2}^{\text{spl, init}} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{Gr}}}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{Q_f^2}\right)^\epsilon \int_0^1 dz P_{g^+ g^+}^{g^-}(z) \sum_{i,j=1,2; i \neq j} d\sigma_{2 \rightarrow 2}(zp_i, p_j, p_3, p_4) \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{spl, init}}(z), \quad (17)$$

$$d\sigma_{2 \rightarrow 2}^{\text{spl, fin}} = \frac{\alpha_{\text{Gr}}}{2\pi} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{Q_f^2}\right)^\epsilon d\sigma_{2 \rightarrow 2}(p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4) \int_0^1 dz P_{g^+ g^+}^{g^-}(z) \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{spl, fin}}(z). \quad (18)$$

The measurement function in this case has the same form as in the case of the real emission, but now depends on the fraction of momentum z and restricts the integration over z :

$$\mathcal{S}_2^{\text{spl},1}(z) = \delta_{+,h_3} \delta^{D-2}(\Omega - \Omega_{13}) \theta(z - z_{\min}), \quad (19)$$

where z_{\min} has the form

$$z_{\min}^{\text{init}} = \frac{(1-\delta)(1-c)}{1+\delta-c(1-\delta)}, \quad z_{\min}^{\text{fin}} = 1-\delta \quad (20)$$

for the splitting function of the initial and final states, respectively. These conditions can be obtained from the requirement $p_3^0 > (1-\delta)E/2$ in the appropriate kinematics.

Integration over the phase space and over the fraction of momentum z gives

$$\begin{aligned} \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}} \right)_{\text{spl,init}}^{(-+-+)} &= \frac{(\alpha_{\text{Gr}} E^2)^3}{\pi E^2} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{s} \right)^{2\epsilon} \frac{128}{(1-c^2)^2} \left[\frac{1}{\epsilon} \left(\frac{1-2\delta}{(\delta-1)\delta} - 2 \ln(1-\delta) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2 \ln \delta - (1-c) \ln \frac{1-c}{2} - (1+c) \ln \frac{1+c}{2} \right) + \text{Finite part}(\delta, c) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

$$\left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}} \right)_{\text{spl,fin}}^{(-+-+)} = \frac{(\alpha_{\text{Gr}} E^2)^3}{\pi E^2} \left(\frac{\mu^2}{s} \right)^{2\epsilon} \frac{128}{(1-c^2)^2} \frac{1}{\epsilon} \left[\frac{2\delta-1}{(\delta-1)\delta} + 2 \ln(1-\delta) - 2 \ln \delta \right]. \quad (22)$$

We do not show here the finite parts for the same reasons as above.

4. IR FINITE OBSERVABLES IN $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA

It is easy to see that the MHV part of the inclusive cross section defined in (2) as a sum of several contributions

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\text{MHV}} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}} \right)_0^{(-+-+)} + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}} \right)_{\text{virt}}^{(-+-+)} + \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}} \right)_{\text{real}}^{(-+-+)} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}} \right)_{\text{spl,init}}^{(-+-+)} + \left(\frac{d\sigma}{d\Omega_{13}} \right)_{\text{spl,fin}}^{(-+-+)} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

is IR finite, all the divergences being canceled out as expected. It should be stressed that this cancellation occurs for arbitrary δ . An analogous cancellation takes place in the anti-MHV channel. Note that A^{MHV} has no simple structure in contrast to the virtual correction to the cross-section $(d\sigma/d\Omega_{13})_0^{(-+-+)}$.

5. CONCLUSION

We have applied the algorithm for constructing IR finite observables in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ SUGRA and explicitly demonstrated the cancellation of the IR divergences in NLO of PT. One can see that such observables, in general, have no simple structure in contrast to the amplitudes defined in the presence of some IR regulator. At the same time there are no “no-go” theorems which prohibit the existence of observables reflecting the rich symmetries of maximally supersymmetric YM or gravity theories. The search for such observables seems to be an interesting challenge, if one wants to construct physically meaningful expressions which reveal the possible integrability structure of the model.

In [22, 23] a similar analysis has been performed for the $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM theory with the same conclusions. This makes us conclude that this type of observables is not optimal in the sense of

“simplicity” of the answer. It is also important to note the dependence of the answers on the factorization scale Q_f , which breaks the conformal invariance. This dependence is a general feature of observables constructed on the basis of (2).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research (project no. 08-02-00856) and by a grant of the President of the Russian Federation (project no. NSh-1027.2008.2).

REFERENCES

1. L. J. Dixon, “Gluon Scattering in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super-Yang–Mills Theory from Weak to Strong Coupling,” Proc. Sci. **RADCOR2007**, 056 (2007); arXiv: 0803.2475 [hep-th].
2. Z. Bern, L. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar, and D. A. Kosower, “Fusing Gauge Theory Tree Amplitudes into Loop Amplitudes,” Nucl. Phys. B **435**, 59–101 (1995); arXiv: hep-ph/9409265.
3. Z. Bern, L. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar, and D. A. Kosower, “One-Loop n-Point Gauge Theory Amplitudes, Unitarity and Collinear Limits,” Nucl. Phys. B **425**, 217–260 (1994); arXiv: hep-ph/9403226.
4. Z. Bern, M. Czakon, L. J. Dixon, D. A. Kosower, and V. A. Smirnov, “Four-Loop Planar Amplitude and Cusp Anomalous Dimension in Maximally Supersymmetric Yang–Mills Theory,” Phys. Rev. D **75**, 085010 (2007); arXiv: hep-th/0610248.
5. F. Cachazo, M. Spradlin, and A. Volovich, “Four-Loop Cusp Anomalous Dimension from Obstructions,” Phys. Rev. D **75**, 105011 (2007); arXiv: hep-th/0612309.
6. D. C. Dunbar and P. S. Norridge, “Infinities within Graviton Scattering Amplitudes,” Class. Quantum Grav. **14**, 351–365 (1997); arXiv: hep-th/9512084.
7. Z. Bern, L. Dixon, M. Perelstein, and J. S. Rozowsky, “Multi-leg One-Loop Gravity Amplitudes from Gauge Theory,” Nucl. Phys. B **546**, 423–479 (1999); arXiv: hep-th/9811140.
8. Z. Bern, L. Dixon, D. C. Dunbar, M. Perelstein, and J. S. Rozowsky, “On the Relationship between Yang–Mills Theory and Gravity and Its Implication for Ultraviolet Divergences,” Nucl. Phys. B **530**, 401–456 (1998); arXiv: hep-th/9802162.
9. Z. Bern, J. J. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson, D. A. Kosower, and R. Roiban, “Cancellations beyond Finiteness in $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity at Three Loops,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 161303 (2007); arXiv: hep-th/0702112.
10. Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, L. J. Dixon, H. Johansson, and R. Roiban, “Ultraviolet Behavior of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity at Four Loops,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 081301 (2009); arXiv: 0905.2326 [hep-th].
11. Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, and R. Roiban, “Is $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity Ultraviolet Finite?,” Phys. Lett. B **644**, 265–271 (2007); arXiv: hep-th/0611086.
12. N. Berkovits, “New Higher-Derivative R^4 Theorems for Graviton Scattering,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 211601 (2007); arXiv: hep-th/0609006.
13. M. B. Green, J. G. Russo, and P. Vanhove, “Ultraviolet Properties of Maximal Supergravity,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 131602 (2007); arXiv: hep-th/0611273.
14. G. Bossard, P. S. Howe, and K. S. Stelle, “A Note on the UV Behaviour of Maximally Supersymmetric Yang–Mills Theories,” Phys. Lett. B **682**, 137–142 (2009); arXiv: 0908.3883 [hep-th].
15. M. B. Green, J. G. Russo, and P. Vanhove, “String Theory Dualities and Supergravity Divergences,” J. High Energy Phys., No. 6, 075 (2010); arXiv: 1002.3805 [hep-th].
16. L. Brink, S.-S. Kim, and P. Ramond, “ $E_{7(7)}$ on the Light Cone,” J. High Energy Phys., No. 6, 034 (2008); AIP Conf. Proc. **1078**, 447–450 (2008); arXiv: 0801.2993 [hep-th].
17. R. Kallosh and M. Soroush, “Explicit Action of $E_{7(7)}$ on $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity Fields,” Nucl. Phys. B **801**, 25–44 (2008); arXiv: 0802.4106 [hep-th].
18. R. Kallosh and T. Kugo, “The Footprint of $E_{7(7)}$ in Amplitudes of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity,” J. High Energy Phys., No. 1, 072 (2009); arXiv: 0811.3414 [hep-th].
19. Z. Bern, J. J. M. Carrasco, and H. Johansson, “Progress on Ultraviolet Finiteness of Supergravity,” arXiv: 0902.3765 [hep-th].
20. P. Vanhove, “The Critical Ultraviolet Behaviour of $\mathcal{N} = 8$ Supergravity Amplitudes,” arXiv: 1004.1392 [hep-th].
21. N. Arkani-Hamed, F. Cachazo, and J. Kaplan, “What Is the Simplest Quantum Field Theory?,” arXiv: 0808.1446 [hep-th].
22. L. V. Bork, D. I. Kazakov, G. S. Vartanov, and A. V. Zhboedov, “Infrared Safe Observables in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super Yang–Mills Theory,” Phys. Lett. B **681**, 296–303 (2009); arXiv: 0908.0387 [hep-th].

23. L. V. Bork, D. I. Kazakov, G. S. Vartanov, and A. V. Zhiboedov, “Construction of Infrared Finite Observables in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ Super Yang–Mills Theory,” Phys. Rev. D **81**, 105028 (2010); arXiv: 0911.1617 [hep-th].
24. Z. Bern, L. J. Dixon, and V. A. Smirnov, “Iteration of Planar Amplitudes in Maximally Supersymmetric Yang–Mills Theory at Three Loops and Beyond,” Phys. Rev. D **72**, 085001 (2005); arXiv: hep-th/0505205.
25. V. Del Duca, C. Duhr, and V. A. Smirnov, “An Analytic Result for the Two-Loop Hexagon Wilson Loop in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM,” J. High Energy Phys., No. 3, 099 (2010); arXiv: 0911.5332 [hep-ph].
26. V. Del Duca, C. Duhr, and V. A. Smirnov, “The Two-Loop Hexagon Wilson Loop in $\mathcal{N} = 4$ SYM,” arXiv: 1003.1702 [hep-th].
27. S. D. Ellis, Z. Kunszt, and D. E. Soper, “One-Jet Inclusive Cross Section at Order α_s^3 : Gluons Only,” Phys. Rev. D **40**, 2188–2222 (1989).
28. S. D. Ellis, Z. Kunszt, and D. E. Soper, “One-Jet Inclusive Cross Section at Order α_s^3 : Quarks and Gluons,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2121–2124 (1990).
29. Z. Kunszt and D. E. Soper, “Calculation of Jet Cross Sections in Hadron Collisions at Order α_s^3 ,” Phys. Rev. D **46**, 192–221 (1992).
30. S. Frixione, Z. Kunszt, and A. Signer, “Three-Jet Cross Sections to Next-to-Leading Order,” Nucl. Phys. B **467**, 399–442 (1996); arXiv: hep-ph/9512328.
31. S. Catani and M. H. Seymour, “A General Algorithm for Calculating Jet Cross Sections in NLO QCD,” Nucl. Phys. B **485**, 291–419 (1997); arXiv: hep-ph/9605323.
32. T. Kinoshita, “Mass Singularities of Feynman Amplitudes,” J. Math. Phys. **3**, 650–677 (1962).
33. T. D. Lee and M. Nauenberg, “Degenerate Systems and Mass Singularities,” Phys. Rev. **133**, B1549–B1562 (1964).
34. L. Dixon, “Calculating Scattering Amplitudes Efficiently,” arXiv: hep-ph/9601359.

Translated by the authors