arXiv:1809.06353v1 [hep-ph] 17 Sep 2018

4-Gluon Vertex Splitting Function and Jet Observables

Fayez Abu-Ajamieh[1]

Department of Physics, University of California Davis
One Shields Ave., Davis, CA 95616

Abstract

I generalize the Altarelli-Parisi approach to finding the QCD splitting functions to the case of 4-vertex interactions. I apply the results to the 4-gluon interaction and use them to define several jet observables. I estimate the correction associated with the 4-gluon interaction compared with QCD 3-vertex interactions, and find that such a correction can be significant, especially at low energies. For instance, it is estimated that at energy scales between 100 GeV and 1 TeV, the corrections associated with the 4-g vertex could range between $\sim 6\% - 10\%$, however, the correction becomes smaller at the TeV scale and 3-vertex interactions become significantly more dominant.

[1] abuajamieh@ucdavis.edu

1 Introduction

In their seminal work [1], Altarelli and Parisi generalized the equivalent photon approximation in QED [2] in order to calculate all QCD 3-vertex splitting functions. These splitting functions have a number of applications, including determining the logarithmic evolution of partons with the energy scale according to the Dokshitzer-Gribov-Lipatov-Altarelli-Parisi (DGLAP) equation [1, 3, 4]:

$$\frac{\partial f_B(z,\mu^2)}{\partial \mu^2} = \sum_A \int_z^1 \frac{d\xi}{\xi} \frac{d\mathcal{P}_{A\to B+C}(z/\xi,\mu^2)}{dz\, dk_T^2} f_A(\xi,\mu^2) \tag{1.1}$$

In addition, the splitting function can be used to resum the Infrared Soft Radiation (ISR) in jet events through the Sudakov factor:

$$\Delta_A(t,t_0) = \exp\left[-\sum_{BC} \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \int dz \frac{d\mathcal{P}_{A\to B+C}(z,t')}{dz\, dt'} \right] \tag{1.2}$$

where $\Delta_A(t,t_0)$ characterizes the spitting below a certain energy scale t. However, all previous work has neglected 4-vertex splittings, i.e. the splitting of an initial state particle into 3 final states particles. There are several 4-vertex interactions in the Standard Model, including the 4-gluon interaction and several EW interactions. The corrections due to these interactions could be significant. In particular, it was suggested in [5] that the 4-g interaction could have a significant contribution and might be important in Monte Carlo simulations. Furthermore, corrections due to the EW 4-verticies could also be significant due to the smaller uncertainties in the EW sector compared with the QCD sector.

In this short paper, I will generalize the formalism used for calculating the 3-vertex splitting functions to the case of 4-vertex splittings. I will also use the splitting function to define the Sudakov factor in order to resum the ISR due to 4-vertex splittings. I will apply the results to the case of 4-g interactions and define several jet quantities using the generating functional formalism, and then try to estimate the size of its contribution in gluon decay events. In particular, I will be interested in the high energy regime relevant for the LHC and the proposed 100-TeV collider, where the final-state jet multiplicity is high. As all the SM 3-vertex interactions have been calculate [1, 2, 6], this calculation fills in the last gap in finding the remaining SM splitting functions.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section 2 I will show how to find the splitting function and the Sudakov factor in the case of 4-vertex interactions. In Section 3 I will define several jet observables using the generating functional formalism, relegating much of the technical details to Appendix A, then apply the results to 4-g splittings. In Section 4 I will compare the 4-g results with the relevant 3-vertex splittings in QCD and try to estimate the correction expected from including the 4-g splitting, and finally I will present the conclusions in Section 5.

2 The 4-g Splitting Function and Sudakov Factor

In order to find the 4-g splitting function, I will generalize the appraoch in [1] to the case of 4-vertex splitting. To this avail, we investigate the processes in Fig. (1). The matrix element of the process in (a) can be written as:

$$M_{E+A\to\, C+D+f} = g^2 \frac{V_{A\to B+C+D} V_{B+E\to f}}{(2E_B)(E_B + E_C + E_D - E_A)} \tag{2.1}$$

where g is the relevant coupling constant and V_{ij} is the invariant matrix element of the vertex. On the other hand, the process in (b) can be writtent as:

$$M_{E+B\to f} = g V_{E+B\to f} \tag{2.2}$$

The differential cross sections of the two processes are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} d\sigma_a = & \frac{g^4}{8E_A E_B} \frac{|V_{A\to B+C+D}|^2 |V_{B+E\to f}|^2}{(2E_B)^2 (E_B + E_C + E_D - E_A)^2} \\ & \times (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(K_A + K_E - K_C - K_D - \sum_f K_f) \frac{d^3K_C}{(2\pi)^3 2E_C} \frac{d^3K_D}{(2\pi)^3 2E_D} \prod_f \frac{d^3p_f}{(2\pi)^3 2E_f} \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

$$d\sigma_b = \frac{g^2}{8E_B E_E} |V_{B+E\to f}|^2 (2\pi)^4 \delta^{(4)}(K_B + K_E - \sum_f K_f) \prod_f \frac{d^3p_f}{(2\pi)^3 2E_f} \tag{2.4}$$




Figure 1: 4-vertex splitting.

The two processes are related by:

$$d\sigma_a = d\mathcal{P}_{ACD}(x,z)\, dx\, dz\, d\sigma_b \tag{2.5}$$

where $d\mathcal{P}_{ACD}(x,z)$ is splitting function of $A \to C + D$ and x and z are the energy fractions of the particles C and D relative to the energy of A. Inspecting (2.3) and (2.4) implies that the 4-vertex splitting function has the general form:

$$d\mathcal{P}_{ACD} = \frac{g^2 |V_{A\to B+C+D}|^2}{(2E_B)^2 (E_B + E_C + E_D - E_A)^2} \frac{d^3K_C}{(2\pi)^3 2E_C} \frac{d^3K_D}{(2\pi)^3 2E_D} \tag{2.6}$$

Notice that in general, particles C and D could have different transverse momenta relative to the momentum of particle A, therefore we parametrize the 4-momenta as follows:

$$K_A = (Q, \mathbf{0}, Q) \tag{2.7}$$

$$K_C = \Big(xQ + \frac{p_T^2}{2xQ}, \vec{p}_T, xQ\Big) \tag{2.8}$$

$$K_D = \Big(zQ + \frac{k_T^2}{2zQ}, \vec{k}_T, zQ\Big) \tag{2.9}$$

$$K_B = \Big((1-x-z)Q + \frac{(\vec{p}_T + \vec{k}_T)^2}{2(1-x-z)Q}, -\vec{p}_T - \vec{k}_T, (1-x-z)Q\Big) \tag{2.10}$$

where p_T and k_T are the transverse momenta assumed to be small in the collinear limit, i.e. $p_T, k_T \ll Q^2$. The phase space factors can be written as:

$$\frac{d^3K_C}{(2\pi)^3 2E_C} = \frac{dx\, dp_T^2}{16\pi^2 x} \tag{2.11}$$

$$\frac{d^3K_D}{(2\pi)^3 2E_D} = \frac{dz\, d\phi\, dk_T^2}{32\pi^3 z} \tag{2.12}$$

where ϕ is the angle between the transverse momenta. Notice here that ϕ need not be small even in the collinear limit, since the angle between $\vec{p}_T$ and $\vec{k}_T$ is independent of the angles between each one of them individually and the momentum of the incoming particle, which *are* small in the collinear limit. Plugging (2.7)-(2.10) in (2.6) and using the phase space factors, we arrive at the following general result:

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}_{A\to BCD}}{dx\, dz\, d\phi\, dp_T^2\, dk_T^2} = \frac{1}{2\pi S}\Big(\frac{g|V|}{16\pi^2}\Big)^2 \frac{x\, z\, (1-x-z)}{[z(1-z)p_T^2 + x(1-x)k_T^2 + 2x\, z\, p_T\, k_T\, \cos(\phi)]^2} \tag{2.13}$$

with S being a possible symmetry factor in the case of identical final particles. Notice that the splitting function has two energy scales p_T and k_T. So in order to properly define the virtuality, i.e. define a single energy scale as an integration variable, we need to integrate the splitting function over one of the transverse momenta from some lower cutoff up to the other transverse momentum, and then define the latter (squared) to be the virtuality. With this prescription, we can readily calculate the Sudakov factor associated with the 4-vertex splitting:

$$\Delta_{A\to BCD}(t, t_0) = exp\Big(-\int_{t_0}^{t} dp_T^2 \int_{t_0}^{p_T^2} dk_T^2 \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\phi} \frac{d\mathcal{P}_{A\to BCD}}{dx\, dz\, d\phi\, dp_T^2\, dk_T^2}\Big) \tag{2.14}$$

In this paper, I will focus on the gluon contact term, i.e. $g \to ggg$, because its correction could be potentially significant. In addition, the 4-g interaction could be important for

improving the accuracy Monte Carlo simulations of jets. The rest of the SM 4-vertex splitting functions will be calculated in [7]. For $g \to ggg$, the interaction vertex is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} gV = -ig^2\Big[& f^{abe}f^{cde}(g^{\mu\rho}g^{\nu\sigma} - g^{\mu\sigma}g^{\nu\rho}) + f^{ace}f^{bde}(g^{\mu\nu}g^{\rho\sigma} - g^{\mu\sigma}g^{\nu\rho}) \\ & + f^{ade}f^{bce}(g^{\mu\nu}g^{\rho\sigma} - g^{\mu\rho}g^{\nu\sigma})\Big]\epsilon_\mu(K_A)\epsilon^*_\rho(K_B)\epsilon^*_\nu(K_C)\epsilon^*_\sigma(K_D) \end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

The physical components of the polarization vectors are given by:

$$\epsilon^i_{L,R}(K_A) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(1, \mp i, 0) \tag{2.16}$$

$$\epsilon^i_{L,R}(K_C) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(1, \mp i, -\frac{p_T}{xQ}\Big) \tag{2.17}$$

$$\epsilon^i_{L,R}(K_D) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(1, \mp i, -\frac{k_T}{zQ}\Big) \tag{2.18}$$

$$\epsilon^i_{L,R}(K_B) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Big(1, \mp i, \frac{\sqrt{p_T^2 + k_T^2 + 2p_T k_T\cos(\phi)}}{(1-x-z)Q}\Big) \tag{2.19}$$

with $-i(+i)$ corresponding to a LH(RH) gluon. Using (2.16)-(2.19) to calculate the matrix element, and after summing and averaging over spin and color, then taking the collinear limit ($p_T, k_T \ll Q^2$), we arrive at the 4-g splitting function:

$$\frac{d\mathcal{P}_{4g}}{dx\,dz\,d\phi\,dp_T^2\,dk_T^2} = \frac{3\alpha_s^2N^2(N^2-1)}{128\pi^2}\frac{xz(1-x-z)}{[z(1-z)\,p_T^2 + x(1-x)\,k_T^2 + 2x\,z\,p_T\,k_T\,\cos(\phi)]^2} \tag{2.20}$$

with $N = 3$ being the color factor. Notice that the splitting function is finite in the double limit $x, z \to 0$, which indicates the absence of any soft divergence. The splitting function is also finite when either transverse momenta vanishes, however, it diverges when both momenta vanish, which indicates the presence of a (single) collinear singularity. Since the splitting function has a single collinear divergence but not a soft one, we expect the Sudakov factor to contain a single logarithm instead of the usual double logarithm.

To find the Sudakov factor, we first perform the integral over k_T. Since the splitting function is finite when k_T vanishes (with p_T remaining finite), we can set the lower limit of the integral to 0. When we perform the integral, the energy dependence separates from the x, z and ϕ dependence:

$$\int_0^{p_T^2} dk_T^2 \frac{d\mathcal{P}_{4g}}{dx\,dz\,d\phi\,dp_T^2\,dk_T^2} = \frac{\alpha_s^2}{p_T^2}P_{4g}(x, z, \phi) \tag{2.21}$$

where the kernel $P_{4g}(x,z,\phi)$ is complicated function that contains the x,z and ϕ dependence, in addition to the color factors. We can set p_T^2 to be virtuality t and integrate over it. Notice that this integral yields a single logarithm, whether or not the running of the strong coupling is taken into consideration, as expected. Finally we arrive at the 4-g Sudakov factor:

$$\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0) = exp\left(-\int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \; P_{4g}(x,z,\phi) \right) \tag{2.22}$$

The energy integral (including the running of α_s) can be done exactly, while the remaining integrals can be done numerically, yielding a factor $\sim O(1)$.

3 The Generating Functional and Jet Observables

The generating functional formalism can be used to define resummed jet quantities [8–11]. In this section, I will generalize the generating functionals and jet quantities presented in [10, 11] to the case of the 4-g vertex. The generating functional is constructed in an arbitrary parameter u such that the repeated differentiation of the generating functional at $u=0$ yields the exclusive multiplicity distribution $P_n \equiv \sigma_n/\sigma_{tot}$:

$$\Phi_g = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} u^n P_{n-1}, \qquad \text{with} \quad P_{n-1} = \frac{\sigma_{n-1}}{\sigma_{tot}} = \frac{1}{n!}\frac{d^n}{du^n}\Phi_g\Big|_{u=0} \tag{3.1}$$

To find the generating functional explicitly, we notice that it evolves according to the DGLAP equation, which can be generalized to the case of 4-vertex splitting as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}\Phi_g(t) = \Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)\Phi_g(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \Delta_{4g}(t,t') \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \; P_{4g}(x,z,\phi) \\ \times \Phi_g(x^2 t')\Phi_g(z^2 t')\Phi_g((1-x-z)^2 t')\end{aligned} \tag{3.2}$$

Using (2.22), the generating functional is found to be (See Appendix A for the complete derivation):

$$\Phi_g(t) = u[\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)]^{1-u^2} \tag{3.3}$$

This result is identical to the one found in [10,11] for the generating functionals of the 3g and $gq\bar{q}$ verticies, except that in the 4-g case, the power is $1-u^2$ instead of $1-u$ as in the latter two. This has its root in the fact that in the 4-g vertex, the initial gluon radiates 2 gluons instead on one. We can use the generating functional in (3.1) in order to find the exclusive multiplicity distribution for the 4-g vertex:

$$P_{n-1} = \begin{cases} \frac{n!!}{n!}\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)[-2\log\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)]^{\frac{n-1}{2}} & ;\, n = \text{odd} \\ 0 & ;\, n = \text{even} \end{cases}$$




Figure 2: (eft): The Sudakov factor of the 4-g vertex as a function of virtuality. Here we set $t_0 = \Lambda^2_{QCD}$. (Right): The 4-g average jet multiplicity as a function of virtuality.

Notice that P_{n-1} describes $n-1$ *radiated* jets, while n gives the *total* number of jets, i.e. including the original gluon that radiated the latter two. The fact that P_{n-1} vanishes for even n simply reflects the fact that for a 4-g splitting, the final number of jets must be odd. Also notice that $n = 1$ corresponds to the original gluon not splitting.

The generating functional can be used to define a number of useful jet observables. For instance, we can measure the average number of jets associated with the 4-g splitting at a certain energy scale by defining the average jet multiplicity:

$$\left.\frac{d\Phi_g}{du}\right|_{u=1} = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} n\, u^{n-1}\, \left.\frac{\sigma_{n-1}}{\sigma_{tot}}\right|_{u=1} = 1 + \frac{1}{\sigma_{tot}} \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (n-1)\, \sigma_{n-1} = 1 - 2\log \Delta_{4g}(t, t_0) \qquad (3.4)$$

As (3.4) shows, the average jet multiplicity grows logarithmically with energy. We can also estimate the suppression associated with each additional 4-g splitting by defining the jet scaling pattern:

$$R_{n+2/n} \equiv \frac{P_{n+2}}{P_n} = \frac{|2\log \Delta_{4g}(t, t_0)|}{n+1}, \qquad n = \text{odd} \qquad (3.5)$$

These observables can be used in studying the 4-g splitting. In particular, we are interested in determining the significance of the soft radiation resulting from this interaction for collider physics, and the size of corrections expected from its inclusion, especially in the high energy regime relevant for the LHC and the future 100-TeV collider. Throughout this paper, I will set the lower energy cutoff scale $t_0 = \Lambda^2_{QCD}$. I will also include the running of the strong couplings:

$$\alpha_s(t) = \frac{\alpha_s(m_z^2)}{1 - \frac{b_0\, \alpha_s(m_z^2)}{4\pi} \log\left(\frac{t}{m_z^2}\right)} \qquad (3.6)$$

where $b_0 = -11 + \frac{2n_f}{3}$. First, we plot the 4-g Sudakov factor in order to obtain a picture




Figure 3: (Left): $R_{n+2/n}$ as a function of the energy scale for $n = 1$ (blue), $n = 2$ (black), $n = 3$ (red), $n = 4$ (magenta) and $n = 5$ (gray). (Right): $R_{n+2/n}$ as a function of the number of jets n at 1 TeV.

of the probability of 4-g splitting. The left panel of Fig. 2 shows the Sudakov factor as a function of virtuality. Since the Sudakov factor expresses the probability of the gluon not splitting, we can see that even at high energies, the probability of a gluon splitting to 3 gluons is rather small. This is mainly due to the suppression of the additional phase space factor of $\frac{1}{16\pi^2}$ compared with 3-splittings. Given the small probability of 4-g splitting, we would expect a small average jet multiplicity for the 4-g vertex, which is indeed the case as can be seen from the right panel of Fig. 2. The plot suggests that even at very high energies, $\bar{n} \sim 1.07$, i.e. in most events, the gluon will not undergo a splitting to three gluons. In the next section we will compare this with the other QCD splittings to estimate the size of its correction.

Next, we investigate the 4-g jet scaling pattern and plot $R_{n+2/n}$ in Fig. 3.[1] As argued in [10, 11], there are two types of scaling patterns for jets in QCD: (1) A Poisson pattern in which the ratios $R_{n+1/n}$ are not constant but are $\propto 1/(n+1)$, and (2) a staircase pattern where $R_{n+1/n}$ is approximately constant with n. Eq. (3.5) suggests that the 4-g splitting belongs to the former, as is apparent from the left panel of Fig. 3. The plot suggests that the suppression associated with radiating an additional pair of gluons through the 4-g vertex becomes smaller with each new splitting, as is typical of a Poisson-type scaling. We can show this more clearly by plotting $R_{n+2/n}$ vs. n at some fixed energy scale. The right panel of Fig. 3 shows this at an energy scale of 1 TeV, where the Poisson nature of the 4-g scaling patter is more apparent.

Due to the small probability of 4-g splitting, in addition to the Poisson-type suppression, we would expect a small number of 4-g splittings in either the LHC or the 100-TeV collider. However, as I show in the next section, the corrections associated with the 4-g splitting could be significant, especially at low energies.

[1] Notice that for 3-vertex splittings we define $R_{n+1/n}$, while for 4-vertex splittings we define $R_{n+2/n}$ as *two* particles are radiated with each new splitting instead of one.

4 Comparison with other QCD Splittings

In this section, I attempt to estimate the significance of the 4-g splitting and the size of the correction it represents. This will provide an answer to a question that was posed in [5] of how important the 4-g vertex is for in calculating QCD quantities and for simulating jet events. To this end, we notice that an initial state gluon can undergo a single spitting through either a 3-vertex interaction or a 4-vertex interaction. In a 3-vertex splitting, the gluon could split into 2 gluons or a quark-antiquark pair, while in a 4-vertex interaction it could only split into 3 gluons. Therefore to estimate the size of the 4-g correction, we can compare the average jet multiplicity for each type of splitting. The 3-vertex splitting includes both the 3-g vertex and the $gq\bar{q}$ vertex, and its Sudakov factor given by:

$$\Delta_{3g}(t,t_0) = exp\bigg(-\int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \Big[\frac{C_A}{2\pi}\frac{\alpha_s(t')}{t'}\Big(\log\frac{t}{t'} - \frac{11}{6}\Big) + \frac{n_f}{6\pi}\frac{\alpha_s(t')}{t'}\Big]\bigg) \tag{4.1}$$

The left panel of Fig. 4 shows the average jet multiplicities for each type of splitting. The plot shows that 3-vertex splitting is always dominant over the 4-vertex one, and that at higher energies it becomes even more dominant. This is to be expected due to the larger phase space available to 3-splittings compared with 4-splittings as indicated earlier. However, the size of the 4-g correction could still be sizable, especially at low energies. We can estimate the size of the 4-g correction by looking at the fraction of 4-g splittings of all single-vertex gluon splittings:

$$\%Corr(t) = \frac{\bar{n}_{4g}(t)}{\bar{n}_{4g}(t) + \bar{n}_{3g}(t)} \tag{4.2}$$

The right panel of Fig. 4 shows a plot of the estimated correction with the energy scale. As the plot reveals, the 4-g correction can be significant at low energies $\lesssim 100$ GeV, and could even reach $\sim 30\%$ for energies $\sim$ a few GeV, However, we should note that at this low energy scale our calculation become less accurate, as the quark masses can no longer be neglected and the high-energy assumption becomes less reliable. Nonetheless, we expect the corrections to remain significant .

In the energy range $\gtrsim 100$ GeV, which is the most relevant for the LHC and the 100-TeV collider, the correction remains significant. For instance, between 100 GeV and 1 TeV, the correction is estimated to range between $\sim 6\% - 10\%$, however, the correction becomes less significant beyond energies of a few TeV, which means that the 4-g splitting becomes less significant for the 100-TeV collider. Nonetheless, since the number of jets in the 100-TeV collider is expected to be fairly large, 4-g splittings could still remain important. Moreover, including the 4-g splitting in Monte Carlo simulations is expected to significantly improve their accuracy, particularly is the low energy regime.




Figure 4: (Left): The average jet multiplicity for an initial state gluon splitting to 2 gluons or a quark and an antiquark (black), and to 3 gluons through a 4-g vertex (blue). (Right): the estimated correction associated with the 4-g interaction in gluonic decays as a function of virtuality.

5 Conclusions

The corrections associated with the 4-g splitting can be significant in the energy range relevant for current and future colliders, especially at low energies $\lesssim 1$ TeV. However, at energies beyond several TeV, the corrections due to the 3g and $gq\bar{q}$ interactions greatly dominate due to the larger increase in their average jet multiplicity compared with the 4-g interaction, which stems from the larger phase space available to 3-vertex interactions compared with 4-vertex interactions. In energy scales between 100 GeV and 1 TeV, the correction is estimated to range between $\sim 6\% - 10\%$, which although comparable to the QCD theoretical uncertainties, is quite significant. For energies $\gtrsim$ a few TeV, the corrections drop $\lesssim 5\%$ and thus become less relevant, especially in the future 100-TeV collider. Nevertheless, including the 4-g interaction in Monte Carlo simulations can significantly improve their accuracy and thus should be incorporated, especially for low energy physics.

A question remains of whether the remaining SM 4-vertex interaction (i.e. Electroweak 4-vertex interactions) could yield significant corrections as well. Although these corrections will also be suppressed by the extra phase space factor, the lower uncertainties in EW compared to QCD means that they could be significant, especially in precision measurements. The answer to this question will be presented in [7].

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank John Conway for answering my questions. I would also like to thank Ali Shayegan for the helpful discussions. I would also like to thank my adviser John Terning for his valuable guidance and support.

A Derivation of the 4-g Generating Functional

We start with the generalized DGLAP equation of the 4-g generating functional:

$$\Phi_g(t) = \Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)\Phi_g(t_0) + \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \Delta_{4g}(t,t') \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi \; P_{4g}(x,z,\phi) \quad \text{(A.1)}$$
$$\times \Phi_g(x^2 t')\Phi_g(z^2 t')\Phi_g((1-x-z)^2 t')$$

Notice that since $\Delta_{4g}(t,t') \sim exp(-\log(t/t'))$, we can write:

$$\Delta_{4g}(t,t') = \frac{\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)}{\Delta_{4g}(t',t_0)} \quad \text{(A.2)}$$

Using (A.2) in (A.1) and taking the derivative with respect to t, we get:

$$\frac{d\Phi_g(t)}{dt} = \frac{d\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)}{dt}\Phi_g(t_0) + \frac{d\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)}{dt} \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \frac{1}{\Delta_{4g}(t',t_0)}$$
$$\times \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi P_{4g}(x,z,\phi)\Phi_g(x^2 t')\Phi_g(z^2 t')\Phi_g((1-x-z)^2 t')$$
$$+ \frac{\alpha_s^2(t)}{t} \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi P_{4g}(x,z,\phi)\Phi_g(x^2 t)\Phi_g(z^2 t)\Phi_g((1-x-z)^2 t) \quad \text{(A.3)}$$

which implies that:

$$\frac{d\Phi_g(t)}{dt} = \frac{d\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)}{dt}\frac{\Phi_g(t)}{\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)} + \frac{\alpha_s^2(t)}{t} \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi P_{4g}(x,z,\phi) \quad \text{(A.4)}$$
$$\times \Phi_g(x^2 t)\Phi_g(z^2 t)\Phi_g((1-x-z)^2 t)$$

Neglecting the logarithmic dependence of the energy fractions, (A.4) simplifies to:

$$\frac{d\Phi_g(t)}{dt} = \frac{d\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)}{dt}\frac{\Phi_g(t)}{\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)} + \frac{\alpha_s^2(t)}{t}\Phi_g^3(t) \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi P_{4g}(x,z,\phi) \quad \text{(A.5)}$$

Dividing the equation by $\Phi_g(t)$ and integrating both sides we obtain:

$$\log\Big[\frac{\Phi_g(t)}{\Phi_g(t_0)}\Big] = \log\Big[\frac{\Delta_{4g}(t,t_0)}{\Delta_{4g}(t_0,t_0)}\Big] + \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'}\Phi_g^2(t') \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\phi} P_{4g}(x,z,\phi) \quad \text{(A.6)}$$

Given that $\Delta_{4g}(t_0, t_0) = 1$, and that by definition, the generating functional evaluated at $t = t_0$ describes jets that have no opportunity of splitting, then by definition $\Phi_g(t_0) \equiv u$, and the generating functional becomes:

$$\Phi_g(t) = u\Delta_{4g}(t, t_0) exp\left(\int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \Phi_g^2(t') \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi P_{4g}(x, z, \phi) \right) \tag{A.7}$$

Using the definition of the 4-g Sudakov factor in (2.22), (A.7) becomes:

$$\Phi_g(t) = u\, exp\left(\int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \Big(\Phi_g^2(t') - 1 \Big) \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi P_{4g}(x, z, \phi) \right) \tag{A.8}$$

Since the integral $\int_{t_0}^{t} \frac{dt'}{t'}$ is dominated near $t' \sim t_0$, and assuming that $\Phi_g(t)$ does not change significantly for t away from t_0, we can approximate:

$$\int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \Phi_g^2(t') \;\simeq\; \Phi_g^2(t_0) \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} = u^2 \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \tag{A.9}$$

Therefore, (A.8) simplifies to:

$$\Phi_g(t) = u\, exp\left(-(1 - u^2) \int_{t_0}^{t} dt' \frac{\alpha_s^2(t')}{t'} \int_0^1 dz \int_0^{1-z} dx \int_0^{2\pi} d\phi P_{4g}(x, z, \phi) \right) \tag{A.10}$$

Given (2.22), we arrive at final equation of the generating functional:

$$\Phi_g(t) = u \Big[\Delta_{4g}(t, t_0) \Big]^{1-u^2} \tag{A.11}$$

References

[1] G. Altarelli and G. Parisi, Nucl. Phys. B **126**, 298 (1977).

[2] C. F. von Weizsacker, Z. Phys. **88**, 612 (1934); E. J. Williams, Phys. Rev. **45**, 729 (1934); V. N. Baier, V. S. Fadin and V. A. Khoze, Nucl. Phys. B **65**, 381 (1973); M. S. Chen and P. M. Zerwas, Phys. Rev. D **12**, 187 (1975).

[3] Y. L. Dokshitzer, Sov. Phys. JETP **46**, 641 (1977).

[4] V. N. Gribov and L. N. Lipatov, Sov. J. Nucl. Phys. **15** (1972) 438 [Yad. Fiz. **15** (1972) 781].

[5] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna and P. Z. Skands, JHEP **0605**, 026 (2006) hep-ph/0603175.

[6] J. Chen, T. Han and B. Tweedie, JHEP **1711**, 093 (2017) hep-ph/1611.00788.

[7] To Appear

[8] Y. L. Dokshitzer, V. A. Khoze, A. H. Mueller and S. I. Troian, "Basics of perturbative QCD,"

[9] R. K. Ellis, W. J. Stirling and B. R. Webber, "QCD and collider physics,"

[10] T. Plehn, Lect. Notes Phys. **844**, 1 (2012) hep-ph/0910.4182.

[11] E. Gerwick, T. Plehn, S. Schumann and P. Schichtel, JHEP **1210**, 162 (2012) hep-ph/1208.3676.