

Feynman Integral Reduction and Landau Singularities

Federico Coro,^{1,*} Pavel P. Novichkov,^{1,†} Ben Page,^{1,‡} and Qian Song^{1,§}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Ghent University, 9000 Ghent, Belgium*

We propose that Feynman integral reduction is controlled by solutions of the Landau equations. We study integral relations with prescribed propagator powers using syzygy methods and discuss how syzygies can be expressed as a sum over components of the Landau singularity locus. This leads to a determinantal approach to solving the syzygy problem, giving rise to highly compact and physically transparent solutions. We demonstrate the method in applications to planar two-loop five-point integrals relevant for the $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ process. Our results suggest an efficient method of Feynman integral reduction and provide a novel physical perspective on the problem.

INTRODUCTION

Perturbative calculations of scattering amplitudes are essential for precise understanding of fundamental physics at particle collider and gravitational-wave experiments. The defining difficulty of such calculations is both the large number and complexity of the Feynman integrals that must be computed. In modern approaches, this issue is tackled by exploiting the linear relations that the integrals satisfy [1]. This both reduces the computational burden to that of a smaller set of “master integrals” as well as facilitates the calculation of the master integrals themselves via the differential equations method [2–5]. While algorithms for integral reduction exist [6] and public implementations are available [7–16], the large demands for precision placed by experimental uncertainties have driven the development of novel reduction methods such as syzygy methods [17–19], finite-field reconstruction [20, 21] and twisted cohomology approaches [22–27].

In this letter we argue that Feynman integral reduction is controlled by the Landau equations [28]. The Landau equations have recently been under intense study [29–36] as singularities of scattering amplitudes are described by solutions that constrain external kinematics. In this work we discuss how solutions of the Landau equations that do not constrain external kinematics organize the set of relations between Feynman integrals. We uncover this physical correspondence by considering the set of integral relations with prescribed propagator powers. It is well-known that these relations are controlled by a so-called syzygy equation [17]. Despite intense study over the past 15 years [17–19, 37–44] and impressive recent computational progress [15, 16, 45], both the physical meaning of the syzygy equation and general solutions have remained elusive. In this work, we tackle both questions by connecting the syzygy problem to the Landau equations.

While a link between syzygies and the Landau equations has been noticed before [37], we employ two advances to make this connection constructive. First, we exploit the recent observation [46] that the large- ϵ limit [24] distinguishes so-called “critical syzygies” for integral reduction purposes. Second, we use advanced technologies from commutative algebra [47, 48]. Together,

this allows us to write the set of critical syzygies as a sum over components of the solutions of the Landau equations. Importantly, this leads to an approach to construct a highly-compact collection of analytic syzygies. We illustrate our approach by applying it to a cutting-edge example of a two-loop pentabox family for the frontier $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ process. We discuss a double box case in detail and present the remaining set of five-point syzygy solutions in supplemental material. Altogether, our results highlight how Feynman integral reduction is controlled by infrared singularities and provide an efficient method of syzygy construction for phenomenological application.

SINGULARITIES AND INTEGRAL RELATIONS

In this work, we study relations between Feynman integrals with prescribed propagator powers. It is well known [17] that these relations are easily constructed once a “syzygy equation” is solved. In the Baikov representation [49], this equation can be formulated as [18, 46]

$$0 = a_0 B + \sum_{i \in \text{ISPs}(\Gamma)} a_i \partial_i B + \sum_{e \in \text{props}(\Gamma)} (\tilde{a}_e z_e B + \bar{a}_e z_e \partial_e B), \quad (1)$$

where Γ is the graph associated to the Feynman integral, $\text{ISPs}(\Gamma)$ labels the irreducible scalar product variables and $\text{props}(\Gamma)$ labels the propagator variables z_e . In eq. (1), B is the Baikov polynomial which, in two-loop, five-point applications, can be normalized and written as

$$B = \mu_{11}\mu_{22} - \mu_{12}^2, \quad \mu_{ij} = \frac{G(\bar{\ell}_i p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4)}{G(\bar{\ell}_j p_1 p_2 p_3 p_4)}, \quad (2)$$

where $\bar{\ell}_i$ are D -dimensional loop momenta, p_k are external momenta, $G(\frac{V}{W})$ is the determinant of the matrix of dot products of vectors in V and W and $G(V) = G(\frac{V}{V})$.

Despite being a linear equation, solving eq. (1) is highly non-trivial since integral reduction demands solutions a_0 , a_i , \tilde{a}_e and \bar{a}_e that are elements of R , the polynomial ring in Baikov variables. In ref. [46], it was observed that integral relations induced by solutions to eq. (1) are governed by the a_0 term. This led to the definition of the set of critical syzygy solutions, $\text{CSyz}(\Gamma)$, that control this

feature at the level of eq. (1). In the following, we develop a novel approach to finding critical syzygy solutions, by highlighting a connection to the Landau equations.

To begin, we consider the maximal cut Landau locus in Baikov parameterization [34, 50]. This is the variety $U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma = V(J_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma)$ associated to the polynomial ideal

$$J_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma = \langle B \rangle + \sum_{i \in \text{ISPs}(\Gamma)} \langle \partial_i B \rangle + J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma, \quad (3)$$

where $+$ denotes the sum of polynomial ideals and $J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma = \sum_{e \in \text{props}(\Gamma)} \langle z_e \rangle$. We consider U_{Landau}^Γ for fixed external kinematics and hence as a variety in Baikov variables alone. Physically, U_{Landau}^Γ describes integration space regions that potentially give rise to divergences. For two-loop, five-point examples, we find that U_{Landau}^Γ admits a decomposition into subvarieties as

$$U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma = V(J_{4d} + J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma) \cup \left[\bigcup_{i=1}^{n_{\text{IR}}} U_i^\Gamma \right], \quad (4)$$

where $J_{4d} = \langle \mu_{11}, \mu_{22}, \mu_{12} \rangle$ and each U_i^Γ is an irreducible component of U_{Landau}^Γ that is not contained in $U_0^\Gamma = V(J_{4d} + J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma)$. We observe that, physically, the $U_{i>0}$ are associated to soft and collinear configurations.

Our main result is to write the critical syzygy module as a sum over the varieties in eq. (4) as

$$\text{CSyz}(\Gamma) = \sum_{i=0}^{n_{\text{IR}}} \text{FittSyz}(U_i^\Gamma), \quad (5)$$

which we dub a ‘‘Landau decomposition’’ of $\text{CSyz}(\Gamma)$. In the following, we define $\text{FittSyz}(U_i^\Gamma)$ by giving an explicit procedure to construct a generating set. To this end, we recall that the module of critical syzygies, $\text{CSyz}(\Gamma)$, is defined such that it is isomorphic to an ideal [46] as

$$\text{CSyz}(\Gamma) \simeq A_0^\Gamma / J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma, \quad A_0^\Gamma = J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma : \langle B \rangle, \quad (6)$$

$$J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma = \sum_{i \in \text{ISPs}(\Gamma)} \langle \partial_i B \rangle + \sum_{e \in \text{props}(\Gamma)} \langle z_e B, z_e \partial_e B \rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $A_0^\Gamma / J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma$ is the image of A_0^Γ in the quotient ring $R / J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma$ and $J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma : \langle B \rangle$ is an ideal quotient. Geometrically, if this quotient is saturated, i.e. $J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma : \langle B \rangle = J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma : \langle B^2 \rangle$, then it can be understood as removing components where $B = 0$ from $V(J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma)$ [46]. We will make use of this ‘‘saturation hypothesis’’ throughout this work. Here, we interpret the ideal quotient as removing Landau singularities from $V(J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma)$ and eq. (5) as an algebraic shadow of this geometric intuition. That is, one can remove Landau locus components one by one in a way that automatically yields critical syzygies.

To set up eq. (5) and introduce some technology. The

main observation is that we can decompose A_0^Γ as

$$A_0^\Gamma = \sum_{i=0}^{n_{\text{IR}}} \text{Fitt}_0(M_i) + J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma, \quad (8)$$

$$M_0 = J_{4d} / J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma, \quad M_i = \left(J_{\text{syzy}}^{\Gamma, [U_i^\Gamma]} \cap J_{4d} \right) / J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma, \quad (9)$$

where the M_i are viewed as R -modules and the $i = 0$ term in both eq. (8) and eq. (5) can be dropped if $n_{\text{IR}} > 0$. This result, and thus eq. (5), can be shown to hold under the saturation hypothesis and

$$V\left(J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma : \sqrt{J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma}\right) \cap U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma \subseteq \bigcup_{i=1}^{n_{\text{IR}}} U_i^\Gamma, \quad (10)$$

where \sqrt{J} denotes the radical of J . $V(J : \sqrt{J})$ is known as the non-reduced locus of J and describes the locus where J is not a radical ideal. The proof is technical and we leave it to supplemental material.

There are two main pieces of mathematical technology in eq. (8). The first is $\text{Fitt}_0(M_i)$, the zeroth Fitting ideal of the module M_i [48]. Denoting a generating set of the numerator ideal of M_i as $\{v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,n}\}$, $\text{Fitt}_0(M_i)$ is generated by the $n \times n$ minors of a presentation matrix \mathcal{M}_i of M_i : a matrix whose rows generate the module of syzygies of a generating set of M_i . Geometrically, for two ideals J, K such that $J \subset K$, the zeroth Fitting ideal satisfies

$$V(\text{Fitt}_0[K/J]) = V(J : K), \quad (11)$$

and is thus intimately related to the ideal quotient. The second technology is $J^{[U]}$, the ‘‘pre-localization’’ of an ideal J at a variety U , which can be built from a primary decomposition of J . Denoting the primary components of J as \mathcal{Q}_j , we define the pre-localization as those components whose associated variety intersects U , i.e.

$$J^{[U]} = \bigcap_{j: V(\mathcal{Q}_j) \cap U \neq \emptyset} \mathcal{Q}_j. \quad (12)$$

Thus, each term in eq. (8) excises $U_0^\Gamma \cup U_i^\Gamma$ from $V(J_{\text{syzy}}^\Gamma)$.

In practice, we can view eq. (8) as a determinantal construction of A_0^Γ . Moreover, via judicious, block construction of the \mathcal{M}_i , we can also use this to build $\text{CSyz}(\Gamma)$. To this end, writing the generators of J_{syzy}^Γ in eq. (7) as $\{b_1, \dots, b_m\}$, we construct a polynomial matrix \mathcal{C}_i such that $b_j = (\mathcal{C}_i)_{jk} v_{i,k}$. Next, we construct a matrix \mathcal{R}_i whose rows generate the module of syzygies of $\{v_{i,1}, \dots, v_{i,n}\}$. It can be shown that the augmented matrix $\mathcal{M}_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{C}_i \\ \mathcal{R}_i \end{pmatrix}$ is a presentation matrix of M_i . To use this to construct syzygies, we exploit that, under the saturation hypothesis, there exists a \vec{c}_i such that $B = \vec{c}_i \cdot \vec{v}_i$. We can combine this vector and \mathcal{M}_i into the matrix

$$\mathcal{F}_i = \begin{pmatrix} B & \vec{c}_i^\Gamma \\ \vec{b} & \mathcal{C}_i \\ \vec{0} & \mathcal{R}_i \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

which satisfies $\mathcal{F}_i(\frac{-1}{v_i}) = 0$ and so maximal minors of \mathcal{F}_i vanish. Therefore, Laplace expansion along the leftmost column yields solutions to eq. (1). We define $\text{FittSyz}(U_i^\Gamma)$ as the module implicitly generated by Laplace expansions of the maximal minors of \mathcal{F}_i that contain the first row. By construction, the coefficients of B generate $\text{Fitt}_0(M_i)$ and we conclude that the decomposition of eq. (5) holds.

In summary, to construct the set of critical syzygies for a topology Γ , we first construct an irreducible decomposition of the maximal-cut Landau locus. Then, for each component, we construct the matrix \mathcal{F}_i by computing the set of polynomial matrices c_i , \mathcal{C}_i and \mathcal{R}_i . Laplace expansion of each \mathcal{F}_i gives syzygy solutions which, when taken together, generate the syzygy module $\text{CSyz}(\Gamma)$.

NOTATION AND VARIABLE CHOICE

In the rest of this letter, we demonstrate how eq. (13) can be used to efficiently build syzygy solutions. For concreteness, we study applications to cases arising in the two-loop contributions to amplitudes for $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$. Here, the external momenta satisfy

$$\sum_{i=1}^5 p_i = 0, \quad p_{1,3}^2 = m_t^2, \quad p_2^2 = m_H^2, \quad p_{4,5}^2 = 0. \quad (14)$$

We route the loop momenta as in fig. 1a and, writing $q_k = \sum_{j=1}^k p_j$, $q_0 = 0$, we define Baikov variables as

$$z_{i,j} = (\bar{\ell}_i - q_j)^2 - m_{i,j}^2, \quad \bar{z} = (\bar{\ell}_1 - \bar{\ell}_2)^2, \quad (15)$$

where $m_{i,j}$ is the mass of the propagator associated to $z_{i,j}$. We abbreviate $\partial_{a,j} = \frac{\partial}{\partial z_{a,j}}$ and $\partial_{\bar{z}} = \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}}$.

For practical computations, as well as ease of physical understanding, we make the observation that, for fixed external kinematics, eq. (15) defines an isomorphism between the polynomial ring in Baikov variables and a polynomial ring in momentum variables. Specifically,

$$R \cong \mathbb{C}[\ell_1^\mu, \ell_2^\mu, \mu_{11}, \mu_{22}, \mu_{12}], \quad (16)$$

where ℓ_i are the four-dimensional projections of the $\bar{\ell}_i$ and $\mu_{ij} = \bar{\ell}_i \cdot \bar{\ell}_j - \ell_i \cdot \ell_j$. The isomorphism in eq. (16) follows as both the forward and the inverse map are polynomial, with inverse map given by the well-known

$$\ell_i = \frac{1}{2} \sum_j (z_{i,0} - z_{i,j} + q_j^2 - m_{i,j}^2 + m_{i,0}^2) v_j, \quad (17)$$

where the v_i are defined by $v_i \cdot q_j = \delta_{ij}$, alongside eq. (2).

The Baikov polynomial and its derivatives can easily be expressed in loop-momentum variables via eq. (2) and

$$\partial_{\bar{z}} B = \mu_{12}, \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \partial_{a,j} B &= \delta_{j,0}(\mu_{a\bar{a}} - \mu_{12}) + w_j \cdot \Lambda_a, \\ \Lambda_a^\nu &= \ell_a^\nu \mu_{a\bar{a}} - \ell_{\bar{a}}^\nu \mu_{12}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$




FIG. 1: Double box topology from $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ and its leading Landau singularities. Black lines are massless particles; red, the top quark; blue, the Higgs boson; dashed, soft particles; dotted, collinear particles.

where $\bar{a} = 3 - a$ and $w_i^\mu = -2\partial_{a,i}\ell_a^\mu$. Moreover, we make use of the Sudakov parameterization,

$$\ell_i = x_i p + \beta_i \eta + \ell_i^\perp \quad (20)$$

where p is the relevant massless momentum, η is a massless reference vector and ℓ_i^\perp is the projection of ℓ_i into the space transverse to p and η .

A FIVE-POINT DOUBLE BOX EXAMPLE

In this section, we apply eq. (5) in the case of the double box of fig. 1a. All explicit computations are performed with **Singular** [51]. To begin, we check the validity of the Landau decomposition, by computing the ingredients of eq. (10). We first compute the irreducible decomposition of the maximal cut Landau locus, finding

$$U_{\text{Landau}}^{\Gamma_1} = U_0^{\Gamma_1} \cup U_1^{\Gamma_1} \cup U_2^{\Gamma_1}, \quad (21)$$

where $U_1^{\Gamma_1}$ and $U_2^{\Gamma_1}$ correspond to configurations of loop-momenta that both satisfy the maximal cut, as well as some internal soft/collinear configuration. We depict them graphically in figs. 1b and 1c.

Next, to compute the non-reduced locus of $J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1}$, we calculate the radical of $J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1}$. Our approach is to express it as the intersection of the minimal associated primes [47] of $R/J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1}$, which we write as $\text{mAss}(J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1})$. As minimal primes correspond to irreducible components of $V(J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1})$, and generators of $J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1}$ factorize, it can be argued that

$$\text{mAss}(J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma}) = \text{mAss}(A_0^{\Gamma}) \cup \min_{\subseteq} \left[\bigcup_{\Gamma' \subseteq \Gamma} \text{mAss}(J_{\text{Landau}}^{\Gamma'}) \right], \quad (22)$$

where the minimum is with respect to inclusion. For the two-loop examples we have studied, eq. (22) can be efficiently implemented for numerical external kinematics.

For the double box example, we find the result

$$\sqrt{J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1}} = A_0^{\Gamma_1} \cap J_{4d}^{\Gamma_1} \cap J_{e\text{-col}}^{\ell_2, p_5} \cap J_{e\text{-col}}^{\ell_2 - q_4, p_4} \cap J_{\text{soft}}^{\ell_1 - \ell_2} \cap J_{\text{soft}}^{\ell_1} \cap J_{i\text{-col}}^{\ell_1, \ell_2}. \quad (23)$$

The novel ideals in eq. (23) correspond to uncut soft or collinear singularities, which we depict in fig. 2. Two ideals describe configurations where an internal momentum




FIG. 2: Diagrams of Landau singularities arising in the computation of $\sqrt{J_{\text{syz}}^\Gamma}$. Notation matches fig. 1.

is collinear to an external momentum, as in fig. 2a, two ideals describe a soft internal momentum, as in fig. 2b and a final ideal describes three collinear internal momenta, as in fig. 2c. Explicitly, they are given by

$$J_{\text{e-col}}^{\ell_i - q_j, p_k} = \langle \mu_{12}, \mu_{ii}, (\ell_i - q_j)^\perp, (\ell_i - q_j) \cdot p_k \rangle, \quad (24)$$

$$J_{\text{soft}}^{\ell_1} = \langle \ell_1^\nu, \mu_{11}, \mu_{12} \rangle, \quad (25)$$

$$J_{\text{soft}}^{\ell_1 - \ell_2} = \langle \ell_1^\nu - \ell_2^\nu, \mu_{11} - \mu_{12}, \mu_{22} - \mu_{12} \rangle, \quad (26)$$

$$J_{\text{i-col}}^{\ell_1, \ell_2} = \langle \ell_1^\mu \ell_2^\nu - \ell_1^\nu \ell_2^\mu, z_{1,0}, z_{2,0}, \tilde{z} \rangle, \quad (27)$$

where we employ the parameterization of eq. (20) for $p = p_k$. With this data, we compute the non-reduced locus of $J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1}$ and find that its intersection with the maximal cut is empty, implying that eq. (10) is satisfied.

These ideals allow us to easily compute the necessary pre-localizations and their associated \mathcal{C} matrices. As the non-reduced locus does not intersect the maximal cut, all pre-localizations are simply intersections of the ideals in eq. (23). For $U_1^{\Gamma_1}$, it is physically clear that it intersects only the p_4/p_5 collinear loci and the 4d locus, giving

$$J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1, [U_1^{\Gamma_1}]} = J_{4d} \cap J_{\text{e-col}}^{\ell_2, p_5} \cap J_{\text{e-col}}^{\ell_2 - q_4, p_4} \quad (28)$$

$$= \langle \mu_{12}, \mu_{22}, \mu_{11} \ell_2^\perp, z_{2,0} z_{2,3} \mu_{11}, z_{2,4} \mu_{11} \rangle,$$

where we employ the parameterization of eq. (20) with $p = p_5, \eta = p_4$. To construct \mathcal{C} , we note that $J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1, [U_1^{\Gamma_1}]}$ contains J_{4d} . We express the generators of $J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1}$ in terms of those of eq. (28) by inspection, using eq. (18) and

$$\partial_{1,j} B = (\partial_{1,j} \mu_{11}) \mu_{22} - 2(\partial_{1,j} \mu_{12}) \mu_{12}, \quad (29)$$

$$z_{2,4} \partial_{2,4} B = (\partial_{2,4} \mu_{22}) z_{2,4} \mu_{11} - 2z_{2,4} (\partial_{2,4} \mu_{12}) \mu_{12}, \quad (30)$$

$$\partial_{2,j} B = (w_j \cdot \ell_2^\perp) \mu_{11} - 2(\partial_{2,j} \mu_{12}) \mu_{12}, \quad (31)$$

$$z_{2,j} \partial_{2,j} B = z_{2,j} \left[\frac{z_{2,(3-j)} - z_{2,4}}{2p_4 \cdot p_5} + w_j \cdot \ell_2^\perp \right] \mu_{11} - z_{2,j} \partial_{2,j} \mu_{12}^2, \quad (32)$$

where eq. (31) holds for $j = 1, 2$; eq. (32) for $j = 0, 3$.

The pre-localization at $U_2^{\Gamma_1}$ can be handled analogously. Physically, the maximal-cut ℓ_1/ℓ_2 collinear singularity intersects with the four-dimensional locus, as well as uncut soft and collinear loci, implying

$$J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_1, [U_2^{\Gamma_1}]} = J_{4d} \cap J_{\text{soft}}^{\ell_1 - \ell_2} \cap J_{\text{i-col}}^{\ell_1, \ell_2}, \quad (33)$$

$$= \langle \Lambda_1^\nu, \chi_1^{(a)}, \chi_1^{(b)}, B \rangle + (1 \leftrightarrow 2),$$

$$\chi_i^{(a)} = z_{i,0}(\mu_{\bar{i}\bar{i}} - \mu_{12}), \quad \chi_i^{(b)} = z_{i,0}(\mu_{ii} - \mu_{\bar{i}\bar{i}}).$$




FIG. 3: Remaining five-point topologies contributing to the leading-color, light-quark-loop contributions to $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ pentabox topology.

The relations required to express the \mathcal{C} matrix are again easy to determine by inspection. They are given by

$$z_{i,0} \partial_{i,0} B = z_{i,0} w_0 \cdot \Lambda_i + \chi_i^{(a)}, \quad (34)$$

$$\tilde{z} \partial_{\tilde{z}} B = 2B + \ell_1 \cdot \Lambda_1 + \ell_2 \cdot \Lambda_2 - \chi_1^{(a)} - \chi_2^{(a)}, \quad (35)$$

alongside eq. (19) for $j > 0$. Given the generating sets in eqs. (28) and (33), the syzygy matrices \mathcal{R} can easily be computed with Groebner basis techniques.

$pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ PENTABOX STUDY

We have applied the Landau decomposition strategy to the set of five-point diagrams within the pentabox topology of fig. 3a, which we depict in fig. 3. In all cases, similar to the double box example, we confirm that the non-reduced locus of J_{syz}^Γ does not intersect the maximal cut, therefore implying eq. (10). As such, we could construct all Landau decompositions with the strategy described for the double box. Moreover, we explicitly confirm the equality of eq. (8) computationally.

We find that the universality of infrared singularities is reflected in our construction: all (singular) minimal primes that we encounter are either J_{4d} or are captured by the graphs in fig. 2. Moreover, we are able to recycle ingredients between topologies. Firstly, the ideal in eq. (28) arises as a pre-localization on the soft singularity for an exchange between the two massless legs also in the pentabox, Γ_2 , and the box-triangle, Γ_5 . Secondly, for each of Γ_4 , Γ_5 and Γ_6 , the singularity where the central line is soft results in the same pre-localization. In both cases, one can easily reuse the building blocks of the Fitting construction. In total, only 7 non-trivially distinct constructions arise. For the interested reader, we present results of the calculations of the \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{R} matrices for all graphs in fig. 3 in supplemental material.

DISCUSSION AND OUTLOOK

In this work, we have studied Feynman integral reduction with syzygy methods. We applied advanced methods from commutative algebra to construct analytic generating sets of syzygies that are essential for efficient computation of Feynman integrals for collider physics. Our formulae are highly compact, and physically transparent:

they are organized by the Landau locus. Strikingly, this highlights how Feynman integral reduction is controlled by infrared singularities. Interestingly, we have observed that, once syzygies associated to a Landau locus component have been constructed, they can be applied to other diagrams. This suggests a universality of the syzygy solutions that we have presented.

Given our results, an important next step is to understand how to construct a minimal set of total derivatives suitable for integrand-level reduction [19, 38]. Indeed, the compact nature of our results hints at the tantalizing possibility of constructing stable, floating-point reduction methods in which there has been renewed interest [38, 52–54]. Altogether, we expect our approach to be of crucial importance for future calculations of LHC scattering amplitudes, enabling progress both beyond $2 \rightarrow 3$ kinematics and at higher loop orders.

Acknowledgments We thank Harald Ita, Andrzej Pokraka and Andrew McLeod for insightful discussions. We thank Harald Ita and Vasily Sotnikov for comments on the draft. The work of Federico Coro, Pavel Novichkov and Qian Song was supported by the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union’s Horizon Europe research and innovation program grant agreement 101078449 (ERC Starting Grant MultiScaleAmp). Views and opinions expressed are however those of the authors only and do not necessarily reflect those of the European Union or the European Research Council Executive Agency. Neither the European Union nor the granting authority can be held responsible for them.

Proof of Fitting Decomposition of A_0^Γ

Our proof of eq. (8) makes use of the fundamental concept in commutative algebra of localization. We refer the interested reader to [48, Chapter 2] and [47, Chapter 3] for introductory details. The main idea that we use is that ideal containment, and therefore equality, is a local property. That is, for ideals J and K ,

$$J = K \Leftrightarrow J_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = K_{\mathfrak{m}_x} \text{ for all maximal ideals } \mathfrak{m}_x, \quad (36)$$

where $J_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ is the image of J in the localization of the polynomial ring at \mathfrak{m}_x and we make use of the fact that, in an algebraically closed field, maximal ideals can be labeled by points x in affine space. The local nature of ideal containment can be easily argued by applying [47, Proposition 3.8] to the module $M = (J + K)/J$. Intuitively, eq. (36) tells us to check that eq. (8) holds locally at all points.

The localization strategy is fruitful as the actors in eq. (8) behave nicely under localization. Firstly, one has

$$J_{\mathfrak{m}_x}^{[U]} = J_{\mathfrak{m}_x}, \quad \text{for all } x \in U. \quad (37)$$

As such, $J^{[U]}$ is the pre-image of the localization of J at any point $x \in U$, hence the name. Secondly, Fitting ideals commute with localization, i.e., one has that

$$\text{Fitt}_0(M)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = \text{Fitt}_0(M_{\mathfrak{m}_x}). \quad (38)$$

This allows us to make frequent use of cases where Fitting ideals can easily be understood. Specifically, for an ideal J one has that

$$\text{Fitt}_0(\langle 0 \rangle_{\mathfrak{m}_x}) = R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}, \quad (39)$$

$$\text{Fitt}_0(R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}/J_{\mathfrak{m}_x}) = J_{\mathfrak{m}_x}. \quad (40)$$

This collection of properties, together with the fact that eq. (8) is organized by the Landau locus are all that is required for the proof. Specifically, we break down the application of eq. (36) into three cases:

1. $x \notin U_{\text{crit}[\log(B)]}^\Gamma \cup U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma$,
2. $x \in U_{\text{crit}[\log(B)]}^\Gamma$ and
3. $x \in U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma$,

where $U_{\text{crit}[\log(B)]}^\Gamma$ is the critical locus of the logarithm of the maximal-cut Baikov polynomial.

First, we argue that eq. (8) holds locally on $x \notin U_{\text{crit}[\log(B)]}^\Gamma \cup U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma$. To this end, note that

$$U_{\text{crit}[\log(B)]}^\Gamma \cup U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma = U_{\text{syz}}^\Gamma \cap U_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma. \quad (41)$$

If we consider localizing at a point outside of this variety then either $x \notin U_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma$ and $(J_{\text{cut}}^\Gamma)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ or $x \notin U_{\text{syz}}^\Gamma$ and $\text{Fitt}_0(M_i)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = \text{Fitt}_0(\langle 0 \rangle_{\mathfrak{m}_x}) = R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$. In each case, both sides of eq. (8) are locally $R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ and equality holds.

Second, we consider localizing at $x \in U_{\text{crit}[\log(B)]}^\Gamma$. As $B \neq 0$ on $U_{\text{crit}[\log(B)]}^\Gamma$, and $B = 0$ on both $V(J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma, [U_i]})$ and $V(J_{4d})$, localizing at x gives

$$\text{Fitt}_0(M_i)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = \text{Fitt}_0(R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}/[J_{\text{syz}}^\Gamma]_{\mathfrak{m}_x}) = (J_{\text{syz}}^\Gamma)_{\mathfrak{m}_x}. \quad (42)$$

Moreover, as $B \neq 0$ on x , B is a unit in $R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ and so $(J_{\text{syz}}^\Gamma)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = (A_0^\Gamma)_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$. Therefore, eq. (8) holds locally here.

Third, we show local equality for $x \in U_{\text{Landau}}^\Gamma$. For the left-hand side, note that $B = 0$ on x , and so we find $R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$. For the right-hand side, we consider the decomposition of U_{Landau}^Γ in eq. (4). First, we consider the localization at a point on some U_i . By construction, $(M_i)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = \langle 0 \rangle_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ and so $\text{Fitt}_0(M_i)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$. Next, consider the localization on any point of U_0^Γ that is not contained within the U_i . By eq. (10), $(J_{\text{syz}}^\Gamma)_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ is radical on these points, and hence equal to $(J_{4d})_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$. Locally, we see that each $(M_i)_{\mathfrak{m}_x} = \langle 0 \rangle_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$ and so each $\text{Fitt}_0(M_i) = R_{\mathfrak{m}_x}$, and so eq. (8) is proven. Finally, as this last statement is true as long as there is at least one term in the sum over i in eq. (8), we can drop the $i = 0$ term if $n_{\text{IR}} > 0$.

Remaining $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}H$ Five-Point Examples

In this appendix, we provide ingredients for the Landau decompositions for the five-point integrals in fig. 3.

Pentabox We consider Γ_2 , the pentabox of fig. 3a. Here, the maximal cut Landau locus is

$$U_{\text{Landau}}^{\Gamma_2} = U_0^{\Gamma_2} \cup U_1^{\Gamma_2} \cup U_2^{\Gamma_2}. \quad (43)$$

On $U_1^{\Gamma_2}$, the momentum in the line between p_4 and p_5 is soft and on $U_2^{\Gamma_2}$, the momentum in central line is soft. In both cases, the remaining propagators are on-shell.

If we pre-localize at $U_1^{\Gamma_2}$ and intersect with J_{4d} , we find the ideal in eq. (28) and no new computation is required. In contrast, the pre-localization at $U_2^{\Gamma_2}$ is novel. We find

$$J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_2, [U_2^{\Gamma_2}]} \cap J_{4d} = \langle \Lambda_{1\perp}^\nu, z_{1,0}(\bar{\Lambda}_1 \cdot P), z_{1,3}(\Lambda_1 \cdot P), \tilde{z}\mu_{11}, \tilde{z}\mu_{12}, \mu_{11}\mu_{22} - \mu_{12}^2 \rangle + (1 \leftrightarrow 2). \quad (44)$$

where $P = q_3$, $\bar{\Lambda}_k = \Lambda_k|_{\ell_i \rightarrow P - \ell_i}$ and $v_\mu^\perp = v_\mu - \frac{(v \cdot P)}{P^2} P_\mu$ is the projection of v onto the space transverse to P . The \mathcal{C} -matrix can be constructed from eq. (18) as well as

$$\partial_{i,j} B = w_j \cdot \Lambda_i^\perp, \quad \text{for } j \in \{1, 2, 4\}, \quad (45)$$

and the four relations generated by applying $1 \leftrightarrow 2$ and $\ell_i \rightarrow P - \ell_i$ to

$$z_{1,3}\partial_{1,3}B = z_{1,3}(w_3 \cdot \Lambda_1^\perp) + \frac{(w_3 \cdot P)}{P^2} z_{1,3}(\Lambda_1 \cdot P). \quad (46)$$

Pentatriangle We consider the pentatriangle diagram of fig. 3b. The Landau locus decomposes as

$$U_{\text{Landau}}^{\Gamma_3} = U_0^{\Gamma_3} \cup U_1^{\Gamma_3} \cup U_2^{\Gamma_3} \cup U_3^{\Gamma_3}. \quad (47)$$

On $U_1^{\Gamma_3}$, the central line momentum is soft; on $U_2^{\Gamma_3}$, ℓ_2 is soft; on $U_3^{\Gamma_3}$, ℓ_2 is collinear to p_5 . In all cases, the other line momenta are on-shell. In practice, it turns out that the Fitting ideal constructed from $U_1^{\Gamma_3}$ contains the other possible Fitting ideals, so we focus here, finding

$$J_{\text{syz}}^{[U_1^{\Gamma_3}]} \cap J_{4d} = \langle \Lambda_1^\nu, \Lambda_2 \cdot p_5, \Lambda_2^\perp, B, \tilde{z}\mu_{22}, \chi_i^{(a)} \rangle. \quad (48)$$

To construct the \mathcal{C} matrix, we first note that the Baikov polynomial is manifestly in the ideal. Further rows can be constructed by using eq. (34) for $i = 1$ and eq. (19) for $a = 1$. Next we note that for $j = \{1, 2, 3\}$

$$\partial_{2,j} B = w_j \cdot \Lambda_2. \quad (49)$$

Moreover, one has that

$$\tilde{z}\partial_z B = \ell_1 \cdot \Lambda_1^\perp + 2 \frac{(\ell_1 \cdot \eta)(\Lambda_1 \cdot p_5)}{p_5 \cdot \eta} + B - \chi_1^{(a)} + (1 \leftrightarrow 2). \quad (50)$$

For the remaining $z_{2,j}\partial_{2,j}B$ we start by rewriting

$$z_{2,j}\partial_{2,j}B = \frac{z_{2,j}}{\eta \cdot p_5} [(w_j \cdot \eta)(p_5 \cdot \Lambda_2) + (w_j \cdot p_5)(\eta \cdot \Lambda_2)] + \chi_2^{(a)} \delta_{j,0} + z_{2,j}(w_j \cdot \Lambda_2^\perp), \quad (51)$$

where only the last term is not manifestly in the ideal of eq. (48). To remedy this, we first define

$$u_j^\nu = \frac{2(\eta \cdot [\ell_2 - q_j])}{\eta \cdot p_5} p_5^\nu + (\ell_2^\perp)^\nu. \quad (52)$$

This allows us to write

$$z_{2,j}(\eta \cdot \Lambda_2) = (u_j \cdot \ell_2)(\eta \cdot \Lambda_2) + \mu_{22}(\eta \cdot \Lambda_2), \quad (53)$$

which holds for $j \in \{0, 4\}$. The right-hand side of eq. (53) can be written in terms of the generators in eq. (48) via

$$\mu_{22}(\Lambda_2 \cdot \eta) = B(\ell_2 \cdot \eta) - \mu_{12}(\Lambda_1 \cdot \eta), \quad (54)$$

$$[u \cdot \ell_2][\eta \cdot \Lambda_2] = [u \cdot \Lambda_2][\eta \cdot \ell_2] - [u \cdot \ell_1][\eta \cdot \Lambda_1] + [\eta \cdot \ell_1][u \cdot \Lambda_1]. \quad (55)$$

First Box-Triangle We consider diagram Γ_4 of fig. 3c. The maximal-cut Landau locus decomposes as

$$U_{\text{Landau}}^{\Gamma_4} = U_0^{\Gamma_4} \cup U_1^{\Gamma_4} \cup U_2^{\Gamma_4}. \quad (56)$$

On $U_1^{\Gamma_4}$, ℓ_2 is collinear to p_5 and on $U_2^{\Gamma_4}$ the middle line momentum is soft. In both cases, the remaining propagators of the diagram are on-shell.

To pre-localize at $U_1^{\Gamma_4}$, we make use of the Sudakov parameterization for $p = p_5$, which leads to

$$J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_4, [U_1^{\Gamma_4}]} \cap J_{4d} = \langle \mu_{12}, \mu_{22}, \mu_{11}\ell_2^\perp, z_{2,0}\mu_{11}, z_{2,4}\mu_{11} \rangle. \quad (57)$$

To construct \mathcal{C} , we express the generators of $J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_4}$ in terms of those in eq. (57) using eq. (18) and

$$\partial_{1,j} B = (\partial_{1,j}\mu_{11})\mu_{22} - 2(\partial_{1,j}\mu_{12})\mu_{12}, \quad (58)$$

$$z_{2,j}\partial_{2,j} B = (\partial_{2,j}\mu_{22})z_{2,j}\mu_{11} - 2z_{2,j}(\partial_{2,j}\mu_{12})\mu_{12}, \quad (59)$$

$$\partial_{2,j} B = \left[\frac{\eta \cdot w_j}{2\eta \cdot p_5} (z_{2,4} - z_{2,0}) + w_j \cdot \ell_2^\perp \right] \mu_{11} - \partial_{2,j}\mu_{12}^2, \quad (60)$$

where eq. (60) holds for $j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Pre-localizing at $U_2^{\Gamma_4}$ gives

$$J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_4, [U_2^{\Gamma_4}]} \cap J_{4d} = \langle \mu_{11} - \mu_{12}, \mu_{11} - \mu_{22}, \mu_{11}(\ell_1 - \ell_2)^\nu \rangle \quad (61)$$

and the associated \mathcal{C} -matrix can be constructed by noting

$$\tilde{z}\partial_z B = (\mu_{11} + \mu_{22} - \tilde{z})(\mu_{11} - \mu_{12}) - \mu_{12}(\mu_{11} - \mu_{22}) + (\ell_1 - \ell_2) \cdot [\mu_{11}(\ell_1 - \ell_2)], \quad (62)$$

$$\Lambda_1^\nu = \mu_{11}(\ell_1 - \ell_2)^\nu + \ell_2^\nu(\mu_{11} - \mu_{12}) - \ell_1^\nu(\mu_{11} - \mu_{22}), \quad (63)$$

$$\Lambda_2^\nu = \ell_1^\nu(\mu_{11} - \mu_{12}) - \mu_{11}(\ell_1 - \ell_2)^\nu, \quad (64)$$

from which it is easy to construct the rows of the \mathcal{C} -matrix by comparison with eq. (19).

Second Box-Triangle We consider diagram Γ_5 of fig. 3d. The maximal-cut Landau locus decomposes as

$$U_{\text{Landau}}^{\Gamma_5} = U_0^{\Gamma_5} \cup U_1^{\Gamma_5} \cup U_2^{\Gamma_5}, \quad (65)$$

where on $U_1^{\Gamma_5}$ the central line momentum is soft and on $U_2^{\Gamma_5}$ the line momentum exchanged between p_4 and p_5 is soft. All other edges are on-shell. If we pre-localize at $U_1^{\Gamma_5}$ and intersect with J_{4d} , we find the ideal in eq. (61). If we pre-localize at $U_2^{\Gamma_5}$ and intersect with J_{4d} , we find the ideal in eq. (28). As such, in both cases, no further computation is required.

Pentabubble We consider the pentabubble diagram of fig. 3e. The maximal-cut Landau locus decomposes as

$$U_{\text{Landau}}^{\Gamma_6} = U_0^{\Gamma_6} \cup U_1^{\Gamma_6} \cup U_2^{\Gamma_6}. \quad (66)$$

On $U_1^{\Gamma_6}$, the central line momentum is soft, and the remaining lines are on-shell. The pre-localization on $U_1^{\Gamma_6}$ is the ideal given in eq. (61). The \mathcal{C} matrix can then be built from the corresponding discussion.

On $U_2^{\Gamma_6}$ the line momentum associated to $z_{2,4}$ is soft with the remaining lines on-shell. Here, the pre-localization computation is novel. One finds

$$J_{\text{syz}}^{\Gamma_6, [U_2^{\Gamma_6}]} \cap J_{4d} = \langle \mu_{22}, \mu_{12}, \Lambda_2^\nu + (\mu_{11} - \mu_{12})p_5^\nu \rangle. \quad (67)$$

The relations required to express the \mathcal{C} matrix are eqs. (58) and (18) as well as

$$z_{2,4}\partial_{2,4}B = ([\ell_1 - \ell_2] \cdot [\ell_2 + p_5] - \mu_{22})\mu_{12} + \mu_{11}\mu_{22} \\ + (\ell_2 + p_5 + z_{2,4}w_4) \cdot (\Lambda_2 + [\mu_{11} - \mu_{12}]p_5), \quad (68)$$

$$\partial_{2,i}B = w_i \cdot (\Lambda_2 + p_5[\mu_{11} - \mu_{12}]), \quad (69)$$

where the second relation holds for $i \neq 4$.

Relation Matrix Ancillary Files

Expressions for the \mathcal{R}_i submatrices needed to construct each of the \mathcal{F}_i studied in this work can be found in Mathematica format under `relationMatrices/*.` Each file is a pair of generators of a pre-localization ideal and syzygies of the generators. There is one file for each of the 7 distinct pre-localizations that we discuss, organized as

- `soft.m`, corresponding to eq. (67);
- `col.m`, corresponding to eq. (57), for $\mathbf{p} = p_5$;
- `2Col.m`, corresponding to eq. (28) for $(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{eta}) = (p_5, p_4)$;
- `midSoft.m`, corresponding to eq. (61);
- `midSoftCol.m`, corresponding to eq. (33);
- `midSoft2Col.m`, corresponding to eq. (44);
- `pt.m`, corresponding to eq. (48), for $\mathbf{p} = p_5$ and using a Sudakov parameterization everywhere.

In the files, we represent the loop momentum components ℓ_i^ν as `li[nu]`, μ_{ij} as `muij` and scalar products of vectors $v \cdot w$ as `sp[v, w]`. For the four-dimensional momentum space, we use the alternating metric signature, $+-+--$. We represent the propagator variables $z_{a,j}$ as `z[a, j]` and \tilde{z} as `zt`. To represent the Sudakov parameterization, we denote x_i as `xi` and β_i as `bei`. Moreover, we explicitly pick a basis of the transverse space, writing

$$\ell_i^\perp = \alpha_{i,+}\omega_+ + \alpha_{i,-}\omega_-, \quad (70)$$

where we make use of ω_\pm such that

$$\omega_\pm^2 = \omega_\pm \cdot p = \omega_\pm \cdot \eta = 0, \quad \omega_+ \cdot \omega_- = -\eta \cdot p. \quad (71)$$

In the files, we represent $\alpha_{i,+}$ as `alip` and $\alpha_{i,-}$ as `alim`. For the pentabox example, we employ a basis for the space transverse to P , we introduce three four-vectors n_i that satisfy

$$n_i \cdot P = 0, \quad n_i \cdot n_j = \delta_{ij}, \quad (72)$$

where we represent the n_i as `n[i]`. For simplicity, we abbreviate $(\ell_a - P)^2$ as `z[a,P]`.

* federico.coro@ugent.be

† pavel.novichkov@ugent.be

‡ ben.page@ugent.be

§ qian.song@ugent.be

- [1] K. G. Chetyrkin and F. V. Tkachov, “Integration by parts: The algorithm to calculate β -functions in 4 loops,” Nucl. Phys. B **192**, 159–204 (1981).
- [2] A. V. Kotikov, “Differential equations method: New technique for massive Feynman diagrams calculation,” Phys. Lett. B **254**, 158–164 (1991).
- [3] Ettore Remiddi, “Differential equations for Feynman graph amplitudes,” Nuovo Cim. A **110**, 1435–1452 (1997), arXiv:hep-th/9711188.
- [4] T. Gehrmann and E. Remiddi, “Differential equations for two-loop four-point functions,” Nucl. Phys. B **580**, 485–518 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9912329.
- [5] Johannes M. Henn, “Multiloop integrals in dimensional regularization made simple,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 251601 (2013), arXiv:1304.1806 [hep-th].
- [6] S. Laporta, “High-precision calculation of multiloop Feynman integrals by difference equations,” Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **15**, 5087–5159 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/0102033.
- [7] Philipp Maierhöfer, Johann Usovitsch, and Peter Uwer, “Kira—A Feynman integral reduction program,” Comput. Phys. Commun. **230**, 99–112 (2018), arXiv:1705.05610 [hep-ph].
- [8] Jonas Klappert, Fabian Lange, Philipp Maierhöfer, and Johann Usovitsch, “Integral reduction with Kira 2.0 and finite field methods,” Comput. Phys. Commun. **266**, 108024 (2021), arXiv:2008.06494 [hep-ph].
- [9] A. V. Smirnov, “Algorithm FIRE – Feynman Integral REDuction,” JHEP **10**, 107 (2008), arXiv:0807.3243 [hep-ph].
- [10] Alexander V. Smirnov and Mao Zeng, “FIRE 7: Automatic Reduction with Modular Approach,” (2025), arXiv:2510.07150 [hep-ph].
- [11] Tiziano Peraro, “FiniteFlow: multivariate functional reconstruction using finite fields and dataflow graphs,” JHEP **07**, 031 (2019), arXiv:1905.08019 [hep-ph].
- [12] Xin Guan, Xiao Liu, Yan-Qing Ma, and Wen-Hao Wu, “Blade: A package for block-triangular form improved Feynman integrals decomposition,” Comput. Phys. Commun. **310**, 109538 (2025), arXiv:2405.14621 [hep-ph].
- [13] R. N. Lee, “Presenting LiteRed: a tool for the Loop InTEgrals REDuction,” (2012), arXiv:1212.2685 [hep-ph].

- [14] Roman N. Lee, “LiteRed 1.4: a powerful tool for reduction of multiloop integrals,” *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **523**, 012059 (2014), arXiv:1310.1145 [hep-ph].
- [15] Zihao Wu, Janko Boehm, Rourou Ma, Hefeng Xu, and Yang Zhang, “NeatIBP 1.0, a package generating small-size integration-by-parts relations for Feynman integrals,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **295**, 108999 (2024), arXiv:2305.08783 [hep-ph].
- [16] Zihao Wu, Janko Böhm, Rourou Ma, Johann Usovitsch, Yingxuan Xu, and Yang Zhang, “Performing integration-by-parts reductions using NeatIBP 1.1 + Kira,” (2025), arXiv:2502.20778 [hep-ph].
- [17] Janusz Gluza, Krzysztof Kajda, and David A. Kosower, “Towards a Basis for Planar Two-Loop Integrals,” *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 045012 (2011), arXiv:1009.0472 [hep-th].
- [18] Kasper J. Larsen and Yang Zhang, “Integration-by-parts reductions from unitarity cuts and algebraic geometry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 041701 (2016), arXiv:1511.01071 [hep-th].
- [19] Harald Ita, “Two-loop Integrand Decomposition into Master Integrals and Surface Terms,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 116015 (2016), arXiv:1510.05626 [hep-th].
- [20] Andreas von Manteuffel and Robert M. Schabinger, “A novel approach to integration by parts reduction,” *Phys. Lett. B* **744**, 101–104 (2015), arXiv:1406.4513 [hep-ph].
- [21] Tiziano Peraro, “Scattering amplitudes over finite fields and multivariate functional reconstruction,” *JHEP* **12**, 030 (2016), arXiv:1608.01902 [hep-ph].
- [22] Sebastian Mizera, “Scattering Amplitudes from Intersection Theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 141602 (2018), arXiv:1711.00469 [hep-th].
- [23] Pierpaolo Mastrolia and Sebastian Mizera, “Feynman Integrals and Intersection Theory,” *JHEP* **02**, 139 (2019), arXiv:1810.03818 [hep-th].
- [24] Sebastian Mizera and Andrzej Pokraka, “From Infinity to Four Dimensions: Higher Residue Pairings and Feynman Integrals,” *JHEP* **02**, 159 (2020), arXiv:1910.11852 [hep-th].
- [25] Hjalte Frellesvig, Federico Gasparotto, Stefano Laporta, Manoj K. Mandal, Pierpaolo Mastrolia, Luca Mattiazzi, and Sebastian Mizera, “Decomposition of Feynman Integrals by Multivariate Intersection Numbers,” *JHEP* **03**, 027 (2021), arXiv:2008.04823 [hep-th].
- [26] Simon Caron-Huot and Andrzej Pokraka, “Duals of Feynman integrals. Part I. Differential equations,” *JHEP* **12**, 045 (2021), arXiv:2104.06898 [hep-th].
- [27] Simon Caron-Huot and Andrzej Pokraka, “Duals of Feynman Integrals. Part II. Generalized unitarity,” *JHEP* **04**, 078 (2022), arXiv:2112.00055 [hep-th].
- [28] L. D. Landau, “On the Analytic Properties of Vertex Parts in Quantum Field Theory,” *Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **37**, 62–70 (1960).
- [29] Martin Helmer and Felix Tellander, “Spectral Decomposition of Euler-Mellin Integrals,” (2025), arXiv:2505.12458 [math-ph].
- [30] Martin Helmer and Felix Tellander, “Geometric singularities of Feynman integrals,” *Phys. Rev. D* **112**, 065019 (2025), arXiv:2506.05042 [hep-th].
- [31] Sebastian Mizera and Simon Telen, “Landau discriminants,” *JHEP* **08**, 200 (2022), arXiv:2109.08036 [math-ph].
- [32] Claudia Fevola, Sebastian Mizera, and Simon Telen, “Landau Singularities Revisited: Computational Algebraic Geometry for Feynman Integrals,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **132**, 101601 (2024), arXiv:2311.14669 [hep-th].
- [33] Claudia Fevola, Sebastian Mizera, and Simon Telen, “Principal Landau determinants,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **303**, 109278 (2024), arXiv:2311.16219 [math-ph].
- [34] Miguel Correia, Mathieu Giroux, and Sebastian Mizera, “SOFIA: Singularities of Feynman Integrals Automated,” (2025), arXiv:2503.16601 [hep-th].
- [35] Martin Helmer, Georgios Papathanasiou, and Felix Tellander, “Landau Singularities from Whitney Stratifications,” (2024), arXiv:2402.14787 [hep-th].
- [36] Christoph Dlapa, Martin Helmer, Georgios Papathanasiou, and Felix Tellander, “Symbol alphabets from the Landau singular locus,” *JHEP* **10**, 161 (2023), arXiv:2304.02629 [hep-th].
- [37] Zvi Bern, Michael Enciso, Harald Ita, and Mao Zeng, “Dual Conformal Symmetry, Integration-by-Parts Reduction, Differential Equations and the Nonplanar Sector,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 096017 (2017), arXiv:1709.06055 [hep-th].
- [38] S. Abreu, F. Febres Cordero, H. Ita, M. Jaquier, B. Page, and M. Zeng, “Two-Loop Four-Gluon Amplitudes from Numerical Unitarity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 142001 (2017), arXiv:1703.05273 [hep-ph].
- [39] Yang Zhang, “Lecture Notes on Multi-loop Integral Reduction and Applied Algebraic Geometry,” (2016) arXiv:1612.02249 [hep-th].
- [40] Janko Böhm, Alessandro Georgoudis, Kasper J. Larsen, Mathias Schulze, and Yang Zhang, “Complete sets of logarithmic vector fields for integration-by-parts identities of Feynman integrals,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 025023 (2018), arXiv:1712.09737 [hep-th].
- [41] Jorrit Bosma, Kasper J. Larsen, and Yang Zhang, “Differential equations for loop integrals in Baikov representation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 105014 (2018), arXiv:1712.03760 [hep-th].
- [42] Robert M. Schabinger, “A New Algorithm For The Generation Of Unitarity-Compatible Integration By Parts Relations,” *JHEP* **01**, 077 (2012), arXiv:1111.4220 [hep-ph].
- [43] Samuel Abreu, Giuseppe De Laurentis, Harald Ita, Maximilian Klinkert, Ben Page, and Vasily Sotnikov, “Two-loop QCD corrections for three-photon production at hadron colliders,” *SciPost Phys.* **15**, 157 (2023), arXiv:2305.17056 [hep-ph].
- [44] Bakul Agarwal, Stephen P. Jones, and Andreas von Manteuffel, “Two-loop helicity amplitudes for $gg \rightarrow ZZ$ with full top-quark mass effects,” *JHEP* **05**, 256 (2021), arXiv:2011.15113 [hep-ph].
- [45] Dominik Bendle, Janko Böhm, Wolfram Decker, Alessandro Georgoudis, Franz-Josef Pfreundt, Mirko Rahn, Pascal Wasser, and Yang Zhang, “Integration-by-parts reductions of Feynman integrals using Singular and GPI-Space,” *JHEP* **02**, 079 (2020), arXiv:1908.04301 [hep-th].
- [46] Ben Page and Qian Song, “Critical Points and Syzygies for Feynman Integrals,” (2025), arXiv:2509.17681 [hep-th].
- [47] M. F. Atiyah and I. G. Macdonald, *Introduction to Commutative Algebra* (Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, 1969).
- [48] David Eisenbud, *Commutative Algebra: With a View Toward Algebraic Geometry* (Springer Science & Business Media, 1995).
- [49] P. A. Baikov, “Explicit solutions of the three loop vacuum integral recurrence relations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **385**, 404–

- 410 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9603267.
- [50] Simon Caron-Huot, Miguel Correia, and Mathieu Giroux, “Recursive Landau Analysis,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **135**, 131603 (2025), arXiv:2406.05241 [hep-th].
 - [51] Wolfram Decker, Gert-Martin Greuel, Gerhard Pfister, and Hans Schönemann, “SINGULAR 4-2-1 — A computer algebra system for polynomial computations,” <http://www.singular.uni-kl.de> (2021).
 - [52] S. Abreu, J. Dormans, F. Febres Cordero, H. Ita, M. Kraus, B. Page, E. Pascual, M. S. Ruf, and V. Sotnikov, “Caravel: A C++ framework for the computation of multi-loop amplitudes with numerical unitarity,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **267**, 108069 (2021), arXiv:2009.11957 [hep-ph].
 - [53] Stefano Pozzorini, Natalie Schär, and Max F. Zoller, “Two-loop tensor integral coefficients in OpenLoops,” *JHEP* **05**, 161 (2022), arXiv:2201.11615 [hep-ph].
 - [54] Giuseppe Bevilacqua, Dhimiter Canko, Costas G. Papadopoulos, and Aris Spourdalakis, “Towards numerical two-loop integrand reduction,” *JHEP* **11**, 069 (2025), arXiv:2506.07231 [hep-ph].