

QCD parameters and SM-high precision from $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{Hadrons}$: Updated*

Stephan Narison

*Laboratoire Univers et Particules de Montpellier (LUPM), CNRS-IN2P3,
Case 070, Place Eugène Bataillon, 34095 - Montpellier, France*

*and
Institute of High-Energy Physics of Madagascar (iHEPMAD)
University of Ankatso, Antananarivo 101, Madagascar*

Abstract

1. I report an update of my previous comparison of the theoretical value of the muon anomaly $a_\mu \equiv \frac{1}{2}(g-2)_\mu$ with the new measurement. One finds: $\Delta a_\mu \equiv a_\mu^{exp} - a_\mu^{th} = (143 \pm 42_{th} \pm 22_{exp}) \times 10^{-11}$ indicating about 3σ discrepancy between the SM predictions and experiment.

2. I improve the estimate of QCD power corrections up to dimension $D = 12$ and provide a new estimate of the ones up to $D = 20$ within the Shifman-Vainshtein-Zahkarov (SVZ) expansion by combining the ratio of the SVZ Borel/Laplace sum rules (LSR) with the Braaten-Pich and the author (BNP) τ -like decay moments for the $I = 1$ vector current. The results summarized in Table 1 confirm a violation of the factorization of the four-quark condensates and the value of the gluon one $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$ from some other sources. Up to $D = 20$, I do not observe any factorial nor exponential growth of the size of these power corrections.

3. I use these new values of the $D = 6, 8$ power corrections to extract α_s from the BNP lowest moment. To order α_s^4 , I find within the SVZ expansion: $\alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.3081(49)_{fit}(71)_{\alpha_s^5}$ [resp. $0.3260(47)_{fit}(62)_{\alpha_s^5}$] implying $\alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.1170(6)(3)_{evol}$ [resp. $0.1192(6)(3)_{evol}$] for Fixed Order (FO) [resp. Contour Improved (CI)] PT series. They lead to the mean: $\alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.3179(58)_{fit}(81)_{syst}$ and $\alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.1182(12)(3)_{evol}$ where the systematic error(syst) takes into account the discrepancy between the FO and CI results. Using the lowest BNP moment, we obtain from the vector (V) component of τ -decay data: $\alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{\tau,V}^{SVZ} = 0.3128(19)_{fit}(77)_{\alpha_s^5}$ [resp. $0.3291(25)_{fit}(65)_{\alpha_s^5}$] implying $\alpha_s(M_Z)|_{\tau,V}^{SVZ} = 0.1176(10)(3)_{evol}$ [resp. $0.1196(8)(3)_{evol}$] for FO [resp. CI] PT series, giving the mean: $\alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{\tau,V}^{SVZ} = 0.3219(52)(91)_{syst}$ leading to: $\alpha_s(M_Z)|_{\tau,V}^{SVZ} = 0.1187(13)(3)_{evol}$. The average of the two determinations from e^+e^- and τ -decay data is: $\langle \alpha_s(M_\tau) \rangle = 0.3198(72)$ which implies $\langle \alpha_s(M_Z) \rangle = 0.1185(9)(3)_{evol}$.

4. Some (eventual) contributions beyond the SVZ expansion ($1/Q^2$, instantons and duality violation) are discussed in Sections 10 and 11 which are expected to be relatively small.

Keywords: Muon anomaly, QCD spectral sum rules, QCD parameters, e^+e^- , τ -decay.

This is an update of the results in Ref. [1], where some preliminary ones have been presented at the alphas 2024 workshop (5-9 february 2024, ECT Trento-IT).

Email address: snarison@yahoo.fr (Stephan Narison)

1. Introduction

Precise determinations of the hadronic contributions to the muon anomaly $a_\mu \equiv \frac{1}{2}(g-2)_\mu$ and the QCD parameters (power corrections and α_s) are important inputs for testing the Standard Model (SM) and for QCD and hadrons phenomenology.

In this paper, I shall revisit the results obtained in [1] (referred hereafter as SN23) due to the new experimental measurement of the positive charged muon anomaly [2] received after the publication of the papers in SN23.

I shall also re-estimate the QCD condensates and some higher dimension ones by combining the analysis from the ratio of the SVZ [3]¹ LSR [8, 9]² with the one from some higher BNP τ -like moments [11–13]. These new values of QCD condensates will be used as inputs for determining α_s from the BNP lowest moment.

In so doing, I shall use, like in SN23 [1], the PDG 22 compilation of the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{Hadrons}$ [14] \oplus the recent CMD3 data [15] for the pion form factor and the value of gluon condensate $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$ from heavy quarkonia and some other sources.

2. The $I = 1$ isovector two-point function

We shall be concerned with the two-point correlator :

$$\Pi_H^{\mu\nu}(q^2) = i \int d^4x e^{-iqx} \langle 0 | \mathcal{T} J_H^\mu(x) (J_H^\nu(0))^\dagger | 0 \rangle = -(g^{\mu\nu} q^2 - q^\mu q^\nu) \Pi_H(q^2) \quad (1)$$

built from the T-product of the bilinear $I = 1$ vector current :

$$J_H^\mu(x) = \frac{1}{2} [: \bar{\psi}_u \gamma^\mu \psi_u - \bar{\psi}_d \gamma^\mu \psi_d :]. \quad (2)$$

It obeys the dispersion relation:

$$\Pi_H(q^2) = \int_{t >}^{\infty} \frac{dt}{t - q^2 - i\epsilon} \frac{1}{\pi} \text{Im} \Pi_H(t) + \dots, \quad (3)$$

where \dots are subtraction constants polynomial in q^2 and $t >$ is the hadronic threshold.. From the optical theorem, the spectral function $\text{Im} \Pi_H(t)$ can be related to the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{Hadrons}$ total cross-section as:

$$R_{ee}^{I=1} \equiv \frac{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{Hadrons})}{\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)} = \left(\frac{3}{2} \right) 8\pi \text{Im} \Pi_H(t). \quad (4)$$

The data handlings have been discussed in details in Ref. [1] and will not be repeated here. We use the compilation of PDG22 [14] which take into account the correlations among different data while we use the new CMD3 [15] data for the pion form factor below 1 GeV. In this paper, we shall be concerned with the data below 1.875 GeV.

¹For reviews, see e.g. [4–7] and references quoted in [1].

²For a recent review, see e.g. [10].

3. Comparison of the experimental and theoretical values of the muon anomaly a_μ

We start the paper by updating our previous comparison (1st reference in Ref. [1]) of the theoretical and new experimental values of the muon anomaly a_μ [2]:

$$a_\mu^{exp} = 116592059(22) \times 10^{-11}, \quad (5)$$

which improves the accuracy of previous results in Refs. [16] and FNAL [17] by a factor 1.86.

This experimental value is to be compared with the theoretical results compiled in Table 1 of Ref. [18] and in Table 8 of Ref. [19] to which we add the new estimate of the lowest order hadronic contributions to the vacuum polarization:

$$a_\mu|_{l.o}^{hvp} = (7036.5 \pm 38.9) \times 10^{-11}. \quad (6)$$

We notice that our prediction using the CMD3 data is larger by an amount of about 100×10^{-11} compared to the previous estimates using KLOE data as compared in Fig. 17 of SN23 [1] and the discussion in Section 10 of this paper. Therefore, we obtain (1st reference in Ref. [1]):

$$a_\mu^{th} = 116591916(42) \times 10^{-11}. \quad (7)$$

This leads to (2nd reference in Ref. [1]):

$$\Delta a_\mu \equiv a_\mu^{exp} - a_\mu^{th} = (143 \pm 42_{th} \pm 22_{exp}) \times 10^{-11}, \quad (8)$$

which indicates about 3σ discrepancy between experiment and the SM predictions.

4. The standard SVZ expansion

Within the SVZ [3] Operator Product Expansion (OPE), QCD condensates with higher and higher dimensions are assumed to approximate the not yet known QCD non-perturbative contributions. The SVZ-expansion reads ($q^2 \equiv -Q^2$):

$$8\pi^2 \Pi_H(-Q^2, m_q^2, \mu) = \sum_{D=0,2,\dots} \frac{C_D(-Q^2, m_q^2, \mu) \langle O_D(\mu) \rangle}{(Q^2)^{D/2}}, \quad (9)$$

where m_q is the quark mass, μ is the subtraction scale which separates the long and short distance dynamics. C_D are perturbatively calculable Wilson coefficients while $\langle O_D(\mu) \rangle$ are non-perturbative QCD condensates of dimension D . In the phenomenological analysis, the OPE is often truncated at $D = 6, 8$ where the approach gives a satisfactory explanation of different data (see e.g. [4–9]).

In addition, one should note that the contributions of higher dimension condensates are not under a good control due to the large number of Feynman diagram ones, to the inaccurate estimate of their size and to the difficulty to build a renormalization group invariant (RGI) condensate due to their mixing under renormalization [20].

In SN23, one uses the PT expression up to order α_s^4 while the OPE is truncated at $D = 6, 8$.

One should mention that, besides the well-known $\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle$ quark condensate, the gluon condensates have been determined from the heavy quark mass-splittings and some other sum rules [21, 22]:

$$\langle\alpha_s G^2\rangle = (6.39 \pm 0.35) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^4, \quad \langle g^3 G^3\rangle/\langle\alpha_s G^2\rangle = 8.2(1.0) [\text{GeV}^4], \quad (10)$$

while different analysis of the light meson systems lead to the value of the four-quark condensate (see e.g. the papers quoted in [7] and [1]) :

$$\rho\alpha_s\langle\bar{\psi}\psi\rangle^2 = 5.8(9) \times 10^{-4} [\text{GeV}^6]. \quad (11)$$

5. The Laplace sum rules (LSR) and their ratios

- *Form of the LSR and their ratio*

In Ref. [23] and SN23 [1], the dimension $D = 4, 6$ and 8 condensates appearing in the OPE of the two-point vector correlator have been estimated using the ratio of Laplace sum rule moments [3, 8, 9]³:

$$\mathcal{R}_{10}^c(\tau) \equiv \frac{\mathcal{L}_1^c}{\mathcal{L}_0^c} = \frac{\int_{t>}^{t_c} dt e^{-t\tau} t R_{ee}^{I=1}(t, \mu)}{\int_{t>}^{t_c} dt e^{-t\tau} R_{ee}^{I=1}(t, \mu)}, \quad (12)$$

where τ is the LSR variable, $t >$ is the hadronic threshold. Here t_c is the threshold of the ‘‘QCD continuum’’ which parametrizes, from the discontinuity of the Feynman diagrams, the spectral function $\text{Im} \Pi_H(t, m_q^2, \mu^2)$. m_q is the quark mass and μ is an arbitrary subtraction point. The exponential weight enhances the contribution of the low-energy region of the spectral function accessible experimentally. We shall see in Eq.14 that it introduces a factorial factor in front of each condensates which accelerates the convergence of the OPE.

- *The PT QCD expression of the LSR*

To order α_s^4 , the perturbative (PT) expression of the lowest moment reads [24]:

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{PT}(\tau) = \frac{3}{2}\tau^{-1} \left[1 + a_s + 2.93856 a_s^2 + 6.2985 a_s^3 + 22.2233 a_s^4 \right]. \quad (13)$$

Then, taking its derivative in τ , one gets $\mathcal{L}_1(\tau)$ and then their ratio $\mathcal{R}_{10}(\tau)$.

- *The NPT QCD expression of the LSR*

From Eq. 9, one can deduce the lowest moment LSR:

$$\mathcal{L}_0^{NPT}(\tau) = \frac{3}{2}\tau^{-1} \sum_D \frac{d_D}{(D/2 - 1)!} \tau^{D/2}, \quad (14)$$

from which one can deduce \mathcal{L}_1^{NPT} and \mathcal{R}_{10} where $d_D \equiv C_D\langle O_D\rangle$.




Figure 1: Cauchy contour integral in the complex $Q^2 \equiv |q^2|$ -plane

6. The τ -decay-like moment sum rules

- *The BNP lowest moment*

Initially introduced by BNP [11, 12], the lowest original τ -decay moment reads in the massless quark limit :

$$\mathcal{R}_0^{ee} = 12\pi \int_{t>}^{x_0} dt (1-x_0)^2 (1+2x_0) 2 R_{ee}^{I=1}(x_0), \quad (15)$$

where : $x_0 \equiv t/M_0^2$ with M_0 is the τ -like lepton mass. The moment can be conveniently reformulated in terms of the Cauchy integral along the contour in Fig. 1 à la Shankar [25]⁴:

$$\mathcal{R}_0^{ee} = 6i\pi \int_{|x_0|=1} dx_0 (1-x_0)^2 (1+2x_0) 2 R_{ee}^{I=1}(x_0), \quad (16)$$

with a radius $|x_0| = 1$. To order α_s^4 , the PT corrections to the lowest BNP moment reads [12, 13, 27, 28]:

$$\delta_0^{(0)} = a_s + 5.2026 a_s^2 + 26.368 a_s^3 + 127.085 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \quad (\text{FO})$$

$$= 1.364 a_s + 2.54 a_s^2 + 9.71 a_s^3 + 64.29 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \quad (\text{CI}) \quad (17)$$

for Fixed Order (FO) and Contour Improved (CI) PT series.

Unlike different Finite Energy Sum Rule (FESR) used in the current literature [29] and its pinched versions [30], the main advantage of the τ -decay-like moment is the presence of the weight factor $(1-x_0)^2$ which suppresses the contribution near the real axis where the data are inaccurate. This approach has lead to an accurate determination of α_s at the τ mass.

³For a recent review, see e.g. [10].

⁴Some other applications in QCD can e.g. by found in [26].

- *The τ -like high moments*

Inspired by the original work of [13], different forms of high-moments have been proposed in the literature for extracting simultaneously α_s and the QCD condensates [31–34]. In this paper, we shall be concerned with the moments of the form:

$$\mathcal{R}_n^{ee} = 6i\pi \int_{|x_0|=1} dx_0 (1-x_0)^2 (1+2x_0)(x_0^n) 2 R_{ee}^{I=1}(x_0), \quad (18)$$

where $n = 1$ to 6.

- *Perturbative corrections to the τ -like high moments at order α_s^4*

The perturbative contributions read to order α_s^4 for fixed order (FO) perturbation series:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta_1^{(0)} &= a_s + 3.7776 a_s^2 + 6.8810 a_s^3 - 66.7235 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \\ \delta_2^{(0)} &= a_s + 3.2151 a_s^2 + 1.0687 a_s^3 - 98.2293 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \\ \delta_3^{(0)} &= a_s + 2.8990 a_s^2 - 1.7710 a_s^3 - 108.034 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \\ \delta_4^{(0)} &= a_s + 2.6928 a_s^2 - 3.4664 a_s^3 - 111.868 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \\ \delta_5^{(0)} &= a_s + 2.4365 a_s^2 - 5.4048 a_s^3 - 119.087 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \\ \delta_6^{(0)} &= a_s + 2.5464 a_s^2 - 4.5966 a_s^3 - 108.552 a_s^4 + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5) \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

- *τ -like high moments with non-Perturbative corrections at lowest order for $m_{u,d} = 0$*

To lowest order in α_s and in the massless quark limit, the non-perturbative corrections to the different moments give:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{R}_0^{ee} &= \frac{3}{2} \left[1 + \delta_0^{(0)} - 6 \frac{d_6}{M_0^6} - 4 \frac{d_8}{M_0^8} + \sum_D \delta_0^{(D)} \right] : & \delta_0^{(D)} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } D \geq 10), \\ \mathcal{R}_1^{ee} &= \frac{9}{20} \left[1 + \delta_1^{(0)} - \frac{20}{3} \frac{d_4}{M_0^4} + 20 \frac{d_8}{M_0^8} + \frac{40}{3} \frac{d_{10}}{M_0^{10}} + \sum_D \delta_1^{(D)} \right] : & \delta_1^{(D)} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } D \geq 12), \\ \mathcal{R}_2^{ee} &= \frac{1}{5} \left[1 + \delta_2^{(0)} + 15 \frac{d_6}{M_0^6} - 45 \frac{d_{10}}{M_0^{10}} - 30 \frac{d_{12}}{M_0^{12}} + \sum_D \delta_2^{(D)} \right] : & \delta_2^{(D)} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } D \geq 14), \\ \mathcal{R}_3^{ee} &= \frac{3}{28} \left[1 + \delta_3^{(0)} - 28 \frac{d_8}{M_0^8} + 84 \frac{d_{12}}{M_0^{12}} + 56 \frac{d_{14}}{M_0^{14}} + \sum_D \delta_3^{(D)} \right] : & \delta_3^{(D)} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } D \geq 16), \\ \mathcal{R}_4^{ee} &= \frac{9}{140} \left[1 + \delta_4^{(0)} + \frac{140}{3} \frac{d_{10}}{M_0^{10}} - 140 \frac{d_{14}}{M_0^{14}} - \frac{280}{3} \frac{d_{16}}{M_0^{16}} + \sum_D \delta_4^{(D)} \right] : & \delta_4^{(D)} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } D \geq 18), \\ \mathcal{R}_5^{ee} &= \frac{1}{24} \left[1 + \delta_5^{(0)} - 72 \frac{d_{12}}{M_0^{12}} - 216 \frac{d_{16}}{M_0^{16}} - 144 \frac{d_{18}}{M_0^{18}} + \sum_D \delta_5^{(D)} \right] : & \delta_5^{(D)} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } D \geq 20), \\ \mathcal{R}_6^{ee} &= \frac{1}{35} \left[1 + \delta_6^{(0)} + 75 \frac{d_{14}}{M_0^{14}} - 225 \frac{d_{18}}{M_0^{18}} - 150 \frac{d_{20}}{M_0^{20}} + \sum_D \delta_6^{(D)} \right] : & \delta_6^{(D)} &= 0 \quad (\text{for } D \geq 22), \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where $\delta_n^{(D)}$ is the contribution of the condensate of dimension D and n is the degree of the moment.

7. Extraction of the QCD condensates

- *Condensates from the τ -decay-like high moments*

In so doing we fix the value of α_s from the world average [14]. Then, we are looking for stability in the change of M_0 for extracting the optimal values of the condensates.

- ◊ \mathcal{R}_0^{ee} moment

- Using a two-parameter (d_6, d_8) fit in the lowest BNP moment, we do not find a conclusive result. We interpret this fact due to the opposite sign of the two contributions which tend to cancel out. However, this feature is welcome for determining α_s as the sum of the non-perturbative contributions are small but may indicate that it is not a good place for determining accurately the condensates.

- We impose more constraints by using a one-parameter fit with as an initial value the one :

$$d_6 = -(20.5 \pm 2) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^6, \quad (21)$$

obtained recently in SN23 [1] from the ratio of LSR into \mathcal{R}_0^{ee} in an attempt to fix d_8 . The resulting value of d_8 does not show any M_0 stability as also observed in SN23. Then, we conclude that the analysis from \mathcal{R}_0^{ee} is not also conclusive.

- ◊ \mathcal{R}_1^{ee} moment

- In the following we shall only work with a one-parameter fit d_0 and use as initial values of $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$ in Eq. 10 obtained from heavy quarks mass-splittings and some other sources and the value of d_8 from SN23:

$$d_8 = (4.7 \pm 3.5) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^8. \quad (22)$$

We extract d_{10} . Then, we repeat the analysis by fixing d_{10} and d_6 and deduce d_8 .

- ◊ \mathcal{R}_2^{ee} moment

- We use the value of d_{10} into \mathcal{R}_2^{ee} and extract d_{12} . Using this value of d_{12} , we re-iterate the analysis to extract d_{10} and continue the iterations.

- ◊ *Higher moments $n = 2$ to 6*

- We repeat the procedure for higher moments and extract d_{14} to d_{20} . The quoted values are obtained without any iterations as they are already quite precise. However, the quoted error does not include the systematic ones which may increase with the degree of moments.

- ◊ *Conclusions from τ -like moments*

- The values of d_8 to d_{20} from the τ -like moments are shown in Figs. 2 and 3 where we notice nice stabilities of the results versus M_0 . The optimal values are quoted in Table 1.




Figure 2: a) Value of the condensate d_8 from \mathcal{R}_1^{ee} versus M_0 ; b) Values of the condensates d_{10} and d_{12} from \mathcal{R}_1^{ee} and \mathcal{R}_2^{ee} versus M_0




Figure 3: a) Value of the condensate d_{14} and d_{16} from \mathcal{R}_3^{ee} and \mathcal{R}_4^{ee} versus M_0 ; b) Value of the condensates d_{18} and d_{20} from \mathcal{R}_5^{ee} and \mathcal{R}_6^{ee} versus M_0

- d_4 and d_6 from the ratio of LSR

Once we obtain the previous values of the $d = 8$ to $d = 20$ condensates, we inject them to the ratio \mathcal{R}_{10} of LSR for re-extracting d_6 and d_4 . To strongly constrain the parameters, we continue to use a one-parameter fit. Fixing again $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$ as in Eq. 10, we re-extract d_6 by including into the QCD expression of \mathcal{R}_{10} the contributions of condensates up to d_{20} . The analysis is shown in Fig. 4. The results are summarized in Table 1 and compared with the other estimates quoted in Table 2. One can notice a good agreement with some published results but the values obtained in the present work are more accurate.

$\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$	$-d_6$	d_8	$-d_{10}$	$-d_{12}$	d_{14}	$-d_{16}$	$-d_{18}$	d_{20}
7.8 ± 3.5	23.6 ± 3.7	18.2 ± 0.6	6.1 ± 0.2	18.4 ± 3.8	59.2 ± 7.1	118.3 ± 13.2	202.0 ± 20.7	421.3 ± 44.3

Table 1: Values of the QCD condensates of dimension D in units of 10^{-2} GeV^D from the present analysis.

- *Comments on the results*

- ◊ The value of $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$ obtained here is compatible with the one in Eq. 10 but less accurate. However, we consider this result as an improvement of the ones from some other τ -decay moments given in Table 2




Figure 4: **a)** Value of the condensate d_6 from \mathcal{R}_{10}^{ee} versus M_0 ; **b)** Value of the condensate d_4 from \mathcal{R}_{10}^{ee} versus M_0

$\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$	$-d_6$	d_8	$-d_{10}$	$-d_{12}$	Refs.
0.67 ± 0.89	15.2 ± 2.2	22.3 ± 2.5			ALEPH [31]
5.34 ± 3.64	14.2 ± 3.5	21.3 ± 2.5			OPAL [32]
$3.5^{+2.2}_{-3.8}$	$19.7^{+11.8}_{-7.9}$	$23.7^{+11.8}_{-15.8}$	11.8 ± 19.7	7.9 ± 19.7	$(d_{14,16} = 0)$ Pich-Rodriguez [33]

Table 2: Values of the QCD condensates from some other τ -moments at Fixed Order (FO) of the PT series.

using FO perturbative series. It disfavors some negative values obtained from CI perturbative series. This value is also consistent with the one $(8 \pm 4) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^4$ obtained from a matching of the short and long distances contributions to the Adler function at large N_c [35].

◇ The value of d_6 is in fair agreement with the one in Eq. 21 from ratio of LSR obtained in SN23 [1] where the OPE has been truncated at $D = 8$. The inclusion of higher dimension condensates has increased slightly $|d_6|$ by about 13.6%. The ratio $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle / \rho \alpha_s \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle^2 = 95.4$ is in the range of the ones obtained using different methods quoted in [36].

◇ The value of d_8 is larger than the one in Eq. 22 from ratio of LSR. As the extraction of d_8 from LSR in SN23 has been done by neglecting all higher dimension condensates included in the present analysis, we interpret the value of d_8 obtained in SN23 as an effective condensate including all high dimension ones. To check this argument, we evaluate the NP contributions to \mathcal{R}_{10}^{ee} at the typical optimization sum rule scale $\tau \approx 1 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$. We neglect all higher dimension condensates and find:

$$\sum_4^8 \delta^{NP} = 5.1 \times 10^{-2}, \quad \sum_4^6 \delta^{NP} = -1.0 \times 10^{-2} \rightarrow d_8 \approx 6.1 \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^8 \quad (23)$$

in perfect agreement with the fitted value in Eq. 22.

◇ Using the previous values of the condensates, we check the convergence of the OPE. We obtain at $\tau \simeq 1 \text{ GeV}^{-2}$:

$$\sum_{10}^{20} \delta^{NP} = -0.4 \times 10^{-2}, \quad (24)$$

which is negligible. This feature justifies (a posteriori) the phenomenological success of the SVZ sum rules

by truncating the OPE up to dimension $D = 6, 8$ condensates.

◊ From Table 1, we observe that there is no signal of a factorial nor/and exponential growth of the size of the condensates up to $D = 20$ where the OPE is truncated. Similar observation can be made in the $V - A$ channel for the OPE up to $D = 18$ [37, 38].

- *Comments on the \mathcal{L}_0 LSR moment*

We have also tried to use the \mathcal{L}_0 LSR moment to fix the $D \leq 8$ dimension condensates⁵. Our analysis is inconclusive and confirms the observation done in SN23. The same feature is observed for an attempt to extract α_s .

8. α_s from the lowest BNP moment using $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ Hadrons data

Armed with these improved values of the QCD condensates, we extract α_s from the lowest BNP moment \mathcal{R}_0^{ee} . For convenience, we rescale at M_τ the value of α_s obtained for different values of M_0

- *Standard SVZ expansion*

◊ *Fit of the data points*

The analysis is shown in Fig. 5 (lower set of points) for (FO) and (CI) perturbative series to order α_s^4 . We observe a stability for M_0 between 1.5 to 1.7 GeV. A least square fit of the data points gives:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_s(M_\tau) &= 0.3081(49)_{fit} & \text{(FO)} \\ &= 0.3260(47)_{fit} & \text{(CI)} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

◊ *Estimate of the α_s^5 corrections*

Noting that the coefficient of α_s for the Adler D -function grows geometrically [47]:

$$D(Q^2) = \sum_n a_s^n c_n : c_0 = c_1 = 1, \quad c_2 = 1.656, \quad c_3 = 6.37, \quad c_4 = 49.09 \quad (26)$$

we deduce:

$$c_4 \approx c_3^2 \longrightarrow c_5 \simeq (c_3/c_2) c_4^2 \simeq 228. \quad (27)$$

This value of c_5 is comparable with some other estimates from FAC: $\simeq 275$ [28], conformal mappings: $= 255$ [48], Padé approximants: $= (277 \pm 51)$ [49] and a linear behavior of FO coefficients: $\simeq 283$ [50].

Writing the QCD expression of the moment as:

$$\mathcal{R}_0^{ee} = \sum_n a_s^n (g_n + c_n), \quad (28)$$

where g_n comes from a RG-resummation [13, 51]. One obtains:

$$\begin{aligned} g_5 &= -780 \longrightarrow \Delta\alpha_s^5(M_\tau) \simeq \pm 71 \times 10^{-4} & \text{(FO)}, \\ &= 0 \longrightarrow \Delta\alpha_s^5(M_\tau) \simeq \pm 62 \times 10^{-4} & \text{(CI)} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

⁵Some other LSR moments with weights are discussed in [37, 39].




Figure 5: **a)** Value of $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$ from the BNP lowest moment for different values of M_0 . The red (green) points correspond to (FO) [resp. (CI)] PT series. The lower curves correspond to the SVZ expansion. The upper ones to the case of zero value of the QCD condensates.

◇ *Final value of α_s using the SVZ expansion*

Adding the different corrections, we deduce:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} &= 0.3081(49)_{fit(71)\alpha_s^5} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.1170(6)(3)_{evol} & \text{(FO)} \\ &= 0.3260(47)_{fit(62)\alpha_s^5} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.1192(6)(3)_{evol} & \text{(CI),} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

where the sum of non-perturbative corrections at the τ -mass is given in Table 3. We notice that the increase of $|d_6|$ has slightly decreased the value of α_s compared to the one in [1]. From the previous values, we attempt to estimate the mean:

$$\alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.3179(58)(81)_{syst} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{SVZ} = 0.1182(12)(3)_{evol}. \quad (31)$$

• *QCD models without power corrections*

Here, we analyze a QCD model without power corrections. We show the result in Fig 5 (upper set of curves). We obtain at the minimum $M_0 \simeq 1.75$ GeV of the curves:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{e^+e^-}^{PT} &= 0.3579(115)_{fit(34)\alpha_s^5} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{PT} = 0.1228(12)(3)_{evol} & \text{(FO)} \\ &= 0.3855(117)_{fit(83)\alpha_s^5} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{PT} = 0.1255(13)(3)_{evol} & \text{(CI),} \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

which corresponds to the mean:

$$\alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{e^+e^-}^{PT} = 0.3692(92)(163)_{syst} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{e^+e^-}^{PT} = 0.1239(18)(3)_{evol}. \quad (33)$$

This result is about 4.6σ higher than the PD23 weighted average [14]:

$$\langle \alpha_s(M_Z) \rangle = 0.1178(5), \quad (34)$$

and disfavors some QCD models without power corrections.

9. Comparison of α_s from e^+e^- and τ -decay data within the SVZ expansion.

- *Update of α_s from τ -decay using the lowest BNP moment*

Within the new set of non-perturbative contributions, we update the determination of α_s from τ -decay. We shall consider the Vector (V) channel. The QCD expression of the lowest moment reads [12]:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tau,V}^{qcd} = \frac{3}{2} |V_{ud}|^2 S_{ew} \left[1 + \delta'_{ew} + \delta_0^{(0)} + \delta_{ud}^{(D=4)} - 6 \frac{d_6}{M_\tau^6} - 4 \frac{d_8}{M_\tau^8} \right], \quad (35)$$

where $\delta_0^{(0)}$ is the PT corrections and $\delta_{ud}^{(D=4)}$ is the dimension 4 contributions given in Eq. 3.11 of [12]. The values of d_6 and d_8 condensate contributions are given in Table 1, while the electroweak parameters are [12]:

$$|V_{ud}| = 0.97425(22), \quad S_{ew} = 1.0194, \quad \delta'_{ew} = 0.0010. \quad (36)$$

Using the updated ALEPH data [34]:

$$\mathcal{R}_{\tau,V}^{exp} = 1.782 \pm 0.009, \quad (37)$$

we obtain from the lowest moment:

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{\tau,V} &= 0.3128(19)_{fit}(77)_{\alpha_s^5} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{\tau,V} = 0.1176(10)(3)_{evol} \quad (\text{FO}) \\ &= 0.3291(25)_{fit}(65)_{\alpha_s^5} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{\tau,V} = 0.1196(8)(3)_{evol} \quad (\text{CI}), \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

which corresponds to the mean:

$$\alpha_s(M_\tau)|_{\tau,V} = 0.3219(52)(91)_{syst} \longrightarrow \alpha_s(M_Z)|_{\tau,V} = 0.1187(13)(3)_{evol}. \quad (39)$$

- *Average value of α_s from e^+e^- and τ -decay data*

One can notice an excellent agreement between the value of $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$ from e^+e^- in Eq. 31 and the one from the vector component of τ -decay in Eq. 39. We consider as a final value of α_s from the present analysis based on the lowest τ -decay-like moment, the average of the results in Eqs. 31 and 39 which is:

$$\langle \alpha_s(M_\tau) \rangle = 0.3198(72) \longrightarrow \langle \alpha_s(M_Z) \rangle = 0.1185(9)(3)_{evol}. \quad (40)$$

This mean value is in excellent agreement with the latest PDG average given in Eq. 34.

	THIS WORK		ALEPH [31]	OPAL [32]	PR [33]	ALEPH [34]
	e^+e^-	τ -decay				
FO	0.3081(86)	0.3128(79)	0.3200(220)	0.3230(160)	0.3200(150)	–
CI	0.3260(78)	0.3291(70)	0.3400(230)	0.3470(220)	0.3370(200)	0.3460(110)
FO \oplus CI	0.3179(100)	0.3219(105)				
$\delta^{(NP)} \times 10^{-2}$	3.8 ± 0.8	3.7 ± 1.0	2.0 ± 0.3	3.6 ± 0.4	1.7 ± 0.3	2.0 ± 0.3

Table 3: $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$ within the SVZ-expansion from the vector (V) component of τ -decay data using some high- τ -moments. For a better comparison with our result where the condensates have been estimated within (FO), we quote the value of $\delta^{(NP)}$ corresponding to (FO) at M_τ . We also show our prediction for the V component of τ -decay using d_6 and d_8 in Table 1.

- *Comparison with α_s from τ -decay data within the SVZ expansion in the literature*

Estimates of α_s using the vector component of τ -decay data within different τ -decay moments are available in the literature [31–34] as shown in Table 3. One can notice that the central value of $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$ from $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ Hadrons data using the lowest BNP moment is slightly lower than the one from τ -decay data but agrees within the errors. We also note that our value of $\delta^{(NP)}$ at the τ -mass agrees with the OPAL one but higher than the ones using ALEPH data.

9. The quest of $1/Q^2$ and tachyonic gluon mass beyond the SVZ expansion

- *The quest of $1/Q^2$*

A priori, this question is irrelevant as one does not expect to have a dimension-two condensate $\langle A^2 \rangle$ (A_μ is the gluon field) due to gauge invariance (see however [40]). However, this term is present in some holographic models [41] and in a lattice calculation of the QCD potential [42] and gluon condensates [43, 44]. It has been also proposed [45, 46] for a phenomenological parametrization of UV renormalon as an alternative to the large β -approximation. The large β -approximation is not yet fully justified due to the non-observation of the factorial growth and alternate signs of the calculated coefficients of the Adler D -function and some other QCD observables known to order α_s^4 . Instead, these calculated coefficients grow as a geometric sum [47].

- *Tachyonic gluon mass λ^2*

◊ In [52, 53], a systematic way to account for a such $1/Q^2$ term is the introduction of a tachyonic gluon mass squared λ^2 . An estimate of this mass using $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ Hadrons data and some other data lead to, [36, 52, 54, 55]:

$$a_s \lambda^2 = -(7 \pm 3) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (41)$$

which we re-estimate here from the ratio of LSR \mathcal{R}_{10}^{ee} . The result is shown in Fig. 6 from which we deduce to order α_s^4 at the stability regions:

$$a_s \lambda^2 = -(6.7 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^2. \quad (42)$$

in perfect agreement with the previous result.




Figure 6: The tachyonic gluon mass squared $a_s \lambda^2$ versus M_0 .

◇ A such value of λ^2 resolves the hierarchy of the π, ρ mesons and glueball sum rule scales [52]. However, a direct inclusion of this effect to the τ -decay moment is quite delicate. It has been argued in Ref.[52] that this term is dual to the large order terms of the PT series and decreases when more terms in the PT series are added. To check this argument, we study the variation of λ^2 versus the number of α_s term added in the PT series of \mathcal{R}_{10} . We show the analysis in Fig. 7a where we, indeed, see that $|\lambda^2|$ decreases when more α_s^n terms are added in the PT series even at low values of n . A similar feature is observed at large orders in the calculation of the gluon condensate $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$ on the lattice [43, 44].




Figure 7: **a)** $a_s \lambda^2$ for different truncations of the PT series; **b)** $a_s \lambda^2$ for different values of the gluon condensate $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$: the blue point is the SVZ value of $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$, the red point is the value in Eq. 10, the green point is the value quoted in Table 1.

We have also checked that the change of d_6 does not almost affect the size of λ^2 while we show in Fig. 7b the effect of $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$. From the above results, we consider that the λ^2 effects to the BNP moment is:

$$\delta_{\lambda^2}^{(2)} \leq 4\%, \quad (43)$$

of the PT lowest order one which is much less than the size of sum of the α_s corrections.

◇ Assuming that our estimate of α_s^5 correction to the τ -decay moment is a good approximation of the contribution of higher order terms and using the duality property with λ^2 advocated by Ref. [47], we do not add this λ^2 correction in \mathcal{R}_0^{ee} to avoid a double counting.

10. Some other contributions beyond the SVZ expansion

- *Small size instantons*

◊ Ref. [56] found that these corrections can be parametrized as:

$$\delta^{inst} \simeq \left(\frac{3.64 \Lambda}{M_\tau} \right)^9 \left(\frac{\hat{m}_u \hat{m}_d \hat{m}_s}{M_\tau^3} \right) \simeq 1.6 \times 10^{-8}, \quad (44)$$

where [57] $\hat{m}_u = 3.1(2)$ MeV, $\hat{m}_d = 6.1(4)$ MeV and $\hat{m}_s = (114.3 \pm 6.4)$ MeV are the renormalization group invariant light quark masses and we use $\Lambda = 0.34$ GeV. This contribution is completely negligible.

◊ In Ref. [58], the instanton effect is introduced via the constituent quark mass:

$$m_{const} = m_{current} - \frac{2}{3} \pi^2 \langle \bar{\psi} \psi \rangle \rho^2, \quad (45)$$

where ρ is the instanton size. The authors conclude that at the τ -mass, the effect behaves as $1/M_\tau^{18}$ and is:

$$\delta^{inst} \simeq 0.03 \sim 0.05, \quad (46)$$

which is comparable with the $D = 6$ dimension condensates contribution. However, one should notice that this effect depends crucially on the value of the instanton size ρ which is not under a good control.

◊ Ref. [59] has tested the validity of Ref. [58] prediction by noting that Ref. [58] result contributes to the $V - A$ τ -decay rate as:

$$\delta_{V-A}^{inst} \simeq 0.09 \sim 0.15, \quad (47)$$

while the ALEPH data [31] only allows the range of values:

$$\delta_{V-A}^{inst} \simeq (1 \pm 3) \times 10^{-3} \quad (48)$$

Using the (accepted) relation:

$$\delta_{V+A}^{inst} \simeq \frac{\delta_{V-A}^{inst}}{20}, \quad (49)$$

one concludes that :

$$\delta_V^{inst} \simeq (0.5 \pm 1.5) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (50)$$

which is less than 5% of the d_6 contribution to the \mathcal{R}_τ^{ee} decay rate. Moreover, the result of [58] is much larger than the direct fit of the dimension $D = 18$ term in the OPE quoted in Table 1.

- *Duality violation*

◊ This effect is maintained by Ref. [30]. It corresponds to an additional QCD contribution to the spectral function introduced by hand as:

$$\Delta \text{Im} \Pi(t)|_{DV} \sim e^{-(\delta + \gamma t)} \sin(\alpha + \beta t), \quad (51)$$

above a certain threshold : $t_c \equiv \hat{s}_0 \simeq 1.5 \text{ GeV}^2$ where δ , γ , α , β are free unknown fitted parameters.




Figure 8: Value of the ratio in Eq. 55.

◊ The eventual presence of a such term in QCD [61] and in some toy-model [62] has been discussed at large N_c with an infinite number of narrow resonances in order to modelize the data in the Minkowski space (see also [60] for QCD in two dimensions). *This oscillating term in the Minkowski space is expected to be dual to an asymptotic exponential behavior of power corrections in the Euclidean region [61].*

◊ One can fix $\hat{s}_0 \equiv t_c$ from the lowest FESR moment [29]:

$$F_0(t_c) \equiv \int_0^{t_c} dt R_{ee}^{I=1} = \frac{3}{2} \hat{s}_0 \left[1 + a_s + 3.891 a_s^2 + 11.228 a_s^3 + \dots \right], \quad (52)$$

which, for a ρ -meson dominance, gives [1, 29, 35]:

$$\hat{s}_0 = 1.5 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (53)$$

◊ Using the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{Hadrons}$ data, until $\sqrt{t_c} \simeq 1.875 \text{ GeV}$, the duality condition requires:

$$\hat{s}_0 \equiv t_c = (5.1 \sim 5.6) \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (54)$$

as shown in Fig. 8 from SN23 [1] where we plot the ratio:

$$r^{fesr} \equiv \frac{F_0^{data}}{F_0^{qcd}}, \quad (55)$$

where $r^{fesr} = 1$ corresponds to the duality region. This value does not support the one 1.6 GeV^2 obtained in [35] using the $e^+e^- \rightarrow \text{Hadrons}$ data (notice that in Ref. [29] a value around 2.1 GeV^2 has been obtained). However, one may (intuitively) expect a value of t_c above the data region.

◊ One can inspect that with a such value of \hat{s}_0 , the additional contribution due to Duality Violation becomes unobservable when one uses a complete data thanks to the exponential weight for its parametrization.

◊ A critical analysis of the effects of DV for values of \hat{s}_0 around 1.5 GeV^2 on the determination of the QCD condensates and α_s using τ -decay ALEPH data is explicitly discussed in Ref. [63].

◊ One should also notice that power corrections in the Euclidean space estimated previously in Table 1 up to $D = 20$ do not show any exponential behavior which disfavors by a *duality analytic continuation* the presence of this oscillating DV term in the Minkowski space.

11. Summary

In this paper, I have updated the results obtained in SN23 [1].

1. By using the new measurement of Ref. [2] of the positive charge muon anomaly, I found about 3σ deviation of the Standard Model predictions.

2. I have combined the uses of ratio of LSR and some high τ -decay like moments to improve the estimates of the QCD condensates of dimension $D \leq 12$ dimensions and give new estimates of the ones $D = 14$ to 20. Up to this order, I have not observed any exponential or/and factorial blow up of their contribution to the two-point function. I confirm the violation of four-quark factorization by a factor $\rho \simeq 6.89$ and the value of the gluon condensate $\langle \alpha_s G^2 \rangle$ (though less accurate) found from heavy quark channels and some other sources.

3. Using these new values of the condensates, I extract from the lowest BNP moment the value of $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$ using the lowest BNP τ -like moment. The results from $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ Hadrons data are given in Eqs. 30 and 31. They are in excellent agreement with the new PDG average. The one from the V component of τ -decay are in Eqs. 38 and 39, where we notice that more precise determinations of the $D = 6, 8$ condensates have improved the accuracy of $\alpha_s(M_\tau)$ from τ -decay compared to the previous ones in the literature quoted in Table 3. The mean of the two determinations from e^+e^- and τ -decay data is in Eq. 40 which is in excellent agreement with the new PDG average.

4. I discuss, in Sections 10 and 11, some (eventual) contributions beyond the SVZ expansion ($1/Q^2$, instantons and Duality Violation). Such effects are expected to be relatively small (see e.g. [64]). The excellent agreement between the present predictions within the standard SVZ expansion and the latest PDG average should provide a strong upper bound on the size of these extra contributions.

Acknowledgements

It is a pleasure to thank Toni Pich and Valya Zakharov for some correspondences.

References

- [1] S. Narison, *Nucl. Phys.* **A** 1039 (2023) 122744; S. Narison, QCD23 (8-14 july 2023, Montpellier-FR), *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **343** (2024): arXiv: 2309.05342 [hep-ph] (2023).
- [2] D.P. Aguillard et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** (2023) 16, 161802.
- [3] M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein, V.I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B147** (1979) 385; *ibid*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B147** (1979) 448.
- [4] V.I. Zakharov, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A14**, (1999) 4865.
- [5] S. Narison, *QCD spectral sum rules, World Sci. Lect. Notes Phys.* **26** (1989) 1.

- [6] S. Narison, *QCD as a theory of hadrons, Cambridge Monogr. Part. Phys. Nucl. Phys. Cosmol.* **17**. (2004) 1-778 [hep-ph/0205006].
- [7] S. Narison, *Nucl. Part. Phys. Proc.* **312-317** (2021) 87; *ibid*, **258-259** (2015) 189.
- [8] S. Narison and E. de Rafael, *Phys. Lett.* **B 103**, (1981) 57.
- [9] J.S. Bell and R.A. Bertlmann, *Nucl. Phys.* **B187**, (1981) 285.
- [10] For a recent review, see e.g. S. Narison, *The Laplace Transform and its Applications*, ed. V. Martinez-Lucaes, Nova Science Pub., New-York - 2024 (arXiv: 2309.00258 [hep-ph]).
- [11] E. Braaten, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60** (1988) 606; E. Braaten, *Phys. Rev.* **D39** (1989) 1458; S. Narison, A. Pich, *Phys. Lett.* **B211** (1988) 183.
- [12] E. Braaten, S. Narison, A. Pich, *Nucl. Phys.* **B373** (1992) 581.
- [13] F. Le Diberder, A. Pich, *Phys. Lett.* **B286** (1992) 147; **B289** (1992) 165.
- [14] R.L. Workman et al. (Particle Data Group), *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [15] CMD-3 Collaboration - F.V. Ignatov et al., 2302.08834 [hep-ex] (2023).
- [16] G. Bennett et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D73** (2006) 072003.
- [17] B. Abi et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **126** (2021) 141801; T. Albahri et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D103** (2021) 072002.
- [18] T. Aoyama et al., *Phys. Rept.* **887** (2020)1.
- [19] M. Knecht, S. Narison, A. Rabemananjara, D. Rabetiarivony *Phys. Lett.* **B787** (2018) 111.
- [20] S. Narison, R. Tarrach, *Phys. Lett.* **B125** (1983) 217; M. Jamin, M. Kremmer, *Nucl. Phys.* **B277** (1986) 349.
- [21] S. Narison, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A33** (2018) no. 10, 185004; Addendum: *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **A33** (2018) no.10, 1850045.
- [22] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B693** (2010) 559, erratum *ibid*, **B705** (2011) 544; *ibid*, **B706** (2012) 412; *ibid*, **B707** (2012) 259.
- [23] G. Launer, S. Narison, R. Tarrach, *Z. Phys.* **C26** (1984) 433.
- [24] M.S.A. Alam Khan (private communication).
- [25] R. Shankar, *Phys. Rev.* **D15** (1977) 755.
- [26] E.G. Floratos, S. Narison, E. de Rafael *Nucl. Phys.* **B155** (1979) 115.

- [27] S.G. Gorishny, A.L. Kataev, S.A. Larin, *Phys. Lett.* **B259** (1991) 144; L.R. Surguladze, M.A. Samuel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66** (1991) 560.
- [28] P. A. Baikov, K.G. Chetyrkin, J.H. Kühn, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **101**(2008) 012002.
- [29] R.A. Bertlmann, G. Launer and E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys.* **B250**, (1985) 61; R.A. Bertlmann, C.A. Dominguez, M. Loewe, M. Perrottet and E. de Rafael, *Z. Phys.* **C39** (1988) 231.
- [30] D. Boito et al., *Phys. Rev.* **D103** (2021) 3, 034028; *Phys. Rev.* **D98** (2018) 074030.
- [31] The ALEPH Collaboration-R. Barate et al., *Eur. Phys. J.* **C4** (1998) 409.
- [32] The OPAL Collaboration-K. Ackerstaff et al., *Eur. Phys. J.* **C7** (1999) 571.
- [33] A. Pich, A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, *Phys.Rev.* **D94** (2016) 3, 034027; *Mod.Phys.Lett.* **A31** (2016) 30, 1630032.
- [34] M. Davier, A. Höcker, B. Malaescu, C. Z. Yuan, Z. Zhang, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C74** (2014) 2803.
- [35] S. Peris, M. Perrottet, E. de Rafael, *JHEP* **05** (1998) 011.
- [36] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B361** (1995) 121.
- [37] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B624** (2005) 223.
- [38] A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, M. González-Alonso, A. Pich, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 014017.
- [39] C. Ayala, G. Cvetič and D. Teca, *J. Phys.* **G50** (2023) 045004.
- [40] L. Stodolsky , P. van Baal, V.I. Zakharov, *Phys. Lett.* **B552**(2003) 214; F.V. Gubarev, L. Stodolsky, V.I. Zakharov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86** (2001) 2220.
- [41] O. Aharony et al., *Phys. Rept.* **323** (2000) 183; O. Andreev, V. I. Zakharov, *Phys. Rev.* **D74** (2006) 025023; F. Jugeau, S. Narison, H. Ratsimbarison, *Phys. Lett.* **B722** (2013) 111.
- [42] S. Bali, *Phys. Lett.* **B460** (1999) 170.
- [43] P.E.L. Rakow, PoS LAT2005 (2006) 284.
- [44] R. Horsley, P. E.L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **106** (2002) 870; A. Di Giacomo, G.C. Rossi, *Phys. Lett.* **B 100** (1981)481; G. Burgio et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B422** (1998) 219.
- [45] R. Akhoury, V. I. Zakharov, *Phys. Lett.* **B438** (1998) 165; M.N. Chernodub et al., *Phys. Lett.* **B475** (2000) 303.
- [46] G Altarelli, P. Nason, G. Ridolfi, *Z. Phys.* **C68** (1995) 257; G. Altarelli, *Nucl. Phys. (Proc. Suppl.)* **B40** (1995)59.

- [47] S. Narison, V.I. Zakharov, *Phys. Lett.* **B679** (2009) 355.
- [48] I. Caprini, *Phys. Rev* **D100** (2019) 056019;
- [49] D. Boito, P. Masjuan, F. Oliani, *JHEP* **08** (2018) 075.
- [50] M. Beneke, M. Jamin *JHEP* **09** (2008)044.
- [51] A. Kataev, V. V. Starshenko, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A10** (1995) 235.
- [52] K.G. Chetyrkin, S. Narison, V. I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys.* **B550**(1999) 353.
- [53] For reviews, see e.g.: V.I. Zakharov, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **164** (2007) 240; S. Narison, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **164** (2007) 225.
- [54] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B300** (1993) 293.
- [55] M. Kozhevnikova, A. Oganesian and O. Teryaev, EPJ Web of Conferences 204 (2019) 02005; M. Kozhevnikova, A. Oganesian, O. Teryaev, O. Solovtsova, *Nonlin. Phenom. Complex Syst.* **25** (2022) 3.
- [56] P. Nason, M. Porrati, *Nucl. Phys.* **B421** (1994) 518.
- [57] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B738** (2014) 346.
- [58] I.I. Balitsky, M. Beneke, Vladimir M. Braun, *Phys. Lett.* **B318** (1993) 371.
- [59] V. Kartvelishvili, M. Margvelashvili, *Phys. Lett.* **B 345** (1995) 161.
- [60] G. 't Hooft, *Nucl. Phys.* **B75** (1974) 461.
- [61] M. Shifman, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **B207-208** (2010) 298; *ibid* arXiv: hep-ph/0009131; B. Blok, M. Shifman, Da-Xin Zhang, *Phys. Rev.* **D 57** (1998) 2691; *Phys. Rev.* **D 59** (1999) 019901 (erratum);
- [62] E. de Rafael, *Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl.* **B207-208** (2010) 290.
- [63] A. Pich, A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, *JHEP* **07** (2022) 145.
- [64] S. Narison, *Phys. Lett.* **B673** (2009) 30.