

Confronting perturbative QCD with the hardest exclusive reactions: kaon electromagnetic form factors

Long-Bin Chen ^{*},¹ Wen Chen [†],^{2,3} Feng Feng [‡],^{4,5} and Yu Jia [§],⁶

¹ *School of Physics and Materials Science, Guangzhou University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

² *Key Laboratory of Atomic and Subatomic Structure and Quantum Control (MOE), Guangdong Basic Research Center of Excellence for Structure and Fundamental Interactions of Matter, Institute of Quantum Matter, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

³ *Guangdong-Hong Kong Joint Laboratory of Quantum Matter, Guangdong Provincial Key Laboratory of Nuclear Science, Southern Nuclear Science Computing Center, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

⁴ *China University of Mining and Technology, Beijing 100083, China*

⁵ *Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

⁶ *School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

(Dated: August 1, 2024)

Among countless channels of hard exclusive reactions, the kaon electromagnetic form factors (EMFFs) are of special interest, which have been measured up to $Q^2 \sim 50 \text{ GeV}^2$ in the timelike domain. The kaon EMFFs thereby serve an ideal platform to critically examine the validity and effectiveness of perturbative QCD (pQCD) in accounting for hard exclusive processes. In this work we confront the pQCD predictions that incorporate the next-to-next-to-leading-order (NNLO) perturbative corrections, with the available kaon EMFFs data set from experimental measurements and from lattice predictions. The inclusion of the NNLO corrections turns out to have a substantial and positive impact. If the profiles of the kaon light-cone distribution amplitudes (LCDAs) are taken from the recent lattice QCD prediction by LPC Collaboration, the satisfactory agreement between theory and data can be reached for both charged and neutral kaons, in both spacelike and timelike large- Q^2 domains.

I. INTRODUCTION

The electromagnetic form factors (EMFFs) of hadrons, which probe the internal charge distributions inside a hadron, play a fundamental role in advancing our knowledge toward Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) and hadron properties. To date, the most intensively studied examples reside in the light hadron sector, exemplified by the EMFFs of the nucleons and the light pseudoscalar mesons such as pion and kaons [1].

The kaons, comprising the charged K^\pm and neutral K^0/\bar{K}^0 , are the next-to-lightest mesons within the $SU_f(3)$ octet pseudoscalar family. As unique carriers of the strange quark, the kaons have historically played a vital role in the making of the Standard Model, in particular in discovering the parity and CP violation in the weak interaction sector. On the other hand, the revelation of the approximate $SU(3)$ flavor symmetry in strong interaction sector stands as a cornerstone in the eventual formulation of QCD. Owing to the hierarchy $m_{u,d} \ll m_s \lesssim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$, the conservation of U and V spins in static properties, such as masses, magnetic moments, and decay constants, are satisfied with an accuracy of approximately 20%, in stark contrast with the nearly perfect (percent level) precision of isospin symmetry.

Experimental investigations of the charged kaon EMFFs have been continuously pursued since 70s [2–10], while the K^0/\bar{K}^0 EMFFs have also been the subject of numerous studies since the beginning of this century [11–16]. On the theoretical front, the kaon EMFFs have also been extensively studied using various approaches [17–26]. Governed by the soft strong interactions, the kaon EMFFs at low Q^2 have been explored within chiral perturbation theory [27], which enables the extraction of the kaon charge radius. Conversely, at large momentum transfer, the kaon EMFFs are anticipated to be accurately captured by perturbative QCD within the context of collinear factorization [28–34] (for a comprehensive review on application of collinear factorization to the hard exclusive reactions, see [35]).

* chenlb@gzhu.edu.cn

† chenwenphy@gmail.com

‡ f.feng@outlook.com

§ jiyai@ihep.ac.cn

It is interesting to realize that the largest Q^2 in kaon EMFFs measurement has surpassed 50 GeV² [8], which is significantly greater than 10 GeV² in the measured pion EMFFs [36, 37], also considerably larger than 30 GeV² in the measured proton EMFFs [38]. We note that, historically the applicability of pQCD at moderate momentum transfer has been subject to controversy [39–42], with the crux centered on whether the soft nonfactorizable mechanisms may dominate the pQCD contributions or not. With Q^2 reaching about 50 GeV², the kaon EMFFs may be viewed as the hardest exclusive reaction ever measured experimentally, so that the pQCD should be reliably applied to such situation. Consequently the kaon EMFFs might serve an ideal arena to critically testify the validity and effectiveness of pQCD for hard exclusive processes.

One may wonder whether the kaon EMFFs are identical to the pion EMFFs within the projected 20% accuracy. Intriguingly, the effects of $SU(3)$ flavor symmetry breaking in these observables turn to be more pronounced than those in static properties. Actually there has existed a long-standing puzzle concerning the kaon EMFFs: although the energy dependence of higher-energy data aligns with the asymptotic form predicted by pQCD, their magnitudes exceed the predicted asymptotic value by a factor of approximately four [7, 8].

Recently the next-to-next-to-leading-order (NNLO) perturbative corrections to pion EMFFs at large momentum transfer have become available in the context of collinear factorization [43]. It was found that the effect of the NNLO correction is positive and substantial. In comparison with the data, some strong constraint has been placed on the profile of the leading-twist light-cone distribution amplitude (LCDA) of pion, especially on the second Gegenbauer moment of the pion LCDA.

Due to the mass hierarchy between u , d and s quark, one anticipates that the profiles of the kaon LCDAs significantly deviate from those of the pions, which are symmetric under the exchange $x \leftrightarrow 1-x$. Thereby the kaon EMFFs provide a prime opportunity to advance our understanding of the intricate interplay between quark masses and $SU_f(3)$ breaking and the underlying QCD dynamics. It is the very goal of this work to extend the preceding analysis of pion EMFFs [43] to the kaon EMFFs, by incorporating the NNLO QCD corrections.

The rest of the paper is distributed as follows. In Sec. II, we sketch the pQCD formula for kaon EMFFs in collinear factorization. With the virtue of turning a convolution task into an algebraic one, we present the master formula for pQCD predictions to kaon EMFFs through NNLO accuracy. In Sec. III, we perform a comprehensive comparison between the state-of-the-art pQCD predictions and the available large- Q^2 data and recent lattice predictions for the EMFFs of the charged and neutral kaons, in both spacelike and timelike domains. Finally we summarize in Sec. IV. In Appendix A, we present the analytic expressions of the lowest-lying short-distance coefficient matrix elements through NNLO accuracy, which appear in the master formula given in Sec. II.

II. TWO-LOOP PQCD CORRECTIONS TO KAON EMFFS

To be specific, let us start with the EMFF of the K^+ meson. It is defined via

$$\langle K^+(P') | J_{\text{em}}^\mu | K^+(P) \rangle = F_K(Q^2)(P^\mu + P'^\mu), \quad (1)$$

where $J_{\text{em}}^\mu = \sum_f e_f \bar{\psi}_f \gamma^\mu \psi_f$ signifies the electromagnetic current, and $Q^2 \equiv -(P' - P)^2$.

At large momentum transfer, the collinear factorization demands that, at the lowest order in $1/Q$, the $F_K(Q^2)$ can be expressed in the following convolution integral:

$$F_K(Q^2) = \iint dx dy \Phi_K^*(x, \mu_F) T \left(x, y, \frac{\mu_R^2}{Q^2}, \frac{\mu_F^2}{Q^2} \right) \Phi_K(y, \mu_F) + \dots, \quad (2)$$

where μ_R and μ_F represent the renormalization and factorization scales, respectively. $T(x, y)$ signifies the perturbatively calculable hard-scattering kernel, and $\Phi_K(x, \mu_F)$ represents the nonperturbative yet universal leading-twist kaon LCDA, *i.e.*, the probability amplitude of finding the valence u and \bar{s} quarks inside K^+ carrying the momentum fractions x and $\bar{x} \equiv 1 - x$, respectively.

The leading-twist kaon LCDA in (2) assumes the following operator definition:

$$\Phi_K(x, \mu_F) = \int \frac{dz^-}{2\pi i} e^{iz^- x P^+} \langle 0 | \bar{s}(0) \gamma^+ \gamma_5 \mathcal{W}(0, z^-) u(z^-) | K^+(P) \rangle, \quad (3)$$

with \mathcal{W} signifies the light-like gauge link to ensure gauge invariance. $\Phi_K(x, \mu_F)$ obeys the celebrated Efremov-Radyushkin-Brodsky-Lepage (ERBL) evolution equation [30, 32]:

$$\frac{d\Phi_K(x, \mu_F)}{d \ln \mu_F^2} = \int_0^1 dy V(x, y) \Phi_K(y, \mu_F). \quad (4)$$

The hard-scattering kernel can be expanded in the power series of α_s :

$$T(x, y, \mu_R^2/Q^2, \mu_F^2/Q^2) = \frac{16C_F\pi\alpha_s}{Q^2} \left\{ T^{(0)} + \frac{\alpha_s}{\pi} T^{(1)} + \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^2 T^{(2)} + \dots \right\}. \quad (5)$$

The hard-scattering kernel can be determined via standard perturbative matching strategy. Luckily, there requires no any extra work except one directly transplants the $T^{(i)}$ ($i = 0, 1, 2$) for the π^+ EMFF [43] by making the substitution $e_d \rightarrow e_s$. For technical details, we refer the interested readers to our preceding paper [43].

The leading-twist kaon LCDA is customarily expanded in the basis of the Gegenbauer polynomials:

$$\Phi_K(x, \mu_F) = \frac{f_K}{2\sqrt{2}N_c} \sum_{n=0} a_n(\mu_F) \psi_n(x), \quad (6a)$$

$$\psi_n(x) = 6x\bar{x} C_n^{3/2}(2x-1), \quad (6b)$$

where $N_c = 3$ is the number of colors, $f_K = 0.160$ GeV signifies the kaon decay constant [44]. All the nonperturbative dynamics is encoded in the Gegenbauer moments. At a given factorization scale, the running Gegenbauer moment $a_n(\mu_F)$ is known to three-loop accuracy [45].

Since the V-spin symmetry has been badly broken, the sum in (6a) entails all integers. This feature should be contrasted with that for the pion LCDA, where the sum is only extended over even integers due to nearly perfect isospin symmetry.

To facilitate phenomenological analysis, it is advantageous to turn the convolution problem into an algebraic one [43]. Substituting (6) into (2), conducting two-fold integration, one can reexpress the kaon EMFF as

$$Q^2 F_K(Q^2) = \frac{2C_F\pi^2 f_K^2}{3} \sum_{k=0} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{\pi}\right)^{k+1} \sum_{m,n} [e_u - (-1)^{m+n} e_s] \mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(k)}(\mu/Q) a_m(\mu) a_n(\mu). \quad (7)$$

The short-distance matrix element $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(k)}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(k)}(\mu/Q) = \frac{1}{e_u - (-1)^{m+n} e_s} \iint dx dy \psi_m(x) T^{(k)}(x, y, \mu^2/Q^2) \psi_n(y), \quad (8)$$

where we have fixed the number of light quarks to three, and for simplicity set $\mu_R = \mu_F = \mu$ in (7).

(m, n)	c_1	c_2	d_1	d_2	d_3
(0,0)	20.25	59.25	45.5625	302.936	514.600
(0,1)	28.25	88.7893	76.1181	540.224	1018.02
(0,2)	32.75	112.473	96.4306	735.637	1498.75
(0,3)	35.95	131.413	112.244	901.650	1933.00
(0,4)	38.45	147.638	125.390	1049.88	2346.49
(1,1)	36.25	130.750	113.785	908.006	1925.92
(1,2)	40.75	160.199	138.097	1184.52	2697.02
(1,3)	43.95	183.855	156.755	1417.99	3398.57
(1,4)	46.45	203.376	172.123	1619.63	4034.36
(2,2)	45.25	192.871	164.660	1513.95	3690.60
(2,3)	48.45	218.864	184.918	1788.70	4575.65
(2,4)	50.95	240.181	201.536	2024.03	5371.58
(3,3)	51.65	246.688	206.313	2096.55	5620.90
(3,4)	54.15	269.327	223.820	2358.13	6548.85
(4,4)	56.65	292.970	242.021	2640.85	7589.17

TABLE I: The numerical values of $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(1,2)}(\mu/Q)$ for $0 \leq m, n \leq 4$. We have parameterized $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(1)}(\mu/Q) = c_1 L_\mu + c_2$ and $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(2)}(\mu/Q) = d_1 L_\mu^2 + d_2 L_\mu + d_3$, with $L_\mu \equiv \ln Q^2/\mu^2$.

The two-fold convolution integrals in (8) can be worked out in closed form at various perturbative orders. At tree level, one simply has $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(0)} = 9$ for all m, n . The analytic expressions of some lowest-lying short-distance matrix elements $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(1,2)}$ have been presented In Appendix A. For reader's convenience, we enumerate in Table I the numerical values of $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(1,2)}$ for $0 \leq m, n \leq 4$, which appears to suffice for most phenomenological applications at current stage. It is straightforward to adapt the master formula for the charged kaon EMFF from spacelike domain to the timelike

one, provided that one makes the replacement $L_\mu \rightarrow L_\mu + i\pi$ in Table I, with Q^2 now indicating the squared invariant mass of the K^+K^- pair.

In the exact U -spin limit, the neutral kaon EMFF vanishes due to $e_d = e_s$. The magnitudes of the neutral kaon EMFFs thereby signal the $SU(3)$ flavor symmetry breaking effect. For the EMFF of neutral K mesons, one simply makes the replacement $e_u \rightarrow e_d$ in (7). In this case, the short-distance matrix element becomes nonvanishing only when $m + n$ is an odd number. Consequently, the leading term of $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(k)}$ starts with (m, n) equal to $(0, 1)$ rather than $(0, 0)$.

Although it is the K^0/\bar{K}^0 that are produced via strong force, it is the approximate CP eigenstates K_S/K_L ($K_S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|K^0\rangle + |\bar{K}^0\rangle)$, $K_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|K^0\rangle - |\bar{K}^0\rangle)$) which are reconstructed via weak decay. By charge conjugation symmetry, the following different kinds of kaon EMFFs are related to each other:

$$F_{K^+}(Q^2) = -F_{K^-}(Q^2), \quad F_{K^0}(Q^2) = -F_{\bar{K}^0}(Q^2), \quad |F_{K_L}(Q^2)| = |F_{K_S}(Q^2)| = |F_{K^0}(Q^2)|. \quad (9)$$

These relations hold both in spacelike and timelike domains.

III. CONFRONTING THE STATE-OF-THE-ART PQCD PREDICTIONS WITH DATA

As the key nonperturbative input, our knowledge of the leading-twist kaon LCDA is still far from complete. Early phenomenological analysis simply uses the asymptotic form and CZ parametrization [35]. In recent years the kaon LCDA have been investigated from different theoretical approaches, such as light-cone sum rule [46, 47], instanton vacuum model [48–50], holographic QCD [51], light-front quantization [52], and recently from the lattice simulations [53–55]. The $SU_f(3)$ symmetry breaking in kaon LCDA has also been studied within the QCD sum rule approach [56, 57]. The kaon's Gegenbauer moments predicted from various approaches are scattered in a wide range.

$a_i(2 \text{ GeV})$	a_1	a_2	a_3	a_4
RQCD [54]	-0.0525^{+31}_{-33}	0.106^{+15}_{-16}	-	-
LPC [55]	$-0.108 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.051$	$0.170 \pm 0.014 \pm 0.044$	$-0.043 \pm 0.006 \pm 0.022$	$0.073 \pm 0.008 \pm 0.021$

TABLE II: The values of a_i ($i = 1, \dots, 4$) at 2 GeV evaluated by RQCD and LPC.

In the phenomenological study, we take the recent lattice results by RQCD [54] and LPC [55] Collaborations as the inputs for the Gegenbauer moments of the kaon LCDAs in $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme, whose values are tabulated in Table II ¹. These two groups of lattice studies are based on quite different algorithms. RQCD has presented precise predictions of the first and second Gegenbauer moment of the kaon LCDA. LPC has presented the profile of the kaon LCDA, from which various Gegenbauer moments can be extracted, and relatively larger $SU_f(3)$ -symmetry breaking effects have been observed.

We use three-loop evolution equation [45, 58] to evolve each a_n evaluated initially at 2 GeV by lattice simulation to any desired scale μ . We retain only those a_n with n up to 4 in phenomenological exploration. The package FAPT [59] is invoked to evaluate the running QCD coupling constant to three-loop accuracy.

In Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 we confront the state-of-the-art pQCD predictions with the available data for charged kaon EMFFs, with the predictions made by taking the central values of a_i given by RQCD and LPC, respectively, as non-perturbative input parameters. Since the experimental measurements of kaon EMFFs at spacelike domain are rather sparse, we invoke the very recent accurate lattice determination of the spacelike kaon EMFFs up to quite large Q^2 [60] as an experimental substitute. The charged kaon EMFFs in the timelike domain have recently been measured quite precisely by BaBar [8] and BESIII [10]. It is impressive that the covered Q^2 range in the former experiment has surpassed 50 GeV², which implies that $e^+e^- \rightarrow K^+K^-$ can be viewed as the hardest hard exclusive reaction, an ideal platform to test the validity of the pQCD and collinear factorization.

In Fig. 3, we also compare the pQCD predictions of the neutral kaon EMFF in timelike domain at various perturbative accuracy with the very recent BESIII data [15, 16]. Clearly the measured $F_{K_S K_L}(Q^2)$ is nonvanishing in a wide range of Q^2 , thereby indicating a notable $SU_f(3)$ flavor symmetry breaking effect.

From Fig. 1 to Fig. 3, we observe a unified pattern that the NNLO perturbative corrections are always positive and substantial for both charged and neutron kaons. Under all the circumstances, including the two-loop QCD corrections

¹ It appears that the convention in defining the kaon LCDA differs between RQCD [54] and LPC [55]. We have inserted an additional minus sign to a_1 in RQCD prediction to be in conformity with the LPC prediction.




FIG. 1: pQCD predictions vs. experimental data for $Q^2 F_{K^\pm}(Q^2)$ in the space-like (left) and timelike (right) domains. We take the central values of $a_{1,2}$ provided by RQCD as input in making predictions. The red, green and blue bands correspond to the LO, NLO and NNLO predictions with the uncertainty estimated by sliding μ from $Q/2$ to Q . Due to lack of experimental measurement in the spacelike domain, we take the lattice data points from the very recent lattice study [60] as substitution. In the timelike domain, we take the data points from BaBar [8] (black) and BESIII [10] (red) experiments.




FIG. 2: Same as Fig. 1, except the predictions are made by taking the central values of a_i from LPC as inputs.

further increase the NLO predictions by a factor of two, thereby bearing a significant phenomenological impact. We also observe that, the NNLO predictions based on the RQCD input appear to be significantly lower than the lattice predictions in spacelike domain [60] and the measured timelike form factors in e^+e^- collision experiments at large Q^2 range, for both charged and neutral kaons. On the contrary, the NNLO predictions based on the LPC input can satisfactorily account for the lattice prediction and measured values for kaon EMFFs at large Q^2 . The reason may be largely attributed to the fact that the value of a_1 given by LPC is about twice greater than that by RQCD².

To strengthen our understanding, we further confront the NNLO predictions with the measurement of the timelike neutral kaon EMFF at $Q^2 = 17.4 \text{ GeV}^2$ by CLEO-c [12]:

$$F_{K_S K_L}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)|_{\text{CLEO-c}} = 5.3 \times 10^{-3}, \quad [(3.1 - 7.9) \times 10^{-3} \text{ at } 90\% \text{ C.L.}] \quad (10a)$$

$$F_{K_S K_L}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)|_{\text{NNLO}}^{\text{RQCD}} = (1.4 - 2.1) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (10b)$$

$$F_{K_S K_L}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)|_{\text{NNLO}}^{\text{LPC}} = (5.2 - 8.5) \times 10^{-3}, \quad (10c)$$

where the theoretical uncertainties are estimated by varying the renormalization and factorization scales in the range $Q/2 < \mu < Q$. Again the NNLO predictions based on the LPC input agrees with the CLEO-c measurement to a decent degree.

² It is worth reminding that, in the pion case, it is the NNLO prediction based on the RQCD input that gives a better account for the measured EMFFs than that based on the LPC input [43].




FIG. 3: pQCD predictions vs. BESIII measurement of $Q^2 F_{K_S K_L}(Q^2)$ in the timelike domain. The predictions are made by taking the central values of the Gegenbauer moments of the kaon LCDA from RQCD (left) an LPC (right) as inputs, respectively. The red, green and blue bands correspond to the LO, NLO and NNLO predictions, with the uncertainty estimated by sliding μ from $Q/2$ to Q .

CLEO-c also presents the ratio of the timelike EMFFs of the neutral kaon to that of the charged kaon at $Q^2 = 17.4 \text{ GeV}^2$ [12], which gauges the degree of the $SU(3)_f$ symmetry breaking. This measurement can be contrasted with the NNLO predictions based on the RQCD and LPC inputs, with uncertainties estimated by varying μ in the range $Q/2 < \mu < Q$:

$$\left. \frac{F_{K_S K_L}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)}{F_{K^+ K^-}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)} \right|_{\text{CLEO-c}} = 0.12, \quad [0.07 - 0.19 \text{ at } 90\% \text{ C.L.}] \quad (11a)$$

$$\left. \frac{F_{K_S K_L}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)}{F_{K^+ K^-}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)} \right|_{\text{NNLO}}^{\text{RQCD}} = 0.076 - 0.087, \quad (11b)$$

$$\left. \frac{F_{K_S K_L}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)}{F_{K^+ K^-}(17.4 \text{ GeV}^2)} \right|_{\text{NNLO}}^{\text{LPC}} = 0.21 - 0.24. \quad (11c)$$

The same ratio of the timelike EMFFs of the neutral to the charged kaons has also been measured at BESIII in the interval $12 \text{ GeV}^2 < Q^2 < 25 \text{ GeV}^2$ [16]:

$$\left. \frac{F_{K_S K_L}(12 \text{ GeV}^2 < Q^2 < 25 \text{ GeV}^2)}{F_{K^+ K^-}(12 \text{ GeV}^2 < Q^2 < 25 \text{ GeV}^2)} \right|_{\text{BESIII}} = 0.21 \pm 0.01. \quad (12)$$




FIG. 4: Ratio of the EMFFs of neutral to charged kaons in the timelike domain as the function of Q^2 . For definiteness, we have chosen the various Gegenbauer moments of kaon LCDA with the central values of LPC predictions. The red, green and blue bands correspond to the LO, NLO and NNLO prediction, with the errors estimated by sliding μ from $Q/2$ to Q . The black rectangles represent the ratio measured by BESIII measurement, (12). However in the theoretical calculation, we extend the upper limit of Q^2 from 25 GeV^2 to 60 GeV^2 .

In Fig. 4 we also juxtapose the ratio predicted by pQCD using the LPC input and measured by BESIII, (12). It is evident from (11) and Fig. 4 that, the pQCD predictions at NNLO accuracy, when armed with the Gegenbauer moments provided by LPC, gives a satisfactory account of the CLEO-c and BESIII data.

IV. SUMMARY

The timelike kaon EMFFs, *viz.*, $e^+e^- \rightarrow \gamma^* \rightarrow K\bar{K}$, are arguably the hardest exclusive reactions ever measured experimentally, with the momentum transfer exceeding 50 GeV^2 . Therefore, the kaon EMFFs may be regarded as an ideal testing ground for the validity of pQCD when applied to hard exclusive processes. Moreover, the magnitude of the neutral kaon's EMFF also affords a sensitive probe to the $SU(3)$ flavor symmetry breaking effect.

In this work we conduct a comprehensive comparison between the state-of-the-art pQCD predictions in collinear factorization and the available kaon EMFFs data sets with large momentum transfer. For the lacking of kaon EMFF measurement in the spacelike domain, we compare our pQCD predictions with the recent lattice determinations of the kaon EMFF at large Q^2 . In the timelike domain, we confront our predictions with the BaBar, BESIII and CLEO-c data. The key finding is that, the inclusion of the NNLO perturbative corrections has a substantial and positive impact on the theoretical predictions. We also observe that, if the values of Gegenbauer moments of the kaon LCDAs are taken from the lattice results given by LPC, the satisfactory agreement between theory and data (including lattice predictions to spacelike kaon EMFFs) can be reached for both charged and neutral kaons, in both spacelike and timelike domains with large momentum transfer. Obviously it is highly desirable if the kaon LCDAs can be ascertained to a higher precision.

Acknowledgments

We thank Heng-Tong Ding and Qi Shi for providing us with the lattice predictions for the spacelike kaon EMFF in [60]. We are also indebted to Jun Hua for clarifying the sign discrepancy in a_1 between RQCD and LPC predictions. The work of L.-B. C. is supported by the NNSFC under Grant No. 12175048. The work of W. C. is supported by Guangdong Major Project of Basic and Applied Basic Research (No. 2020B0301030008). The work of F. F. is supported by the NNSFC under Grant No. 12275353. The work of Y. J. is supported in part by the NNSFC under Grant No. 11925506.

Appendix A: The analytical expressions of the lowest-lying $\mathcal{T}_{mn}^{(k)}$

The two-fold convolution integrals in (8) can be worked out in the closed form. At one-loop level, the lowest-lying short-distance coefficient matrix elements read

$$\mathcal{T}_{01}^{(1)} = \frac{113}{4}L_\mu - \frac{18}{5}\zeta_3 + \frac{5587}{60}, \quad (\text{A1a})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{02}^{(1)} = \frac{131}{4}L_\mu - 9\zeta_3 + \frac{2959}{24}, \quad (\text{A1b})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{03}^{(1)} = \frac{719}{20}L_\mu - 9\zeta_3 + \frac{85339}{600}, \quad (\text{A1c})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{04}^{(1)} = \frac{769}{20}L_\mu - 9\zeta_3 + \frac{47537}{300}, \quad (\text{A1d})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{11}^{(1)} = \frac{145}{4}L_\mu + \frac{523}{4}, \quad (\text{A1e})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{12}^{(1)} = \frac{163}{4}L_\mu - \frac{351\zeta_3}{35} + \frac{48231}{280}, \quad (\text{A1f})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{13}^{(1)} = \frac{879}{20}L_\mu - 27\zeta_3 + \frac{259573}{1200}, \quad (\text{A1g})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{14}^{(1)} = \frac{929}{20}L_\mu - 27\zeta_3 + \frac{141499}{600}, \quad (\text{A1h})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{22}^{(1)} = \frac{181}{4}L_\mu + \frac{54\zeta_3}{7} + \frac{20563}{112}, \quad (\text{A1i})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{23}^{(1)} = \frac{969}{20}L_\mu - \frac{108\zeta_3}{7} + \frac{997123}{4200}, \quad (\text{A1j})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{24}^{(1)} = \frac{1019}{20}L_\mu - 54\zeta_3 + \frac{732221}{2400}, \quad (\text{A1k})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{33}^{(1)} = \frac{1033}{20}L_\mu + 30\zeta_3 + \frac{2274761}{10800}, \quad (\text{A1l})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{34}^{(1)} = \frac{1083}{20}L_\mu - \frac{180\zeta_3}{11} + \frac{22888579}{79200}, \quad (\text{A1m})$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{44}^{(1)} = \frac{1133}{20}L_\mu + \frac{810\zeta_3}{11} + \frac{674701}{3300}. \quad (\text{A1n})$$

At two-loop level, the lowest-lying short-distance coefficient matrix elements read

$$\mathcal{T}_{00}^{(2)} = \frac{729L_\mu^2}{16} - (8\zeta_3 + \frac{35\pi^2}{6} - \frac{2961}{8})L_\mu + 205\zeta_5 - \frac{3\pi^4}{20} - \frac{651\zeta_3}{2} - \frac{275\pi^2}{24} + 821, \quad (\text{A2a})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{01}^{(2)} &= \frac{10961L_\mu^2}{144} + \left(-\frac{137\zeta_3}{5} + \frac{704879}{1080} - \frac{145\pi^2}{18}\right)L_\mu - \frac{1577\zeta_5}{2} - \frac{4\pi^2\zeta_3}{5} - \frac{251\pi^4}{1350} \\ &+ \frac{16009\zeta_3}{100} - \frac{20857\pi^2}{1080} + \frac{30154739}{16200}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2b})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{02}^{(2)} &= \frac{6943L_\mu^2}{72} + \left(-61\zeta_3 + \frac{387371}{432} - \frac{80\pi^2}{9}\right)L_\mu + \frac{155\zeta_5}{2} - 2\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{67\pi^4}{270} - \frac{107491\zeta_3}{180} \\ &- \frac{5921\pi^2}{216} + \frac{254500067}{103680}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2c})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{03}^{(2)} &= \frac{202039L_\mu^2}{1800} + \left(-\frac{321\zeta_3}{5} + \frac{58020191}{54000} - \frac{436\pi^2}{45}\right)L_\mu + \frac{165\zeta_5}{2} - 2\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{343\pi^4}{1350} \\ &- \frac{12785497\zeta_3}{18900} - \frac{28237\pi^2}{900} + \frac{3042907421}{1008000}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2d})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{04}^{(2)} &= \frac{451403L_\mu^2}{3600} + \left(-\frac{667\zeta_3}{10} + \frac{33226643}{27000} - \frac{917\pi^2}{90}\right)L_\mu + \frac{355\zeta_5}{4} - 2\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{1397\pi^4}{5400} \\ &- \frac{76336859\zeta_3}{100800} - \frac{740213\pi^2}{21600} + \frac{257785535129}{72576000}, \end{aligned}$$

$$\mathcal{T}_{11}^{(2)} = \frac{16385L_\mu^2}{144} + \left(-8\zeta_3 + \frac{220117}{216} - \frac{185\pi^2}{18}\right)L_\mu + 3546\zeta_5 - \frac{3\pi^4}{20} - \frac{56177\zeta_3}{20} - \frac{2711\pi^2}{108} + \frac{4892983}{2592}, \quad (\text{A2e})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{12}^{(2)} &= \frac{9943L_\mu^2}{72} + \left(-\frac{2659\zeta_3}{35} + \frac{20948881}{15120} - \frac{100\pi^2}{9}\right)L_\mu - \frac{11037\zeta_5}{2} - \frac{78\pi^2\zeta_3}{35} - \frac{869\pi^4}{3150} \\ &+ \frac{81199421\zeta_3}{29400} - \frac{294449\pi^2}{7560} + \frac{140650728527}{25401600}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2f})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{13}^{(2)} &= \frac{31351L_\mu^2}{200} + \left(-\frac{1003\zeta_3}{5} + \frac{15990101}{9000} - \frac{536\pi^2}{45}\right)L_\mu + \frac{495\zeta_5}{2} - 6\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{38\pi^4}{75} \\ &- \frac{39593063\zeta_3}{25200} - \frac{82603\pi^2}{1350} + \frac{208836835727}{36288000}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2g})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{14}^{(2)} &= \frac{619643L_\mu^2}{3600} + \left(-\frac{2081\zeta_3}{10} + \frac{107582681}{54000} - \frac{1117\pi^2}{90}\right)L_\mu + \frac{1035\zeta_5}{4} - 6\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{937\pi^4}{1800} \\ &- \frac{59475599\zeta_3}{33600} - \frac{470201\pi^2}{7200} + \frac{1450125210497}{217728000}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2h})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{22}^{(2)} &= \frac{23711L_\mu^2}{144} + \left(\frac{337\zeta_3}{7} + \frac{9519367}{6048} - \frac{215\pi^2}{18}\right)L_\mu + \frac{281325\zeta_5}{14} + \frac{12\pi^2\zeta_3}{7} - \frac{29\pi^4}{630} \\ &- \frac{20454703\zeta_3}{1470} - \frac{37249\pi^2}{1512} - \frac{977775959}{5080320}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2i})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{23}^{(2)} &= \frac{73967L_\mu^2}{400} + \left(-\frac{4402\zeta_3}{35} + \frac{28919281}{14000} - \frac{1147\pi^2}{90}\right)L_\mu - \frac{44685\zeta_5}{2} - \frac{24\pi^2\zeta_3}{7} - \frac{773\pi^4}{2100} \\ &+ \frac{1162960399\zeta_3}{88200} - \frac{1365911\pi^2}{25200} + \frac{3573525754441}{285768000}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2j})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{24}^{(2)} = & \frac{90691L_\mu^2}{450} + \left(-\frac{2176\zeta_3}{5} + \frac{48201937}{18000} - \frac{596\pi^2}{45} \right) L_\mu + \frac{915\zeta_5}{2} - 12\pi^2\zeta_3 - \frac{847\pi^4}{900} \\ & - \frac{25432877\zeta_3}{8400} - \frac{2216813\pi^2}{21600} + \frac{1065085696391}{108864000}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2k})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{33}^{(2)} = & \frac{742727L_\mu^2}{3600} + \left(\frac{695\zeta_3}{3} + \frac{1897099387}{972000} - \frac{1219\pi^2}{90} \right) L_\mu + \frac{144475\zeta_5}{2} + \frac{20\pi^2\zeta_3}{3} + \frac{119\pi^4}{405} \\ & - \frac{91161661\zeta_3}{1890} - \frac{74287\pi^2}{16200} - \frac{773409858259}{68040000}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2l})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{34}^{(2)} = & \frac{11191L_\mu^2}{50} + \left(-\frac{1576\zeta_3}{11} + \frac{1585362629}{594000} - \frac{632\pi^2}{45} \right) L_\mu - \frac{1465225\zeta_5}{22} - \frac{40\pi^2\zeta_3}{11} - \frac{793\pi^4}{1980} \\ & + \frac{1689813617\zeta_3}{40656} - \frac{44720293\pi^2}{712800} + \frac{2603110257632537}{98794080000}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2m})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{T}_{44}^{(2)} = & \frac{871277L_\mu^2}{3600} + \left(\frac{6833\zeta_3}{11} + \frac{605198897}{297000} - \frac{1309\pi^2}{90} \right) L_\mu + \frac{4380975\zeta_5}{22} + \frac{180\pi^2\zeta_3}{11} + \frac{67\pi^4}{66} \\ & - \frac{8897578969\zeta_3}{67760} + \frac{511331\pi^2}{9900} - \frac{11028087335760793}{263450880000}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2n})$$

-
- [1] F. Gross, E. Klempt, S. J. Brodsky, A. J. Buras, V. D. Burkert, G. Heinrich, K. Jakobs, C. A. Meyer, K. Orginos and M. Strickland, *et al.* Eur. Phys. J. C **83**, 1125 (2023) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-023-11949-2 [arXiv:2212.11107 [hep-ph]].
- [2] M. Bernardini, D. Bollini, P. L. Brunini, E. Fiorentino, T. Massam, L. Monari, F. Palmonari, F. Rimondi and A. Zichichi, Phys. Lett. B **46**, 261-264 (1973) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(73)90699-0
- [3] D. Bisello *et al.* [DM2], Z. Phys. C **39**, 13 (1988) doi:10.1007/BF01560386
- [4] T. K. Pedlar *et al.* [CLEO], Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 261803 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.261803 [arXiv:hep-ex/0510005 [hep-ex]].
- [5] R. R. Akhmetshin *et al.* [CMD-2], Phys. Lett. B **669**, 217-222 (2008) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.09.053 [arXiv:0804.0178 [hep-ex]].
- [6] K. K. Seth, S. Dobbs, Z. Metreveli, A. Tomaradze, T. Xiao and G. Bonvicini, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, no.2, 022002 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.110.022002 [arXiv:1210.1596 [hep-ex]].
- [7] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **88**, no.3, 032013 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.032013 [arXiv:1306.3600 [hep-ex]].
- [8] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **92**, no.7, 072008 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.072008 [arXiv:1507.04638 [hep-ex]].
- [9] S. I. Serednyakov, [arXiv:1510.01432 [hep-ex]].
- [10] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], Phys. Rev. D **99**, no.3, 032001 (2019) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.032001 [arXiv:1811.08742 [hep-ex]].
- [11] R. R. Akhmetshin, V. M. Aulchenko, V. S. Banzarov, L. M. Barkov, S. E. Baru, N. S. Bashtovoy, A. E. Bondar, D. V. Bondarev, A. V. Bragin and S. K. Dhawan, *et al.* Phys. Lett. B **551**, 27-34 (2003) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)02985-4 [arXiv:hep-ex/0211004 [hep-ex]].
- [12] K. K. Seth, S. Dobbs, A. Tomaradze, T. Xiao and G. Bonvicini, Phys. Lett. B **730**, 332-335 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.02.003 [arXiv:1307.6587 [hep-ex]].
- [13] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **89**, no.9, 092002 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.092002 [arXiv:1403.7593 [hep-ex]].
- [14] E. A. Kozyrev *et al.* [CMD-3], Phys. Lett. B **760**, 314-319 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2016.07.003 [arXiv:1604.02981 [hep-ex]].
- [15] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], Phys. Rev. D **104**, no.9, 092014 (2021) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.092014 [arXiv:2105.13597 [hep-ex]].
- [16] M. Ablikim *et al.* [BESIII], Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, no.13, 131901 (2024) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.131901 [arXiv:2312.10962 [hep-ex]].
- [17] X. G. Wu and T. Huang, JHEP **04**, 043 (2008) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/04/043 [arXiv:0803.4229 [hep-ph]].
- [18] U. Raha and A. Aste, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 034015 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.034015 [arXiv:0809.1359 [hep-ph]].
- [19] U. Raha and H. Kohyama, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 114012 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.114012 [arXiv:1005.1673 [hep-ph]].
- [20] F. Gao, L. Chang, Y. X. Liu, C. D. Roberts and P. C. Tandy, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no.3, 034024 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.034024 [arXiv:1703.04875 [nucl-th]].
- [21] A. F. Krutov, S. V. Troitsky and V. E. Troitsky, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no.7, 464 (2017) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5038-8 [arXiv:1610.06405 [hep-ph]].
- [22] D. Stamen, D. Hariharan, M. Hoferichter, B. Kubis and P. Stoffer, Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, no.5, 432 (2022) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-022-10348-3 [arXiv:2202.11106 [hep-ph]].

- [23] H. A. Ahmed, Y. Chen and M. Huang, Phys. Rev. D **108**, no.8, 086034 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.108.086034 [arXiv:2308.14975 [hep-ph]].
- [24] Y. Z. Xu, M. Ding, K. Raya, C. D. Roberts, J. Rodríguez-Quintero and S. M. Schmidt, Eur. Phys. J. C **84**, no.2, 191 (2024) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-024-12518-x [arXiv:2311.14832 [hep-ph]].
- [25] C. Bruch, A. Khodjamirian and J. H. Kuhn, Eur. Phys. J. C **39**, 41-54 (2005) doi:10.1140/epjc/s2004-02064-3 [arXiv:hep-ph/0409080 [hep-ph]].
- [26] A. S. Miramontes and A. Bashir, Phys. Rev. D **107**, no.1, 014016 (2023) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.014016 [arXiv:2212.10800 [hep-ph]].
- [27] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Annals Phys. **158**, 142 (1984) doi:10.1016/0003-4916(84)90242-2
- [28] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Lett. B **87**, 359-365 (1979) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(79)90554-9
- [29] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, no.21, 545-549 (1979) [erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1625-1626 (1979)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.43.1625.2
- [30] G. P. Lepage and S. J. Brodsky, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2157 (1980) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.22.2157
- [31] A. V. Efremov and A. V. Radyushkin, Theor. Math. Phys. **42**, 97-110 (1980) doi:10.1007/BF01032111
- [32] A. V. Efremov and A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Lett. B **94**, 245-250 (1980) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(80)90869-2
- [33] A. Duncan and A. H. Mueller, Phys. Lett. B **90**, 159-163 (1980) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(80)90074-X
- [34] A. Duncan and A. H. Mueller, Phys. Rev. D **21**, 1636 (1980) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.21.1636
- [35] V. L. Chernyak and A. R. Zhitnitsky, Phys. Rept. **112**, 173 (1984) doi:10.1016/0370-1573(84)90126-1
- [36] C. J. Bebek, C. N. Brown, S. D. Holmes, R. V. Kline, F. M. Pipkin, S. Raither, L. K. Sisterson, A. Browman, K. M. Hanson and D. Larson, *et al.* Phys. Rev. D **17**, 1693 (1978) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.17.1693
- [37] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 032013 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.032013 [arXiv:1205.2228 [hep-ex]].
- [38] A. F. Sill, R. G. Arnold, P. E. Bosted, C. C. Chang, J. Gomez, A. T. Katramatou, C. J. Martoff, G. Petratos, A. A. Rahbar and S. Rock, *et al.* Phys. Rev. D **48**, 29-55 (1993) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.48.29
- [39] N. Isgur and C. H. Llewellyn Smith, Phys. Lett. B **217**, 535-538 (1989) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(89)90092-0
- [40] J. Bolz and P. Kroll, Z. Phys. A **356**, 327 (1996) doi:10.1007/s002180050186 [arXiv:hep-ph/9603289 [hep-ph]].
- [41] A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 114008 (1998) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.58.114008 [arXiv:hep-ph/9803316 [hep-ph]].
- [42] V. M. Braun, A. Khodjamirian and M. Maul, Phys. Rev. D **61**, 073004 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.61.073004 [arXiv:hep-ph/9907495 [hep-ph]].
- [43] L. B. Chen, W. Chen, F. Feng and Y. Jia, Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, no.20, 201901 (2024) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.132.201901 [arXiv:2312.17228 [hep-ph]].
- [44] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022**, 083C01 (2022) doi:10.1093/ptep/ptac097
- [45] M. Strohmaier, *Conformal symmetry breaking and evolution equations in Quantum Chromodynamics*, Ph.D. thesis, Regensburg U. (2018).
- [46] A. Khodjamirian, T. Mannel and M. Melcher, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 094002 (2004) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.094002 [arXiv:hep-ph/0407226 [hep-ph]].
- [47] P. Ball, V. M. Braun and A. Lenz, JHEP **05**, 004 (2006) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/05/004 [arXiv:hep-ph/0603063 [hep-ph]].
- [48] S. i. Nam and H. C. Kim, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 096007 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.096007 [arXiv:hep-ph/0608018 [hep-ph]].
- [49] S. i. Nam and H. C. Kim, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 076005 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.076005 [arXiv:hep-ph/0609267 [hep-ph]].
- [50] S. i. Nam, H. C. Kim, A. Hosaka and M. M. Musakhanov, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 014019 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.014019 [arXiv:hep-ph/0605259 [hep-ph]].
- [51] Q. Chang, S. J. Brodsky and X. Q. Li, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no.9, 094025 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.094025 [arXiv:1612.05298 [hep-ph]].
- [52] J. Lan, C. Mondal, S. Jia, X. Zhao and J. P. Vary, Phys. Rev. D **101**, no.3, 034024 (2020) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.034024 [arXiv:1907.01509 [nucl-th]].
- [53] V. M. Braun, M. Gockeler, R. Horsley, H. Perlt, D. Pleiter, P. E. L. Rakow, G. Schierholz, A. Schiller, W. Schroers and H. Stuben, *et al.* Phys. Rev. D **74**, 074501 (2006) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.074501 [arXiv:hep-lat/0606012 [hep-lat]].
- [54] G. S. Bali *et al.* [RQCD], JHEP **08**, 065 (2019) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2019)065 [arXiv:1903.08038 [hep-lat]].
- [55] J. Hua *et al.* [Lattice Parton], Phys. Rev. Lett. **129**, no.13, 132001 (2022) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.132001 [arXiv:2201.09173 [hep-lat]].
- [56] P. Ball and M. Boglione, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 094006 (2003) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.68.094006 [arXiv:hep-ph/0307337 [hep-ph]].
- [57] K. G. Chetyrkin, A. Khodjamirian and A. A. Pivovarov, Phys. Lett. B **661**, 250-258 (2008) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.02.031 [arXiv:0712.2999 [hep-ph]].
- [58] V. M. Braun, A. N. Manashov, S. Moch and M. Strohmaier, JHEP **06**, 037 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2017)037 [arXiv:1703.09532 [hep-ph]].
- [59] A. P. Bakulev and V. L. Khandramai, Comput. Phys. Commun. **184**, no.1, 183-193 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2012.08.014 [arXiv:1204.2679 [hep-ph]].
- [60] H. T. Ding, X. Gao, A. D. Hanlon, S. Mukherjee, P. Petreczky, Q. Shi, S. Syritsyn, R. Zhang and Y. Zhao, [arXiv:2404.04412 [hep-lat]].