

Soft-gluon coupling and the TMD parton branching Sudakov form factor

A. Bermudez Martinez,¹ F. Hautmann,^{2,3} L. Keersmaekers,² A. Lelek,²
M. Mendizabal Morentin,¹ S. Taheri Monfared,¹ and A. M. van Kampen²

¹*Deutsches Elektronen-Synchrotron DESY, D 22607 Hamburg*

²*Elementaire Deeltjes Fysica, Universiteit Antwerpen, B 2020 Antwerpen*

³*Theoretical Physics Department, University of Oxford, Oxford OX1 3PU*

The evolution of transverse momentum dependent (TMD) distributions in Quantum Chromodynamics (QCD) can be formulated in a parton branching (PB) framework. We show that next-to-next-to-leading-logarithm (NNLL) accuracy can be achieved in this framework by using the concept of soft-gluon physical coupling. We present results for the TMD distributions and for the Collins-Soper kernel controlling rapidity evolution. The results pave the way for PB predictions at NNLL level for physical observables at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and future colliders.

One of the essential elements of the high-precision physics program at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) and future high-energy experiments [1–5] is a reliable, accurate description of the initial state of the collision, involving hadron structure and initial-state QCD radiation. Depending on the kinematic regions probed, this can be treated by collinear [6] or transverse momentum dependent (TMD) [7] parton distribution functions. The former provide an effective 1-dimensional picture of the hadronic initial states; the latter provide a 3-dimensional picture, which is needed in phase-space regions near the kinematic boundaries such as the Sudakov region [8] and high-energy region [9].

The effort towards higher precision also affects the parton-shower Monte Carlo generators [10] employed for realistic event simulations at colliders. A large body of work is devoted to improving their logarithmic accuracy [11–23] and exploring their systematic uncertainties associated with initial-state parton distributions [24–32]. Refs. [33, 34] propose the use of TMD parton distributions in parton branching (PB) algorithms, implementable in Monte Carlo generators.

The PB approach of Refs. [33, 34] has so far been applied with leading-logarithm (LL) and next-to-leading-logarithm (NLL) accuracy in the Sudakov region. For instance, it has been applied through NLL to the computation of Z/γ boson transverse momentum spectra [35, 36] and determination of TMD parton distributions [37, 38] from Drell-Yan (DY) experimental data. The NLL contributions have been matched [35, 39, 40] with next-to-leading-order (NLO) perturbative corrections in the MCatNLO [41] framework. The inclusion of logarithmic contributions to TMD evolution from the high-energy (small- x) region has also been studied [42, 43]. However, PB contributions beyond NLL in the Sudakov region have not been considered so far.

The purpose of this paper is to start the investigation of the PB Sudakov form factor at next-to-next-to-leading-logarithm (NNLL) accuracy and beyond. To this end, we use the soft-gluon physical coupling [44–

46] (which is the higher-order extension of the CMW result [47]) in the Sudakov evolution of TMD parton distributions. With this approach, in this work we obtain the perturbative NNLL Sudakov coefficients in the PB TMD evolution and identify the non-perturbative Sudakov contributions at large distances.

Besides improving the logarithmic accuracy of PB TMD evolution, this work allows us to observe features of the perturbative theory which appear for the first time at NNLL. Starting from NNLL, the double-logarithmic coefficient in the Sudakov form factor is no longer proportional to the cusp anomalous dimension, due to the collinear anomaly [48]. Working in the PB TMD approach supplemented with the soft-gluon coupling, we relate the difference between the cusp and the Sudakov double-log coefficient to the perturbative contribution to the Collins-Soper (CS) kernel [8, 49, 50]. We then perform the evaluation of the CS kernel at NNLL (including perturbative and non-perturbative components), using the computational technique [51].

The results of this work will be applicable to studies of collider observables. For the purpose of such applications we recall that, besides NLO matching in the MCatNLO [41] framework, TMD multi-jet merging [52–54], in the MLM [55, 56] method, has also been developed; furthermore, the PB TMD method is implemented in the open-source QCD platform `xFitter` [57, 58], while the fitted TMD sets are available in the TMDLIB library [59, 60] and included in the CASCADE Monte Carlo event generator [61, 62].

In this paper we describe the main idea of this work and illustrate it with a few calculations at NNLL for the evolved TMD distributions and the CS kernel. Full details will be reported elsewhere [63]. Results from this study have been presented earlier in Refs. [64, 65]. In the following, we start by recalling basic features of the PB Sudakov form factor; then we describe the soft-gluon coupling and discuss its role in the TMD evolution; finally we present NNLL numerical results.

According to the PB method [33, 34, 66], TMD distri-

butions fulfill evolution equations in terms of evolution kernels which can be expressed through the Sudakov form factors

$$\Delta_a(\mu^2, \mu_0^2) = \exp \left(- \sum_b \int_{\mu_0^2}^{\mu^2} \frac{d\mu'^2}{\mu'^2} \int_0^{z_M} dz z P_{ba}^R(z, \alpha_s) \right) \quad (1)$$

where z and μ' are the branching variables, representing respectively the longitudinal momentum transfer and the mass scale at the branching; z_M is the soft-gluon resolution scale [33], characterizing resolvable and non-resolvable branchings; $P_{ba}^R(z, \alpha_s)$ are the real-emission splitting functions, computable in perturbation theory as power series expansions in the coupling α_s . The form factor $\Delta_a(\mu^2, \mu_0^2)$ may be interpreted as the probability for parton a to evolve from μ_0 to μ without resolvable branchings. By using unitarity and the momentum sum rule to relate $P_{ba}^R(z, \alpha_s)$ to the virtual parts of the splitting functions [67], and introducing the coefficients k_a and d_a of the singular terms of the splitting functions for $z \rightarrow 1$, the form factor $\Delta_a(\mu^2, \mu_0^2)$ may be rewritten as

$$\Delta_a(\mu^2, \mu_0^2) = \exp \left(- \int_{\mu_0^2}^{\mu^2} \frac{d\mu'^2}{\mu'^2} \times \left(\int_0^{z_M} dz k_a(\alpha_s) \frac{1}{1-z} - d_a(\alpha_s) \right) \right). \quad (2)$$

The coefficients k_a and d_a are given as power series expansions in α_s [34],

$$k_a(\alpha_s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right)^n k_a^{(n-1)}, \quad d_a(\alpha_s) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right)^n d_a^{(n-1)}. \quad (3)$$

The one-loop contributions are

$$k_q^{(0)} = 2C_F, \quad k_g^{(0)} = 2C_A, \quad (4)$$

$$d_q^{(0)} = \frac{3}{2}C_F, \quad d_g^{(0)} = \frac{11}{6}C_A - \frac{2}{3}T_R N_f, \quad (5)$$

where $C_A = 3$, $C_F = 4/3$, $T_R = 1/2$, and N_f is the number of flavors. The two-loop contributions are

$$k_a^{(1)} = 2C_a \left(C_A \left(\frac{67}{18} - \frac{\pi^2}{6} \right) - \frac{10}{9}T_R N_f \right), \quad (6)$$

$$d_q^{(1)} = C_F^2 \left(\frac{3}{8} - \frac{\pi^2}{2} + 6\zeta_3 \right) + C_F C_A \left(\frac{17}{24} + \frac{11}{18}\pi^2 - 3\zeta_3 \right) - C_F T_R N_f \left(\frac{1}{6} + \frac{2}{9}\pi^2 \right), \quad (7)$$

$$d_g^{(1)} = C_A^2 \left(\frac{8}{3} + 3\zeta_3 \right) - \frac{4}{3}C_A T_R N_f - C_F T_R N_f, \quad (8)$$

where $C_a = C_F$ for quarks and $C_a = C_A$ for gluons, and ζ is the Riemann zeta function. The k_a terms are double-logarithmic contributions, corresponding to the cusp anomalous dimension, while the d_a terms are single-logarithmic. In the logarithmic power counting for the Sudakov evolution of TMD distributions, the LL accuracy is obtained by including the $k_a^{(0)}$ coefficients, and the NLL accuracy is obtained by including the $k_a^{(1)}$ and $d_a^{(0)}$ coefficients [67].

We now proceed to make two transformations on the Sudakov form factor. First, to achieve NNLL accuracy we appeal to the concept of soft-gluon physical coupling [45, 46], which extends the CMW result [47] to higher order. To do this, we modify Eq. (2) by the transformation $\alpha_s \rightarrow \alpha_s^{\text{phys}}$, with the soft-gluon physical coupling given by

$$\alpha_s^{\text{phys}} = \alpha_s \left(1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \mathcal{K}^{(n)} \left(\frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \right)^n \right), \quad (9)$$

where the first-order coefficient is [47]

$$\mathcal{K}^{(1)} = C_A \left(\frac{67}{18} - \frac{\pi^2}{6} \right) - \frac{5}{9}N_f, \quad (10)$$

and the second-order coefficient is [45, 46]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}^{(2)} = & C_A^2 \left(\frac{245}{24} - \frac{67}{9}\zeta_2 + \frac{11}{6}\zeta_3 + \frac{11}{5}\zeta_2^2 \right) \\ & + C_F N_f \left(-\frac{55}{24} + 2\zeta_3 \right) \\ & + C_A N_f \left(-\frac{209}{108} + \frac{10}{9}\zeta_2 - \frac{7}{3}\zeta_3 \right) \\ & - \frac{1}{27}N_f^2 + \frac{\pi\beta_0}{2} \left(C_A \left(\frac{808}{27} - 28\zeta_3 \right) - \frac{224}{54}N_f \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $\beta_0 = (11C_A - 2N_f)/(12\pi)$. We will see shortly that the role of the soft-gluon coupling in the PB TMD evolution is to guarantee that, provided two-loop splitting functions are used in the Sudakov form factor, NNLL accuracy is achieved, for both single-logarithmic and double-logarithmic terms.

Second, as in Refs. [37, 68] for each branching evolution scale μ' we split the integration over the branching's longitudinal momentum transfer z in Eq. (2) into two parts, by classifying parton emissions according to whether the emitted transverse momenta q_{\perp} are above or below the semihard "showering" scale q_0 [69–71] (of order $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ GeV})$). By using the kinematic relationship between the branching's mass scale and the transverse momentum of the parton emission dictated by soft-gluon angular ordering [47, 68–72], this subdivides the z integration range into two regions

$$\begin{aligned} \text{a) : } & z < z_{\text{dyn}} = 1 - q_0/\mu', \\ \text{b) : } & z_{\text{dyn}} < z < z_M, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where $z_{\text{dyn}} = 1 - q_0/\mu'$ is the dynamical resolution scale [68] associated with the angular ordering. We refer to the contributions to evolution from regions a) and b), respectively, as the perturbative (P) and non-perturbative (NP) Sudakov components.

We are now in a position to evaluate the form factor including the soft-gluon physical coupling. We perform a mapping from the branching variables (z, μ') to (q_\perp, z) for regions a) and b). Details of the calculation are given in [63]. For the perturbative Sudakov form factor at NNLL we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \ln(\Delta_a^{(P)}(\mu^2, q_0^2)) = & - \int_{q_0^2}^{\mu^2} \frac{dq_\perp^2}{q_\perp^2} \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} \left(\ln \frac{\mu^2}{q_\perp^2} k_a^{(0)} \right. \\ & + \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} k_a^{(1)} \ln \frac{\mu^2}{q_\perp^2} - d_a^{(0)} \\ & \left. + \frac{\alpha_s^2}{(2\pi)^2} \mathcal{K}^{(2)} k_a^{(0)} \frac{1}{2} \ln \frac{\mu^2}{q_\perp^2} - \frac{\alpha_s}{2\pi} d_a^{(1)} + \dots \right). \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

The three lines in Eq. (13) give, respectively, the LL, NLL and NNLL contributions to the TMD parton branching Sudakov form factor. In particular, the double-logarithmic coefficient of order $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$, $\mathcal{K}^{(2)} k_a^{(0)} \equiv A_a^{(3)}$, is supplied by the soft-gluon coupling in the PB TMD evolution. The NNLL single-logarithmic coefficient, $-2d_a^{(1)} \equiv B_a^{(2)}$, is supplied, on the other hand, by the two-loop splitting functions in the PB TMD evolution.

As regards the single-logarithmic, or B , coefficients, Ref. [63] studies the relationship between the \overline{MS} re-summation scheme used by PB and the commonly used DY and Higgs schemes [73–77]. This is given by

$$B_q^{(2)\text{DY}} - (-2) \cdot d_q^{(1)} = 16C_F\pi\beta_0 (\zeta_2 - 1) \quad (14)$$

and

$$B_g^{(2)\text{H}} - (-2) \cdot d_g^{(1)} = 16C_A\pi\beta_0 \left(\zeta_2 + \frac{11}{24} \right). \quad (15)$$

In Fig. 1 we present results of the numerical Monte Carlo implementation of the soft-gluon coupling in the PB TMD evolution. These are not intended as a detailed phenomenological study, but as an illustration that such studies will be feasible, based on the framework of this paper. The general set-up for the numerical evolution code is as in [66]. In particular, the strong coupling α_s is evaluated at the transverse momentum q_\perp , according to angular ordering [47, 68, 70]. The non-perturbative region b) of Eq. (12) is treated by modeling the strong coupling as $\alpha_s = \alpha_s(\max(q_{\text{cut}}^2, \mathbf{q}_\perp^2))$, with q_{cut} on the order of the GeV. The solid purple and blue curves give, respectively, the NNLL and NLL results.

The top panel of Fig. 1 shows the transverse momentum dependence of the d -quark TMD distribution for given values of momentum fraction x and evolution scale μ . The middle panel shows the x dependence of the same




FIG. 1. Impact of the soft-gluon physical coupling on down quark TMD (top), integrated TMD (middle) and DY p_\perp spectrum at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV (bottom). We compare NNLL and NLL results.

TMD distribution integrated over transverse momenta. The bottom panel shows predictions for the Z -boson transverse momentum distribution, obtained using NLO matching with MCatNLO as in [35, 39]. For reference, we also show with the red curve the result of Ref. [35]. The uncertainty bands shown are those corresponding to variations of factorization and renormalization scales. We see that the primary effect of NNLL corrections is on the shape of the Z -boson spectrum for p_T below or around the peak, and that the region of higher p_T above the peak is however also affected.

As a final application of our study, we next turn to the evaluation of the CS kernel. The perturbative part of the CS kernel controls the relationship between the NNLL double-log coefficient, obtained in the last line of Eq. (13) from the PB TMD implementation of the soft-gluon coupling, and the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ k -coefficient in Eq. (3) [63]. More precisely, by taking the derivative of the CS kernel with respect to transverse coordinate b [49, 50, 75, 76], we have

$$A_a^{(3)} - k_a^{(2)} = C_a \pi \beta_0 \left[C_A \left(\frac{808}{27} - 28\zeta_3 \right) - \frac{112}{27} N_f \right]. \quad (16)$$

The non-perturbative part of the CS kernel receives contribution, in our framework, from region b) of Eq. (12). It can be taken into account by using the technique [51, 78]. This consists in extracting the CS kernel from ratios of appropriate Fourier transforms of physical DY p_T distributions computed at different masses. We use this technique to study the CS kernel extracted from PB TMD predictions including the soft-gluon physical coupling at NNLL.




FIG. 2. The b -dependence of the CS kernel at $\mu = 2$ GeV, obtained from NNLL predictions with soft-gluon coupling (top five entries in the legend, corresponding to different scenarios for resolution scale and α_s) and from several extractions in the literature (bottom six entries in the legend, based on fits to experimental data and on lattice calculations).

In Fig. 2 we show a summary plot, reporting results for the CS kernel as a function of transverse coordinate b at evolution scale $\mu = 2$ GeV. The plot in Fig. 2 presents results obtained from our computations (corresponding to different scenarios for the strong coupling and the resolution scale, as indicated for the five curves at the top of the legend) in comparison to several extractions from the literature [79–86] (based on fits to experimental data or on lattice calculations). The uncertainty bands are computed using the method proposed in [51].

We observe that the curves with $\alpha_s(q_\perp)$ (which fulfills angular ordering) are close to one another for $b < 1$ GeV^{-1} and start to differ for larger b as an effect of the resolution scale, while the curve with $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is already very different at small b . It is known from [35, 40], on the other hand, that $\alpha_s(\mu)$ is already strongly disfavored by DY and jet data. We also note the flattening behavior at large b in the purple curve (dynamical resolution scale) compared to the red curve (fixed resolution scale). This is potentially of interest because, while traditionally fits to DY transverse momentum have assumed a quadratically rising large- b behavior (see e.g. [79, 87–90]), recent analyses have observed a preference for a flat large- b behavior [76], in a similar spirit to parton saturation in the s -channel picture [91, 92] for partonic distribution functions (see e.g. [93, 94] in DY and [95] in e^+e^- fragmentation).

In conclusion, in this paper we study PB algorithms which include the effects of TMD physics. We achieve perturbative NNLL accuracy by introducing the soft-gluon coupling in the TMD evolution and, taking into account non-perturbative Sudakov effects, we establish the relationship of the PB calculation at NNLL with the CS kernel throughout the range in transverse coordinate b , from short to long distances.

This is the first computation of NNLL accuracy done with PB TMD techniques. It will impact future applications, given that PB TMD predictions have been successful in describing a wide range of collider processes, from DIS structure functions to DY spectra to multi-jets. Also, NNLL is the first logarithmic order sensitive to features of the perturbative theory such as the collinear anomaly. It thus provides a significant test of the method.

The results obtained in this paper are relevant from the theoretical standpoint, with the CS kernel being a major focus of non-perturbative QCD studies, e.g. by lattice QCD methods, and from the phenomenological standpoint, as precision physics in electroweak boson production channels at the LHC (as well as future colliders) requires an accurate control of Sudakov and TMD dynamics in the low transverse momentum region.

These results may be susceptible to being systematically extended to higher orders, as the notion of soft-gluon coupling also holds beyond order $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$. As regards applications to collider observables, we note that

TMD matching and merging techniques are available (respectively with MCatNLO method and MLM method), so that predictions become possible which include finite-order perturbative contributions together with the results of the present paper. As PB TMD algorithms can be implemented in parton-shower Monte Carlo event generators, the results of this work can contribute to improve the accuracy of initial-state parton showers.

Acknowledgments. We thank A. Banfi, T. Becher, S. Catani, H. Jung and A. Vladimirov for useful discussions. AL acknowledges funding by Research Foundation-Flanders (FWO) (application number: 1272421N).

-
- [1] P. Azzi *et al.*, CERN Yellow Rep. Monogr. **7**, 1 (2019), arXiv:1902.04070 [hep-ph].
- [2] P. Agostini *et al.* (LHeC, FCC-he Study Group), J. Phys. G **48**, 110501 (2021), arXiv:2007.14491 [hep-ex].
- [3] A. Abada *et al.* (FCC), Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 474 (2019).
- [4] Y. Hatta *et al.*, (2020), 10.1142/11684, arXiv:2002.12333 [hep-ph].
- [5] H. Cheng *et al.* (CEPC Physics Study Group), in *Snowmass 2021* (2022) arXiv:2205.08553 [hep-ph].
- [6] K. Kovarik, P. M. Nadolsky, and D. E. Soper, Rev. Mod. Phys. **92**, 045003 (2020), arXiv:1905.06957 [hep-ph].
- [7] R. Angeles-Martinez *et al.*, Acta Phys. Polon. B **46**, 2501 (2015), arXiv:1507.05267 [hep-ph].
- [8] J. C. Collins, D. E. Soper, and G. F. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B **250**, 199 (1985).
- [9] S. Catani, M. Ciafaloni, and F. Hautmann, Nucl. Phys. B **366**, 135 (1991).
- [10] S. Alioli *et al.*, (2019), arXiv:1902.01674 [hep-ph].
- [11] G. Bewick, S. Ferrario Ravasio, P. Richardson, and M. H. Seymour, JHEP **04**, 019 (2020), arXiv:1904.11866 [hep-ph].
- [12] Z. Nagy and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 054049 (2021), arXiv:2011.04773 [hep-ph].
- [13] Z. Nagy and D. E. Soper, (2020), arXiv:2011.04777 [hep-ph].
- [14] J. R. Forshaw, J. Holguin, and S. Plätzer, JHEP **09**, 014 (2020), arXiv:2003.06400 [hep-ph].
- [15] J. Holguin, J. R. Forshaw, and S. Plätzer, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 364 (2021), arXiv:2011.15087 [hep-ph].
- [16] M. van Beekveld *et al.*, (2024), arXiv:2406.02661 [hep-ph].
- [17] M. van Beekveld, M. Dasgupta, B. K. El-Menoufi, J. Helliwell, P. F. Monni, and G. P. Salam, (2024), arXiv:2409.08316 [hep-ph].
- [18] S. Ferrario Ravasio, K. Hamilton, A. Karlberg, G. P. Salam, L. Scyboz, and G. Soyez, (2023), arXiv:2307.11142 [hep-ph].
- [19] M. van Beekveld, S. Ferrario Ravasio, G. P. Salam, A. Soto-Ontoso, G. Soyez, and R. Verheyen, JHEP **11**, 019 (2022), arXiv:2205.02237 [hep-ph].
- [20] K. Hamilton, R. Medves, G. P. Salam, L. Scyboz, and G. Soyez, JHEP **03**, 041 (2021), arXiv:2011.10054 [hep-ph].
- [21] M. Dasgupta, F. A. Dreyer, K. Hamilton, P. F. Monni, G. P. Salam, and G. Soyez, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 052002 (2020), arXiv:2002.11114 [hep-ph].
- [22] F. Herren, S. Höche, F. Krauss, D. Reichelt, and M. Schoenherr, (2022), arXiv:2208.06057 [hep-ph].
- [23] L. Gellersen, S. Höche, and S. Prestel, Phys. Rev. D **105**, 114012 (2022), arXiv:2110.05964 [hep-ph].
- [24] Z. Nagy and D. E. Soper, JHEP **06**, 179 (2014), arXiv:1401.6368 [hep-ph].
- [25] Z. Nagy and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 014025 (2020), arXiv:2002.04125 [hep-ph].
- [26] S. Dooling, P. Gunnellini, F. Hautmann, and H. Jung, Phys. Rev. **D87**, 094009 (2013), arXiv:1212.6164 [hep-ph].
- [27] S. Hoche, F. Krauss, and S. Prestel, (2017), arXiv:1705.00982 [hep-ph].
- [28] L. Gellersen, D. Napoletano, and S. Prestel, in *PhysTeV Les Houches* (2020) arXiv:2003.01700 [hep-ph].
- [29] M. van Beekveld and S. Ferrario Ravasio, JHEP **02**, 001 (2024), arXiv:2305.08645 [hep-ph].
- [30] M. van Beekveld, S. Ferrario Ravasio, K. Hamilton, G. P. Salam, A. Soto-Ontoso, G. Soyez, and R. Verheyen, JHEP **11**, 020 (2022), arXiv:2207.09467 [hep-ph].
- [31] M. Mendizabal, F. Guzman, H. Jung, and S. Taheri Monfared, (2023), arXiv:2309.11802 [hep-ph].
- [32] S. Frixione and B. R. Webber, JHEP **03**, 150 (2024), arXiv:2309.15587 [hep-ph].
- [33] F. Hautmann, H. Jung, A. Lelek, V. Radescu, and R. Zlebcik, Phys. Lett. **B772**, 446 (2017), arXiv:1704.01757 [hep-ph].
- [34] F. Hautmann, H. Jung, A. Lelek, V. Radescu, and R. Zlebcik, JHEP **01**, 070 (2018), arXiv:1708.03279 [hep-ph].
- [35] A. Bermudez Martinez *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 074027 (2019), arXiv:1906.00919 [hep-ph].
- [36] A. Bermudez Martinez *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 598 (2020), arXiv:2001.06488 [hep-ph].
- [37] I. Bujanja *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **84**, 154 (2024), arXiv:2312.08655 [hep-ph].
- [38] W. Zhan, S. Yang, M. Liu, F. Hautmann, and L. Han, (2024), arXiv:2412.19060 [hep-ph].
- [39] H. Yang *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, 755 (2022), arXiv:2204.01528 [hep-ph].
- [40] M. I. Abdulhamid *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, 36 (2022), arXiv:2112.10465 [hep-ph].
- [41] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, H. S. Shao, T. Stelzer, P. Torrielli, and M. Zaro, JHEP **07**, 079 (2014), arXiv:1405.0301 [hep-ph].
- [42] F. Hautmann, M. Hentschinski, L. Keersmaekers, A. Kusina, K. Kutak, and A. Lelek, Phys. Lett. B **833**, 137276 (2022), arXiv:2205.15873 [hep-ph].
- [43] S. Taheri Monfared, F. Hautmann, H. Jung, and M. Schmitz, PoS **DIS2019**, 136 (2019), arXiv:1908.01621 [hep-ph].
- [44] S. Catani, D. de Florian, S. Devoto, M. Grazzini, and J. Mazzitelli, JHEP **11**, 217 (2023), arXiv:2309.11584 [hep-ph].
- [45] S. Catani, D. De Florian, and M. Grazzini, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 685 (2019), arXiv:1904.10365 [hep-ph].
- [46] A. Banfi, B. K. El-Menoufi, and P. F. Monni, JHEP **01**, 083 (2019), arXiv:1807.11487 [hep-ph].
- [47] S. Catani, B. R. Webber, and G. Marchesini, Nucl. Phys. **B349**, 635 (1991).
- [48] T. Becher and M. Neubert, Eur. Phys. J. C **71**, 1665

- (2011), arXiv:1007.4005 [hep-ph].
- [49] J. C. Collins and D. E. Soper, Nucl. Phys. **B197**, 446 (1982).
- [50] J. C. Collins and D. E. Soper, Nucl. Phys. **B193**, 381 (1981), [Erratum: Nucl. Phys. **B213**, 545 (1983)].
- [51] A. Bermudez Martinez and A. Vladimirov, Phys. Rev. D **106**, L091501 (2022), arXiv:2206.01105 [hep-ph].
- [52] A. Bermudez Martinez, F. Hautmann, and M. L. Mangano, Phys. Lett. B **822**, 136700 (2021), arXiv:2107.01224 [hep-ph].
- [53] A. Bermudez Martinez, F. Hautmann, and M. L. Mangano (2021) arXiv:2109.08173 [hep-ph].
- [54] A. Bermudez Martinez, F. Hautmann, and M. L. Mangano, JHEP **09**, 060 (2022), arXiv:2208.02276 [hep-ph].
- [55] J. Alwall et al., Eur. Phys. J. C **53**, 473 (2008), arXiv:0706.2569 [hep-ph].
- [56] M. L. Mangano, M. Moretti, F. Piccinini, and M. Trecani, JHEP **01**, 013 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0611129.
- [57] H. Abdolmaleki et al. (xFitter) (2022) arXiv:2206.12465 [hep-ph].
- [58] S. Alekhin et al., Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, 304 (2015), arXiv:1410.4412 [hep-ph].
- [59] N. A. Abdulov et al., Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 752 (2021), arXiv:2103.09741 [hep-ph].
- [60] F. Hautmann, H. Jung, M. Kraemer, P. J. Mulders, E. R. Nocera, T. C. Rogers, and A. Signori, Eur. Phys. J. **C74**, 3220 (2014), arXiv:1408.3015 [hep-ph].
- [61] S. Baranov et al. (CASCADE), Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 425 (2021), arXiv:2101.10221 [hep-ph].
- [62] H. Jung et al. (CASCADE), Eur. Phys. J. C **70**, 1237 (2010), arXiv:1008.0152 [hep-ph].
- [63] A. Lelek et al., in preparation, (2024).
- [64] A. Bermudez Martinez et al., PoS **EPS-HEP2023**, 270 (2024).
- [65] A. Lelek, in Physics In Collision 2023 (2024) arXiv:2412.09108 [hep-ph].
- [66] A. Bermudez Martinez et al., Phys. Rev. D **99**, 074008 (2019), arXiv:1804.11152 [hep-ph].
- [67] A. M. van Kampen, SciPost Phys. Proc. **8**, 151 (2022), arXiv:2108.04099 [hep-ph].
- [68] F. Hautmann, L. Keersmaekers, A. Lelek, and A. M. Van Kampen, Nucl. Phys. B **949**, 114795 (2019), arXiv:1908.08524 [hep-ph].
- [69] B. R. Webber, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **36**, 253 (1986).
- [70] A. Bassetto, M. Ciafaloni, and G. Marchesini, Phys. Rept. **100**, 201 (1983).
- [71] G. Marchesini and B. R. Webber, Nucl. Phys. **B310**, 461 (1988).
- [72] Y. L. Dokshitzer, V. A. Khoze, S. I. Troian, and A. H. Mueller, Rev. Mod. Phys. **60**, 373 (1988).
- [73] S. Catani, D. de Florian, and M. Grazzini, Nucl. Phys. B **596**, 299 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0008184.
- [74] D. de Florian and M. Grazzini, Nucl. Phys. B **616**, 247 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0108273.
- [75] J. Collins and T. C. Rogers, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 054011 (2017), arXiv:1705.07167 [hep-ph].
- [76] J. Collins and T. Rogers, Phys. Rev. D **91**, 074020 (2015), arXiv:1412.3820 [hep-ph].
- [77] W. Bizon, P. F. Monni, E. Re, L. Rottoli, and P. Torrielli, JHEP **02**, 108 (2018), arXiv:1705.09127 [hep-ph].
- [78] A. Bermudez Martinez, Phys. Lett. B **845**, 138182 (2023), arXiv:2307.06704 [hep-ph].
- [79] A. Bacchetta, V. Bertone, C. Bissolotti, G. Bozzi, M. Cerutti, F. Piacenza, M. Radici, and A. Signori (MAP (Multi-dimensional Analyses of Partonic distributions)), JHEP **10**, 127 (2022), arXiv:2206.07598 [hep-ph].
- [80] A. Bacchetta, V. Bertone, C. Bissolotti, G. Bozzi, M. Cerutti, F. Delcarro, M. Radici, L. Rossi, and A. Signori (MAP), JHEP **08**, 232 (2024), arXiv:2405.13833 [hep-ph].
- [81] V. Moos, I. Scimemi, A. Vladimirov, and P. Zurita, JHEP **05**, 036 (2024), arXiv:2305.07473 [hep-ph].
- [82] M. Bury, F. Hautmann, S. Leal-Gomez, I. Scimemi, A. Vladimirov, and P. Zurita, JHEP **10**, 118 (2022), arXiv:2201.07114 [hep-ph].
- [83] I. Scimemi and A. Vladimirov, JHEP **06**, 137 (2020), arXiv:1912.06532 [hep-ph].
- [84] M.-H. Chu et al. (LPC), Phys. Rev. D **106**, 034509 (2022), arXiv:2204.00200 [hep-lat].
- [85] M. Schlemmer, A. Vladimirov, C. Zimmermann, M. Engelhardt, and A. Schäfer, JHEP **08**, 004 (2021), arXiv:2103.16991 [hep-lat].
- [86] Y. Li et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 062002 (2022), arXiv:2106.13027 [hep-lat].
- [87] G. A. Ladinsky and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D50**, R4239 (1994), arXiv:hep-ph/9311341 [hep-ph].
- [88] F. Landry, R. Brock, G. Ladinsky, and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 013004 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/9905391 [hep-ph].
- [89] F. Landry, R. Brock, P. M. Nadolsky, and C. P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. **D67**, 073016 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0212159 [hep-ph].
- [90] A. V. Konychev and P. M. Nadolsky, Phys. Lett. **B633**, 710 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0506225 [hep-ph].
- [91] F. Hautmann and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 074020 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0702077.
- [92] F. Hautmann and D. E. Soper, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 011501 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0008224.
- [93] F. Hautmann, I. Scimemi, and A. Vladimirov, Phys. Lett. B **806**, 135478 (2020), arXiv:2002.12810 [hep-ph].
- [94] F. Hautmann, I. Scimemi, and A. Vladimirov, SciPost Phys. Proc. **8**, 123 (2022), arXiv:2109.12051 [hep-ph].
- [95] M. Boglione and A. Simonelli, JHEP **09**, 006 (2023), arXiv:2306.02937 [hep-ph].