

An improved evaluation of the electroweak contribution to $(g - 2)_\mu$

Martin Hoferichter^a, Jan Lütke^b, Luca Naterop^{c,d}, Massimiliano Procura^b, Peter Stoffer^{c,d}

^aAlbert Einstein Center for Fundamental Physics, Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Bern, Sidlerstrasse 5, 3012 Bern, Switzerland

^bFaculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Boltzmannngasse 5, 1090 Vienna, Austria

^cPhysik-Institut, Universität Zürich, Winterthurerstrasse 190, 8057 Zürich, Switzerland

^dPSI Center for Neutron and Muon Sciences, 5232 Villigen PSI, Switzerland

Abstract

A precise evaluation of the electroweak contribution to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon requires control over all aspects of the Standard Model, ranging from Higgs physics, over multi-loop computations for bosonic and (heavy-)fermion diagrams, to non-perturbative effects in the presence of light quarks. Currently, the dominant uncertainties arise from such hadronic effects in the vector–vector–axial-vector three-point function, an improved understanding of which has recently emerged in the context of hadronic light-by-light scattering. Profiting from these developments as well as new perturbative and non-perturbative input for the charm contribution, we obtain $a_\mu^{\text{EW}} = 154.4(4) \times 10^{-11}$.

1. Introduction

The anomalous magnetic moment of the muon $a_\mu = (g - 2)_\mu/2$ has been measured to a precision of 0.19 ppm [1, 2],

$$a_\mu^{\text{exp}} = 116\,592\,059(22) \times 10^{-11}, \quad (1)$$

projected to improve to $\Delta a_\mu^{\text{exp}} \simeq 13 \times 10^{-11}$ with the upcoming release of the final result from the Fermilab experiment, possibly even improving upon the original design goal [3]. To confront the latest experimental determination with an up-to-date Standard-Model prediction, a community-wide effort [4] is currently ongoing to revise the 2020 review [5] according to the latest developments [6]. In this context, the limiting factor concerns the unclear situation regarding hadronic vacuum polarization, in which case tensions among data-driven evaluations [7–27] and with lattice QCD [28–36] need to be resolved to match the experimental precision, e.g., regarding the role of radiative corrections [37–43]. For hadronic light-by-light (HLbL) scattering [44–59] (as well as higher-order hadronic effects [60–63]), the situation is already much better, with recent work both in lattice QCD [64–68] and using phenomenological approaches suggesting a viable path towards the required precision. The latter includes work on exclusive hadronic states [18, 69–78] in a dispersive approach to HLbL scattering [79–82], higher-order short-distance constraints [83–86], and the combination with hadronic descriptions [87–96]. In particular, there is now a complete dispersive evaluation of the HLbL contribution at a precision of $\Delta a_\mu^{\text{HLbL}} = 8 \times 10^{-11}$ [97, 98], including a detailed study of the matching to constraints from perturbative QCD (pQCD) and the operator product expansion (OPE), which relates the HLbL tensor in parts of the parameter space to the vector–vector–axial-vector (VVA) correlator [44, 99, 100].

In this Letter, we aim to explore the consequences of these latter developments for the electroweak (EW) contribution a_μ^{EW} .




Figure 1: EW diagrams afflicted by hadronic effects, including the VVA correlator (left) and the γ – Z two-point function (right), both indicated by gray blobs. The two diagrams are sensitive to the axial-vector and vector components of the Z boson, respectively.

That is, while for QED the dominant uncertainty arises from six-loop effects enhanced by powers of $\log(m_\mu/m_e)$ [101, 102], the entire class of EW contributions, defined as all diagrams involving Z , W , or h , includes loops of light quarks, and their non-perturbative manifestation proves to be the dominant source of uncertainty [103, 104], see Fig. 1. In view of the fact that the evaluation of a_μ^{EW} in Refs. [5, 104] still relies on the non-perturbative estimates from Ref. [103], as well as recent work that has led to an improved understanding of the VVA correlator [75], it is timely that these estimates be reconsidered.

First, even for the heavy quarks new information has become available, thanks to the α_s corrections calculated in Ref. [105], see Sec. 2. In Sec. 3 we turn to the light quarks, building on the first-generation analysis from Ref. [75], which we first adapt to the strange quark, before combining the result with a new estimate of the charm contribution in Sec. 4. Finally, also the evaluation of non-perturbative effects in γ – Z mixing can be made more robust, incorporating recent results from lattice QCD [106, 107], as discussed in Sec. 5. We combine everything into a new evaluation of a_μ^{EW} in Sec. 6, before concluding in Sec. 7. Throughout, we follow the conventions of Ref. [104], i.e., the parameters are determined via G_F as mea-

sured in muon decay, α , and m_t , in terms of which M_W is predicted, and the on-shell scheme for the weak mixing angle $s_W^2 \equiv \sin^2 \theta_W = 1 - M_W^2/M_Z^2$ is employed. Changes in the input parameters compared to Ref. [5] are small, so that for the one-loop result [108–112] and the two-loop bosonic [113–115] and Higgs [104, 116] contributions the numbers remain almost identical [6, 117].

2. Perturbative corrections

The left diagram in Fig. 1 can be expressed in terms of the VVA correlator, decomposed into a longitudinal (L) and transversal (T) contribution. After performing the Wick rotation, one obtains [56]

$$a_\mu^{VVA} = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \frac{G_F}{24\pi^2 \sqrt{2}} \int_0^\infty dQ^2 Q^2 \sum_{i=L,T} c_i(Q^2) w_i(Q^2),$$

$$c_L(Q^2) = \left(1 - \frac{Q^2}{2m_\mu^2}\right) W_\mu + \frac{Q^2}{2m_\mu^2}, \quad W_\mu = \sqrt{1 + \frac{4m_\mu^2}{Q^2}},$$

$$c_T(Q^2) = \left[\left(2 + \frac{Q^2}{2m_\mu^2}\right) W_\mu - \left(3 + \frac{Q^2}{2m_\mu^2}\right)\right] \frac{M_Z^2}{M_Z^2 + Q^2}, \quad (2)$$

where the normalization conventions can be most easily read off from the perturbative one-loop expressions [103, 118–120]

$$w_L^{1\text{-loop}}(Q^2) = 2w_T^{1\text{-loop}}(Q^2)$$

$$= 4T_f^3 N_f Q_f^2 \int_0^1 dx \frac{x(1-x)}{x(1-x)Q^2 + m_f^2}$$

$$= \frac{4T_f^3 N_f Q_f^2}{Q^2} \left(1 + \frac{2m_f^2}{Q^2 W_f} \log \frac{W_f - 1}{W_f + 1}\right), \quad (3)$$

for a fermion f with mass m_f , third component of weak isospin T_f^3 , charge Q_f , and a potential color factor N_f . The α_s corrections for massive quarks were calculated in Ref. [105], and provided as a Padé series in Q^2/m_f^2 . Using these expressions, we find for the contribution from the third generation

$$a_\mu^{VVA}[t, b, \tau] = -8.12(1) \times 10^{-11}, \quad (4)$$

where the remaining perturbative error, estimated using either a fixed $\alpha_s(m_f^2)$ or one-loop running $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ in the respective Q^2 integrals, is amply covered by the indicated uncertainty.¹ We recall that only the combined contribution of each generation is physical, as reflected by the anomaly cancellation condition

$$\sum_f N_f Q_f^2 T_f^3 = 0, \quad (5)$$

which ensures that the integral in Eq. (2) converges.

¹Throughout, we use mass parameters from Ref. [121], in particular, $m_t = 172.57(29)$ GeV, $\tilde{m}_b(m_b) = 4.183(7)$ GeV, $\tilde{m}_c(m_c) = 1.2730(46)$ GeV, and convert the latter two into on-shell masses at $O(\alpha_s)$, consistent with the order to which we are working, yielding $m_b = 4.58$ GeV, $m_c = 1.48$ GeV. The uncertainty is dominated by higher orders in α_s , which we estimate by comparing $\alpha_s(Q^2)$ and $\alpha_s(m_f^2)$ evaluations of the VVA contribution. For the top quark, this also covers the corrections that would need to be applied to the Monte Carlo m_t parameter quoted above.

3. Light quark loops

For the first generation, we use the results of the dedicated dispersive calculation of the triplet VVA correlator from Ref. [75]

$$a_\mu^{VVA,L}[u, d, e] = -0.892(10) \times 10^{-11},$$

$$a_\mu^{VVA,T}[u, d, e] = -1.192(29) \times 10^{-11},$$

$$a_\mu^{VVA}[u, d, e] \equiv a_\mu^{VVA,L+T}[u, d, e] = -2.08(3) \times 10^{-11}. \quad (6)$$

As preparation for an improved estimate of the second generation, we first reconstruct a simplified version of this result. Following Ref. [98], we find

$$w_L^{ud}(Q^2) = \frac{2Q^2[Q^2 + M_\pi^2 + M_\rho^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2 - \kappa_{\text{OPE}}^{ud}]}{(Q^2 + M_\pi^2)(Q^2 + M_\rho^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)}$$

$$+ \frac{M_\pi^2 M_\rho^2 M_{\text{eff}}^2 w_L^{ud}(0)}{(Q^2 + M_\pi^2)(Q^2 + M_\rho^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)},$$

$$w_T^{ud}(Q^2) = \frac{Q^2[Q^2 + M_{a_1}^2 + M_\rho^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2 - \kappa_{\text{OPE}}^{ud}]}{(Q^2 + M_{a_1}^2)(Q^2 + M_\rho^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)}$$

$$+ \frac{M_{a_1}^2 M_\rho^2 M_{\text{eff}}^2 w_T^{ud}(0)}{(Q^2 + M_{a_1}^2)(Q^2 + M_\rho^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)}, \quad (7)$$

implementing the normalizations from chiral perturbation theory [89, 90]

$$w_L^{ud}(0) = \frac{8\pi^2(1 + a_\pi)F_{\pi\gamma\gamma}F_\pi}{M_\pi^2}, \quad w_T^{ud}(0) = \frac{8\pi^2 a_\pi F_{\pi\gamma\gamma}F_\pi}{M_\pi^2}, \quad (8)$$

with slope parameter $a_\pi = 31.5(9) \times 10^{-3}$ [49, 122], pion decay constant $F_\pi = 92.32(10)$ MeV [121], form-factor normalization $F_{\pi\gamma\gamma} = 0.2754(21)$ GeV⁻¹ [123], and the OPE constraint

$$w_L^{ud}(Q^2)|_{\text{OPE}} = 2w_T^{ud}(Q^2)|_{\text{OPE}} = \frac{2}{Q^2} \left[1 - \frac{\kappa_{\text{OPE}}^{ud}}{Q^2} + \mathcal{O}((Q^2)^{-2})\right], \quad (9)$$

with subleading coefficient

$$\kappa_{\text{OPE}}^{ud} = \frac{8\pi^2 \hat{m} \hat{X}}{3e} \simeq 0.012 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (10)$$

where we used the tensor coefficients $X_u = 40.7(1.3)$ MeV, $X_d = 39.4(1.4)$ MeV, $X_s = 53.0(7.2)$ MeV [51, 75, 124], the quark masses $\hat{m} = 3.49(7)$ MeV, $m_s = 93.5(8)$ MeV [121, 125–130], and neglected isospin-breaking effects beyond $\hat{m} = (m_u + m_d)/2$, $\hat{X} = (X_u + X_d)/2$. As observed in Ref. [98], the dispersive result of Ref. [75] is almost perfectly reproduced for effective masses $M_{\text{eff}} = 1.5$ GeV and $M_{\text{eff}} = 1.0$ GeV for the longitudinal and transversal components, respectively, producing $a_\mu^{VVA}[u, d, e] = -2.07(6) \times 10^{-11}$, where the uncertainty indicates the sensitivity to varying $M_{\text{eff}} \in [1.0, 2.0]$ GeV.

For the generalization to the strange-quark case, the most complicated aspect concerns the η - η' and f_1 - f_1' mixings. For the normalizations we have

$$w_L^s(0) = -4\pi^2 \sum_{P=\eta,\eta'} \frac{(1 + b_P M_P^2) F_{P\gamma\gamma} F_P^s}{M_P^2},$$

$$w_T^s(0) = -4\pi^2 \sum_{P=\eta,\eta'} b_P F_{P\gamma\gamma} F_P^s, \quad (11)$$

with slope parameters $b_\eta = 1.833(41) \text{ GeV}^{-2}$, $b_{\eta'} = 1.493(32) \text{ GeV}^{-2}$ [78, 131], normalizations $F_{\eta\gamma\gamma} = 0.2736(48) \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, $F_{\eta'\gamma\gamma} = 0.3437(55) \text{ GeV}^{-1}$ [121], and strangeness decay constants F_P^s . The latter can be reconstructed from the singlet and octet decay constants and mixing angles [78, 132] (consistent with Refs. [133, 134]), yielding

$$F_\eta^s = -111.7(4.4) \text{ MeV}, \quad F_{\eta'}^s = 140.8(4.8) \text{ MeV}, \quad (12)$$

and similarly, the relative weight of f_1, f'_1 can be estimated from light-cone sum rules for the strangeness couplings F_A^s [135] and the experimental normalizations $\mathcal{F}_2^A(0,0)$ [136, 137]. Defining

$$\xi_P = \frac{F_{P\gamma\gamma} F_P^s}{\sum_{P'=\eta,\eta'} F_{P'\gamma\gamma} F_{P'}^s}, \quad \xi_A = \frac{\frac{F_A^s}{M_A} \mathcal{F}_2^A(0,0)}{\sum_{A'=f_1,f'_1} \frac{F_{A'}^s}{M_{A'}} \mathcal{F}_2^{A'}(0,0)}, \quad (13)$$

these weights become

$$\xi_\eta \simeq -1.7, \quad \xi_{\eta'} \simeq 2.7, \quad \xi_{f_1} \simeq -2.0, \quad \xi_{f'_1} \simeq 3.0, \quad (14)$$

which together with the OPE constraint

$$w_L^s(Q^2)|_{\text{OPE}} = 2w_T^s(Q^2)|_{\text{OPE}} = -\frac{2}{3Q^2} \left[1 - \frac{\kappa_{\text{OPE}}^s}{Q^2} + \mathcal{O}((Q^2)^{-2}) \right],$$

$$\kappa_{\text{OPE}}^s = \frac{8\pi^2 m_s X_s}{3e} \simeq 0.43 \text{ GeV}^2, \quad (15)$$

leads to the following generalization of Eq. (7):

$$w_L^s(Q^2) = \left\{ -\frac{2Q^2[Q^2 + \xi_\eta M_\eta^2 + \xi_{\eta'} M_{\eta'}^2 + M_\phi^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2 - \kappa_{\text{OPE}}^s]}{3(Q^2 + M_\phi^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)} + \frac{M_{\eta\eta'}^2 M_\phi^2 M_{\text{eff}}^2 w_L^s(0)}{(Q^2 + M_\phi^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)} \right\} \sum_{P=\eta,\eta'} \frac{\xi_P}{Q^2 + M_P^2},$$

$$w_T^s(Q^2) = \left\{ -\frac{Q^2[Q^2 + \xi_{f_1} M_{f_1}^2 + \xi_{f'_1} M_{f'_1}^2 + M_\phi^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2 - \kappa_{\text{OPE}}^s]}{3(Q^2 + M_\phi^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)} + \frac{M_{f_1 f'_1}^2 M_\phi^2 M_{\text{eff}}^2 w_T^s(0)}{(Q^2 + M_\phi^2)(Q^2 + M_{\text{eff}}^2)} \right\} \sum_{A=f_1, f'_1} \frac{\xi_A}{Q^2 + M_A^2}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$M_{\eta\eta'}^2 = \frac{M_\eta^2 M_{\eta'}^2}{\xi_\eta M_{\eta'}^2 + \xi_{\eta'} M_\eta^2}, \quad M_{f_1 f'_1}^2 = \frac{M_{f_1}^2 M_{f'_1}^2}{\xi_{f_1} M_{f'_1}^2 + \xi_{f'_1} M_{f_1}^2}. \quad (17)$$

As reference point, we first evaluate the second generation with a leading-order (LO) pQCD loop for charm

$$a_\mu^{\text{VVA},L}[c, s, \mu] \Big|_{\text{LO pQCD}} = -2.92(2) \times 10^{-11},$$

$$a_\mu^{\text{VVA},T}[c, s, \mu] \Big|_{\text{LO pQCD}} = -1.70(5) \times 10^{-11},$$

$$a_\mu^{\text{VVA}}[c, s, \mu] \Big|_{\text{LO pQCD}} = -4.62(5) \times 10^{-11}, \quad (18)$$

where the indicated errors only refer to the surprisingly small sensitivity to M_{eff} . In fact, by far the largest uncertainty arises from the relative weight of the η and η' contributions, determined in Eq. (14) via the two-photon couplings and the




Figure 2: $w_L(Q^2)$ for the charm loop. The black lines refer to pQCD (dashed: LO, dot-dashed: NLO, solid: sum), while the η_c estimate according to Eq. (21) is represented by the red lines (dashed: $\eta_c(1S)$, dot-dashed: $\eta_c(2S)$, solid: sum). The bands are propagated from the uncertainties in F_P and $F_{P\gamma\gamma}$.

strangeness decay constants. This could be improved by a dedicated dispersive analysis; here, we assign the variation compared to the weights $\xi_\eta = -1$, $\xi_{\eta'} = 2$ [103], corresponding to the limit in which η - η' mixing is neglected in $F_{P\gamma\gamma}$ and F_P^s , as an additional uncertainty, which yields

$$a_\mu^{\text{VVA}}[c, s, \mu] \Big|_{\text{LO pQCD}} = -4.62(14) \times 10^{-11}. \quad (19)$$

4. Charm loop

For the charm contribution, it is clear that perturbative corrections will be more sizable than in the context of Eq. (4). Evaluating the α_s corrections from Ref. [105], with a running α_s kept constant below $Q_0 = m_c$, one obtains the shifts

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\text{VVA},L}[c] \Big|_{\alpha_s} = 0.33(17) \times 10^{-11},$$

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\text{VVA},T}[c] \Big|_{\alpha_s} = 0.14(7) \times 10^{-11},$$

$$\Delta a_\mu^{\text{VVA}}[c] \Big|_{\alpha_s} = 0.48(24) \times 10^{-11}, \quad (20)$$

where the uncertainties indicate the variation observed when keeping $\alpha_s(Q_0)$ fixed (for both L and T in the upward direction). However, this procedure may not capture non-perturbative effects that could play a role for small Q^2 , the most important of which are likely the $\eta_c(1S)$, $\eta_c(2S)$ poles, suggesting the estimate

$$w_L^{\eta_c}(Q^2) = \sum_{P=\eta_c(1S), \eta_c(2S)} \frac{8\pi^2 F_{P\gamma\gamma} F_P}{M_P^2 + Q^2} \frac{M_V^2}{M_V^2 + Q^2}, \quad (21)$$

where the vector mass is set to $M_V = M_{J/\psi}$ and $M_V = M_{\psi(2S)}$, respectively.² The $\eta_c(1S)$ decay constant was calculated in lattice QCD (including quenched QED) in Ref. [140],

²This is motivated by the fact that the decay $\psi(2S) \rightarrow \gamma J/\psi$ has been observed [138], while for $\eta_c(2S) \rightarrow \gamma J/\psi$ only limits are available [139]. However, the difference between the scales is small and only has negligible impact on the analysis.

$F_{\eta_c(1S)} = 398.1(1.0)$ MeV, which together with the two-photon coupling $F_{\eta_c(1S)\gamma\gamma} = 0.067(3)$ GeV $^{-1}$ [121] then defines the simplest estimate of non-perturbative effects. To include, in addition, the $\eta_c(2S)$, we use $F_{\eta_c(2S)\gamma\gamma} = 0.032(11)$ GeV $^{-1}$ [121] and $F_{\eta_c(2S)} = 271(69)$ MeV [141], whose result $F_{\eta_c(1S)} = 385(94)$ MeV agrees well with Ref. [140].

As shown in Fig. 2, this model matches the sum of LO and next-to-leading-order (NLO) pQCD almost perfectly in the limit $Q^2 \rightarrow 0$. Matching the hadronic and pQCD description at a low scale at which pQCD starts to apply therefore incurs negligible changes compared to Eq. (20). A smooth matching in the intermediate range could also be achieved by modeling the effects of even heavier intermediate states, e.g., in terms of effective poles similarly to the first generation [75], leading to results compatible within uncertainties. One could further try to extract non-perturbative input for $w_T(Q^2)$ from the radiative axial-vector decay $\chi_{c1} \rightarrow \gamma J/\psi$, following Refs. [70, 73], but the required model assumptions would be too severe to allow for an improved estimate. Overall, we therefore obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta a_\mu^{\text{VVA}}[c] \Big|_{\alpha_s+\eta_c} &= 0.48(24) \times 10^{-11}, \\ a_\mu^{\text{VVA}}[c, s, \mu] &= -4.14(28) \times 10^{-11}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

5. γ -Z mixing

The second class of non-perturbative contributions, represented by the right diagram in Fig. 1, is conventionally included in the fermionic remainder, once Higgs and VVA contributions have been separated. Writing this γ -Z-mixing term in the form

$$a_\mu^{\gamma Z} = -\frac{G_F m_\mu^2}{8\pi^2 \sqrt{2}} \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \times \frac{4}{3} (1 - 4s_W^2) \times 8\pi^2 \bar{\Pi}^{\gamma Z}(-M_Z^2), \quad (23)$$

with the correlator and running couplings defined in the conventions

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Pi}^{\gamma Z}(q^2) &= -\frac{s_W^2}{4\pi\alpha} \Delta_{\text{had}} s_W^2(q^2), \\ \Delta_{\text{had}} s_W^2(q^2) &= \Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(q^2) - \Delta\alpha_{2,\text{had}}(q^2), \\ \alpha(q^2) &= \frac{\alpha(0)}{1 - \Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(q^2) - \Delta\alpha_{\text{lep}}(q^2)}, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

one has the perturbative expression

$$8\pi^2 \bar{\Pi}^{\gamma Z}(-M_Z^2) = 2 \sum_{q=u,d,s,c,b} \left[T_q^3 Q_q - 2Q_q^2 s_W^2 \right] \log \frac{M_Z}{m_q}, \quad (25)$$

which needs to be amended due to non-perturbative effects. In the evaluation of Refs. [5, 103, 104] the replacement $8\pi^2 \bar{\Pi}^{\gamma Z}(-M_Z^2) \rightarrow 6.88(50)$ is used, which goes back to Ref. [142] (with input from Refs. [143–145]). The more recent data-driven update from Ref. [56], also using the methodology for the flavor separation from Ref. [144], finds 5.87(4) instead. To assess the SU(3) corrections in the flavor decomposition in a more robust manner, we consider the lattice-QCD

	Ref. [5]	This work
one-loop	194.79(1)	194.79(1)*
two-loop, bosonic	-19.96(1)	-19.96(0)*
two-loop, Higgs	-1.51(1)	-1.50(0)*
two-loop, VVA, $[u, d, e]$	-2.28(20)	-2.08(3)
two-loop, VVA, $[c, s, \mu]$	-4.63(30)	-4.14(28)
two-loop, VVA, $[t, b, \tau]$	-8.21(10)	-8.12(1)
two-loop, fermionic (rest)	-4.64(10)	-4.58(10)
three-loop, NLL	0.00(20)	0.00(20)*
total	153.56(1.00)	154.41(36)

Table 1: Our evaluation of a_μ^{EW} in comparison to Ref. [5] (based on Refs. [103, 104]; entries marked with an asterisk are taken over from Ref. [5], updated to current values for particle masses [6, 117]). All numbers in units of 10^{-11} .

input from Ref. [106] (see Ref. [107] for the time-like evolution to $q^2 = M_Z^2$), which amounts to writing

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\Pi}^{\gamma Z}(-M_Z^2) &= \frac{1 - 2s_W^2}{8\pi\alpha} \Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}^{(5)}(-M_Z^2) \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{6\sqrt{3}} \bar{\Pi}^{08}(-M_Z^2) - \frac{1}{12} \sum_{q=c,b} Q_q \bar{\Pi}^{qq}(-M_Z^2), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

neglecting small isospin-breaking and heavy-quark disconnected contributions. This formulation shows explicitly that the by far numerically dominant contribution can be retrieved from $e^+e^- \rightarrow$ hadrons cross sections, while $\bar{\Pi}^{08}$ parameterizes the amount of SU(3) breaking. Using $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}(-M_Z^2) = 0.02756(10)$ [11, 12, 146], the first term gives 6.56(3), consistent with the lattice+pQCD evaluation from Ref. [106], 6.59(4). The subsequent terms lead to a reduction of the central value. Taking $\bar{\Pi}^{08}(-M_Z^2) = 7.0(2) \times 10^{-3}$ [106] (extrapolated from $q^2 = -7$ GeV 2 to $q^2 = -M_Z^2$ with a Padé ansatz), $\bar{\Pi}^{08}$ induces a shift by about -0.05, while the pQCD result for $q = c, b$ [147, 148] adds another -0.52(4) (with the uncertainty covering the difference between LO and NLO in α_s). Taking everything together, we find a combined value $8\pi^2 \bar{\Pi}^{\gamma Z}(-M_Z^2) = 6.0(1)$,³ leading to an uncertainty in $\Delta a_\mu^{\gamma Z}$ that is negligible compared to the uncertainty from terms suppressed by higher powers in $1 - 4s_W^2$ or M_Z^2/m_q^2 , see Ref. [104], whose error estimate we take over. Updating particle masses to Ref. [121] then leads to the value for the fermionic remainder given in Table 1.

6. Bottom line

Summing everything up, we obtain the total as given in Table 1, i.e.,

$$a_\mu^{\text{EW}} = 154.4(4) \times 10^{-11}. \quad (27)$$

³We also considered the results for the pQCD corrections given in Ref. [149], both for $\Delta\alpha_{\text{had}}$ and $\bar{\Pi}^{qq}$, leading to a result for $\bar{\Pi}^{\gamma Z}(-M_Z^2)$ consistent within uncertainties.

This result is almost 1σ larger than the previous evaluation from Refs. [5, 103, 104], with changes primarily driven by (i) dispersive evaluation of the VVA correlator for the first generation (+0.20), (ii) η - η' mixing in w_L^s (+0.14), (iii) α_s and non-perturbative corrections for charm loop (+0.48), and all these effects happen to go in the same direction.

At this point, the largest uncertainties originate from the second generation, therein mainly due to charm physics, and the estimate of three-loop corrections by renormalization-group arguments [103, 150]. In Table 1 we took over the previous estimate for next-to-leading logarithms (NLL), improvements of which could lie within reach using modern EFT technology [151].

7. Conclusions

In this Letter we revised the evaluation of the EW contribution to the anomalous magnetic moment of the muon, building on an improved understanding of the required two- and three-point functions that has become available thanks to recent work on the VVA correlator in the context of HLbL scattering, α_s corrections to the heavy quark loops, and the running of $\sin^2 \theta_W$. In total, we find a rather sizable shift compared to previous work, see Eq. (27) for the final result, but consistent within uncertainties and driven by the accumulation of a number of small improvements that happen to point in the same direction. While some further refinements could be envisioned, mainly in the context of the second-generation VVA contribution and three-loop NLL estimates, our work provides a reassessment of the EW contribution including a state-of-the-art evaluation of non-perturbative effects.

Acknowledgments

We thank Nora Brambilla, Aida El-Khadra, Jens Erler, Rodolfo Ferro-Hernández, Simon Holz, Simon Kuberski, and Dominik Stöckinger for valuable discussions, as well as Dominik Stöckinger and Hyejung Stöckinger-Kim for providing updated values for the two-loop bosonic and Higgs contributions. Financial support by the SNSF (Project Nos. TMC2_2.13690 and PCEFP2.194272) as well as by the FWF (DACH Grant I 3845-N27 and Doctoral Program Particles and Interactions, project no. W1252-N27) is gratefully acknowledged. This research was supported in part by grant NSF PHY-2309135 to the Kavli Institute for Theoretical Physics (KITP).

References

[1] D. P. Aguillard *et al.* (Muon $g-2$), Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 161802 (2023), arXiv:2308.06230 [hep-ex].
[2] D. P. Aguillard *et al.* (Muon $g-2$), Phys. Rev. D **110**, 032009 (2024), arXiv:2402.15410 [hep-ex].
[3] J. Grange *et al.* (Muon $g-2$), (2015), arXiv:1501.06858 [physics.ins-det].
[4] G. Colangelo *et al.*, (2022), arXiv:2203.15810 [hep-ph].
[5] T. Aoyama *et al.*, Phys. Rept. **887**, 1 (2020), arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph].
[6] Second White Paper of the Muon $g-2$ Theory Initiative, forthcoming.
[7] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, B. Malaescu, and Z. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, 827 (2017), arXiv:1706.09436 [hep-ph].

[8] A. Keshavarzi, D. Nomura, and T. Teubner, Phys. Rev. D **97**, 114025 (2018), arXiv:1802.02995 [hep-ph].
[9] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, and P. Stoffer, JHEP **02**, 006 (2019), arXiv:1810.00007 [hep-ph].
[10] M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, and B. Kubis, JHEP **08**, 137 (2019), arXiv:1907.01556 [hep-ph].
[11] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, B. Malaescu, and Z. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 241 (2020), [Erratum: Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 410 (2020)], arXiv:1908.00921 [hep-ph].
[12] A. Keshavarzi, D. Nomura, and T. Teubner, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 014029 (2020), arXiv:1911.00367 [hep-ph].
[13] B.-L. Hoid, M. Hoferichter, and B. Kubis, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 988 (2020), arXiv:2007.12696 [hep-ph].
[14] A. Crivellin, M. Hoferichter, C. A. Manzari, and M. Montull, Phys. Rev. Lett. **125**, 091801 (2020), arXiv:2003.04886 [hep-ph].
[15] A. Keshavarzi, W. J. Marciano, M. Passera, and A. Sirlin, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 033002 (2020), arXiv:2006.12666 [hep-ph].
[16] B. Malaescu and M. Schott, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 46 (2021), arXiv:2008.08107 [hep-ph].
[17] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, and P. Stoffer, Phys. Lett. B **814**, 136073 (2021), arXiv:2010.07943 [hep-ph].
[18] D. Stamen, D. Hariharan, M. Hoferichter, B. Kubis, and P. Stoffer, Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, 432 (2022), arXiv:2202.11106 [hep-ph].
[19] G. Colangelo, A. X. El-Khadra, M. Hoferichter, A. Keshavarzi, C. Lehner, P. Stoffer, and T. Teubner, Phys. Lett. B **833**, 137313 (2022), arXiv:2205.12963 [hep-ph].
[20] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, B. Kubis, and P. Stoffer, JHEP **10**, 032 (2022), arXiv:2208.08993 [hep-ph].
[21] M. Hoferichter, G. Colangelo, B.-L. Hoid, B. Kubis, J. Ruiz de Elvira, D. Schuh, D. Stamen, and P. Stoffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **131**, 161905 (2023), arXiv:2307.02532 [hep-ph].
[22] M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, B. Kubis, and D. Schuh, JHEP **08**, 208 (2023), arXiv:2307.02546 [hep-ph].
[23] P. Stoffer, G. Colangelo, and M. Hoferichter, JINST **18**, C10021 (2023), arXiv:2308.04217 [hep-ph].
[24] M. Davier, A. Hoecker, A.-M. Lutz, B. Malaescu, and Z. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. C **84**, 721 (2024), arXiv:2312.02053 [hep-ph].
[25] F. V. Ignatov *et al.* (CMD-3), Phys. Rev. D **109**, 112002 (2024), arXiv:2302.08834 [hep-ex].
[26] F. V. Ignatov *et al.* (CMD-3), Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 231903 (2024), arXiv:2309.12910 [hep-ex].
[27] T. P. Leplumey and P. Stoffer, (2025), arXiv:2501.09643 [hep-ph].
[28] S. Borsányi *et al.* (BMWc), Nature **593**, 51 (2021), arXiv:2002.12347 [hep-lat].
[29] M. Cè *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **106**, 114502 (2022), arXiv:2206.06582 [hep-lat].
[30] C. Alexandrou *et al.* (ETM), Phys. Rev. D **107**, 074506 (2023), arXiv:2206.15084 [hep-lat].
[31] A. Bazavov *et al.* (Fermilab Lattice, HPQCD, MILC), Phys. Rev. D **107**, 114514 (2023), arXiv:2301.08274 [hep-lat].
[32] T. Blum *et al.* (RBC, UKQCD), Phys. Rev. D **108**, 054507 (2023), arXiv:2301.08696 [hep-lat].
[33] A. Boccaletti *et al.* (BMWc), (2024), arXiv:2407.10913 [hep-lat].
[34] T. Blum *et al.* (RBC, UKQCD), (2024), arXiv:2410.20590 [hep-lat].
[35] D. Djukanovic, G. von Hippel, S. Kuberski, H. B. Meyer, N. Miller, K. Ottnad, J. Parrino, A. Risch, and H. Wittig, (2024), arXiv:2411.07969 [hep-lat].
[36] A. Bazavov *et al.* (Fermilab Lattice, HPQCD, MILC), (2024), arXiv:2412.18491 [hep-lat].
[37] F. Campanario, H. Czyż, J. Gluza, T. Jeliński, G. Rodrigo, S. Tracz, and D. Zhuridov, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 076004 (2019), arXiv:1903.10197 [hep-ph].
[38] F. Ignatov and R. N. Lee, Phys. Lett. B **833**, 137283 (2022), arXiv:2204.12235 [hep-ph].
[39] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, J. Monnard, and J. Ruiz de Elvira, JHEP **08**, 295 (2022), [Erratum: JHEP **09**, 177 (2024)], arXiv:2207.03495 [hep-ph].
[40] J. Monnard, *Radiative corrections for the two-pion contribution to the hadronic vacuum polarization contribution to the muon $g-2$* , Ph.D. thesis, Universität Bern (2021).
[41] G. Abbiendi *et al.*, (2022), arXiv:2201.12102 [hep-ph].

- [42] J. P. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), Phys. Rev. D **108**, L111103 (2023), arXiv:2308.05233 [hep-ex].
- [43] R. Aliberti *et al.*, (2024), arXiv:2410.22882 [hep-ph].
- [44] K. Melnikov and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 113006 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0312226.
- [45] P. Masjuan and P. Sánchez-Puertas, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 054026 (2017), arXiv:1701.05829 [hep-ph].
- [46] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 232001 (2017), arXiv:1701.06554 [hep-ph].
- [47] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, JHEP **04**, 161 (2017), arXiv:1702.07347 [hep-ph].
- [48] M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, B. Kubis, S. Leupold, and S. P. Schneider, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 112002 (2018), arXiv:1805.01471 [hep-ph].
- [49] M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, B. Kubis, S. Leupold, and S. P. Schneider, JHEP **10**, 141 (2018), arXiv:1808.04823 [hep-ph].
- [50] A. Gérardin, H. B. Meyer, and A. Nyffeler, Phys. Rev. D **100**, 034520 (2019), arXiv:1903.09471 [hep-lat].
- [51] J. Bijnens, N. Hermansson-Truedsson, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, Phys. Lett. B **798**, 134994 (2019), arXiv:1908.03331 [hep-ph].
- [52] G. Colangelo, F. Hagelstein, M. Hoferichter, L. Laub, and P. Stoffer, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 051501 (2020), arXiv:1910.11881 [hep-ph].
- [53] G. Colangelo, F. Hagelstein, M. Hoferichter, L. Laub, and P. Stoffer, JHEP **03**, 101 (2020), arXiv:1910.13432 [hep-ph].
- [54] V. Pauk and M. Vanderhaeghen, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 3008 (2014), arXiv:1401.0832 [hep-ph].
- [55] I. Danilkin and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. D **95**, 014019 (2017), arXiv:1611.04646 [hep-ph].
- [56] F. Jegerlehner, *The Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Muon*, Vol. 274 (Springer, Cham, 2017).
- [57] M. Knecht, S. Narison, A. Rabemananjara, and D. Rabietarivony, Phys. Lett. B **787**, 111 (2018), arXiv:1808.03848 [hep-ph].
- [58] G. Eichmann, C. S. Fischer, and R. Williams, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 054015 (2020), arXiv:1910.06795 [hep-ph].
- [59] P. Roig and P. Sánchez-Puertas, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 074019 (2020), arXiv:1910.02881 [hep-ph].
- [60] J. Calmet, S. Narison, M. Perrottet, and E. de Rafael, Phys. Lett. B **61**, 283 (1976).
- [61] A. Kurz, T. Liu, P. Marquard, and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Lett. B **734**, 144 (2014), arXiv:1403.6400 [hep-ph].
- [62] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, A. Nyffeler, M. Passera, and P. Stoffer, Phys. Lett. B **735**, 90 (2014), arXiv:1403.7512 [hep-ph].
- [63] M. Hoferichter and T. Teubner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 112002 (2022), arXiv:2112.06929 [hep-ph].
- [64] T. Blum, N. Christ, M. Hayakawa, T. Izubuchi, L. Jin, C. Jung, and C. Lehner (RBC, UKQCD), Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 132002 (2020), arXiv:1911.08123 [hep-lat].
- [65] E.-H. Chao, R. J. Hudspith, A. Gérardin, J. R. Green, H. B. Meyer, and K. Otnad, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 651 (2021), arXiv:2104.02632 [hep-lat].
- [66] E.-H. Chao, R. J. Hudspith, A. Gérardin, J. R. Green, and H. B. Meyer, Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, 664 (2022), arXiv:2204.08844 [hep-lat].
- [67] T. Blum, N. Christ, M. Hayakawa, T. Izubuchi, L. Jin, C. Jung, C. Lehner, and C. Tu (RBC, UKQCD), Phys. Rev. D **111**, 014501 (2025), arXiv:2304.04423 [hep-lat].
- [68] Z. Fodor, A. Gérardin, L. Lellouch, K. K. Szabó, B. C. Toth, and C. Zimmermann (BMWc), (2024), arXiv:2411.11719 [hep-lat].
- [69] M. Hoferichter and P. Stoffer, JHEP **05**, 159 (2020), arXiv:2004.06127 [hep-ph].
- [70] M. Zanke, M. Hoferichter, and B. Kubis, JHEP **07**, 106 (2021), arXiv:2103.09829 [hep-ph].
- [71] I. Danilkin, M. Hoferichter, and P. Stoffer, Phys. Lett. B **820**, 136502 (2021), arXiv:2105.01666 [hep-ph].
- [72] J. Lüdtke, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, JHEP **04**, 125 (2023), arXiv:2302.12264 [hep-ph].
- [73] M. Hoferichter, B. Kubis, and M. Zanke, JHEP **08**, 209 (2023), arXiv:2307.14413 [hep-ph].
- [74] M. Hoferichter, P. Stoffer, and M. Zillinger, JHEP **04**, 092 (2024), arXiv:2402.14060 [hep-ph].
- [75] J. Lüdtke, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, (2024), arXiv:2410.11946 [hep-ph].
- [76] O. Deineka, I. Danilkin, and M. Vanderhaeghen, Phys. Rev. D **111**, 034009 (2025), arXiv:2410.12894 [hep-ph].
- [77] S. Holz, M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, and B. Kubis, (2024), arXiv:2411.08098 [hep-ph].
- [78] S. Holz, M. Hoferichter, B.-L. Hoid, and B. Kubis, (2024), arXiv:2412.16281 [hep-ph].
- [79] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, JHEP **09**, 091 (2014), arXiv:1402.7081 [hep-ph].
- [80] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, B. Kubis, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, Phys. Lett. B **738**, 6 (2014), arXiv:1408.2517 [hep-ph].
- [81] G. Colangelo, M. Hoferichter, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, JHEP **09**, 074 (2015), arXiv:1506.01386 [hep-ph].
- [82] M. Hoferichter, G. Colangelo, M. Procura, and P. Stoffer, Int. J. Mod. Phys. Conf. Ser. **35**, 1460400 (2014), arXiv:1309.6877 [hep-ph].
- [83] J. Bijnens, N. Hermansson-Truedsson, L. Laub, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, JHEP **10**, 203 (2020), arXiv:2008.13487 [hep-ph].
- [84] J. Bijnens, N. Hermansson-Truedsson, L. Laub, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, JHEP **04**, 240 (2021), arXiv:2101.09169 [hep-ph].
- [85] J. Bijnens, N. Hermansson-Truedsson, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, JHEP **02**, 167 (2023), arXiv:2211.17183 [hep-ph].
- [86] J. Bijnens, N. Hermansson-Truedsson, and A. Rodríguez-Sánchez, (2024), arXiv:2411.09578 [hep-ph].
- [87] J. Leutgeb and A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 114015 (2020), arXiv:1912.01596 [hep-ph].
- [88] L. Cappiello, O. Catà, G. D'Ambrosio, D. Greynat, and A. Iyer, Phys. Rev. D **102**, 016009 (2020), arXiv:1912.02779 [hep-ph].
- [89] M. Knecht, JHEP **08**, 056 (2020), arXiv:2005.09929 [hep-ph].
- [90] P. Masjuan, P. Roig, and P. Sánchez-Puertas, J. Phys. G **49**, 015002 (2022), arXiv:2005.11761 [hep-ph].
- [91] J. Lüdtke and M. Procura, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 1108 (2020), arXiv:2006.00007 [hep-ph].
- [92] G. Colangelo, F. Hagelstein, M. Hoferichter, L. Laub, and P. Stoffer, Eur. Phys. J. C **81**, 702 (2021), arXiv:2106.13222 [hep-ph].
- [93] J. Leutgeb and A. Rebhan, Phys. Rev. D **104**, 094017 (2021), arXiv:2108.12345 [hep-ph].
- [94] P. Colangelo, F. Giannuzzi, and S. Nicotri, Phys. Rev. D **109**, 094036 (2024), arXiv:2402.07579 [hep-ph].
- [95] J. Leutgeb, J. Mager, and A. Rebhan, (2024), arXiv:2411.10432 [hep-ph].
- [96] J. Mager, L. Cappiello, J. Leutgeb, and A. Rebhan, (2025), arXiv:2501.19293 [hep-ph].
- [97] M. Hoferichter, P. Stoffer, and M. Zillinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. **134**, 061902 (2025), arXiv:2412.00190 [hep-ph].
- [98] M. Hoferichter, P. Stoffer, and M. Zillinger, JHEP **02**, 121 (2025), arXiv:2412.00178 [hep-ph].
- [99] A. Vainshtein, Phys. Lett. B **569**, 187 (2003), arXiv:hep-ph/0212231.
- [100] M. Knecht, S. Peris, M. Perrottet, and E. de Rafael, JHEP **03**, 035 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0311100.
- [101] T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita, and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 111808 (2012), arXiv:1205.5370 [hep-ph].
- [102] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita, and M. Nio, Atoms **7**, 28 (2019).
- [103] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano, and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 073006 (2003), [Erratum: Phys. Rev. D **73**, 119901 (2006)], arXiv:hep-ph/0212229.
- [104] C. Gnendiger, D. Stöckinger, and H. Stöckinger-Kim, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 053005 (2013), arXiv:1306.5546 [hep-ph].
- [105] K. Melnikov, Phys. Lett. B **639**, 294 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0604205.
- [106] M. Cè *et al.*, JHEP **08**, 220 (2022), arXiv:2203.08676 [hep-lat].
- [107] J. Erler, R. Ferro-Hernandez, and S. Kuberski, Phys. Rev. Lett. **133**, 171801 (2024), arXiv:2406.16691 [hep-ph].
- [108] R. Jackiw and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. D **5**, 2396 (1972).
- [109] I. Bars and M. Yoshimura, Phys. Rev. D **6**, 374 (1972).
- [110] G. Altarelli, N. Cabibbo, and L. Maiani, Phys. Lett. B **40**, 415 (1972).
- [111] W. A. Bardeen, R. Gastmans, and B. E. Lautrup, Nucl. Phys. B **46**, 319 (1972).
- [112] K. Fujikawa, B. W. Lee, and A. I. Sanda, Phys. Rev. D **6**, 2923 (1972).
- [113] A. Czarnecki, B. Krause, and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 3267 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9512369.
- [114] S. Heinemeyer, D. Stöckinger, and G. Weiglein, Nucl. Phys. B **699**, 103 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0405255.
- [115] T. Gribouk and A. Czarnecki, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 053016 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0509205.
- [116] A. Czarnecki, B. Krause, and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D **52**, R2619 (1995), arXiv:hep-ph/9506256.

- [117] D. Stöckinger and H. Stöckinger-Kim, (2025), private communication.
- [118] L. Rosenberg, *Phys. Rev.* **129**, 2786 (1963).
- [119] S. L. Adler, *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2426 (1969).
- [120] T. V. Kukhto, E. A. Kuraev, Z. K. Silagadze, and A. Schiller, *Nucl. Phys. B* **371**, 567 (1992).
- [121] S. Navas *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [122] M. Hoferichter, B. Kubis, S. Leupold, F. Niecknig, and S. P. Schneider, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 3180 (2014), arXiv:1410.4691 [hep-ph].
- [123] I. Larin *et al.* (PrimEx-II), *Science* **368**, 506 (2020).
- [124] G. S. Bali *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 094512 (2012), arXiv:1209.6015 [hep-lat].
- [125] S. Dürr *et al.* (BMWc), *Phys. Lett. B* **701**, 265 (2011), arXiv:1011.2403 [hep-lat].
- [126] R. Arthur *et al.* (RBC, UKQCD), *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 094514 (2013), arXiv:1208.4412 [hep-lat].
- [127] A. Bazavov *et al.* (Fermilab Lattice, MILC, TUMQCD), *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 054517 (2018), arXiv:1802.04248 [hep-lat].
- [128] A. T. Lytle, C. T. H. Davies, D. Hatton, G. P. Lepage, and C. Sturm (HPQCD), *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 014513 (2018), arXiv:1805.06225 [hep-lat].
- [129] M. Bruno *et al.* (ALPHA), *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 169 (2020), arXiv:1911.08025 [hep-lat].
- [130] C. Alexandrou *et al.* (ETM), *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 074515 (2021), arXiv:2104.13408 [hep-lat].
- [131] S. Holz, C. Hanhart, M. Hoferichter, and B. Kubis, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 434 (2022), [Addendum: *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 1159 (2022)], arXiv:2202.05846 [hep-ph].
- [132] M. Hoferichter, J. Menéndez, and F. Noël, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 131902 (2023), arXiv:2204.06005 [hep-ph].
- [133] R. Escribano, S. González-Solís, P. Masjuan, and P. Sánchez-Puertas, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 054033 (2016), arXiv:1512.07520 [hep-ph].
- [134] G. S. Bali, V. Braun, S. Collins, A. Schäfer, and J. Simeth (RQCD), *JHEP* **08**, 137 (2021), arXiv:2106.05398 [hep-lat].
- [135] K.-C. Yang, *Nucl. Phys. B* **776**, 187 (2007), arXiv:0705.0692 [hep-ph].
- [136] P. Achard *et al.* (L3), *Phys. Lett. B* **526**, 269 (2002), arXiv:hep-ex/01110073.
- [137] P. Achard *et al.* (L3), *JHEP* **03**, 018 (2007).
- [138] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BES), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 042003 (2012), arXiv:1205.5103 [hep-ex].
- [139] M. Ablikim *et al.* (BESIII), *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 072004 (2017), arXiv:1701.01197 [hep-ex].
- [140] D. Hatton, C. T. H. Davies, B. Galloway, J. Koponen, G. P. Lepage, and A. T. Lytle (HPQCD), *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 054511 (2020), arXiv:2005.01845 [hep-lat].
- [141] H. S. Chung, *JHEP* **12**, 065 (2020), arXiv:2007.01737 [hep-ph].
- [142] W. J. Marciano, in *21st Annual SLAC Summer Institute on Particle Physics: Spin Structure in High-energy Processes (School: 26 Jul - 3 Aug, Topical Conference: 4-6 Aug) (SSI 93)* (1993) pp. 35–56.
- [143] W. J. Marciano and A. Sirlin, *Phys. Rev. D* **29**, 75 (1984), [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. D* **31**, 213 (1985)].
- [144] F. Jegerlehner, *Z. Phys. C* **32**, 195 (1986).
- [145] F. Jegerlehner, *Conf. Proc. C* **900603**, 476 (1990).
- [146] F. Jegerlehner, CERN Yellow Reports: Monographs **3**, 9 (2020).
- [147] A. O. G. Källén and A. Sabry, *Kong. Dan. Vid. Sel. Mat. Fys. Med.* **29**, 1 (1955).
- [148] K. G. Chetyrkin, J. H. Kühn, and M. Steinhauser, *Nucl. Phys. B* **482**, 213 (1996), arXiv:hep-ph/9606230.
- [149] J. Erler and R. Ferro-Hernández, *JHEP* **12**, 131 (2023), arXiv:2308.05740 [hep-ph].
- [150] G. Degross and G. F. Giudice, *Phys. Rev. D* **58**, 053007 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9803384.
- [151] L. Naterop and P. Stoffer, (2024), arXiv:2412.13251 [hep-ph].