

# Evaluation of Bjorken polarised sum rule with a renormalon-motivated approach

César Ayala<sup>a,\*</sup>, Camilo Castro-Arriaza<sup>b,†</sup> and Gorazd Cvetič<sup>b,‡</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Instituto de Alta Investigación, Sede La Tirana,*

*Universidad de Tarapacá, Av. La Tirana 4802, Iquique, Chile and*

<sup>b</sup>*Department of Physics, Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María, Avenida España 1680, Valparaíso, Chile*

(Dated: September 25, 2023)

We use the known renormalon structure of Bjorken polarised sum rule (BSR)  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  to evaluate the leading-twist part of that quantity. In addition, we include  $D = 2$  and  $D = 4$  Operator Product Expansion (OPE) terms and fit this expression to available experimental data for inelastic BSR. Since we use perturbative QCD (pQCD) coupling, which fails at low squared spacelike momenta  $Q^2 \lesssim 1 \text{ GeV}^2$  due to Landau singularities, the fit is performed for  $Q^2 \geq Q_{\min}^2$  where  $Q_{\min}^2 \approx (1.7 \pm 0.3) \text{ GeV}^2$ . Due to large BSR experimental uncertainties, the extracted value of the pQCD coupling has very large uncertainties, especially when  $Q_{\min}^2$  is varied. However, when we fix the pQCD coupling to the known world average values, the  $D = 2$  and  $D = 4$  residue parameters can be determined within large but reasonable uncertainties.

Keywords: renormalons; resummations; QCD phenomenology

## I. INTRODUCTION

The polarised Bjorken sum rule (BSR)  $\Gamma_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  [1] is the difference of the first moment of the spin-dependent structure functions of proton and neutron. Due to its spacelike and isovector nature it has a relatively simple form of OPE. Experiments with scattering of polarised leptons on polarised targets give us measured values of the inelastic BSR  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$ . They have been performed over a large interval of  $Q^2$ ,  $0.02 \text{ GeV}^2 < Q^2 < 5 \text{ GeV}^2$ , at CERN [2], DESY [3], SLAC [4], and at various experiments at the Jefferson Lab [5–9]. These data points still have significant statistical and systematic uncertainties.

The theoretical evaluation of the inelastic BSR  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  is performed usually by using truncated OPE, and the leading-twist (i.e., the dimension  $D = 0$  part) is evaluated usually by using truncated perturbation series or specific variants thereof [5, 6, 8, 10, 11]. In the  $D = 0$  part of BSR, the coefficients at powers of the perturbative QCD (pQCD) coupling,  $a(\mu^2) \equiv \alpha_s(\mu^2)/\pi$ , are explicitly known up to power  $a^4$ . Then the resulting truncated OPE (usually truncated at the dimension  $D = 2$  or  $D = 4$  term) is fitted to the experimental data, and the (effective)  $D = 2$ , and possibly  $D = 4$ , coefficients are determined, as well as the resulting quality of this fit.

Since the experimental data are available also at low momenta  $Q^2 \lesssim 1 \text{ GeV}^2$  where the pQCD couplings  $a(Q^2)$  in general have Landau singularities, which do not reflect the holomorphic properties of spacelike quantities such as  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$ , approaches with holomorphic (analytic) QCD couplings  $[a(Q^2) \mapsto \mathcal{A}(Q^2)]$  have been used in such regimes [10, 12], as well as specific low- $Q^2$  models [6, 13, 14].

In this work we return to pQCD to evaluate the leading-twist part  $d(Q^2)$  of BSR, by applying a specific renormalon-motivated approach [15], where we use the relatively good knowledge of the renormalon structure of  $d(Q^2)$  and the knowledge of several first coefficients of the perturbation series of  $d(Q^2)$ . Using this renormalon-motivated resummation of the  $D = 0$  part in the OPE, we then perform fits to the experimental data for the inelastic BSR, extract the effective  $D = 2$  and  $D = 4$  coefficients of the OPE, and comment on the quality of the fit and on the regime of validity of this resummed pQCD approach.

In Sec. II we write down the theoretical (OPE) expressions of BSR. In Sec. III we present the renormalon-motivated resummation of the canonical  $D = 0$  part,  $d(Q^2)$ , of BSR. In Sec. IV we explain the fixing of the renormalisation scheme. And finally in Sec. V we present the fitting procedure, show the results for the extracted parameters, and make conclusions.

---

\*Electronic address: c.ayala86@gmail.com

†Electronic address: camilo.castroa@sansano.usm.cl

‡Electronic address: gorazd.cvetic@gmail.com

## II. THEORETICAL EXPRESSIONS OF BJORKEN SUM RULE

The polarised Bjorken sum rule (BSR),  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}$ , is the difference between the polarised structure functions  $g_1$  integrated over the  $x$ -Bjorken interval

$$\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2) = \int_0^1 dx [g_1^p(x, Q^2) - g_1^n(x, Q^2)] . \quad (1)$$

The bar over  $\Gamma_1$  denotes that we take here only the inelastic part. The inelastic BSR  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  has been extracted at various values of  $Q^2 \equiv -q^2 > 0$ , from various experiments [2–9]. The theoretical Operator Product Expansion (OPE) for this quantity has the form [1, 16]

$$\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n, \text{OPE}}(Q^2) = \left| \frac{g_A}{g_V} \right| \frac{1}{6} (1 - d(Q^2)) + \sum_{i=2}^{\infty} \frac{\mu_{2i}(Q^2)}{Q^{2i-2}} , \quad (2)$$

where we take  $|g_A/g_V| = 1.2754$  (consistent with PDG 2020 [17]) for the ratio of the nucleon axial charge,  $d(Q^2) = a(Q^2) + \mathcal{O}(a^2)$  is the canonical pQCD part, and  $\mu_{2i}/Q^{2i-2}$  are  $D \equiv (2i-2) \geq 2$  contributions. The term proportional to  $|g_A/g_V|$  is the total leading-twist (LT) contribution ( $D = 0$ ).

The canonical part,  $d(Q^2)$ , has perturbation expansion in powers of  $a \equiv a(Q^2) \equiv \alpha_s(Q^2)/\pi$

$$d(Q^2)_{\text{pt}} = a + d_1 a^2 + d_2 a^3 + d_3 a^4 + \mathcal{O}(a^5). \quad (3)$$

In the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme we have  $d_j = \bar{d}_j^{\overline{\text{MS}}}$  and  $a = \bar{a}^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(Q^2)$ . Hereafter, we will consider  $N_f = 3$ , for  $Q^2 < (2m_c)^2$  regime. The coefficients  $\bar{d}_j^{\overline{\text{MS}}}$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) were obtained in [18–20]. In any other scheme, the series is then also known up to  $a^4$  (e.g., cf. App. A of [10]).

The  $D = 2$  OPE coefficient  $\mu_4$  has known  $Q^2$ -dependence

$$\frac{\mu_4(Q^2)}{Q^2} = \frac{M_N^2}{9} \frac{[A + 4\bar{f}_2 a(Q^2)^{k_1}]}{Q^2}, \quad (4)$$

where  $k_1 = 32/81$  is the anomalous dimension [21],  $M_N = 0.9389$  GeV is the nucleon mass, and the constant  $A = (a_2^{p-n} + 4d_2^{p-n}) \approx 0.063$  contains the (twist-2) target correction  $a_2^{p-n} \approx 0.031$  and a twist-3 matrix element  $d_2^{p-n} = \int dx x^2 (2g_1^{p-n} + 3g_2^{p-n}) \approx 0.008$ . The parameter  $\bar{f}_2$  will be determined by the fit, as will be the  $D = 4$  OPE coefficient  $\mu_6$  which will be considered  $Q^2$ -independent.

The next coefficient  $\bar{d}_4^{\overline{\text{MS}}}$  in the perturbation series can be estimated, for example, by the ECH method [22]

$$\bar{d}_4^{\overline{\text{MS}}} = \bar{d}_4^{\overline{\text{MS}}}(\text{ECH}) \pm 32.8 \approx 1557.4 \pm 32.8. \quad (5)$$

The uncertainty  $\pm 32.8$  was estimated here by the following reasoning: when  $\bar{d}_4^{\overline{\text{MS}}} = 1557.4 - 32.8 = 1524.6$ , we obtain in the preferred renormalisation scheme [ $c_2 = 9$ . and  $c_3 = 20$ ., cf. Eq. (13b)] for  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  the disappearance of the  $u=2$  UV renormalon, i.e.,  $\tilde{d}_2^{\text{UV}} = 0$ ., cf. Sections III and IV.

## III. RENORMALON STRUCTURE OF $d(Q^2)$

According to the approach Ref. [15], to account for the renormalon structure and obtain the characteristic function of  $d(Q^2)$ , it is important to construct first the auxiliary quantity  $\tilde{d}(Q^2)$  [auxiliary to  $d(Q^2)$ ]. First, the above power series (3) is reorganised in logarithmic derivatives  $\tilde{a}_{n+1}$

$$\tilde{a}_{n+1}(Q^2) \equiv \frac{(-1)^n}{n! \beta_0^n} \left( \frac{d}{d \ln Q^2} \right)^n a(Q^2) \quad (n = 0, 1, 2, \dots), \quad (6)$$

[note:  $\tilde{a}_{n+1}(Q^2) = a(Q^2)^{n+1} + \mathcal{O}(a^{n+2})$ ] and we obtain

$$d(Q^2) = a(Q^2) + \tilde{d}_1 \tilde{a}_2(Q^2) + \dots + \tilde{d}_n \tilde{a}_{n+1}(Q^2) + \dots \quad (7)$$

By the use of the renormalisation group equation (RGE), in a chosen renormalisation scheme, we can relate the new coefficients  $\tilde{d}_n$  with the original ones  $d_n, d_{n-1}, \dots$

TABLE I: The values of  $\tilde{K}$  and of the renormalon residues  $\tilde{d}_j^X$  ( $X=IR, UV$ ) for the five-parameter ansatz (11) in the (5-loop)  $\overline{MS}$  and in the 'P44' scheme with  $c_2 = 9.$  &  $c_3 = 20.$ , and with  $c_2^{\overline{MS}} (= 4.47106)$  and  $c_3^{\overline{MS}} (= 20.9902)$  (for the schemes 'P44', see Sec. IV), when  $d_4$  is taken such that  $d_4^{\overline{MS}} = 1557.43$  as predicted by ECH. The last line is again for the case of 'P44' scheme with  $c_2 = 9.$  &  $c_3 = 20.$ , but  $d_4^{\overline{MS}} = 1557.43 - 32.84 = 1524.59$ .

scheme	$\tilde{K}$	$\tilde{d}_1^{IR}$	$\tilde{d}_2^{IR}$	$\tilde{d}_1^{UV}$	$\tilde{d}_2^{UV}$
$\overline{MS}$ (5-loop)	-1.82336	7.81560	-14.8199	-0.0413348	-0.0920349
$\overline{MS}$ (P44)	-1.83223	7.86652	-14.9299	-0.0444416	-0.0776748
$c_2 = 9.$ & $c_3 = 20.$ (P44)	0.450041	0.331813	0.231437	-0.0809782	-0.0964868
$d_4^{\overline{MS}} = 1524.6$	0.528239	0.276962	0.283465	-0.100381	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$

Then in this original quantity  $d(Q^2)$  we replace  $\tilde{a}_n(Q^2)$  by  $a(Q^2)^n$ , which leads to the auxiliar quantity  $\tilde{d}(Q^2)$

$$\tilde{d}(Q^2) = a(Q^2) + \tilde{d}_1 a(Q^2)^2 + \dots + \tilde{d}_n a(Q^2)^{n+1} + \dots, \quad (8)$$

whose Borel transform is

$$\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u) \equiv 1 + \frac{\tilde{d}_1}{1!\beta_0} u + \dots + \frac{\tilde{d}_n}{n!\beta_0^n} u^n + \dots \quad (9)$$

It turns out that this transform has the simple one-loop form of the dependence on the renormalisation scale  $\mu^2$  ( $\kappa \equiv \mu^2/Q^2$ )

$$\frac{d}{d \ln \kappa} \tilde{d}_n(\kappa) = n\beta_0 \tilde{d}_{n-1}(\kappa) \quad \Rightarrow \quad \mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u; \kappa) = \kappa^u \mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u). \quad (10)$$

This dependence is exact, in contrast to the case of  $\mathcal{B}[d](u; \kappa)$ .

As a consequence, it can be shown [15] that this Borel transform  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  has a structure very similar to the known [23, 24] large- $\beta_0$  structure of the Borel  $\mathcal{B}[d](u)$

$$\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u) = \exp(\tilde{K}u) \pi \left\{ \tilde{d}_1^{IR} \frac{1}{(1-u)^{\kappa_1}} + \tilde{d}_2^{IR} \frac{1}{(2-u)} + \tilde{d}_1^{UV} \frac{1}{(1+u)} + \tilde{d}_2^{UV} \frac{1}{(2+u)} \right\}, \quad (11)$$

Here,  $\kappa_1 = 1 - k_1$ , where  $k_1 = 32/81$  is the aforementioned anomalous dimension of the  $D = 2$  OPE term.<sup>1</sup> The five parameters ( $\tilde{K}$  and the residues  $\tilde{d}_1^{IR}, \tilde{d}_2^{IR}, \tilde{d}_1^{UV}, \tilde{d}_2^{UV}$ ) are determined by the knowledge of the first five coefficients  $d_n$  (and thus  $\tilde{d}_n$ ),  $n = 0, 1, 2, 3, 4$ . In Table I we present the numerical values for these five parameters in the case of the (5-loop)  $\overline{MS}$  scheme, and in the P44-scheme with  $c_2 = 9.$  and  $c_3 = 20.$  (that is explained later in Sec. IV).

It can be shown [15, 25] that this ansatz for  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  implies the theoretically expected structure of the corresponding renormalon terms in the Borel  $\mathcal{B}[d](u)$  of the canonical BSR  $d(Q^2)$

$$\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u) = \frac{A}{(p \mp u)^\kappa} \Rightarrow \quad (12a)$$

$$\mathcal{B}[d](u) = \frac{B}{(p \mp u)^{\kappa \pm p\beta_1/\beta_0^2}} [1 + \mathcal{O}(p \mp u)], \quad (12b)$$

where  $\beta_0$  and  $\beta_1$  are the one-loop and two-loop QCD  $\beta$ -coefficients (they are universal) appearing in the RGE

$$\frac{da(Q^2)}{d \ln Q^2} = -\beta_0 a(Q^2)^2 - \beta_1 a(Q^2)^3 - \beta_2 a(Q^2)^4 - \dots \quad (13a)$$

$$= -\beta_0 a(Q^2)^2 [1 + c_1 a + c_2 a^2 + \dots]. \quad (13b)$$

<sup>1</sup> The reason for this, as argued later in Eqs. (14), lies in the fact that the corresponding renormalon ambiguity in the Borel-resummed quantity  $d(Q^2)$  has the same  $Q^2$ -dependence  $\sim a(Q^2)^{k_1}/Q^2$  as has the Bjorken  $D = 2$  OPE term Eq. (4).

The renormalon ambiguity in the Borel-resummed expression of the IR renormalon term (12b) has the following  $Q^2$ -dependence:

$$\delta d(Q^2)_{p,\kappa} \sim \frac{1}{\beta_0} \text{Im} \int_{+i\varepsilon}^{+\infty+i\varepsilon} du \exp\left(-\frac{u}{\beta_0 a(Q^2)}\right) \frac{1}{(p-u)^{\kappa+p\varepsilon_1/\beta_0}} \quad (14a)$$

$$\sim \frac{1}{(Q^2)^p} a(Q^2)^{1-\kappa} [1 + \mathcal{O}(a)]. \quad (14b)$$

This means that the renormalon ambiguity corresponding to the IR-terms of the ansatz of the entire Borel  $B[\tilde{d}](u)$  Eq. (11) has the same  $Q^2$ -dependence as the  $D = 2$  and  $D = 4$  OPE terms of BSR Eqs. (2) and (4) (we note that we take  $\mu_6$  as  $Q^2$ -independent).

The characteristic function  $G_d(t)$  that enters in the (formal) resummation of the canonical BSR  $d(Q^2)$

$$d(Q^2)_{\text{res}} = \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} G_d(t) a(te^{-\tilde{K}} Q^2) \quad (15)$$

is the inverse Mellin transform of the Borel  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  [15]

$$G_d(t) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_{u_0-i\infty}^{u_0+i\infty} du \mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u) t^u, \quad (16)$$

where  $-1 < u_0 < +1$ . Explicit evaluation gives:

$$G_d(t) = \Theta(1-t) \pi \left[ \frac{\tilde{d}_1^{\text{IR}} t}{\Gamma(1-k_1) \ln^{k_1}(1/t)} + \tilde{d}_2^{\text{IR}} t^2 \right] + \Theta(t-1) \pi \left[ \frac{\tilde{d}_1^{\text{UV}}}{t} + \frac{\tilde{d}_2^{\text{UV}}}{t^2} \right]. \quad (17)$$

It can be verified that the resummation (15) reproduces the correct perturbation series (7) when we Taylor-expand the coupling  $a(te^{\tilde{K}} Q^2)$  ( $\equiv f[\ln(te^{\tilde{K}} Q^2)]$ ) around  $\ln Q^2$ , or even around any renormalisation scale  $\ln \mu^2$ , cf. [15] [in that case the series is in  $\tilde{a}_{n+1}(\mu^2)$ 's].

In practice, the pQCD coupling  $a(Q'^2)$  has (unphysical) Landau singularities at low positive  $Q'^2$ , thus in the integration (15) we have to avoid them. We do this by the PV-type of regularisation

$$d(Q^2)_{\text{res}} = \text{Re} \left[ \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} G_d(t) a(te^{-\tilde{K}} Q^2 + i\varepsilon) \right]. \quad (18)$$

On the other hand, if we used an IR-safe coupling  $a(Q^2) \mapsto \mathcal{A}(Q^2)$  that has no Landau singularities but practically coincides with  $a(Q^2)$  at large  $|Q^2| > \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2$ , such as the  $3\delta\text{QCD}$  coupling [26], no additional regularisation would be needed

$$d(Q^2)_{\text{res}} = \int_0^\infty \frac{dt}{t} G_d(t) \mathcal{A}(te^{-\tilde{K}} Q^2). \quad (19)$$

In the following, we will fit the OPE expression (2), with terms up to dimension  $D = 4$  ( $i = 3$ ), to experimental data for BSR  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$ , where we evaluate the QCD canonical part  $d(Q^2)$  with the renormalon-motivated resummation Eq. (18).

#### IV. RENORMALISATION SCHEME VARIATION

First we notice from Table I that in the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme we have the two IR renormalon residues  $\tilde{d}_1^{\text{IR}}$  and  $\tilde{d}_2^{\text{IR}}$  with large values and opposite signs. This indicates that the two corresponding contributions to the canonical part of BSR,  $d(Q^2)$ , are large and have opposite signs, possibly even strong cancellations, which would be an unexpected behaviour. We can check this by performing the integration Eq. (18), with  $G_d$  of Eq. (17), term-by-term, cf. Table II (last row).

The expectation, based on arguments of [27], is that the leading IR renormalon contribution ( $\text{IR}_1: \propto \tilde{d}_1^{\text{IR}}$ ) gives us the dominant contribution to  $d(Q^2)$ , and that the subleading IR contribution ( $\text{IR}_2: \propto \tilde{d}_2^{\text{IR}}$ ) as well as the UV renormalon contributions ( $\text{UV}_j: \propto \tilde{d}_j^{\text{UV}}; j = 1, 2$ ) all give numerically subdominant contributions to  $d(Q^2)$ . This is evidently not the case in our obtained renormalon-model resummation (18) in the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme. Therefore, we will

vary the renormalisation scheme (via the leading-scheme parameters  $c_k \equiv \beta_k/\beta_0$ ;  $k = 2, 3$ ) in such a way as to achieve the mentioned expected hierarchy of the four different renormalon contributions.

One may argue that, as the quantity  $d(Q^2)$  must be renormalisation scale and scheme independent, so must be also the resummed results (18). The evaluated resummed quantity is exactly renormalisation scale independent, as mentioned above. However, it is not scheme independent (i.e.,  $\beta_j$ -independent, where  $j \geq 2$ ). This is so because the expression (11) for  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  in general does not contain all the terms. Namely, the anomalous dimensions corresponding to the three renormalons  $u = 2, -1, -2$  were taken to be zero (as are in the large- $\beta_0$  limit) and consequently the corresponding singularity structures there were taken to be simple poles. In reality, these terms are expected to be different from the simple poles. Further, for each such term  $1/(p \mp u)^\kappa$  in  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  we expect to have subleading terms  $\sim 1/(p \mp u)^{\kappa-1}$ , and those terms were not included either, i.e., they were “truncated out” because of lack of information. The five-parameter ansatz (11) is thus a somewhat simplified and truncated version, in which we were able to determine the parameters on the basis of the information about the pQCD perturbation series (8) truncated at  $\sim \tilde{a}_5 \sim a^5$ . For these reasons, we cannot expect that our resummed results (18) are invariant under the scheme variation. Therefore, we will have uncertainties of the extracted parameter values from scheme variation.

We then proceed in the following way. We vary the scheme, by varying the  $c_2$  and  $c_3$  scheme parameters (where  $c_j \equiv \beta_j/\beta_0$ ). There are also other, more subleading, scheme parameters  $\beta_j$  (or  $c_j \equiv \beta_j/\beta_0$ ) ( $j \geq 3$ ). For convenience, we will vary only the first two  $c_j$  ( $j = 2, 3$ ) and construct the beta-function with such  $c_j$  which allows an explicit solution for the running coupling  $a(Q^2; c_2, c_3)$  in terms of the Lambert function [28]. The corresponding beta-function  $\beta(a)$  has a Padé [4/4]( $a$ ) (‘P44’) form

$$\frac{da(Q^2)}{d \ln Q^2} = \beta(a(Q^2)) \equiv -\beta_0 a(Q^2)^2 \frac{[1 + a_0 c_1 a(Q^2) + a_1 c_1^2 a(Q^2)^2]}{[1 - a_1 c_1^2 a(Q^2)^2][1 + (a_0 - 1)c_1 a(Q^2) + a_1 c_1^2 a(Q^2)^2]}, \quad (20)$$

where  $c_j \equiv \beta_j/\beta_0$  and

$$a_0 = 1 + \sqrt{c_3/c_1^3}, \quad a_1 = c_2/c_1^2 + \sqrt{c_3/c_1^3}. \quad (21)$$

Expansion of this  $\beta$ -function up to  $\sim a(Q^2)^5$  gives the expression (13b) with  $c_2$  and  $c_3$ . In Ref. [28] it was shown that the RGE (20) has explicit solution in terms of the Lambert functions  $W_{\mp 1}(z)$

$$a(Q^2) = \frac{2}{c_1} \left[ -\sqrt{\omega_2} - 1 - W_{\mp 1}(z) + \sqrt{(\sqrt{\omega_2} + 1 + W_{\mp 1}(z))^2 - 4(\omega_1 + \sqrt{\omega_2})} \right]^{-1}, \quad (22)$$

where  $\omega_1 = c_2/c_1^2$ ,  $\omega_2 = c_3/c_1^3$ ,  $Q^2 = |Q^2| \exp(i\phi)$ . The Lambert function  $W_{-1}$  is used when  $0 \leq \phi < \pi$ , and  $W_{+1}$  when  $-\pi \leq \phi < 0$ . The argument  $z = z(Q^2)$  appearing in  $W_{\pm 1}(z)$  is

$$z \equiv z(Q^2) = -\frac{1}{c_1 e} \left( \frac{\Lambda_L^2}{Q^2} \right)^{\beta_0/c_1}. \quad (23)$$

Here, the scale  $\Lambda_L$  we call the Lambert scale ( $\Lambda_L \sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$ ). This scale is related with the strength of the coupling. We will call this class of schemes ‘P44’. We recall that this coupling (22), used in the resummation (18), has  $N_f = 3$  for all  $Q^2$  in (18), because this resummation then corresponds to the perturbation expansions (7) or equivalently (3) of BSR at low  $Q^2$  where  $N_f = 3$ . The coupling (22) is determined by the value of  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}})$  (which is at  $N_f = 5$ ) via the 5-loop  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  RGE running and the corresponding 4-loop quark threshold relations at  $Q^2 = \kappa \bar{m}_q$  (we took  $\kappa = 2$ ;  $\bar{m}_b = 4.2$  GeV and  $\bar{m}_c = 1.27$  GeV), and by changing the scheme from (5-loop)  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  to the abovementioned scheme, at  $Q^2 = (2\bar{m}_c)^2 - 0$  (with  $N_f = 3$ ) by the known transformation (e.g., cf. Eq. (13) of Ref. [26]).

For example, when we choose the P44 scheme with the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  values of  $c_2$  and  $c_3$ , the parameters of  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  are those in the second row of Table I, very close to the 5-loop  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  case (first row there). The decomposition of the resummed  $d(Q^2)$  expression (18), at  $Q^2 = 3 \text{ GeV}^2$ , in the separate renormalon contributions is given in the last row of Table II in this (P44)  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  case, which shows that the two IR contributions are large and with strong cancellation (over 90 %). For this reason, we will consider such scheme as unacceptable in our approach.

We will confine ourselves to the schemes (P44-class) which give us the following type of contributions to  $d(Q^2)$ :

1. IR ( $u = 1$ ) contribution  $d(Q^2)_{\text{IR}1}$  is the dominant contribution.
2. The rescaling parameter  $\tilde{K}$  in  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  is  $|\tilde{K}| < 1$ .
3. IR ( $u = 2$ ) contribution  $d(Q^2)_{\text{IR}2}$  will be restricted to:  $0 < d(Q^2)_{\text{IR}2} < d(Q^2)_{\text{IR}1}$

TABLE II: The values of parameters of the five-parameter ansatz (11) in the P44 renormalisation schemes, for various scheme parameters  $c_2$  and  $c_3$  covering the intervals Eq. (24). Included are also the corresponding numerical values of the canonical BSR  $d(Q^2)$  as well as its numerical decomposition to the four renormalon contributions, for the renormalon-motivated resummation (18), at  $Q^2 = 3 \text{ GeV}^2$  (and  $N_f = 3$ ) and for  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}}) = 0.1179$ . The coefficient  $d_4$  corresponds to the (5-loop)  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  coefficient value  $d_4(\overline{\text{MS}}) = 1557.43$  as predicted by ECH.

$c_2$	$c_3$	$\tilde{K}$	$\tilde{d}_1^{\text{IR}}$	$\tilde{d}_2^{\text{IR}}$	$\tilde{d}_1^{\text{UV}}$	$\tilde{d}_2^{\text{UV}}$	$d(Q^2)$	$d(Q^2)_{\text{IR1}}$	$d(Q^2)_{\text{IR2}}$	$d(Q^2)_{\text{UV1}}$	$d(Q^2)_{\text{UV2}}$
9.	20.	0.450041	0.331813	0.231437	-0.0809782	0.0964868	0.1816	0.1631	0.0597	-0.0247	-0.0164
7.6	20.	0.896252	0.210843	0.137235	-0.158441	0.394581	0.1843	0.1196	0.0421	-0.0551	0.0777
11.0	20.	0.12894	0.422324	0.301175	-0.015641	-0.477922	0.1807	0.1904	0.0701	-0.0044	-0.0752
9.	5.	0.359327	0.474866	-0.026115	-0.080151	-0.126694	0.1737	0.2243	-0.0064	-0.0236	-0.0207
9.	35.	0.484948	0.237256	0.431189	-0.067963	-0.133156	0.1888	0.1188	0.1143	-0.0212	-0.0232
$c_2^{\overline{\text{MS}}}$	$c_3^{\overline{\text{MS}}}$	-1.83223	7.86652	-14.9299	-0.0444416	-0.0776748	0.1632	1.9466	-1.7675	-0.0082	-0.0076

4. UV ( $u = -2$ ) contribution  $d(Q^2)_{\text{UV2}}$  should not be too large:  $|\tilde{d}_2^{\text{UV}}| < 0.5$ .

The conditions 2. and 3. turn out to be usually related: namely, if  $d(Q^2)_{\text{IR2}} < 0$ , we usually have  $|\tilde{K}| > 1$ , and  $d(Q^2)_{\text{IR1}}$  and  $d(Q^2)_{\text{IR2}}$  are large and with opposite signs and give strong cancellation. Taking into account these conditions, we obtain as acceptable (P44)-schemes those with

$$c_2 = 9_{-1.4}^{+2}, \quad c_3 = 20 \pm 15. \quad (24)$$

We note that when  $c_2$  goes below the value  $(9 - 1.4)$ , the value of  $|\tilde{K}|$  becomes suddenly large and we obtain strong cancellations of  $d(Q^2)_{\text{IR1}}$  and  $d(Q^2)_{\text{IR2}}$ .

In Table II we present the results for these P44-schemes, when  $c_2$  and  $c_3$  have the central values, or one of them varies to an edge value given in Eqs. (24): the parameters of  $\mathcal{B}[\tilde{d}](u)$  and the decomposition of  $d(Q^2)$  into the four contributions. In Fig. 1 we present the resummed values of the canonical BSR part  $d(Q^2)$ , Eq. (18), for the considered central case of renormalisation scheme (P44 with  $c_2 = 9.$  and  $c_3 = 20.$ ) and with the strength of the coupling corresponding to the value  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}}) = 0.1179$  (giving  $\Lambda_L = 0.2175 \text{ GeV}$ ). We can see in this Figure that the




FIG. 1: The resummed canonical part of BSR,  $d(Q^2)_{\text{res}}$ , according to Eq. (18), in the 'P44' renormalisation scheme with  $c_2 = 9.$  and  $c_3 = 20.$ , for  $N_f = 3$ . The strength of the coupling is determined by the choice  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}}) = 0.1179$ . The resummation with the corresponding 3dAQCD coupling is included as dotted red line, for comparison.

curve loses its expected monotonically decreasing behaviour for  $Q^2 < 1.44 \text{ GeV}^2$ . This occurs because for such low  $Q^2$  the effects of the Landau singularities of the pQCD running coupling  $a(te^{-\tilde{K}Q^2} + i\epsilon)$  in the integral (18) become significant.<sup>2</sup> Stated otherwise, the used renormalon-motivated resummation in the considered scheme starts failing at  $Q^2 < 1.44 \text{ GeV}^2$  due to (unphysical) Landau singularities of the pQCD running coupling. In Fig. 1 we included, for comparison, the results of resummation Eq. (19) when the coupling  $a(Q^2) \mapsto \mathcal{A}(Q^2)$  is holomorphic (i.e., without Landau singularities). We used a specific 3dAQCD coupling in miniMOM scheme, for the case  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}}) = 0.1179$  and with the spectral function  $\rho(\sigma) \equiv \text{Im}\mathcal{A}(-\sigma - i\epsilon)$  with the threshold value  $\sigma_{\text{thr}} = M_1^2 = 0.150^2 \text{ GeV}^2$ , for details see [26].

<sup>2</sup> In the considered case, the pQCD coupling  $a(Q'^2)$  has Landau cut for  $0 \leq Q'^2 \leq 0.869 \text{ GeV}^2$ .

## V. FITTING TO THE EXPERIMENTAL DATA AND CONCLUSIONS

In Figs. 2 we present the numerical results for the inelastic BSR  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  from various experiments, with the statistical and systematic uncertainties. We will perform the fit by using for  $d(Q^2)$  the resummed expression (18)




FIG. 2: The measured results for the inelastic BSR  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q^2)$  for different experiments, with the statistical (left Figure) and systematic (right Figure) uncertainties.

with the ( $N_f = 3$ ) pQCD coupling in the P44-renormalisation scheme with  $c_2 = 9.$  and  $c_3 = 20.$ , such that it corresponds to  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}}) = 0.1179$  ( $N_f = 5$ ) which is the central value of the world average [29]. The number of fit parameters will be either  $\bar{f}_2$  or  $(\bar{f}_2, \mu_6)$ , i.e., we truncate the OPE (2) at  $D = 2$  ( $i = 2$ ) or  $D = 4$  ( $i = 3$ ). We do not know which experimental uncertainties are correlated and which are not. The statistical uncertainties could be considered to be uncorrelated, but the correlations of the systematic uncertainties are expected to be considerable and difficult to estimate. Therefore, we follow the method of unbiased estimate [17, 30, 31]: a fraction of systematic uncertainty is added in quadrature to the statistical uncertainty,  $\sigma^2(Q_j^2) = \sigma_{\text{stat}}^2(Q_j^2) + k\sigma_{\text{sys}}^2(Q_j^2)$ , we consider then these  $\sigma(Q_j^2)$  as uncorrelated, and we determine the fit parameters ( $\bar{f}_2$ ; or  $\bar{f}_2$  and  $\mu_6$ ) by minimising the corresponding  $\chi^2/\text{n.d.f.}$  for points in a chosen fixed interval  $[Q_{\text{min}}^2, Q_{\text{max}}^2]$  (with  $Q_{\text{max}}^2 = 4.74 \text{ GeV}^2$ ). We continue adjusting the fraction parameter  $k$  and minimising again, iteratively, until we obtain, when minimising,  $\chi^2/\text{n.d.f.} = 1$ . In practice, we always obtain  $0 < k < 0.5$ . The experimental uncorrelated uncertainty (exp.u.) of the extracted parameters is then obtained by the conventional methods (cf. App. of Ref. [32], App. D of [25]). The correlated experimental uncertainties (exp.c.) are then obtained by shifting the central experimental values  $\bar{\Gamma}_1^{p-n}(Q_j^2)$  by  $(1 - \sqrt{k})\sigma_{\text{sys}}(Q_j^2)$  up and down and reperforming the fit for these values.

We point out that the smaller the obtained value of  $k$ , the better the fit. It turns out that, in the above approach, the results depend considerably on the value of  $Q_{\text{min}}^2$  that we choose. We chose  $Q_{\text{min}}^2 = 1.71 \text{ GeV}^2$  for the fit with two parameters ( $\bar{f}_2, \mu_6$ ) for the following reasons. 1.) If we decrease  $Q_{\text{min}}^2$  to the adjacent lower neighbouring data points, the value of  $k$  increases: from  $k = 0.163$  (for  $Q_{\text{min}}^2 = 1.71 \text{ GeV}^2$ ) to  $k = 0.173, 0.202$  (for  $Q_{\text{min}}^2 = 1.59, 1.50 \text{ GeV}^2$ ). If we decrease  $Q_{\text{min}}^2$  one step further, to  $1.44 \text{ GeV}^2$ , then we can see numerically that the evaluation of  $d(Q^2)$  via Eq. (18) is already on the border of applicability at such  $Q^2$ , due to the effects of the Landau singularities of  $a(te^{-\tilde{K}}Q^2 + i\epsilon)$  in the integral, cf. Fig. 1. On the other hand, increasing  $Q_{\text{min}}^2$  above  $1.71 \text{ GeV}^2$  to the upper neighbour  $1.915 \text{ GeV}^2$ , the value of  $k$  increases (to  $k = 0.180$ ). If we increase  $Q_{\text{min}}^2$  even further, we obtain the results with strong cancellations between the  $D = 2$  and  $D = 4$  terms. For all these reasons, we choose  $Q_{\text{min}}^2 = 1.71_{-0.27}^{+0.205} \text{ GeV}^2$ , and the value of  $k$  parameter is  $k = 0.1626$ .

If the fit is performed only with one fit parameter ( $\bar{f}_2$ ), similar verifications give us  $Q_{\text{min}}^2 = 1.71_{-0.27}^{+0.39} \text{ GeV}^2$ , and the value of  $k$  parameter is  $k = 0.1493$ .

With the approach described above, we obtain the final result for the fits. For the two-parameter fit the result is  $k = 0.1626$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_2 = & -0.165_{+0.026}^{-0.007}(c_2)_{-0.039}^{+0.054}(c_3)_{-0.041}^{+0.044}(\alpha_s)_{+0.016}^{-0.012}(d_4) \mp 0.043(\text{ren}) \\ & +_{+0.120}^{+0.016}(Q_{\text{min}}^2) \pm 0.160(\text{exp.u.}) \pm 0.296(\text{exp.c.}), \end{aligned} \quad (25a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mu_6 = & +0.023_{-0.008}^{+0.003}(c_2)_{+0.004}^{-0.013}(c_3)_{+0.008}^{-0.009}(\alpha_s)_{-0.003}^{+0.002}(d_4) \mp 0.010(\text{ren}) \\ & -_{-0.054}^{+0.006}(Q_{\text{min}}^2) \pm 0.062(\text{exp.u.}) \mp 0.059(\text{exp.c.}). \end{aligned} \quad (25b)$$

The quantity  $\mu_6$  is in units of  $\text{GeV}^4$ . Here, the uncertainties at  $'(c_2)'$  and  $'(c_3)'$  come from renormalisation scheme variation Eq. (24). The uncertainty at  $'(\alpha_s)'$  comes from the world average uncertainty  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}}) = 0.1179 \pm 0.0009$  [29]. The uncertainty at  $'(d_4)'$  comes from the variation of  $d_4$  in such a way that the corresponding (5-loop)  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  value  $d_4^{\overline{\text{MS}}}$  varies according to Eq. (5). The uncertainty at  $'(\text{ren})'$  is the renormalon uncertainty, it comes when in the evaluation of  $d(Q^2)$ , Eq. (18), we add or subtract the same integral, but imaginary part (divided by  $\pi$ ) instead of the real part  $[\pm(1/\pi)\text{Im}(\dots)]$ . These are all the theoretical uncertainties.

The uncertainty at  $'(Q_{\min}^2)'$  can be regarded as coming primarily from experimental uncertainties, and it originates from the variation  $Q_{\min}^2 = 1.71_{-0.27}^{+0.205} \text{ GeV}^2$  as mentioned above. The experimental uncertainties at  $'(\text{exp.u.})'$  and  $'(\text{exp.c.})'$  were discussed in the previous paragraphs.

The one-parameter fit ( $\bar{f}_2$ ) gives, on the other hand,  $k = 0.1493$  and

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{f}_2 = & -0.108_{+0.006}^{-0.001}(c_2) + 0.021_{-0.029}(c_3) + 0.019_{-0.021}(\alpha_s) \mp 0.009(d_4) \mp 0.067(\text{ren}) \\ & + 0.011_{-0.030}(Q_{\min}^2) \pm 0.033(\text{exp.u.}) \pm 0.153(\text{exp.c.}), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

Here, the uncertainty ( $Q_{\min}^2$ ) comes from  $Q_{\min}^2 = 1.71_{-0.27}^{+0.39} \text{ GeV}^2$  as mentioned above.

We note that we keep the (central) value of the parameter  $k$  fixed under all the variations, except the variations of ( $Q_{\min}^2$ ) where the amount of included experimental data points is varied and we require again  $\chi^2/\text{n.d.f} = 1$ .

The above results show that we have a competition between various theoretical uncertainties (which are in general moderate) and various experimental uncertainties of the extracted values. The latter uncertainties are large and are in general dominant over the theoretical uncertainties. The experimental uncertainties of the extracted parameter values have their origin, directly or indirectly, in the large statistical and systematic uncertainties of the BSR data points.

As mentioned earlier, the large experimental uncertainties of the data points make the deduction of the preferred value of  $\alpha_s$  from the BSR data practically impossible, especially under the variation of  $Q_{\min}^2$ , and hence we used the world average data for  $\alpha_s$ .

In Figs. 3 we present the obtained central fit theoretical curves (when truncation is made at  $D = 4$  and at  $D = 2$ ), i.e., when  $\bar{f}_2$  and  $\mu_6$  have the central values of Eqs. (25) and (26), respectively. For comparison, we included in Figs. 3




FIG. 3: The theoretical OPE curves, when  $D = 2$  and  $D = 4$  terms are included, and when only  $D = 2$  term is included. The results are for the central values of  $\bar{f}_2$  and  $\mu_6$  obtained from the fit in the interval  $Q_{\min}^2 = 1.71 \text{ GeV}^2$ , Eqs. (25) and (26). The central renormalisation scheme is used (P44 with  $c_2 = 9$  and  $c_3 = 20$ ). The experimental data are included in the Figures. The left-hand Figure is for  $Q^2 > 1.71 \text{ GeV}^2$  (the interval of fitting), and the right-hand Figure has extrapolation to the interval  $Q^2 > 1.0 \text{ GeV}^2$ . The right-hand Figure contains also the corresponding 3dAQCD curves, cf. the text for explanations.

the 3dAQCD curves (as in Fig. 1), where the fit for  $(\bar{f}_2, \mu_6)$  or  $(\bar{f}_2)$  was performed, as in pQCD case, for the interval with  $Q_{\min}^2 = 1.71 \text{ GeV}^2$ , and the same values of the  $k$  parameter were used as in the pQCD case.

We can also apply, to the same interval of the data points, and for the same values of the  $k$  parameter, the two-parameter and one-parameter fit when the canonical BRS part  $d(Q^2)$  is evaluated as a simple truncated perturbation series (TPS), in  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme and for  $\alpha_s(M_Z^2; \overline{\text{MS}}) = 0.1179$ . We have here additional theoretical uncertainties: the renormalisation scale dependence, and the truncation index ( $N_{\text{tr}}$ ) dependence.<sup>3</sup> We choose for simplicity for the

<sup>3</sup> This means that we truncate the TPS at the power at  $a(\mu^2)^{N_{\text{tr}}}$ .



renormalisation scale only the value  $\mu^2 = Q^2$ . Then we obtain for the two-parameter fit  $(\bar{f}_2, \mu_6)$  with TPS a strong  $N_{\text{tr}}$  dependence; at  $N_{\text{tr}} = 8$  we obtain small  $\chi^2/\text{n.d.f.} = 0.890$ , but there  $\bar{f}_2 \approx -0.45$  and  $\mu_6 = 0.43 \text{ GeV}^4$  are both large and give significant cancellation effects between  $D = 2$  and  $D = 4$  BSR terms in the range  $2 \text{ GeV}^2 < Q^2 < 3 \text{ GeV}^2$ . For  $N_{\text{tr}} \geq 10$  we get  $\chi^2/\text{n.d.f.} > 4$ , i.e., very large. For the one-parameter fit  $(\bar{f}_2)$  we obtain for all  $N_{\text{tr}} \geq 3$  the values  $\chi^2/\text{n.d.f.} > 1$ , and these values increase when  $N_{\text{tr}}$  increases.

For these reasons, we consider that our renormalon-motivated approach with the resummation Eq. (18) is more reliable than the simpler TPS approach. As a consequence, Eqs. (25) and (26), as well as Figs. 3, represent the central results of our work. Furthermore, the presented work is an example of practical use of known renormalon information for an efficient evaluation (resummation) of the perturbation series of a spacelike observable in pQCD.

The mathematica programs that were constructed and used in the calculations of this work, with the experimental data included, are available on the web page [33].

### Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by FONDECYT (Chile) Grants No. 1200189 and No. 1220095.

- 
- [1] J. D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. **148** (1966), 1467-1478.
  - [2] B. Adeva *et al.* [Spin Muon (SMC)], Phys. Lett. B **412** (1997), 414-424;  
D. Adams *et al.* [Spin Muon (SMC)], Phys. Rev. D **56** (1997), 5330-5358;  
E. S. Ageev *et al.* [COMPASS], Phys. Lett. B **612** (2005), 154-164;  
V. Y. Alexakhin *et al.* [COMPASS], Phys. Lett. B **647** (2007), 8-17;  
M. G. Alekseev *et al.* [COMPASS], Phys. Lett. B **690** (2010), 466-472;  
C. Adolph *et al.* [COMPASS], Phys. Lett. B **753** (2016), 18-28;  
C. Adolph *et al.* [COMPASS], Phys. Lett. B **769** (2017), 34-41;  
M. Aghasyan *et al.* [COMPASS], Phys. Lett. B **781** (2018), 464-472.
  - [3] K. Ackerstaff *et al.* [HERMES], Phys. Lett. B **404** (1997), 383-389;  
A. Airapetian *et al.* [HERMES], Phys. Lett. B **442** (1998), 484-492; Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007), 012007.
  - [4] K. Abe *et al.* [E143], Phys. Rev. D **58** (1998), 112003;  
P. L. Anthony *et al.* [E142], Phys. Rev. D **54** (1996), 6620-6650;  
K. Abe *et al.* [E154], Phys. Rev. Lett. **79** (1997), 26-30;  
P. L. Anthony *et al.* [E155], Phys. Lett. B **463** (1999), 339-345;  
P. L. Anthony *et al.* [E155], Phys. Lett. B **493** (2000), 19-28.
  - [5] A. Deur *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004), 212001.
  - [6] A. Deur *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **78** (2008), 032001.
  - [7] K. Slifer *et al.* [Resonance Spin Structure], Phys. Rev. Lett. **105** (2010), 101601.
  - [8] A. Deur *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) no.1, 012009.
  - [9] K. P. Adhikari *et al.* [CLAS], Phys. Rev. Lett. **120** (2018) no.6, 062501;  
X. Zheng *et al.* [CLAS], Nature Phys. **17** (2021) no.6, 736-741;  
V. Sulkosky *et al.* [Jefferson Lab E97-110], Phys. Lett. B **805** (2020), 135428.
  - [10] C. Ayala, G. Cvetič, A. V. Kotikov and B. G. Shaikhatdenov, Eur. Phys. J. C **78** (2018) no.12, 1002.
  - [11] Q. Yu, X. G. Wu, H. Zhou and X. D. Huang, Eur. Phys. J. C **81** (2021) no.8, 690.
  - [12] I. R. Gabdrakhmanov, N. A. Gramotkov, A. V. Kotikov, D. A. Volkova and I. A. Zemlyakov, [arXiv:2307.16225 [hep-ph]];  
A. V. Kotikov and I. A. Zemlyakov, Phys. Rev. D **107** (2023) no.9, 094034.
  - [13] S. J. Brodsky, G. F. de T ramond and A. Deur, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 096010 (2010).
  - [14] A. Deur, J. M. Shen, X. G. Wu, S. J. Brodsky and G. F. de T ramond, Phys. Lett. B **773**, 98 (2017).
  - [15] G. Cveti , Phys. Rev. D **99** (2019) no.1, 014028.
  - [16] J. D. Bjorken, Phys. Rev. D **1** (1970), 1376-1379.
  - [17] P. A. Zyla *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2020** (2020) no.8, 083C01.
  - [18] S. G. Gorishnii and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **172** (1986), 109-112.
  - [19] S. A. Larin and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. B **259** (1991), 345-352.
  - [20] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin and J. H. K hn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104** (2010), 132004.
  - [21] H. Kawamura, T. Uematsu, J. Kodaira and Y. Yasui, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **12** (1997), 135-143.
  - [22] A. L. Kataev and V. V. Starshenko, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **10** (1995), 235-250.
  - [23] D. J. Broadhurst and A. L. Kataev, Phys. Lett. B **315** (1993), 179-187.
  - [24] M. Beneke, Phys. Rept. **317** (1999), 1-142.
  - [25] C. Ayala, G. Cveti  and D. Teca, J. Phys. G **50** (2023) no.4, 045004.
  - [26] C. Ayala, G. Cveti , R. K gerler and I. Kondrashuk, J. Phys. G **45** (2018) no.3, 035001.
  - [27] F. Campanario and A. Pineda, Phys. Rev. D **72** (2005), 056008;

- C. Ayala and A. Pineda, Phys. Rev. D **106** (2022) no.5, 056023.
- [28] G. Cvetič and I. Kondrashuk, JHEP **12** (2011), 019.
  - [29] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], PTEP **2022** (2022), 083C01, and 2023 update.
  - [30] A. Deur, J. P. Chen, *et al.* Phys. Lett. B **825** (2022), 136878.
  - [31] M. Schmelling, Phys. Scripta **51** (1995), 676-679.
  - [32] D. Boito, O. Cata, M. Golterman, M. Jamin, K. Maltman, J. Osborne and S. Peris, Phys. Rev. D **84** (2011), 113006.
  - [33] Web page <http://www.gcvetic.usm.cl/>. The set of mathematica programs is contained in the tarred file fitBSRgenP44res.tar. Some of these programs are interdependent because some of them call some of the others. The central program is fitBSRgenP44res.m.