Thrust distribution in electron-positron annihilation at full N³LL+NNLO (and beyond) in QCD

Ugo Giuseppe Aglietti $^{(a)}$, Giancarlo Ferrera $^{(b,c)}$, Wan-Li Ju $^{(c,d)}$ and Jiahao Miao $^{(b)}$

- (a) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Roma "La Sapienza" and INFN, Sezione di Roma, I-00185 Rome, Italy
- (b) Dipartimento di Fisica, Università di Milano, I-20133 Milan, Italy
 (c) INFN, Sezione di Milano, I-20133 Milan, Italy
- (d) Department of Physics, University of Alberta, Edmonton AB T6G 2J1, Canada

Abstract

We consider the thrust (T) distribution in electron-positron (e^+e^-) annihilation into hadrons and we perform the all-order resummation of the large logarithms of 1-T up to next-to-next-to-next-to-leading logarithmic (N⁴LL) accuracy in QCD. We consistently combine resummation with the known fixed-order results up to next-to-next-to-leading order (NNLO). All perturbative terms up to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ are included in our calculation, which, thanks to a unitarity constraint, exactly reproduces, after integration over T, the next-to-next-to-next-to-leading order (N³LO) result for the total cross section of e^+e^- into hadrons. We perform resummation in the Laplace-conjugated space and compare our results with those obtained with the resummation formalism in the physical (T) space. We find that the differences in the spectra obtained with the two different formalisms are sizable. Non-perturbative corrections are included using an analytic hadronization model, depending on two free parameters. Finally, we present a comparison of our spectra with experimental data at the Z-boson mass (m_Z) energy, which enables us to extract the value of the QCD coupling $\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.1181 \pm 0.0018$ fully consistent with the world average.

One of the key parameters of the Standard Model is the QCD coupling constant α_S , which governs the strength of the strong interactions. While the nonabelian gauge structure of QCD predicts the (logarithmic) energy scaling of the coupling via the renormalization group equation, the value of the coupling at an initial (or reference) scale has to be determined by comparing theory predictions against experimental data. Among the fundamental couplings, α_S is by far the least well-known. Increasing its accuracy, being *per se* interesting to test the over-all consistency of QCD, is crucial for improving the theoretical predictions for hard scattering processes at, present and future, high-energy colliders, such as the Large Hadron Collider (LHC).

A classical method to obtain a precise determination of α_S involves the analysis of shape variables in high-energy electron-positron annihilation into hadrons. Shape variables are functions of the space momenta of all the particles in the final state, which characterize the topology of an event. Shape variables are strongly sensitive to QCD radiation and thus to the precise value of the strong coupling, offering then a method for an accurate extraction of α_S . Among the first and most widely used shape variables is the thrust T [1] defined as

$$T \equiv 1 - \tau = \max_{\mathbf{n}} \frac{\sum_{i} |\mathbf{p}_{i} \cdot \mathbf{n}|}{\sum_{i} |\mathbf{p}_{i}|},$$
 (1)

where the sum is over all final state particles i with three-momentum \mathbf{p}_i and the maximum is taken with respect to the direction of the unit three-vector \mathbf{n} . The thrust variable thus maximizes the sum of the moduli of the projected three-momenta along the vector \mathbf{n} , and the value of \mathbf{n} that realizes this maximum is called the thrust axis \mathbf{n}_T . As is clear from its definition in Eq. (1), the thrust is an infrared (soft and collinear) safe quantity, that is, it is insensitive to the emission of zero-momentum (soft) particles and to the splitting of one particle into two collinear ones. Therefore the thrust distribution can be safely calculated in a perturbative QCD expansion in powers of α_S . It can easily be shown that the allowed values of the thrust lie in the range $1/2 \leq T \leq 1$: it approaches T = 1 ($\tau = 0$) in the two-jet limit (pencil-like event) and T = 1/2 ($\tau = 1/2$) in the opposite limit of a completely isotropic event.

Away from the two-jet region, the perturbative QCD series for the thrust distribution is well behaved, and calculations based on the truncation at a fixed order in α_S are reliable. Since hadron production away from the back-to-back region has to be accompanied by the radiation of at least one hard recoiling parton, the leading-order (LO) term for this observable is $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S)$. The fixed-order expansion of the thrust distribution for $T \neq 1$ is known up $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S^3)$. It has been obtained by numerical Monte Carlo integration of the fully differential cross section for three-jet production in electron-positron annihilation at next-to-next-to-leading (NNLO) order in QCD [2–8].

However at large values of T ($\tau = 1 - T \ll 1$), the fixed-order QCD perturbative expansion does not provide a good approximation, because its coefficients contain large logarithmic corrections of infrared (soft and collinear) origin, of the type $\ln \tau$. The resummation of such logarithms to all orders in α_S has been formulated in the seminal papers [9,10]. More recent studies can be found in Refs. [11–23].

Resummed and fixed-order calculations must be consistently combined with each other

at intermediate values of T, in order to obtain accurate QCD predictions over a wide kinematical region.

In this Letter, we present a resummed calculation of the infrared (or Sudakov) logarithms occurring in the thrust distribution in the back-to-back region, up to next-to-next-to-next-to-next-to-leading logarithmic (N⁴LL) accuracy in full QCD. We also match the resummed calculation with the corresponding NNLO results in Ref. [5]. Therefore all perturbative terms up to the next-to-next-to-leading order (N³LO), i.e. up to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S^3)$, are consistently included in our calculation.

We implement a unitarity constraint in the resummation formalism in such a way that our calculation exactly reproduces, after integration over T, the corresponding fixed-order result for the total cross section of electron-positron annihilation into hadrons up to N³LO [24, 25].

We have then included non-perturbative (NP) effects in the thrust distribution [26–33], by using an analytic hadronization model depending on two free parameters, which enables us to perform an extraction of the value of the QCD coupling, by comparing our results with LEP and SLD data at the Z-boson mass (m_Z) energy.

The result of our fit, $\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.1181 \pm 0.0018$, is fully consistent with the world average [35]. Furthermore, we observe that our result is substantially higher than other determinations of α_S based on thrust-space resummation [15, 23, 36]*. We will explicitly show that, performing the resummation of Sudakov logarithms in Laplace-conjugated space (ensuring the factorization of kinematical momentum conservation constraint), is crucial to obtain a result which is consistent with the world average.

We start considering the differential thrust distribution $d\sigma/d\tau$ and we define the *cumulative* distribution

$$R_T(\tau) \equiv \frac{1}{\sigma_{\text{tot}}} \int_0^{\tau} d\tau' \frac{d\sigma}{d\tau'}, \qquad (2)$$

where σ_{tot} is the total cross section of e^+e^- annihilation into hadrons.

The upper limit of τ , $\tau_{\rm max}$, (or, equivalently, the lower limit on T, $T_{\rm min}=1-\tau_{\rm max}$) depends on the number (n) of final-state partons and approaches from below the value $\tau_{\rm max}=1/2$, in the (formal) limit of infinite parton emissions $(n\to\infty)$. The knowledge of $\tau_{\rm max}$ is important in order to correctly normalize the cross section. In the massless approximation, for three particles (n=3), $\tau_{\rm max}=1/3$, corresponding to a symmetric trigonal-planar configuration. For four particles (n=4), $\tau_{\rm max}=1-1/\sqrt{3}=0.4226497\cdots$, which corresponds to final-state three-momenta forming a regular tetrahedron. For more than four particles, as far as we know, there are no known values of $\tau_{\rm max}$ in the literature. For five particles (n=5), $\tau_{\rm max}$ was previously estimated to be $\tau_{\rm max}=0.4275$ [16]. The estimate was obtained by considering at which bin the cross section of the NNLO Monte Carlo (MC) calculation [6] vanishes.

In general, finding the upper limit of τ for a generic number n of final state particles is a non-trivial kinematical problem, as it involves a double optimization. In this paper, to find the maximum value of τ for a given n, we have used stochastic optimization algorithms,

^{*}See also Refs. [37,38] and the discussion in the Sec. 9.4.4 of Ref. [35].

such as the Genetic Algorithm and the Particle Swarm Optimization. The results for the $3 \le n \le 14$ are shown in Tab. (1). The numbers in the table should be interpreted as lower limits to the maximum value of τ , since a stochastic algorithm is not guaranteed to find the absolute minimum. However, we observe that the results obtained with these algorithms for n = 3 and n = 4 agree (within the numerical precision of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$) with the exact analytical values.

n	3	4	5	6	7	8
$\tau_{ m max}$	0.3333	0.4226	0.4539	0.4629	0.4716	0.4753
$\mid n \mid$	9	10	11	12	13	14
$ au_{ m max}$	0.4790	0.4811	0.4834	0.4842	0.4845	0.4857

Table 1: Maximum kinematically allowed value of τ as a function of the number of particles n in the final state.

The cumulant cross section $R_T(\tau)$ in Eq. (2) can be factorized as follows [9, 10]:

$$R_T(\tau) = C\left(\alpha_S(Q^2)\right) \Sigma\left(\tau, \alpha_s(Q^2)\right) + D\left(\tau, \alpha_s(Q^2)\right). \tag{3}$$

 $C(\alpha_S)$ is a hard-virtual factor with a standard (fixed-order) perturbative expansion:

$$C(\alpha_S) = 1 + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_S}{\pi}\right)^n C_n.$$
 (4)

 $D(\alpha_S)$ is a short-distance remainder function vanishing at small τ ,

$$D(\tau, \alpha_S) = \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_S}{\pi}\right)^n D_n(\tau).$$
 (5)

 $\Sigma(\tau, \alpha_s)$ is a long-distance dominated form factor, which contains all the logarithms of soft and collinear origin enhanced at small τ , of the type $\alpha_S^n \ln^m \tau$ $(1 \le m \le 2n)$; it can be written in an exponential form in the Laplace-conjugated space:

$$\Sigma(\tau, \alpha_S) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C \frac{dN}{N} e^{N\tau} e^{\mathcal{F}(\alpha_S, L)}, \qquad (6)$$

where the contour of integration C runs parallel to the imaginary axis and lies to the right of all singularities of the integrand. The exponent $\mathcal{F}(\alpha_S L)$ in Eq. (6) resums to all orders in α_S , classes of logarithms $L = \ln N$, which are large for $N \to \infty$ (and correspond, in physical space, to $\ln \tau$ terms, enhanced in the two-jet region $\tau \to 0$):

$$\mathcal{F}(\alpha_S, L) = L f_1(\lambda) + f_2(\lambda) + \frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} f_3(\lambda) + \sum_{n=4}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_S}{\pi}\right)^{n-2} f_n(\lambda), \qquad (7)$$

with $\lambda \equiv \beta_0 \alpha_S L/\pi$ and β_0 is the first-order coefficient of the QCD β function. At large N, $L \gg 1$ and $\alpha_S L$ is assumed to be $\mathcal{O}(1)$, implying that the r.h.s. of Eq. (7) has a customary perturbative expansion in powers of α_S . The truncation of such a (function) series at a given order yield the resummation of certain classes (infinite series) of logarithmic corrections. The leading-logarithmic (LL) approximation is provided by the function $f_1(\lambda)$, the next-to-LL (NLL) approximation requires also the inclusion of the function $f_2(\lambda)$, the next-to-NLL (NNLL) approximation requires also the function $f_3(\lambda)$ and so on. We have explicitly evaluated the resummation functions $f_n(\lambda)$, with $1 \le n \le 5$ (explicit expressions are given in the Appendix), thus reaching the N⁴LL accuracy. We have also evaluated up to $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^3)$ both the coefficients of the hard factor $C(\alpha_S)$ and, by using the numerical NNLO results of Ref. [5], the remainder function $D(\alpha_S)$. By evaluating numerically the inverse Laplace transform $(N \mapsto \tau)$ in Eq. (6), we have been able to perform the resummation of the large logarithms $\ln N$ in Laplace space (or N space) up to N^4LL accuracy, matching the results up to $O(\alpha_S^3)$, i.e. with the N³LO hard virtual corrections at small τ and the NNLO hard real (and real-virtual) corrections at large τ . The expression of the factor given in Eq. (6) involves an integration over the (formally non-integrable) Landau singularity of the QCD running, which manifests itself in singularities of the $f_n(\lambda)$ functions at the points $\lambda = 1/2$ and $\lambda = 1$ (i.e. $N \sim N_L = \exp\{1/[2\beta_0 \alpha_S(Q^2)]\}$ and $N \sim N_L' = \exp\{1/[\beta_0 \alpha_S(Q^2)]\}$, respectively). These singularities, which signal the onset of non-perturbative phenomena at very large values of N (i.e. in the region of very small τ), have been regularized through the so-called Minimal Prescription of Ref. [39], in which the contour of integration C lies to the right of all physical singularities but to the left of the (unphysical) Landau pole. The results obtained by using this prescription converge asymptotically to the perturbative series and do not include any power correction.

A commonly used alternative to the numerical computation of the inverse Laplace transform, is an analytic approximate calculation of the latter. In this case, the Taylor expansion of the integrand in Eq. (6) around the point [9, 10, 40]

$$ln N = ln(1/\tau) \equiv \ell \,,$$
(8)

gives

$$\Sigma(\tau, \alpha_S) = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \int_C \frac{dN}{N} e^{N\tau} \exp\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\mathcal{F}^{(k)}(\alpha_S, \ell)}{k!} \ln^k(\tau N)\right], \tag{9}$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}^{(k)}(\alpha_S, \ell) \equiv \frac{\partial^k}{\partial \ell^k} \mathcal{F}(\alpha_S, \ell) , \qquad k = 1, 2, 3, \cdots .$$
 (10)

Since it is not possible to evaluate the series on the r.h.s. of Eq. (9) exactly, a hierarchy is defined in τ -space. The NⁿLL accuracy in τ space is defined by keeping in Eq. (9) the dominant logarithmic terms $\alpha_S^{n-1}(\alpha_S \ell)^k$, up to a given n and for all k. However, we stress that the resulting resummation formula in τ space is only an approximation of the resummation formula in N space. In particular, the resummation in τ space at a given logarithmic accuracy does not resum all the $\ln N$ terms of the corresponding logarithmic accuracy in N space. The crucial point is that there is not an exact correspondence between

 $\ln N$ and $\ln(1/\tau)$ terms. The kinematical constraints of momentum conservation factorize only in N space, not in τ space, and thus exponentiation is strictly valid only in N space.

Let us also remark that the above analytic approximation is not a fully consistent saddlepoint expansion; that implies that the resulting expansion is not a truly asymptotic one for large N. The true saddle point is obtained by finding the value of N for which the logarithm of the integrand in Eq. (6) is stationary, that is, by solving the following equation in N:

$$N\tau = 1 - f_1 \left(\beta_0 \frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} \ln N \right) - \beta_0 \frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} \ln(N) f_1' \left(\beta_0 \frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} \ln N \right) - \beta_0 \frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \left(\frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} \right)^{n-2} f_n' \left(\beta_0 \frac{\alpha_S}{\pi} \ln N \right),$$
(11)

where $f'_n(\lambda) \equiv df_n(\lambda)/d\lambda$. The value of N in Eq. (8) is instead the solution of the saddle point equation of the free theory $(\alpha_S \to 0)$,

$$N = \frac{1}{\tau}. (12)$$

While the last term in the r.h.s. of Eq. (11) is a $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S)$ correction to the saddle point of the free theory, the same is not true for the second and the third terms, which are both $\mathcal{O}(1)$, since $\alpha_S \ln N$ is $\mathcal{O}(1)$. We have thus proved that the analytic formula based on the expansion around the point in Eq. (8) is not a fully consistent saddle point expansion and therefore not a correct asymptotic expansion for large N.

As observed in Ref. [10], while the resummation procedure uniquely determines the structure of the large logarithms in the two-jet region, it leaves an ambiguity on the non-logarithmic contributions, which is partially solved with the matching against the fixed-order result. This ambiguity can be exploited to impose the following physical constraints:

$$R_T(\tau_{\text{max}}) = 1, \qquad \frac{dR_T}{d\tau}(\tau = \tau_{\text{max}}) = 0, \qquad (13)$$

which are violated by higher-order terms beyond the nominal fixed-order accuracy of the calculation (e.g. by $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S^4)$ terms at N³LL+NNLO). The first requirement in Eq. (13), which follows from perturbative unitarity, is particularly relevant. It can be fulfilled in τ space using the following replacement [10, 34]

$$\ell \equiv \ln(1/\tau) \quad \mapsto \quad \tilde{\ell} \equiv \ln(1/\tau - 1/\tau_{\text{max}} + 1) \stackrel{\tau \ll 1}{=} \ell + \mathcal{O}(\tau),$$
 (14)

which indeed acts as a perturbative unitarity constraint, since:

$$\Sigma(\tau = \tau_{\text{max}}, \alpha_S)|_{\ell \to \tilde{\ell}} = 1.$$
 (15)

An analogous constraint can be imposed in N space by means of the following replacement

$$L \equiv \ln N \quad \mapsto \quad \tilde{L} \equiv \ln(N - N_c) \stackrel{N \gg 1}{=} L + \mathcal{O}(1/N),$$
 (16)

with N_c a constant such that

$$\Sigma(\tau = \tau_{\text{max}}, \alpha_S)|_{L \to \tilde{L}} = 1. \tag{17}$$

We observe that the replacements in Eqs. (14,16), besides affecting $\Sigma(\tau, \alpha_S)$, have also an impact on the remainder function $D(\tau, \alpha_S)$, which has to be properly taken into account. The second requirement in Eq. (13) can be fulfilled by a suitable modification of subleading terms away from the $\tau \to 0$ limit, as discussed in Ref. [9, 34]. However, the second requirement is mainly relevant in the large- τ region ($\tau \lesssim \tau_{\text{max}}$), where the thrust distribution is affected by instabilities from higher-order enhanced corrections of soft and collinear origin near the kinematic fixed-order boundaries [41]. A proper treatment of these regions requires a resummation of such corrections to all orders, which gives rise to the so called $Sudakov\ shoulder\ [41–44]$.

In the following part of this Letter, we present Laplace-space (N-space) resummed results and we compare them with corresponding results in τ space. We will show that the formally subleading terms neglected in the τ -space resummation, actually give a non negligible contribution and turn out to be essential for a precise extraction of the value of α_S .

In Fig. 1 we show our results for the thrust distribution at $Q = m_Z = 91.1876 \,\text{GeV}$ with $\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.118$. We plot results obtained via Laplace-space resummation at NLL+LO, NNLL+NLO and N³LL+NNLO accuracies (solid bands), where uncertainty bands correspond to renormalization scale variation by a factor of two around the central value $\mu_R = Q$. We also show the impact of N⁴LL corrections (solid line), which is very small (differences with respect to N³LL+NNLO result at few permille level). This is not unexpected because a full next-order accuracy would also require the inclusion of the, presently unknown, $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_S^4)$ corrections both in the hard factor $C(\alpha_S)$ and in the remainder function $D(\tau, \alpha_S)$.

In Fig. 1 we also show (dashed lines) perturbative predictions obtained by using momentum-space resummation at NLL+LO, NNLL+NLO, N³LL+NNLO and the impact of N⁴LL terms. We observe that the differences among the predictions obtained with resummation in Laplace space and τ space are substantial; these differences are larger than the perturbative uncertainties (estimated through both scale variation and the difference between two consecutive perturbative orders).

Up to now, our results entirely relied on perturbation theory. However, in order to compare our predictions with experimental data, we need to include non-perturbative (NP) hadronization effects. In this Letter, we use an analytic model based on a correlation [9] or shape function [45] $f_{NP}(\tau_h, \tau)$ depending on very few NP parameters, such that:

$$\frac{d\sigma_h}{d\tau_h} = \int d\tau \frac{d\sigma}{d\tau} f_{NP}(\tau, \tau_h), \qquad (18)$$

where $d\sigma_h/d\tau_h$ is the hadronic thrust distribution and τ_h is the hadronic thrust variable. We have tried various ansatz for $f_{NP}(\tau, \tau_h)$ and we have found that we can have a very good description of the LEP and SLD data at the Z boson peak $(Q = m_Z)$ [46–51], by means of a Gaussian function depending on two free parameters only:

$$f_{NP}(\tau_h, \tau) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\sigma_{NP}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\tau_h - \tau - \delta_{NP})^2}{2\sigma_{NP}^2}\right], \qquad (19)$$




Figure 1: The thrust distribution at Q = 91.1876 GeV at various perturbative orders in QCD. Results obtained through resummation in Laplace-conjugated space (solid bands) are compared with physical τ -space approximated results (dashed lines).

where δ_{NP} represents a shift and σ_{NP} a smearing of the perturbative prediction † .

We finally performed a three parameter $(\alpha_S(m_Z^2), \delta_{NP}, \sigma_{NP})$ fit in the small/intermediate τ region $(0 < \tau < 0.15)$, obtaining, at N³LL+NNLO accuracy, the following values:

$$\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.1181 \pm 0.0018$$
, $\delta_{NP} = 0.0071 \pm 0.0007$, $\sigma_{NP} = 0.0060 \pm 0.0013$, (20)

where the uncertainties include experimental and theoretical (perturbative) errors (the latter estimated by means of a renormalization scale variation of a factor two).

A comparison of our best prediction against experimental LEP and SLD data at the Z boson peak ($Q = m_Z$) is shown in Fig.(2), where the uncertainty band is obtained by a variation of the extracted parameters within the uncertainties. As a check of our results, we have performed the fit at NNLL+NLO accuracy which gives a result (fully consistent with the N³LL+NNLO one):

$$\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.1194 \pm 0.0020$$
, $\delta_{NP} = 0.0071 \pm 0.0007$, $\sigma_{NP} = 0.0062 \pm 0.0014$ [‡].

Conversely, an analogous fit performed using the τ -space resummation formalism, gives a sensibly lower value of the strong coupling $\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.1120 \pm 0.0019$ (with $\delta_{NP} =$

[†]Different functions, depending on more parameters, such as an asymmetry or skewness parameter, only marginally improve the description of the data.

[‡]We made also a fit including the (known) N⁴LL corrections, which, as expected by the smallness of latter, gives basically the same results of the N³LL+NNLO analysis ($\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.1177 \pm 0.0018$ with δ_{NP} and σ_{NP} unchanged).




Figure 2: The thrust distribution at Q = 91.1876 GeV at $N^3LL+NNLO$ in QCD without (blue solid line) and with (red band) the inclusion of NP effects.

 0.0083 ± 0.0010 and $\sigma_{NP} = 0.0055 \pm 0.0020$) thus indicating that the approximations used to perform the resummation in τ space have to be properly included in order to obtain a reliable determination of $\alpha_S(m_Z^2)$ within a τ -space resummation formalism.

In this Letter, we have presented a resummed calculation of the thrust distribution in electron-positron annihilation into hadrons up to full N³LL+NNLO accuracy (including also the N⁴LL terms available) in QCD perturbation theory. We have performed the resummation directly in the Laplace-conjugated space and we have evaluated exactly (in numerical way) the inverse Laplace transform. We compared our theoretical distributions with LEP and SLD data at the Z-boson mass (m_Z) energy, which enabled us to extract the value of the QCD coupling $\alpha_S(m_Z^2) = 0.1181 \pm 0.0018$, fully consistent with the world average. We have also shown that the commonly used (approximate) analytic formalism in the physical space gives quite different results with respect to the Laplace-space formalism, with a corresponding lower determination of $\alpha_S(m_Z^2)$.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Stefano Camarda, Stefano Forte and Lorenzo Rossi for useful discussions on α_S determination and Bryan Webber for comments on the manuscript.

*

A Resummation coefficients

In this Appendix we give the explicit expressions of the resummation coefficients up to N⁴LL and N³LO accuracy. The functions $f_i(\lambda)$ in Eq. (7) are:

$$\begin{split} f_1(\lambda) &= -\frac{A_1}{\beta_0 \lambda} \left[\bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - 2\bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] \,, \end{split} \tag{21} \\ f_2(\lambda) &= \frac{A_2}{g_0^2} \ln \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda^2} + \frac{2\gamma_E A_1}{\beta_0} \ln \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda} + \frac{A_1 \beta_1}{\beta_0^3} \left[\ln^2 \bar{\lambda} - \frac{\ln^2 \bar{\lambda}}{2} - \ln \frac{\bar{\lambda}}{\lambda^2} \right] + \frac{B_1}{\beta_0} \ln \bar{\lambda} \,, \end{split} \tag{22} \\ f_3(\lambda) &= -\frac{A_3 \lambda^2}{g_0^2 \lambda \bar{\lambda}} + \frac{\beta_1 A_2}{\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}} \left[3\lambda^2 + \bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - 2\bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] - \frac{2\gamma_E A_2 \lambda}{\beta_0 \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}} + \frac{\gamma_E^2 A_1 \lambda (2\lambda - 3)}{\bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}} \\ &- \frac{2\beta_1 \gamma_E A_1}{\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}} \left[\bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda} \right] - \frac{\beta_1^2 A_1}{\beta_0^2} \left[\frac{\bar{\lambda}^2}{\lambda \bar{\lambda}} - \frac{\ln \bar{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} (2\lambda + \ln \bar{\lambda}) + \frac{\ln^2 \bar{\lambda}}{2\bar{\lambda}} + \frac{2\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] \\ &- \frac{\beta_2 A_1}{\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}} \left[\bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda} \right] - \frac{\beta_1^2 A_1}{\beta_0^2} \left[\frac{\bar{\lambda}^2}{\bar{\lambda}} - \frac{\ln \bar{\lambda}}{\bar{\lambda}} (2\lambda + \ln \bar{\lambda}) + \frac{\ln^2 \bar{\lambda}}{2\bar{\lambda}} + \frac{2\lambda}{\bar{\lambda}} \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] \\ &- \frac{\beta_2 A_1}{\beta_0^3 \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}} \left[\bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - 2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] - \frac{\beta_1 A_3}{\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}} \left[\bar{\lambda} + \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] - \frac{\gamma_E B_1 \lambda}{\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}} \,, \end{split} \tag{23} \\ &- \frac{\beta_2 A_1}{\beta_0^3 \bar{\lambda} \bar{\lambda}} \left[\bar{\lambda} + 2 \bar{\lambda} \ln \bar{\lambda} - 2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] - \frac{\beta_1 A_3}{\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left[15\lambda^2 + 10(\lambda - 3)\lambda^3 + 3\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} - 6\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \right] + \frac{\gamma_E A_3 \lambda (3\lambda - 2)}{\beta_0 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \\ &+ \frac{\gamma_E^2 A_2 \lambda}{3\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left[\lambda^2 (2\lambda^2 - 30\lambda + 9) + 3\lambda^2 \ln^2 \bar{\lambda} + 3\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} - 6\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \left(\ln \bar{\lambda} + 1 \right) \right] + \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_E A_3}{\beta_0 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \\ &- \frac{\beta_1^2 A_2}{6\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left[\lambda^2 (2\lambda^2 - 30\lambda + 9) + 3\lambda^2 \ln^2 \bar{\lambda} + 3\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} - 6\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \left(\ln h + 1 \right) \right] + \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_E A_1}{\beta_0 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left(2\lambda^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \right) \\ &+ \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_E A_1}{6\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left[\lambda^2 (2\lambda^2 - 30\lambda + 9) + 3\lambda^2 \ln^2 \bar{\lambda} - 6\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \left(\ln h + 1 \right) \right] + \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_E A_1}{\beta_0 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left(2\lambda^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \right) \\ &- \frac{\beta_1^2 A_1}{6\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left[\lambda^2 (2\lambda^2 - 30\lambda + 9) + 3\lambda^2 \ln^2 \bar{\lambda} - 6\bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \left(\ln h + 1 \right) \right] + \frac{\beta_1 \gamma_E A_1}{\beta_0 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left(2\lambda^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} - \bar{\lambda}^2 \ln \bar{\lambda} \right) \\ &- \frac{\beta_1^2 A_1}{6\beta_0^2 \bar{\lambda}^2 \bar{\lambda}^2} \left[\lambda^2 (2\lambda^2 - 30\lambda + 9) + 3\lambda^2 \ln^2 \bar{\lambda} - 6\bar{\lambda}^2$$

$$\begin{split} &+6\beta_{1}\left(12\gamma_{E}^{2}\beta_{3}^{4}-\left(\beta_{1}^{2}-\beta_{0}\beta_{2}\right)\left(6\lambda-1\right)\right)\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}-12\beta_{1}\left(3\gamma_{E}^{2}\beta_{3}^{4}-\left(\beta_{1}^{2}-\beta_{0}\beta_{2}\right)\left(3\lambda-1\right)\right)\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}} \\ &+\frac{2A_{1}}{\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}}\left[\frac{\beta_{1}^{4}}{24\beta_{0}^{6}}\left(-56\lambda^{6}+108\lambda^{5}-66\lambda^{4}+12\lambda^{3}-8(4\lambda-3)\bar{\lambda}^{3}\lambda^{2}\ln\bar{\lambda}+4(2\lambda-3)\bar{\lambda}^{3}\lambda^{2}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &+12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\lambda\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}-12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\lambda\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}-\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{4}\bar{\lambda}+2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}+2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}-4\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &+\frac{7E\beta_{1}^{3}}{6\beta_{0}^{3}}\left(2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}-3\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}-12\lambda\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}-2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}+2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}+4\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &+\frac{7E\beta_{1}^{3}}{6\beta_{0}^{3}}\left(2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}-3\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}-12\lambda\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}-2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{3}\bar{\lambda}+3\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}+6\lambda\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+\lambda^{2}P_{2}(\lambda)\right) \\ &+\frac{2\beta_{1}^{2}\gamma_{E}^{2}}{2\beta_{0}^{2}}\left(4\lambda^{4}-6\lambda^{2}+3\lambda-2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}+2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}-18\bar{\lambda}^{3}\lambda\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &-\frac{2\beta_{1}^{2}\beta_{2}}{36\beta_{0}^{3}}\left(-164\lambda^{6}+306\lambda^{5}-165\lambda^{4}+12\lambda^{3}+6\lambda^{2}+18\bar{\lambda}^{3}\lambda\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}-18\bar{\lambda}^{3}\lambda\ln^{2}\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &+\frac{12\ln\bar{\lambda}}{3}\left(3\lambda\lambda^{2}-1\right)\bar{\lambda}^{3}+\left(144\lambda^{6}-576\lambda^{5}+900\lambda^{4}-690\lambda^{3}+270\lambda^{2}-54\lambda+6\right)\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &+\frac{\beta_{1}\gamma_{E}^{2}}{6}\left(-\lambda P_{3}(\lambda)+8\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}-2\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &-\frac{\gamma_{E}\beta_{1}\beta_{2}\lambda}{3\beta_{0}^{3}}\left(-6\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+3\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+\lambda P_{2}(\lambda)\right)+\frac{\beta_{1}\beta_{3}}{18\bar{\beta}_{0}^{3}}\left(-28\lambda^{6}+72\lambda^{5}-51\lambda^{4}+6\lambda^{3}+3\lambda^{2}\right) \\ &-3(2\lambda(\lambda(8\lambda-9)+3)-1)\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+3(\lambda(\lambda(4\lambda-9)+6)-2)\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right)+\frac{\beta_{1}^{2}\gamma_{E}^{4}}{6\beta_{0}^{3}}P_{2}(\lambda)+\frac{\beta_{2}^{2}}{36\beta_{0}^{3}}\left(-20\lambda^{6}-18\lambda^{5}+69\lambda^{4}-42\lambda^{3}+6\lambda^{2}-12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &+\frac{\gamma_{E}\lambda^{2}\beta_{3}}{6\beta_{0}^{3}}P_{2}(\lambda)+\frac{\beta_{2}^{2}\beta_{2}}{36\beta_{0}^{3}}\left(-20\lambda^{6}-18\lambda^{5}+69\lambda^{4}-42\lambda^{3}+6\lambda^{2}-12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &-\frac{\beta_{1}}{3\beta_{0}^{3}}\left[3\lambda^{2}P_{1}(\lambda)-12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+6\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &-\frac{\beta_{1}}{3\beta_{0}^{3}}\left[3\lambda^{2}P_{1}(\lambda)-12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+6\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &-\frac{\beta_{1}}{3\beta_{0}^{3}}\left[2\lambda^{2}P_{1}(\lambda)-12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+6\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &-\frac{\beta_{1}}{3\beta_{0}^{3}}\left[2\lambda^{2}P_{1}(\lambda)-12\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}+6\bar{\lambda}^{3}\bar{\lambda}^{3}\ln\bar{\lambda}\right) \\ &-\frac{\beta_{1}}{3\beta_{0}^{3}}\left[2\lambda^{$$

where $\lambda = \frac{\beta_0}{\pi} \alpha_s \ln N$, $\bar{\lambda} = 1 - \lambda$, $\tilde{\lambda} = 1 - 2\lambda$, and $\gamma_E = 0.5772 \cdots$ is the Euler-Mascheroni constant. The QCD β -function coefficients read, up to five loops [52–56]:

$$\beta_0 = \frac{11C_A - 2n_f}{12} \,, \qquad \beta_1 = \frac{1}{24} \left(17C_A^2 - 5C_A n_f - 3C_F n_f \right) \,, \tag{27}$$

$$\beta_2 = \frac{1}{64} \left[\frac{2857}{54} C_A^3 - \left(\frac{1415}{54} C_A^2 + \frac{205}{18} C_A C_F - C_F^2 \right) n_f + \left(\frac{79}{54} C_A + \frac{11}{9} C_F \right) n_f^2 \right], \tag{28}$$

$$\beta_3 = \frac{1093}{186624} n_f^3 + n_f^2 \left(\frac{809\zeta_3}{2592} + \frac{50065}{41472} \right) + n_f \left(-\frac{1627\zeta_3}{1728} - \frac{1078361}{41472} \right) + \frac{891}{64}\zeta_3 + \frac{149753}{1536} , \tag{29}$$

$$\beta_4 = -0.00179929 \, n_f^4 - 0.225857 \, n_f^3 + 17.156 \, n_f^2 - 181.799 \, n_f + 524.558 \,, \tag{30}$$

where n_f is the number of QCD active (effective massless) flavors at the hard scale Q ($n_f = 5$ for $Q = m_Z$) and $\zeta_3 = 1.20206 \cdots$. The coefficients A_i and B_i are extracted from the fixed-order calculations for the thrust distribution [12, 57–66] and the cusp anomalous dimensions [67–70]:

$$A_1 = C_F, \qquad A_2 = \frac{C_F}{2} \left[\left(\frac{67}{18} - \frac{\pi^2}{6} \right) C_A - \frac{5}{9} n_f \right],$$
 (31)

$$A_3 = \frac{25 + 3\pi^2}{243}n_f^2 + \frac{288\zeta_3 - 72\pi^2 - 2381}{324}n_f + \frac{77515 - 390\pi^2 - 35640\zeta_3 + 198\pi^4}{1080},$$
 (32)

$$A_4 = \left(\frac{4\zeta_3}{81} - \frac{\pi^2}{27} + \frac{91}{4374}\right)n_f^3 + \left(-\frac{407\zeta_3}{108} - \frac{31\pi^4}{1080} + \frac{23\pi^2}{12} + \frac{147199}{46656}\right)n_f^2$$

$$+\left(-\frac{125\zeta_5}{18}-\frac{7\pi^2\zeta_3}{36}+\frac{71057\zeta_3}{648}+\frac{143\pi^4}{180}-\frac{266\pi^2}{9}-\frac{1820789}{15552}\right)n_f$$

$$+\frac{3025\zeta_{5}}{12}-6\zeta_{3}^{2}+\frac{99\pi^{2}\zeta_{3}}{8}-\frac{24451\zeta_{3}}{24}-\frac{2033\pi^{6}}{15120}-\frac{759\pi^{4}}{160}+\frac{20483\pi^{2}}{144}+\frac{4311229}{5184},$$
(33)

$$A_5 = 0.001302 \Gamma_{\text{cusp}}^{(4)} + 16445.4 - 5225.93 n_f + 567.497 n_f^2 - 24.5952 n_f^3 + 0.356813 n_f^4,$$
(34)

$$B_1 = -\frac{3C_F}{2}, \qquad B_2 = C_A C_F \left(\frac{3\zeta_3}{2} - \frac{57}{16} + \frac{11\pi^2}{24} \right) + C_F^2 \left(-3\zeta_3 + \frac{\pi^2}{4} - \frac{3}{16} \right) + C_F n_f \left(\frac{5}{8} - \frac{\pi^2}{12} \right), \quad (35)$$

$$B_3 = \left(-\frac{20\zeta_3}{81} + \frac{173\pi^2}{972} - \frac{191}{324}\right)n_f^2 + \left(\frac{62\zeta_3}{9} + \frac{52\pi^4}{405} - \frac{1109\pi^2}{162} + \frac{2467}{108}\right)n_f$$

$$-\frac{155\zeta_5}{9} - \frac{4\pi^2\zeta_3}{81} - \frac{481\zeta_3}{27} - \frac{2539\pi^4}{1080} + \frac{26189\pi^2}{432} - \frac{18797}{108},$$
 (36)

$$B_4 = 2592.79 - 620.792 n_f + 44.0707 n_f^2 - 0.949394 n_f^3, (37)$$

where $\zeta_5 = 1.03693 \cdots$ and $\Gamma_{\text{cusp}}^{(4)} \simeq 49873.5$ for $n_f = 5$ [70]. The hard-virtual coefficients C_i are derived from the quark form factor [71–74] and the constant terms in the collinear/soft functions [12, 57–66]§:

$$C_{1} = C_{F} \left(-\frac{5}{4} + \frac{3\gamma_{E}}{2} - \gamma_{E}^{2} \right),$$

$$C_{2} = C_{A}C_{F} \left(\frac{41\zeta_{3}}{6} - \frac{3\gamma_{E}\zeta_{3}}{2} - \frac{491}{96} + \frac{57\gamma_{E}}{16} - \frac{169\gamma_{E}^{2}}{144} - \frac{11\gamma^{3}}{12} - \frac{275\pi^{2}}{864} - \frac{11\gamma_{E}\pi^{2}}{24} + \frac{\gamma_{E}^{2}\pi^{2}}{12} + \frac{31\pi^{4}}{1440} \right)$$

$$+ C_{F}^{2} \left(-\frac{9\zeta_{3}}{2} + 3\gamma_{E}\zeta_{3} + \frac{41}{32} - \frac{27\gamma_{E}}{16} + \frac{19\gamma_{E}^{2}}{8} - \frac{3\gamma_{E}^{3}}{2} + \frac{\gamma_{E}^{4}}{2} + \frac{17\pi^{2}}{96} - \frac{\gamma_{E}\pi^{2}}{4} + \frac{19\pi^{4}}{720} \right)$$

$$+ C_{F}n_{f} \left(-\frac{5\zeta_{3}}{6} + \frac{35}{48} - \frac{5\gamma_{E}}{8} + \frac{11\gamma_{E}^{2}}{72} + \frac{\gamma_{E}^{3}}{6} + \frac{25\pi^{2}}{432} + \frac{\gamma_{E}\pi^{2}}{12} \right),$$

$$C_{3} = -0.573462 n_{f}^{2} + 4.90384 n_{f} + 13.4156.$$

$$(40)$$

To avoid cumbersome formulae, in the higher-order terms we have replaced the explicit value of the color factors of $SU(N_c = 3)$, namely $C_F = 4/3$, $C_A = 3$.

[§]The numerical impact of the, usually neglected, singlet diagrams induced by axial-vector currents and their implementation, can be found in [75].

References

- [1] E. Farhi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **39** (1977), 1587-1588 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.39.1587
- A. Gehrmann-De Ridder, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover and G. Heinrich, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99 (2007), 132002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.99.132002 [arXiv:0707.1285 [hep-ph]].
- [3] S. Weinzierl, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101** (2008), 162001 doi:10.1103/ Phys-RevLett.101.162001 [arXiv:0807.3241 [hep-ph]].
- [4] A. Gehrmann-De Ridder, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover and G. Heinrich, JHEP **05** (2009), 106 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/05/106 [arXiv:0903.4658 [hep-ph]].
- [5] S. Weinzierl, JHEP **06** (2009), 041 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/06/041 [arXiv:0904.1077 [hep-ph]].
- [6] A. Gehrmann-De Ridder, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover and G. Heinrich, Comput. Phys. Commun. 185 (2014), 3331 doi:10.1016/j.cpc.2014.07.024 [arXiv:1402.4140 [hep-ph]].
- [7] V. Del Duca, C. Duhr, A. Kardos, G. Somogyi and Z. Trócsányi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 117 (2016) no.15, 152004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.152004 [arXiv:1603.08927 [hep-ph]].
- [8] V. Del Duca, C. Duhr, A. Kardos, G. Somogyi, Z. Szőr, Z. Trócsányi and Z. Tulipánt, Phys. Rev. D 94 (2016) no.7, 074019 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.074019 [arXiv:1606.03453 [hep-ph]].
- [9] S. Catani, G. Turnock, B. R. Webber and L. Trentadue, Phys. Lett. B 263 (1991), 491-497 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)90494-B
- [10] S. Catani, L. Trentadue, G. Turnock and B. R. Webber, Nucl. Phys. B 407 (1993), 3-42 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(93)90271-P
- [11] M. D. Schwartz, Phys. Rev. D 77 (2008), 014026 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.014026 [arXiv:0709.2709 [hep-ph]].
- [12] T. Becher and M. D. Schwartz, JHEP $\mathbf{07}$ (2008), 034 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2008/07/034 [arXiv:0803.0342 [hep-ph]].
- [13] G. Dissertori, A. Gehrmann-De Ridder, T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, G. Heinrich, G. Luisoni and H. Stenzel, JHEP 08 (2009), 036 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/08/036 [arXiv:0906.3436 [hep-ph]].
- [14] A. Hornig, C. Lee and G. Ovanesyan, JHEP $\mathbf{05}$ (2009), 122 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/05/122 [arXiv:0901.3780 [hep-ph]].

- [15] R. Abbate, M. Fickinger, A. H. Hoang, V. Mateu and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D 83 (2011), 074021 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.074021 [arXiv:1006.3080 [hep-ph]].
- [16] P. F. Monni, T. Gehrmann and G. Luisoni, JHEP **08** (2011), 010 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2011)010 [arXiv:1105.4560 [hep-ph]].
- [17] R. Abbate, M. Fickinger, A. H. Hoang, V. Mateu and I. W. Stewart, Phys. Rev. D **86** (2012), 094002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.094002 [arXiv:1204.5746 [hep-ph]].
- [18] L. G. Almeida, S. D. Ellis, C. Lee, G. Sterman, I. Sung and J. R. Walsh, JHEP **04** (2014), 174 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2014)174 [arXiv:1401.4460 [hep-ph]].
- [19] A. Banfi, H. McAslan, P. F. Monni and G. Zanderighi, JHEP **05** (2015), 102 doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2015)102 [arXiv:1412.2126 [hep-ph]].
- [20] J. Baron, S. Marzani and V. Theeuwes, JHEP **08** (2018), 105 [erratum: JHEP **05** (2019), 056] doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2018)105 [arXiv:1803.04719 [hep-ph]].
- [21] S. Q. Wang, S. J. Brodsky, X. G. Wu and L. Di Giustino, Phys. Rev. D 99 (2019) no.11, 114020 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.99.114020 [arXiv:1902.01984 [hep-ph]].
- [22] S. Marzani, D. Reichelt, S. Schumann, G. Soyez and V. Theeuwes, JHEP **11** (2019), 179 doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2019)179 [arXiv:1906.10504 [hep-ph]].
- [23] M. A. Benitez, A. H. Hoang, V. Mateu, I. W. Stewart and G. Vita, [arXiv:2412.15164 [hep-ph]].
- [24] S. G. Gorishnii, A. L. Kataev and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B 259 (1991), 144-150 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(91)90149-K
- [25] L. R. Surguladze and M. A. Samuel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991), 560-563 [erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. 66 (1991), 2416] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.66.560
- [26] B. R. Webber, Phys. Lett. B 339 (1994), 148-150 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(94)91147-9 [arXiv:hep-ph/9408222 [hep-ph]].
- [27] Y. L. Dokshitzer and B. R. Webber, Phys. Lett. B 352 (1995), 451-455 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)00548-Y [arXiv:hep-ph/9504219 [hep-ph]].
- [28] P. Nason and M. H. Seymour, Nucl. Phys. B 454 (1995), 291-312 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(95)00461-Z [arXiv:hep-ph/9506317 [hep-ph]].
- [29] Y. L. Dokshitzer and B. R. Webber, Phys. Lett. B 404 (1997), 321-327 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(97)00573-X [arXiv:hep-ph/9704298 [hep-ph]].
- [30] E. Gardi and G. Grunberg, JHEP **11** (1999), 016 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/1999/11/016 [arXiv:hep-ph/9908458 [hep-ph]].

- [31] E. Gardi, JHEP $\mathbf{04}$ (2000), 030 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2000/04/030 [arXiv:hep-ph/0003179 [hep-ph]].
- [32] E. Gardi and J. Rathsman, Nucl. Phys. B 609 (2001), 123-182 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00284-X [arXiv:hep-ph/0103217 [hep-ph]].
- [33] C. Lee and G. F. Sterman, Phys. Rev. D **75** (2007), 014022 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.75.014022 [arXiv:hep-ph/0611061 [hep-ph]].
- [34] R. A. Davison and B. R. Webber, Eur. Phys. J. C **59** (2009), 13-25 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-008-0836-7 [arXiv:0809.3326 [hep-ph]].
- [35] S. Navas *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Phys. Rev. D **110** (2024) no.3, 030001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.110.030001
- [36] T. Gehrmann, G. Luisoni and P. F. Monni, Eur. Phys. J. C **73** (2013) no.1, 2265 doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-012-2265-x [arXiv:1210.6945 [hep-ph]].
- [37] P. Nason and G. Zanderighi, JHEP **06** (2023), 058 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2023)058 [arXiv:2301.03607 [hep-ph]].
- [38] P. Nason and G. Zanderighi, [arXiv:2501.18173 [hep-ph]].
- [39] S. Catani, M. L. Mangano, P. Nason and L. Trentadue, Nucl. Phys. B **478** (1996), 273-310 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(96)00399-9 [arXiv:hep-ph/9604351 [hep-ph]].
- [40] U. Aglietti and G. Ricciardi, Phys. Rev. D **66** (2002), 074003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.66.074003 [arXiv:hep-ph/0204125 [hep-ph]].
- [41] S. Catani and B. R. Webber, JHEP 10 (1997), 005 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/1997/10/005
 [arXiv:hep-ph/9710333 [hep-ph]].
- [42] U. Aglietti, Nucl. Phys. B 610 (2001), 293-315 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(01)00316-9 [arXiv:hep-ph/0104020 [hep-ph]].
- [43] U. Aglietti, G. Ricciardi and G. Ferrera, Phys. Rev. D **74** (2006), 034004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.74.034004 [arXiv:hep-ph/0507285 [hep-ph]].
- [44] A. Bhattacharya, M. D. Schwartz and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D 106 (2022) no.7, 074011 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.074011 [arXiv:2205.05702 [hep-ph]].
- [45] G. P. Korchemsky and G. F. Sterman, Nucl. Phys. B **555** (1999), 335-351 doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00308-9 [arXiv:hep-ph/9902341 [hep-ph]].
- [46] K. Abe *et al.* [SLD], Phys. Rev. D **51** (1995), 962-984 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.51.962 [arXiv:hep-ex/9501003 [hep-ex]].
- [47] D. Wicke, WUB-DIS-1999-05.

- [48] P. Abreu *et al.* [DELPHI], Eur. Phys. J. C **14** (2000), 557-584 doi:10.1007/s100520000354 [arXiv:hep-ex/0002026 [hep-ex]].
- [49] A. Heister et al. [ALEPH], Eur. Phys. J. C 35 (2004), 457-486 doi:10.1140/epjc/s2004-01891-4
- [50] G. Abbiendi *et al.* [OPAL], Eur. Phys. J. C **40** (2005), 287-316 doi:10.1140/epjc/s2005-02120-6 [arXiv:hep-ex/0503051 [hep-ex]].
- [51] P. Achard *et al.* [L3], Phys. Rept. **399** (2004), 71-174 doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2004.07.002 [arXiv:hep-ex/0406049 [hep-ex]].
- [52] O. V. Tarasov, A. A. Vladimirov and A. Y. Zharkov, Phys. Lett. B 93 (1980), 429-432 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(80)90358-5
- [53] S. A. Larin and J. A. M. Vermaseren, Phys. Lett. B **303** (1993), 334-336 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(93)91441-O [arXiv:hep-ph/9302208 [hep-ph]].
- [54] T. van Ritbergen, J. A. M. Vermaseren and S. A. Larin, Phys. Lett. B **400** (1997), 379-384 doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(97)00370-5 [arXiv:hep-ph/9701390 [hep-ph]].
- [55] M. Czakon, Nucl. Phys. B 710 (2005), 485-498 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.01.012 [arXiv:hep-ph/0411261 [hep-ph]].
- [56] F. Herzog, B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, JHEP 02 (2017), 090 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2017)090 [arXiv:1701.01404 [hep-ph]].
- [57] R. Brüser, Z. L. Liu and M. Stahlhofen, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121 (2018) no.7, 072003 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.072003 [arXiv:1804.09722 [hep-ph]].
- [58] R. Kelley, M. D. Schwartz, R. M. Schabinger and H. X. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D 84 (2011), 045022 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.045022 [arXiv:1105.3676 [hep-ph]].
- [59] W. Chen, F. Feng, Y. Jia and X. Liu, JHEP **12** (2022), 094 doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2022)094 [arXiv:2206.12323 [hep-ph]].
- [60] D. Baranowski, M. Delto, K. Melnikov and C. Y. Wang, JHEP 02 (2022), 081 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2022)081 [arXiv:2111.13594 [hep-ph]].
- [61] D. Baranowski, M. Delto, K. Melnikov and C. Y. Wang, Phys. Rev. D 106 (2022) no.1, 014004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.106.014004 [arXiv:2204.09459 [hep-ph]].
- [62] I. Moult, H. X. Zhu and Y. J. Zhu, JHEP 08 (2022), 280 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2022)280 [arXiv:2205.02249 [hep-ph]].
- [63] C. Duhr, B. Mistlberger and G. Vita, Phys. Rev. Lett. 129 (2022) no.16, 162001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.129.162001 [arXiv:2205.02242 [hep-ph]].

- [64] C. Duhr, B. Mistlberger and G. Vita, JHEP **09** (2022), 155 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2022)155 [arXiv:2205.04493 [hep-ph]].
- [65] D. Baranowski, M. Delto, K. Melnikov, A. Pikelner and C. Y. Wang, [arXiv:2412.14001 [hep-ph]].
- [66] D. Baranowski, M. Delto, K. Melnikov, A. Pikelner and C. Y. Wang, [arXiv:2409.11042 [hep-ph]].
- [67] S. Moch, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, Nucl. Phys. B 688 (2004), 101-134 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2004.03.030 [arXiv:hep-ph/0403192 [hep-ph]].
- [68] J. M. Henn, G. P. Korchemsky and B. Mistlberger, JHEP **04** (2020), 018 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2020)018 [arXiv:1911.10174 [hep-th]].
- [69] A. von Manteuffel, E. Panzer and R. M. Schabinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 124 (2020) no.16, 162001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.124.162001 [arXiv:2002.04617 [hep-ph]].
- [70] F. Herzog, S. Moch, B. Ruijl, T. Ueda, J. A. M. Vermaseren and A. Vogt, Phys. Lett. B 790 (2019), 436-443 doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2019.01.060 [arXiv:1812.11818 [hep-ph]].
- [71] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102 (2009), 212002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.212002 [arXiv:0902.3519 [hep-ph]].
- [72] R. N. Lee, A. V. Smirnov and V. A. Smirnov, JHEP **04** (2010), 020 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2010)020 [arXiv:1001.2887 [hep-ph]].
- [73] T. Gehrmann, E. W. N. Glover, T. Huber, N. Ikizlerli and C. Studerus, JHEP **06** (2010), 094 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2010)094 [arXiv:1004.3653 [hep-ph]].
- [74] R. N. Lee, A. von Manteuffel, R. M. Schabinger, A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. 128 (2022) no.21, 212002 doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.128.212002 [arXiv:2202.04660 [hep-ph]].
- [75] W. L. Ju and M. Schönherr, JHEP ${\bf 10}$ (2021), 088 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2021)088 [arXiv:2106.11260 [hep-ph]].