

# Determination of the top-quark on-shell mass $M_t$ via the scale-invariant perturbative relation to its $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass

Xu-Dong Huang<sup>1,2,\*</sup>, Xing-Gang Wu<sup>3,†</sup>, Xu-Chang Zheng<sup>3,‡</sup>, Jiang Yan<sup>3,§</sup>, Zhi-Fei Wu<sup>3</sup>, and Hong-Hao Ma<sup>4¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences,  
19B Yuquan Road, Shijingshan District, Beijing, 100049, P.R. China*

<sup>2</sup> *University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Chinese Academy of Sciences,  
19A Yuquan Road, Shijingshan District, Beijing, 100049, P.R. China*

<sup>3</sup> *Department of Physics, Chongqing Key Laboratory for Strongly Coupled Physics,  
Chongqing University, Chongqing 401331, P.R. China and*

<sup>4</sup> *Center for High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, P.R. China*  
(Dated: September 23, 2022)

In the paper, we firstly improve the scale-setting procedures of the principle of maximum conformality (PMC) such that the correct magnitudes of the  $\alpha_s$  and the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass  $\overline{m}$  of the perturbative QCD series are determined simultaneously with the help of the renormalization group equation. By using the derived formulas, we determine the top-quark on-shell mass via the four loop  $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -on-shell quark mass relation. Its prediction avoids the conventional renormalization scale ambiguity, and a more precise pQCD prediction can be achieved. By taking the top-quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass fixed-point  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) = 162.5_{-1.5}^{+2.1}$  GeV as an input, we obtain,  $M_t \simeq 172.41_{-1.57}^{+2.21}$  GeV, in which the error is the squared average of those from  $\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)$ ,  $\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$ , and the approximate error from the uncalculated five-loop terms predicted by using the Padé approximation approach.

PACS numbers: 12.38.-t, 12.38.Bx, 11.10.Gh

## I. INTRODUCTION

The top quark is the heaviest elementary particle in the Standard Model (SM), and its mass is one of the most important input parameters of the SM. The largest mass amongst the quarks, or equivalently the strongest Yukawa coupling, implies that the top quark plays an important role in governing the stability of the electroweak vacuum. Determining the top-quark mass accurately is helpful not only for precision test of the SM, but also for the search of new physics beyond the SM. Direct measurements of the top quark mass reach a highly precision in proton-proton ( $pp$ ) collisions at the LHC [1–8], which rely on the reconstruction of the top quark decay products and the multipurpose Monte Carlo (MC) event generators. Some other measurements have also been performed in Refs.[9–17]. In the theoretical side, there are many attempts to relate it to the on-shell (OS) scheme mass, c.f. Refs.[18–25]. It has a  $0.5 \sim 1$  GeV uncertainty between the top-quark MC mass ( $M_t^{\text{MC}}$ ) and the top-quark OS mass ( $M_t^{\text{OS}}$ ) [26–32].

The top-quark OS mass has been investigated in detail in Refs.[33–50]. The OS mass can also be related to the modified minimal subtraction ( $\overline{\text{MS}}$ ) scheme mass by using the perturbative relation between the bare mass ( $m_0$ ) and renormalized mass in the OS or  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme, e.g.  $m_0 = Z_m^{\text{OS}} M_t^{\text{OS}}$  and  $m_0 = Z_m^{\overline{\text{MS}}} \overline{m}_t(\mu)$ . The  $Z_m^{\text{OS}}$

and  $Z_m^{\overline{\text{MS}}}$  are the quark mass renormalization constants in the OS or  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme, respectively. In perturbative Quantum Chromodynamics (pQCD) theory, the relation between the OS mass and  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass has been calculated up to four-loop level [51–63]. Using this relation, one can determine the OS mass by using the experimental result of  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass. During the determination, the key issue is to determine the exact values of the strong coupling constant ( $\alpha_s$ ) and the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass ( $\overline{m}$ ). The scale running behavior of  $\alpha_s$  and  $\overline{m}(\mu)$  are governed by a general renormalization group equation (RGE) involving both the  $\beta$  function [64–68] and the quark mass anomalous dimension  $\gamma_m$  [69, 70]. Using the reference points, such as  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1179 \pm 0.0009$  and  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) = 162.5_{-1.5}^{+2.1}$  GeV issued in Particle Data Group [71], one can obtain their numerical values at any scale. The remaining task for determining the precise value of top-quark OS mass is then to fix the correct  $\alpha_s$  and  $\overline{m}_t$  values for the perturbative series of a pQCD approximant.

In general, people take the guessed renormalization scale as the momentum flow of the process, whose purpose is to eliminate large logarithms, or to minimize the higher-order contributions, or to achieve theoretical predictions consistent with the experimental data, and etc. Such naive treatment will violate the renormalization group invariance (RGI) [72–74], which indicates that the predictions for physical observables should be independent of the choice of the renormalization scale. In order to eliminate the artificially introduced renormalization scale ambiguity, the principle of maximum conformality (PMC) has been suggested [75–78]. The PMC provides a rigorous scale-setting approach for obtaining unambiguous fixed-order pQCD predictions consistent with the principles of renormalization group. And it also satis-

\* huangxd@ihep.ac.cn

† wuxg@cqu.edu.cn

‡ zhengxc@cqu.edu.cn

§ yjiang@cqu.edu.cn

¶ mahonghao@pku.edu.cn

fies all of the requirements of RGI. The complete discussions about the PMC can be found in these review articles [79, 80]. The PMC method has been successfully applied to several high-energy processes [81–87], which aim to determine the correct magnitude of the strong running coupling  $\alpha_s$  of the perturbative series by using the procedures performed in Refs.[88, 89]. However, there are also many other progresses associated with both the running coupling  $\alpha_s$  and the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass  $\overline{m}$ . Due to the appearance of  $n_f$ -terms from the quark mass  $\overline{m}$ -running, the formulas listed in Refs.[88, 89] are not applicable in these perturbative series <sup>1</sup>. In this paper, we will improve the PMC scale-setting procedures to determine the top-quark OS mass by simultaneously fixing the correct magnitudes of the  $\alpha_s$  and the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass  $\overline{m}$  of the perturbative series with the help of RGE.

The remaining parts of this paper are organized as follows. In Sec. II, we will show the special degeneracy relations of the nonconformal terms in the perturbative coefficients by using the  $\mathcal{R}_\delta$ -scheme <sup>2</sup>. Then we will give the improved procedures of the PMC scale-setting approach under the running mass scheme. We will apply them to determine the top-quark OS mass  $M_t$  via its perturbative relation to the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass in Sec. III. Section IV is reserved for a summary.

## II. CALCULATION TECHNOLOGY

### A. Observables in $\mathcal{R}_\delta$

As the extension of Ref.[88], we consider the pQCD prediction  $\rho_0(Q^2)$  including the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass. In

the reference scheme  $\mathcal{R}_0$ , it can be written as:

$$\rho_0(Q^2) = \mathcal{C}_0 \overline{m}^n(\mu_r) \left[ 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} r_k (\mu_r^2/Q^2) a_s^k(\mu_r) \right], \quad (1)$$

where  $a_s = \alpha_s/(4\pi)$ ,  $\mu_r$  stands for the renormalization scale, and  $Q$  represents a physical scale of the measured observable,  $\overline{m}$  is the quark running mass,  $n$  is the power of  $\overline{m}$  associated with the tree-level term, and the  $\mathcal{C}_0$  is a global factor. The pQCD series will be independent of the choice of renormalization scale  $\mu_r$ , if it can be possible to calculated up to all orders. However, it is not feasible to achieve this goal due to the difficulty of the high-order calculation. Generally, the pQCD series becomes renormalization scale and scheme dependent at any finite order, whose dependencies can be exposed by using the  $\mathcal{R}_\delta$ -scheme. One can derive the general expression for  $\rho$  in  $\mathcal{R}_\delta$  by using the scale displacements in any  $\mathcal{R}_\delta$ -scheme:

$$a_s(\mu_r) = a_s(\mu_\delta) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left. \frac{d^n a_s(\mu)}{(d \ln \mu^2)^n} \right|_{\mu=\mu_\delta} (-\delta)^n, \quad (2)$$

$$\overline{m}(\mu_r) = \overline{m}(\mu_\delta) + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \left. \frac{d^n \overline{m}(\mu)}{(d \ln \mu^2)^n} \right|_{\mu=\mu_\delta} (-\delta)^n, \quad (3)$$

where  $\delta = -\ln \frac{\mu_r^2}{\mu_\delta^2}$ . It is useful to derive the general displacement relations as expansions up to fixed order, which is shown in the Appendix.

Inserting these expressions into Eq. (1), one can obtain the expression of  $\rho$  for an arbitrary  $\delta$  up to  $a_s^4$ -order in any  $\mathcal{R}_\delta$ -scheme:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_\delta(Q^2) = \mathcal{C}_0 \overline{m}^n(\mu_\delta) & \left\{ 1 + (r_1 + n\gamma_0\delta) a_s(\mu_\delta) + \left[ r_2 + \beta_0 r_1 \delta + n(\gamma_1 + \gamma_0 r_1) \delta + \frac{n^2}{2} \beta_0 \gamma_0 \delta^2 + \frac{n^2}{2} \gamma_0^2 \delta^2 \right] a_s^2(\mu_\delta) \right. \\ & + \left[ r_3 + \beta_1 r_1 \delta + 2\beta_0 r_2 \delta + \beta_0^2 r_1 \delta^2 + n(\gamma_2 + \gamma_0 r_2 + \gamma_1 r_1) \delta + n\beta_0 \left( \gamma_1 + \frac{3\gamma_0 r_1}{2} \right) \delta^2 + \frac{n}{2} \beta_1 \gamma_0 \delta^2 \right. \\ & + \left. \frac{n}{3} \beta_0^2 \gamma_0 \delta^3 + n^2 \left( \gamma_1 \gamma_0 + \frac{\gamma_0^2 r_1}{2} \right) \delta^2 + \frac{n^2}{2} \beta_0 \gamma_0^2 \delta^3 + \frac{n^3}{6} \gamma_0^3 \delta^3 \right] a_s^3(\mu_\delta) + \left[ r_4 + (2\beta_1 r_2 + \beta_2 r_1) \delta \right. \\ & + 3\beta_0 r_3 \delta + \frac{5}{2} \beta_0 \beta_1 r_1 \delta^2 + 3\beta_0^2 r_2 \delta^2 + \beta_0^3 r_1 \delta^3 + n(\gamma_3 + \gamma_0 r_3 + \gamma_1 r_2 + \gamma_2 r_1) \delta + n\beta_0 \left( \frac{3\gamma_2}{2} + \frac{5\gamma_0 r_2}{2} + 2\gamma_1 r_1 \right) \delta^2 \\ & + n \left( \frac{\beta_2 \gamma_0}{2} + \beta_1 \gamma_1 + \frac{3}{2} \beta_1 \gamma_0 r_1 \right) \delta^2 + n\beta_0^2 \left( \gamma_1 + \frac{11\gamma_0 r_1}{6} \right) \delta^3 + \frac{5n}{6} \beta_0 \beta_1 \gamma_0 \delta^3 + \frac{n}{4} \beta_0^3 \gamma_0 \delta^4 \\ & + n^2 \left( \gamma_2 \gamma_0 + \frac{\gamma_1^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma_0^2 r_2}{2} + \gamma_1 \gamma_0 r_1 \right) \delta^2 + n^2 \beta_0 \left( \frac{3\gamma_1 \gamma_0}{2} + \gamma_0^2 r_1 \right) \delta^3 + \frac{n^2}{2} \beta_1 \gamma_0^2 \delta^3 + \frac{11n^2}{24} \beta_0^2 \gamma_0^2 \delta^4 \\ & \left. \left. + n^3 \left( \frac{\gamma_1 \gamma_0^2}{2} + \frac{\gamma_0^3 r_1}{6} \right) \delta^3 + \frac{n^3}{4} \beta_0 \gamma_0^3 \delta^4 + \frac{n^4}{24} \gamma_0^4 \delta^4 \right] a_s^4(\mu_\delta) + \mathcal{O}[a_s^5(\mu_\delta)] \right\}, \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup> During the preparation of this paper, we have observed that a study on the relation between the OS mass and the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass by using PMC has been issued in Ref.[90]. It should be pointed out that the authors there do not distinguish the functions of various  $n_f$ -terms in the perturbative series, which is important to achieve a precise prediction [91]. Thus their

treatments can only be treated as an effective but not an strict application of the PMC.

<sup>2</sup> The  $\mathcal{R}_\delta$ -scheme represents the MS-type renormalization scheme with a subtraction term  $\ln(4\pi) - \gamma_E - \delta$ , where the  $\delta$  is an arbitrary finite number. Especially,  $\mathcal{R}_{\delta=0} = \overline{\text{MS}}$ . Detailed description about the  $\mathcal{R}_\delta$ -scheme can be found in Sec. II of Ref.[88].

where  $\mu_\delta^2 = \mu_r^2 e^\delta$ .

The renormalization equations acquires that the all-orders expression for a physical observable is renormalization scale invariant; i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho_\delta}{d\delta} &= \frac{\partial\rho_\delta}{\partial\delta} + \beta(a_s) \frac{\partial\rho_\delta}{\partial a_s} + \overline{m}\gamma_m(a_s) \frac{\partial\rho_\delta}{\partial\overline{m}} \\ &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Thus, we can obtain

$$\frac{\partial\rho_\delta}{\partial\delta} = -\beta(a_s) \frac{\partial\rho_\delta}{\partial a_s} - \overline{m}\gamma_m(a_s) \frac{\partial\rho_\delta}{\partial\overline{m}}. \quad (6)$$

Therefore, by absorbing all  $\{\beta_i\}$  and  $\{\gamma_i\}$  dependence into the running coupling and running mass, one can obtain a scale-invariant prediction due to the  $\delta$ -dependence

is to be vanished in Eq. (4). The coefficients of the resultant series will thus be equal to those of the conformal theory, e.g.  $\partial\rho_\delta/\partial\delta = 0$ . The expression in Eq. (4) also exposes the pattern of  $\{\beta_i\}$ -terms and  $\{\gamma_i\}$ -terms in the coefficients at each order. It is possible to find that there are some degenerated relations between some of the coefficients of the  $\{\beta_i\}$ -terms and the  $\{\gamma_i\}$ -terms; e.g., the coefficient of  $\beta_0 a_s^2$ ,  $n\gamma_0 a_s^2$  and  $\beta_1 a_s^3$  can be set equal. Thus, one can rewrite the expression of  $\rho$  as the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(Q^2) &= C_0 \overline{m}^n(\mu_r) \left\{ 1 + C_1(\mu_r) a_s(\mu_r) + C_2(\mu_r) a_s^2(\mu_r) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + C_3(\mu_r) a_s^3(\mu_r) + C_4(\mu_r) a_s^4(\mu_r) + \mathcal{O}[a_s^5(\mu_r)] \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where

$$C_1(\mu_r) = \hat{r}_{1,0} + n\gamma_0 \ln \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2}, \quad (8)$$

$$C_2(\mu_r) = \hat{r}_{2,0} + \beta_0 \hat{r}_{2,1} + n\gamma_0 \hat{r}_{2,1} + (\beta_0 \hat{r}_{1,0} + n\gamma_1 + n\gamma_0 \hat{r}_{1,0}) \ln \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2} + \frac{1}{2} (n\beta_0 \gamma_0 + n^2 \gamma_0^2) \ln^2 \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2}, \quad (9)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_3(\mu_r) &= \hat{r}_{3,0} + \beta_1 \hat{r}_{2,1} + 2\beta_0 \hat{r}_{3,1} + \beta_0^2 \hat{r}_{3,2} + n(\gamma_0 \hat{r}_{3,1} + \gamma_1 \hat{r}_{2,1}) + \frac{3n}{2} \beta_0 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{3,2} + \frac{n^2}{2} \gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{3,2} \\ &\quad + [\beta_1 \hat{r}_{1,0} + 2\beta_0 \hat{r}_{2,0} + 2\beta_0^2 \hat{r}_{2,1} + n(\gamma_2 + \gamma_1 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{2,0} + 3\beta_0 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{2,1} + n\gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{2,1})] \ln \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2} \\ &\quad + \left[ \beta_0^2 \hat{r}_{1,0} + n \left( \beta_0 \gamma_1 + \frac{1}{2} \beta_1 \gamma_0 + \frac{3}{2} \beta_0 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{1,0} \right) + n^2 \left( \gamma_0 \gamma_1 + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{1,0} \right) \right] \ln^2 \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2} \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{6} (2n\beta_0^2 \gamma_0 + 3n^2 \beta_0 \gamma_0^2 + n^3 \gamma_0^3) \ln^3 \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_4(\mu_r) &= \hat{r}_{4,0} + \beta_2 \hat{r}_{2,1} + 2\beta_1 \hat{r}_{3,1} + 3\beta_0 \hat{r}_{4,1} + \frac{5}{2} \beta_0 \beta_1 \hat{r}_{3,2} + 3\beta_0^2 \hat{r}_{4,2} + \beta_0^3 \hat{r}_{4,3} + n\beta_0 (2\gamma_1 \hat{r}_{3,2} + \frac{5}{2} \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{4,2}) \\ &\quad + n \left( \frac{3}{2} \beta_1 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{3,2} + \gamma_2 \hat{r}_{2,1} + \gamma_1 \hat{r}_{3,1} + \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{4,1} \right) + \frac{11n}{6} \beta_0^2 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{4,3} + n^2 \left( \frac{\gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{4,2}}{2} + \gamma_1 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{3,2} \right) \\ &\quad + n^2 \beta_0 \gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{4,3} + \frac{n^3}{6} \gamma_0^3 \hat{r}_{4,3} + \left[ \beta_2 \hat{r}_{1,0} + 2\beta_1 \hat{r}_{2,0} + 3\beta_0 \hat{r}_{3,0} + 6\beta_0^2 \hat{r}_{3,1} + 3\beta_0^3 \hat{r}_{3,2} + 5\beta_1 \beta_0 \hat{r}_{2,1} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + n(\gamma_3 + \gamma_2 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \gamma_1 \hat{r}_{2,0} + \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{3,0} + \frac{11}{2} \beta_0^2 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{3,2} + 4\beta_0 \gamma_1 \hat{r}_{2,1} + 5\beta_0 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{3,1} + 3\beta_1 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{2,1}) \right] \ln \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2} \\ &\quad + \left[ 3\beta_0^2 \hat{r}_{2,0} + 3\beta_0^3 \hat{r}_{2,1} + \frac{5}{2} \beta_0 \beta_1 \hat{r}_{1,0} + n \left( \frac{3}{2} \beta_0 \gamma_2 + \beta_1 \gamma_1 + \frac{1}{2} \beta_2 \gamma_0 + \frac{3}{2} \beta_1 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \frac{11}{2} \beta_0^2 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{2,1} \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 2\beta_0 \gamma_1 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \frac{5}{2} \beta_0 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{2,0} \right) + n^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} \gamma_1^2 + \gamma_0 \gamma_2 + \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{2,0} + 3\beta_0 \gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{2,1} \right) + \frac{n^3}{2} \gamma_0^3 \hat{r}_{2,1} \right] \ln^2 \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2} \\ &\quad \left[ \beta_0^3 \hat{r}_{1,0} + n \left( \beta_0^2 \gamma_1 + \frac{11}{6} \beta_0^2 \gamma_0 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \frac{5}{6} \beta_0 \beta_1 \gamma_0 \right) + n^2 \left( \beta_0 \gamma_0^2 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \frac{1}{2} \beta_1 \gamma_0^2 + \frac{3}{2} \beta_0 \gamma_0 \gamma_1 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + n^3 \left( \frac{1}{6} \gamma_0^3 \hat{r}_{1,0} + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_0^2 \gamma_1 \right) \right] \ln^3 \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2} + \left( \frac{n}{4} \beta_0^3 \gamma_0 + \frac{11n^2}{24} \beta_0^2 \gamma_0^2 + \frac{n^3}{4} \beta_0 \gamma_0^3 + \frac{n^4}{24} \gamma_0^4 \right) \ln^4 \frac{\mu_r^2}{Q^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where the  $\hat{r}_{i,j}$  are independent of  $\mu_r$ , the  $\hat{r}_{i,0}$  are conformal coefficients, and the  $\{\beta_i\}$ -terms and  $\{\gamma_i\}$ -terms are the nonconformal terms. In the case  $n = 0$ , one can obtain scale independent conformal series by applying the

PMC procedures shown in Ref.[88, 89], which indicates that only the  $\{\beta_i\}$ -terms appear in the pQCD series. In the next section, we will firstly show the formulas in the case  $n \neq 0$ .

## B. PMC single-scale approach under the running mass scheme

Adopting the idea of PMC single-scale approach [89], the effective running coupling  $a_s(Q_*)$  and running mass  $\overline{m}(Q_*)$  can be formed by absorbing all the nonconformal terms. Eq. (7) will change to the following conformal series,

$$\rho(Q) = C_0 \overline{m}^n(Q_*) \left\{ 1 + \hat{r}_{1,0} a_s(Q_*) + \hat{r}_{2,0} a_s^2(Q_*) + \hat{r}_{3,0} a_s^3(Q_*) + \hat{r}_{4,0} a_s^4(Q_*) + \mathcal{O}[a_s^5(Q_*)] \right\}, \quad (12)$$

where  $Q_*$  is the PMC scale. More explicitly, by using scale displacement relations to shift the scale  $\mu_r$  to  $Q_*$  in the Eq. (7), the PMC scale  $Q_*$  is determined by requiring all the nonconformal terms vanish.

Due to its perturbative nature, the solution of  $\ln \frac{Q^2}{Q_*^2}$  and

can be expand as a power series over  $a_s(Q_*)$ ; i.e.,

$$\ln \frac{Q^2}{Q_*^2} = \sum_{i=0}^n S_i a_s^i(Q_*), \quad (13)$$

where  $S_i$  are perturbative coefficients that can be derived by using the known pQCD series. For  $n \neq 0$ , the first four coefficients are

$$S_0 = 0, \quad (14)$$

$$S_1 = -\frac{(\beta_0 + n\gamma_0)\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n\gamma_0}, \quad (15)$$

$$S_2 = \hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{2,1} - \hat{r}_{3,1} - \frac{n\gamma_0\hat{r}_{3,2}}{2} - \frac{\beta_1\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n\gamma_0} + \beta_0 \left( \frac{\gamma_1\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n\gamma_0^2} + \frac{2\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{2,1} - 2\hat{r}_{3,1}}{n\gamma_0} - \frac{3\hat{r}_{3,2}}{2} \right) + \beta_0^2 \left( \frac{\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n^2\gamma_0^2} - \frac{\hat{r}_{3,2}}{n\gamma_0} \right), \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} S_3 = & \hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{3,1} - \hat{r}_{1,0}^2\hat{r}_{2,1} + \hat{r}_{2,0}\hat{r}_{2,1} - \hat{r}_{4,1} + \frac{n\gamma_0}{2}(\hat{r}_{2,1}^2 + \hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{3,2} - \hat{r}_{4,2}) - \frac{n\gamma_1\hat{r}_{3,2}}{2} - \frac{n^2\gamma_0^2\hat{r}_{4,3}}{6} - \frac{\beta_2\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n\gamma_0} \\ & + \beta_1 \left( \frac{\gamma_1\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n\gamma_0^2} + \frac{2\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{2,1} - 2\hat{r}_{3,1}}{n\gamma_0} - \frac{3\hat{r}_{3,2}}{2} \right) + \beta_0\beta_1 \left( \frac{2\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n^2\gamma_0^2} - \frac{5\hat{r}_{3,2}}{2n\gamma_0} \right) + \beta_0 \left( \frac{5\hat{r}_{2,1}^2}{2} - n\gamma_0\hat{r}_{4,3} - \frac{5\hat{r}_{4,2}}{2} \right) \\ & + 2\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{3,2} - \frac{n\gamma_1\hat{r}_{3,2} + 6\hat{r}_{2,1}\hat{r}_{1,0}^2 - 6\hat{r}_{3,1}\hat{r}_{1,0} - 6\hat{r}_{2,0}\hat{r}_{2,1} + 6\hat{r}_{4,1}}{2n\gamma_0} - \frac{\gamma_1^2\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n\gamma_0^3} + \frac{\gamma_2\hat{r}_{2,1} + 2\gamma_1\hat{r}_{3,1} - 2\gamma_1\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n\gamma_0^2} \\ & + \beta_0^2 \left( \frac{7\hat{r}_{2,1}^2 + 5\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{3,2} - 6\hat{r}_{4,2}}{2n\gamma_0} + \frac{n\gamma_1\hat{r}_{3,2} - 3\hat{r}_{2,1}\hat{r}_{1,0}^2 + 2\hat{r}_{3,1}\hat{r}_{1,0} + 2\hat{r}_{2,0}\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n^2\gamma_0^2} - \frac{2\gamma_1\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{2,1}}{n^3\gamma_0^3} - \frac{11\hat{r}_{4,3}}{6} \right) \\ & \beta_0^3 \left( \frac{3\hat{r}_{2,1}^2 + 2\hat{r}_{1,0}\hat{r}_{3,2}}{2n^2\gamma_0^2} - \frac{\hat{r}_{2,1}\hat{r}_{1,0}^2}{n^3\gamma_0^3} - \frac{\hat{r}_{4,3}}{n\gamma_0} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

It can be found that the PMC scale  $Q_*$  is explicitly independent of the choice of the renormalization scale  $\mu_r$  at any fixed order. The magnitudes of the running mass  $\overline{m}$  and running coupling constant  $a_s$  are determined simultaneously. Matching with the  $\mu_r$ -independent conformal coefficients  $r_{i,0}$ , the conventional renormalization scale ambiguity is eliminated. In the following section, we will apply these formulas to determine the top-quark OS mass  $M_t$  via its perturbative relation to the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass.

## III. NUMERICAL RESULTS

To do the numerical calculation, we adopt  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1179 \pm 0.0009$  and  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) = 162.5_{-1.5}^{+2.1}$  GeV [71]. And the running of the strong coupling  $\alpha_s(\mu_r)$  is evaluated by using the RunDec [92].

### A. Properties of the top-quark on-shell mass $M_t$

The top-quark OS mass can be expressed as following perturbative series by using the relation between the OS mass and the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass; i.e.,

$$M_t = \overline{m}_t(\mu_r) \left\{ 1 + C_1(\mu_r) a_s(\mu_r) + C_2(\mu_r) a_s^2(\mu_r) + C_3(\mu_r) a_s^3(\mu_r) + C_4(\mu_r) a_s^4(\mu_r) + \mathcal{O}[a_s^5(\mu_r)] \right\} \quad (18)$$

where the perturbative coefficients  $C_i$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3, 4$ ) have been known in Refs.[59, 60] and  $C_n(\mu_r)$  are functions of  $\ln(\mu_r^2/\overline{m}_t^2(\mu_r))$ . The  $\mu_r$  dependence of the top-quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass  $\overline{m}_t(\mu_r)$  is governed by the quark mass anomalous dimension  $\gamma_m$ , which has been calculated up to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$  [93, 94]. Then the top-quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass

$\overline{m}_t(\mu_r)$  can be fixed by the following equation [94]:

$$\overline{m}_t(\mu_r) = \overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) \frac{c_t[\alpha_s(\mu_r)/\pi]}{c_t[\alpha_s(\overline{m}_t)/\pi]} \quad (19)$$

where  $c_t(x) = x^{4/7}(1 + 1.19796x + 1.79348x^2 - 0.683433x^3 - 3.53562x^4)$ .




FIG. 1. The top-quark OS mass  $M_t$  versus the renormalization scale ( $\mu_r$ ) under conventional scale-setting approach up to different perturbative orders.

By taking all input parameters to be their central values, we show the top-quark OS mass  $M_t$  under conventional scale-setting approach in FIG. 1. FIG. 1 indicates that the conventional renormalization scale dependence becomes small when more loop terms have been included. Numerically, we have  $M_t|_{\text{Conv.}} = [172.23, 172.88]$  for  $\mu_r \in [\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)/2, 2\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)]$ ; e.g., the net scale error is  $\sim 0.4\%$ . It should be pointed out that such small net scale dependence for the prediction up to  $a_s^4$ -order is due to the well convergent behavior of the perturbative series. The relative magnitudes of the leading-order-terms (LO): next-to-leading-order-terms (NLO): next-to-next-to-leading-order-terms ( $\text{N}^2\text{LO}$ ): next-to-next-to-next-to-leading-order-terms ( $\text{N}^3\text{LO}$ ): next-to-next-to-next-to-next-to-leading-order-terms ( $\text{N}^4\text{LO}$ )  $\simeq 1: 4.60\%: 0.98\%: 0.30\%: 0.12\%$  for the case of  $\mu_r = \overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$ , and also due to the cancellation of scale dependence among different orders. However, the renormalization scale uncertainty at each perturbative order is still large and unchangeable. For example, the  $M_t$  up to  $\text{N}^4\text{LO}$ -level has the following perturbative behavior:

$$\begin{aligned} M_t|_{\text{Conv.}} &= 162.5_{-0.83}^{-8.15} + 7.48_{+0.62}^{+6.36} + 1.60_{+0.14}^{+1.80} \\ &\quad + 0.49_{+0.03}^{+0.47} + 0.19_{+0.01}^{+0.14} \\ &= 172.26_{-0.03}^{+0.62} (\text{GeV}) \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where the central values are for  $\mu_r = \overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  GeV, and the errors are obtained by varying  $\mu_r \in [\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)/2, 2\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)]$ . It shows that the absolute scale errors are about 5%, 86%, 115%, 98%, and 74% for the LO: NLO:  $\text{N}^2\text{LO}$ :  $\text{N}^3\text{LO}$ :  $\text{N}^4\text{LO}$ , respectively.




FIG. 2. The top-quark OS mass  $M_t$  versus the renormalization scale ( $\mu_r$ ) under PMC single-scale approach up to different perturbative orders.

Similarly, we present  $M_t$  under PMC scale-setting approach in FIG. 2. After applying the PMC scale-setting procedures shown in Section II, the perturbative nature of the top-quark OS mass  $M_t$  pQCD series is greatly improved. For example, the convergence of  $M_t$  pQCD series is improved because of the elimination of divergent renormalon terms  $n!\beta_i^n a_s^n$ , and the relative magnitudes of the LO: NLO:  $\text{N}^2\text{LO}$ :  $\text{N}^3\text{LO}$ :  $\text{N}^4\text{LO}$  of the pQCD series changes to 1: 4.79%:  $-1.15\%$ :  $-0.15\%$ : 0.07%. This leads to the results of  $M_t$  up to different orders are nearly consistent with each other. Furthermore, there is no renormalization scale ambiguity for the PMC prediction; e.g., FIG. 2 also shows that  $M_t$  is independent to any choice of  $\mu_r$ . Numerically, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M_t|_{\text{PMC}} &= \overline{m}_t(Q_*) \left\{ 1 + \hat{r}_{1,0} a_s(Q_*) + \hat{r}_{2,0} a_s^2(Q_*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \hat{r}_{3,0} a_s^3(Q_*) + \hat{r}_{4,0} a_s^4(Q_*) + \mathcal{O}[a_s^5(Q_*)] \right\} \\ &= 166.49 + 7.97 - 1.92 - 0.25 + 0.12 \\ &= 172.41 (\text{GeV}), \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the PMC scale  $Q_*$  can be fixed up to  $\text{N}^2\text{LL}$  accuracy by using Eqs.(13-17); i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \ln \frac{Q_*^2}{\overline{m}_t^2(Q_*)} &= -68.73 a_s(Q_*) + 247.483 a_s^2(Q_*) \\ &\quad - 6447.27 a_s^3(Q_*), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

which leads to  $Q_* = 123.3$  GeV.  $Q_*$  is independent of the choice of  $\mu_r$ . Due to its perturbative nature, we take the magnitude of the last known term as the unknown  $\text{N}^3\text{LL}$  term. As a conservative estimation of the unknown perturbative terms, we obtain a scale shift of  $\Delta Q_* = \begin{pmatrix} +0.2 \\ -0.3 \end{pmatrix}$  GeV and then

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{PMC}} = \begin{pmatrix} +0.04 \\ -0.03 \end{pmatrix} (\text{GeV}). \quad (23)$$

This error is called as *the first kind of residual scale dependence due to unknown higher-order terms* [95].

## B. Theoretical uncertainties

In the pQCD calculation, the magnitude of unknown perturbative terms is also a major source of errors. It is helpful to find a reliable prediction of the unknown higher-order terms. The Padé approximation approach (PAA) [96, 97] is a well known method to estimate the  $(n+1)$ -th-order coefficient for a given  $n$ -th-order perturbative series, which has been tested on various known QCD results [98]. More explicitly, for the pQCD approximant  $\rho(Q) = c_1 a_s + c_2 a_s^2 + c_3 a_s^3 + c_4 a_s^4$ , the preferable  $[n/n+1]$ -type PAA predictions [99] of the  $a_s^5$ -terms of  $M_t$  under the conventional scale-setting approach is

$$\rho_{[1/2]}^{\text{N}^5\text{LO}} = \frac{2c_2 c_3 c_4 - c_3^3 - c_1 c_4^2}{c_2^2 - c_1 c_3} a_s^5, \quad (24)$$

and the preferable  $[0/n-1]$ -type PAA predictions the  $a_s^5$ -terms of  $M_t$  under the PMC scale-setting approach [81] is

$$\rho_{[0/3]}^{\text{N}^5\text{LO}} = \frac{c_2^4 - 3c_1 c_2^2 c_3 + 2c_1^2 c_2 c_4 + c_1^2 c_3^2}{c_1^3} a_s^5. \quad (25)$$

This error could be called as *the second kind of residual scale dependence* due to unknown higher-order terms. Then, our prediction of the magnitude of the  $\text{N}^5\text{LO}$ -terms of top-quark OS mass  $M_t$  is

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{Conv.}}^{\text{N}^5\text{LO}} = \pm 0.08(\text{GeV}), \quad (26)$$

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{PMC}}^{\text{N}^5\text{LO}} = \pm 0.02(\text{GeV}). \quad (27)$$

Note that, the conventional result is obtained by taking  $\mu_r = \overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$ , whose numerical result will vary with the renormalization scale. However, the PAA prediction of the PMC series is independent of the choice of  $\mu_r$ , since the PMC coefficients are scale-invariant.

The squared average of the above two residual scale dependence leads to a net perturbative error due to uncalculated higher-order terms under conventional and PMC scale-setting approaches; i.e.,

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{Conv.}}^{\text{High order}} = (+0.63, -0.09)(\text{GeV}), \quad (28)$$

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{PMC}}^{\text{High order}} = \pm 0.04(\text{GeV}). \quad (29)$$

This shows that the PMC scale-invariant series provides a more accurate basis than the conventional scale-dependent one for estimating the errors caused by uncalculated higher-order terms.

There is theoretical error due to  $\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)$ . As an estimation, using  $\alpha_s(M_Z) = 0.1179 \pm 0.0009$  [71], we obtain

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{Conv.}}^{\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)} = \pm 0.09(\text{GeV}), \quad (30)$$

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{PMC}}^{\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)} = (+0.10, -0.08)(\text{GeV}). \quad (31)$$

As for the error from the choice of the top-quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass  $\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) = (+2.1, -1.5)\text{ GeV}$ , we obtain

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{Conv.}}^{\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)} = (+2.20, -1.57)(\text{GeV}), \quad (32)$$

$$\Delta M_t|_{\text{PMC}}^{\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)} = (+2.21, -1.57)(\text{GeV}). \quad (33)$$

This indicates that the top-quark OS mass could depend almost linearly on its  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass, since the error is at the same order of  $\mathcal{O}(\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t))$  <sup>3</sup>.

## IV. SUMMARY

In the present paper, we improve the PMC scale-setting procedures for eliminating the conventional renormalization scale ambiguity of the predictions under the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass scheme, which simultaneously determine correct magnitudes of the  $\alpha_s$  and the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass  $\overline{m}$  of the perturbative series with the help of the RGE. By applying such formulas, we have obtained a precise top-quark OS mass,

$$M_t|_{\text{Conv.}} = 172.26_{-1.58}^{+2.29}(\text{GeV}), \quad (34)$$

$$M_t|_{\text{PMC}} = 172.41_{-1.57}^{+2.21}(\text{GeV}), \quad (35)$$

where the errors are mean square of those from  $\Delta M_t|_{\text{High order}}$ ,  $\Delta M_t|_{\Delta\alpha_s(M_Z)}$ , and  $\Delta M_t|_{\text{Conv.}}^{\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)}$ . Among the errors, the one caused by  $\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  is dominant <sup>4</sup>, and we need more accurate data to suppress this uncertainty. The conventional predictions have still the renormalization scale uncertainty by varying  $\mu_r \in [\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)/2, 2\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)]$ , even though its magnitude is small due to the cancellation of scale errors among different orders. Up to the present known  $\text{N}^4\text{LO}$  level, the predictions under the PMC and conventional scale-setting approaches are both consistent with the newest experimental measurement [9].

The accuracy of the pQCD prediction under the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass scheme depends strongly on the exact value of  $\alpha_s$  and  $\overline{m}$ . After applying the PMC, the correct values of the effective  $\alpha_s$  and  $\overline{m}$  can be determined, its resultant more convergent pQCD series also leads to a much smaller residual scale dependence, thus a reliable and precise pQCD prediction can be achieved. It is also a very useful method to determine the bottom-quark OS mass and the charm-quark OS mass in the future.

**Acknowledgments:** We thank Sheng-Quan Wang, Jian-Ming Shen, Jun Zeng and Qing Yu for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant No.12175025 and No.12147102, and by the graduate research and innovation foundation of Chongqing, China under Grant No.ydstd1912.

<sup>3</sup> Due to the experimentally measured value of top-quark OS mass is more precise than that of the top-quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass, one can extract the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  by using the Eq.(18) or the resultant PMC series. Such discussion has been shown in the Appendix.

<sup>4</sup> If the value of  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  can be measured very accurately to avoid the  $\Delta\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  error, we will obtain  $M_t|_{\text{Conv.}} = 172.26_{-0.13}^{+0.64}(\text{GeV})$ , and  $M_t|_{\text{PMC}} = 172.41_{-0.09}^{+0.11}(\text{GeV})$ .

## APPENDIX

### 1. Scale Displacement Relation

The general scale displacement relations of the strong coupling constant  $a_s$  and the quark running mass  $\overline{m}$  up to fourth-order are

$$\begin{aligned} a_s^k(\mu_0) &= a_s^k(\mu_\delta) + k\beta_0\delta a_s^{k+1}(\mu_\delta) \\ &+ k\left(\beta_1\delta + \frac{k+1}{2}\beta_0^2\delta^2\right)a_s^{k+2}(\mu_\delta)\delta + k\left[\beta_2\right. \\ &+ \frac{2k+3}{2}\beta_0\beta_1\delta^2 + \frac{(k+1)(k+2)}{3!}\beta_0^3\delta^3\left.]a_s^{k+3}(\mu_\delta)\right. \\ &\left. + \mathcal{O}[a_s^{k+4}(\mu_\delta)]\right]. \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{m}^n(\mu_0) &= \overline{m}^n(\mu_\delta)\left\{1 + n\gamma_0\delta a_s + \left[\frac{1}{2}(n\beta_0\gamma_0 + n^2\gamma_0^2)\delta^2\right.\right. \\ &\left. + n\gamma_1\delta\right]a_s^2 + \left[n\gamma_2\delta + \frac{1}{2}(2n\beta_0\gamma_1 + n\beta_1\gamma_0\right. \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\left. + 2n^2\gamma_0\gamma_1\right)\delta^2 + \frac{1}{3!}\left(2n\beta_0^2\gamma_0 + 3n^2\beta_0\gamma_0^2\right. \\ &\left. + n^3\gamma_0^3\right)\delta^3 + \left[n\gamma_3\delta + \frac{1}{2}\left(3n\beta_0\gamma_2\right.\right. \\ &\left. + 2n\beta_1\gamma_1 + n\beta_2\gamma_0 + 2n^2\gamma_0\gamma_2 + n^2\gamma_1^2\right)\delta^2 \\ &+ \frac{1}{3!}\left(6n\beta_0^2\gamma_1 + 5n\beta_0\beta_1\gamma_0 + 9n^2\beta_0\gamma_0\gamma_1\right. \\ &\left. + 3n^2\beta_1\gamma_0^2 + 3n^3\gamma_0^2\gamma_1\right)\delta^3 + \frac{1}{4!}\left(6n\beta_0^3\gamma_0\right. \\ &\left. + 11n^2\beta_0^2\gamma_0^2 + 6n^3\beta_0\gamma_0^3 + n^4\gamma_0^4\right)\delta^4\left.]a_s^4\right. \\ &\left. + \mathcal{O}(a_s^5)\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (37)$$

### 2. Degeneracy Relation

Due to the special degeneracy found in Eq. (4), the expression for  $\rho$  at  $\mu_r = Q$  can be rewritten as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho(Q^2) &= \mathcal{C}_0\overline{m}^n(Q)\left\{1 + \hat{r}_{1,0}a_s(Q) + (\hat{r}_{2,0} + \beta_0\hat{r}_{2,1} + n\gamma_0\hat{r}_{2,1})a_s^2(Q)\right. \\ &+ \left[\hat{r}_{3,0} + \beta_1\hat{r}_{2,1} + 2\beta_0\hat{r}_{3,1} + \beta_0^2\hat{r}_{3,2} + n(\gamma_0\hat{r}_{3,1} + \gamma_1\hat{r}_{2,1}) + \frac{3n}{2}\beta_0\gamma_0\hat{r}_{3,2} + \frac{n^2}{2}\gamma_0^2\hat{r}_{3,2}\right]a_s^3(Q) \\ &+ \left[\hat{r}_{4,0} + \beta_2\hat{r}_{2,1} + 2\beta_1\hat{r}_{3,1} + 3\beta_0\hat{r}_{4,1} + \frac{5}{2}\beta_0\beta_1\hat{r}_{3,2} + 3\beta_0^2\hat{r}_{4,2} + \beta_0^3\hat{r}_{4,3} + n\beta_0\left(2\gamma_1\hat{r}_{3,2} + \frac{5}{2}\gamma_0\hat{r}_{4,2}\right)\right. \\ &+ n\left(\frac{3}{2}\beta_1\gamma_0\hat{r}_{3,2} + \gamma_2\hat{r}_{2,1} + \gamma_1\hat{r}_{3,1} + \gamma_0\hat{r}_{4,1}\right) + \frac{11n}{6}\beta_0^2\gamma_0\hat{r}_{4,3} + n^2\left(\frac{\gamma_0^2\hat{r}_{4,2}}{2} + \gamma_1\gamma_0\hat{r}_{3,2}\right) + n^2\beta_0\gamma_0^2\hat{r}_{4,3} \\ &\left. + \frac{n^3}{6}\gamma_0^3\hat{r}_{4,3}\right]a_s^4(Q) + \mathcal{O}[a_s^5(Q)]\left.\right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

On the other hand, a pQCD calculation prediction for a physical observable at  $\mu_r = Q$  is

$$\rho(Q^2) = \mathcal{C}_0\overline{m}^n(Q)\left[1 + \sum_{i=1}^{\infty}\left(\sum_{j=0}^{i-1}c_{i,j}n_f^j\right)a_s^i(Q)\right] \quad (39)$$

Comparing the Eq. (38) with Eq. (39) in each order, the coefficients of  $n_f$  series can be matched to the  $r_{i,j}$  coefficients in a unique way<sup>5</sup>. More explicitly, one can derive the relations between  $c_{n,j}$  and  $r_{i,j}$  by using the  $\beta_i$  and  $\gamma_i$  coefficients given in [68, 94]; e.g., it is easy to find that  $\hat{r}_{1,0} = c_{1,0}$ . Substituting  $\beta_0 = 11 - \frac{2}{3}n_f$  and  $\gamma_0 = 4$  into the  $a_s^2$ -order coefficient of Eq. (38), we can find  $r_{2,0}$

and  $r_{2,1}$ :

$$c_{2,0} + c_{2,1}n_f = \hat{r}_{2,0} + \left(11 - \frac{2}{3}n_f\right)\hat{r}_{2,1} + 4n\hat{r}_{2,1}, \quad (40)$$

which leads to

$$\hat{r}_{1,0} = c_{1,0}, \quad (41)$$

$$\hat{r}_{2,0} = c_{2,0} + \left(6n + \frac{33}{2}\right)c_{2,1}, \hat{r}_{2,1} = -\frac{3}{2}c_{2,1}. \quad (42)$$

Following the same procedures, one can derive these relations up to any order. In present work, we will use the relations up to fourth order; i.e.,

<sup>5</sup> In principle, one must treat the  $n_f$  terms unrelated to renormalization of the running coupling and running mass as part of the

conformal coefficient; e.g., the  $n_f$  terms coming from light-by-light diagrams in QCD belongs to the conformal series.

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r}_{3,0} &= c_{3,0} + \left(3n + \frac{33}{2}\right) c_{3,1} \left(9n^2 + 99n + \frac{1089}{4}\right) c_{3,2} - \left(10n^2 + 11n + \frac{321}{2}\right) c_{2,1}, \\ \hat{r}_{3,1} &= -\frac{3}{4}c_{3,1} - \frac{27n+99}{4}c_{3,2} + \frac{10n+57}{4}c_{2,1}, \hat{r}_{3,2} = \frac{9}{4}c_{3,2},\end{aligned}\quad (43)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r}_{4,0} &= c_{4,0} + \left(2n + \frac{33}{2}\right) c_{4,1} + \left(4n^2 + 66n + \frac{1089}{4}\right) c_{4,2} + \left(8n^3 + 198n^2 + \frac{3267n}{2} + \frac{35937}{8}\right) c_{4,3} \\ &\quad - \left(\frac{50n^3}{3} + 185n^2 + \frac{2595n}{2} + \frac{10593}{2}\right) c_{3,2} - \left(\frac{10n^2}{3} + 15n + \frac{321}{2}\right) c_{3,1} + \left(\frac{20n^3}{27} - 160\zeta_3n^2\right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{2411n^2}{9} - \frac{860n}{3} - 1320\zeta_3n + \frac{11675}{16}\right) c_{2,1},\end{aligned}\quad (44)$$

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{r}_{4,1} &= -\frac{1}{2}c_{4,1} - \frac{1}{2}(5n+33)c_{4,2} - \left(\frac{19n^2}{2} + \frac{495n}{4} + \frac{3267}{8}\right) c_{4,3} + \left(\frac{85n^2}{6} + \frac{401n}{4} + \frac{4113}{8}\right) c_{3,2} \\ &\quad + \left(\frac{5n}{6} + \frac{19}{2}\right) c_{3,1} + \left(\frac{100n^2}{27} + 40\zeta_3n + \frac{2467n}{72} - \frac{479}{4}\right) c_{2,1},\end{aligned}\quad (45)$$

$$\hat{r}_{4,2} = \frac{3}{4}c_{4,2} + \left(\frac{33n}{4} + \frac{297}{8}\right) c_{4,3} - \left(5n + \frac{285}{8}\right) c_{3,2} + \left(\frac{325}{48} - \frac{35n}{18}\right) c_{2,1}, \hat{r}_{4,3} = -\frac{27}{8}c_{4,3}.\quad (46)$$

### 3. Extracting the $\overline{\text{MS}}$ mass $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$

It is also a useful way to extract the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  from the experimental result of OS mass. The PDG [71] shows the world average result of top-quark OS mass is  $M_t = 172.5 \pm 0.7$  GeV, which is more precise than that of the top-quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) = 162.5^{+2.1}_{-1.5}$  GeV.

In the conventional scale-setting approach, one can extract the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  by using the Eq.(18) and setting the renormalization scale  $\mu_r = \overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$ ; i.e.,

$$\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)|_{\text{Conv.}} = 162.73^{+0.67}_{-0.67}(\text{GeV}),\quad (47)$$

where the center value is obtained by adopting  $M_t = 172.5$  GeV and the error is cause by the  $\Delta M_t = \pm 0.7$  GeV.

If considering the uncertainty of the renormalization scale  $\mu_r \in [\frac{1}{2}\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t), 2\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)]$ , we obtain

$$\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)|_{\text{Conv.}} = 162.73^{+0.00}_{-1.16}(\text{GeV}),\quad (48)$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)|_{\text{Conv.}} = 162.73^{+0.67}_{-1.34}(\text{GeV}),\quad (49)$$

where the errors are mean square of  $\Delta M_t = \pm 0.7$  GeV and the renormalization scale  $\mu_r \in [\frac{1}{2}\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t), 2\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)]$ .

In the PMC scale-setting approach, one can extract the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)$  by using the PMC series without

renormalization scale uncertainty; i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned}M_t|_{\text{PMC}} &= \overline{m}_t(Q_*) \left\{ 1 + \hat{r}_{1,0}a_s(Q_*) + \hat{r}_{2,0}a_s^2(Q_*) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \hat{r}_{3,0}a_s^3(Q_*) + \hat{r}_{4,0}a_s^4(Q_*) + \mathcal{O}[a_s^5(Q_*)] \right\}\end{aligned}\quad (50)$$

where the PMC scale  $Q_*$  satisfy

$$\begin{aligned}\ln \frac{Q_*^2}{\overline{m}_t^2(Q_*)} &= -68.73a_s(Q_*) + 247.483a_s^2(Q_*) \\ &\quad - 6447.27a_s^3(Q_*).\end{aligned}\quad (51)$$

Thus, we obtain

$$\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t)|_{\text{PMC}} = 163.08^{+0.66}_{-0.66}(\text{GeV}),\quad (52)$$

where the center value is obtained by adopting  $M_t = 172.5$  GeV and the error is cause by the  $\Delta M_t = \pm 0.7$  GeV. It can be found that the PMC result predicted by Eq. (52) is more accurate than the conventional result predicted by Eq. (49). Finally, the PMC result and the conventional result both overlap with our previous work  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) = 162.6^{+0.4}_{-0.4}$  GeV [84] and the experimental result  $\overline{m}_t(\overline{m}_t) = 162.9 \pm 0.5 \pm 1.0^{+2.1}_{-1.2}$  GeV [10].

[1] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS], Measurement of the top quark mass in the  $t\bar{t} \rightarrow$  dilepton channel from  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV ATLAS data, Phys. Lett. B **761**, 350-371 (2016).

[2] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS], Top-quark mass measurement in the all-hadronic  $t\bar{t}$  decay channel at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV with the ATLAS detector, JHEP **09**, 118 (2017).

[3] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS], Measurement of the top quark mass in the  $t\bar{t} \rightarrow$  lepton+jets channel from  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV ATLAS data and combination with previous results, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 290 (2019).

[4] V. Khachatryan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the top quark mass using proton-proton data at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  and 8

- TeV, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 072004 (2016).
- [5] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the top quark mass in the dileptonic  $t\bar{t}$  decay channel using the mass observables  $M_{b\ell}$ ,  $M_{T2}$ , and  $M_{b\ell\nu}$  in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV, Phys. Rev. D **96**, 032002 (2017).
- [6] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the top quark mass with lepton+jets final states using p p collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 891 (2018), [erratum: Eur. Phys. J. C **82**, 323 (2022)].
- [7] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the top quark mass in the all-jets final state at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV and combination with the lepton+jets channel, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 313 (2019).
- [8] A. Tumasyan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the top quark mass using events with a single reconstructed top quark in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV, JHEP **12**, 161 (2021).
- [9] [CMS], Measurement of the top quark pole mass using  $t\bar{t}$ +jet events in the dilepton final state in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV, [arXiv:2207.02270 [hep-ex]].
- [10] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS], Measurement of the top-quark mass in  $t\bar{t} + 1$ -jet events collected with the ATLAS detector in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV, JHEP **11**, 150 (2019).
- [11] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Measurement of  $t\bar{t}$  normalised multi-differential cross sections in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV, and simultaneous determination of the strong coupling strength, top quark pole mass, and parton distribution functions, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 658 (2020).
- [12] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS], Measurement of lepton differential distributions and the top quark mass in  $t\bar{t}$  production in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV with the ATLAS detector, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, 804 (2017).
- [13] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS], Determination of the top-quark pole mass using  $t\bar{t} + 1$ -jet events collected with the ATLAS experiment in 7 TeV pp collisions, JHEP **10**, 121 (2015).
- [14] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the Jet Mass Distribution and Top Quark Mass in Hadronic Decays of Boosted Top Quarks in pp Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV, Phys. Rev. Lett. **124**, 202001 (2020).
- [15] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the top quark mass using single top quark events in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 8$  TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, 354 (2017).
- [16] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0], Measurement of the Inclusive  $t\bar{t}$  Production Cross Section in  $p\bar{p}$  Collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 1.96$  TeV and Determination of the Top Quark Pole Mass, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 092004 (2016).
- [17] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0], Determination of the pole and  $\overline{MS}$  masses of the top quark from the  $t\bar{t}$  cross section, Phys. Lett. B **703**, 422-427 (2011).
- [18] A. Buckley *et al.*, General-purpose event generators for LHC physics, Phys. Rep. **504**, 145 (2011).
- [19] P. Z. Skands and D. Wicke, Non-perturbative QCD effects and the top mass at the Tevatron, Eur. Phys. J. C **52**, 133 (2007).
- [20] S. Kawabata, Y. Shimizu, Y. Sumino, and H. Yokoya, Weight function method for precise determination of top quark mass at Large Hadron Collider, Phys. Lett. B **741**, 232 (2015).
- [21] J. Kieseler, K. Lipka, and S. O. Moch, Calibration of the Top-Quark Monte Carlo Mass, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 162001 (2016).
- [22] B. Dehnadi, A. H. Hoang, V. Mateu, M. Preisser, and I. W. Stewart, Monte Carlo top quark mass calibration, Proc. Sci., RADCOR2017 (2018) 062.
- [23] A. H. Hoang, What is the Top Quark Mass?, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **70**, 225-255 (2020).
- [24] S. Fleming, A. H. Hoang, S. Mantry, and I. W. Stewart, Jets from massive unstable particles: Top-mass determination, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 074010 (2008).
- [25] V. Khachatryan *et al.* (CMS Collaboration), Measurement of the  $t\bar{t}$  production cross section in the  $e\mu$  channel in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 7$  and 8 TeV, J. High Energy Phys. **08** (2016) 029.
- [26] S. Ferrario Ravasio, T. Ježo, P. Nason and C. Oleari, A theoretical study of top-mass measurements at the LHC using NLO+PS generators of increasing accuracy, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 458 (2018).
- [27] M. Butenschoen, B. Dehnadi, A. H. Hoang, V. Mateu, M. Preisser and I. W. Stewart, Top Quark Mass Calibration for Monte Carlo Event Generators, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 232001 (2016).
- [28] [ATLAS, CDF, CMS and D0], First combination of Tevatron and LHC measurements of the top-quark mass, [arXiv:1403.4427 [hep-ex]].
- [29] S. Moch, S. Weinzierl, S. Alekhin, J. Blumlein, L. de la Cruz, S. Dittmaier, M. Dowling, J. Erler, J. R. Espinosa and J. Fuster, *et al.* High precision fundamental constants at the TeV scale, [arXiv:1405.4781 [hep-ph]].
- [30] A. Juste, S. Mantry, A. Mitov, A. Penin, P. Skands, E. Varnes, M. Vos and S. Wimpenny, Determination of the top quark mass circa 2013: methods, subtleties, perspectives, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 3119 (2014).
- [31] A. H. Hoang, The Top Mass: Interpretation and Theoretical Uncertainties, [arXiv:1412.3649 [hep-ph]].
- [32] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* [CMS], Measurement of the  $t\bar{t}$  production cross section, the top quark mass, and the strong coupling constant using dilepton events in pp collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  TeV, Eur. Phys. J. C **79**, 368 (2019).
- [33] R. Hempfling and B. A. Kniehl, On the relation between the fermion pole mass and MS Yukawa coupling in the standard model, Phys. Rev. D **51**, 1386 (1995).
- [34] K. G. Chetyrkin and M. Steinhauser, Short Distance Mass of a Heavy Quark at Order  $\alpha_s^3$ , Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4001 (1999).
- [35] F. Jegerlehner and M. Y. Kalmykov,  $O(\alpha\alpha_s)$  correction to the pole mass of the  $t$  quark within the standard model, Nucl. Phys. **B676**, 365 (2004).
- [36] S. P. Martin, Fermion self-energies and pole masses at two-loop order in a general renormalizable theory with massless gauge bosons, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 096008 (2005).
- [37] A. B. Galtieri, F. Margaroli and I. Volobouev, Precision measurements of the top quark mass from the Tevatron in the pre-LHC era, Rept. Prog. Phys. **75**, 056201 (2012).
- [38] S. P. Martin, Top-quark pole mass in the tadpole-free  $\overline{MS}$  scheme, Phys. Rev. D **93**, 094017 (2016).
- [39] P. Nason, Theory summary, Proc. Sci., TOP2015 (2016) 056.
- [40] M. Beneke, P. Marquard, P. Nason, and M. Steinhauser, On the ultimate uncertainty of the top quark pole mass, Phys. Lett. B **775**, 63 (2017).
- [41] G. Bevilacqua, H. B. Hartanto, M. Kraus, M. Schulze and M. Worek, Top quark mass studies with  $t\bar{t}j$  at the LHC, JHEP **1803**, 169 (2018).
- [42] S. Q. Wang, X. G. Wu, Z. G. Si, and S. J. Brodsky, A precise determination of the top-quark pole mass, Eur.

- Phys. J. C **78**, 237 (2018).
- [43] P. Marquard, A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov and M. Steinhauser, Four-loop quark mass and field renormalization in the on-shell scheme, PoS **RADCOR2017**, 029 (2018).
- [44] C. Ayala, X. Lobregat and A. Pineda, Hyperasymptotic approximation to the top, bottom and charm pole mass, Phys. Rev. D **101**, 034002 (2020).
- [45] W. L. Ju, G. Wang, X. Wang, X. Xu, Y. Xu and L. L. Yang, Top quark pair production near threshold: single/double distributions and mass determination, JHEP **2006**, 158 (2020).
- [46] S. Q. Wang, X. G. Wu, J. M. Shen and S. J. Brodsky, Precise determination of the top-quark pole mass from the  $t\bar{t}$  production cross-section at the LHC, arXiv:2011.00535 [hep-ph].
- [47] A. M. Cooper-Sarkar, M. Czakon, M. A. Lim, A. Mitov and A. S. Papanastasiou, Simultaneous extraction of  $\alpha_s$  and  $m_t$  from LHC  $t\bar{t}$  differential distributions, arXiv:2010.04171 [hep-ph].
- [48] M. S. Gao, S. R. Yuan and J. Gao, Top-quark mass determination from t-channel single top production at the LHC, JHEP **04**, 054 (2021).
- [49] M. Beneke, Pole mass renormalon and its ramifications, Eur. Phys. J. ST **230**, 2565-2579 (2021).
- [50] S. Alioli, J. Fuster, M. V. Garzelli, A. Gavardi, A. Irlles, D. Melini, S. O. Moch, P. Uwer and K. Voß, Top-quark mass extraction from  $t\bar{t}j + X$  events at the LHC: theory predictions, [arXiv:2203.07344 [hep-ph]].
- [51] R. Tarrach, The pole mass in perturbative QCD, Nucl. Phys. **B183**, 384 (1981).
- [52] N. Gray, D. J. Broadhurst, W. Grafe, and K. Schilcher, Three loop relation of quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  and pole masses, Z. Phys. C **48**, 673 (1990).
- [53] K. G. Chetyrkin and M. Steinhauser, ‘The relation between the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  and the on-shell quark mass at order  $\alpha_s^3$ , Nucl. Phys. **B573**, 617 (2000).
- [54] K. Melnikov and T. V. Ritbergen, The three loop relation between the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  and the pole quark masses, Phys. Lett. B **482**, 99 (2000).
- [55] F. Jegerlehner, M. Y. Kalmykov, and O. Veretin,  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  vs. pole masses of gauge bosons II: Two loop electroweak fermion corrections, Nucl. Phys. **B658**, 49 (2003).
- [56] F. Jegerlehner and M. Y. Kalmykov,  $O(\alpha_s)$  relation between pole and  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  mass of the  $t$  quark, Acta Phys. Polon. B **34**, 5335 (2003).
- [57] M. Faisst, J. H. Kuhn, and O. Veretin, Pole versus MS mass definitions in the electroweak theory, Phys. Lett. B **589**, 35 (2004).
- [58] P. Marquard, L. Mihaila, J. H. Piclum, and M. Steinhauser, Relation between the pole and the minimally subtracted mass in dimensional regularization and dimensional reduction to three-loop order, Nucl. Phys. **B773**, 1 (2007).
- [59] P. Marquard, A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov, and M. Steinhauser, Quark Mass Relations to Four-Loop Order in Perturbative QCD, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 142002 (2015).
- [60] P. Marquard, A. V. Smirnov, V. A. Smirnov, M. Steinhauser, and D. Wellmann,  $\overline{\text{MS}}$ -on-shell quark mass relation up to four loops in QCD and a general  $SU(N)$  gauge group, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 074025 (2016).
- [61] A. L. Kataev and V. S. Molokoedov, Dependence of Five- and Six-loop estimated QCD corrections to the relation between pole and running masses of heavy quarks on the number of light flavors, JETP Lett. **108**, 777 (2018).
- [62] A. L. Kataev and V. S. Molokoedov, Least squares method: Application to analysis of the flavor dependence of the QCD relation between pole and scheme running heavy quark masses, Theor. Math. Phys. **200**, 1374 (2019).
- [63] A. L. Kataev and V. S. Molokoedov, Multiloop contributions to the on-shell- $\overline{\text{MS}}$  heavy quark mass relation in QCD and the asymptotic structure of the corresponding series: the updated consideration, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 1160 (2020).
- [64] H. D. Politzer, Reliable Perturbative Results for Strong Interactions?, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1346 (1973).
- [65] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Ultraviolet Behavior of Nonabelian Gauge Theories, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1343 (1973).
- [66] H. D. Politzer, Asymptotic freedom: An approach to strong interactions, Phys. Rep. **14**, 129 (1974).
- [67] D. J. Gross and F. Wilczek, Asymptotically free gauge theories. I, Phys. Rev. D **8**, 3633 (1973).
- [68] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, and J. H. Kühn, Five-Loop Running of the QCD Coupling Constant, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, 082002 (2017).
- [69] J. A. M. Vermaseren, S. A. Larin, and T. van Ritbergen, The four loop quark mass anomalous dimension and the invariant quark mass, Phys. Lett. B **405**, 327 (1997).
- [70] K. G. Chetyrkin, Quark mass anomalous dimension to  $O(\alpha_s^4)$ , Phys. Lett. B **404**, 161 (1997).
- [71] R.L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Review of Particle Physics, PTEP **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [72] S. J. Brodsky and X. G. Wu, Self-consistency requirements of the renormalization group for setting the renormalization scale, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 054018 (2012).
- [73] X. G. Wu, S. J. Brodsky, and M. Mojaza, The renormalization scale-setting problem in QCD, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **72**, 44 (2013).
- [74] X. G. Wu, Y. Ma, S. Q. Wang, H. B. Fu, H. H. Ma, S. J. Brodsky, and M. Mojaza, Renormalization group invariance and optimal QCD renormalization Scale-Setting, Rept. Prog. Phys. **78**, 126201 (2015).
- [75] S. J. Brodsky and X. G. Wu, Scale setting using the extended renormalization group and the principle of maximum conformality: The QCD coupling constant at four loops, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 034038 (2012).
- [76] S. J. Brodsky and L. Di Giustino, Setting the renormalization scale in QCD: The principle of maximum conformality, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 085026 (2012).
- [77] S. J. Brodsky and X. G. Wu, Eliminating the Renormalization Scale Ambiguity for Top-Pair Production Using the Principle of Maximum Conformality, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 042002 (2012).
- [78] M. Mojaza, S. J. Brodsky, and X. G. Wu, Systematic All-Orders Method to Eliminate Renormalization-Scale and Scheme Ambiguities in Perturbative QCD, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 192001 (2013).
- [79] X. G. Wu, J. M. Shen, B. L. Du, and S. J. Brodsky, Novel demonstration of the renormalization group invariance of the fixed-order predictions using the principle of maximum conformality and the  $C$ -scheme coupling, Phys. Rev. D **97**, 094030 (2018).
- [80] X. G. Wu, J. M. Shen, B. L. Du, X. D. Huang, S. Q. Wang, and S. J. Brodsky, The QCD renormalization group equation and the elimination of fixed-order

- scheme-and-scale ambiguities using the principle of maximum conformality, *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **108**, 103706 (2019).
- [81] B. L. Du, X. G. Wu, J. M. Shen, and S. J. Brodsky, Extending the Predictive Power of Perturbative QCD, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 182 (2019).
- [82] Q. Yu, X. G. Wu, J. Zeng, X. D. Huang, and H. M. Yu, The heavy quarkonium inclusive decays using the principle of maximum conformality, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 362 (2020).
- [83] Q. Yu, X. G. Wu, S. Q. Wang, X. D. Huang, J. M. Shen, and J. Zeng, Properties of the decay  $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  using the approximate  $\alpha_s^4$  corrections and the principle of maximum conformality, *Chin. Phys. C* **43**, 093102 (2019).
- [84] X. D. Huang, X. G. Wu, J. Zeng, Q. Yu, X. C. Zheng, and S. Xu, Determination of the top-quark  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  running mass via its perturbative relation to the on-shell mass with the help of principle of maximum conformality, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 114024 (2020).
- [85] H. M. Yu, W. L. Sang, X. D. Huang, J. Zeng, X. G. Wu, and S. J. Brodsky, Scale-Fixed Predictions for  $\gamma + \eta_c$  production in electron-positron collisions at NNLO in perturbative QCD, *JHEP* **2101**, 131 (2021).
- [86] X. D. Huang, X. G. Wu, X. C. Zheng, Q. Yu, S. Q. Wang, and J. M. Shen,  $Z$ -boson hadronic decay width up to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$ -order QCD corrections using the single-scale approach of the principle of maximum conformality, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 291 (2021).
- [87] X. D. Huang, X. G. Wu, Q. Yu, X. C. Zheng, and J. Zeng, The Gross-Llewellyn Smith sum rule up to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^4)$ -order QCD corrections, *Nucl. Phys. B* **969**, 115466 (2021).
- [88] S. J. Brodsky, M. Mojaza, and X. G. Wu, Systematic scale-setting to all orders: The principle of maximum conformality and commensurate scale relations, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 014027 (2014).
- [89] J. M. Shen, X. G. Wu, B. L. Du, and S. J. Brodsky, Novel all-orders single-scale approach to QCD renormalization scale-setting, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 094006 (2017).
- [90] D. Salinas-Arizmendi and I. Schmidt, Relation between polar and running masses of heavy quarks using the principle of maximum conformality, [arXiv:2209.06881 [hep-ph]].
- [91] S. Q. Wang, X. G. Wu, X. C. Zheng, J. M. Shen and Q. L. Zhang, The Higgs boson inclusive decay channels  $H \rightarrow b\bar{b}$  and  $H \rightarrow gg$  up to four-loop level, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2825 (2014).
- [92] F. Herren and M. Steinhauser, Version 3 of RunDec and CRunDec, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **224**, 333-345 (2018).
- [93] K. G. Chetyrkin, Four-loop renormalization of QCD: Full set of renormalization constants and anomalous dimensions, *Nucl. Phys.* **B710**, 499 (2005).
- [94] P. A. Baikov, K. G. Chetyrkin, and J. H. Kühn, Quark mass and field anomalous dimensions to  $\mathcal{O}(\alpha_s^5)$ , *J. High Energy Phys.* **10** (2014) 076.
- [95] X. C. Zheng, X. G. Wu, S. Q. Wang, J. M. Shen, and Q. L. Zhang, Reanalysis of the BFKL Pomeron at the next-to-leading logarithmic accuracy, *J. High Energy Phys.* **10**, 117 (2013).
- [96] J. L. Basdevant, The Pade approximation and its physical applications, *Fortsch. Phys.* **20**, 283 (1972).
- [97] M. A. Samuel, G. Li, and E. Steinfelds, Estimating perturbative coefficients in quantum field theory using Pade approximants. 2., *Phys. Lett. B* **323**, 188 (1994).
- [98] M. A. Samuel, J. R. Ellis, and M. Karliner, Comparison of the Pade Approximation Method to Perturbative QCD Calculations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4380 (1995).
- [99] E. Gardi, Why Pade approximants reduce the renormalization scale dependence in QFT?, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 68 (1997).