

Complete two-loop electroweak corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$

Xiang Chen,^{1,*} Xin Guan,^{1,†} Chuan-Qi He,^{1,‡} Zhao Li,^{2,3,4,§} Xiao Liu,^{5,¶} and Yan-Qing Ma^{1,4,**}

¹*School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

²*Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

³*School of Physics Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100039, China*

⁴*Center for High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

⁵*Rudolf Peierls Centre for Theoretical Physics, Clarendon Laboratory, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PU, UK*

We compute the complete two-loop electroweak corrections to the Higgsstrahlung process $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ at the future Higgs factory. The Feynman integrals involved in the computation are decomposed into linear combinations of a minimal set of master integrals taking advantage of the recent developments of integral reduction techniques. The master integrals are then evaluated by differential equations with boundary conditions provided by the auxiliary mass flow method. Our final result for given \sqrt{s} is expressed as a piecewise function defined by several deeply expanded power series, which has high precision and can be further manipulated efficiently. Our calculation presents the first complete two-loop electroweak corrections for processes with four external particles.

I. INTRODUCTION

The physics related to the Higgs boson has become the frontier of the high energy physics since its discovery a decade ago [1, 2]. In the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics, the Higgs boson is known as the direct evidence of the electroweak (EW) spontaneous symmetry breaking based on the Higgs mechanism. However, the current experiment precision cannot exclude the possibility of exotic Higgs potential deviated from the SM, which is the typical structure in most of the new physics models. Therefore, the Higgs boson could be the most promising probe to new physics beyond the SM.

The precise measurement on the Higgs boson is the most important mission for the next generation of high-energy experiment facility. In the past few years, there have been several proposals of the Higgs factory, including the International Linear Collider (ILC) [3–5], the Circular Electron Positron Collider (CEPC) [6, 7], and the Future Circular Collider (FCC-ee) [8–10]. Millions of Higgs bosons are expected to be produced in these Higgs factories via the processes including the Higgsstrahlung $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$, the W boson fusion $e^+e^- \rightarrow \nu_e \bar{\nu}_e H$, and the Z boson fusion $e^+e^- \rightarrow e^+e^- H$. At a typical center-of-mass energy 240 GeV, the dominant contribution is the Higgsstrahlung process.

The preliminary investigations have shown that, with the expected integrated luminosity of 5.6 ab^{-1} [11], the Higgsstrahlung cross section $\sigma(e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH)$ can be measured with the precision 0.51% [11]. Consequently, the precision of the relevant theoretical predictions must be pushed to at least the same level. The next-to-leading order (NLO) EW effect has been investigated in Refs.[12–

14], and in recent years the mixed EW-QCD correction effect has been obtained [15–18]. Even though, the current theoretical uncertainty is still as large as 1%, which is not compatible to the experiment accuracy yet. Therefore, higher order radiative corrections are crucial for the Higgs physics analysis at the future Higgs factory. Recently some integrals involved in two-loop EW corrections were calculated [19, 20], but complete two-loop calculation is still missing.

The complete two-loop EW calculation for this $2 \rightarrow 2$ process is always challenging but is indispensable for the reliable theoretical predictions. On one hand, 25377 Feynman diagrams [21] make all subsequent procedures very time and resource consuming. And on the other hand, the Feynman integrals involving six mass scales are out of the reach of all analytical toolkit. In this paper, by taking advantage of the recent developments of multiloop calculation techniques, we eventually achieve the complete two-loop EW corrections for the Higgsstrahlung process $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ at the future Higgs factory.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, technique details of the calculation of two-loop EW correction are explained. In Section 3, the γ_5 scheme and renormalization are discussed. In Section 4, we present the numerical results of two-loop EW corrections. The summary is made in the last section.

II. TWO-LOOP CALCULATION

We consider the two-loop electroweak correction to the following process

$$e^+(k_1) + e^-(k_2) \rightarrow H(k_3) + Z(k_4), \quad (1)$$

where the external momenta satisfy the on-shell conditions

$$k_1^2 = k_2^2 = 0, \quad k_3^2 = m_H^2, \quad k_4^2 = m_Z^2, \quad (2)$$

and momentum conservation

$$k_1 + k_2 = k_3 + k_4. \quad (3)$$

* xchenphy@pku.edu.cn

† guanxin0507@pku.edu.cn

‡ legend_he@pku.edu.cn

§ zhaoli@ihep.ac.cn

¶ xiao.liu@physics.ox.ac.uk

** yqma@pku.edu.cn

The Mandelstam variables are defined as usual

$$s = (k_1 + k_2)^2, \quad t = (k_1 - k_3)^2. \quad (4)$$

We generate the Feynman amplitudes with **QGRAF** [22, 23] and **FeynArts** [24], with some sample two-loop Feynman diagrams shown in Fig 1. A detailed classification of all 25377 two-loop diagrams have been provided in Ref [21], from which one can reckon the complexity of the calculation. We use a private **Mathematica** package to deal with Lorentz algebras, and express the interference of two-loop amplitudes with tree-level amplitudes as linear combinations of some scalar integrals. The coefficients of these integrals are rational functions of physical parameters, including the Mandelstam variables s and t , squared mass of corresponding particles m_t^2, m_H^2, m_Z^2 and m_W^2 , dimensional regulator $\epsilon = (4 - D)/2$, and the electroweak coupling constant α .




FIG. 1: Some sample Feynman diagrams at the two-loop level.

Totally we get about 3×10^4 Feynman integrals, which are then clustered into 372 integral families. To illustrate how to evaluate these integrals, let us take the integral family defined by the Feynman diagram shown in Fig. 1 (i) as an example, which is one of the most complicated

Feynman integral family. The integrals in this family can be expressed as

$$I(\nu_1, \dots, \nu_9) = \int \prod_{i=1}^L \frac{d^D \ell_i}{i\pi^{D/2}} \frac{\mathcal{D}_8^{-\nu_8} \mathcal{D}_9^{-\nu_9}}{\mathcal{D}_1^{\nu_1} \dots \mathcal{D}_7^{\nu_7}}, \quad (5)$$

where inverse propagators can be chosen as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_1 &= \ell_1^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_2 = (\ell_1 + k_1)^2 - m_W^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_3 = (\ell_1 - k_2)^2 - m_W^2, \\ \mathcal{D}_4 &= (\ell_1 - \ell_2)^2 - m_H^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_5 = (\ell_1 - \ell_2 + k_4)^2 - m_Z^2, \\ \mathcal{D}_6 &= (\ell_2 - k_2)^2 - m_W^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_7 = (\ell_2 + k_1 - k_4)^2 - m_W^2, \\ \mathcal{D}_8 &= (\ell_1 - \ell_2 + k_1)^2, \quad \mathcal{D}_9 = (\ell_1 - \ell_2 + k_2)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with the last two being irreducible scalar products introduced for completeness. For simplicity, during the computation, we fix masses of particles as rational numbers. Then for any given rational value of s , the integrals only depend on two variables, t and ϵ .

We first decompose our target integrals into linear combinations of a smaller set of so-called master integrals using integration-by-parts (IBP) [25] reduction¹. In detail, we first use **LiteRed** [26] and **FiniteFlow** [27] to generate and solve the system of IBP identities [25] based on Laporta's algorithm [28] over finite field. Around 200 numerical samplings are sufficient to construct the block-triangular relations for target integrals proposed in Refs. [29, 30]. We then make full use of the block-triangular relations to efficiently generate large amount of samplings (approximately 10^4) to eventually reconstruct the reduction coefficients. This strategy reduces the computational time by several times, compared with the reduction without using block-triangular relations.

Next we compute the master integrals using differential equations [31] based on power series expansion [32, 33]. The differential equations of master integrals with respect to t are constructed using aforementioned IBP reduction. The boundary conditions, say at $t/m_t^2 = -1/2$, are then fixed by the auxiliary mass flow method [20, 34–36] implemented in **AMFlow** [37]. More specifically, we employ the “mass” mode [20], to insert the auxiliary mass parameter η to propagators $\mathcal{D}_2, \mathcal{D}_3, \mathcal{D}_6$ and \mathcal{D}_7 . This is equivalent to directly treat m_W^2 as a dynamical parameter. By doing so, we get the integrals simplified, in the large mass limit [38, 39], to some factorized one loop integrals and vacuum integrals. These simplified integrals will be then evaluated again by using the **AMFlow**. Finally, a numerical continuation of the auxiliary mass from the large mass limit to zero would give us high precision physical results, which serves as the boundary conditions. With these in hand, we are able to construct a piecewise function for each master integral represented by some deeply expanded power series expansions, which

¹ Integrals needed for constructing differential equations are also included in the target integrals, see next paragraph.

is straightforward using the differential equations solver in **AMFlow**. During the numerical evaluations, ϵ are set to some fixed values and the ϵ dependence is only reconstructed at the final stage as proposed in Ref. [36, 37]. In this way, we do not need to manipulate Laurent expansions of ϵ during the intermediate stages of calculations, which significantly reduces the computational time.

One of the difficulties to solve the differential equations is that there are many singularities, shown in Fig 2, as a result of multiscaleness of this process. By investigating asymptotic behaviours near each singularity, with the help of differential equations and boundary conditions, we find only a few of them are physical, while all the others are non-physical, arising probably from the “bad” choice of master integrals or singularities in other Riemann sheets. Although most singularities are non-physical, they would affect the stability of our numerical computations. Therefore we must carefully design a segmentation of the physical region to reduce these effects. By trial and error, we finally obtain a possible segmentation, where the physical region are divided into more than 20 pieces. We perform a deep power series expansion in each piece such that, after reconstructing the ϵ dependence, high precision are obtained in the whole physical region.




FIG. 2: Singularities distribution. Blue dots are singularities read from differential equations. Two red dots on the real axis are the boundary points of physical region.

The evaluation of integrals in other families are quite similar. To summarize, we get 7675 master integrals in total after reduction. The integrals reduction along with the differential equations construction cost about $\mathcal{O}(10^4)$ CPU \cdot h. Calculating the boundary conditions at $t = -1/2$ cost about 1.5×10^4 CPU \cdot h. And the piecewise functions of master integrals are obtained in 3×10^3 CPU \cdot h.

III. γ_5 SCHEME AND RENORMALIZATION

It is well known that, in dimensional regularization, the anticommutation relation $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma_5\}$ and the cyclicity of Dirac trace cannot be satisfied simultaneously. In practice, we prefer to keep the anticommutation relation $\{\gamma^\mu, \gamma_5\}$ not only to simplify the computation, but also because using a non-anticommute γ_5 with the other Dirac matrices γ^μ leads to “spurious anomalies” which violate chiral symmetry and hence gauge invariance [40]. In this case, one must impose the relevant Ward-Takahashi (WT) and Slavnov-Taylor identities order by order to keep the renormalizability of a perturbation theory, which will make practical calculations much more difficult and tedious obviously. Thus we choose the so-called naïve- γ_5 scheme so that anticommutation relations hold. Then a new problem arises: where should we read a fermion loop? Due to the lack of the cyclicity of the trace, reading a fermion loop from a different point may give different final result. This ambiguity can be fixed by the KKS-scheme [41], where the final result is defined as the average of all possible reading points starting from a γ_5 .

Once the γ_5 scheme is fixed, one can study the renormalization of ultraviolet divergences. For two-loop EW corrections, this includes renormalization of masses, couplings, wave functions, field mixings, and so on. In literature, frequently used renormalization schemes include on-shell scheme, such as in Ref. [42], and $\overline{\text{MS}}$ scheme. Results obtained in different schemes can be related by a finite renormalization, and thus are equivalent.

IV. NUMERICAL RESULTS

By combining everything together, we finally obtain the result of two-loop electroweak contribution $\mathcal{A}^{(2)}$ defined by

$$\mathcal{A}^{(2)} = 2 \sum_{\text{spin}} \Re \left(\mathcal{M}^{(2)} \mathcal{M}^{(0)*} \right), \quad (7)$$

where $\mathcal{M}^{(2)}$ is the two-loop amplitude and $\mathcal{M}^{(0)}$ is the tree level amplitude. Our computation is carried out under the following numerical configuration

$$\frac{m_H^2}{m_t^2} = \frac{12}{23}, \quad \frac{m_Z^2}{m_t^2} = \frac{23}{83}, \quad \frac{m_W^2}{m_t^2} = \frac{14}{65}, \quad (8)$$

which correspond to $m_t = 172.69$ GeV [43], $m_H = 124.7$ GeV, $m_Z = 90.906$ GeV and $m_W = 80.145$ GeV.

As a benchmark, we provide numerical results with the following phase space point

$$\frac{s}{m_t^2} = \frac{83}{43}, \quad \frac{t}{m_t^2} = -\frac{5}{7}, \quad (9)$$

or $\sqrt{s} = 240$ GeV and $t = -21301.3$ GeV². Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}^{(2)} = & \alpha^4 (75548.083\epsilon^{-4} \\ & - 3.1962821 \times 10^6 \epsilon^{-3} \\ & + 1.1548893 \times 10^7 \epsilon^{-2} \\ & + 2.6990603 \times 10^8 \epsilon^{-1} \\ & + 1.5608903 \times 10^9 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon)), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where divergences should be canceled if we sum over all contributions at NNLO level, including real emissions. In addition, we provide the result of the corner integral of the top sector in Eq. (5)

$$\begin{aligned} I(1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 1, 0, 0) = & (0.35203833 - 16.253246i) \\ & + (10.998841 - 64.231845i)\epsilon \\ & + (32.180275 - 134.31458i)\epsilon^2 \\ & + (45.366882 - 198.45944i)\epsilon^3 \\ & + (27.957706 - 234.39361i)\epsilon^4 + \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^5). \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

For other values of \sqrt{s} and t , results can be obtained similarly.

V. SUMMARY

In this paper we present the first complete calculation of two-loop EW corrections for Higgsstrahlung process

$e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ at the future Higgs factory. Our result for given \sqrt{s} is expressed as a piece-wise function defined by several deeply expanded power series. The results have high precision and can be used in future efficiently. This work is possible thanks to many state-of-the-art techniques. Our calculation represents the first complete two-loop electroweak corrections for processes with four external particles.

What we have done is the most difficult part of the complete NNLO EW corrections for $H + Z$ production at the future Higgs factory. In the near future, we will calculate also real-emission corrections and then the complete NNLO EW corrections can be achieved.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to thank Ayres Freitas, Yu Jia, Li Lin Yang and Yang Zhang for many helpful discussions. This work is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 11875071, No. 11975029, No. 12075251), the National Key Research and Development Program of China under Contracts No. 2020YFA0406400, and the High-performance Computing Platform of Peking University. The research of XL was also supported by the ERC Starting Grant 804394 HiPQCD and by the UK Science and Technology Facilities Council (STFC) under grant ST/T000864/1. JaxoDraw [44] was used to generate Feynman diagrams.

Note added: When our paper was being finalized, a preprint appeared [45] which presents the fermion-loop contributions to the same process.

-
- [1] **ATLAS**, G. Aad *et al.*, *Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC*, *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 1–29 [[arXiv:1207.7214](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [2] **CMS**, S. Chatrchyan *et al.*, *Observation of a New Boson at a Mass of 125 GeV with the CMS Experiment at the LHC*, *Phys. Lett. B* **716** (2012) 30–61 [[arXiv:1207.7235](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [3] H. Baer *et al.*, *The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report - Volume 2: Physics*, [[arXiv:1306.6352](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [4] T. Behnke *et al.*, *The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report - Volume 1: Executive Summary*, [[arXiv:1306.6327](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [5] P. Bambade *et al.*, *The International Linear Collider: A Global Project*, [[arXiv:1903.01629](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [6] **CEPC Study Group**, M. Dong *et al.*, *CEPC Conceptual Design Report: Volume 2 - Physics & Detector*, [[arXiv:1811.10545](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [7] CEPC Study Group, *CEPC Conceptual Design Report: Volume 1 - Accelerator*, [[arXiv:1809.00285](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [8] **TLEP Design Study Working Group**, M. Bicer *et al.*, *First Look at the Physics Case of TLEP*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 164 [[arXiv:1308.6176](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [9] **FCC**, A. Abada *et al.*, *FCC Physics Opportunities: Future Circular Collider Conceptual Design Report Volume 1*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** (2019) 474 [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [10] **FCC**, A. Abada *et al.*, *FCC-ee: The Lepton Collider: Future Circular Collider Conceptual Design Report Volume 2*, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **228** (2019) 261–623 [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [11] F. An *et al.*, *Precision Higgs physics at the CEPC*, *Chin. Phys. C* **43** (2019) 043002 [[arXiv:1810.09037](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [12] J. Fleischer and F. Jegerlehner, *Radiative Corrections to Higgs Production by $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$ in the Weinberg-Salam Model*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **216** (1983) 469–492 [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [13] B. A. Kniehl, *Radiative corrections for associated ZH production at future e^+e^- colliders*, *Z. Phys. C* **55** (1992) 605–618 [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [14] A. Denner, J. Kublbeck, R. Mertig, and M. Bohm, *Electroweak radiative corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$* , *Z. Phys. C* **56** (1992) 261–272 [[INSPIRE](#)].
 - [15] Y. Gong, Z. Li, X. Xu, L. L. Yang, and X. Zhao, *Mixed QCD-EW corrections for Higgs boson production at e^+e^- colliders*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 093003 [[arXiv:1609.03955](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].

- [16] Q.-F. Sun, F. Feng, Y. Jia, and W.-L. Sang, *Mixed electroweak-QCD corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ at Higgs factories*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 051301 [[arXiv:1609.03995](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [17] W. Chen, F. Feng, Y. Jia, and W.-L. Sang, *Mixed electroweak-QCD corrections to $e^+e^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-H$ at CEPC with finite-width effect*, *Chin. Phys. C* **43** (2019) 013108 [[arXiv:1811.05453](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [18] C. Ma, Y. Wang, X. Xu, L. L. Yang, and B. Zhou, *Mixed QCD-EW corrections for Higgs leptonic decay via HW^+W vertex*, *JHEP* **09** (2021) 114 [[arXiv:2105.06316](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [19] Q. Song and A. Freitas, *On the evaluation of two-loop electroweak box diagrams for $e^+e^- \rightarrow HZ$ production*, *JHEP* **04** (2021) 179 [[arXiv:2101.00308](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [20] X. Liu and Y.-Q. Ma, *Multiloop corrections for collider processes using auxiliary mass flow*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) L051503 [[arXiv:2107.01864](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [21] Z. Li, Y. Wang, and Q.-f. Wu, *Categorization of two-loop Feynman diagrams in the $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^2)$ correction to $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$* , *Chin. Phys. C* **45** (2021) 053102 [[arXiv:2012.12513](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [22] P. Nogueira, *Automatic Feynman graph generation*, *J. Comput. Phys.* **105** (1993) 279–289 [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [23] P. Nogueira, *Feynman graph generation and propagator mixing, I*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **269** (2021) 108103 [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [24] T. Hahn, *Generating Feynman diagrams and amplitudes with FeynArts 3*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **140** (2001) 418–431 [[hep-ph/0012260](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [25] K. G. Chetyrkin and F. V. Tkachov, *Integration by Parts: The Algorithm to Calculate beta Functions in 4 Loops*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B192** (1981) 159–204 [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [26] R. N. Lee, *LiteRed 1.4: a powerful tool for reduction of multiloop integrals*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **523** (2014) 012059 [[arXiv:1310.1145](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [27] T. Peraro, *FiniteFlow: multivariate functional reconstruction using finite fields and dataflow graphs*, *JHEP* **07** (2019) 031 [[arXiv:1905.08019](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [28] S. Laporta, *High precision calculation of multiloop Feynman integrals by difference equations*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **15** (2000) 5087–5159 [[hep-ph/0102033](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [29] X. Liu and Y.-Q. Ma, *Determining arbitrary Feynman integrals by vacuum integrals*, *Phys. Rev. D* **99** (2019) 071501 [[arXiv:1801.10523](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [30] X. Guan, X. Liu, and Y.-Q. Ma, *Complete reduction of two-loop five-light-parton scattering amplitudes*, *Chin. Phys. C* **44** (2020) 9 [[arXiv:1912.09294](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [31] A. V. Kotikov, *Differential equations method: New technique for massive Feynman diagrams calculation*, *Phys. Lett.* **B254** (1991) 158–164 [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [32] M. Caffo, H. Czyz, M. Gunia, and E. Remiddi, *BOKASUN: A Fast and precise numerical program to calculate the Master Integrals of the two-loop sunrise diagrams*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **180** (2009) 427–430 [[arXiv:0807.1959](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [33] M. Czakon, *Tops from Light Quarks: Full Mass Dependence at Two-Loops in QCD*, *Phys. Lett.* **B664** (2008) 307–314 [[arXiv:0803.1400](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [34] X. Liu, Y.-Q. Ma, and C.-Y. Wang, *A Systematic and Efficient Method to Compute Multi-loop Master Integrals*, *Phys. Lett.* **B779** (2018) 353–357 [[arXiv:1711.09572](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [35] X. Liu, Y.-Q. Ma, W. Tao, and P. Zhang, *Calculation of Feynman loop integration and phase-space integration via auxiliary mass flow*, *Chin. Phys. C* **45** (2021) 013115 [[arXiv:2009.07987](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [36] Z.-F. Liu and Y.-Q. Ma, *Feynman integrals are completely determined by linear algebra*, [[arXiv:2201.11637](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [37] X. Liu and Y.-Q. Ma, *AMFlow: a Mathematica package for Feynman integrals computation via Auxiliary Mass Flow*, [[arXiv:2201.11669](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [38] M. Beneke and V. A. Smirnov, *Asymptotic expansion of Feynman integrals near threshold*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B522** (1998) 321–344 [[hep-ph/9711391](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [39] V. A. Smirnov, *Problems of the strategy of regions*, *Phys. Lett. B* **465** (1999) 226–234 [[hep-ph/9907471](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [40] F. Jegerlehner, *Facts of life with gamma(5)*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **18** (2001) 673–679 [[hep-th/0005255](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [41] J. G. Korner, D. Kreimer, and K. Schilcher, *A Practicable gamma(5) scheme in dimensional regularization*, *Z. Phys. C* **54** (1992) 503–512 [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [42] A. Freitas, W. Hollik, W. Walter, and G. Weiglein, *Complete fermionic two-loop results for the MW–MZ interdependence*, *Physics Letters B* **495** (Dec, 2000) 338–346 [[InSPIRE](#)]. <https://doi.org/10.1016/2F0370-2693%2800%2901263-6>.
- [43] **Particle Data Group**, R. L. Workman, *Review of Particle Physics*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01 [[InSPIRE](#)].
- [44] D. Binosi and L. Theussl, *Jaxodraw: A graphical user interface for drawing feynman diagrams*, *Computer Physics Communications* **161** (2004) 76–86 [[InSPIRE](#)]. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0010465504002115>.
- [45] A. Freitas and Q. Song, *Two-Loop Electroweak Corrections with Fermion Loops to $e^+e^- \rightarrow ZH$* , [[arXiv:2209.07612](#)] [[InSPIRE](#)].