

Kinematic power corrections in off-forward hard reactions

V.M. Braun¹ and A.N. Manashov^{1,2}

¹*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, D-93040 Regensburg, Germany*

²*Department of Theoretical Physics, St.-Petersburg State University, 199034, St.-Petersburg, Russia*
(ΩDated: October 2, 2018)

We develop a general approach to the calculation of kinematic corrections $\sim t/Q^2, m^2/Q^2$ in hard processes which involve momentum transfer from the initial to the final hadron state. As the principal result, the complete expression is derived for the time-ordered product of two electromagnetic currents that includes all kinematic corrections to twist-four accuracy. The results are immediately applicable e.g. to the studies of deeply-virtual Compton scattering.

PACS numbers: 12.38.Bx, 13.88.+e, 12.39.St

Keywords: DVCS; conformal symmetry; higher twist

It is generally accepted that hard exclusive scattering processes with nonzero momentum transfer to the target can provide one with a three-dimensional picture of the proton in longitudinal and transverse plane, encoded in generalized parton distributions (GPDs) [1, 2]. One of the principal reactions in this context is Compton scattering with one real and one highly-virtual photon (DVCS) which has received a lot of attention. The QCD description of DVCS is based on the operator product expansion (OPE) of the time-ordered product of two electromagnetic currents where the GPDs appear as operator matrix elements and the coefficient functions can be calculated perturbatively. In order to unravel the transverse proton structure one is interested in particular in the dependence of the amplitude on the momentum transfer to the target $t = (P' - P)^2$ in a reasonably broad range. Since, on the other hand, the available photon virtualities Q^2 are not very large, corrections of the type $\sim t/Q^2$ which are formally twist-four effects, can be significant and should be taken into account.

Such corrections can be called “kinematic” since they only involve ratios of kinematic variables and are seemingly disconnected from nonperturbative effects (e.g. one may consider a theoretical limit $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2 \ll t \ll Q^2$). Yet the separation of kinematic corrections $\sim t/Q^2$ from generic twist-four corrections $\sim \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^2/Q^2$ proves to be surprisingly difficult. The problem is well known and important for phenomenology, as acknowledged by many authors [2–10].

The difficulty is due to the fact that, unlike target mass corrections in inclusive reactions [11] which are determined solely by the contributions of leading twist operators, the $\sim t/Q^2$ corrections (and for spin-1/2 targets also $\sim m^2/Q^2$ corrections) also arise from higher-twist-four operators that can be reduced to total derivatives of the twist-two ones. Indeed, let $\mathcal{O}_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}$ be a multiplicatively renormalizable (conformal) local twist-two operator, symmetrized and traceless over all indices. Then the operators

$$\mathcal{O}_1 = \partial^2 \mathcal{O}_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n}, \quad \mathcal{O}_2 = \partial^{\mu_1} \mathcal{O}_{\mu_1 \dots \mu_n} \quad (1)$$

are, on the one hand, twist-four, and on the other hand their matrix elements are obviously given by the re-

duced leading twist matrix elements, times the momentum transfer squared (up to, possibly, target mass corrections). Thus, contributions of the both operators must be taken into account.

The problem arises because \mathcal{O}_2 has very peculiar properties: divergence of a conformal operator vanishes in a free theory (the Ferrara-Grillo-Parisi-Gatto theorem [12]). As a consequence, using QCD equations of motion (EOM) \mathcal{O}_2 can be expressed as a sum of contributions of quark-antiquark-gluon operators. The simplest example of such relation is [13–15]

$$\partial^\mu \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu} = 2i\bar{q}i\mathcal{g}G_{\nu\mu}\gamma^\mu q, \quad (2)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu} = (i/2)[\bar{q}\gamma_\mu \overleftrightarrow{D}_\nu q + (\mu \leftrightarrow \nu)]$ is the quark part of the energy-momentum tensor. The operator on the r.h.s. of Eq. (2) involves the gluon field strength and, not knowing this identity, it would be tempting to assume that hadronic matrix elements of this operator are of the order of Λ_{QCD}^2 , which is wrong. More complicated examples involving leading-twist operators with two derivatives can be found in [16, 17].

The general structure of such relations is, schematically

$$(\partial\mathcal{O})_N = \sum_k a_k^{(N)} G_{Nk}, \quad (3)$$

where G_{Nk} are twist-four quark-antiquark-gluon (and more complicated) operators and $a_k^{(N)}$ the numerical coefficients. The subscript N stands for the number of derivatives in \mathcal{O}_N and the summation goes over all contributing operators, with and without total derivatives (so that in reality k is some multi-index). The same operators, G_{Nk} , also appear in the OPE for the current product at the twist-four level:

$$T\{j(x)j(0)\}^{t=4} = \sum_{N,k} c_{N,k}(x) G_{Nk}. \quad (4)$$

A separation of “kinematic” and “dynamical” contributions implies rewriting this expansion in such a way that the contribution of the particular combination appearing

in (3) is separated from the remaining twist-four contributions. The “kinematic” approximation would correspond to taking into account this term only, and neglecting contributions of “genuine” quark-gluon operators.

Our starting observation is that the separation of kinematic and dynamical effects is only meaningful if they have autonomous scale dependence. Different twist-four operators of the same dimension mix with each other and satisfy a matrix renormalization group (RG) equation which can be solved, at least in principle. Let $\mathcal{G}_{N,k}$ be the set of multiplicatively renormalizable twist-four operators so that

$$\mathcal{G}_{N,k} = \sum_{k'} \psi_{k,k'}^{(N)} G_{N,k'}. \quad (5)$$

The relation (3) tells us that one of the solutions of the RG equation is known *without the calculation*. Namely, there exists a twist-four operator with the anomalous dimension equal to the anomalous dimension of the leading twist operator, and Eq. (3) presents the corresponding eigenvector. (For simplicity we ignore the contributions of $\partial^2 \mathcal{O}_N$ operators in this discussion; they do not pose a “problem” and can simply be taken into account.)

Assume this special solution corresponds to $k = 0$, so $\mathcal{G}_{N,k=0} \equiv (\partial \mathcal{O})_N$ and $\psi_{k=0,k'}^{(N)} = a_{k'}$. Inverting the matrix of coefficients $\psi_{k,k'}^{(N)}$ we can write the expansion of an arbitrary twist-four operator in terms of the multiplicatively renormalizable ones

$$G_{N,k} = \phi_{k,0}^{(N)} (\partial \mathcal{O})_N + \sum_{k' \neq 0} \phi_{k,k'}^{(N)} \mathcal{G}_{N,k'}. \quad (6)$$

Inserting this expansion in Eq. (4) one obtains

$$T\{j(x)j(0)\}^{\text{tw}-4} = \sum_{N,k} c_{N,k}(x) \phi_{k,0}^{(N)} (\partial \mathcal{O})_N + \dots, \quad (7)$$

where ellipses stand for the contributions of “genuine” twist-four operators (with different anomalous dimensions). The problem with this (formal) solution is that finding the coefficients $\phi_{k,0}^{(N)}$ in general requires the knowledge of the full matrix $\psi_{k,k'}^{(N)}$, alias explicit solution of the twist-four RG equations, which is not available.

Twist-four operators in QCD can be divided in two classes: quasipartonic [18], that only involve “plus” components of the fields, and non-quasipartonic which also include “minus” light-cone projections. Our next observation is that quasipartonic operators are irrelevant for the present discussion since they have autonomous evolution (to the one-loop accuracy). Hence terms in $(\partial \mathcal{O})_N$ do not appear in the re-expansion of quasipartonic operators in multiplicatively renormalizable operators, Eq. (6): the corresponding coefficients $\phi_{k,0}^{(N)}$ vanish. As the result, the kinematic power correction $\sim (\partial \mathcal{O})_N$ is entirely due to contributions of non-quasipartonic operators.

Renormalization of twist-four non-quasipartonic operators was studied systematically in [19, 20]. The main

result is that the RG equations can be written in terms of several $SL(2)$ -invariant kernels. Using this technique, we are able to prove that the anomalous dimension matrix for non-quasipartonic operators is hermitian with respect to a certain scalar product, which implies that different eigenvectors are mutually orthogonal, i.e.

$$\sum_k \mu_k^{(N)} \psi_{l,k}^{(N)} \psi_{m,k}^{(N)} \sim \delta_{l,m}, \quad (8)$$

where $\mu_k^{(N)}$ is the corresponding (nontrivial) measure. Using this orthogonality relation and the expression (3) for the relevant eigenvector, one obtains, for the non-quasipartonic operators

$$\phi_{k,0}^{(N)} = a_k^{(N)} \|a^{(N)}\|^{-2}, \quad (9)$$

where $\|a^{(N)}\|^2 = \sum_k \mu_k^{(N)} (a_k^{(N)})^2$. Inserting this expression in (7) one obtains the desired separation of kinematic effects.

The actual derivation proves to be rather involved. It is done using the two-component spinor formalism in intermediate steps and requires some specific techniques of the $SL(2)$ representation theory. The purpose of this letter is to present our main result; the technical details will be given elsewhere.

We define nonlocal (light-ray) vector O_V and axial-vector O_A operators of the leading-twist-two as the generating functions for local twist-two operators

$$O(z_1 x, z_2 x) = [\bar{q}(z_1 x) \not{x} (\gamma_5) Q q(z_2 x)]_{l.t.}. \quad (10)$$

Here x_μ is a four-vector which is not necessarily light-like, z_1 and z_2 are real numbers and Q is the (diagonal) matrix of quark electromagnetic charges squared. The Wilson line between the quark fields is implied. The leading-twist projector $[\dots]_{l.t.}$ stands for the subtraction of traces of the local operators so that formally

$$\begin{aligned} & [\bar{q}(z_1 x) \not{x} Q q(z_2 x)]_{l.t.} = \\ & = \sum_N \frac{1}{N!} x_\mu x_{\mu_1} \dots x_{\mu_N} \left\{ \bar{q}(0) \gamma_\mu [z_1 \overleftarrow{D}_{\mu_1} + z_2 \overrightarrow{D}_{\mu_1}] \dots \right. \\ & \quad \left. \dots [z_1 \overleftarrow{D}_{\mu_N} + z_2 \overrightarrow{D}_{\mu_N}] Q q(0) - \text{traces} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

The leading-twist light-ray operators satisfy the Laplace equation $\partial_x^2 O(z_1 x, z_2 x) = 0$. Explicit form of the projector $[\dots]_{l.t.}$ is irrelevant for the further discussion (some useful representations can be found e.g. in [6, 22]).

Alternatively, one can expand a nonlocal operator in the contributions of multiplicatively renormalizable (in one loop) conformal operators

$$O(z_1 x, z_2 x) = \sum_N \varkappa_N z_{12}^N \int_0^1 du (u\bar{u})^{N+1} [\mathcal{O}_N(z_{12}^u x)]_{l.t.}, \quad (12)$$

where $\varkappa_N = 2(2N+3)/(N+1)!$. Here and below we use the following shorthand notation:

$$\bar{u} = 1 - u, \quad z_{12} = z_1 - z_2, \quad z_{12}^u = \bar{u}z_1 + uz_2. \quad (13)$$

The conformal operator \mathcal{O}_N is defined as

$$\mathcal{O}_N(y) = (\partial_{z_1} + \partial_{z_2})^N C_N^{3/2} \left(\frac{\partial_{z_1} - \partial_{z_2}}{\partial_{z_1} + \partial_{z_2}} \right) \times O(z_1 x + y, z_2 x + y) \Big|_{z_i=0}, \quad (14)$$

where $C_N^{3/2}(x)$ is the Gegenbauer polynomial.

We are able to find the contributions related to the leading-twist operator (10) in the time-ordered product of two electromagnetic currents

$$T_{\mu\nu} = iT \left\{ j_\mu^{em}(x) j_\nu^{em}(0) \right\} \quad (15)$$

to the twist-four accuracy. The result has the form

$$T_{\mu\nu} = -\frac{1}{\pi^2 x^4} \left\{ x^\alpha \left[S_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta} \mathbb{V}^\beta + i\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta} \mathbb{A}^\beta \right] + x^2 \left[(x_\mu \partial_\nu + x_\nu \partial_\mu) \mathbb{X} + (x_\mu \partial_\nu - x_\nu \partial_\mu) \mathbb{Y} \right] \right\}, \quad (16)$$

where $\partial_\mu = \partial/\partial x^\mu$, $S_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta} = g_{\mu\alpha} g_{\nu\beta} + g_{\nu\alpha} g_{\mu\beta} - g_{\mu\nu} g_{\alpha\beta}$ and the totally antisymmetric tensor is defined such that $\epsilon_{0123} = 1$. The expansion of \mathbb{V}_β and \mathbb{A}_β starts from twist two, $\mathbb{V}_\beta = \mathbb{V}_\beta^{t=2} + \mathbb{V}_\beta^{t=3} + \mathbb{V}_\beta^{t=4} + \dots$, $\mathbb{A}_\beta = \mathbb{A}_\beta^{t=2} + \mathbb{A}_\beta^{t=3} + \mathbb{A}_\beta^{t=4} + \dots$, while $\mathbb{X} = \mathbb{X}^{t=4} + \dots$ and $\mathbb{Y} = \mathbb{Y}^{t=4} + \dots$ are twist-four.

It turns out that vector operators always appear to be antisymmetrized and axial-vector symmetrized over the quark and antiquark positions, respectively, so we define the corresponding combinations:

$$\begin{aligned} O_V^{(-)}(z_1, z_2) &= [\bar{q}(z_1 x) \not{x} Q q(z_2 x)]_{l.t.} - (z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2), \quad (17) \\ O_A^{(+)}(z_1, z_2) &= [\bar{q}(z_1 x) \not{x} \gamma_5 Q q(z_2 x)]_{l.t.} + (z_1 \leftrightarrow z_2). \end{aligned}$$

The leading-twist expressions are well known and can be written as (cf. [22])

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_\mu^{t=2} &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \int_0^1 du O_V^{(-)}(u, 0), \\ \mathbb{A}_\mu^{t=2} &= \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \int_0^1 du O_A^{(+)}(u, 0). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Note that separation of the leading-twist contributions [...] from the nonlocal operators by itself produces a series of kinematic power corrections to the amplitudes, which are analogous to Nachtmann target mass corrections to deep-inelastic scattering [11]. Such corrections are discussed in detail in [5–10].

For the twist-three functions we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_\mu^{t=3} &= \left[i\mathbf{P}^\nu, \int_0^1 du \left\{ i\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\nu} x^\alpha \partial^\beta \tilde{O}_A^{(+)}(u) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left(S_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta} x^\alpha \partial^\beta + \ln u \partial^\mu x^2 \partial^\nu \right) \tilde{O}_V^{(-)}(u) \right\} \right], \\ \mathbb{A}_\mu^{t=3} &= \left[i\mathbf{P}^\nu, \int_0^1 du \left\{ i\epsilon_{\mu\alpha\beta\nu} x^\alpha \partial^\beta \tilde{O}_V^{(-)}(u) \right. \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + \left(S_{\mu\alpha\nu\beta} x^\alpha \partial^\beta + \ln u \partial^\mu x^2 \partial^\nu \right) \tilde{O}_A^{(+)}(u) \right\} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here \mathbf{P}_ν is the momentum operator

$$[i\mathbf{P}_\nu, q(y)] = \frac{\partial}{\partial y^\nu} q(y), \quad \langle p' | [i\mathbf{P}_\nu, O] | p \rangle = (p' - p)_\nu \langle p' | O | p \rangle$$

and we used a notation

$$\tilde{O}_a^{(\pm)}(z) = \frac{1}{4} \int_0^z dw O_a^{(\pm)}(z, w). \quad (20)$$

One can easily check that $x^\mu \mathbb{V}_\mu^{t=3} = \partial^\mu \mathbb{V}_\mu^{t=3} = 0$ and similarly $x^\mu \mathbb{A}_\mu^{t=3} = \partial^\mu \mathbb{A}_\mu^{t=3} = 0$. Note that the terms in $\ln u$ in Eqs. (19) are themselves twist-four and can be dropped if the calculation is done to twist-three accuracy. The resulting simplified expression is in agreement with Refs. [4, 5]. These terms must be included, however, in order to ensure the separation of twist-three and twist-four contributions.

The twist-four contributions $\mathbb{V}_\mu^{t=4}$, $\mathbb{A}_\mu^{t=4}$, $\mathbb{X}^{t=4}$ and $\mathbb{Y}^{t=4}$ present our main result. In this case we did not find a simple nonlocal representation and write the answer in terms of integrals over the position of the local operators, cf. Eq. (12). This form is equally well known and usually referred to as conformal OPE [23]. It proves to be the most convenient for implementing the scale dependence in leading-twist GPDs [24, 25]. We obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{V}_\mu^{t=4} &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{N,\text{odd}} \varkappa_N \frac{1}{(N+2)^2} \int_0^1 du (u\bar{u})^{N+1} \left\{ x_\mu [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N^V(ux)]_{l.t.} + \frac{1}{2} N(N+3) \int_0^1 dv v^{N-1} x^2 \partial_\mu [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N^V(ux)]_{l.t.} \right\}, \\ \mathbb{A}_\mu^{t=4} &= \frac{1}{4} x^2 \partial_\mu \sum_{N,\text{even}} \varkappa_N \frac{N(N+3)}{(N+2)^2} \int_0^1 du (u\bar{u})^{N+1} \int_0^1 dv v^{N-1} [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N^A(ux)]_{l.t.}, \\ \mathbb{X}^{t=4} &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{N,\text{odd}} \varkappa_N \frac{N+1}{(N+2)^2} \int_0^1 du (u\bar{u})^N (u - \bar{u}) \int_0^1 dv v^{N-1} [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N^V(ux)]_{l.t.}, \\ \mathbb{Y}^{t=4} &= -\frac{1}{4} \sum_{N,\text{odd}} \varkappa_N \frac{N+1}{(N+2)^2} \int_0^1 du (u\bar{u})^N (u^2 + \bar{u}^2) \int_0^1 dv v^{N-1} [\hat{\mathcal{O}}_N^V(ux)]_{l.t.} \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

Here $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_N$ is defined as the divergence of the leading-twist conformal operator, cf. \mathcal{O}_2 in Eq. (1):

$$\begin{aligned}\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_N(y) &= \frac{1}{N+1} \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\mu} [i\mathbf{P}^\mu, \mathcal{O}_N(y)] \\ &= [i\mathbf{P}^\mu, \mathcal{O}_{\mu\mu_1\dots\mu_N}(y)] x^{\mu_1} \dots x^{\mu_N}. \quad (22)\end{aligned}$$

One of the two integrals over the position of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_N$ can easily be taken, resulting in slightly more lengthy expressions.

Note that the operator \mathcal{O}_1 in Eq. (1), which reads $[i\mathbf{P}_\mu, [i\mathbf{P}^\mu, \mathcal{O}_N]]$ in our present notation, does not contribute to the answer for our special choice of the correlation function $T\{j_\mu(x)j_\nu(0)\}$. The T-product with generic positions of the currents, $T\{j_\mu(z_1x)j_\nu(z_2x)\}$, includes both operators. The corresponding result is much more cumbersome and will be given elsewhere.

For comparison we rewrite the leading-twist contribution in the same form:

$$\mathbb{V}_\mu^{t=2} = \partial_\mu \sum_{N,\text{odd}} \frac{\varkappa_N}{N+2} \int_0^1 du u^N \bar{u}^{N+2} \mathcal{O}_N^V(ux), \quad (23)$$

where $\mathcal{O}_N^V(ux)$ is the conformal operator (14) at the space-time position ux .

Conservation of the electromagnetic current implies that

$$\partial^\mu T_{\mu\nu}(x) = 0, \quad \partial^\nu T_{\mu\nu}(x) = i[\mathbf{P}^\nu, T_{\mu\nu}(x)]. \quad (24)$$

We have checked that these identities are satisfied up to twist-5 terms.

For completeness we give the expression for the operator $[i\mathbf{P}_\mu, \partial^\mu O(z_1, z_2)]$ entering the twist-three functions

\mathbb{V}_μ^{t-3} , \mathbb{A}_μ^{t-3} in terms of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_N$:

$$\begin{aligned}[i\mathbf{P}_\mu, \partial^\mu O(z_1, z_2)] &= \frac{1}{2} S^+ \int_0^1 u du [i\mathbf{P}_\mu [i\mathbf{P}^\mu, O(uz_1, uz_2)]] \\ &+ \sum_N \varkappa_N (N+1)^2 z_{12}^N \int_0^1 dv v^N \int_0^1 du (u\bar{u})^{N+1} \widehat{\mathcal{O}}_N(vz_{12}^u x),\end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $S^+ = z_1^2 \partial_{z_1} + z_2^2 \partial_{z_2} + 2z_1 + 2z_2$. In phenomenological applications it can be advantageous to use relations of this kind to rewrite all contributions of $\widehat{\mathcal{O}}_N$ in terms of $[i\mathbf{P}_\mu, \partial^\mu O(z_1, z_2)]$.

To summarize, we have given a complete expression for the time-ordered product of the two electromagnetic currents that resums all kinematic corrections to the twist-four accuracy. The results have immediate applications to the studies of deeply-virtual Compton scattering and $\gamma^* \rightarrow (\pi, \eta, \dots) + \gamma$ transition form factors. The twist-four terms calculated in this work give rise *both* to a $\sim t/Q^2$ correction and the target mass correction $\sim m^2/Q^2$ for DVCS, whereas for the transition form factors these two effects are indistinguishable as there is only one mass scale. We remark that the distinction between the kinematic corrections due to contributions of leading-twist [4–10] and higher-twist operators considered in our work is not invariant under translations along the line connecting the currents and has no physical meaning. Such corrections must always be summed up. Concrete applications go beyond the tasks of this letter.

Acknowledgements The work by A.M. was supported by the DFG, grant BR2021/5-2, and RFFI, grant 09-01-93108.

-
- [1] M. Diehl, Phys. Rept. **388**, 41 (2003).
 - [2] A. V. Belitsky, A. V. Radyushkin, Phys. Rept. **418**, 1 (2005).
 - [3] J. Blumlein and D. Robaschik, Nucl. Phys. B **581**, 449 (2000).
 - [4] A. V. Radyushkin, C. Weiss, Phys. Rev. **D63**, 114012 (2001).
 - [5] A. V. Belitsky, D. Mueller, Nucl. Phys. B **589**, 611 (2000).
 - [6] A. V. Belitsky, D. Mueller, Phys. Lett. **B507**, 173 (2001).
 - [7] A. V. Belitsky, D. Mueller, Phys. Rev. **D82**, 074010 (2010).
 - [8] B. Geyer, D. Robaschik, J. Eilers, Nucl. Phys. **B704**, 279 (2005).
 - [9] J. Blumlein, B. Geyer, D. Robaschik, Nucl. Phys. **B755**, 112 (2006).
 - [10] J. Blumlein, D. Robaschik, B. Geyer, Eur. Phys. J. **C61**, 279 (2009).
 - [11] O. Nachtmann, Nucl. Phys. **B63**, 237 (1973).
 - [12] S. Ferrara, A. F. Grillo, G. Parisi, R. Gatto, Phys. Lett. **B38**, 333 (1972).
 - [13] A. V. Kolesnichenko, Yad. Fiz. **39**, 1527 (1984).
 - [14] V. M. Braun, A. Lenz, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 074020 (2004).
 - [15] I. V. Anikin, B. Pire, L. Szymanowski, O. V. Teryaev, S. Wallon, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 034021 (2005).
 - [16] I. I. Balitsky, V. M. Braun, A. V. Kolesnichenko, Nucl. Phys. **B312**, 509 (1989).
 - [17] P. Ball, V. M. Braun, Nucl. Phys. **B543**, 201 (1999).
 - [18] A. P. Bukhvostov, G. V. Frolov, L. N. Lipatov, E. A. Kuraev, Nucl. Phys. **B258**, 601 (1985).
 - [19] V. M. Braun, A. N. Manashov, J. Rohrwild, Nucl. Phys. **B807**, 89 (2009).
 - [20] V. M. Braun, A. N. Manashov, J. Rohrwild, Nucl. Phys. **B826**, 235 (2010).
 - [21] N. Kivel, M. V. Polyakov, A. Schafer, O. V. Teryaev, Phys. Lett. B **497**, 73 (2001).
 - [22] I. I. Balitsky, V. M. Braun, Nucl. Phys. B **311**, 541 (1989).
 - [23] V. M. Braun, G. P. Korchemsky, D. Mueller, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **51**, 311 (2003).
 - [24] D. Mueller, A. Schafer, Nucl. Phys. **B739**, 1 (2006).
 - [25] M. Kirch, A. Manashov, A. Schafer, Phys. Rev. **D72**, 114006 (2005).