

Full phenomenological consistency of the singlet-triplet scotogenic model

Andrés Rivera*, Diego Restrepo†

Instituto de Física, Universidad de Antioquia,

Calle 70 No. 52-21, Medellín, Colombia

September 18, 2018

Abstract

The singlet-triplet fermion dark matter model...

1 Introduction

The singlet-triplet scotogenic model was introduced in [1]. Is a simple model that in essence combine two known models. The former is the radiative seesaw model (the scotogenic model) [2] and latter is the triplet fermion dark matter model [3]. Both models propose a good WIMP dark matter candidates, they gives the correct relic density in the universe [4], and they are able to reproduced the parameters of the neutrino physics choosing some adequate regions of their parameter space. The single triplet fermion scotogenic model have a rich phenomenology. It has signal for WIMP nuclear-recoils, i.e. it has direct detection signal that can be testec in future experiments like XENON1T [5], LZ [6] and Darwin [7]. Something remarkable is that in the simple model proposed, it only has features for spin-independent interaction of the dark matter with nucleons, it is blind for spin-dependent interaction of the dark matter with nucleons, because it does not have interaction since the Z gauge boson. However, this observable can be generated to one loop in some region that we will aboard in this letter. Other remarkable features of this model us that it has some lepton flavor violation (LFV) processes that restring the model itself and impose strong condition in its parameter space. In particular, it have some strong restriction in radiative decays signals as $l_\alpha \rightarrow l_\beta \gamma$ in witch the principal is the $\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$ process, 3-body LFV decays as $\mu \rightarrow 3e$ and $\mu - e$ conversion in nuclei [8]. Even more, recently, it was shown that this model have a good consistency to high energies. Specifically, the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry that stabilizes the dark matter particle and ensure the radiative seesaw of the neutrino mass is preserve, i.e., is possible to have a exact \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry without an spontaneous breaking in the evolution of the renormalization group equation thanks to the presence of the scalar particles inside the model [9]. Indirect signal In retrospective, this model is able to reproduce the dark matter present in our universe, it can be explain the neutrino masses, it have a direct and

*afelipe.rivera@udea.edu.co

†restrepo@udea.edu.co

	Scalars		Fermions	
Particle	η	Ω	N	Σ
$SU(2)_L$	2	3	1	3
$U(1)_Y$	1/2	0	0	0
\mathbb{Z}_2	-	+	-	-

Table 1: New particle content and charge under the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ group.

indirect detection signals that can be tested in future experiments, it has LFV observables that are restricted by currently experiments and will impose strong constraints in the future, and even more, this model has a collider signals that can be tested in some experiments like the LHC [10].

After, this short introduction, the propose of this letter is to study the full consistence of all those observables at the same time. It is in this way that the model takes sense, looking for the full consistency at to some acceptable limit, i.e. our idea is to find the correct parameter space that fulfill the relic density [4], the neutrino physics parameters [11, 12], the LFV observables [8], and elastic scatter cross-section with nucleons, i.e. direct and indirect detection experiments. After that, we will show the future prospects regarding fermionic dark matter in this model and we will looking for some observables to 1-loop as gamma ray lines $\chi^0 \chi^0 \rightarrow \gamma \gamma$ and 1-loop correction to the elastic scatter cross-section with nucleon.

The paper is organized as follows. In section 2 we introduce the model, in section 3 we do a broad search of the parameter space that is consistent with the dark matter, the neutrino physics an the theoretical constraints, specifically, regarding to the perturbativity of the theory and the *co-positivity* of the scalar potential(bounded from below) [9]. In section ?? we analyzed the direct detection status of the model and the future prospects. In section ?? we study the indirect detection status as well as its future perspectives. In section 5 we will compute some observalbes to 1-loop as future signals of the model. Finally, in section 6 we summarize our results, we give the conclusions and the future perspectives of the model.

2 The model

This model extend the gauge symmetry of the standard model (SM) with a new discrete \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry that stabilize the dark mater particle. In addition to the standard model particle content, all even under the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry, the model is extend with an scalar doublet η , an real scalar triplet Ω , an two fermions with zero hypercharge, the former a singlet N and the later a triplet Σ . Their charge assignment is shown in Table 1. We follow the notation given in [8,9]. Explicitly, the new fields are,

$$\eta = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^+ \\ \eta^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\eta^R + i\eta^I) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Omega = \begin{pmatrix} \Omega^0 & \Omega^+ \\ \Omega^- & -\frac{\Omega^0}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad N, \quad \Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\Sigma^0}{\sqrt{2}} & \Sigma^+ \\ \Sigma^- & -\frac{\Sigma^0}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

The most general and invariant Lagrangian is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L} = & Y_e^{\alpha\beta} \bar{L}_\alpha \phi e_\beta + Y_N^\alpha \bar{L}_\alpha \tilde{\eta} N + Y_\Sigma^\alpha \bar{L}_\alpha \tilde{\eta} \Sigma + Y_\Omega \bar{\Sigma} \Omega N \\ & + \frac{1}{2} M_\Sigma \bar{\Sigma}^c \Sigma + \frac{1}{2} M_N \bar{N}^c N + \text{h.c.} - V(\phi, \eta, \Omega),\end{aligned}\quad (2)$$

where L and e are the fermions of the standard model, $\alpha, \beta = 1, 2, 3$, ϕ is the scalar doublet of the standard model, $\tilde{\eta} = i\sigma_2 \eta^*$ as usual, and $V(\phi, \eta, \Omega)$ is the scalar potential of this new model, which is given by

$$\begin{aligned}V(\phi, \eta, \Omega) = & -m_\phi^2 \phi^\dagger \phi + m_\eta^2 \eta^\dagger \eta + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^{\text{SM}} (\phi^\dagger \phi)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 (\eta^\dagger \eta)^2 + \lambda_3 (\phi^\dagger \phi) (\eta^\dagger \eta) + \lambda_4 (\phi^\dagger \eta) (\eta^\dagger \phi) \\ & + \frac{\lambda_5}{2} [(\phi^\dagger \eta) + \text{h.c.}] - \frac{m_\Omega^2}{2} \Omega^\dagger \Omega + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^\Omega (\phi^\dagger \phi) (\Omega^\dagger \Omega) + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_2^\Omega (\Omega^\dagger \Omega)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^\eta (\eta^\dagger \eta) (\Omega^\dagger \Omega) \\ & + \mu_1 \phi^\dagger \Omega \phi + \mu_2 \eta^\dagger \Omega \eta.\end{aligned}\quad (3)$$

This scalar potential is subject to some theoretical constraints. First, we demand the perturbativity of the theory, i.e. all the λ couplings needs to be ≤ 1 . Second, we demand the stability of the potential, i.e. it has to be bounden from below. In this case, it have been study that the *co-positivity* of the potential is guaranteed if [9];

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1 \geq 0, \quad \lambda_2 \geq 0, \quad \lambda_2^\Omega \geq 0, \quad \lambda_3 + \sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \geq 0, \\ \lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5| + \sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2} \geq 0, \quad \lambda_1^\Omega + \sqrt{2\lambda_1 \lambda_2^\Omega} \geq 0, \quad \lambda^\eta + \sqrt{2\lambda_2 \lambda_2^\Omega} \geq 0, \\ \sqrt{2\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_2^\Omega} + \lambda_3 \sqrt{2\lambda_2^\Omega} + \lambda_1^\Omega \sqrt{\lambda_2} + \lambda^\eta \sqrt{\lambda_1} + \sqrt{\left(\lambda_3 + \sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}\right) \left(\lambda_1^\Omega + \sqrt{2\lambda_1 \lambda_2^\Omega}\right) \left(\lambda^\eta + \sqrt{2\lambda_2 \lambda_2^\Omega}\right)} \geq 0,\end{aligned}\quad (4)$$

where we should replace λ_3 by $(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5|)$ in the last inequality in case that $\lambda_4 + |\lambda_5| < 0$.

The symmetry breaking in this model is such that

$$\langle \phi^0 \rangle = \frac{v_\phi}{2}, \quad \langle \Omega^0 \rangle = v_\Omega, \quad \langle \eta^0 \rangle = 0, \quad (5)$$

where the vacuum expectation values (VEVs) are itself determinate by the tadpoles equations

$$t_\phi = \frac{\partial V}{\partial v_\phi} = -m_\phi^2 v_\phi + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 v_\phi^3 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^\Omega v_\phi v_\Omega^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v_\phi v_\Omega \mu_1 = 0 \quad (6)$$

$$t_\Omega = \frac{\partial V}{\partial v_\Omega} = -m_\Omega^2 v_\Omega + \lambda_2^\Omega v_\Omega^3 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^\Omega v_\phi^2 v_\Omega - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v_\phi^2 \mu_1 = 0. \quad (7)$$

In this frame, the standard gauge boson receive new contribution to its mass, those are

$$m_W^2 = \frac{1}{4} g^2 (v_\phi^2 + 4v_\Omega^2), \quad m_Z^2 = \frac{1}{4} (g^2 + g'^2) v_\phi^2. \quad (8)$$

In particular, the W boson mass is strongly constrained by the value of the triplet VEV, we demand that $v_\Omega < 5 \text{ GeV}$ [13].

2.1 \mathbb{Z}_2 -even and \mathbb{Z}_2 -odd spectrum

The new scalar spectrum in this model is divided in two parts. The \mathbb{Z}_2 -even scalars ϕ^0 , Ω^0 , Ω^\pm , ϕ^\pm and the \mathbb{Z}_2 -odd scalars η^0 , η^\pm , where η^0 is a good dark matter candidate widely studied in the literature. In this frame, the neutral scalars ϕ^0 and Ω^0 are mixed by a 2×2 mass matrix. We assume that this matrix is diagonalized with the β angle, such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & \sin \beta \\ -\sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi^0 \\ \Omega^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

The lightest h_i \mathbb{Z}_2 -even scalar needs to be identified with the 126 GeV scalar discovered at the LHC and the heavier one remains as a new scalar higgs boson present in this theory. In the same way, the charged scalars ϕ^\pm and Ω^\pm are too mixed by a 2×2 mass matrix. We assume that this matrix is diagonalized with the δ angle, such that

$$\begin{pmatrix} H_1^\pm \\ H_2^\pm \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \delta & \sin \delta \\ -\sin \delta & \cos \delta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi^\pm \\ \Omega^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

One of the H^\pm charged scalar needs to be identified with the Goldstone boson usual in the standard model which is identified with longitudinal component of the W boson. The remainder is identified as a new charged scalar present in this theory. On the other hand, the \mathbb{Z}_2 -odd scalars η^0 and η^\pm do not mix because \mathbb{Z}_2 is conserved. Their masses are given by

$$m_{\eta^\pm}^2 = m_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda_3 v_\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^\eta v_\Omega^2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}v_\Omega \mu_2 \quad (11)$$

$$m_{\eta_R}^2 = m_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 + \lambda_5) v_\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^\eta v_\Omega^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}v_\Omega \mu_2 \quad (12)$$

$$m_{\eta_I}^2 = m_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2}(\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - \lambda_5) v_\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2}\lambda^\eta v_\Omega^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}v_\Omega \mu_2. \quad (13)$$

The new fermion spectrum of the model consist of two neutral fermions χ_i^0 which the lightest one can play the roll of the dark matter particle and one charge femion χ^\pm which comes from the charged component of the triplet fermion field Σ ¹. In this framework, the \mathbb{Z}_2 -odd fields Σ^0 and N mixed by the Yukawa coupling Y_Ω of the eq. 2 and a non-zero VEV v_Ω . The Majorana mass matrix in the basis (Σ^0, N) is given by

$$M_\chi = \begin{pmatrix} M_\Sigma & Y_\Omega v_\Omega \\ Y_\Omega v_\Omega & M_N \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

which is diagonalized by a 2×2 matrix $V(\alpha)$, such that,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \chi_1^0 \\ \chi_2^0 \end{pmatrix} = V(\alpha) \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma^0 \\ N \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & \sin \alpha \\ -\sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma^0 \\ N \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

¹The mass of the χ^\pm particle at tree level is given by M_Σ , however, it is known that there is a mass gap between the Σ^0 and Σ^\pm in the pure triplet fermion model which is approximately given by the mass of the neutral pion π^0 [10, 14].

Therefore, the tree level mass for χ^\pm and the χ_i^0 eigenstates are

$$\begin{aligned} m_{\chi_i^0} &= M_\Sigma \\ m_{\chi_1^0} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(M_\Sigma + M_N - \sqrt{(M_\Sigma - M_N)^2 - 4(Y_\Omega v_\Omega)^2} \right) \\ m_{\chi_2^0} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(M_\Sigma + M_N + \sqrt{(M_\Sigma - M_N)^2 - 4(Y_\Omega v_\Omega)^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

and the α mixing angle fulfill the relation

$$\tan(2\alpha) = \frac{2Y_\Omega v_\Omega}{M_\Sigma - M_N}. \quad (17)$$

2.2 Dark matter candidates

In the singlet-triplet scotogenic model we have scalars and fermionic dark matter particles. The lightest state charged under the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry will be a good candidate for weakly interacting dark matter particle.

- i) Regarding scalars candidates, the lightest component of the neutral η^0 state, i.e. η^R or η^I will be the scalar dark matter candidate. This model has been studied extensively in the literature [15] \dots , and it is known that its phenomenology is driven principally for gauge interactions which dominated the dark matter production in the early universe.
- ii) On the other hand, the lightest χ_i^0 eigenvalue that comes from the mixing between the triplet component Σ^0 and the fermion singlet N will be the fermion dark matter candidate. In this case, we have a rich phenomenology that comes itself by the mixing between the singlet and the triplet fermion [1, 8, 9]. Some important features of this dark matter candidate are based in its nature. When it is principally singlet, i.e. when $\chi_i^0 \approx N$, the dark matter phenomenology is dominated by the Yukawa interactions, principally driven by the Y_N coupling of the Lagrangian 2. It implies some direct relation with LFV observables and it is so difficult to explain the relic density with Yukawa coupling to order $\mathcal{O} \lesssim 1$ [16]. On the other hand, when the dark is mostly triplet, i.e. when $\chi_i^0 \approx \Sigma^0$, its phenomenology is driven by gauge interaction. In this framework is important the coannihilation with the charged fermion χ^\pm and it does not have serious implications in LFV observables. Even more, it is known that in this regime the correct relic density is only reproduced when the dark matter mass is around ~ 2.4 GeV [3]. However, some very features of the singlet-triplet mixing, perhaps the most attractive one, is that the mixing itself give us the opportunity to have a dark fermion mass in the GeV-TeV range.

In this paper we will focus in the fermion dark matter case, which is the lightest eigenvalue χ_i^0 of the eq. 15. We will called it χ^0 in the developing of this work.

2.3 Neutrino masses

In this model the neutrino masses are generated to 1-loop level. They have the nature of being Majorana masses. Concretely, the mass is generated by the four diagrams schematically shown in Figure 1. Note that η^0 implies two fields, η^R , η^I and $i = 1, 2$. The neutrino mass matrix to 1-loop




Figure 1: 1-loop diagram that generate masses in this model.

can be written as

$$(\mathcal{M}_\nu)_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{h_{\alpha i} h_{\beta i} m_{\chi_i^0}}{2(4\pi)^2} \left[\frac{m_{\eta_R}^2 \ln \left(\frac{m_{\chi_i^0}^2}{m_{\eta_R}^2} \right)}{m_{\chi_i^0}^2 - m_{\eta_R}^2} - \frac{m_{\eta_I}^2 \ln \left(\frac{m_{\chi_i^0}^2}{m_{\eta_I}^2} \right)}{m_{\chi_i^0}^2 - m_{\eta_I}^2} \right] = \sum_{i=1}^2 h_{\alpha i} \Lambda_i (h^T)_{i\beta} = (h \Lambda h^T)_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (18)$$

where h and Λ are matrices, respectively given by

$$h = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} Y_\Sigma^1 & \sqrt{2} Y_N^1 \\ Y_\Sigma^2 & \sqrt{2} Y_N^2 \\ Y_\Sigma^3 & \sqrt{2} Y_N^3 \end{pmatrix} \cdot V^T(\alpha), \quad \Lambda = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

with

$$\Lambda_i = \frac{m_{\chi_i^0}}{2(4\pi)^2} \left[\frac{m_{\eta_R}^2 \ln \left(\frac{m_{\chi_i^0}^2}{m_{\eta_R}^2} \right)}{m_{\chi_i^0}^2 - m_{\eta_R}^2} - \frac{m_{\eta_I}^2 \ln \left(\frac{m_{\chi_i^0}^2}{m_{\eta_I}^2} \right)}{m_{\chi_i^0}^2 - m_{\eta_I}^2} \right]. \quad (20)$$

Note that in the limit of $m_{\eta_R} = m_{\eta_I}$ we have a zero neutrino masses. This vanishing can be understood because according with the eq. 12 and 13 it means that $\lambda_5=0$ and therefore it can be impose a conserved lepton number in this model. Even more, it can be shown that in the limit where the χ_i^0 eigenvalues are lighter than the other fields, we obtain a simple expression for the neutrino mass matrix in terms of λ_5 [1], it is

$$(\mathcal{M}_\nu)_{\alpha\beta} \approx \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{h_{\alpha i} h_{\beta i}}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{\lambda_5 v_\phi^2}{m_0^2} m_{\chi_i^0}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$m_0^2 = m_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_3 + \lambda_4) v_\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda^\eta v_\Omega^2 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} v_\Omega \mu_2 \Rightarrow m_{\eta^{I,R}}^2 = m_0^2 \pm \lambda_5 v_\phi^2. \quad (22)$$

Parameter	Range
M_N	$1 - 10^4$ (GeV)
M_Σ	$100 - 10^4$ (GeV)
m_η	$100 - 10^4$ (GeV)
μ_i	$1 - 10^5$ (GeV)
$ \lambda_i $, $ \lambda_i^\Omega $, $ \lambda^\eta $	$10^{-4} - 1$
v_Ω	$10^{-2} - 5$ (GeV)

Table 2: Scanning parameter ranges.

It is convenient express the Yukawas couplings $h_{\alpha i}$ in the eq. 18 using the Casas-Ibarra parametrization [17, 18]. It turns out that

$$h = U^* \sqrt{\widetilde{M}} R \sqrt{\Lambda}^{-1}, \quad (23)$$

where U is the PMNS (Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata) matrix, $\widetilde{M} = \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3)$ with m_i the neutrino physical masses, Λ is given by the eq. 19 and R is a 3×2 complex, arbitrary and orthogonal matrix, such that $R R^T = \mathbb{I}_{3 \times 3}$. The R matrix is similar to that one found in the context of type-one seesaw with two generations of right-handed neutrinos, where we obtain one massless neutrino [18]. It depends of the neutrino hierarchy (NH: Normal hierarchy, IH: Inverse hierarchy),

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \cos \gamma & \sin \gamma \\ -\sin \gamma & \cos \gamma \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for NH}, \quad m_1 \rightarrow 0$$

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \gamma & \sin \gamma \\ -\sin \gamma & \cos \gamma \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for IH}, \quad m_3 \rightarrow 0, \quad (24)$$

where γ is in general a complex angle.

3 The compatibility between the dark matter and neutrino physics

In order to study the dark matter phenomenology of this model, we scan the parameter space by considering the ranges that are shown in Table 2. We fixed m_η and $M_\Sigma > 100$ GeV in order to be conservative with LEP searches of charge particles [19] and $v_\Omega < 5$ GeV constrained by the W gauge boson mass [13]. The remaining parameters were computed from this set. In particular, m_Ω was computed using the tadpole eq. 7, λ_1^{SM} and m_ϕ^2 in the scalar potential 3 were fixed by the tadpole eq. 6 and the mass for the scalar of the standard model, $m_h \approx 125$ GeV. We did a carefully random search where we imposed the theoretical constraints given by the eq. 4 and the correct Yukawa coupling Y_Σ^i , Y_N^i that reproduced the neutrino oscillation parameters [11, 12]. In order to do that, we follow the algorithm described in sec. 2.3². After that, we implement this model in SARAH [29, 30] couple to the SPheno [31, 32] routines. Later, we used MicrOMEGAs 4.2.5 [20] in order to compute the relic density and we only took the models that fulfill the current value $\Omega h^2 = (0.120 \pm 0.001)$ to 3σ [4]. We

²We realized that neutrino hierarchy (IH, NH) does not play an important role in the analysis, for that reason we select randomly both hierarchies.




Figure 2: Parameter space that is fully consistent with dark matter and neutrino physics in the singlet-triplet scotogenic model. In color, we show the variable ξ define in the eq. 25. Bigger values of ξ is the limit for singlet fermion model $\sim N$ and shorts values correspond to the limit for triplet fermion dark matter $\sim \Sigma^0$.

realized, although the mixture between the triplet fermion Σ^0 and the singlet fermion N is important, the parameters space that is full consistent with the dark matter framework and the neutrino physics status, prefers a singlet component. In the left plot of Figure 2 we show that the mass of the dark matter particle is principally the mass of the singlet fermion M_N . Even more, in the right plot of this figure, we can see that the difference between the mass of the dark matter particle and the triplet fermion mass M_Σ . We realized that $|m_{\chi^0} - m_\Sigma|$ is always bigger than 10 GeV for $m_{\chi^0} < 2 \times 10^3$ GeV and for $m_{\chi^0} > 2 \times 10^3$ GeV the model recovers the known limit of the Minimal Dark Matter scenarios when the dark matter particle is the triplet Σ and the co-annihilation process are important. In those plots we show in color the quantity

$$\xi = \frac{|M_\Sigma - m_{\chi^0}|}{m_{\chi^0}} \quad (25)$$

that was introduce in [1] as a indicator of the behavior of the singlet-triplet mixing in all the full region.

3.1 The status of direct-indirect detection of dark matter

A tree level, this model produce direct detection signal. In particular, it has nuclear recoils, i.e. it has an spin-independent cross-section (σ_{SI}) and it is blind to spin-dependent signals because we do not have a tree level coupling between the dark matter and Z gauge boson. The spin-independent scattering process between the dark matter an the nucleon are mediated by the two higgses h_i of the model that comes from the mixing between the scalars Ω^0 and ϕ . The process is shown in Figure 3 and it is easily computed, in the limit where the Mandelstam variable t is negligible. It is given by

$$\sigma_{SI} = \frac{\mu_{\text{red}}^2}{\pi} \left[\frac{M_{\text{Nuc}} f_N}{v} \frac{Y_\Omega \sin(2\alpha) \sin(2\beta)}{2} \left(\frac{1}{m_{h_2}^2} - \frac{1}{m_{h_1}^2} \right) \right]^2, \quad (26)$$




Figure 3: Spin-independent process in the singlet-triple scotogenic model. In the left, we show the process in the gauge basis. In the right, we show the process in the mass basis in order to show that actually we have contributions coming from the two higgses h_i .

where, M_{Nuc} is the nucleon mass, $f_N \approx 0.3$ is the nucleon form factor, $\mu_{\text{red}} = m_{\chi^0} M_{\text{Nuc}} / (m_{\chi^0} + M_{\text{Nuc}})$ is the reduced mass of the system and m_{h_i} is the mass of the higgs h_i .

We compute the σ_{SI} for each point of the scan that was compatible with the relic density of the dark matter and the neutrino physics at the same time. Even more, we did a cross-check with the **MicrOMEGAs** 4.2.5 routine [20]. Our results are shown in the left part of Figure 4 with the current experimental limits of XENON1T [5], PANDAS [21] and the LZ prospects [6]. After this, we clearly see that the scan prefers the region with a dark matter mass $m_{\chi^0} \gtrsim 100$ GeV. Even more, we assure that the region with low dark matter mass will be excluded by LFV processes as we will show in the next section. We can see that the model is not seriously restricted by the current experimental searches. Even more, the majority of the points fall into the Neutrino Coherent Scattering (NCS) [22, 23], where they will be challenging to look for in the future. Perhaps, the most important feature is that the neutrino oscillation parameters drastically restrict the parameter space of the model. After the Casas-Ibarra routine described in section 2.3, the model gives us Yukawa couplings Y_{Σ}^i and Y_N^i all of them in the range $1^{-4} < |Y_{\Sigma, N}^i| < 1$. By construction, they reproduce the neutrino physics and they reduce drastically the parameter space of the model. In order to show that, we plot in grey the contour of the naked parameter space that is only compatible with dark matter and was established in the ref. [1].

On the other hand, we used the **MicrOMEGAs** 4.2.5 routine [20] to compute the velocity annihilation cross-section $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ of this model for each point of the scan that was compatible with the relic density of the dark matter and the neutrino physics at the same time. It is shown in the right part of Figure 4 with the 95% C.L gamma-ray upper limits from dSphs for dark matter annihilation into $b\bar{b}$ and WW [24]. As in the previous analysis, the region of low dark matter mass is seriously constrained by the neutrino physics. In grey, we plot the contour of the naked parameter space that is only compatible with dark matter and was established in the ref. [1].

4 Lepton Flavor Violation (LFV) processes

In this model we have LFV processes that seriously constrain its parameter space. Recently it was shown that the most promising experiments perspectives are based on $\mu \rightarrow 3e$, $\mu - e$ conversion in nuclei and 3-body decays $l_{\beta} \rightarrow l_{\alpha} \gamma$ which $\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$ is the most important one [8].

Before doing this analysis we take care of our previous findings. In sec. 3.1 we realized that the




Figure 4: Left: Spin-independent cross-section. We show the current limits of XENON1T [5], PANDAS [21], the LZ prospects [6] and the Neutrino Coherent Scattering (NCS) [22, 23]. Right: Velocity averaged annihilation cross-section as a function of the dark matter mass in comparison to current indirect detection limits in different channels. The 95% C.L gamma-ray upper limits from dSphs were extracted from ref. [24]. In both plots, we show the region compatible with the relic density but without the correct Yukawas that reproduce the neutrino oscillation parameters. In colors, we plot the ξ variable defined in the eq. 25.

mixing between the triplet Σ^0 and the singlet N is necessary in order to get the correct relic density of the dark matter with a fermion mass $m_{\chi^0} < 2.7$ TeV. However, we found that in the special region with $100 \text{ GeV} < m_{\chi^0} < 1 \text{ TeV}$, the eigenvalue given by the mixing is almost singlet. This was assured by the value of the ξ parameters plotted in all previous figures. Even more, we checked that mixed angle defined by the eq. 15 fulfill that $\cos \alpha \approx 0$ and $\sin \alpha \approx 1$ in this region. Therefore, we computed the $l_\beta \rightarrow l_\alpha \gamma$ process in this limit. Its principal contributions come from the Feynman diagrams shown in Figure 5 which the left diagram with neutral fermion in the loop is common to the original scotogenic model [16, 25]. However, the diagram with the charged fermion in the loop is characteristic of this model, i.e. we have two contributions. The former comes from the mixing of the neutral fermions and the last comes from the charge fermion Σ^\pm . The branching ratio for this




Figure 5: Dominant Feynman diagrams in the $l_\beta \rightarrow l_\alpha \gamma$ process.




Figure 6: Left: $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ values for the scan of the parameter space agree with dark matter and the neutrino oscillation parameter. The grey line show the current limit [26], i.e. the upper region is exclude. Right: $\mu \rightarrow 3e$ values for the scan. The grey line show the current limit [27].

process is approximately given by

$$\text{Br}(l_\beta \rightarrow l_\alpha \gamma) \approx \frac{3 \alpha_{em} \text{Br}(l_\beta \rightarrow l_\alpha \nu_\beta \bar{\nu}_\alpha)}{64 \pi G_F^2} \left| \frac{Y_{N\alpha} Y_{N\beta}^* F_2(\xi_1) + \frac{1}{2} Y_{\Sigma\alpha} Y_{\Sigma\beta}^* F_2(\xi_2)}{m_{\eta^\pm}^2} - \frac{1}{m_{\eta^0}^2} Y_{\Sigma\alpha} Y_{\Sigma\beta}^* G_2 \left(\frac{m_{\chi_2^\pm}^2}{m_{\eta^0}^2} \right) \right|^2, \quad (27)$$

where,

$$\xi_i = \frac{m_{\chi_i^0}^2}{m_{\eta^\pm}^2} \quad (28)$$

$$F_2(z) = \frac{1 - 6z + 3z^2 + 2z^3 - 6z^2 \ln z}{6(1 - z)^4} \quad (29)$$

$$G_2(z) = \frac{2 + 3z - 6z^2 + z^3 + 6z \ln z}{6(1 - z)^4}. \quad (30)$$

We clearly see the two contribution of the diagrams shown in Figure 5. Even more, we check that in the limit of the single scotogenic model, we recover the expression reported in the ref. [16] and in the limit of $\cos \alpha \approx 0$ we recover the expression reported in the ref. [8]. In the left part of Figure 6 we show the the behavior of the $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ process for the scan done in the previous section. Our analytical expression was checked with the **FalvorKit** [28] of **SARAH** [29, 30] couple to the **SPheno** [31, 32] routines. Also, we show the current experimental bounds carry out by MEG experiment [26]. Even more, we compute numerically the $\mu \rightarrow 3e$ process which is shown in the right part of Figure 6 with its present bound given by the SINDRUM experiment [27]. We realize that some points of the parameter space are excluded, specially those with bigger ξ values. Even more, we can see that




Figure 7: Behavior of the parameters of the singlet-triplet scotogenic model that fulfil dark matter neutrino physics and LFV process.

although LFV processes exclude almost all the region with $m_{\chi^0} \lesssim 100$ GeV, the majority of the models with $m_{\chi^0} \gtrsim 100$ GeV survives and the previous analysis does not change significantly.

As a final part of this section, in Figure 7 we show the behavior of some of the parameters of the model that past all the last constraints. According with those plots we conclude the next features. The Yukawa couplings Y_N^1 and Y_Σ^1 control the $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ process. Bigger couplings than one give us LFV in this model as we show in the up plots of the figure with similar behavior is found for all the Yukawa couplings Y_N^i and Y_Σ^i . The VEV v_Ω of the triplet scalar controls the spin-independent cross section as we expect by the construction of the model. The velocity averaged annihilation cross-section is clearly controlled by the mixing angle α defined in the ec. 15. Sizable values for $|\alpha - 90^\circ|$ give us sizable values for the $\langle\sigma v\rangle$ as we can see in lower-right part of this figure. Even more, we assure that those are the promising points that will create bigger fluxes of gamma-ray as we will see in next section.

5 1-loop prospect processes

In this section we compute some new observables to 1-loop level in this model that were forbidden to tree level. The former is the spin-dependent cross-section of dark matter recoil with nuclei and the last is dark matter annihilation into two photons. Both of them are promising process for future searches of this model.

5.1 Spin-dependent cross-section to 1-loop

$$\begin{aligned}\sigma_{N,SD} &= \frac{16}{\pi} \frac{M_1^2 m_N^2}{(M_1 + m_N)^2} J_N(J_N + 1) \xi_N^2 \\ &\approx 10^{-4} \text{pb} \left(\frac{y_1}{0.3}\right)^4 \mathcal{G}_\epsilon \left(\frac{M_1^2}{m_S^2}\right)^2 V_{12}^4 \dots \text{in process}\end{aligned}\quad (31)$$




Figure 8: Do plot ...

5.2 Gamma-ray signal: DM annihilation into two photons

The dark matter annihilation into photons in this model is a loop process given for multiples topologies. In general, the dark matter annihilates into two photons ($\chi_1^0 \chi_1^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$) and into a photon and a one Z gauge boson ($\chi_1^0 \chi_1^0 \rightarrow \gamma Z$). In this work, we compute the complete amplitude for the former process, the later one is off to the scope of this work. Following the general expression given in [33] we computed the general amplitude for the $\chi_1^0 \chi_1^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ process. Even more, we use **FeynArts** [34], **FormCalc** to reduce the tensor loop integrals to scalar Passarino–Veltman functions [35] and **Package-X** [36] to compute the amplitude of this process and to do a cross-check with the general algorithm implemented in [33]. The cross-section for this process is given by

$$\sigma v(\chi_1^0 \chi_1^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma) = \frac{|\mathcal{B}|^2}{32\pi m_{\chi_1^0}^2}, \quad (32)$$

where \mathcal{B} is an scalar function that we will call the \mathcal{B} factor. It is given in the Appendix A, eq. 33. It was written in such a way that we factorized the gauge invariant contribution in order to see




Figure 9: Dark matter annihilation into two photon in the singlet-triplet scotogenic model.

the impact of the different parameters of the model. Even more, in the Appendix A we show that this general expression reproduce some known limits. For instance, in the limit of singlet fermion dark matter, that is, $\alpha = 90^\circ$ and $Y_\Omega = 0$, the eq. 33 reproduced the amplitude of the scotogenic model [33, 37] as we show sec. A.1. In the same way, in the limit of pure triplet dark matter, that is $Y_\Omega = Y_N^\alpha = Y_\Sigma^\alpha = v_\Omega = 0$, $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and $m = M_\Sigma$, the eq. 33 reproduce the results obtained in the high mass region for minimal dark matter [14] as we show in sec. A.2. After doing this check for those two known limits, we disagree with the ref. [10]. This contribution can not be extracted from a super-symmetry limit because that case does not have a pure triplet scalar Ω .

In Figure 9 we show the dark matter annihilation into two photons in this model. The black point in process ...

6 Conclusions

In this work we ...

7 Acknowledgments

We would like to thank ...

A General \mathcal{B} factor in this model

We factorized the \mathcal{B} factor in gauge invariant terms in order to get clarity in the expression

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{B} = & \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha m^2 \sin^2(\alpha) \mathbf{Y}_\Omega^2 (\sin(\delta) + \cos(\delta))^2}{\pi} \left[\frac{M_{H^\pm}^2 C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; M_{H^\pm}^2, M_{H^\pm}^2, M_\Sigma^2)}{M_{H^\pm}^2 - M_\Sigma^2} \right. \\
& - \frac{M_\Sigma (-2mM_{H^\pm}^2 - M_\Sigma M_{H^\pm}^2 + m^2 M_\Sigma + 2mM_\Sigma^2 + M_\Sigma^3) C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; M_\Sigma^2, M_\Sigma^2, M_{H^\pm}^2)}{(M_{H^\pm}^2 - M_\Sigma^2)(M_{H^\pm}^2 + m^2 - M_\Sigma^2)} \\
& + \left. \frac{2M_\Sigma(m + M_\Sigma) C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; M_\Sigma^2, M_\Sigma^2, M_\Sigma^2)}{-M_{H^\pm}^2 - m^2 + M_\Sigma^2} \right] \\
& + \frac{\alpha m^2 \sin(\alpha) \cos(\alpha) \mathbf{Y}_N^\alpha \mathbf{Y}_\Sigma^\alpha}{\pi} \left[- \frac{m_\eta^2 C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_\eta^2, m_\eta^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2} \right. \\
& + \frac{m_{e_i}^2 (m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 - m_\eta^2) C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_\eta^2)}{(m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2)(-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2)} + \frac{2m_{e_i}^2 C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2} \Big] \\
& + \frac{\alpha m^2 \cos^2(\alpha) (\mathbf{Y}_\Sigma^\alpha)^2}{2\sqrt{2}\pi} \left[\frac{m_\eta^2 C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_\eta^2, m_\eta^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2} \right. \\
& - \frac{m_{e_i}^2 (m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 - m_\eta^2) C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_\eta^2)}{(m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2)(-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2)} - \frac{2m_{e_i}^2 C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2} \Big] \\
& + \frac{\sqrt{2}\alpha m^2 \sin^2(\alpha) (\mathbf{Y}_N^\alpha)^2}{2\pi} \left[\frac{m_\eta^2 C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_\eta^2, m_\eta^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2} \right. \\
& - \frac{m_{e_i}^2 (m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 - m_\eta^2) C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_\eta^2)}{(m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2)(-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2)} - \frac{2m_{e_i}^2 C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2} \Big] \\
& - \frac{8\sqrt{2}\alpha m^2 \cos^2(\alpha) M_W^2}{\pi (M_\Sigma^2 - M_W^2) (4v_\Omega^2 + v_\phi^2) (m^2 - M_\Sigma^2 + M_W^2) (m^2 + M_\Sigma^2 - M_W^2)} \\
& \left[4(m^2 - M_W^2) (M_\Sigma^2 - M_W^2) (m^2 - M_\Sigma^2 + M_W^2) C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; M_W^2, M_W^2, M_W^2) \right. \\
& + 2M_\Sigma (2m - M_\Sigma) (M_\Sigma^2 - M_W^2) (m^2 + M_\Sigma^2 - M_W^2) C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; M_\Sigma^2, M_\Sigma^2, M_\Sigma^2) \\
& - (m^2 - M_\Sigma^2 + M_W^2) (-M_W^2 (m^2 + M_\Sigma^2) - 4mM_\Sigma (m^2 + M_\Sigma^2 - M_W^2) + 4M_\Sigma^4 + M_W^4) \\
& C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; M_W^2, M_W^2, M_\Sigma^2) - M_\Sigma (m^2 + M_\Sigma^2 - M_W^2) (4m^3 - 3m^2 M_\Sigma + M_\Sigma^3 - M_\Sigma M_W^2) \\
& \left. C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; M_\Sigma^2, M_\Sigma^2, M_W^2) \right] \tag{33}
\end{aligned}$$

A.1 Pure singlet dark matter (Scotogenic limit)

The \mathcal{B} factor in this case can be obtained from the eq. 33 taken $\alpha = 90^\circ$, $Y_\Omega = 0$. In this limit we have:

$$\mathcal{B} = \frac{\alpha m^2 (Y_N^\alpha)^2}{\sqrt{2}\pi} \left[\frac{m_\eta^2 C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_\eta^2, m_\eta^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2} - \frac{m_{e_i}^2 (m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 - m_\eta^2) C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_\eta^2)}{(m_\eta^2 - m_{e_i}^2)(-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2)} - \frac{2m_{e_i}^2 C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2, m_{e_i}^2)}{-m_{e_i}^2 + m^2 + m_\eta^2} \right] \quad (34)$$

in the limit of $m \gg m_{e_i}$, i.e. when the dark matter mass is bigger than standard model lepton masses, this expression gives (we used `PackageX` [36])

$$\mathcal{B} = \frac{\alpha (Y_N^\alpha)^2}{2\sqrt{2}\pi} \left[\text{Li}_2\left(\frac{m^2}{m_\eta^2}\right) - \text{Li}_2\left(-\frac{m^2}{m_\eta^2}\right) \right]. \quad (35)$$

Therefore, using the eq. 32, we have

$$\sigma v = \frac{|\mathcal{B}|^2}{32\pi m^2} = \frac{\alpha^2 (Y_N^\alpha)^4}{256\pi^3} \left[\text{Li}_2\left(\frac{m^2}{m_\eta^2}\right) - \text{Li}_2\left(-\frac{m^2}{m_\eta^2}\right) \right]^2, \quad (36)$$

in agreement with [37].

A.2 Pure triplet dark matter (Minimal dark matter limit)

The \mathcal{B} factor in this case can be obtained from the eq. 33 taken $Y_\Omega = Y_N^\alpha = Y_\Sigma^\alpha = v_\Omega = 0$, $\alpha = 0^\circ$ and $m = M_\Sigma$. In this limit we have:

$$\mathcal{B} = \frac{8\sqrt{2}\alpha^2 m^2}{\sin(\theta_W)^2} \left[\frac{m^2 (M_W^2 - 2m^2) C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; m^2, m^2, M_W^2)}{M_W^2 (M_W^2 - m^2)} - \frac{2m^2 C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; m^2, m^2, m^2)}{M_W^2} - \frac{4(M_W^2 - m^2) C_0(0, 0, 4m^2; M_W^2, M_W^2, M_W^2)}{M_W^2 - 2m^2} + \frac{(-4m^4 + 2m^2 M_W^2 + M_W^4) C_0(0, -m^2, m^2; M_W^2, M_W^2, m^2)}{2m^4 - 3m^2 M_W^2 + M_W^4} \right]. \quad (37)$$

In the limit of $m \gg M_W$ we used `PackageX` [36] to get the approximated expressions for the Passarino-Veltman functions and we found that

$$\mathcal{B} \approx \frac{\sqrt{2}\pi\alpha^2 m (-8m^2 + \pi m M_W + 4M_W^2) \csc^2(\theta_W)}{M_W^3 - m^2 M_W} \quad (38)$$

and therefore, using the eq. 32, we have get that in this limit

$$\sigma v = \frac{|\mathcal{B}|^2}{32\pi m^2} \approx \frac{4\pi\alpha^4(\theta_W)}{M_W^2 \sin(\theta_W)^4}, \quad (39)$$

in agreement with [14].

References

- [1] M. Hirsch, R. A. Lineros, S. Morisi, J. Palacio, N. Rojas, and J. W. F. Valle, *WIMP dark matter as radiative neutrino mass messenger*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 149, [[arXiv:1307.8134](#)].
- [2] E. Ma, *Verifiable radiative seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass and dark matter*, *Phys.Rev.* **D73** (2006) 077301, [[hep-ph/0601225](#)].
- [3] E. Ma and D. Suematsu, *Fermion Triplet Dark Matter and Radiative Neutrino Mass*, *Mod. Phys. Lett.* **A24** (2009) 583–589, [[arXiv:0809.0942](#)].
- [4] **Planck** Collaboration, N. Aghanim et al., *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, [arXiv:1807.06209](#).
- [5] **XENON** Collaboration, E. Aprile et al., *Dark Matter Search Results from a One Tonne \times Year Exposure of XENON1T*, [arXiv:1805.12562](#).
- [6] B. J. Mount et al., *LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) Technical Design Report*, [arXiv:1703.09144](#).
- [7] **DARWIN** Collaboration, J. Aalbers et al., *DARWIN: towards the ultimate dark matter detector*, *JCAP* **1611** (2016) 017, [[arXiv:1606.07001](#)].
- [8] P. Rocha-Moran and A. Vicente, *Lepton Flavor Violation in the singlet-triplet scotogenic model*, *JHEP* **07** (2016) 078, [[arXiv:1605.01915](#)].
- [9] A. Merle, M. Platscher, N. Rojas, J. W. F. Valle, and A. Vicente, *Consistency of WIMP Dark Matter as radiative neutrino mass messenger*, *JHEP* **07** (2016) 013, [[arXiv:1603.05685](#)].
- [10] S. Choubey, S. Khan, M. Mitra, and S. Mondal, *Singlet-Triplet Fermionic Dark Matter and LHC Phenomenology*, *Eur. Phys. J.* **C78** (2018), no. 4 302, [[arXiv:1711.08888](#)].
- [11] D. Forero, M. Tortola, and J. Valle, *Neutrino oscillations refitted*, *Phys.Rev.* **D90** (2014), no. 9 093006, [[arXiv:1405.7540](#)].
- [12] P. F. de Salas, D. V. Forero, C. A. Ternes, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, *Status of neutrino oscillations 2018: 3σ hint for normal mass ordering and improved CP sensitivity*, *Phys. Lett.* **B782** (2018) 633–640, [[arXiv:1708.01186](#)].
- [13] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, K. A. Olive et al., *Review of Particle Physics*, *Chin. Phys.* **C38** (2014) 090001.
- [14] M. Cirelli, N. Fornengo, and A. Strumia, *Minimal dark matter*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B753** (2006) 178–194, [[hep-ph/0512090](#)].
- [15] N. G. Deshpande and E. Ma, *Pattern of Symmetry Breaking with Two Higgs Doublets*, *Phys.Rev.* **D18** (1978) 2574.
- [16] A. Ibarra, C. E. Yaguna, and O. Zapata, *Direct Detection of Fermion Dark Matter in the Radiative Seesaw Model*, *Phys. Rev.* **D93** (2016), no. 3 035012, [[arXiv:1601.01163](#)].

- [17] J. A. Casas and A. Ibarra, *Oscillating neutrinos and muon $\rightarrow e$, gamma*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B618** (2001) 171–204, [[hep-ph/0103065](#)].
- [18] A. Ibarra and G. G. Ross, *Neutrino phenomenology: The Case of two right-handed neutrinos*, *Phys.Lett.* **B591** (2004) 285–296, [[hep-ph/0312138](#)].
- [19] **SLD Electroweak Group, DELPHI, ALEPH, SLD, SLD Heavy Flavour Group, OPAL, LEP Electroweak Working Group, L3 Collaboration**, S. Schael et al., *Precision electroweak measurements on the Z resonance*, *Phys. Rept.* **427** (2006) 257–454, [[hep-ex/0509008](#)].
- [20] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, *MicrOMEGAs 2.0: A Program to calculate the relic density of dark matter in a generic model*, *Comput.Phys.Comm.* **176** (2007) 367–382, [[hep-ph/0607059](#)].
- [21] **PandaX-II Collaboration**, X. Cui et al., *Dark Matter Results From 54-Ton-Day Exposure of PandaX-II Experiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017), no. 18 181302, [[arXiv:1708.06917](#)].
- [22] P. Cushman et al., *Working Group Report: WIMP Dark Matter Direct Detection*, in *Community Summer Study 2013: Snowmass on the Mississippi (CSS2013) Minneapolis, MN, USA, July 29-August 6, 2013*, 2013. [arXiv:1310.8327](#).
- [23] J. Billard, L. Strigari, and E. Figueroa-Feliciano, *Implication of neutrino backgrounds on the reach of next generation dark matter direct detection experiments*, *Phys. Rev.* **D89** (2014), no. 2 023524, [[arXiv:1307.5458](#)].
- [24] **Fermi-LAT Collaboration**, M. Ackermann et al., *Searching for Dark Matter Annihilation from Milky Way Dwarf Spheroidal Galaxies with Six Years of Fermi-LAT Data*, [arXiv:1503.02641](#).
- [25] T. Toma and A. Vicente, *Lepton Flavor Violation in the Scotogenic Model*, *JHEP* **1401** (2014) 160, [[arXiv:1312.2840](#)].
- [26] **MEG Collaboration**, J. Adam et al., *New constraint on the existence of the $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \gamma$ decay*, *Phys.Rev.Lett.* **110** (2013) 201801, [[arXiv:1303.0754](#)].
- [27] **SINDRUM Collaboration**, W. H. Bertl et al., *Search for the Decay $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ e^+ e^-$* , *Nucl. Phys.* **B260** (1985) 1–31.
- [28] W. Porod, F. Staub, and A. Vicente, *A Flavor Kit for BSM models*, *Eur.Phys.J.* **C74** (2014), no. 8 2992, [[arXiv:1405.1434](#)].
- [29] F. Staub, *SARAH*, [arXiv:0806.0538](#).
- [30] F. Staub, *SARAH 4: A tool for (not only SUSY) model builders*, *Comput.Phys.Comm.* **185** (2014) 1773–1790, [[arXiv:1309.7223](#)].
- [31] W. Porod, *SPheno, a program for calculating supersymmetric spectra, SUSY particle decays and SUSY particle production at $e^+ e^-$ colliders*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **153** (2003) 275–315, [[hep-ph/0301101](#)].

- [32] W. Porod and F. Staub, *SPheno 3.1: Extensions including flavour, CP-phases and models beyond the MSSM*, *Comput.Phys.Commun.* **183** (2012) 2458–2469, [[arXiv:1104.1573](#)].
- [33] C. Garcia-Cely and A. Rivera, *General calculation of the cross section for dark matter annihilations into two photons*, *JCAP* **1703** (2017), no. 03 054, [[arXiv:1611.08029](#)].
- [34] T. Hahn, *Generating Feynman diagrams and amplitudes with FeynArts 3*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **140** (2001) 418–431, [[hep-ph/0012260](#)].
- [35] G. Passarino and M. Veltman, *One Loop Corrections for $e^+ e^-$ Annihilation Into $\mu^+ \mu^-$ in the Weinberg Model*, *Nucl.Phys.* **B160** (1979) 151.
- [36] H. H. Patel, *Package-X: A Mathematica package for the analytic calculation of one-loop integrals*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **197** (2015) 276–290, [[arXiv:1503.01469](#)].
- [37] M. Garny, A. Ibarra, and S. Vogl, *Signatures of Majorana dark matter with t -channel mediators*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys.* **D24** (2015), no. 07 1530019, [[arXiv:1503.01500](#)].