UCRHEP-T454 KANAZAWA-08-07 September 2008

Ferm ion Triplet Dark M atter and R adiative N eutrino M ass

 $E \, {\rm rnest} \, M \, \, a^a$ and D aijiro Suem atsu^b

^a D epartm ent of P hysics and A stronom y, U niversity of C alifornia, R iverside, C alifornia 92521, U SA

^b Institute for Theoretical Physics, Kanazawa University, 920–1192 Kanazawa, Japan

Abstract

The neutral member of a Majorana ferm ion triplet ($^+$; 0 ;) is proposed as a candidate for the dark matter of the Universe. It may also serve as the seesaw anchor for obtaining a radiative neutrino mass.

<u>Introduction</u> : The cosm obgical and astrophysical evidence [1] for dark matter (DM) is a powerful incentive for considering new particles and interactions beyond those of the standard model (SM) of quarks and leptons. Whereas most studies have concentrated on supersym – metric extensions of the SM, other excellent DM candidates abound. For example, if the SM is extended to include just one new scalar or ferm ion multiplet, then there are many possible DM candidates [2]. In particular, a scalar doublet ($^+$; 0) odd under an exactly conserved Z_2 symmetry [3] is a very good choice [4, 5, 6, 7].

Such a \dark" scalar doublet is an enable to discovery at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) [8]. It is also very useful for generating sm all radiative M a jorana neutrino m asses [4] if there exist neutral singlet ferm ions N_i which are odd under Z_2 . For a brief review of the further developm ents of this idea of \scotogenic" neutrino m ass, see R ef. [9]. M ore recently, it has been extended to include A₄ tribin axim alm ixing [10] as well.

Now the lightest N_i may also be considered a DM candidate [11, 12, 13]. However, processes such as ! e in pose severe constraints on the Yukawa couplings of N_i , making it di cult to satisfy the cosm ological relic abundance required. One way to avoid this problem is to introduce additional interactions for N_i [14, 15, 16]. Other SM singlets have also been considered [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25].

W hereas the canonical seesaw mechanism uses the ferm ion singlet N so that the neutrino mass is given by m $m_D^2 = m_N$ where m_D is the D irac mass linking to N, it is not the only way to realize the generic dimension-velocetive operator [26]

$$L_{5} = \frac{f_{ij}}{2} \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array}\right)^{0} \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array}\right)^{+} \left(\begin{array}{c} 1 \\ 1 \end{array}\right)^{+} + H \mathfrak{c}:$$
(1)

for obtaining small M a jorana neutrino m asses in the SM. In fact, there are three tree-level (and three generic one-loop) realizations [27]. The second m ost offen considered m echanism for neutrino m ass is that of a scalar triplet ($^{++}$; $^{+}$; 0), whereas the third tree-level realization, i.e. that of a ferm ion triplet ($^{++}$; 0 ;) [28], has not received as much attention. However, it has some rather intriguing properties. It supports a new U (1) gauge symmetry [29, 30, 31] and may be important for gauge-coupling unication [32, 33, 34] in the SM. It may be probed [30, 35, 36, 37] at the LHC, and is being discussed in a variety of other contexts [38, 39, 40, 41, 42]. Now suppose ⁰ is also odd under Z_2 , then it may become a DM candidate [32, 40] and replace N in the radiative generation of neutrino mass as shown in Fig. 1. The di erence between N and ⁰ is that whereas the form of has only Yukawa inter-



Figure 1:0 ne-bop generation of seesaw neutrino m ass.

actions in the m inim al scenario, the latter has electroweak gauge interactions, i.e. 0 W , which will allow 0 and to annihilate and coannihilate in the early Universe to account for the correct DM relic abundance without relying on their Yukawa couplings [12]. Note that is slightly heavier than 0 from electroweak radiative corrections [2]. It is also possible [43] that 0 exists as DM without having anything to do with neutrino m ass.

<u>G auge-coupling unit cation</u>: It is well-known that gauge-coupling unit cation occurs for the m inim al supersymmetric standard model (M SSM) but not the SM. On the other hand, the addition of improves the situation and gauge-coupling unit cation in the SM is possible [32, 33, 34] with the inclusion of some other elds. Consider the one-loop renorm alization-group equations governing the evolution of the three gauge couplings of the standard SU (3)_c

3

SU (2)_L U (1)_k gauge group as functions of m as scale:

$$\frac{1}{\underline{M}_{1}} \quad \frac{1}{\underline{M}_{2}} = \frac{b_{i}}{2} \ln \frac{M_{2}}{M_{1}}; \qquad (2)$$

where $_{i} = g_{i}^{2} = 4$ and the numbers b_{i} are determined by the particle content of the model between M₁ and M₂. In the SM with one Higgs scalar doublet, these are given by

$$SU(3)_{c}$$
 : $b_{c} = 11 + (4=3)N_{f} = 7;$ (3)

SU (2)_L :
$$b_L = 22=3+(4=3)N_F + 1=6 = 19=6;$$
 (4)

$$U(1)_{Y}$$
 : $b_{Y} = (4=3)N_{f} + 1=10 = 41=10;$ (5)

where $N_f = 3$ is the number of quark and lepton families and b_r has been normalized by the well-known factor of 3/5. Using the input [44]

$$_{\rm L}$$
 (M $_{\rm Z}$) = $(2 =)G_{\rm F} M_{\rm W}^2 = 0.0340;$ (6)

$$_{\rm Y} (M_{\rm Z}) = _{\rm L} (M_{\rm Z}) \tan^2 _{\rm W} = 0.0102; \qquad (7)$$

$$_{\rm C}$$
 (M $_{\rm Z}$) = 0:122; (8)

it is easy to check that the SM particle content is incom patible with the unication condition

$$_{C}(M_{U}) = _{L}(M_{U}) = (5=3) _{Y}(M_{U}) = _{U}$$
 (9)

Suppose (+; 0;) (1;3;0) and (+; 0) (1;2;1=2) are added at the scale M_X , together with two real scalar color octets $_{1;2}$ (8;1;0), then $b_L = 2(2=3) + 1=6 = 3=2$, $b_Y = 1=10$, and $b_C = 3(2)(1=6) = 1$ between M_X and M_U , so that Eq. (9) in plies

$$\ln \frac{M_{U}}{M_{Z}} = \frac{3}{45} - \frac{3}{_{Y}(M_{Z})} + \frac{9}{_{L}(M_{Z})} - \frac{14}{_{C}(M_{Z})} = 31.0:$$
(10)

Hence M_u ' 2:65 10^{15} GeV, which is an acceptable value [45] for suppressing the proton decay lifetime above the experimental lower bound of about 10^{32} years. The scale M_X is determined to be about 730 GeV. Thus the new particles have a chance of being observed at

the LHC. In particular, the scalars would be produced in abundance at the LHC because they are color octets [46, 47] and would decay in one loop to two gluons [32], i.e. ! ! gg. 0 as dark matter : Consider the minimal case where the SM is extended to include only one ferm ion triplet = (⁺; ⁰;) (1;3;0) which is odd under Z₂ with all other elds even. In that case, m = m $_{0}$ at tree level, but the form er is heavier than the latter from one-loop electroweak radiative corrections, namely [2]

$$= m \qquad m_{0} = \frac{L^{m}}{4} f \frac{M_{W}}{m} \qquad \cos^{2} w f \frac{M_{Z}}{m} ; \qquad (11)$$

where

$$f(\mathbf{r}) = \mathbf{r}^{2} + \mathbf{r}^{4} \ln \mathbf{r} + \mathbf{r} (\mathbf{r}^{2} + 4)^{1-2} (1 + \mathbf{r}^{2} = 2) \ln [1 + (\mathbf{r}^{2} + 4)^{1-2} \mathbf{r} = 2 + \mathbf{r}^{2} = 2]$$

$$\mathbf{r}^{2} \mathbf{r} = 3\mathbf{r}^{2}; \text{ for } \mathbf{r} = 1:$$
(12)

This splitting is positive and approaches ($_{\rm L}=2$) cos $_{\rm W}$ (1 cos $_{\rm W}$) M $_{\rm Z}$ ' 167 M eV for large m . This means that is allowed to decay into 0 plus a virtual W which then converts into or leptons.

The relic abundance of 0 is determined by the annihilation and coannihilation of itself and . These cross sections are dominated by their s-wave contributions. For 0 0 ! W $^{+}$ W through exchange,

$$({}^{0}{}^{0})jvj'\frac{2}{m^{2}};$$
 (13)

where v is the relative velocity of the incident particles in their center of m ass and m is assumed. As for coannihilation, several processes have to be included: 0 ! W 0 W through exchange and 0 ! W ! ff⁰; W W ⁰; W H, as well as ⁺ ! W 0 W 0 W 0 through exchange, ⁺ ! W $^{+}$ W through 0 exchange, ⁺ ! W 0 ! M 0 through exchange, ⁺ ! W $^{+}$ W through 0 exchange, ⁺ ! W 0 !

They are also easily calculated to be

$$(\ ^{0} \)jvj' \ \frac{29 \ ^{2}_{\rm L}}{8m^{2}}; \qquad (\ ^{+} \)jvj' \ \frac{37 \ ^{2}_{\rm L}}{8m^{2}}; \qquad (\)jvj' \ \frac{2}{m^{2}}: \qquad (14)$$

In the above, we have kept only the a_{ij} coe cients in the relative-velocity expansion of the cross section: $_{ij}jvj = a_{ij} + b_{ij}v^2$. Note that $(\ ^0 \ ^0)jvj$ is smaller than $(\ ^0 \)jvj$ and $(\ ^+ \)jvj$. This means that contributes in portantly to the relic abundance of $\ ^0$.

U sing the m ethod developed in R ef. [48] to take coannihilation into account, we calculate below the relic abundance of 0 as a function of m and . The decoupling tem perature T $_{\rm f}$ of 0 is estimated by using the elective cross section $_{\rm e}$ and the elective degrees of freedom $g_{\rm e}$ from the condition

$$x = \ln \frac{0.038 g_e M_{Pl} m h_e j v j i}{P \frac{q}{q x}};$$
(15)

where x = m = T, g = 106.75 is the SM number of relativistic degrees of freedom at T_f , M_{Pl} = 1.22 10^{19} GeV is the Planck mass, and

$$h_{e} jr ji = \frac{g_{0}^{2}}{g_{e}^{2}} ({}^{0} {}^{0}) + 4 \frac{g_{0}g}{g_{e}^{2}} ({}^{0} {}) (1 + {}^{3=2} \exp(x) + \frac{g^{2}}{g_{e}^{2}} [2 ({}^{+}) + 2 ()] (1 + {}^{2} \exp(2x); g_{e} = g_{0} + 2g (1 + {}^{3=2} \exp(x); (16))$$

with $g_0 = g = 2$ and = -m. The relic abundance is then given by

$$h^{2} = \frac{1.04 \quad 10^{9} x_{f}}{g^{1-2} M_{Pl} (G \text{ eV}) I_{a}};$$
(17)

where $I_a = x_f \frac{R_1}{x_f} a_e x^2 dx$, $x_f = m = T_f$, and a_e is extracted from $e^j y j = a_e + b_e v^2$.

U sing the observational data $h^2 = 0.11 \quad 0.006$ [49], we nd m \circ to be in the range 2.28 to 2.42 TeV. Here the electroweak radiative contribution to is already at its asymptotic value of about 167 M eV and its electron m \circ is negligible. There is no tree-level contribution to unless a Higgs triplet (s $+; s^0; s$) is added [32] with $hs^0 i \in 0$. However, this value should

be less than about 1 G eV to conform to precision electroweak measurements; hence would still be negligible and our result is unchanged.

<u>Neutrino m asses</u>: To have scotogenic neutrino m asses, consider now the addition of the dark scalar doublet and the speci c choice of one and two N 's, then under the assumption $m^2; m_N^2 = m^2$, the resulting radiative m asses are given by [4]

$$(M) = \frac{5v^2}{8^2} \frac{x}{j=0;1;2} \frac{h_j h_j M_j}{m^2};$$
(18)

where $M_0 = m_{1,2} = m_{N_{1,2}}$, h_j are their Yukawa couplings, $v = h^{0}i$, and $_5$ is the scalar coupling in the quartic term $(_5=2)(_{y})^2 + H$ c: which splits Re(0) and Im(0). Since $_5$ and m are adjustable, it is clear that realistic neutrino m assess may be obtained for h_{10}^{2} , in which case processes such as $! e_{10}^{2}$ are well below their experimental upper bounds. The problem with N as dark matter is the requirement of h > 1 for it to have a large enough annihilation cross section [12].

Looking at the form of Eq. (18), it is clear that it is possible to have a one-to-one correspondence between the neutrino mass eigenvalues $m_{1;2;3}$ and the seesaw andhorm asses $M_{0;1;2}$. As an anstaz, let the 3 3 Yukawa coupling matrix linking e; ; to $M_{0;1;2}$ be given by $0 q - p_{1,2} p_{1,2} = 1$

$$h_{j} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & q & p_{-} & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 2=3 & 1=3 & 0 & h_{0} & 0 & 0 \\ p_{-} & p_{-} & p_{-} & p_{-} & C & B \\ 1=6 & 1=3 & 1=2 & C & B & 0 & h_{1} & 0 & C \\ p_{-} & p_{-} & p_{-} & p_{-} & 0 & 0 & h_{2} \end{bmatrix}$$
(19)

then the tribin axim alm ixing of neutrinos is obtained, and their mass eigenvalues are

$$m_{i+1} = \frac{5v^2 h_i^2 M_i}{8^{-2}m^2}; \quad i = 0;1;2:$$
(20)

<u>Relaxation of ! e constraints</u>: Since ⁰ has gauge interactions, its relic abundance is adequately accounted for. There is no need for it to have large Yukawa couplings, as is in the case [12] of choosing the singlet ferm ion N as dark matter, where m must also be close to m_N . This means radiative avor-changing decays are easily suppressed. In the above example, using the experimental upper bound of 12 10¹¹ on the branching fraction of ! e , this corresponds to the condition

$$jh_0 f j_1 f j < 0.77 \text{ (m} = 2.35 \text{ TeV})^2$$
: (21)

Since h is not required to be large and should be heavier than , the tension between the constraints of dark-m atter relic abundance and avor-changing radiative decays is rem oved. <u>Conclusion</u>: In this paper we have proposed the addition of a ferm ion triplet ($^+$; 0 ;) to the standard m odel of quarks and leptons. We consider 0 as a dark-m atter candidate, being odd under an exactly conserved Z_2 sym m etry. We show that with slightly heavier than

 $^{\circ}$ from electroweak radiative corrections, m $^{\circ}$ 2:35 TeV yields the correct dark-m atter relic abundance from the annihilation and coannihilation of through gauge interactions.

We also consider as the seesaw anchor in the radiative generation of neutrino mass with a second scalar doublet . The constraints due to avor-changing radiative decays such as ! e are then easily satis ed because the Yukawa couplings need not be large. (If is replaced by N, then N must have large Yukawa couplings to be a dark-m atter candidate.)

 $E M \cdot was$ supported in part by the U \cdot S \cdot D epartm ent of E nergy under G rant N \circ \cdot D E - FG 03-94ER 40837. D \cdot S $\cdot was$ supported in part by a G rant-in-A id for Scienti c R esearch (C) from the Japan Society for P rom otion of Science (N \circ 17540246).

References

- For a recent review, see for example G.Bertone, D.Hooper, and J.Silk, Phys.Rept. 405,279 (2005).
- [2] M. Cirelli, N. Fornengo, and A. Strum ia, Nucl. Phys. B 753, 178 (2006). [N e use the most recently corrected version, i.e. arX is hep-ph/0512090v4.]
- [3] N.G.Deshpande and E.Ma, Phys. Rev. D 18, 2574 (1978).
- [4] E.Ma, Phys. Rev. D 73, 077301 (2006).
- [5] R.Barbieri, L.J.Hall, and V.S.Rychkov, Phys. Rev. D 74, 015007 (2006).
- [6] L. Lopez Honorez, E. Nezri, J. F. O liver, and M. H. G. Tytgat, JCAP 02, 028 (2007).
- [7] M.Gustafsson, E.Lundstrom, L.Bergstrom, and J.Edsjo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 041301 (2007).
- [8] Q.-H. Cao, E. Ma, and G. Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. D 76, 095011 (2007).
- [9] E.Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 23, 647 (2008).
- [10] E.Ma, arX iv:0808.1729 [hep-ph].
- [11] L.M. Krauss, S.Nasri, and M. Trodden, Phys. Rev. D 67, 085002 (2003).
- [12] J.Kubo, E.Ma, and D.Suematsu, Phys. Lett. B 642, 18 (2006).
- [13] D. Aristizabal Sierra, J. Kubo, D. Restrepo, D. Suematsu, and O. Zapata, arXiv:0808.3340 [hep-ph].
- [14] J.Kubo and D.Suem atsu, Phys. Lett. B 643, 336 (2006).

- [15] K.S.Babu and E.Ma, Int.J.M od. Phys. A 23, 1813 (2008).
- [16] D. Suem atsu, arX iv:0706.2401 [hep-ph] (EPJC, in press).
- [17] V. Silveira and A. Zee. Phys. Lett. B 161, 136 (1985).
- [18] X.-G. He, T. Li, X.-Q. Li, and H.-C. Tsai, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 22, 2121 (2007).
- [19] V. Barger, P. Langacker, M. McCaskey, M. J. Ram sey-Musolf, and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Rev. D 77, 035005 (2008).
- [20] E.Ma, Phys. Lett. B 662, 49 (2008).
- [21] T.Hur, H.-S.Lee, and S.Nasri, Phys. Rev. D 77, 015008 (2008).
- [22] H.-S.Lee, Phys. Lett. B 663, 255 (2008).
- [23] H.S.Cheon, S.K.Kang, and C.S.Kim, JCAP 0805, 004 (2008); arXiv:0807.0981 [hep-ph].
- [24] S.Khaliland O.Seto, arX iv:0804.0336 [hep-ph].
- [25] D.G.Cerdeno, C.Munoz, and O.Seto, arX iv:0807.3029 [hep-ph].
- [26] S.W einberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 43, 1566 (1979).
- [27] E.Ma, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 1171 (1998).
- [28] R.Foot, H.Lew, X.-G.He, and G.C.Joshi, Z.Phys. C 44, 441 (1989).
- [29] E.Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. A 17, 535 (2002).
- [30] E.M a and D.P.Roy, Nucl. Phys. B 644, 290 (2002).
- [31] S.M. Barr and I. Dorsner, Phys. Rev. D 72, 015011 (2005); see also S.M. Barr, B. Bednarz, and C. Benesh, Phys. Rev. D 34, 235 (1986).

- [32] E.Ma, Phys. Lett. B 625, 76 (2005).
- [33] B.Bajc and G.Senjanovic, JHEP 0708, 014 (2007).
- [34] I.Dorsner and P.Fileviez Perez, JHEP 0706, 029 (2007).
- [35] B.Bajc, M. Nem evsek, and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. D 76, 055011 (2007).
- [36] R.Franceschini, T.Hambye, and A.Strum ia, arX iv:0805.1613 [hep-ph].
- [37] F. del Aguila and J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, arX iv 0808 2468 [hep-ph].
- [38] P.Fileviez Perez, Phys.Rev.D 76, 071701 (2007).
- [39] A.Abada, C.Biggio, F.Bonnet, M.B.G avela, and T.Hambye, Phys.Rev.D 78,033007 (2008).
- [40] W .Fischler and R.Flauger, JHEP 09, 020 (2008).
- [41] E.Ma, arX iv:0806.4386 [hep-ph].
- [42] R.N.Mohapatra, N.Okada, and H.B.Yu, arX iv:0807.4524 [hep-ph].
- [43] E.Ma, Phys. Rev. D 78, 017701 (2008).
- [44] Particle Data Group, W. M. Yao et al., J. Phys. G 33, 1 (2006).
- [45] See for example K.Biswal, L.Maharana, and S.P.Misra, Phys. Rev. D 25, 266 (1982).
- [46] K.S.Babu and E.Ma, Phys. Lett. B 144, 381 (1984).
- [47] M.I.Gresham and M.B.W ise, Phys. Rev. D 76, 075003 (2007).
- [48] K.G riest and D.Seckel, Phys. Rev. D 43, 3191 (1991).
- [49] W M A P Collaboration, D. N. Spergelet al., A strophys. J. Suppl. 148, 175 (2003); SD SS Collaboration, M. Tegmark et al., Phys. Rev. D 69, 103501 (2004).