

# Top quark rare three-body decays in the littlest Higgs model with T-parity

Jinzhong Han, Bingzhong Li, and Xuelei Wang

*College of Physics and Information Engineering,  
Henan Normal University, Xinxiang, Henan 453007. P.R. China*

In the littlest Higgs model with T-parity (LHT), the mirror quarks have flavor structures and will contribute to the top quark flavor changing neutral current. In this work, we perform an extensive investigation of the top quark rare three-body decays  $t \rightarrow cVV$  ( $V = \gamma, Z, g$ ) and  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  ( $f = b, \tau, \mu, e$ ) at one-loop level. Our results show that the branching ratios of  $t \rightarrow cgg$  and  $t \rightarrow cb\bar{b}$  could reach  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$  in the favorite parameter space of the littlest Higgs model with T-parity, which implies that these decays may be detectable at the LHC or ILC, while for the other decays, their rates are too small to be observable at the present or future colliders.

PACS numbers: 14.65.Ha, 12.60.-i, 12.15.Mm

## I. INTRODUCTION

Top quark physics is among the central physical topics at the Tevatron and will continue to be so at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) in the next few years. Compared to other lighter SM fermions, the top quark is the only fermion with mass at the electroweak symmetry breaking scale, so it is widely speculated that the properties of the top quark are sensitive to new physics. Among various top quark processes at present and future colliders, the flavor changing neutral current (FCNC) processes are often utilized to probe new physics (NP) because in the SM, the FCNC processes are highly suppressed [1], while in NP models, there may be no such suppression. Therefore, searching for top FCNC at colliders can serve as an effective way to hunt for NP.

The two-body FCNC decays of top quark such as  $t \rightarrow cg, c\gamma, cZ, cH$  received much attention in the past. In the SM, the rates of these decays are less than  $10^{-11}$  [2], which is far below the reaches of the LHC [3, 4] and the International Linear Collider (ILC) [5], while in many NP models these decays may be enhanced to detectable levels [6]. By now, the two-body processes  $t \rightarrow cg, c\gamma, cZ, cH$  have been extensively investigated in the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM) [7], the left-right supersymmetric models [8], the supersymmetric model with R-parity violation [9], the two-Higgs doublet model (2HDM) [10], the topcolor-assisted technicolor model (TC2) [11], as well as models with extra singlet quarks [12]. Beside this, some three-body FCNC decays of the top quark, such as  $t \rightarrow cVV$  ( $V = \gamma, Z, g$ ) and  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  ( $f = b, \tau, \mu, e$ ), were also studied in the framework of the SM [13–16], 2HDM [15–17], MSSM [16, 18–20], TC2 [21–24], or in a model-independent way [25].

The aim of this work is to perform a comprehensive analysis of the FCNC top quark decays  $t \rightarrow cVV$  ( $V = \gamma, Z, g$ ) and  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  ( $f = b, \tau, \mu, e$ ) in the little Higgs model with T-parity (LHT) [26]. In the LHT model, the related two-body decays  $t \rightarrow cg, c\gamma, cZ, cH$  and the three-body decays  $t \rightarrow cl\bar{l}$  ( $l = \tau, \mu, e$ ) have been studied in [27, 28] respectively, and these studies show that, compared with the SM, the rates of these decays can be greatly enhanced. So taking the completeness and the phenomenon of higher order dominance into consideration [14], it is necessary to consider all the three-body decays, which will be done in this work.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec II a brief review of the LHT is given. In Sec III we present the details of our calculation of the decays  $t \rightarrow cVV$  and  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$ , and show some numerical results. Finally, we give a short conclusion in Sec IV.

## II. A BRIEF REVIEW OF THE LHT

One of the major motivations for the little Higgs model [29, 30] is to resolve the little hierarchy problem [31], in which the quadratic divergence of the Higgs mass term at one-loop level was canceled by the new diagrams with additional gauge bosons and a heavy top-quark partner. It was soon recognized that the scale of the new particles should be in the multi-TeV range in order to satisfy the constraints from electroweak precision measurements, which in turn reintroduces the little hierarchy problem [32]. This problem has been eased in the LHT model where a new  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  discrete symmetry called “T-parity” is introduced, and in this way, all dangerous tree level contribution to the precision measurements are forbidden [26].

Just like the little Higgs model, in the LHT model the assumed global symmetry  $SU(5)$  is spontaneously broken down to  $SO(5)$  at a scale  $f \sim \mathcal{O}(TeV)$ , and the embedded  $[SU(2) \otimes U(1)]^2$  gauge symmetry is simultaneously broken at  $f$  to the diagonal subgroup  $SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ , which is identified with the SM gauge group.

From the  $SU(5)/SO(5)$  breaking, there arise 14 Goldstone bosons which are described by the “pion” matrix  $\Pi$ , given explicitly by

$$\Pi = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\omega^0}{2} - \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{20}} & -\frac{\omega^+}{\sqrt{2}} & -i\frac{\pi^+}{\sqrt{2}} & -i\phi^{++} & -i\frac{\phi^+}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{\omega^-}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\omega^0}{2} - \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{20}} & \frac{v+h+i\pi^0}{2} & -i\frac{\phi^+}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{-i\phi^0+\phi^P}{\sqrt{2}} \\ i\frac{\pi^-}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{v+h-i\pi^0}{2} & \sqrt{4/5}\eta & -i\frac{\pi^+}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{v+h+i\pi^0}{2} \\ i\phi^{--} & i\frac{\phi^-}{\sqrt{2}} & i\frac{\pi^-}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{\omega^0}{2} - \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{20}} & -\frac{\omega^-}{\sqrt{2}} \\ i\frac{\phi^-}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{i\phi^0+\phi^P}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{v+h-i\pi^0}{2} & -\frac{\omega^+}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\omega^0}{2} - \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{20}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

Among the Goldstone bosons, the fields  $\omega^0, \omega^\pm$  and  $\eta$  are eaten by the new heavy gauge bosons  $Z_H, W_H^\pm$  and  $A_H$  so that the gauge bosons acquire following masses:

$$M_{W_H^\pm} = M_{Z_H} = gf(1 - \frac{v^2}{8f^2}), \quad M_{A_H} = \frac{g'}{\sqrt{5}}f(1 - \frac{5v^2}{8f^2}). \quad (2)$$

Likewise, the fields  $\pi^0$  and  $\pi^\pm$  are eaten by the SM gauge bosons  $Z$  and  $W^\pm$ , but one minor difference from the SM is the masses of these bosons, up to  $\mathcal{O}(v^2/f^2)$ , are given by

$$M_{W_L} = \frac{gv}{2}(1 - \frac{v^2}{12f^2}), \quad M_{Z_L} = \frac{gv}{2\cos\theta_W}(1 - \frac{5v^2}{12f^2}), \quad (3)$$

where  $g$  and  $g'$  are the SM  $SU(2)$  and  $U(1)$  gauge couplings respectively, and  $v = 246\text{GeV}$ .

In the framework of the LHT model, all the SM particles are assigned to be T-parity even, and the other particles, such as the new gauge bosons, are assigned to T-parity odd. In particular, in order to implement the T-parity symmetry, each SM fermion must be accompanied by one heavy fermion called the mirror fermion. In the following, we denote the mirror fermions by  $u_H^i$  and  $d_H^i$  with  $i = 1, 2, 3$  being the generation index. At the order of  $\mathcal{O}(v^2/f^2)$ , their masses are given by

$$m_{d_H^i} = \sqrt{2}\kappa_i f, \quad m_{u_H^i} = m_{d_H^i}(1 - \frac{v^2}{8f^2}), \quad (4)$$

where the Yukawa couplings  $\kappa_i$  generally depend on the fermion species  $i$ .

Since the T-parity is conserved in the LHT model, the fermion pairs interacting with the T-odd gauge boson must contain one SM fermion and one mirror fermion. In this case, due to the misalignment of the mass matrices for the SM fermions and for the mirror fermions, new gauge bosons can mediate flavor changing interactions. As pointed out in [33, 34], these interactions can be described by two correlated CKM-like unitary mixing matrices  $V_{H_u}$  and  $V_{H_d}$  satisfying  $V_{H_u}^\dagger V_{H_d} = V_{CKM}$  with the subscripts  $u$  and  $d$  denoting which type of the SM fermion is involved in the interaction. The details of the Feynman rules for such interactions were given in Ref. [34], and in order to clarify our results, we list some of them:

$$\bar{u}_H^i \eta u^j : -\frac{ig'}{10m_{A_H}}(m_{H_i}^u P_L - m_u^j P_R)(V_{H_u})_{ij}, \quad (5)$$

$$\bar{u}_H^i \omega^0 u^j : \frac{ig'}{2m_{Z_H}}(m_{H_i}^u P_L - m_u^j P_R)(V_{H_u})_{ij}, \quad (6)$$

$$\bar{d}_H^i \omega^- u^j : \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}m_{W_H}}(m_{H_i}^d P_L - m_u^j P_R)(V_{H_u})_{ij}, \quad (7)$$

$$\bar{u}_H^i A_H u^j : -\frac{ig'}{10}(V_{H_u})_{ij}\gamma^\mu P_L, \quad (8)$$

$$\bar{u}_H^i Z_H u^j : -\frac{ig}{2}(V_{H_u})_{ij}\gamma^\mu P_L, \quad (9)$$

$$\bar{d}_H^i W_H^{-\mu} u^j : \frac{ig}{\sqrt{2}}(V_{H_u})_{ij}\gamma^\mu P_L. \quad (10)$$

The unitary matrix  $V_{H_d}$  is usually parameterized with three angles  $\theta_{12}^d, \theta_{23}^d, \theta_{13}^d$  and three phases  $\delta_{12}^d, \delta_{23}^d, \delta_{13}^d$




FIG. 1: The Feynman diagrams of the LHT model contributing to the FCNC couplings  $t\bar{c}V$  ( $V = \gamma, Z, g$ ).

[35]:

$$V_{H_d} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}^d c_{13}^d & s_{12}^d c_{13}^d e^{-i\delta_{12}^d} & s_{13}^d e^{-i\delta_{13}^d} \\ -s_{12}^d c_{23}^d e^{i\delta_{12}^d} - c_{12}^d s_{23}^d s_{13}^d e^{i(\delta_{13}^d - \delta_{23}^d)} & c_{12}^d c_{23}^d - s_{12}^d s_{23}^d s_{13}^d e^{i(\delta_{13}^d - \delta_{12}^d - \delta_{23}^d)} & s_{23}^d c_{13}^d e^{-i\delta_{23}^d} \\ s_{12}^d s_{23}^d e^{i(\delta_{12}^d + \delta_{23}^d)} - c_{12}^d c_{23}^d s_{13}^d e^{i\delta_{13}^d} & -c_{12}^d s_{23}^d e^{i\delta_{23}^d} - s_{12}^d c_{23}^d s_{13}^d e^{i(\delta_{13}^d - \delta_{12}^d)} & c_{23}^d c_{13}^d \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

and with the relation  $V_{H_u}^\dagger V_{H_d} = V_{CKM}$ , one can determine the expression of  $V_{H_u}$ .

### III. CALCULATIONS

#### A. The loop-level FC couplings $t\bar{c}V$ ( $V = \gamma, Z, g$ ) in the LHT model

As introduced above, in the LHT model new contributions to the FCNC top quark coupling  $t\bar{c}V$  come from the new gauge interactions mediated by  $(A_H, Z_H, W_H^\pm)$ , which are shown in Fig. 1. Since we use Feynman gauge in our calculation, the Goldstone bosons  $\eta, \omega^0$  and  $\omega^\pm$  also appear in the diagrams. The heavy scalar triplet  $\Phi$ , in principle, may also contribute to the FCNC coupling, but since such a contribution is suppressed by the factor  $v^2/f^2$ , we neglect it hereafter. It should be noted that the rules in (5)-(10) imply that the form factors of the loop-induced  $t\bar{c}V$  interaction,  $F$ , must take the following form

$$F \propto \sum_{i=1}^3 \left( V_{H_u}^\dagger \right)_{ti} f(m_{H_i}) (V_{H_u})_{ic} \quad (12)$$

where  $f(m_{H_i})$  is a universal function for three generation mirror quarks, but its value depends on the mass of  $i$ -th-generation mirror quark,  $m_{H_i}$ . Obviously, for the degeneracy of the three generation mirror quarks,  $F$  vanished exactly due to the unitarity of  $V_{H_u}$ , while for the degeneracy of the first two generations as discussed below, the factor behaviors like  $(V_{H_u}^\dagger)_{t3} (f(m_{H3}) - f(m_H)) (V_{H_u})_{3c}$  with  $m_H$  being the common mass of the first two generations. In the case of very heavy third generation mirror quarks,  $f(m_{H3})$  vanish, that is its effect decouples, then  $F$  is proportional to  $(V_{H_u}^\dagger)_{t3} f(m_H) (V_{H_u})_{3c}$ , which are independent of  $m_{H3}$ .




FIG. 2: The Feynman diagrams for the decays  $t \rightarrow cVV$  and  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  ( $f = b, \tau, \mu, e$ ) in the LHT.

The Feynman diagrams for the top quark decays  $t \rightarrow cVV$  and  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  are shown in Fig. 2 with the black square denoting the loop-induced  $t\bar{c}V$  vertex. One important difference of the effective  $t\bar{c}V$  vertices in Figs. 2(a, d, e) from those in Fig. 2(b, c) is for the former cases, both top and charm quarks are on-shell, while for the latter case, either top or charm quark is off-shell. In order to simplify our calculation, we adopt the calculation method introduced in [19] which uses a universal form of the effective  $t\bar{c}V$  vertices, but is valid for all the cases. In Appendix A we give the analytical expressions of the effective vertices  $t\bar{c}V$  and use the codes LoopTools [36] to get the numerical results of the relevant loop functions. To secure the correctness of our results, we recalculated the two-body decay  $t \rightarrow cV$  and find our results agree with those in Ref. [27].

### B. Amplitude for $t \rightarrow cVV$ in the LHT model

Since the expressions of the amplitudes for  $t \rightarrow cgg, cg\gamma, cgZ, c\gamma\gamma$  are quite similar, we only list the result for  $t \rightarrow cgg$ , which is given by

$$\mathcal{M}(t \rightarrow cgg) = \mathcal{M}_a^g + \mathcal{M}_b^g + \mathcal{M}_c^g \quad (13)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M}_a^g &= -ig_s f^{abc} G(p_t - p_c, 0) \bar{u}_c^i(p_c) \Gamma_{tcg}^{\mu cji} [(p_1 - p_2)_\mu \varepsilon^a(p_1) \cdot \varepsilon^b(p_2) + 2p_2 \cdot \varepsilon^a(p_1) \varepsilon_\mu^b(p_2) \\ &\quad - 2p_1 \cdot \varepsilon^b(p_2) \varepsilon_\mu^a(p_1)] u_t^j(p_t) \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_b^g = g_s T^{aki} G(p_t - p_2, m_c) \bar{u}_c^i(p_c) \not{\epsilon}_1^a(p_1) (\not{p}_t - \not{p}_2 + m_c) \Gamma_{tcg}^{\mu bjk} (p_t - p_2, p_c) \varepsilon_\mu^b(p_2) u_t^j(p_t) \quad (15)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_c^g = g_s T^{bjk} G(p_t - p_2, m_t) \bar{u}_c^i(p_c) \Gamma_{tcg}^{\mu aki} (p_c, p_t - p_1) \varepsilon_\mu^a(p_1) (\not{p}_t - \not{p}_2 + m_t) \not{\epsilon}_2^b(p_2) u_t^j(p_t) \quad (16)$$

In above expressions,  $P_{L,R} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \mp \gamma_5)$  are the left and right chirality projectors,  $p_t$  is the top quark momentum,  $p_c, p_1, p_2$  are the momentum of the charm quark and gluons respectively,  $\varepsilon$ s are wave functions of the gluons, and  $G(p, m)$  is defined as  $\frac{1}{p^2 - m^2}$ . In actual calculation, we compute the amplitudes numerically by using the method of Ref. [19], instead by calculating the amplitude square analytically. This greatly simplifies our calculations.

### C. Numerical results for $t \rightarrow cVV$ and $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$ in the LHT model

In this work, we take the SM parameters as:  $m_t = 172.0$  GeV,  $m_c = 1.27$  GeV,  $m_e = 0.00051$  GeV,  $m_\mu = 0.106$  GeV,  $m_\tau = 1.777$  GeV,  $m_b = 4.2$  GeV,  $m_Z = 91.2$  GeV,  $\sin^2 \theta_W = 0.231$ ,  $\alpha_e = 1/128.8$ ,  $\alpha_s(m_t) = 0.107$  [37]. For the parameters in the LHT model, the breaking scale  $f$ , the three generation mirror quark masses  $m_{H_i}$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) and six mixing parameters ( $\theta_{ij}^d$  and  $\delta_{ij}^d$  with  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$  and  $i \neq j$ ) in Eq. (11) are involved. The breaking scale  $f$  determines the new gauge boson masses, and it has been proven that, as long as  $f \geq 500$  GeV, the




FIG. 3: The rates for  $t \rightarrow cgg, cgZ, cg\gamma, c\gamma\gamma$  as a function of  $m_{H_3}$  for different values of  $f$  and  $V_{H_d}$ . We take a common mass for the first two generation mirror quarks, i.e.  $m_{H_1} = m_{H_2} = 500$  GeV .

LHT model can be consistent with the precision electroweak data[38]. So we set  $f = 500\text{GeV}, 1000\text{GeV}$  as two representative cases. The matrix elements of  $V_{H_d}$  have been severely constrained by the FCNC processes in  $K$ ,  $B$  and  $D$  meson systems [34, 39]. To simplify our discussion, we consider two scenarios which can easily escape the constraints [27, 28, 40]:

$$\text{Case I: } V_{H_d} = I, V_{H_u} = V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger \quad (17)$$

$$\text{Case II: } s_{23}^d = 1/\sqrt{2}, s_{12}^d = s_{13}^d = 0, \delta_{12}^d = \delta_{23}^d = \delta_{13}^d = 0 \quad (18)$$

As for the mirror quark masses, it has been shown that the experimental bounds on four-fermi interactions require  $m_{H_i} \leq 4.8f^2/\text{TeV}$ [38]. In our discussion, we take this bound. We also assume a common mass for the first two generation up-type mirror quarks, i.e.  $m_{H_1} = m_{H_2} = 500$  GeV and let the third generation quark mass  $m_{H_3}$  to vary from 600GeV to 1200GeV for  $f = 500\text{GeV}$  and from 600GeV to 4800GeV for  $f = 1000\text{GeV}$ . To make our predictions more realistic, we apply some kinematic cuts as did in Ref. [41], that is, we require the energy of each decay product larger than 15 GeV in the top quark rest frame.

In Fig.3 we show the dependence of the rates for  $t \rightarrow cgg, cgZ, cg\gamma, c\gamma\gamma$  on  $m_{H_3}$ . This figure indicates that the dependence is quite strong, i.e. more than 1 order of magnitude change when  $m_{H_3}$  varies from 600 GeV to 1200 GeV in Fig. (3a) and (3c) and from 600 GeV to 4800 GeV in Figs. (3b) and (3d). The reason is, as explained in Eq. (12) and below, the cancellation between the third generation mirror quark contribution and the first two generation mirror quark contribution is alleviated with the increase of  $m_{H_3}$ . This figure also indicates that the rates  $t \rightarrow cgg, cgZ, cg\gamma, c\gamma\gamma$  are also sensitive to the parametrization scenarios of  $V_{H_d}$  when one compares the results in Fig.3 (a) and Fig.3 (b) with those in Fig.3 (c) and Fig.3 (d). This character can be easily understood from the expression in Eq. (12). From Fig.3, one may conclude that in the LHT model, the rate for the decay  $t \rightarrow cgg$  is much larger than the others, reaching  $10^{-3}$  in optimal cases, while the rates




FIG. 4: Same as Fig.3, but for the rates of  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  ( $f = b, e, \mu, \tau$ ).

of the decays  $t \rightarrow cgZ, cg\gamma, c\gamma\gamma$  are all below  $10^{-5}$ .

We investigate the same dependence of the decays  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  ( $f = b, e, \mu, \tau$ ) in Fig.4. Since the lepton masses are small compared with top quark mass, the rates for the decay  $t \rightarrow cl\bar{l}$  with  $l = e, \mu, \tau$  are approximately equal. This figure shows that the dependence of  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  on  $m_{H_3}$  is similar to that of  $t \rightarrow cVV$  shown in Fig.3. This figure also shows the rate of the decay  $t \rightarrow cb\bar{b}$  can reach  $10^{-3}$  in the optimum case, while the rate of the decay  $t \rightarrow cl\bar{l}$  is usually less than  $10^{-6}$ .

The authors of [42] have roughly estimated the discovery potentials of the high energy colliders in probing top quark FCNC decay for  $100fb^{-1}$  of integrated luminosity, and they obtained

$$\text{LHC} : Br(t \rightarrow cX) \geq 5 \times 10^{-5} \quad (19)$$

$$\text{ILC} : Br(t \rightarrow cX) \geq 5 \times 10^{-4} \quad (20)$$

$$\text{TEV33} : Br(t \rightarrow cX) \geq 5 \times 10^{-3} \quad (21)$$

Then by the results presented in Figs. 3 and 4, one can learn that the LHT model can enhance the decays  $t \rightarrow cgg(bb)$  to the observable level of the LHC. So we may conclude that the LHC is capable in testing the flavor structure of the LHT model.

Table I: Optimum predictions for the decays  $t \rightarrow cgg, cb\bar{b}, cl\bar{l}$  in different models.

	SM	MSSM	TC2	2HDM	LHT Case I/Case II
$Br(t \rightarrow cgg)$	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-9})$ [13]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ [19]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ [22]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ [15]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-5}) / \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$
$Br(t \rightarrow cl\bar{l})$	$10^{-14}$ [16]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$ [20]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$ [23]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-8})$ [17]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-8}) / \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$
$Br(t \rightarrow cb\bar{b})$	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$ [24]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-7})$ [24]	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ [24]	—	$\mathcal{O}(10^{-5}) / \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$

Finally, we summarize the LHT model predictions for the FCNC three-body decays  $t \rightarrow cgg, cb\bar{b}, cl\bar{l}$  in comparison with the predictions of the SM, the MSSM, the TC2, and the 2HDM in Table I. This table indicates that the optimum rates of the decays in the LHT model are comparable with those in the TC2 model, and the predictions of the two models are significantly larger than the corresponding predictions of the SM and the MSSM. As far as the decay  $Br(t \rightarrow cb\bar{b})$  is concerned, its branching ratios may reach  $10^{-3}$ . So if the decays  $t \rightarrow cgg$  and  $t \rightarrow cb\bar{b}$  are observed at the LHC, more careful theoretical analysis and more precise measurement are needed to distinguish the models; while on the other hand, if these decays are not observed, one can constrain the parameter space of the LHT model. This table also indicates that, even in the optimum cases, the rate for  $t \rightarrow cl\bar{l}$  is only  $10^{-6}$ , which implies that it is difficult to detect such decay.

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In this work, we investigate the FCNC three-body decays  $t \rightarrow cVV$  ( $V = \gamma, Z, g$ ) and  $t \rightarrow cf\bar{f}$  ( $f = b, e, \mu, \tau$ ) in the LHT. We conclude that: i) The rates of these decays strongly depend on the mirror quark mass splitting. ii) The rates rely significantly on the flavor structure of the mirror quarks, namely  $V_{H_u}$  and  $V_{H_d}$ . iii) In the optimum case of the LHT model, the rates for the decays  $t \rightarrow cgg$  and  $t \rightarrow cb\bar{b}$  are large enough to be observed at present or future colliders and with the running of the LHC, one get some useful information about the flavor structure of the LHT model by detecting these decays.

#### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Junjie Cao and Lei Wu for helpful discussions and suggestions. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos.10775039, 11075045, by Specialized Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education under Grant No.20094104110001, 20104104110001 and by HASTIT under Grant No.2009HASTIT004.

- 
- [1] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, Acta Phys. Polon. B **35**, 2695 (2004).
  - [2] G. Eilam, J. L. Hewett, and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 1473 (1991); **59**, 039901 (1999); B. Mele, S. Petrarca, and A. Soddu, Phys. Lett. B **435**, 401 (1998).
  - [3] M. Beneke, I. Efthymipoulos, M. L. Mangano, J. Womersley (conveners) *et al.*, arXiv: hep-ph/0003033.
  - [4] J. Carvalho, N. Castro, A. Onofre, and F. Velasco (ATLAS Collaboration), ATLAS internal note, ATL-PHYS-PUB-2005-009, 2005.
  - [5] M. Cöbal, AIP Conf. Proc. No. 753, (AIP, New York, 2005), p. 234.
  - [6] W. Wagner, Rept. Prog. Phys. **68**, 2409 (2005); A. Juste *et al.*, econf C0508141, PLEN0043 (2005); J. M. Yang, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **316**, 529 (2005); D. Chakraborty, J. Konigsberg, and D. Rainwater, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **53**, 301 (2003); F. Larios, R. Martinez, and M. A. Perez, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **21**, 3473 (2006).
  - [7] C. S. Li, R. J. Oakes and J. M. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **49**, 293 (1994); **56**, 3156 (1997); J. L. López, D. V. Nanopoulos and R. Rangarajan, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 3100 (1997); G. M. de Divitiis, R. Petronzio and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. B **504**, 45 (1997); J. Guasch and J. Sola, Nucl. Phys. B **562**, 3 (1999); J. J. Liu, C. S. Li, L. L. Yang and L. G. Jin, Phys. Lett. B **599**, 92 (2004).
  - [8] M. Frank and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 035008 (2005).
  - [9] J. M. Yang, B.-L. Young and X. Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **58**, 055001 (1998).
  - [10] A. Arhrib, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 075016 (2005); S. Bejar, J. Guasch, and J. Sola, Nucl. Phys. B **675**, 270 (2003); E. O. Iltan, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 075017 (2002); W. S. Hou, Phys. Lett. B **296**, 179 (1992); R. A. Díaz, R. Martínez, and J. Alexis Rodríguez, hep-ph/0103307.
  - [11] Xue-lei Wang, Gong-ru Lu, Jin-min Yang, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **50**, 5781 (1994); Gong-ru Lu, Chong-xing Yue and Jin-shu Huang, J. Phys. G **22**, 305 (1996); Phys. Rev. D **57**, 1755 (1998); Gong-ru Lu, Fu-rong Yin, Xue-lei Wang, and Ling-de Wan, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 015002 (2003); Chong-xing Yue, Gong-ru Lu, Guo-li Liu, and Qing-jun Xu, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 095004 (2001).
  - [12] A. Arhrib and W. S. Hou, JHEP **0607**, (2006) 009.
  - [13] E. Jenkins, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 458 (1997); G. Altarelli, L. Conti and V. Lubicz, Phys. Lett. B **502**, 125 (2001).
  - [14] G. Eilam, M. Frank and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 053011 (2006).
  - [15] S. Bar-Shalom, G. Eilam, M. Frank and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 055018 (2005); J. L. Díaz-Cruz, M. A. Pérez, G. Tavares-Velasco, and J. J. Toscano, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 115014 (1999).

- [16] M. Frank and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 073014 (2006).
- [17] E. O. Iltan and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 015004 (2003); S. Bar-Shalom, G. Eilam, A. Soni and J. Wudka, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 2957 (1998).
- [18] G. Eilam, M. Frank and I. Turan, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 035012 (2006).
- [19] J. J. Cao, G. Eilam, M. Frank, K. Hikasa, G. L. Liu, I. Turan, and J. M. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 075021 (2007).
- [20] Zhaoxia Heng, Gongru Lu, Lei Wu, Jin Min Yang, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 094029 (2009).
- [21] Chong-xing Yue, Gong-ru Lu, Qing-jun Xu, *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **508**, 290 (2001).
- [22] Huan-Jun Zhang, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 057501 (2008).
- [23] Chong-xing Yue, Lei Wang, Dong-qi Yu Phys. Rev. D **70**, 054011 (2004); Chong-xing Yue, *et al.*, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **18**, 2187 (2003).
- [24] Guoli Liu, Chin. Phys. Lett. **26**, 101401 (2009).
- [25] J. Drobnak, S. Fajfer and J. F. Kamenik, JHEP, **0903**, 077 (2009).
- [26] H. C. Cheng and I. Low, JHEP, **0309**, 051 (2003); I. Low, JHEP, **0410**, 067 (2004); H. C. Cheng and I. Low, JHEP, **0408**, 061 (2004); J. Hubisz and P. Meade, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 035016 (2005).
- [27] Hou Hong-Sheng, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 094010 (2007).
- [28] Hui-Di Yang, Chong-Xing Yue, Jia Wen, Yong-Zhi Wang, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **24**, 1943 (2009).
- [29] N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **513**, 232 (2001); N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, T. Gregoire, J. G. Wacker, JHEP **0208**, 020 (2002); N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, E. Katz, A. E. Nelson, T. Gregoire, J. G. Wacker, JHEP **0208**, 021 (2002).
- [30] N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, E. Katz, A. E. Nelson, JHEP **0207**, 034 (2002) ; T. Han, H. E. Logan, B. McElrath and L. T. Wang, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 095004 (2003).
- [31] R. Barbieri, A. Strumia, Phys. Lett. B **462**, 144 (1999).
- [32] W. Kilian, J. Reuter, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 015004 (2004); C. Csaki, J. Hubisz, G. D. Kribs, P. Meade, J. Terning, Phys. Rev. D **67**, 115002 (2003); J. L. Hewett, F. J. Petriello, T. G. Rizzo, JHEP **0310**, 062 (2003); C. Csaki, J. Hubisz, G. D. Kribs, P. Meade, J. Terning, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 035009 (2003).
- [33] M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, A. Poschenrieder, C. Tarantino, S. Uhlig, A. Weiler, JHEP **0612**, 003 (2006) ; J. Hubisz, S. J. Lee, and G. Paz, JHEP **0606**, 041 (2006). M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, S. Recksiegel, C. Tarantino, S. Uhlig, Phys. Lett. B **657**, 81 (2007); M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, S. Recksiegel, C. Tarantino, S. Uhlig, JHEP **0706**, 082 (2007); M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, S. Recksiegel, C. Tarantino, arXiv:0805.4393v2 [hep-ph]; M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, B. Duling, A. Poschenrieder, C. Tarantino, JHEP **0705**, 013 (2007).
- [34] M. Blanke, A. J. Buras, A. Poschenrieder, S. Recksiegel, C. Tarantino, S. Uhlig, A. Weiler, JHEP **0701**, 066 (2007).
- [35] Andrzej J. Buras, Anton Poschenrieder, Selma Uhlig, and William A. Bardeen, JHEP **0611**, 062 (2006).
- [36] T. Hahn, M. Perez-Victoria, Comput. Phys. Commun. **118**, 153 (1999); T. Hahn, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **135**, 333 (2004).
- [37] C. Amsler *et al.*, Particle Data Group, Phys. Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).
- [38] J. Hubisz, P. Meade, A. Noble, M. Perelstein, JHEP **0601**, 135 (2006).
- [39] M. Blanke *et al.*, Phys. Lett. B **646**, 253 (2007).
- [40] C. X. Yue, J. Wen, J. Y. Liu, W. Liu, Chin. Phys. C **3**, 89 (2009); X. L. Wang, *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **807**, 210 (2009); X. L. Wang, *et al.*, Nucl. Phys. B **810**, 226 (2009).
- [41] Jun jie Cao, Gad Eilam, Ken-ichi Hikasa, Jin Min Yang, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 031701 (2006).
- [42] J. Guasch and J. Sola, Nucl. Phys. B **562**, 3 (1999).
- [43] M. Clements, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. D **27**, 570 (1983); A. Axelrod, Nucl. Phys. B **209**, (1982) 349; G. Passarino, M. Veltman, Nucl. Phys. B **160** 151 (1979).



## Appendix: Expressions of the effective $t\bar{c}V$ vertex

The effective  $t\bar{c}V$  vertex can be obtained by calculating directly the diagrams in Fig.1 and with the help of the formula in [19]. The loop functions in the effective vertex are defined by the convention of [43] with  $p_t$  defined as the incoming momentum while  $p_c$  as the outgoing momentum. In our calculation, higher order terms, namely, terms proportional to  $v^2/f^2$ , in the masses of new gauge bosons and in the Feynman rules are ignored.

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(p_c, p_t) = \Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(\eta) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(\omega^0) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(\omega^\pm) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(A_H) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(Z_H) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(W_H^\pm) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(W_H^\pm, \omega^\pm).$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(\eta) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{eg'^2}{150M_{A_H}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (A + B + C),$$

$$A = \frac{1}{p_c^2 - m_t^2} [m_{Hi}^2 (m_t^2 B_0^a + p_c^2 B_1^a) \gamma^\mu P_L + m_t m_c (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^a + p_c^2 B_1^a) \gamma^\mu P_R + m_c (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^a + m_t^2 B_1^a) \not{p}_c \gamma^\mu P_L + m_{Hi}^2 m_t (B_0^a + B_1^a) \not{p}_c \gamma^\mu P_R],$$

$$B = \frac{1}{p_t^2 - m_c^2} [m_{Hi}^2 (m_c^2 B_0^b + p_t^2 B_1^b) \gamma^\mu P_L + m_t m_c (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^b + p_t^2 B_1^b) \gamma^\mu P_R + m_c m_{Hi}^2 (B_0^b + B_1^b) \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t P_L + m_t (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^b + m_c^2 B_1^b) \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t P_R],$$

$$C = [-m_{Hi}^4 C_0^1 \gamma^\mu P_L - m_t m_c m_{Hi}^2 C_0^1 \gamma^\mu P_R + m_{Hi}^2 m_c C_\alpha^1 \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L + m_c m_{Hi}^2 (-\gamma^\mu \not{p}_c C_0^1 + \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t C_0^1 + \gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha^1) P_L + m_{Hi}^2 m_t C_\alpha^1 \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu P_R + m_{Hi}^2 m_t (\gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha^1 - \gamma^\mu \not{p}_c C_0^1 + \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t C_0^1) P_R + m_{Hi}^2 (\gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \not{p}_c C_\alpha^1 - \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t C_\alpha^1 - \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \gamma^\beta C_{\alpha\beta}^1) P_L + m_t m_c (\gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \not{p}_c C_\alpha^1 - \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t C_\alpha^1 - \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \gamma^\beta C_{\alpha\beta}^1) P_R].$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(\omega^0) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{eg^2}{6M_{Z_H}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (D + E + F),$$

$$D = A(B_0^a \rightarrow B_0^c, B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^c),$$

$$E = B(B_0^b \rightarrow B_0^d, B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^d),$$

$$F = C(C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta}^2, C_\alpha^1 \rightarrow C_\alpha^2, C_0^1 \rightarrow C_0^2).$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(\omega^\pm) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{eg^2}{2M_{W_H}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} [\frac{2}{3}G + \frac{2}{3}H - \frac{1}{3}I + J],$$

$$J = m_{Hi}^2 m_c (p_t^\mu C_0^4 - p_c^\mu C_0^4 + 2C_\mu^4) P_L + m_{Hi}^2 m_t (p_t^\mu C_0^4 - p_c^\mu C_0^4 + 2C_\mu^4) P_R - m_{Hi}^2 [p_{\mu\alpha} (p_t^\mu - p_c^\mu + 2C_\mu^4) + (p_t^\mu - p_c^\mu) C_\alpha^4 + 2C_{\mu\alpha}^4] \gamma^\alpha P_L - m_t m_c [p_{t\alpha} (p_t^\mu - p_c^\mu + 2C_\mu^4) + (p_t^\mu - p_c^\mu) C_\alpha^4 + 2C_{\mu\alpha}^4] \gamma^\alpha P_L,$$

$$\begin{aligned}
G &= A(B_0^a \rightarrow B_0^e, B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^e), \\
H &= B(B_0^b \rightarrow B_0^f, B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^f), \\
I &= C(C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta}^3, C_\alpha^1 \rightarrow C_\alpha^3, C_0^1 \rightarrow C_0^3). \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(A_H) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{eg'^2}{75} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (K + L + M), \\
K &= \frac{1}{p_c^2 - m_t^2} [p_c^2 B_1^a + m_t \not{p}_c B_1^a] \gamma^\mu P_L, \\
L &= \frac{1}{p_t^2 - m_c^2} [p_t^2 B_1^b + m_c \not{p}_t B_1^b] \gamma^\mu P_L, \\
M &= [(\not{p}_t - \not{p}_c) C_\alpha^1 \gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha - m_{Hi}^2 C_0^1 \gamma^\mu - C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \gamma^\beta] P_L. \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(Z_H) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{eg^2}{3} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (N + O + P), \\
N &= K(B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^c), \\
O &= L(B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^d), \\
P &= M(C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta}^2, C_\alpha^1 \rightarrow C_\alpha^2, C_0^1 \rightarrow C_0^2). \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(W_H^\pm) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{eg^2}{2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (\frac{4}{3}Q + \frac{4}{3}R - \frac{2}{3}S - T), \\
T &= [2\gamma^\mu (b_0 + m_{WH}^2 C_0^4) + 4\gamma^\alpha C_{\mu\alpha} + 2(P_t^\mu - P_c^\mu) \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha - \gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha \\
&\quad + \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha + \gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha (\not{p}_c - \not{p}_t) C_\alpha + 2(\not{p}_t - \not{p}_c) \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu C_\alpha + \gamma^\alpha \not{p}_t \gamma^\mu C_\alpha \\
&\quad + 4\not{p}_t C_\mu + 2\not{p}_t (p_t^\mu - p_c^\mu) + p_t^2 \gamma^\mu C_0^4 + \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t \not{p}_c C_0^4 - 2\not{p}_t \not{p}_c \gamma^\mu C_0^4] P_L, \\
Q &= K(B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^e), \\
R &= L(B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^f), \\
S &= M(C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta}^3, C_\alpha^1 \rightarrow C_\alpha^3, C_0^1 \rightarrow C_0^3). \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}\gamma}^\mu(W_H^\pm, \omega^\pm) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g^2 e}{2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} [m_t (\gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha^4 + 2p_t^\mu C_0^4 - \not{p}_t \gamma^\mu C_0^4) P_R \\
&\quad + (m_c \not{p}_t C_0^4 + m_c \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha^4 - 2m_{Hi}^2 C_0^4) \gamma^\mu P_L]. \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(p_c, p_t) &= \Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(\eta) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(\omega^0) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(\omega^\pm) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(A_H) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(Z_H) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(W_H^\pm) \\
&\quad + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(W_H^\pm, \omega^\pm). \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(\eta) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} \frac{g'^2}{100 M_{AH}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (A' + B' + C'), \\
A' &= \frac{1}{p_c^2 - m_t^2} [(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W) m_{Hi}^2 (m_t^2 B_0^a + p_c^2 B_1^a) \gamma^\mu P_L - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W m_t m_c (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^a \\
&\quad + p_c^2 B_1^a) \gamma^\mu P_R + (\frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W) m_c (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^a + m_t^2 B_1^a) \not{p}_c \gamma^\mu P_L \\
&\quad - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W m_{Hi}^2 m_t (B_0^a + B_1^a) \not{p}_c \gamma^\mu P_R],
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
B' = & \frac{1}{p_t^2 - m_c^2} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \right) m_{Hi}^2 (m_c^2 B_0^b + p_t^2 B_1^b) \gamma^\mu P_L - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W m_t m_c (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^b \right. \\
& + p_t^2 B_1^b) \gamma^\mu P_R + \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \right) m_t (m_{Hi}^2 B_0^b + m_c^2 B_1^b) \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t P_R \\
& \left. - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W m_c m_{Hi}^2 (B_0^b + B_1^b) \gamma^\mu \not{p}_t P_L \right],
\end{aligned}$$

$$C' = \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \right) C.$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(\omega^0) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} \frac{g^2}{4M_{ZH}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} m_{Hi}^2 (D' + E' + F'),$$

$$D' = A'(B_0^a \rightarrow B_0^c, B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^c),$$

$$E' = B'(B_0^b \rightarrow B_0^d, B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^d),$$

$$F' = C'(C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta}^2, C_\alpha^1 \rightarrow C_\alpha^2, C_0^1 \rightarrow C_0^2).$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(\omega^\pm) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} \frac{g^2}{2M_{WH}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (G' + H' + I' + J'),$$

$$G' = A'(B_0^a \rightarrow B_0^e, B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^e),$$

$$H' = B'(B_0^b \rightarrow B_0^f, B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^f),$$

$$I' = C'(C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta}^3, C_\alpha^1 \rightarrow C_\alpha^3, C_0^1 \rightarrow C_0^3),$$

$$J' = \cos^2 \theta_W J.$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(A_H) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} \frac{g'^2}{100} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (K' + L' + M'),$$

$$K' = \frac{1}{p_c^2 - m_t^2} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \right) p_c^2 B_1^a - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W m_t \not{p}_c B_1^a \right] \gamma^\mu P_L,$$

$$L' = \frac{1}{p_t^2 - m_c^2} \left[ \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \right) p_t^2 B_1^b - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W m_c \not{p}_t B_1^b \right] \gamma^\mu P_L,$$

$$M' = \left( \frac{1}{2} - \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \right) [(\not{p}_t - \not{p}_c) C_\alpha^1 \gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha - m_{Hi}^2 C_0^1 \gamma^\mu - C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \gamma^\beta] P_L.$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(Z_H) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} \frac{g^2}{4} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (N' + O' + P'),$$

$$N' = K'(B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^c),$$

$$O' = L'(B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^d),$$

$$P' = M'(C_{\alpha\beta}^1 \rightarrow C_{\alpha\beta}^2, C_\alpha^1 \rightarrow C_\alpha^2, C_0^1 \rightarrow C_0^2).$$

$$\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(W_H^\pm) = \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g}{\cos \theta_W} g^2 (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} (Q' + R' + S' + T'),$$

$$Q' = K'(B_1^a \rightarrow B_1^e),$$

$$R' = L'(B_1^b \rightarrow B_1^f),$$

$$S' = \left( -\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3} \sin^2 \theta_W \right) [(\not{p}_t - \not{p}_c) C_\alpha^3 \gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha - m_{Hi}^2 C_0^3 \gamma^\mu - C_{\alpha\beta}^3 \gamma^\alpha \gamma^\mu \gamma^\beta] P_L,$$

$$T' = \cos^2 \theta_W T.$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}Z}^\mu(W_H^\pm, \omega^\pm) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g^3 \cos \theta_W}{2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} [m_t (\gamma^\mu \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha^4 + 2p_t^\mu C_0^4 - \not{p}_t \gamma^\mu C_0^4) P_R \\
&\quad + (m_c \not{p}_t C_0^4 + m_c \gamma^\alpha C_\alpha^4 - 2m_{Hi}^2 C_0^4) \gamma^\mu P_L] \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(p_c, p_t) &= \Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(\eta^0) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(\omega^0) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(\omega^\pm) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(A_H) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(Z_H) + \Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(W_H^\pm), \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(\eta^0) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g'^2}{100M_{A_H}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} g_s T^{aij} (A + B + C), \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(\omega^0) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g^2}{4M_{Z_H}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} g_s T^{aij} (D + E + F), \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(\omega^\pm) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g^2}{2M_{W_H}^2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} g_s T^{aij} (G + H + I), \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(A_H) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g'^2}{100} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} g_s T^{aij} (K + L + M), \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(Z_H) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g^2}{4} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} g_s T^{aij} (N + O + P), \\
\Gamma_{t\bar{c}g}^{\mu aij}(W_H^\pm) &= \frac{i}{16\pi^2} \frac{g^2}{2} (V_{Hu})_{it}^* (V_{Hu})_{ic} g_s T^{aij} (Q + R + S).
\end{aligned}$$

The two-point and three-point loop functions  $B_0, B_1, C_0, C_{ij}$  in the above expressions are defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
C_{ij}^1 &= C_{ij}^1(-p_c, p_t, m_{Hi}, M_{A_H}, m_{Hi}), \quad C_{ij}^2 = C_{ij}^2(-p_c, p_t, m_{Hi}, M_{Z_H}, m_{Hi}), \\
C_{ij}^3 &= C_{ij}^3(-p_c, p_t, m_{Hi}, M_{W_H}, m_{Hi}), \quad C_{ij}^4 = C_{ij}^4(p_c, -p_t, M_{W_H}, m_{Hi}, M_{W_H}), \\
B^a &= B^a(-p_c, m_{Hi}, M_{A_H}), \quad B^b = B^b(-p_t, M_{Hi}, M_{A_H}), \\
B^c &= B^c(-p_c, m_{Hi}, M_{Z_H}), \quad B^d = B^d(-p_t, M_{Hi}, M_{Z_H}), \\
B^e &= B^e(-p_c, m_{Hi}, M_{W_H}), \quad B^f = B^f(-p_t, M_{Hi}, M_{W_H}).
\end{aligned}$$