

# $ZZ\gamma$ and $Z\gamma\gamma$ anomalous couplings in $\gamma p$ collision at the LHC

A. Senol\*

*Kastamonu University, Department of Physics, 37100, Kastamonu, Turkey and*

*Abant Izzet Baysal University, Department of Physics, 14280, Bolu, Turkey*

## Abstract

We study the sensitivity of anomalous  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  vertex couplings  $h_3^{\gamma,Z}$  and  $h_4^{\gamma,Z}$ , which would be powerful sign of new physics, via the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  of the main reaction  $pp \rightarrow p\gamma p \rightarrow ZqX$  at the LHC. We calculated limits on these couplings at 95% confidence level for various values of integrated luminosity. It is shown that the  $pp \rightarrow p\gamma p \rightarrow ZqX$  reaction provides one order of magnitude improvement in the couplings  $h_4^{\gamma,Z}$  compared to the current experimental limits obtained in events dominated by  $Z\gamma$  production from the LHC and Tevatron.

PACS numbers: 12.15.Ji, 12.15.-y, 12.60.Cn

---

\*Electronic address: asenol@kastamonu.edu.tr

## I. INTRODUCTION

The gauge boson self-interactions are determined by the non-Abelian  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  gauge group of the electroweak sector in the Standard Model (SM). Precision measurements of these interactions will be important for the test of the SM structure. The tree-level couplings between the  $Z$  boson and the photon ( $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$ ) vanish in the SM. Any detected signals of these couplings being from the SM expectations within the experimental precision would provide crucial clues for new physics beyond the SM. These new physics effects are parametrized at higher energies via an effective Lagrangian which reduces to the SM at low energies.

The most general anomalous trilinear  $Z\gamma Z$  vertex function, being consistent with Lorentz and  $U(1)_{em}$  gauge invariance, is given by [1, 2]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{Z\gamma Z}^{\alpha\beta\mu}(p_1, p_2, p_3) = & \frac{p_3^2 - p_1^2}{m_Z^2} \left[ h_1^Z (p_2^\mu g^{\alpha\beta} - p_2^\alpha g^{\mu\beta}) + \frac{h_2^Z}{M_Z^2} p_3^\alpha [(p_3 \cdot p_2) g^{\mu\beta} - p_2^\mu p_3^\beta] \right. \\ & \left. + h_3^Z \epsilon^{\mu\alpha\beta\rho} p_{2\rho} + \frac{h_4^Z}{m_Z^2} p_3^\alpha \epsilon^{\mu\beta\rho\sigma} p_{3\rho} p_{2\sigma} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $m_Z$  denotes the  $Z$ -boson mass. Formalism of this vertex is depicted in Fig.1 where  $e$  is the charge of the proton. Further, the photon and  $Z$  boson in the final state are on-shell while the  $Z$  boson in the initial state is off-shell. The most general  $Z\gamma\gamma$  vertex function can




FIG. 1: Feynman rule for the  $ZZ\gamma$  vertex.

be obtained from Eq.(1) with the replacements:

$$\frac{p_3^2 - p_1^2}{m_Z^2} \rightarrow \frac{p_3^2}{m_Z^2}, \quad h_i^Z \rightarrow h_i^\gamma, \quad i = 1, \dots, 4 \quad (2)$$

Here the overall factor  $p_3^2$  in the  $Z\gamma\gamma$  vertex function results in electromagnetic gauge invariance, while the factor  $p_3^2 - p_1^2$  in the  $Z\gamma Z$  vertex function (Eq.(1)) ensures Bose symmetry.

TABLE I: Summary table of limits at the 95% C.L. on anomalous  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  couplings from  $Z\gamma$  events.

Parameters	ATLAS	CMS	D0	CDF	LEP
$h_3^\gamma$	(-0.028,0.027)	(-0.07, 0.07)	(-0.027, -0.027)	(-0.022, 0.020)	(-0.049,0.008)
$h_3^Z$	(-0.022,0.026)	(-0.05, 0.06)	(-0.026, 0.026)	(-0.020, 0.021)	(-0.20,0.07)
$h_4^\gamma$	(-0.00021,0.00021)	(-0.0005, 0.0006)	(-0.0014, 0.0014)	(-0.0008,0.0008)	(-0.002,0.034)
$h_4^Z$	(-0.00022,0.00021)	(-0.0005, 0.0005)	(-0.0013, 0.0013)	(-0.0009,0.0009)	(-0.05,0.12)

The  $h_i^Z$  and  $h_i^\gamma$  coupling constants in Eq.(1) have to be described by means of the energy-dependent form factors in a dipolelike form due to the restriction of the  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  couplings to their SM values at high energies at tree-level unitary [3–5]. Following Ref. [2], the generalized dipolelike form factors are described:

$$h_i^V(\hat{s}) = \frac{h_{i0}^V}{(1 + \hat{s}/\Lambda^2)^3} \quad ; \quad i = 1, 3 \quad (3)$$

$$h_i^V(\hat{s}) = \frac{h_{i0}^V}{(1 + \hat{s}/\Lambda^2)^4} \quad ; \quad i = 2, 4 \quad (4)$$

$h_{3,4}^V(h_{1,2}^V)$  couplings are CP-conserving (CP-violating). All the  $h_i^V$  couplings vanish at the tree-level in the SM. The CP-violating couplings always cause completely imaginary amplitudes that do not interfere with amplitudes of SM diagrams; thus, we are interested in the CP-conserving couplings. Also, we assume that the new physics scale  $\Lambda$  is above the collision energy  $\sqrt{\hat{s}}$  to neglect the energy dependence of the form factors.

The 95 % C.L. intervals for anomalous  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  couplings have been provided by ATLAS [6] for an integrated luminosity ( $L_{int}$ ) of  $1.02 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  and  $\Lambda = \infty$ , CMS [7] for  $L_{int}=36 \text{ pb}^{-1}$  and  $\Lambda = \infty$ , D0 [8] for  $L_{int}=7.2 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  and  $\Lambda = \infty$ , CDF [9] for  $L_{int}=5.1 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  and  $\Lambda = 1.5 \text{ TeV}$  and LEP [10] obtained from  $Z\gamma$  events which are given in Table I.

Probing on  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  couplings has been studied in the  $pp$  [2, 11–13],  $e^+e^-$  [14–20], and  $ep$  [21, 22] colliders. In this work, we focus on limits of the anomalous  $h_3^V$  and  $h_4^V$  couplings via the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  of the main reaction  $pp \rightarrow p\gamma p \rightarrow ZqX$  at the LHC. Here, the quasireal photons emitted from one proton beam are described by equivalent photon approximation (EPA) [23, 24] and can interact with quarks coming from the other proton beam. Any process in a  $\gamma$ -proton collision is different from the pure deep inelastic scattering process as a result of two distinctive experimental features. Namely, the first

feature is the quasireal photons emitted from the proton have a low virtuality and are scattered with small angles from the beam pipe in the framework of EPA, and for this reason photon-emitting intact protons get away from the central detector without being detected. This leads to a reduction in the energy deposit in the corresponding forward region. Therefore, one of the forward regions of the central detector has a considerable lack of energy, i.e. forward rapidity gaps. Applying a selected cut on this quantity, ordinary  $pp$  deep inelastic processes can be sorted out. Another feature is provided by forward detectors. Particles with large pseudorapidity can be detected from forward detectors. If the intact proton emitting a photon is scattered with a large pseudorapidity, it escapes from the central detectors. These protons leave a characteristic sign in the forward detectors for  $\gamma$ -proton collision. These features increase interest in probing new physics via photon-induced processes at the LHC in the literature [25–33].

## II. THE CROSS SECTIONS OF THE SUBPROCESS $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$

The subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  of the main reaction  $pp \rightarrow p\gamma p \rightarrow ZqX$  at the tree level receives contributions from four Feynman diagrams, as shown in Fig. 2. The last two diagrams account for the anomalous  $Z\gamma\gamma$  and  $ZZ\gamma$  couplings, and the others depict the SM contributions. The total cross section for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  is obtained by integrating the cross sections over the photon and quark distributions, where  $q = u, \bar{u}, d, \bar{d}, b, \bar{b}, s, \bar{s}, c, \bar{c}$ . All calculations were performed by means of the computer package CalcHEP [34], after implementation of the vertex functions Eq. (1). During calculations, we use parton distribution functions library CTEQ6L [35] and the photon spectrum in the EPA [23] embedded in CalcHEP.

The photon spectrum in EPA as a function of photon energy  $E_\gamma$  and its virtuality  $Q^2$  is given by the following formula [23, 32, 36]:

$$\frac{dN_\gamma}{dE_\gamma dQ^2} = \frac{\alpha}{\pi} \frac{1}{E_\gamma Q^2} \left[ \left(1 - \frac{E_\gamma}{E}\right) \left(1 - \frac{Q_{min}^2}{Q^2}\right) F_E + \frac{E_\gamma^2}{2E^2} F_M \right] \quad (5)$$

where  $\alpha$  is the fine structure constant, and  $Q_{min}^2$  standing for the minimum photon virtuality is given by

$$Q_{min}^2 = \frac{m_p^2 E_\gamma^2}{E(E - E_\gamma)}.$$

Here,  $m_p$  is the mass of the proton and  $E$  denotes the energy of the incoming proton beam. The functions of the electric and magnetic form factors  $F_E$  and  $F_M$  are displayed by

$$F_E = \frac{4m_p^2 G_E^2 + Q^2 G_M^2}{4m_p^2 + Q^2}, \quad F_M = G_M^2$$

$$G_E^2 = \frac{G_M^2}{7.78} = (1 + \frac{Q^2}{0.71 \text{GeV}^2})^{-4}$$

The cross section of the process  $pp \rightarrow p\gamma p \rightarrow ZqX$  can be expressed by integrating the cross section for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  over the photon and quark spectra

$$\sigma(pp \rightarrow p\gamma p \rightarrow ZqX) = \int_{Q_{min}^2}^{Q_{max}^2} dQ^2 \int_{x_{1min}}^{x_{1max}} dx_1 \int_{x_{2min}}^{x_{2max}} dx_2 \left( \frac{dN_\gamma}{dx_1 dQ^2} \right) \left( \frac{dN_q}{dx_2} \right) \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma q \rightarrow Zq}(\hat{s}) \quad (6)$$

where,  $x_1 = \frac{E_\gamma}{E}$ , and  $x_2$  is the momentum fraction of the proton's momentum carried by the quark when  $\frac{dN_q}{dx_2}$  is the quark distribution function of the proton. We have considered photon virtuality  $\langle Q^2 \rangle \approx 0.01 \text{GeV}^2$ , due to the low virtuality of the emitted photons in the EPA [36]. In our calculations, we set  $Q_{max}^2 = 2 \text{GeV}^2$  for which the contribution to the integral above this value is negligible.

In Figs. 3 and 4, we plot the total cross section of the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  as a function of anomalous  $h_3^{\gamma,Z}$  and  $h_4^{\gamma,Z}$  couplings at the center of mass energy of 14 TeV. In these figures, only one of the anomalous couplings is kept to be different from zero. As seen from the figures, cross sections for  $h_3^Z$  couplings are larger as compared to  $h_3^\gamma$ . In contrast, the cross sections for  $h_4^\gamma$  couplings are larger than those of  $h_4^Z$  couplings. This is related to the fact that, the dependencies of the terms of  $h_3^Z$  ( $h_4^Z$ ) and  $h_3^\gamma$  ( $h_4^\gamma$ ) on the matrix element squared are not the same, because of the presence of the different overall factors in the vertex functions.




FIG. 2: Tree-level Feynman diagrams for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  ( $q = u, \bar{u}, d, \bar{d}, b, \bar{b}, s, \bar{s}, c, \bar{c}$ ).




FIG. 3: The total cross sections depending on anomalous  $h_3^\gamma$  and  $h_3^Z$  couplings for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  with taking  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV.




FIG. 4: The total cross sections depending on anomalous  $h_4^\gamma$  and  $h_4^Z$  couplings for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  with taking  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV.

### III. LIMITS ON THE ANOMALOUS $ZZ\gamma$ AND $Z\gamma\gamma$ COUPLINGS

One-dimensional and two-dimensional  $\chi^2$  tests were applied without a systematic error to obtain 95% C.L. on the upper limits of anomalous  $h_3^{\gamma,Z}$  and  $h_4^{\gamma,Z}$  couplings. The  $\chi^2$  function is

$$\chi^2 = \left( \frac{\sigma_{SM} - \sigma_{AN}}{\sigma_{SM} \delta} \right)^2 \quad (7)$$

TABLE II: One-dimensional limits on  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  coupling parameters at 95% C.L. for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  with taking  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV.

$L(\text{fb}^{-1})$	$h_3^Z$	$h_4^Z$	$h_3^\gamma$	$h_4^\gamma$
30	(-0.016, 0.018)	(-0.000099, 0.000098)	(-0.019, 0.022)	(-0.000053, 0.000053)
50	(-0.014, 0.016)	(-0.000088, 0.000086)	(-0.017, 0.020)	(-0.000047, 0.000046)
100	(-0.012, 0.013)	(-0.000074, 0.000072)	(-0.014, 0.017)	(-0.000039, 0.000039)
200	(-0.009, 0.011)	(-0.000062, 0.000061)	(-0.012, 0.014)	(-0.000033, 0.000033)

where  $\delta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$  is the statistical error. The number of events are given by  $N = S \times E \times \sigma_{SM} \times L_{int} \times BR(Z \rightarrow l\bar{l})$  where  $S$  is the survival probability factor,  $E$  denotes the jet reconstruction efficiency,  $L_{int}$  is the integrated luminosity and  $l = e^-$  or  $\mu^-$ . When calculating the number of events we assume  $S = 0.7$  and  $E = 0.6$  for our process, the same as in Ref. [32]. Due to the overwhelming four jet QCD background,  $Z$  bosons decaying hadronically are not considered here. We applied both cuts for the transverse momentum of final state quarks to be  $p_T^j > 15$  GeV and the pseudorapidity of final state quarks to be  $|\eta| < 2.5$ , because ATLAS and CMS have central detectors with a pseudorapidity coverage  $|\eta| < 2.5$ .

If a lower cut is applied on the transverse momentum of scattered protons emitting photons in a photoproduction process, such a cut helps us to discern a photoproduction process deduced from the usual  $pp$  backgrounds, since the transverse momenta of the scattered protons are typically  $p_T \lesssim 1$  GeV [28]. Therefore, the transverse momentum of an outgoing proton to be  $p_T > 0.1$  GeV within the photon spectrum is applied.

According to these restrictions, we have calculated  $\sigma_{SM} = 0.39$  pb for  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  ( $q = u, \bar{u}, d, \bar{d}, b, \bar{b}, s, \bar{s}, c, \bar{c}$ ) at  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV. In Table II, we present 95 % C.L. sensitivity limits on  $h_3^{\gamma,Z}$  and  $h_4^{\gamma,Z}$  for various integrated luminosities by varying one coupling at a time.

The background considered above comes from the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  of which the final state is composed of an admixture of light quarks and jets, and dileptons originating from  $Z \rightarrow l^+l^-$ . In the case of  $b$ -tagging we assume the efficiency of 60%, and the miss-tagging factors for  $c$ -quarks and light quarks are taken as 10% and 1%, respectively. Taking all these criteria, the background cross section is diminished by 2.1%. Then, the sensitivity of our bounds are spoiled by about a factor of 1.75. To illustrate, the bounds on  $h_4^\gamma$  and  $h_4^Z$  became (-0.000069,0.000069) and (-0.00013,0.00013) for  $L_{int}=100 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ , respectively. Besides,

the other source of backgrounds is the instrumental background arising from the calorimeter noise. The calorimeter noise can be prohibited with a suitable cut on the transverse energy of jets (e.g.  $E_T > 40$  GeV).

When comparing these limits with the experimental bounds given in Table I, we can see that the bounds on  $h_3^{\gamma,Z}$  in the unitarity violation scheme obtained from ATLAS, D0, and CDF are of the same order as our bounds, while the  $h_4^{\gamma,Z}$  limits are 1 order weaker than our limits. In addition, we show two-dimensional 95% C.L. limit contours for  $ZZ\gamma$  vertex couplings  $h_3^Z$  and  $h_4^Z$  in Fig.5 and for  $Z\gamma\gamma$  vertex couplings  $h_3^\gamma$  and  $h_4^\gamma$  in Fig.6 at  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV for various integrated luminosities. Due to the fact that the  $h_4^{Z,\gamma}$  couplings come from dimension-eight operators, the bounds are more restricted than those of  $h_3^{Z,\gamma}$  which stem from dimension-six.




FIG. 5: Two-dimensional 95% limit contour for anomalous  $h_3^Z$  and  $h_4^Z$  couplings for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  with taking  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV.






FIG. 6: Two-dimensional 95% limit contour for anomalous  $h_3^\gamma$  and  $h_4^\gamma$  couplings for the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  with taking  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have examined the model-independent parametrization of anomalous  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  vertex couplings  $h_3^V$  and  $h_4^V$  within the effective operator approach via the subprocess  $\gamma q \rightarrow Zq$  of the main reaction  $pp \rightarrow p\gamma p \rightarrow ZqX$  at the LHC with a center of mass energy of 14 TeV. The potential of the LHC to probe anomalous  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  couplings is analyzed via hadronic  $Z\gamma$  production at  $\sqrt{s}=14$  TeV with the integrated luminosity of 10 and 100  $\text{fb}^{-1}$  [11]. The limits obtained via the  $pp \rightarrow Z\gamma + X \rightarrow \cancel{p}_T\gamma + X$  process in Ref.[11] are  $|h_3^Z| < 1.9 \times 10^{-3} (3.4 \times 10^{-3})$  and  $|h_4^Z| < 1.2 \times 10^{-5} (2.5 \times 10^{-5})$  at the LHC with  $L_{int}=100$  (10)  $\text{fb}^{-1}$ . Our results on  $h_4^V$  are of the same order with those of Ref.[11] at  $L_{int}=100 \text{ fb}^{-1}$ , while the limits on  $h_3^V$  remains one order lower. However, a photoproduction process at hadron colliders provides a rather clean channel compared to the pure deep inelastic process due to the detection of scattered protons emitting photons by the forward detectors. Furthermore, the obtained results being related to the anomalous  $ZZ\gamma$  and  $Z\gamma\gamma$  vertex couplings from a photoproduction process are complementary to traditional  $pp$  studies. Nevertheless, if we

compare the current experimental limits with the results determined from this work, our limits on the couplings  $h_4^V$  with  $L_{int}=30 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  are one order better than the experimental limits obtained from LHC and Tevatron as given in Table I, while the  $h_3^V$  couplings are of the same order as the current experimental limits.

## Acknowledgments

This work is dedicated to my cute daughter, Zeynep Buse Senol. I would like to thank G. Yildirim and A. T. Tasci for useful discussions and Orhan Cakir for useful comments.

- 
- [1] K. Hagiwara, R. D. Peccei, D. Zeppenfeld and K. Hikasa, Nucl. Phys. B **282**, 253 (1987).
  - [2] U. Baur and E. L. Berger, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 4889 (1993).
  - [3] J. M. Cornwall, D. N. Levin and G. Tiktopoulos, Phys. Rev. Lett. **30**, 1268 (1973) [Erratum-  
ibid. **31**, 572 (1973)].
  - [4] J. M. Cornwall, D. N. Levin and G. Tiktopoulos, Phys. Rev. D **10**, 1145 (1974) [Erratum-ibid.  
D **11**, 972 (1975)].
  - [5] C. H. Llewellyn Smith, Phys. Lett. B **46**, 233 (1973).
  - [6] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **717**, 49 (2012) [arXiv:1205.2531 [hep-ex]].
  - [7] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **701**, 535 (2011) [arXiv:1105.2758  
[hep-ex]].
  - [8] V. M. Abazov *et al.* [D0 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **85**, 052001 (2012) [arXiv:1111.3684  
[hep-ex]].
  - [9] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 051802 (2011) [arXiv:1103.2990  
[hep-ex]].
  - [10] J. Alcaraz *et al.* [ALEPH and DELPHI and L3 and OPAL and LEP Electroweak Working  
Group Collaborations], hep-ex/0612034.
  - [11] U. Baur, T. Han and J. Ohnemus, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 2823 (1998) [hep-ph/9710416].
  - [12] U. Baur and D. L. Rainwater, Phys. Rev. D **62**, 113011 (2000) [hep-ph/0008063].
  - [13] D. Choudhury, S. Dutta, S. Rakshit and S. Rindani, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **16**, 4891 (2001)  
[hep-ph/0011205].

- [14] T. G. Rizzo, Phys. Rev. D **54**, 3057 (1996) [hep-ph/9602331].
- [15] R. Walsh and A. J. Ramalho, Phys. Rev. D **57**, 5908 (1998).
- [16] R. Walsh and A. J. Ramalho, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 055011 (2002).
- [17] S. Atag and I. Sahin, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 093014 (2003) [hep-ph/0310047].
- [18] S. Atag and I. Sahin, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 053014 (2004) [hep-ph/0408163].
- [19] A. Gutierrez-Rodriguez, M. A. Hernandez-Ruiz and M. A. Perez, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 017301 (2009) [arXiv:0808.0945 [hep-ph]].
- [20] B. Ananthanarayan, S. K. Garg, M. Patra and S. D. Rindani, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 034006 (2012) [arXiv:1104.3645 [hep-ph]].
- [21] Y. A. Coutinho, A. J. Ramalho, R. Walsh and S. Wulck, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 115008 (2001).
- [22] I. Turk Cakir, Acta Phys. Polon. B **40**, 309 (2009).
- [23] V. M. Budnev, I. F. Ginzburg, G. V. Meledin and V. G. Serbo, Phys. Rept. **15**, 181 (1975).
- [24] I. F. Ginzburg, G. L. Kotkin, V. G. Serbo and V. I. Telnov, Nucl. Instrum. Meth. **205**, 47 (1983).
- [25] V. A. Khoze, A. D. Martin and M. G. Ryskin, Eur. Phys. J. C **23**, 311 (2002) [hep-ph/0111078].
- [26] O. Kepka and C. Royon, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 073005 (2008) [arXiv:0808.0322 [hep-ph]].
- [27] J. de Favereau de Jeneret, V. Lemaitre, Y. Liu, S. Oryn, T. Pierzchala, K. Piotrkowski, X. Rouby and N. Schul *et al.*, arXiv:0908.2020 [hep-ph].
- [28] M. G. Albrow, T. D. Coughlin and J. R. Forshaw, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **65**, 149 (2010) [arXiv:1006.1289 [hep-ph]].
- [29] I. Sahin and A. A. Billur, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 035011 (2011) [arXiv:1101.4998 [hep-ph]].
- [30] R. S. Gupta, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 014006 (2012) [arXiv:1111.3354 [hep-ph]].
- [31] I. Sahin, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 033002 (2012) [arXiv:1201.4364 [hep-ph]].
- [32] I. Sahin and B. Sahin, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 115001 (2012) [arXiv:1211.3100 [hep-ph]].
- [33] B. Sahin and A. A. Billur, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 074026 (2012) [arXiv:1210.3235 [hep-ph]].
- [34] A. Belyaev, N. D. Christensen and A. Pukhov, arXiv:1207.6082 [hep-ph].
- [35] J. Pumplin, D. R. Stump, J. Huston, H. L. Lai, P. M. Nadolsky and W. K. Tung, JHEP **0207**, 012 (2002) [hep-ph/0201195].
- [36] K. Piotrkowski, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 071502 (2001) [hep-ex/0009065].