

Dark matter in little Higgs model under current experimental constraints from LHC, Planck and Xenon

Lei Wang¹, Jin Min Yang², Jingya Zhu²

¹ *Department of Physics, Yantai University, Yantai 264005, PR China*

² *State Key Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,
Institute of Theoretical Physics, Academia Sinica, Beijing 100190, PR China*

Abstract

We examine the status of dark matter (heavy photon) in the littlest Higgs model with T-parity (LHT) in light of the new results from the LHC Higgs search, the Planck dark matter relic density and the XENON100 limit on the dark matter scattering off the nucleon. We obtain the following observations: (i) For the LHC Higgs data, the LHT can well be consistent with the CMS results but disfavored by the ATLAS observation of diphoton enhancement; (ii) For the dark matter relic density, the heavy photon in the LHT can account for the Planck data for the small mass splitting of mirror lepton and heavy photon; (iii) For the dark matter scattering off the nucleon, the heavy photon can give a spin-independent cross section below the XENON100 upper limit for $m_{A_H} > 95$ GeV ($f > 665$ GeV); (iv) A fit using the CMS Higgs data gives the lowest chi-square of 2.63 (the SM value is 4.75) at $f \simeq 1120$ GeV and $m_{A_H} \simeq 170$ GeV (at this point the dark matter constraints from Planck and XENON100 can also be satisfied). Such a best point and its nearby favored region (even for a f value up to 3.8 TeV) can be covered by the future XENON1T (2017) experiment.

PACS numbers: 12.60.Fr, 95.35.+d, 14.80.Ec

I. INTRODUCTION

To solve the fine-tuning problem of the standard model (SM), the little Higgs theory [1] is proposed as a kind of electroweak symmetry breaking mechanism accomplished by a naturally light Higgs boson. The littlest Higgs model (LH) [2] provides an economical realization for this theory. Further, to relax the constraints from the electroweak precision data [3], a discrete symmetry called T-parity is introduced to the LH [4, 5]. The LH with T-parity (LHT) predicts a heavy photon as a candidate for the weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP) dark matter (DM), whose relic density, direct detection, indirect detection and phenomenology at the LHC have been intensively studied [6, 7].

Very recently, some experiments have made significant progress, which allow for a test for new physics like the LHT. On the one hand, for the dark matter the Planck collaboration [8] released its relic density as $\Omega_c h^2 \pm \sigma = 0.1199 \pm 0.0027$ (in combination with the WMAP data [9]) and the CDMS II direct detection experiment has reported three WIMP-candidate events corresponding to a WIMP around 8.6 GeV [10]. However, such a CDMS result is in tension with other direct detection results like the latest XENON100 results [11], which provided the most stringent upper limits on the spin-independent WIMP-nucleon scattering cross section for a WIMP above 7 GeV.

On the other hand, for the Higgs search the CMS and ATLAS collaborations have announced observation of a Higgs-like boson around 125 GeV [12–15]. This observation is supported by the Tevatron search which showed a 3.1σ excess at $M_h = 125$ GeV [16]. The properties of this observed particle are well consistent with the SM Higgs boson for most of the search channels. Note that the Higgs diphoton rate from the ATLAS is sizably larger than the SM expectation, 1.6 ± 0.3 [14], but the central value of CMS is smaller than the SM prediction, 0.77 ± 0.27 [15]. The Higgs properties in the LHT have been studied in [17–20] and the diphoton rate was found to be always suppressed (in contrast to the low energy supersymmetric models which can either enhance or suppress the diphoton rate [21]).

In this work we examine the status of dark matter (heavy photon) in the LHT under the latest experimental constraints from the LHC Higgs result, the Planck DM relic density and the XENON100 (2012) limit on the DM-nucleon scattering. In Sec. II we recapitulate the dark matter sector in the LHT. In Sec. III we examine the status of dark matter (heavy photon) in light of the latest experimental results. Finally, we give our conclusion in Sec.

IV.

II. THE LITTLEST HIGGS MODEL WITH T-PARITY

This model [2] consists of a nonlinear sigma model with a global $SU(5)$ symmetry which is broken down to $SO(5)$ by a vacuum expectation value (VEV) f . A subgroup $[SU(2) \otimes U(1)]^2$ of $SU(5)$ is gauged. T-parity is an automorphism which exchanges the $[SU(2) \otimes U(1)]_1$ and $[SU(2) \otimes U(1)]_2$ gauge fields. While all the SM particles are T-even, the new gauge bosons (W_H^\pm, Z_H, A_H) and the triplet scalar ($\Phi^{++}, \Phi^+, \Phi^0, \Phi^P$) are T-odd, whose masses are given by

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

Here h and v are respectively the SM-like Higgs boson and its vacuum expectation value (vev). The relation between G_F and v is modified from its SM form and reads as [18]

$$v \simeq v_{SM}(1 + \frac{1}{12} \frac{v_{SM}^2}{f^2}), \quad (2)$$

where $v_{SM} = 246$ GeV is the SM Higgs vev. The heavy photon A_H is typically the lightest T-odd state and thus can serve as a candidate for dark matter.

In the top quark sector, there are a T-even (denoted as T) and a T-odd partner (denoted as T_-). The T-even one mixes with the top quark and cancels the quadratic divergent contribution of the top quark to the Higgs boson mass. The mixing can be parameterized by

$$r = \frac{\lambda_1}{\lambda_2}, \quad c_t = \frac{1}{\sqrt{r^2 + 1}}, \quad s_t = \frac{r}{\sqrt{1 + r^2}}, \quad (3)$$

where λ_1 and λ_2 are two dimensionless top quark Yukawa couplings. The masses of the T-even partner and the T-odd partner are given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_T &= \frac{m_t f}{s_t c_t v} \left[1 + \frac{v^2}{f^2} \left(\frac{1}{3} - s_t^2 c_t^2 \right) \right], \\ m_{T_-} &= \frac{m_t f}{s_t v} \left[1 + \frac{v^2}{f^2} \left(\frac{1}{3} - \frac{1}{2} s_t^2 c_t^2 \right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

For each SM quark (lepton), a heavy mirror quark (lepton) with T-odd quantum number is added in order to preserve T-parity. Their masses are given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_{u_{Hi}} &= \sqrt{2}\kappa_{qi}f(1 - \frac{v^2}{8f^2}), & m_{d_{Hi}} &= \sqrt{2}\kappa_{qi}f, \\ m_{v_{Hi}} &= \sqrt{2}\kappa_{li}f(1 - \frac{v^2}{8f^2}), & m_{l_{Hi}} &= \sqrt{2}\kappa_{li}f, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where κ_{qi} and κ_{li} with $i = 1, 2, 3$ are the eigenvalues of the mirror quark and lepton mass matrices, respectively.

For the SM down-type quarks (leptons), the Higgs couplings of LHT have two different cases [18]:

$$\begin{aligned}\frac{C_{hd\bar{d}}}{C_{hd\bar{d}}^{\text{SM}}} &\simeq 1 - \frac{1}{4} \frac{v_{SM}^2}{f^2} + \frac{7}{32} \frac{v_{SM}^4}{f^4} \quad \text{for LHT - A,} \\ &\simeq 1 - \frac{5}{4} \frac{v_{SM}^2}{f^2} - \frac{17}{32} \frac{v_{SM}^4}{f^4} \quad \text{for LHT - B.}\end{aligned}$$

The relation of down-type quark couplings also applies to the lepton couplings.

In our analysis we use MicrOMEGAs3.2 to calculate the relic density and the cross section between DM and nucleon [22]. The CalcHEP LHT model files are provided by [23]. We add the Higgs couplings to the u-quark, d-quark and electron, and modify the Z and W couplings to mirror fermions. In addition, we assume the interactions between the mirror fermions and the SM fermions are diagonal.

Some typical Higgs and DM couplings are given by [18, 24, 25]

$$\begin{aligned}hA_H A_H : & -\frac{g'^2}{2}v \left[1 - \frac{v^2}{f^2} \left(\frac{4}{3} - \frac{2c_W}{s_W} x_H \right) \right] g^{\mu\nu}, & hu_{Hi} \bar{u}_{Hi} : & \frac{m_{u_{Hi}}}{v} \frac{v^2}{4f^2}, \\ hW^+ W^- : & \frac{2m_W^2}{v} \left(1 - \frac{1}{6} \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right) g^{\mu\nu}, & hZZ : & \frac{2m_Z^2}{v} \left(1 - \frac{1}{6} \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right) g^{\mu\nu}, \\ hW_H^+ W_H^- : & -\frac{2m_{W_H}^2}{v} \frac{v^2}{4f^2} g^{\mu\nu}, & h\Phi^+ \Phi^- : & \frac{2m_\Phi^2}{v} \frac{v^2}{3f^2}, \\ hu\bar{u} : & -\frac{m_u}{v} \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right), & hc\bar{c} : & -\frac{m_c}{v} \left(1 - \frac{2}{3} \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right), \\ ht\bar{t} : & -\frac{m_t}{v} \left[1 + \frac{v^2}{f^2} \left(-\frac{2}{3} + c_t^2 s_t^2 \right) \right], & hT\bar{T} : & \frac{m_T}{v} c_t^2 s_t^2 \frac{v^2}{f^2}, \\ A_H l_i \bar{l}_{Hi} : & -\left(\frac{g'}{10} - \frac{g}{2} x_H \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right) \gamma^\mu P_L, & A_H \nu_i \bar{\nu}_{Hi} : & -\left(\frac{g'}{10} + \frac{g}{2} x_H \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right) \gamma^\mu P_L \\ A_H d_i \bar{d}_{Hi} : & -\left(\frac{g'}{10} - \frac{g}{2} x_H \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right) \gamma^\mu P_L, & A_H u_i \bar{u}_{Hi} : & -\left(\frac{g'}{10} + \frac{g}{2} x_H \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right) \gamma^\mu P_L \\ A_H t \bar{u}_{H3} : & -\left[\frac{g'}{10} + \left(\frac{g'}{20} s_t^2 - \frac{g}{2} x_H \right) \frac{v^2}{f^2} \right] \gamma^\mu P_L, & W l_{Hi} \bar{\nu}_{Hi} : & \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \gamma^\mu \left[1 - \left(\frac{v^2}{8f^2} P_R \right) \right] \\ Z \nu_{Hi} \bar{\nu}_{Hi} : & \frac{g}{c_W} \gamma^\mu \left[\frac{1}{2} - \left(\frac{v^2}{8f^2} P_R \right) \right], & Z l_{Hi} \bar{l}_{Hi} : & \frac{g}{c_W} \gamma^\mu \left(-\frac{1}{2} + s_W^2 \right),\end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

where $x_H = \frac{5gg'}{4(5g^2 - g'^2)}$.

III. DARK MATTER IN LHT UNDER CURRENT EXPERIMENTAL CONSTRAINTS

A. Implication of LHC Higgs data on LHT parameter space

In our calculations, the Higgs mass is fixed as 125.5 GeV, and the new free parameters are f , r , κ_{li} , κ_{qi} . The electroweak precision data favor $f > 500$ GeV and $0.5 < r < 2$ [26].

We assume that the three generations of mirror quarks (leptons) are degenerate in mass, namely $\kappa_{l1} = \kappa_{l2} = \kappa_{l3}$ and $\kappa_{q1} = \kappa_{q2} = \kappa_{q3}$. For $\kappa_{qi} < 0.45$, the mirror quark is lighter than the heavy gauge bosons W_H and Z_H , and thus its only decay mode is the two-body decay into A_H and a SM quark. The ATLAS and CMS collaborations have analyzed jets plus missing transverse momentum signal, and not yet found any hints of new physics [27, 28]. Therefore, we take $0.45 < \kappa_{qi} < 1$ conservatively. In addition, we impose the LEP limits on the masses of charged leptons which are required to be larger than 105 GeV [29].

We consider the relevant QCD and electroweak corrections using the code Hdecay [30]. For the Higgs productions and decays, the LHT gives the corrections by directly modifying the Higgs couplings to the relevant SM particles. For the loop-induced decays $h \rightarrow gg$ and $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, the LHT gives the partial corrections via the reduced $ht\bar{t}$ and hWW couplings, respectively. Besides, $h \rightarrow gg$ can get contributions from the loops of heavy partner quark T and mirror up-type quarks. In addition to the loops of the heavy quarks involved in the $h \rightarrow gg$, the decay $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ can be also altered by the loops of W_H , Φ^\pm and $\Phi^{\pm\pm}$ in the LHT. The doubly charged $\Phi^{\pm\pm}$ contributions are enhanced by a relative factor 4 in the amplitude, but can still be ignored due to the very small coupling $h\Phi^{++}\Phi^{--}$ (in contrast to the type II seesaw model whose doubly charged scalar can give the dominant contributions to the decay $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ [31]). Since the mirror charged lepton, the mirror down-type quark and the top partner T_- do not have tree-level couplings to the Higgs boson, they do not contribute to $h \rightarrow gg$ and $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ at leading order. For $m_h = 125.5$ GeV, the decay $h \rightarrow A_H A_H$ is kinematically forbidden in the LHT (such an invisible decay was possible in some supersymmetric models [32]).

The decays $h \rightarrow gg$ and $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ are not sensitive to the mirror quark masses as long as they are much larger than half of the Higgs boson mass. The parameter r determines the Higgs couplings to t , T and m_T , and is involved in the calculations of $h \rightarrow gg$ and $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$. The r dependence of the top quark loop and T quark loop can cancel to a large extent, as can be seen from Eq. (6). Therefore, the Higgs signal rates in many channels are only sensitive to the scale f .

Requiring that the heavy photon is the lightest T-odd particle, we scan over the parameter space of f , r , κ_{qi} and κ_{li} in the ranges allowed by the electroweak precision data (κ_{li} is not involved in the calculation of the Higgs signal rates). We show the inclusive diphoton signal rate normalized to the SM value in Fig. 1. From this figure we find that the diphoton rates




FIG. 1: The scatter plots of the LHT parameter space projected on the plane of the LHC diphoton rate versus f . The inclusive diphoton data are taken from [14, 15].

in the LHT-A and LHT-B are always suppressed, and approach to the SM predictions for a large scale f . The suppression in the former is more sizable than in the latter because the $hb\bar{b}$ coupling in the LHT-B is suppressed more sizably. Since the ATLAS diphoton data is above the SM value by about 2σ , the predicted rates in both the LHT-A and LHT-B are outside the 2σ range of the ATLAS data. For the CMS diphoton data which shows no enhancement relative to the SM value, the LHT-A and LHT-B can both give the signal rates in its 1σ range. In the following, we will focus on the CMS data instead of combining the two groups' results.

Now we perform a fit to the CMS Higgs data in the LHT-A and LHT-B. We compute the χ^2 values by the method introduced in [33, 34], with the CMS Higgs data in 9 channels from Fig.4 of [15]. Since the data for different exclusive search channels presented by one collaboration are not independent, we consider the correlation coefficient as in [35, 36].

In Fig. 2 we project the samples on the plane of χ^2 versus f . Similar to the diphoton rates, the χ^2 of LHT-A and LHT-B is only sensitive to f . The χ^2 is larger than the SM value for low values of f , then becomes smaller than the SM value for intermediate values




FIG. 2: The scatter plots of the LHT parameter space projected on the plane of χ^2 versus f . Here we considered the CMS Higgs data in 9 channels. The samples with the minimal values of χ^2 are marked out as stars. Also showed are the 1σ ($\chi^2 = 10.43$) and 2σ ($\chi^2 = 16.92$) values as well as the SM fit value ($\chi^2 = 4.75$).

of f , and finally approaches to the SM value for sufficiently high values of f . For f around 1 TeV, χ^2 in the LHT-A and LHT-B reaches to the minimal value, which is 2.63 for LHT-A and 3.70 for LHT-B. So we see that the best point favored by the CMS Higgs data is at $f \sim 1$ TeV.

We also performed the fit using the ATLAS data [14, 37]. We found that the χ^2 values are much larger than using the CMS data. The main source of large χ^2 comes from the diphoton enhancement [14].

B. Dark matter relic density and scattering with nucleon

Our results show that the heavy photon relic density and its spin-independent cross section with nucleon are very similar for the LHT-A and LHT-B. So we only present the results for LHT-A. We will display the dark matter relic density and its spin-independent

cross section with the nucleon in the parameter space allowed by the CMS Higgs data at 2σ level (as shown in the left panel of Fig. 2, most samples in our scan can survive such a 2σ criterion). The theoretical predictions in the LHT-A will be compared with the relic density data from the Planck and the scattering rate limit from the XENON100. Also, the future XENON-1T sensitivity will be shown for the LHT-A.

The heavy photon pair-annihilation processes include $A_H A_H \rightarrow f\bar{f}$, ZZ , WW which proceed via an s -channel h exchange, and $A_H A_H \rightarrow hh$ which proceeds via a 4-point contact interaction, an s -channel h exchange, and t - and u -channel A_H exchange. Also, $A_H A_H \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ can proceed via the t - and u -channel T-odd fermion exchange (including the mirror quark, mirror lepton, top partner T_-), whose contributions to the relic density are generally suppressed by the interactions between the T-odd fermions and SM fermions mediated by the heavy photon. In addition, the mirror lepton can have an important effect on the relic density via the coannihilation processes for the mirror lepton masses close to the heavy photon. However, the other T-odd particles, including the mirror quarks, top partner quark T_- , heavy gauge bosons and scalars, do not contribute to the relic density since their mass are much larger than A_H .

In Fig. 3 we project the LHT samples showing the dependence of the heavy photon relic density on m_{A_H} and ΔM (the mass splitting between mirror neutrino and heavy photon). We see that in order to account for the DM relic density, ΔM must be small and thus the mirror leptons play an important role via the coannihilation processes. For the heavy photon pair-annihilation, there is no s -channel Higgs resonance since the mass splitting of $2m_{A_H}$ and m_h is much larger than the total width of Higgs. Further, the relevant Higgs and heavy photon couplings are suppressed by a factor of $1 - \mathcal{O}(\frac{v^2}{f^2})$ (see Eq. 6). Therefore, the cross sections of the heavy photon pair-annihilation are too small to provide the correct relic density of DM, and the mirror leptons have to play an important role via the coannihilation processes.

The heavy photon scattering off the nucleon can occur via exchanging a Higgs boson or a mirror quark. The former will give the dominant contribution to the spin-independent cross section, especially for the Higgs-gluon interaction via the heavy quark loops. For the latter case, since the mirror quarks are much heavier than the heavy photon, we have no enhancement in the propagator [6]. They can not contribute sizably to the spin-independent cross section due to the small couplings of $A_H u\bar{u}_{H1}$ and $A_H d\bar{d}_{H1}$.




FIG. 3: The scatter plots of the LHT-A parameter space allowed by the CMS Higgs data at 2σ level, showing the dark matter relic density $\Omega_c h^2$. The central value of 0.1199 is from the Planck data [8].

In Fig. 4 we display the scatter plots of the LHT-A parameter space allowed by the CMS Higgs data at 2σ level and by the Planck dark matter relic density at 2σ level, showing the spin-independent scattering cross section off the nucleon. We see that the spin-independent cross section decreases with the increasing of m_{A_H} , and is below the upper limit of XENON100 (2012) for $m_{A_H} > 95$ GeV ($f > 665$ GeV). The best point from the fit of the CMS Higgs data (also give the relic density in the 2σ range) happens at $f \simeq 1120$ GeV and $m_{A_H} \simeq 170$ GeV. Such a best point and its nearby favored region (even for a f value up to 3.8 TeV) can be covered by the future XENON1T (2017) experiment.

Finally, in Table I we present the detailed information for two samples (LHT-A P1 and LHT-B P3) which give minimal χ^2 for the CMS Higgs data and also the best relic density (closest to the measured central value). Also, another two samples (LHT-A P2 and LHT-B P4) for $f = 800$ GeV are given for comparison. As previously discussed, χ^2 is sensitive to f and the relic density is sensitive to f and κ_l . For the best-fit points, σ^{SI} is almost the same in the LHT-A and LHT-B, while the Higgs properties have sizable differences. Especially, the rates for the Higgs signals $\gamma\gamma$, ZZ^* , and WW^* via the $VBF+VH$ production channel are enhanced in the LHT-B, but suppressed in the LHT-A, which may be useful for distinguishing between the two models.

TABLE I: The detailed information of some samples in the LHT-A and LHT-B.

| | LHT-A P1 | LHT-A P2 | LHT-B P3 | LHT-B P4 |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|
| $f(\text{GeV})$ | 1121.5 | 800.0 | 1050.7 | 800.0 |
| r | 1.908 | 1.183 | 0.504 | 1.183 |
| κ_l | 0.1167 | 0.1169 | 0.1168 | 0.1169 |
| κ_q | 0.900 | 0.911 | 0.624 | 0.911 |
| χ^2 | 2.63 | 4.31 | 3.70 | 4.25 |
| $\Omega_c h^2$ | 0.1199 | 0.1199 | 0.1199 | 0.1199 |
| $\sigma^{SI}(\times 10^{-44} \text{cm}^2)$ | 0.0967 | 0.1761 | 0.1042 | 0.1596 |
| $M_{A_H}(\text{GeV})$ | 169.81 | 117.50 | 158.40 | 117.50 |
| $M_{W_H}(M_{Z_H})(\text{GeV})$ | 701.99 | 497.75 | 657.08 | 497.75 |
| $M_\Phi(\text{GeV})$ | 805.19 | 572.15 | 753.91 | 572.15 |
| $M_T(\text{GeV})$ | 1918.32 | 1137.19 | 1841.03 | 1137.19 |
| $M_{T_-}(\text{GeV})$ | 899.30 | 747.19 | 1660.50 | 747.19 |
| $M_{\nu_-}(\text{GeV})$ | 183.98 | 130.66 | 172.41 | 130.66 |
| $M_{l_-}(\text{GeV})$ | 185.09 | 132.22 | 173.60 | 132.22 |
| $M_{d_-}(\text{GeV})$ | 1427.05 | 1030.40 | 926.38 | 1030.40 |
| $M_{u_-}(\text{GeV})$ | 1418.45 | 1018.20 | 920.02 | 1018.20 |
| $ C_{hgg}/SM ^2$ | 0.861 | 0.734 | 0.842 | 0.734 |
| $ C_{hbb}/SM ^2$ | 0.977 | 0.957 | 0.864 | 0.769 |
| $ C_{h\tau\tau}/SM ^2$ | 0.977 | 0.957 | 0.864 | 0.769 |
| $ C_{h\gamma\gamma}/SM ^2$ | 0.985 | 0.972 | 0.983 | 0.972 |
| $ C_{hWW}/SM ^2$ | 0.976 | 0.953 | 0.973 | 0.953 |
| $ C_{hZZ}/SM ^2$ | 0.976 | 0.953 | 0.973 | 0.953 |
| $ C_{htt}/SM ^2$ | 0.946 | 0.907 | 0.935 | 0.907 |
| LHC, ggF+ttH, $\gamma\gamma$ | 0.772 | 0.580 | 0.861 | 0.758 |
| LHC, VBF+VH, $\gamma\gamma$ | 0.991 | 0.978 | 1.147 | 1.277 |
| LHC, ggF+ttH, ZZ^* | 0.757 | 0.558 | 0.842 | 0.728 |
| LHC, VBF+VH, ZZ^* | 0.972 | 0.940 | 1.122 | 1.227 |
| LHC, ggF+ttH, WW^* | 0.757 | 0.558 | 0.842 | 0.728 |
| LHC, VBF+VH, WW^* | 0.972 | 0.940 | 1.122 | 1.227 |
| LHC, VH, $b\bar{b}$ | 0.974 | 0.948 | 0.886 | 0.799 |
| LHC, ggF+ttH, $\tau\tau$ | 0.759 | 0.563 | 0.665 | 0.474 |
| LHC, VBF+VH, $\tau\tau$ | 0.974 | 0.948 | 0.886 | 0.799 |




FIG. 4: The scatter plots of the LHT-A parameter space allowed by the CMS Higgs data at 2σ level and by the Planck dark matter relic density at 2σ level, showing the spin-independent scattering cross section off the nucleon. The best point, which gives minimal χ^2 for the CMS Higgs data and also the best relic density (closest to the measured central value), is marked as a star. The curves denote the XENON100 (2012) limits [11] and XENON1T (2017) sensitivity [38], respectively.

IV. CONCLUSION

The LHT provides a heavy photon as a candidate for weakly interacting massive particle dark matter. In this note we examined the status of such a dark matter candidate in light of the new results from the LHC Higgs search, the Planck dark matter relic density and the XENON100 limit on the dark matter scattering off the nucleon. We scanned over the parameter space in the ranges allowed by the electroweak precision data. By confronting the parameter space with the LHC Higgs data, we found that the LHT can well be consistent with the CMS results but disfavored by the ATLAS observation of diphoton enhancement. Then in the parameter space allowed by the CMS Higgs data at 2σ level, we calculated the heavy photon relic density and found that the heavy photon can account for the Planck

data for the small mass splitting of mirror lepton and heavy photon. Finally, under the constraints from LHC Higgs and Planck dark matter relic density, we checked the heavy photon scattering off the nucleon and found that the heavy photon can give a spin-independent cross section below the XENON100 upper limit for $m_{A_H} > 95$ GeV ($f > 665$ GeV). The whole parameter space allowed by the current experiments (LHC Higgs, Planck, XENON100) can be covered by the future XENON1T (2017) experiment for a f value up to 3.8 TeV.

Acknowledgment

Lei Wang would like to thank Genevieve Belanger for helpful discussion on MicrOMEGAs. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NNSFC) under grant Nos. 11005089, 11105116, 11275245, 10821504 and 11135003.

-
- [1] N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen and H. Georgi, Phys. Lett. B **513**, 232 (2001); N. Arkani-Hamed et al., JHEP **0208**, 021 (2002).
 - [2] N. Arkani-Hamed, A. G. Cohen, E. Katz, A. E. Nelson, JHEP **0207**, 034 (2002).
 - [3] C. Csaki et al., Phys. Rev. D **67**, 115002 (2003); Phys. Rev. D **68**, 035009 (2003); J. L. Hewett, F. J. Petriello, T. G. Rizzo, JHEP **0310**, 062 (2003); M. C. Chen, S. Dawson, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 015003 (2004); M. C. Chen et al., Mod. Phys. Lett. A **21**, 621 (2006); W. Kilian, J. Reuter, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 015004 (2004).
 - [4] H. C. Cheng and I. Low, JHEP **0309**, 051 (2003).
 - [5] H. C. Cheng and I. Low, JHEP **0408**, 061 (2004); I. Low, JHEP **0410**, 067 (2004).
 - [6] A. Birkedal, A. Noble, M. Perelstein, A. Spray, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 035002 (2006).
 - [7] J. Hubisz, P. Meade, Phys. Rev. D **71**, 035016 (2005); M. Asano, S. Matsumoto, N. Okada, Y. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 063506 (2007); C.-S. Chen, K. Cheung, T.-C. Yuan, Phys. Lett. B **644**, 158-164 (2007); M. Perelstein, A. Spray, Phys. Rev. D **75**, 083519 (2007).
 - [8] P. A. R. Ade et al. [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076.
 - [9] G. Hinshaw et al. [WMAP Collaboration], arXiv:1212.5226.
 - [10] R. Agnese et al. [CDMS Collaboration], arXiv:1304.4279.
 - [11] E. Aprile et al. [XENON100 Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 181301 (2012)

- [12] S. Chatrchyan et al. [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012).
- [13] G. Aad et al. [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012).
- [14] ATLAS Collaboration, ATLAS-CONF-2013-034.
- [15] CMS Collaboration, CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005.
- [16] T. Aaltonen *et al.* [CDF and D0 Collaborations], arXiv:1303.6346.
- [17] L. Wang, J. M. Yang, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 075024 (2011); Phys. Rev. D **79**, 055013 (2009).
- [18] C. R. Chen, K. Tobe, C. P. Yuan, Phys. Lett. B **640**, 263 (2006).
- [19] X.-F. Han, L. Wang, J. M. Yang, J. Zhu, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 055004 (2013); J. Reuter, M. Tonini, JHEP **0213**, 077 (2013); J. Reuter, M. Tonini, M. de Vries, arXiv:1307.5010.
- [20] Q.-G. Zeng, S. Yang, C.-X. Yue, L.-S. Chen, arXiv:1304.5576.
- [21] See, e.g., M. Carena *et al.*, JHEP **1203**, 014 (2012); U. Ellwanger, JHEP **1203**, 044 (2012); G. Belanger *et al.*, arXiv:1208.4952; J. Cao *et al.*, JHEP **1203**, 086 (2012); JHEP **1210**, 079 (2012); Phys. Lett. B **710**, 665 (2012); Phys. Lett. B **703**, 462 (2011); arXiv:1301.4641.
- [22] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, A. Semenov, arXiv:1305.0237.
- [23] A. Belyaev, C.-R. Chen, K. Tobe, C.-P. Yuan, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 115020 (2006).
- [24] M. Blanke et al., JHEP **0701**, 066 (2007)
- [25] F. del Aguila, J. I. Illana, M. D. Jenkins, JHEP **0901**, 080 (2009); T. Goto, Y. Okada, Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. B **670**, 378-382 (2009).
- [26] J. Hubisz, P. Meade, A. Noble, M. Perelstein, JHEP **0601**, 135 (2006).
- [27] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **710**, 67 (2012); Phys. Rev. D **87**, 012008 (2013); Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 211802 (2012).
- [28] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 221804 (2011); JHEP **1108**, 155 (2011); JHEP **1301**, 077 (2013); Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 171803 (2012).
- [29] R. Dermisek, A. Raval, arXiv:1305.3522; J. Abdallah et al. [DELPHI Collaboration], Eur. Phys. Jour. C **34**, 399 (2004).
- [30] A. Djouadj, J. Kalinowski and M. Spira, Computl. Phys. Commun. **108**, 56 (2006).
- [31] A. G. Akeroyd, S. Moretti, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 035015 (2012); A. Arhrib *et al.*, JHEP **1204**, 136 (2012); L. Wang, X.-F. Han, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 095007 (2012); Phys. Rev. D **87**, 015015 (2013); Y. Kajiyama, H. Okada, K. Yagyu, arXiv:1303.3463; P. S. B. Dev, D. K. Ghosh, N. Okada, I. Saha, arXiv:1301.3453.
- [32] See, e.g., J. Cao *et al.*, JHEP **1206**, 145 (2012); Phys. Lett. B **703**, 292 (2011); JHEP **1007**,

- 044 (2010); Phys. Rev. D **82** (2010) 051701.
- [33] J. R. Espinosa, C. Grojean, M. Muhlleitner, M. Trott, JHEP **1205**, 097 (2012); JHEP **1212**, 045 (2012).
- [34] P. P. Giardino et al., JHEP 1206, 117(2012); Phys. Lett. B **718**, 469 (2012).
- [35] G. Belanger et al., arXiv:1212.5244.
- [36] F. Boudjema et al., arXiv:1307.5865.
- [37] J. Cao, P. Wan, J. M. Yang and J. Zhu, arXiv:1303.2426.
- [38] E. Aprile et al. [XENON1T Collaboration], arXiv:1206.6288.