arXiv:1309.0831v1 [hep-ph] 3 Sep 2013

Unitarity constraints for Yukawa couplings in the two Higgs doublet model type III

Andrés Castillo*, Rodolfo A. Diaz†, John Morales‡
Universidad Nacional de Colombia,
Departamento de Física. Bogotá, Colombia.

February 26, 2022

Abstract

Unitarity constraints for Yukawa couplings are considered in the Two Higgs Doublet Model type III, by using a general expansion in partial waves for fermionic scattering processes. Constraints over general Flavor Changing Neutral Currents are found from that systematic, such bounds compete with those coming from Lagrangian perturbativity requirement but are weaker than those imposed from phenomenological processes and precision tests. Nevertheless, for bounds based on unitarity the number of assumptions is the lowest among phenomenological and theoretical limits. Indeed, these new theoretical constraints are independent of scalar masses or mixing angles for this extended Higgs sector, making them less model dependent.

1 Introduction and 2HDM-Motivations

The successful discovery of a Standard Model (SM)-like Higgs boson in the mass region around 125-126 GeV * could open a new stage of motivations in phenomenological studies of Extended Higgs Sectors (EHS). The Two Higgs Doublet Model (2HDM) is one of the simplest examples of EHS, which represents the non-trivial next extension compatible with the gauge invariance and with the Electroweak Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking (EWSSB) in the SM. In this framework, a second Higgs doublet is added with the same quantum numbers as the first one. The 2HDM induces several features, among them we have [6, 7, 8]: i) the possibility of generating either spontaneous or explicit CP violation, ii) the generation of Flavor Changing Neutral Currents (FCNC) (inspired on neutrino oscillations) still compatible with the strong experimental limits on them, and iii) the prospect that some theories with larger symmetries end up at low energies in a non minimal Higgs sector as in the case of SUSY and Left-Right models.
The discrete symmetry Z_2 (e.g. $\Phi_1 \leftrightarrow \Phi_1$ and $\Phi_2 \leftrightarrow -\Phi_2$) is usually implemented in the 2HDM because it forbids mixing between the two doublets. Moreover, this symmetry ensures a CP- conserving frame in the scalar sector and FCNCs are forbidden. In the last point, the Z_2 transformation unfolds the 2HDM since its presence (absence) leads to different forms of the Yukawa couplings between fermions and Higgs bosons with (without) flavor natural conservation. In the CP-conserving frame, after the EWSSB all eight components of the two doublets are transformed into three Goldstone bosons ($G^0, G^\pm$), two CP-even Higgs bosons (h^0, H^0), one CP-odd Higgs boson (A^0) and two charged Higgs bosons ($H^\pm$). Although experimental accessibility is now significant, those scenarios of 2HDM remain unknown. Hence, theoretical constraints must be obtained by making additional fundamental assumptions on the Quantum Field Theory background of the 2HDM. Among these constraints we have: Vacuum stability, triviality, oblique parameters, and the unitarity at the tree level. Triviality limits rely on the fact that the quartic couplings in the potential remain finite up to large scales of energy. On the other hand, the condition of vacuum stability requires that couplings in the Higgs potential must be positive in all field space directions for their asymptotically large values, otherwise the potential would be unbounded from below and had no minimum.

*afcastillor@unal.edu.co
†radiazs@unal.edu.co
‡jmoralesa@unal.edu.co

*Recent analyses show that the data were consistent with a scalar with even parity at 97% confidence level. The mass of the new particle has also been measured precisely in ZZ decay channel: $m_h = 125.8GeV$ [2].

*The parameter $\rho \equiv m_w^2/m_z^2 \cos^2\theta_w$ is a critical piece sensitive to the scalar structure of EWSSB. A very good feature of models with extra $SU(2)$ doublets (or singlets) is that they do not break the custodial $SU(2)$ global symmetry, that protects $\rho = 1$ at the tree level.

On the other hand, $S-$matrix unitarity is embodied in all perturbative levels due to the Optical Theorem (OT)[39]. Especially, for asymptotically flat models (wherein scattering amplitudes do not exhibit any power-like growth in the high energy limit), and main contributions lie at the tree level. Therefore, the other theoretical constraints are guaranteed through forthright realization of perturbation theory.
Perturbative unitarity bounds are derived from the Lee-Quigg-Thacker (LQT) method which shows that if the Higgs boson mass m_{η^0} exceeds critical values obtained from partial wave decomposition, unitarity is violated at the tree level for different binary scattering processes $p_1p_2 \to p_3p_4$ at high energies, $s >> m^2_{\eta^0}$ [13, 14, 16, 15, 17].
These constraints have only been applied to bosonic scalar and bosonic vectorial sectors because the unitarity limits emerge from Plane Waves Decomposition, which is only valid for spinless particles (for vector bosons this formalism can be applied because of the theorem of equivalence). For fermionic sectors it is necessary to introduce a General Partial Waves Decomposition where different spin states are involved. The Jacob-Wick expansion is the most natural and simplified method for partial diagonalization in the angular momentum basis, since such expansion relies on the appropriate choice of physical states in the initial characterization of scattering processes. Attempts to constrain the fermionic sector of four generation models with criteria of unitarity (but without this approach) have been carried out in [26].
To incorporate all these concepts, we first show some few issues of the 2HDM in section 2, where the general Yukawa sector is introduced and the FCNC's sources are described. At this point, we review the different phenomenological methods to obtain bounds on Yukawa couplings. In section 3, we consider the general form of the Jacob-Wick approach. Assumptions over helicity states are imposed in order to obtain a decoupling regime of this method to the traditional wave expansion and thereby to build up unitarity constraints over their associated coefficients. Then in section 4, some particular scattering processes involving fermionic interactions are studied within the framework of the 2HDM type III. The last section 5 is dedicated to extrapolate this method to the study of charged channels of fermionic interactions. Finally, some concluding remarks are given, and some prospects for further studies involving others models are established.

2 Fundamentals of the 2HDM

The 2HDM is one of the simplest non-trivial extension of the Higgs sector in the Standard Model, where two doublets of scalars with unit hypercharge are considered in order to achieve the Electroweak Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking. The full Lagrangian of the most general 2HDM contains additional terms with respect to the minimal SM in the scalar potential, the kinetic sector and the Yukawa interactions sector.
Since there are two vacuum expectation values (VEV), one for each doublet, there could be in general a relative phase between them. This fact is the source for a spontaneous CP-violation coming from the EWSSB, which produces a vacuum different from a neutral one. Moreover, if the parameters in the scalar and Yukawa potentials are complex, explicit CP violation also arises. Since we are not going to treat these effects here, we assume all parameters and VEVs to be real in the following. This formalism will be named the *CP-conserving 2HDM frame*. On the other hand, the most general Yukawa Lagrangian has a set of dimension-4 Higgs Fermion couplings, given by

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y = \eta^{U,0}_{i,j}\bar{Q}^0_{iL}\tilde{\Phi}_1 U^0_{jR} + \eta^{D,0}_{i,j}\bar{Q}^0_{iL}\Phi_1 D^0_{jR} + \xi^{U,0}_{i,j}\bar{Q}^0_{iL}\tilde{\Phi}_2 U^0_{jR} + \xi^{D,0}_{i,j}\bar{Q}^0_{iL}\Phi_2 D^0_{jR} + \text{leptonic sector} + h.c., \tag{1}$$

where Q^0_{iL} denote the left-handed quark doublets -with i the family index-. U_{jR} (D_{jR}) correspond to the right-handed singlets of up-type (down-type) quarks. η^0_{ij} and ξ^0_{ij} are non-diagonal 3×3 matrices. The superscript "0" indicates that the fields are not mass eigenstates yet.
The general Yukawa Lagrangian in (1) leads to processes with Flavour Changing Neutral Currents (FCNC) at the tree level. It is due to the fact that by rotating the down sector of quarks (or up and lepton sectors) to get the mass eigenstates it is not possible to diagonalize both coupling matrices η^0_{ij}, ξ^0_{ij} simultaneously.
Processes containing FCNCs are strongly supressed experimentally, in particular due to the small $K_L - K_s$ mass difference. In SM the FCNC are strongly suppressed by virtue of the GIM mechanism [27]. In the 2HDM, several mechanisms to suppress FCNC at the tree level were proposed. One of them is to consider the exchange of heavy scalar or pseudoscalar Higgs Fields or by cancellation of large values with opposite sign. In 2HDM, one mechanism is provided by Glashow and Weinberg, who implemented in the Yukawa Lagrangian a discrete simmetry that automatically forbids the couplings among fermions and scalars that generate such rare decays. From $K-\bar{K}$ mixing, as well as many processes involving kaon and muon decays [29], it has been considered that the heaviest fermion set the scale for the entire matrix of Yukawa couplings. This assumption yields many stringent bounds for the heavy scalars, for instance 150 TeV (lower bound) from $K-\bar{K}$ mixing.

λ_{ij}	Process	Assumptions	Bound	Reference
$\sqrt{\lambda_{bs}\lambda_{\mu\tau}}$	$B \to K\mu\tau$	Presicion Test	$\lesssim \mathcal{O}(10)$	[34]
$\sqrt{\lambda_{ut}\lambda_{ct}}$	$D-D$	$100 \leq$scalar masses (GeV)≤ 400	≤ 0.6	[35]
λ_{tt}	$b \to s\gamma$	$\lambda_{ii}=0$ $i \neq t,b$ and $m_{H^\pm} \leq 300$ GeV	$\lesssim 1.7$	[36]
$\lambda_{\mu\tau}$	$(g-2)_\mu$	$m_{A^0} >> m_{H^0}, m_{h^0}$	$(10, 80)$	[37]
$\lambda_{e\tau}\lambda_{\mu\tau}$	$(g-2)_\mu$	$m_{A^0} >> m_{H^0}, m_{h^0}$	< 0.004	[37]
$\lambda_{e\tau}$	$(g-2)_\mu$	$m_{A^0} >> m_{H^0}, m_{h^0}$	$< 10^{-3}$	[37]

Table 1: *Phenomenological Bounds on Yukawa couplings in the 2HDM type III under Cheng and Sher anzats.*

However the most outstanding feature of the fermion masses is their hierarchical structure. If we expect roughly the same hierarchy in the Yukawa couplings, setting all the Flavour Changing (FC) couplings to be of the order of the heaviest-fermion Yukawa couplings is not reliable [8]. From these considerations, Cheng and Sher proposed that FC couplings should be of the order of the geometric mean of the Yukawa couplings of the two fermions. Such an ansatz leads to a parametrization for the Yukawa couplings of the form

$$\xi_{ij} = \frac{\lambda_{ij}\sqrt{2m_i m_j}}{v}, \tag{2}$$

because under the Cheng and Sher ansatz we expect that $\lambda_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$. If the Cheng and Sher ansatz is correct, the FCNC coming from the first two generations are strongly supressed since the associated Yukawa couplings are. As a consequence, the lower bound on Higgs boson masses is reduced [8, 30].

It is usual to assume the validity of the Cheng and Sher ansatz in the 2HDM type III, and its implications are explored in different studies. Many searches focus on some few specific processes, including Δm_B, $\quad t \to ch$ and $h \to t\bar{c} + \bar{c}t$, rare μ, τ, and B decays ($B \to K\mu\tau$), $\mu \to e\gamma$ at the two loop level, $t \to c\gamma$ and $t \to cZ^0$, muon-electron conversion, and $b \to s\gamma$.

If the Cheng and Sher ansatz is correct, then one would expect from λ_{ij} to be all of order unity (emulating to SM). This request is very weak since there are unknown mixing angles. In addition, for many phenomenological limits, several scalar masses enter in all specific processes.

One of the most stringent experimental constraints on the 2HDM comes from flavor physics. For the 2HDM with general (flavor diagonal) Yukawa couplings, and from the charged Higgs contribution to different transitions such as $b \to s\gamma$ in [31], bounds on $|\lambda_{tt}|$ were found; which must be less or equal to unity when $m_{H^\pm} \lesssim 500$ GeV. With theoretical and experimental assumptions over SM predictions (from QCD lattice) of observables involving $F - \bar{F}$ mixing (with $F \equiv K, D, B_d$ or B_s) and with the measured meson mass differences ΔM_F [32], contraints over flavor space have been computed. Reference [33] considers that the addition between SM and the new contribution does not exceed the experimental values, $\Delta M_{B_d}^{expt} = (3.337 \pm 0.033) \times 10^{-13}$ GeV and $\Delta M_{B_s}^{expt} = (117.0 \pm 0.8) \times 10^{-13}$ GeV, by more than two standard deviations for B_d and B_s systems. This procedure impose upper bounds on ξ_{db} and ξ_{sb} Yukawa couplings. Moreover for K and D systems, in order to obtain the upper bounds on ξ_{ds} and ξ_{uc} it is required that only the 2HDM contribution does not exceed the experimetal values, $\Delta M_K^{expt} = (3.476 \pm 0.006) \times 10^{-15}$ GeV and $\Delta M_D^{expt} = (0.95 \pm 0.37) \times 10^{-14}$ GeV, by more than two standard deviations. For a mass degenerate spectrum in neutral scalar and pseudoscalar sector $m_{h^0} = m_{H^0} = m_{A^0} = 120$ GeV those bounds are transformed in limits on Cheng-Sher couplings: $(\lambda_{ds}, \lambda_{uc}, \lambda_{bd}, \lambda_{bs}) \leq (0.1, 0.2, 0.06, 0.06)$. Another phenomenological bounds on Cheng-Sher couplings for quark and leptonic sectors are revised in table 2.

From this phenomenological review, it is clear that bounds on Yukawa couplings depend strongly on the Higgs mass pattern (and also from other free parameters such as the mixing angles). In what follows, we consider a theoretical limit for the fermionic sector through general unitarity constraints, where by means of a helicity formalism, it is possible to find bounds on the general structure of Yukawa couplings. We shall see that, despite those bounds are weaker than the phenomenological ones, such limits are independent of the Higgs masses and mixing angles, making them more model independent.

3 An alternative approach to the unitarity constraints on Yukawa couplings

With the aim of obtaining unitarity constraints of scattering processes that involves fermionic states, we introduce a general result based on an expansion of partial waves through the so-called Jacob-Wick Formalism (JWF) [18]. The JWF is based on a diagonalization (at least partial) in the angular momentum basis of the $\widehat{S}$ matrix for the scattering of

two particles (with initial helicities λ_a, λ_b and final helicities λ_c, λ_d) in the center of mass frame[†]. This procedure leads to the following general expansion of the invariant amplitude [18, 40, 41]

$$\mathcal{M}(s,\Omega) = 16\pi \sum_J (2J+1)\mathcal{D}^{\dagger}_{(J)}(\Omega)^{\lambda_a-\lambda_b}_{\lambda_c-\lambda_d}\mathcal{M}^J(s),$$

where s is the CM energy, and $\Omega \equiv (\theta, \phi)$ defines the scattering polar and azimuthal angles. In addition, $\mathcal{D}(\Omega)^{\lambda}_{\lambda'}$ are Wigner functions (from Rotations Group Representations [40]). These functions acomplish the following orthogonality relation

$$\int \mathcal{D}^{*(j_1)}_{m_1 m_1'}(\Omega)\mathcal{D}^{(j_2)}_{m_2 m_2'}(\Omega)\frac{d\Omega}{4\pi} = \frac{1}{2j_1+1}\delta_{m_1 m_2}\delta_{m_1' m_2'}\delta_{j_1 j_2}. \tag{3}$$

$\mathcal{M}^J(s)$ represents partial wave amplitudes obtained from the matrix element $\mathcal{M}^J(s) \equiv \langle \lambda_c\lambda_d||\mathcal{M}(s,\Omega)||\lambda_a\lambda_b\rangle$. From (3) we can get an explicit form for these coefficients

$$\mathcal{M}^J(s) = \frac{1}{16\pi}\int \mathcal{M}(s,\Omega)\mathcal{D}^{*(J)}(\Omega)^{\lambda_a-\lambda_b}_{\lambda_c-\lambda_d}d\Omega. \tag{4}$$

If the initial and the final helicity states are zero (i.e. $\lambda_a = \lambda_b$ and $\lambda_c = \lambda_d$), the $\mathcal{D}$ functions are reduced to Legendre polynomials,

$$\mathcal{M}^J(s) = \frac{1}{32\pi}\int_{-1}^{1} \mathcal{M}(s,\theta)P^J(\cos\theta)d(\cos\theta). \tag{5}$$

This relation leads to the form of the coefficients in the traditional partial waves decomposition. At the high energy limit, perturbative unitarity requires that

$$|\mathrm{Re}(\mathcal{M}^J(s))| \leq \frac{1}{2}. \tag{6}$$

4 $f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}$ processes

In the following we consider the tree level matrix elements for the process $f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}$ at the high energy limit under the helicity spinors formalism. The neutral Higgs (η^0) contributions are shown in Fig. 1.




Figure 1: *Diagrams at the tree level with scalar contribution (neutral Higgs bosons) for $f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}$ processes.*

First, we write the invariant amplitude in the CP-conserving frame:

[†]In the helicity formalism, the spin degrees of freedom of the particle involved do not introduce any significant complication with respect to spinless particles. By contrast, in the conventional approach with static spin labels for the particles, the relationship between "plane wave" and "angular momentum" states, leads to multiple Clebsh-Gordan couplings coefficients for both the initial and the final states, and consequently the partial wave is much more complicated than that of spinless particles [40]

$$\mathcal{M}(f\bar{f}\to f\bar{f}) = \sum_{\eta^0_{CP-even}}\left(\bar{v}_2 i\chi^{\eta^0}_{ff}u_1\frac{1}{s-m^2_{\eta^0}}\bar{u}_3 i\chi^{\eta^0}_{ff}v_4+\bar{v}_2 i\chi^{\eta^0}_{ff}v_4\frac{1}{t-m^2_{\eta^0}}\bar{u}_3 i\chi^{\eta^0}_{ff}u_1\right)$$
$$+\sum_{\phi^0_{CP-odd}}\left(\bar{v}_2 i\chi^{\phi^0}_{ff}\gamma_5 u_1\frac{1}{s-m^2_{\phi^0}}\bar{u}_3 i\chi^{\phi^0}_{ff}\gamma_5 v_4+\bar{v}_2 i\chi^{\phi^0}_{ff}\gamma_5 v_4\frac{1}{t-m^2_{\phi^0}}\bar{u}_3 i\chi^{\phi^0}_{ff}\gamma_5 u_1\right), \tag{7}$$

here $\chi^{\eta^0}_{ff}(\chi^{\phi^0}_{ff})$ are the couplings between fermions and CP-even (CP-odd) neutral Higgs bosons. For different helicity combinations that satisfy the relations $\lambda_a=\lambda_b$ and $\lambda_c=\lambda_d$, we get the following non-zero coupled channels (see appendix A)

$$\mathcal{M}(f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow\to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\sqrt{2}G_f m_f^2\sum_{\eta^0_{all}}\left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{ff}\right)^2\left(\frac{s}{s-m^2_{\eta^0}}\right) \tag{8a}$$

$$\mathcal{M}(f_\downarrow\bar{f}_\downarrow\to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\sqrt{2}G_f m_f^2\sum_{\eta^0_{all}}\left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{ff}\right)^2\left(\frac{s}{s-m^2_{\eta^0}}-\frac{t}{t-m^2_{\eta^0}}\right), \tag{8b}$$

where s and t are Mandelstam variables and Ξ_s are relative Yukawa couplings of neutral Higgs bosons with respect to SM. The input associated with the pseudoscalar sector is the same as to the scalar sector, because in the high energy limit the eigenspinors are also chiral eigenstates (see appendix A).
There are other channels, e.g. $\mathcal{M}(f_\downarrow\bar{f}_\downarrow\to f_\downarrow\bar{f}_\downarrow)$ and $\mathcal{M}(f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow\to f_\downarrow\bar{f}_\downarrow)$, which just differ by a minus sign from amplitudes (8a) and (8b) respectively. Therefore, they would not provide new information about unitarity bounds.
The $J=0$ partial wave coefficient is given by (5). From the definition of the Mandelstam variables, we have in the high energy limit

$$a^0\equiv\mathcal{M}^{J=0}(s)=\frac{1}{16\pi s}\int_{-s}^{0}\mathcal{M}(s,t)dt. \tag{9}$$

Therefore, in the regime of $s>>m^2_{\eta^0}$ and for elastic scattering channels (e.g. $f_i\bar{f}_i\to f_i\bar{f}_i$), the non-zero matrix elements lead us to the following coefficients

$$a^0(f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow\to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}G_f m_f^2}{16\pi}\sum_{\eta^0_{all}}\left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{ff}\right)^2, \tag{10}$$

$$a^0(f_\downarrow\bar{f}_\downarrow\to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow) = 0. \tag{11}$$

For the 2HDM type III (in the fundamental parametrization i.e. $\tan\beta=0$) the Yukawa couplings for neutral interactions are displayed in table 2.

Coupling/Model	2HDM III (up-sector)	2HDM III (down-sector)
$\Xi^{H^0}_{q_i\bar{q}_j}$	$\left(\delta_{ij}\cos\alpha+\frac{\xi^U_{ij}\sin\alpha}{\sqrt{2m_{u_i}m_{u_j}}}v\right)$	$\left(\delta_{ij}\cos\alpha+\frac{\xi^D_{ij}\sin\alpha}{\sqrt{2m_{d_i}m_{d_j}}}v\right)$
$\Xi^{h^0}_{q_i\bar{q}_j}$	$\left(-\delta_{ij}\sin\alpha+\frac{\xi^U_{ij}\cos\alpha}{\sqrt{2m_{u_i}m_{u_j}}}v\right)$	$\left(-\delta_{ij}\sin\alpha+\frac{\xi^D_{ij}\cos\alpha}{\sqrt{2m_{d_i}m_{d_j}}}v\right)$
$\Xi^{A^0}_{q_i\bar{q}_j}$	$-i\frac{\xi^U_{ij}}{\sqrt{2m_{u_i}m_{u_j}}}v\gamma_5$	$i\frac{\xi^D_{ij}}{\sqrt{2m_{d_i}m_{d_j}}}v\gamma_5$

Table 2: *Yukawa couplings structure for 2HDM III (neutral Higgs with quarks and charged leptons) in the fundamental parametrization. α is the mixing angle between neutral gauge eigenstates and mass eigenstates (CP-even) [6].*

By using the Cheng-Sher parametrization Eq. (2) for diagonal couplings, we obtain the unitarity constraints by combining Eqs. (6), (9) and (10). They are given by

$$|\lambda^{U,D}_{ii}|\leq\left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_f^2}-\frac{1}{2}\right)^{1/2}. \tag{12}$$

These relations lead to upper bounds for the fermion generations. We obtain them by taking the input parameters in [3], and they are specified in the caption of table 3.

$\lambda_{ii}^{U,D}$	$\lvert\lambda_{ii}\rvert_{unit}$	$\sim \mathcal{O}$
λ_{tt}	5	$\mathcal{O}(1)$
λ_{bb}	208	$\mathcal{O}(10^2)$
λ_{cc}	687	$\mathcal{O}(10^2)$
λ_{ss}	8.6×10^3	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
λ_{uu}	$(2.6\text{-}5.1) \times 10^5$	$\mathcal{O}(10^5)$
λ_{dd}	$(1.5\text{-}2.1) \times 10^5$	$\mathcal{O}(10^5)$
$\lambda_{\tau\tau}$	491	$\mathcal{O}(10^2)$
$\lambda_{\mu\mu}$	8.3×10^3	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
λ_{ee}	1.7×10^6	$\mathcal{O}(10^6)$

Table 3: *Bounds on Yukawa couplings from relation (12) for elastic processes $f_i\bar{f}_i \to f_i\bar{f}_i$ in the 2HDM type III. The parameters were taken from [3] (central values): $m_t = 172\ GeV$, $m_b = 4.19\ GeV$, $m_c = 1.27\ GeV$, $m_s = 0.101\ GeV$, $m_d = (0.0041 - 0.0058)\ GeV$, $m_u = (0.0017 - 0.0033)\ GeV$, $m_\tau = 1.776\ GeV$, $m_\mu = 0.106\ GeV$ and $m_e = 0.00051\ GeV$.*

In the same way, for non-diagonal couplings, the upper bounds become

$$|\lambda_{ij}^{U,D}| \leq \left(\frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_{_i} m_{_j}}\right)^{1/2}, \tag{13}$$

and they are evaluated numerically in table 4.

$\lambda_{ij}^{U,D}$	$\lvert\lambda_{ij}\rvert_{unit}$	$\sim \mathcal{O}$
λ_{tc}	59	$\mathcal{O}(10)$
λ_{tu}	$1.2 - 1.6 \times 10^3$	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
λ_{bs}	1.3×10^3	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
λ_{bd}	$5.6 - 6.6 \times 10^3$	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
$\lambda_{\tau\mu}$	2.0×10^3	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
$\lambda_{\tau e}$	2.9×10^4	$\mathcal{O}(10^4)$
$\lambda_{\mu e}$	1.2×10^5	$\mathcal{O}(10^5)$

Table 4: *Bounds on Yukawa couplings from (13) for mixed channels $f_i\bar{f}_j \to f_i\bar{f}_j$ in the 2HDM type III. The parameters were taken from [3], and they are specified in the caption of table 4.*

All unitarity constraints compete with those coming from perturbativity, in which we require that the running coupling constants of the Higgs self-couplings and the Yukawa couplings do not blow up below a certain energy scale Λ : $\lambda_i(\mu) < 8\pi$ and $(g_f^\eta(\mu))^2 < 4\pi$, for a renormalization scale μ less than Λ [4][‡]. If these couplings were higher, their β-functions will be positive and their renormalization scale evolution will drive them to even higher values [5].
With mixed channels (e.g. $f_i\bar{f}_i \to f_j\bar{f}_j$), the partial wave coefficients (9) are transformed into

$$a^0(f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow \to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}G_f m_i m_j}{16\pi}\sum_{\eta^0_{all}}\left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_if_i}\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_jf_j}\right), \tag{14a}$$

$$a^0(f_\downarrow\bar{f}_\downarrow \to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\frac{\sqrt{2}G_f m_i m_j}{16\pi}\sum_{\eta^0_{all}}\left[\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_if_i}\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_jf_j} - \left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_if_j}\right)^2\right]. \tag{14b}$$

[‡]In particular, from pseudoscalar-fermion couplings perturbativity requires that: $\xi_{ij}^2 < 4\pi$. It is is translated into $\lambda_{ij} < \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_i m_j}\right)^{1/2}$. Since the scalar couplings depend on the mixing angle α as well as on the elements λ_{ij}, the perturbative constraints depend on more degrees of freedom.

From which the unitarity limits become

$$\sum_{\eta^0} \Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_i f_i} \Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_j f_j} \leq \frac{8\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_i m_j}, \tag{15a}$$

$$\sum_{\eta^0} \left[\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_i f_i} \Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_j f_j} - \left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f_i f_j} \right)^2 \right] \leq \frac{8\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_i m_j}. \tag{15b}$$

The sum runs over all neutral Higgs states (CP-even and CP-odd). In the particular case of the 2HDM type III (from couplings in table 2), these relations in terms of Sher-Cheng couplings satisfy

$$\lambda^{U,D}_{ii} \lambda^{U,D}_{jj} \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_i m_j} - \frac{1}{2}, \tag{16a}$$

$$\lambda^{U,D}_{ii} \lambda^{U,D}_{jj} - \left(\lambda^{U,D}_{ij} \right)^2 \leq \frac{4\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_i m_j} - \frac{1}{2}. \tag{16b}$$

Where the products are only by pairs either $\lambda^U_{ii}\lambda^U_{jj}$ or $\lambda^D_{ii}\lambda^D_{jj}$. The numerical evaluations of these crossed products for FCNC couplings are displayed in table 16. It worths saying that if some of these couplings were determined, these bounds could help in restricting the remaining ones.

$\lambda^{U,D}_{ii}\lambda^{U,D}_{jj}$	$\lambda^{U,D}_{ii}\lambda^{U,D}_{jj} - \left(\lambda^{U,D}_{ij}\right)^2$	Bound	$\sim \mathcal{O}$
$\lambda_{tt}\lambda_{cc}$	$\lambda_{tt}\lambda_{cc} - \lambda^2_{tc}$	7.0×10^3	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
$\lambda_{tt}\lambda_{uu}$	$\lambda_{tt}\lambda_{uu} - \lambda^2_{tu}$	(2.7-5.2)$\times10^6$	$\mathcal{O}(10^6)$
$\lambda_{bb}\lambda_{ss}$	$\lambda_{bb}\lambda_{ss} - \lambda^2_{bs}$	3.6×10^6	$\mathcal{O}(10^6)$
$\lambda_{bb}\lambda_{dd}$	$\lambda_{bb}\lambda_{dd} - \lambda^2_{bd}$	(6.3-8.8)$\times10^7$	$\mathcal{O}(10^7)$
$\lambda_{\tau\tau}\lambda_{\mu\mu}$	$\lambda_{\tau\tau}\lambda_{\mu\mu} - \lambda^2_{\tau\mu}$	8.2×10^6	$\mathcal{O}(10^6)$
$\lambda_{\tau\tau}\lambda_{ee}$	$\lambda_{\tau\tau}\lambda_{ee} - \lambda^2_{\tau e}$	1.7×10^9	$\mathcal{O}(10^9)$
$\lambda_{\tau\tau}\lambda_{ee}$	$\lambda_{\tau\tau}\lambda_{ee} - \lambda^2_{\tau e}$	2.8×10^{10}	$\mathcal{O}(10^{10})$

Table 5: *Bounds on Yukawa couplings from (16a) and (16b) for mixed channels $f_i\bar{f}_i \to f_j\bar{f}_j$ in the 2HDM type III. The parameters was taken from [3], and they are specified in table 4.*

In the same way in which the unitarity constraints are interpreted for self-couplings of the Higgs potential, these Yukawa couplings constraints can be treated (without inclusion of new physics) as the upper values for which the perturbation theory will become reliable at all energy scales.

5 Charged Channels.

It is also possible to evaluate the contribution from charged channels (final and initial charged states) to the unitary amplitude. It is worthwhile to observe that the matrix elements ξ_{ij} modify the charged Higgs couplings:

$$\chi^{H^\pm}_{f_i f_j} = (K_{ik}\xi^D_{kj} P_R - \xi^U_{ik} K_{kj} P_L),$$

for the fundamental parametrization [6, 8], where K is the Kobayashi Maskawa matrix and $P_{L(R)}$ are the Left(Right) projection operators. Hence, there are two facts to point out i) the flavor changing charged currents (FCCC) in the quark sector are modified by the same matrix that produces FCNC, ii) in the lepton sector FCCC are generated by the same matrix that generates FCNC.
A typical charged scattering process at the tree level for the scalar sector has two contributions: the first one associated with $H^\pm$ states in the propagator for the s-channel and the second one with neutral scalar states in the propagator for the t-channel:

$$\mathcal{M}(f_i\bar{f}_j \to f_i\bar{f}_j) = \sum_{\eta_{H^\pm}} \left(\bar{v}_2 \chi^{H^\pm}_{f_i f_j} u_1 \frac{1}{s - m^2_{\eta_{H^\pm}}} \bar{u}_3 \chi^{H^\pm}_{f_i f_j} v_4 \right) + \sum_{\eta^0} \left(\bar{v}_2 i\chi^{\eta^0}_{f_j f_j} v_4 \frac{1}{t - m^2_{\eta^0}} \bar{u}_3 i\chi^{\eta^0}_{f_i f_i} u_1 \right).$$

Assuming diagonal textures for both flavor matrices in 2HDM type III (quark sector) and using the systematic got in the last section, the amplitudes for the polarized process $f_{i\uparrow}\bar{f}_{j\uparrow} \to f_{i\uparrow}\bar{f}_{j\uparrow}$ becomes

$$\mathcal{M}(f_{i\uparrow}\bar{f}_{j\uparrow} \to f_{i\uparrow}\bar{f}_{j\uparrow}) = \bar{v}_{2\uparrow}\chi^{H^\pm}_{f_i f_j} u_{1\uparrow} \frac{1}{s - m^2_{H^\pm}} \bar{u}_{3\uparrow}\chi^{H^\pm}_{f_i f_j} v_{4\uparrow} = \xi^U_{ii}\xi^D_{jj} K^2_{ij} \frac{s}{s - m^2_{H^\pm}}. \tag{17}$$

where $i = u, c, t$ and $j = d, s, b$. We have used the CKM hierarchy and the assumption of universality deviation in the same generation. Here $u_{1\uparrow}, \bar{v}_{2\uparrow}, \bar{u}_{3\uparrow}$ and $v_{4\uparrow}$ are the eigenspinors as (right-handed) helicity states. Since $\bar{u}_{3_\uparrow} u_{1_\uparrow} = 0$ at the high energy limit (appendix A), the neutral channel does not have a contribution for this helicity choice. From Cheng-Sher anzats for diagonal couplings, the partial wave coefficient has the unitarity bound

$$\lambda^U_{ii}\lambda^D_{jj} \leq \frac{2\sqrt{2}\pi}{G_f m_i m_j K^2_{ij}}. \tag{18}$$

We have summarized these bounds in the table 6.
If some of these couplings were determined (say couplings from the up sector), these bounds could help in restricting the remaining ones (say couplings from the down sector)[§].

$\lambda^U_{ij}\lambda^D_{jj}$	Bound	$\sim \mathcal{O}$
$\lambda_{tt}\lambda_{bb}$	1055	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$
$\lambda_{cc}\lambda_{ss}$	5.9×10^6	$\mathcal{O}(10^6)$
$\lambda_{uu}\lambda_{dd}$	(0.4-1.1) $\times 10^{11}$	$\mathcal{O}(10^3)$

Table 6: *Bounds on Yukawa couplings from (18) for mixed channels $f_i\bar{f}_j \to f_i\bar{f}_j$ in the 2HDM type III. The parameters was taken from [3]. and they are specified in table 4.*

6 Conclusions and Remarks

Under the use of a general expansion of partial waves, unitarity constraints over fermionic scattering processes were obtained. The method relies on a diagonalization (at least partial) in the angular momentum basis of the $\widehat{S}$ matrix for the scattering of two particles in the center of mass frame and the appropriate choice of helicity states. In the helicity formalism, the spin degrees of freedom of the particle involved do not introduce any significant complication with respect to spinless particles, at least when $\lambda_a = \lambda_b$ (initial helicities) and $\lambda_c = \lambda_d$ (final helicities). In fact, this particular case recovers the traditional partial wave expansion as well as its unitary conditions over the coefficients expansion. This leads to build up a well grounded formalism in order to impose the unitary constraints over spin 1/2 states or in general states of any spin.
Due to the universality deviation by the presence of FCNC vertices for fermionic interactions with scalars in the type III 2HDM, this formalism is applied in all its generality to get unitary constraints over Yukawa couplings values under Cheng and Sher parametrization. The constraints obtained are indeed independent of other parameters of the Higgs sector, i.e. the scalar masses and mixing angles. Such constraints only depend on the fermionic masses which are input parameters.
In the case of elastic scattering processes, diagonal Yukawa couplings constraints (coming from $f_i\bar{f}_i \to f_i\bar{f}_i$) are more stringent that non-diagonal couplings (coming from $f_i\bar{f}_k \to f_i\bar{f}_k$). In addition, these unitarity limits compete with those imposed from perturbative interactions, which could introduce more parameters. Moreover, our limitations compete with current phenomenological constraints ($\bar{B}^0 - B^0$ mixing, $(g-2)_\mu$ factor) for heavy fermionic masses, e.g. the top mass. It is worthwhile emphasizing that the phenomenological constraints demand the use of several parameters like scalar masses or mixing angles. Further, those computations lie on two-loop radiative corrections to the physical processes unlike the unitary constraints, which unfold naturally at the tree level.
Finally, this systematic might be extrapolated to other fermionic sectors such as the minimal supersymmetric standard model, minimal $B - L$ extension of the SM, the SM with fourth generations, etc.

[§]For instance, the process $b \to s\gamma$ could determine the value of λ_{tt}, from which our present bounds would help in obtaining the associated λ_{dd}.

A Computations of the polarized amplitudes

We consider scattering amplitudes of the type $f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}$ by means of the helicity formalism when $s \gg m^2_{\eta^0}$ and $m^2_{\eta^0} \gg m^2_z, m^2_w$. These developments are useful in the fermionic unitarity constraints. In that regime, Feynman diagrams for these processes are displayed in Fig. 1. The matrix element for CP-even states is

$$\mathcal{M}(f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}) = -\sqrt{2} G_f m_f^2 \sum_{\eta^0} \left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f\bar{f}}\right)^2 \left(\bar{v}_2 u_1 \frac{1}{s - m^2_{\eta^0}} \bar{u}_3 v_4 + \bar{v}_2 v_4 \frac{1}{t - m^2_{\eta^0}} \bar{u}_3 u_1 \right). \tag{19}$$

Here the relative couplings with respect to the SM ones ($\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f\bar{f}}$) have been factorized. The eigenspinors as helicity states in spherical polar coordinates have the form [42]:

$$u_\uparrow(p) = \sqrt{E+m} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m} e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_\downarrow(p) = \sqrt{E+m} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m} e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{20a}$$

$$v_\uparrow(p) = \sqrt{E+m} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m} e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad v_\downarrow(p) = \sqrt{E+m} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \frac{|\mathbf{p}|}{E+m} e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{20b}$$

At the high energy limit $E \gg m$, we obtain

$$u_\uparrow(p) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_\downarrow(p) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} -\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{21a}$$

$$v_\uparrow(p) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad v_\downarrow(p) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ e^{i\phi}\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{21b}$$

Moreover in the center of mass frame, the 4-momenta can be written as

$$p_1 = (E, 0, 0, p)\,; \quad p_2 = (E, 0, 0, -p)\,. \tag{22a}$$

$$p_3 = (E, \overrightarrow{p}_f)\,; \quad p_4 = (E, -\overrightarrow{p}_f)\,. \tag{22b}$$

Where $E \equiv E_{cm}/2$. Figure 2 displays the kinematic parametrization used for the eigenspinors evaluation.
The initial state of the fermion can be of up or down helicity. By taking $\phi = 0$, it reads

$$u_\uparrow(p_1) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad u_\downarrow(p_1) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{23}$$

For antifermion initial states ($\theta = \pi$) we have

$$v_\uparrow(p_2) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ -1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad v_\downarrow(p_2) = \sqrt{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{24}$$




Figure 2: *Kinematic parametrization used for the scattering process $f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}$ in the center of mass system.*

Hence, the final fermion states, (choosing $\phi = 0$) yield

$$u_\uparrow(p) = \sqrt{E}\begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad u_\downarrow(p) = \sqrt{E}\begin{pmatrix} -\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{25}$$

while for antifermions ($\theta \to \pi - \theta$ and $\phi = \pi$) we obtain

$$v_\uparrow(p) = \sqrt{E}\begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad v_\downarrow(p) = \sqrt{E}\begin{pmatrix} \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{26}$$

For instance for $f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow \to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow$, the matrix element is

$$\mathcal{M}(f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow \to f_\uparrow\bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\sqrt{2}G_f m_f^2 \sum_{\eta^0}\left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f\bar{f}}\right)^2 \left(\bar{v}_{2\uparrow}u_{1\uparrow}\frac{1}{s - m^2_{\eta^0}}\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}v_{4\uparrow} + \bar{v}_{2\uparrow}v_{4\uparrow}\frac{1}{t - m^2_{\eta^0}}\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}u_{1\uparrow}\right). \tag{27}$$

calculating all the products for initial states we have

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{v}_{2\uparrow}u_{1\uparrow} = v^\dagger_{2\uparrow}\gamma^0 u_{1\uparrow} &= E\begin{pmatrix}1,0,-1,0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ &= E\begin{pmatrix}1,0,1,0\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix} = 2E. \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

while for final states they are given by

$$\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}v_{4\uparrow} = u^\dagger_{3\uparrow}\gamma^0 v_{4\uparrow} = E\begin{pmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2},\sin\frac{\theta}{2},\cos\frac{\theta}{2},\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\cos\frac{\theta}{2} \\ -\sin\frac{\theta}{2} \end{pmatrix} = 2E. \tag{29}$$

In the same way, for the mixing between antifermions in initial and final states we have

$$\bar{v}_{2\uparrow}v_{4\uparrow} = v_2^{\dagger}\gamma^0 v_4 = E\left(1,0,-1,0\right)\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\\0&0&-1&0\\0&0&0&-1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\\ -\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\\ -\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\end{pmatrix} = 0. \tag{30}$$

For the mixing between fermions in their initial and final states we obtain

$$\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}u_{1\uparrow} = u_{3\uparrow}^{\dagger}\gamma^0 u_{1\uparrow} = E\left(\cos\tfrac{\theta}{2},\sin\tfrac{\theta}{2},\cos\tfrac{\theta}{2},\sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\right)\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\\0&0&-1&0\\0&0&0&-1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\1\\0\end{pmatrix} = 0. \tag{31}$$

Therefore, the matrix element is written by ($s = 4E^2$)

$$\mathcal{M}(f_{\uparrow}\bar{f}_{\uparrow}\to f_{\uparrow}\bar{f}_{\uparrow}) = -\sqrt{2}G_f m_f^2\sum_{\eta^0}\left(\Xi_{f\bar{f}}^{\eta^0}\right)^2\left(\frac{s}{s-m_{\eta^0}^2}\right). \tag{32}$$

With a similar procedure it is shown that

$$\mathcal{M}(f_{\downarrow}\bar{f}_{\downarrow}\to f_{\downarrow}\bar{f}_{\downarrow}) = \sqrt{2}G_f m_f^2\sum_{\eta^0}\left(\Xi_{f\bar{f}}^{\eta^0}\right)^2\left(\frac{s}{s-m_{\eta^0}^2}\right). \tag{33}$$

Now, we consider a mixed channel in helicity states for scattering amplitude with the structure

$$\mathcal{M}(f_{\downarrow}\bar{f}_{\downarrow}\to f_{\uparrow}\bar{f}_{\uparrow}) = -\sqrt{2}G_f^2 m_f^2\sum_{\eta^0}\left(\Xi_{f\bar{f}}^{\eta^0}\right)^2\left(\bar{v}_{2\downarrow}u_{1\downarrow}\frac{1}{s-m_{\eta^0}^2}\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}v_{4\uparrow} + \bar{v}_{2\downarrow}v_{4\uparrow}\frac{1}{t-m_{\eta^0}^2}\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}u_{1\downarrow}\right). \tag{34}$$

The products are the following

$$\bar{v}_{2\downarrow}u_{1\downarrow} = v_{2\downarrow}^{\dagger}\gamma^0 u_{1\downarrow} = E\left(0,1,0,1\right)\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\\0&0&-1&0\\0&0&0&-1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}0\\1\\0\\-1\end{pmatrix} = 2E. \tag{35}$$

$$\bar{v}_{2\downarrow}v_{4\uparrow} = v_{2\downarrow}^{\dagger}\gamma^0 v_{4\uparrow} = E\left(0,1,0,1\right)\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\\0&0&-1&0\\0&0&0&-1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\\ \sin\frac{\theta}{2}\\ -\cos\frac{\theta}{2}\\ -\sin\frac{\theta}{2}\end{pmatrix} = 2E\sin\frac{\theta}{2}. \tag{36}$$

Since $\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}v_{4\uparrow} = 2E$ and using

$$\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}u_{1\downarrow} = u_{3\uparrow}^{\dagger}\gamma^0 u_{1\downarrow} = E\left(\cos\tfrac{\theta}{2},\sin\tfrac{\theta}{2},\cos\tfrac{\theta}{2},\sin\tfrac{\theta}{2}\right)\begin{pmatrix}1&0&0&0\\0&1&0&0\\0&0&-1&0\\0&0&0&-1\end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix}1\\0\\-1\\0\end{pmatrix} = 2E\sin\frac{\theta}{2}, \tag{37}$$

the matrix element becomes

$$\mathcal{M}(f_\downarrow \bar{f}_\downarrow \to f_\uparrow \bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\sqrt{2} G_f m_f^2 \sum_{\eta^0} \left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f\bar{f}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{s}{s - m^2_{\eta^0}} + \frac{s}{2}\frac{(1-\cos\theta)}{t - m^2_{\eta^0}}\right). \tag{38}$$

In the frame displayed in Fig. 2, Mandelstam variables (with $m_{f1} = m_{f2}$ y $m_{f3} = m_{f4}$[¶]) are described by

$$\begin{aligned} s = (p_1 + p_2)^2 &= 2m_f^2 + 2p_1 \cdot p_2 = 2m_f^2 + 2\frac{E_{cm}^2}{4} - 2(\mathbf{p}_{1cm} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{2cm}) = 2m_f^2 + \frac{E_{cm}^2}{2} - 2|\mathbf{p}_{1cm}|^2 \cos\theta_{12}, \\ &= 2m_f^2 + \frac{E_{cm}^2}{2} + 2\left(\frac{E_{cm}^2}{4} - m_f^2\right) = E_{cm}^2. \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

$$\begin{aligned} t = (p_1 - p_3) &= m_{f_1}^2 + m_{f_3}^2 - 2p_1 \cdot p_3 = m_{f_1}^2 + m_{f_3}^2 - 2\left(\frac{E_{cm}^2}{4} - (\mathbf{p}_{1cm} \cdot \mathbf{p}_{3cm})\right), \\ &= m_{f_1}^2 + m_{f_3}^2 - 2\left(\frac{E_{cm}^2}{4} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{E_{cm}^2}{4} - m_{f1}^2\right)\left(\frac{E_{cm}^2}{4} - m_{f3}^2\right)}\cos\theta\right). \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

Replacing (39) in (40), we get

$$\begin{aligned} t &= m_{f_1}^2 + m_{f_3}^2 - 2\left(\frac{s}{4} - \sqrt{\left(\frac{s}{4} - m_{f1}^2\right)\left(\frac{s}{4} - m_{f_3}^2\right)}\cos\theta\right), \\ &= m_{f_1}^2 + m_{f_3}^2 - \frac{s}{2}\left(1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{4}{s}(m_{f1}^2 + m_{f_3}^2) + \frac{16}{s^2} m_{f_1}^2 m_{f_3}^2}\cos\theta\right). \end{aligned} \tag{41}$$

which for the high energy limit yields

$$t = -\frac{s}{2}(1 - \cos\theta). \tag{42}$$

Taking into account (42) in the amplitude (38), it is obtained

$$\mathcal{M}(f_\downarrow \bar{f}_\downarrow \to f_\uparrow \bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\sqrt{2} G_f m_f^2 \sum_{\eta^0} \left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f\bar{f}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{s}{s - m^2_{\eta^0}} - \frac{t}{t - m^2_{\eta^0}}\right). \tag{43}$$

Under the same assumptions, it can be shown that the mixed channel becomes

$$\mathcal{M}(f_\uparrow \bar{f}_\uparrow \to f_\downarrow \bar{f}_\downarrow) = \sqrt{2} G_f m_f^2 \sum_{\eta^0} \left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f\bar{f}}\right)^2 \left(\frac{s}{s - m^2_{\eta^0}} - \frac{t}{t - m^2_{\eta^0}}\right). \tag{44}$$

Therefore we should consider only Eqs. (32) and (43) as the scattering amplitudes that emerge from a general treatment for the process $f\bar{f} \to f\bar{f}$ at the high energy limit and $m_{\eta^0} >> m_W, m_z$, with respect to the computed unitarity constraints on free parameters in the scalar-fermionic sector of the 2HDM. Other channels just differ by a minus sign. This fact is not relevant for the computation of unitarity bounds since they depend on the $J = 0$ partial wave norm.

[¶]For any combination of initial states, the Mandelstam variable s reads

$$s = (p_1 + p_2)^2 = m_{f_1}^2 + m_{f_2}^2 + 2E_{1cm}E_{2cm} + 2E_{1cm}E_{2cm}\sqrt{1 - \frac{m_{f_2}^2}{E_{2cm}^2} - \frac{m_{f_1}^2}{E_{1cm}^2} + \frac{m_{f_1}^2 m_{f_2}^2}{E_{1cm}E_{2cm}}}.$$

and at the high energy limit $s \to E_{cm}^2$.

Couplings with pseudoscalars A^0

The amplitude with pseudoscalars couplings (CP-odd states) gives

$$\mathcal{M}(f_\uparrow \bar{f}_\uparrow \to f_\uparrow \bar{f}_\uparrow) = -\sqrt{2} G_f m_f^2 \sum_{\eta^0_{CP-imp}} \left(\Xi^{\eta^0}_{f\bar{f}}\right)^2 \left(i\bar{v}_{2\uparrow}\gamma_5 u_{1\uparrow} \frac{1}{s - m^2_{\eta^0}} i\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}\gamma_5 v_{4\uparrow} + i\bar{v}_{2\uparrow}\gamma_5 v_{4\uparrow} \frac{1}{t - m^2_{\eta^0}} i\bar{u}_{3\uparrow}\gamma_5 u_{1\uparrow} \right). \quad (45)$$

At the high energy limit $s \gg m^2$, the helicity states are also chiral states. Then we have

$$\gamma_5 u_\uparrow = +u_\uparrow; \quad \gamma_5 u_\downarrow = -u_\downarrow; \quad \gamma_5 v_\uparrow = -v_\uparrow; \quad \gamma_5 v_\downarrow = +v_\downarrow. \quad (46)$$

The products with γ_5 are the following

$$\bar{v}_{2\uparrow}\gamma_5 u_{1\uparrow} = \bar{v}_{2\uparrow} u_{1\uparrow} \quad , \quad \bar{u}_{3\uparrow}\gamma_5 v_{4\uparrow} = -\bar{u}_{3\uparrow} v_{4\uparrow}, \quad (47a)$$

$$\bar{v}_{2\uparrow}\gamma_5 v_{4\uparrow} = -\bar{v}_{2\uparrow} v_{4\uparrow} \quad , \quad \bar{u}_{3\uparrow}\gamma_5 u_{1\uparrow} = \bar{u}_{3\uparrow} u_{1\uparrow}. \quad (47b)$$

Which reproduce the amplitude for scalars with CP-even states (27). Another combinations for helicity states also satisfy these properties. Hence, the scattering amplitude at the tree level with $s \gg m$ is the sum among CP-even ones and CP-odd ones.

References

[1] CMS collaboration, Phys. Lett. **B716** (2012) 30-61.

[2] CMS collaboration, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 081803 (2013).

[3] Particle data group collaboration, C. Amsler et al. *Phys. Lett.* **B667** (2008).

[4] S. Kanemura, T. Kasai, and Y. Okada, Phys. Lett. **B471** (1999) 182, [arXiv:hep-ph/9903289].

[5] S. Nie and M. Sher. Phys. Lett. **B449** (1999) 89-92, [hep-ph/9811234]; S. Kanemura, T. Kasai, and Y. Okada Phys. Lett. **B471** (1999) 182-190, [hep-ph/9903289]; P. M. Ferreira and D. R. T. Jones [arXiv:0903.2856].

[6] R. A. Diaz. *Phenomenological analysis of the Two Higgs Doublet Model*. Ph.D. Thesis. arXiv: hep-ph/0212237. Universidad Nacional de Colombia. Bogotá 2003.

[7] J. Gunion, H. Haber, G. Kane y S. Dawson. *The Higgs Hunter's Guide*. Addison-Wesley, New York, 1990.

[8] G. Branco, P. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. Rebelo, M. Sher, J. Silva. Phys. Rep. 516, 1-102 (2012). arXiv: hep-ph/1106.0034v3.

[9] F. Ginzburg, I. Ivanov, K. Kanishev. Phys. Rev. **D81**, 085031 (2010).

[10] F. Ginzburg, K. Kanishev. Phys. Rev. **D76**, 095013 (2007); arXiv:0704.3664.

[11] W. Cottingham, N. Hasan. Phys. Rev. **D51**, 866 (2007);

[12] I. Ginzburg, I. Ivanov. arXiv:hep-ph/0508020v1.

[13] Dicus D, Mathur V. Phys. Rev. **D7** (1973) 3111.

[14] Lee B, Quigg C, Thacker G. Phys. Rev. Lett. 38 (1977) 883; Phys. Rev. Lett. 38 (1977).

[15] A. Akeroyd, A. Arhrib, E. Naimi. Phys. Lett. **B490**, 119 (2000).

[16] Kanemura S, Kubota T, Takasugi E. *Phys. Lett.* **B313**, 155 (1993).

[17] J. Hořejsi, M. Kladiva. Master's Thesis (review). arXiv:hep-ph/0510154v2.

[18] Jacob M. Wick G, *Annals of Physics*, 7 (1959) 404.

[19] P. Bechtle, O. Brein, S. Heinemeyer, G. Weiglein, E. Williams. *Comput. Phys. Commun.* 181:138-167, 201

[20] D. Eriksson, J. Rathsman, O. Stal. arXiv:hep-ph 0902.0851v2.

[21] OPAL-Collaboration. CERN-P-HEP/2004-020

[22] M. Deshapnde, Phys. Rev. **D18**, 2574 (1978). N. Sher, Phys. Lett. **B449**, 89 (1999).

[23] M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi Phys. Rev. Lett. 65 (1990) 964–967; G. Altarelli and R. Barbieri Phys. Lett. **B253** (1991) 161–167; M. E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi. *Phys. Rev.* **D46** (1992) 381–409; G. Altarelli, R. Barbieri, and S. Jadach. Nucl. Phys. **B369** (1992) 3–32.

[24] P. Sikivie, L. Susskind, M. B. Voloshin, and V. I. Zakharov. Nucl. Phys. **B173** (1980) 189.

[25] Weinberg S. *The quantum theory fields of fields*. Volume I. Cambridge University Press. Second edition, 2005.

[26] S. Dawson, P. Jaiswal, Phys. Rev. D 82: 073017 (2010).

[27] S. Glashow, J. Iliopulos and L. Maiani, Phys. Rev. **D2** (1977) 1285.

[28] D. Atwood, L. Reina and A. Soni, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 3156 (1997).

[29] B. McWilliams y L. Li, Nucl. Phys. **B179** (1981) 62. U. Shanker, Nucl. Phys. **B206** (1982) 253.

[30] T. Cheng y M. Sher, Phys. Rev. **D35** (1987) 3484.

[31] F. Mahmoudi y O. Stal, Phys. Rev. **D81** (2010) 035016. D. Milanes, A. Rodriguez, R. Martinez. Phys. Rev. **D72** (2005) 035017.

[32] E. Lunghi and A. Soni, JHEP **0709**, 053 (2007) [arXiv:0707.0212 [hep-ph]].

[33] R. S. Gupta and J. D. Wells, Phys. Rev. **D81** (2010) 055012 [arXiv:0912.0267[hep-ph]].

[34] B. Aubert et al. [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. 99 (2007) 201801 [arXiv:0708.1303 [hep-ex]].

[35] E. Golowich, J. Hewett, S. Pakvasa, and A. A. Petrov, Phys. Rev. **D76** (2007) 095009 [arXiv:0705.3650 [hep-ph]].

[36] Z. J. Xiao and L. Guo, Phys. Rev. **D69** (2004) 014002 [hep-ph/0309103]. Z. J. Xiao and C. Zhuang, Eur. Phys. J. **C33** (2004) 349 [hep-ph/0310097].

[37] R. A. Diaz, R. Martinez, and J. A. Rodriguez, Phys. Rev. **D67** (2003) 075011. R. A. Diaz, R. Martinez, and C. E. Sandoval, Eur. Phys. J. **C41** (2005) 305.

[38] Ryder L. *Quantum field theory*. Cambridge University Press. Segunda Edition. Cambridge 1996.

[39] Peskin. M, Schroeder D. *An introduction to quantum field theory*. Westview Press. 1995.

[40] Wu-Ki Tung. Group Theory in Physics. World Scientific Publishing. 2003. Claude Itzykson and Jean Bernard Zuber. Quantum Field Theory. McGraw Hill Inc. 1980.

[41] J. Hořejsi. Introduction to Electroweak Unification: Standard Model from Tree Unitarity. World Scientific. 1994.

[42] M. Thomson, Particle Physics. Cambridge Particle Physics Courses. http://www.hep.phy.cam.ac.uk/∼thomson/partIIIparticles