

Longevity Problem of Sterile Neutrino Dark Matter

Hiroyuki Ishida^{a*}, Kwang Sik Jeong^{a†}, and Fuminobu Takahashi^{a,b‡}

^a *Department of Physics, Tohoku University, Sendai 980-8578, Japan*

^b *Kavli IPMU, TODIAS, University of Tokyo, Kashiwa 277-8583, Japan*

Abstract

Sterile neutrino dark matter of mass $\mathcal{O}(1-10)$ keV decays into an active neutrino and an X-ray photon, and the non-observation of the corresponding X-ray line requires the sterile neutrino to be more long-lived than estimated based on the seesaw formula: *the longevity problem*. We show that, if one or more of the B–L Higgs fields are charged under a flavor symmetry (or discrete R symmetry), the split mass spectrum for the right-handed neutrinos as well as the required longevity is naturally realized. We provide several examples in which the predicted the X-ray flux is just below the current bound.

* email: h_ishida@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp

† email: ksjeong@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp

‡ email: fumi@tuhep.phys.tohoku.ac.jp

I. INTRODUCTION

One of the central issues in modern cosmology and particle physics is the identity of dark matter. If dark matter is made of as-yet-unknown species of particles, they must be stable on a cosmological time scale. The required longevity can be attributed to their light mass and/or extremely weak interactions, and the elusiveness of dark matter is probably related to its longevity to some extent. This however does not necessarily imply that dark matter is completely stable; it may have a long but finite lifetime, decaying into lighter particles. If so, it will enable us to identify dark matter by detecting the signal of the decay products.

Sterile neutrino is one of the plausible candidates for dark matter, and it has been extensively studied from various aspects such as the structure formation and baryogenesis. See Refs. [1–5] for a review. Interestingly, sterile neutrino dark matter decays into an active neutrino and an X-ray photon through mixing with active neutrinos [6–9]. So far, the corresponding X-ray line has not been observed, which places severe constraints on the mixing angle, or equivalently, its neutrino Yukawa couplings.

The smallness of the neutrino Yukawa couplings can be partially understood by a simple Froggatt-Nielsen (FN) type flavor model [10] or the split seesaw mechanism [11], in which the right-handed neutrinos are charged under a flavor symmetry or propagate in an extra dimension, while the other standard model (SM) particles are neutral or reside on the four dimensional brane. One of the interesting features of these models is that the beauty of the seesaw formula [12], which relates the light neutrino masses to the ratio of the electroweak scale to the GUT (or B–L) scale, is preserved even for a split mass spectrum of the right-handed neutrinos, e.g. $M_1 = \mathcal{O}(1 - 10) \text{ keV} \ll M_{2,3}$, where 1, 2 and 3 represent the generation index. This is because both the light sterile (or right-handed) neutrino mass and the corresponding neutrino Yukawa couplings are suppressed simultaneously in such a way that the seesaw formula remains intact. However, the suppression is not sufficient to avoid the X-ray constraint; the observation requires the sterile neutrino dark matter to be more long-lived than naively expected. The gap becomes acute for a heavier mass. As

we shall see shortly, for the sterile neutrino mass of 10 keV, the corresponding neutrino Yukawa couplings must be more than two orders of magnitude smaller than estimated based on the seesaw formula. If there is no correlation among different elements of the neutrino Yukawa matrix as in the neutrino mass anarchy hypothesis [13, 14], it would amount to fine-tuning of order 10^{-6} . We call this fine-tuning associated with the neutrino Yukawa couplings of the sterile neutrino dark matter as “*the longevity problem*.”

Taken at a face value, the longevity problem of the sterile neutrino dark matter suggests an extended structure of the theory, such as an additional symmetry forbidding the neutrino Yukawa couplings. In particular, it requires a slight deviation from the seesaw formula for the sterile neutrino dark matter.

In fact, it is well known that, if the sterile neutrino comprises all the dark matter, its contribution to the light neutrino mass must be negligible in order to satisfy the X-ray bounds [15, 16]. The point of this paper is to take the observational constraint seriously and construct theoretical models that could realize both the required split mass hierarchy and the longevity simultaneously. In Ref. [17], it was shown that the mass spectrum and the mixing angles in the so called ν MSM [15], where the lightest sterile neutrino has a mass of order keV and the other two heavy sterile neutrinos have quasi-degenerate masses of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ GeV, can be realized by introducing Q_6 , Z_2 , and Z_3 flavor symmetries as well as four SM singlet scalars. Importantly, the longevity problem was solved in their flavor model. On the other hand, our purpose is to solve the longevity problem and not to realize the quasi-degenerate mass for the two heavy sterile neutrinos, and so, we will consider a relatively simple model in which the SM is extended by introducing three right-handed neutrinos, a gauged $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry, and an extra flavor symmetry. Actually one can easily make the lightest sterile neutrino completely stable by assigning a discrete symmetry such as Z_2 [18], which however implies that one cannot observe the sterile neutrino dark matter through its decay. Also an additional mechanism is required to realize the split mass spectrum for the sterile neutrinos. Instead, we will construct models in which a single flavor symmetry realizes both the split mass spectrum and the longevity of the lightest sterile neutrino. In particular, the predicted X-ray flux can marginally satisfy the

observational bounds, so that the X-ray observation still remains a viable probe of the sterile neutrino dark matter scenario.

In this paper we show that the longevity problem can be solved naturally if one or more of the B–L Higgs fields is charged under a flavor symmetry which also realizes the split mass spectrum, $M_1 \ll M_{2,3}$. The main difference from the simple FN model is that the scalar charged under the flavor symmetry has a non-zero B–L charge, and we call such mechanism achieving the split mass spectrum for the right-handed neutrinos with a sufficiently long lifetime as “*split flavor mechanism*” in order to distinguish it from the simple FN model. As we shall see shortly, the split flavor mechanism works well for both continuous and discrete flavor symmetries, and we provide several examples which solve the longevity problem and predict the X-ray flux just below the current bound.

II. LONGEVITY PROBLEM

We consider an extension of the SM with three right-handed neutrinos, and assume the seesaw mechanism [12] throughout this paper. The relevant interactions for the seesaw mechanism are given by

$$\mathcal{L} = i\bar{N}_I\gamma^\mu\partial_\mu N_I - \left(\lambda_{I\alpha}\bar{N}_I L_\alpha H + \frac{1}{2}M_I\bar{N}_I^c N_I + \text{h.c.} \right), \quad (1)$$

where N_I , L_α and H are the right-handed neutrino, lepton doublet and Higgs scalar, respectively, I denotes the generation of the right-handed neutrinos, and α runs over the lepton flavor, e , μ and τ . The sum over repeated indices is understood. Here we adopt a basis in which the right-handed neutrinos are mass eigenstates, and M_I is set to be real and positive. If there is a $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge symmetry, the breaking scale M is tied to the right-handed neutrino mass, as long as the coupling of the B–L Higgs to the right-handed neutrinos is not suppressed.

Integrating out the massive right-handed neutrinos yields the seesaw formula for the light neutrino mass:

$$(m_\nu)_{\alpha\beta} = \lambda_{\alpha I}\lambda_{I\beta}\frac{v^2}{M_I}, \quad (2)$$

where $v \equiv \langle H^0 \rangle \simeq 174 \text{ GeV}$ is the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of the Higgs field. The solar and atmospheric neutrino oscillation experiments clearly showed that at least two neutrinos have small but non-zero masses, and the mass splittings are given by $\Delta m_{\odot}^2 \simeq 8 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ and $\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 \simeq 2.3 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$. The seesaw mechanism then suggests that a typical mass scale of the right-handed neutrinos or the B–L breaking scale is around 10^{15} GeV , close to the GUT scale, for $\lambda_{I\alpha} \sim 1$. An attractive feature of the seesaw formula is that it explains the smallness of the neutrino masses by relating them to the ratio of the electroweak scale to the GUT (or B–L) scale. Furthermore, the baryon asymmetry of the Universe can be generated via leptogenesis by out-of-equilibrium decays of such heavy right-handed neutrinos [19].

The above argument does not necessarily mean that all the right-handed neutrinos have a mass of order 10^{15} GeV . In fact, it is known that the above mentioned feature of the seesaw formula can be preserved even for a split mass spectrum of the right-handed neutrinos in the simple FN model [10] or the split seesaw mechanism [11]. Most importantly, the lightest right-handed neutrino can be dark matter, as it becomes stable in a cosmological time scale for a sufficiently light mass. Thus an interesting scenario is that sterile neutrinos have a split mass spectrum $M_1 \ll M_{2,3}$ so that the lightest one contributes to the dark matter while the other two implement leptogenesis. Intriguingly, this may explain why there are three generations [11].

In the simple FN model or the split seesaw mechanism, N_1 transforms differently from N_i ($i = 2, 3$) under some symmetry or has an exponentially different localization property due to slightly different bulk masses, respectively. The mass and Yukawa couplings of the lightest right-handed neutrino N_1 are then suppressed as

$$M_1 = x^2 M, \tag{3}$$

$$|\lambda_{1\alpha}| = x_{\alpha}, \tag{4}$$

where $x \sim x_{\alpha} \ll 1$ represents the suppression factor, and M is the $U(1)_{\text{B-L}}$ breaking scale. The relation $x \sim x_{\alpha}$ arises from the crucial assumption that the suppression mechanism is independent of the $U(1)_{\text{B-L}}$ symmetry and its breaking. The light neutrino masses are




FIG. 1: X-ray bounds on the mixing angle $\sin^2 2\theta_1$ (left) and ϵ (right) given as a function of the sterile neutrino mass M_1 . In the left panel, the dashed green lines show the value of $\sin^2 2\theta_1$ estimated by Eq. (5) for $\epsilon = 10^{-4}, 10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 10^{-1}$ and 1, from bottom to top, respectively. The upper-right (pink) shaded region in both panels is excluded by the X-ray observations [3], while the upper-left (yellow) shaded region in the left panel is excluded by the dark matter overproduction via the Dodelson-Widrow mechanism [20, 21]. Note that the yellow region becomes viable if there is a late-time entropy production.

still related to the ratio of the electroweak scale to the GUT (or B–L) scale, since the dependence on x and x_α is cancelled in the seesaw formula (2) as long as $x \sim x_\alpha$.

On the other hand, the mixing angle between N_1 and active neutrinos is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1^2 &\equiv \sum_\alpha \frac{|\lambda_{1\alpha}|^2 v^2}{M_1^2} \\ &= 10^{-5} \epsilon^2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{seesaw}}}{0.1 \text{ eV}} \right) \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}} \right)^{-1},\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

where we have defined $\epsilon^2 \equiv \sum_\alpha x_\alpha^2 / x^2$, and m_{seesaw} denotes the typical neutrino mass induced by the seesaw mechanism,

$$m_{\text{seesaw}} \equiv \frac{v^2}{M} \simeq 0.03 \text{ eV} \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{ GeV}} \right)^{-1}.\tag{6}$$

Through the mixing θ_1 , the sterile neutrino decays into three active neutrinos, and also radiatively into active neutrino plus photon [6–9]. The latter process is strongly constrained by the non-observation of the corresponding X-ray line [3] (see also Refs. [22–24]), leading to a tight upper bound on the mixing angle as shown Fig. 1. The bound can be conveniently parameterized by [1]

$$\theta_1^2 \lesssim 1.8 \times 10^{-10} \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}} \right)^{-5}. \quad (7)$$

Therefore, ϵ should be much smaller than unity to satisfy the X-ray bound for $M_1 \gtrsim$ a few keV:

$$\epsilon \lesssim 4 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{m_{\text{seesaw}}}{0.1 \text{ eV}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}} \right)^{-2}. \quad (8)$$

This requires a deviation from the seesaw formula (2) for the sterile neutrino dark matter N_1 , and the gap becomes acute for a heavier M_1 . Note that the Lyman alpha bounds on M_1 reads $M_1 \gtrsim 8 \text{ keV}$ (99.7% C.L.), assuming the non-resonant production for the sterile neutrino dark matter [25].¹ Therefore ϵ must be much smaller than unity, which implies the neutrino Yukawa couplings $\lambda_{1\alpha}$ should be suppressed by about ϵ with respect to that estimated from the seesaw formula. For instance, for $M_1 = 10 \text{ keV}$, we need ϵ smaller than 4×10^{-3} . If x_α/x takes a value of order unity randomly as in the neutrino mass anarchy, it would require a fine-tuning of order $\epsilon^3 \sim 10^{-7}$. We call this fine-tuning problem as the longevity problem. Importantly, the problem cannot be resolved in the split seesaw mechanism or the simple FN model. As we shall see in the next section, the split mass spectrum as well as the required longevity can be naturally explained if one or more of the B–L Higgs is charged under a flavor symmetry; the key is to combine the flavor symmetry with the B–L symmetry.

¹ The bound is relaxed for the production from the singlet Higgs decay [26, 27] or the resonant production which works in the presence of large lepton asymmetry [25].

III. SPLIT FLAVOR MECHANISM

In this section, we present a modified seesaw model which realizes the split mass spectrum for N_I while solving the longevity problem. We consider an extension of the SM with three right-handed neutrinos $N_I = (N_1, N_i)$ for $i = 2, 3$, the $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge symmetry, and two B–L Higgs fields Φ and Φ' whose VEVs provide masses to the sterile neutrinos. The reason why two B–L Higgs fields are needed will be clarified soon. In a supersymmetric theory, two Higgs fields are anyway required for the anomaly cancellation. Here we adopt a flavor basis for N_I , but the mixing between N_1 and N_i is suppressed in the models considered below. In the split flavor mechanism, we will introduce a flavor symmetry, under which only the fields in the seesaw sector are charged, and the SM fields are assumed to be neutral. The role of the flavor symmetry is to suppress both the mass and mixings of N_1 to satisfy the X-ray bound (7), and the key is to assign a flavor charge on one or more of the B–L Higgs fields. As reference values we take $M_1 \approx 1 - 10$ keV and $M_i \approx 10^{14-15}$ GeV, but it is straightforward to further impose a usual FN flavor symmetry, e.g., in order to make N_2 much lighter than N_3 .

A. Non-supersymmetric case

We adopt a Z_4 flavor symmetry under which only Φ' and N_1 are charged while the others are singlet:

	Φ	Φ'	N_1	N_i	L_α	H
$U(1)_{B-L}$	2	$-2n$	-1	-1	-1	0
Z_4	0	-1	1	0	0	0

with n being a positive integer, and $i = 2, 3$. Then the seesaw sector is described by

$$-\Delta\mathcal{L} = \frac{1}{2}\kappa_i\Phi\bar{N}_i^cN_i + \lambda_i\bar{N}_iLH + \frac{1}{2}\kappa_1\frac{(\Phi^{2n-1}\Phi'^2)^*}{\Lambda^{2n}}\bar{N}_1^cN_1 + \tilde{\lambda}\frac{(\Phi^n\Phi')^*}{\Lambda^{n+1}}\bar{N}_1LH + \text{h.c.}, \quad (9)$$

for a cut-off scale Λ . Here κ_1 , κ_i , λ_i and $\tilde{\lambda}$ are numerical coefficients of order unity, and we have dropped the lepton flavor indices. Note that the term $\Phi^{n+1}\Phi'\bar{N}_1^cN_i$ has been




FIG. 2: The mixing angle $\sin^2 2\theta_1$ in the non-supersymmetric model with the Z_4 flavor symmetry, where we have taken $n = 3$ and $\Lambda = M_p$ under the assumption that Φ and Φ' have VEVs of a similar size. The upper-right (pink) and upper-left (yellow) shaded regions are excluded by the X-ray observations and the dark matter overproduction via the Dodelson-Widrow mechanism, respectively.

omitted as it can be removed by redefining N_I without any significant effects on the above interactions.

The $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken when Φ and Φ' develop a non-zero VEV. Here we assume $\langle \Phi \rangle \gtrsim \langle \Phi' \rangle$. As a result, the mass of the two heavy right-handed neutrinos is set by $M = \langle \Phi \rangle$, and the light neutrino masses are nicely explained by the seesaw mechanism. The above neutrino interactions lead to the mass and mixing of the N_1 as

$$M_1 \approx \left(\frac{M}{\Lambda} \right)^{2(n-1)} \left(\frac{\langle \Phi' \rangle}{\Lambda} \right)^2 M, \quad (10)$$

$$\lambda_{1\alpha} \approx \left(\frac{M}{\Lambda} \right)^n \frac{\langle \Phi' \rangle}{\Lambda}, \quad (11)$$

implying

$$\epsilon \approx \frac{M}{\Lambda}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore the suppression of ϵ is achieved for $M \ll \Lambda$, and consequently the active-sterile neutrino mixing is estimated to be

$$\begin{aligned}\theta_1^2 &\approx 10^{-5} \left(\frac{M}{\Lambda}\right)^2 \left(\frac{m_{\text{seesaw}}}{0.1 \text{ eV}}\right) \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}}\right)^{-1}, \\ &\simeq 2 \times 10^{-12} \left(\frac{m_{\text{seesaw}}}{0.1 \text{ eV}}\right) \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}}\right)^{-1} \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{ GeV}}\right)^2,\end{aligned}\tag{13}$$

where we have set Λ to be the Planck scale, $M_p \simeq 2.4 \times 10^{18} \text{ GeV}$, in the second equality. Note that the mixing angle depends on n only through M_1 . For instance, in the case of $n = 3$, M_1 is around 10 keV when both Φ and Φ' have a VEV around 10^{15} GeV . Fig. 2 shows the property of N_1 for the case with $n = 3$, assuming that Φ and Φ' have VEVs of a similar size. Also, $M_1 \sim 10 \text{ keV}$ can be realized for $n = 1$ or 2 if $\langle \Phi' \rangle$ is at an intermediate scale, which is possible because there is no dynamical reason to relate $\langle \Phi \rangle$ to $\langle \Phi' \rangle$ in contrast to supersymmetric cases.

It is possible to consider a general discrete symmetry Z_k under which only Φ' and N_1 are charged. A proper Z_k charge assignment makes N_1 have a small Yukawa coupling induced from the term $(\Phi^a \Phi'^b)^* \bar{N}_1 L H$ after B–L breaking. Here Φ' carries a B–L charge equal to $-2a/b$ for coprime positive integers a and b . Then it is obvious that M_1 always receives contribution from $\Phi(\Phi^a \Phi'^b)^2 \bar{N}_1^c N_1$. If it is the dominant contribution, one obtains $\epsilon \sim 1$ as in the simple FN model, and thus the longevity problem is not solved. This holds also when one uses a global U(1) instead of Z_k . We note that a suppression of ϵ can be achieved by taking a Z_k charge assignment such that N_1 gets a mass dominantly either from $(\Phi^{2a-1} \Phi'^{2b})^* \bar{N}_1^c N_1$ or from $\Phi(\Phi^a \Phi'^b)^* \bar{N}_1^c N_1$.

B. Supersymmetric case

The seesaw mechanism can be embedded into a supersymmetric framework. For the anomaly cancellation, Φ and Φ' must be vector-like under $U(1)_{B-L}$. Interestingly enough, it is then possible to suppress M_1 as well as the active-sterile neutrino mixing by both supersymmetry (SUSY) breaking effects and a flavor symmetry. We will also show that a discrete R-symmetry can do the job.

1. Discrete flavor symmetry

Let us first consider a Z_k flavor symmetry with $k \geq 3$, under which only Φ' and N_1 transform non-trivially and the others are neutral:

	Φ	Φ'	N_1	N_i	L_α	H_u
$U(1)_{B-L}$	-2	2	1	1	-1	0
Z_k	0	1	1	0	0	0

with H_u being the up-type Higgs doublet superfield. Such discrete symmetry acting on one of the B–L Higgs fields was considered in the B–L Higgs inflation models [28]. Note that N_I , Φ and Φ' are left-chiral superfields, and in particular, the fermionic component of N_I is the left-handed anti-neutrino. That is why the B–L charge assignment on these fields is different from the non-supersymmetric case.

With the above charge assignment, the relevant terms in the Kähler and superpotentials of the seesaw sector are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K &= \frac{\Phi'^*}{\Lambda} N_1 N_i + \frac{1}{2} \frac{(\Phi \Phi'^2)^*}{\Lambda^3} N_1 N_1 + \text{h.c.}, \\ \Delta W &= \frac{1}{2} \Phi N_i N_i + N_i L H_u + \frac{(\Phi \Phi')^{k-1}}{\Lambda^{2k-2}} N_1 L H_u + \frac{1}{2} \frac{\Phi (\Phi \Phi')^{k-2}}{\Lambda^{2k-4}} N_1 N_1,\end{aligned}\quad (14)$$

where we have omitted coupling constants of order unity.² Though we have not considered here, one may impose a $U(1)_R$ symmetry under the assumption that it is broken by a small constant term in the superpotential, i.e. by the gravitino mass $m_{3/2}$. As we shall see shortly, in such case, both of the terms in ΔK can be further suppressed by $m_{3/2}$ if the superpotential is to possess the term $\Phi N_i N_i$. Note here that the gravitino mass represents the explicit $U(1)_R$ breaking by two units.

To examine the property of sterile neutrino dark matter, it is convenient to integrate out the $U(1)_{B-L}$ sector. The $U(1)_{B-L}$ is broken along the D -flat direction $|\Phi|^2 = |\Phi'|^2 = M^2$,

² Instead of the discrete symmetry, one can take a global $U(1)$ symmetry under which Φ' and N_1 have the same charge and the other fields are neutral. Then the terms in ΔK are still allowed while the last two terms in ΔW are forbidden. The Nambu-Goldstone boson associated with $U(1)$ may contribute to dark radiation [29, 30].

which is stabilized by higher dimension operators, or by a radiative potential induced by the λ_i interaction. For M much larger than the gravitino mass $m_{3/2}$, the effective theory of neutrinos is written as

$$\Delta W_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2}\kappa_i M N_i N_i + \lambda_i N_i L H_u + \frac{1}{2}M_1 N_1 N_1 + \lambda_{1\alpha} N_1 L H_u, \quad (15)$$

at energy scales around and below M , where the sterile neutrino N_1 obtains

$$M_1 = \frac{m_{3/2} M^3}{\Lambda^3} + \frac{M^{2k-3}}{\Lambda^{2k-4}}, \quad (16)$$

$$\lambda_{1\alpha} = \frac{m_{3/2}}{\Lambda} + \frac{M^{2k-2}}{\Lambda^{2k-2}} \quad (17)$$

omitting numerical coefficients of order unity. Here the terms proportional to $m_{3/2}$ arise from ΔK after redefining N_i to remove mixing terms $N_1 N_i$ in the effective superpotential. In contrast to the non-supersymmetric case, there are two important effects here. One is the holomorphic nature of the superpotential, and the other is the SUSY breaking effects represented by the gravitino mass.

Depending on the values of M , Λ , $m_{3/2}$ and k , there are various possibilities. To simplify our analysis, let us focus on the case of the reference values, $M \sim 10^{15}$ GeV and $\Lambda = M_p$. Then $M_1 \sim 10$ keV is realized for $m_{3/2} \lesssim \mathcal{O}(100)$ TeV and $k \geq 5$,³ for which the neutrino Yukawa coupling $\lambda_{1\alpha}$ receives the dominant contribution from the SUSY breaking effect, i.e., from the first term in Eq. (17). Note also that M_1 is determined entirely by the SUSY breaking effect for $k \geq 6$. In the following we consider $m_{3/2} \sim 100$ TeV and $k \geq 6$. The ϵ parameter and active-sterile neutrino mixing angle then read

$$\epsilon \approx 4 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{100 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{\frac{5}{6}} \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{3}}, \quad (18)$$

$$\theta_1^2 = \epsilon^2 \frac{m_{\text{seesaw}}}{M_1} \approx 10^{-12} \left(\frac{m_{\text{seesaw}}}{0.1 \text{ eV}} \right) \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{100 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{\frac{5}{3}} \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}} \right)^{-\frac{5}{3}}. \quad (19)$$

³ This may provide a motivation to consider SUSY around 100 TeV, which is consistent with the recent discovery of the SM-like Higgs boson of mass ~ 126 GeV. If the SUSY breaking was much higher, the sterile neutrino could not be dark matter because of its too short lifetime. Note that the decay rate is proportional to M_1^5 .




FIG. 3: Contours of the sterile neutrino mass M_1 (solid (blue)) and the mixing angle θ_1^2 (dashed (green)) in the M - $m_{3/2}$ plane for the case of the discrete Z_k with $k \geq 6$. The upper-right (pink) shaded region is excluded by the X-ray observations. Here we have fixed the cut-off scale as $\Lambda = M_p$.

Thus, the observational constraint (7) is naturally satisfied if the gravitino mass is smaller than or comparable to 100 TeV. In particular, the predicted X-ray flux is just below the observational bound for $m_{3/2} \sim 100$ TeV. See Fig. 3, where the contours of M_1 and θ_1^2 are shown in the $(M, m_{3/2})$ plane. On the other hand, the squarks and sleptons acquire soft SUSY breaking masses in the range between about $m_{3/2}/8\pi^2$ and $m_{3/2}$, depending on mediation mechanism. It is interesting to note that the gravitino mass around 100 TeV leads to TeV to sub-PeV scale SUSY, which can accommodate a SM-like Higgs boson at 126 GeV within the minimal supersymmetric SM (MSSM).

Lastly we comment on the case with an approximate global $U(1)_R$ broken by a constant superpotential term. The neutrino interactions are then further constrained. For instance, let us consider the case where N_I and L_α have the same R charge equal to one while Φ , Φ' and H_u are neutral. Then both the terms in ΔK are further suppressed by the gravitino mass. As a result, the sterile neutrino mass as well as the neutrino Yukawa couplings are determined by the ratio of the B–L breaking scale to the cut-off scale, and the effect

of SUSY breaking is negligibly small. That is to say, M_1 and $\lambda_{1\alpha}$ receive the dominant contributions from the second terms in (16) and (17), respectively. For the reference values $M \sim 10^{15}$ GeV and $\Lambda = M_p$, k must be equal to 5 to realize $M_1 \sim 10$ keV unless $m_{3/2}$ is extremely heavy (say, 10^{11} GeV or heavier). Then the neutrino Yukawa couplings will become extremely small so that sterile neutrino dark matter becomes practically stable and the predicted X-ray flux is negligibly small. Although not pursued here, it may be interesting to consider the case of $k < 5$ where a sterile neutrino dark matter is much heavier than 10 keV and has a sufficiently small mixing angle.⁴

2. Discrete R symmetry

Next let us consider a case of discrete R symmetry. The discrete R symmetry has been extensively studied from various cosmological and phenomenological aspects. See e.g. Refs. [32–37]. Now we show that the split flavor mechanism can be implemented by the discrete R symmetry with the following charge assignment,

	Φ	Φ'	N_1	N_i	L_α	H_u
$U(1)_{B-L}$	-2	2	1	1	-1	0
Z_{kR}	0	p	q	1	1	0

where p and q are integers mod k . To simplify our analysis, we assume that the cut-off scale for higher dimensional operators is given by the Planck scale, M_p , and the B–L breaking scale M is about 10^{15} GeV. The gravitino mass is assumed to be below PeV scale.

Note that the discrete Z_{kR} symmetry ($k \geq 3$) is explicitly broken by the constant term in the superpotential, $\langle W \rangle \simeq m_{3/2} M_p^2$. Therefore, the mass M_1 and neutrino Yukawa couplings $\lambda_{1\alpha}$ generically receive two contributions; one is invariant under Z_{kR} , and the other is not invariant and is proportional to the gravitino mass.

⁴ See Ref. [31] for the latest X-ray and gamma-ray constraints on such heavy sterile neutrino dark matter.

The sterile neutrino mass $M_1 \sim 10 \text{ keV}$ is numerically close to M^7/M_p^6 or $m_{3/2}M^3/M_p^3$, and the mass of this order can be generated if one or more of the following operators are allowed:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K &= \frac{(\Phi\Phi'^2)^*}{M_p^3} N_1 N_1 + \text{h.c.}, \\ \Delta W &= \frac{\Phi(\Phi\Phi')^3}{M_p^6} N_1 N_1 \text{ or } m_{3/2} \frac{\Phi^2\Phi'}{M_p^3} N_1 N_1.\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

Similarly, the neutrino Yukawa coupling of the desired magnitude can be induced from the following operators,

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K &= \frac{\Phi'^*}{M_p} N_1 N_i + \text{h.c.}, \\ \Delta W &= \frac{(\Phi\Phi')^2}{M_p^4} N_1 L H_u \text{ or } \frac{m_{3/2}}{M_p} N_1 L H_u.\end{aligned}\quad (21)$$

In order for one or more of the above operators to give the dominant contribution to M_1 and $\lambda_{1\alpha}$, the following operators must be forbidden by the discrete R-symmetry:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta K_{\text{forbidden}} &= \frac{\Phi'^*}{M_p} N_1 N_1 + \text{h.c.}, \\ \Delta W_{\text{forbidden}} &= \Phi N_1 N_I + \frac{\Phi^2\Phi'}{M_p^2} N_1 N_I + \frac{\Phi(\Phi\Phi')^2}{M_p^4} N_1 N_1 + N_1 L H_u + \frac{\Phi\Phi'}{M_p^2} N_1 L H_u,\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

which puts constraints on p and q .

To summarize, we need to find a set of (k, p, q) satisfying

$$2p - 2q \equiv 0 \quad \text{or} \quad 3p + 2q \equiv 2 \quad \text{or} \quad p + 2q \equiv 0, \quad (23)$$

$$p - q - 1 \equiv 0 \quad \text{or} \quad 2p + q + 1 \equiv 2 \quad \text{or} \quad q + 1 \equiv 0, \quad (24)$$

$$p - 2q \not\equiv 0, \quad 2q \not\equiv 2, \quad q + 1 \not\equiv 2, \quad p + 2q \not\equiv 2, \quad p + q + 1 \not\equiv 2, \quad 2p + 2q \not\equiv 2, \quad (25)$$

where all the equations are mod k . Some of the solutions of the above conditions are⁵

$$(k, p, q) = (5, 2, 2), (5, 4, 3), (7, 3, 2), (7, 5, 4), (7, 5, 5), (7, 6, 6), \dots \quad (26)$$

⁵ If we forbid a SUSY mass $\Phi\Phi'$ in the superpotential, the solutions with $p = 2$ should be excluded.




FIG. 4: Contours of the sterile neutrino mass M_1 (solid (blue)) and the mixing angle θ_1^2 (dashed (green)) in the M - $m_{3/2}$ plane for the case of the discrete R symmetry. The upper-right (pink) and lower-right (yellow) shaded region are excluded by the X-ray observations and the dark matter overproduction via the Dodelson-Widrow mechanism, respectively.

In fact there is no solution for which both M_1 and $\lambda_{1\alpha}$ are generated by the Z_{kR} invariant operators. That is to say, either or both of them should be generated by the SUSY breaking effect proportional to the gravitino mass.

Let us focus on the case of $(k, p, q) = (5, 4, 3)$. Then the relevant terms in the super-potential are given by

$$\Delta W = \frac{1}{2}\Phi N_i N_i + N_i L H_u + \frac{1}{2}m_{3/2}\frac{\Phi^2\Phi'}{M_p^3}N_1 N_1 + \frac{(\Phi\Phi')^2}{M_p^4}N_1 L H_u, \quad (27)$$

where we have dropped numerical coefficients of order unity. The other interactions in the Kähler and super-potentials are either forbidden or irrelevant for the following discussion. The mass and neutrino Yukawa couplings for N_1 are given by

$$M_1 \approx 10 \text{ keV} \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{100 \text{ TeV}} \right) \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{ GeV}} \right)^3, \quad (28)$$

$$\lambda_{1\alpha} \approx 10^{-14} \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{ GeV}} \right)^4, \quad (29)$$

from which one finds

$$\epsilon \simeq 3 \times 10^{-4} \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{100 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{ GeV}} \right)^3, \quad (30)$$

using the D-flat condition, $\langle \Phi \rangle = \langle \Phi' \rangle = M$. Therefore the mass M_1 is close to 10 keV and $\epsilon \sim 10^{-3}$ for the reference values $M = 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$ and $\Lambda = M_p$. Finally, the mixing angle reads

$$\theta_1^2 \approx 2 \times 10^{-12} \left(\frac{m_{\text{seesaw}}}{0.1 \text{ eV}} \right) \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}} \right) \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{100 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{-3}. \quad (31)$$

We show the contours of M_1 and the mixing angle θ_1^2 are shown in the M - $m_{3/2}$ plane in Fig. 4. It is interesting to note that $m_{3/2} \sim 100 \text{ TeV}$ and $M \sim 10^{15} \text{ GeV}$ lead to the sterile neutrino mass $M_1 \sim 10 \text{ keV}$ with the predicted X-ray line flux just below the current bound.

IV. COSMOLOGICAL ASPECTS

We have so far focused on the mass and mixing angles of the sterile neutrinos. In order for the lightest sterile neutrino N_1 to account for the observed dark matter, a right amount of N_1 must be produced in the early Universe. The density parameter of dark matter is related to the number to entropy ratio n_{N_1}/s as

$$\Omega_{\text{DM}} h^2 \simeq 0.14 \left(\frac{M_1}{10 \text{ keV}} \right) \left(\frac{n_{N_1}/s}{5 \times 10^{-5}} \right), \quad (32)$$

where h is the dimensionless Hubble parameter in the units of $100 \text{ km s}^{-1} \text{ Mpc}^{-1}$, and n_{N_1} and s are the number density of N_1 and the entropy density, respectively. The latest observations give $\Omega_{\text{DM}} h^2 \simeq 0.1199 \pm 0.0027$ [38].

The thermal production known as the Dodelson-Widrow mechanism [21] is in tension with the X-ray bound for $M_1 \gtrsim 10 \text{ keV}$, as can be seen from Fig. 1. Therefore we need another production mechanism. One possibility is that the N_1 is produced via the s-channel exchange of the B-L gauge boson [11]. The number to entropy ratio of the sterile neutrino produced by this mechanism is roughly estimated as

$$\frac{n_{N_1}}{s} \sim 10^{-4} \left(\frac{g_*}{100} \right)^{\frac{3}{2}} \left(\frac{M}{10^{15} \text{ GeV}} \right)^{-4} \left(\frac{T_R}{5 \times 10^{13} \text{ GeV}} \right)^3, \quad (33)$$

where g_* counts the relativistic degrees of freedom at the reheating, and T_R denotes the reheating temperature. The numerical solution of the Boltzmann equation gives a consistent result [39]. The assumption here is that the B–L symmetry is spontaneously broken during and after inflation. This production mechanism works both for supersymmetric and non-supersymmetric cases. Also, a right amount of the baryon asymmetry can be created via thermal leptogenesis due to the two heavy right-handed neutrinos N_2 and N_3 for such high reheating temperature [41, 42].⁶

On the other hand, if the B–L symmetry is restored during or after inflation, the sterile neutrinos will be in thermal equilibrium through the $U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge interactions. The thermal abundance is given by

$$\frac{n_{N_1}^{(\text{eq})}}{s} \simeq 2 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{g_*}{100} \right)^{-1}. \quad (34)$$

So, if there is an entropy dilution of the order of a few tens, the right amount of N_1 can be generated. In the non-supersymmetric case, such entropy dilution can be easily realized by the B–L Higgs dynamics. Suppose that the mass of the B–L Higgs is slightly smaller than the B–L breaking scale. Then it remains trapped at the origin due to the thermal mass induced by the B–L gauge boson loop, dominating the Universe for a while. This is a mini-thermal inflation.⁷ When the plasma temperature becomes lower than the mass, the B–L Higgs develops a large VEV, and the subsequent decays of the B–L Higgs produce the entropy. Also, thermal and/or non-thermal leptogenesis works successfully in this case. Since we have imposed a discrete symmetry on the B–L Higgs, domain walls are generally produced. The domain walls will annihilate if we add a small breaking of the discrete symmetry. Interestingly, gravitational waves [44] are likely produced during the violent annihilation processes of the domain walls [36, 45–49], which may be within the reach of the future and planned gravitational wave experiments. After the domain wall annihilation, we are left with the cosmic strings whose tension is consistent with the CMB observation [50] for $M \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{15})$ GeV.

⁶ Thermal leptogenesis in the neutrino mass anarchy hypothesis was studied in Ref. [43].

⁷ See Ref. [40] for the usual thermal inflation. The entropy production due to the bubble formation was discussed in Ref. [11].

In a supersymmetric case, on the other hand, the stabilization of the B–L Higgs is slightly more involved. To be concrete, let us consider the model based on the discrete R symmetry and adopt $(k, p, q) = (5, 4, 3)$ in the following. The D -flat direction composed of Φ and Φ' can be stabilized by the balance between non-renormalizable superpotential term ϕ^6/M_p^3 and SUSY breaking effect (negative soft mass squared at the origin, or the A -term associated with the superpotential term):

$$V = -m_\phi^2 |\phi|^2 - \left(m_{3/2} \frac{\phi^6}{M_p^3} + \text{h.c.} \right) + \frac{|\phi|^{10}}{M_p^6}, \quad (35)$$

where $\phi^2 \equiv \Phi\Phi'$ parameterizes the D -flat direction, m_ϕ^2 represents the soft mass for the D -flat direction, and we have dropped numerical coefficients of order unity. The B–L Higgs is then stabilized at

$$M = \langle \phi \rangle \sim 10^{15} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{m_{3/2}}{100 \text{ TeV}} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}}. \quad (36)$$

If the $U(1)_{B-L}$ symmetry is restored during or after inflation, thermal inflation generically takes place because ϕ has a relatively flat potential. Then the entropy dilution factor tends to be large, and any pre-existing N_1 will be diluted away. The subsequent domain walls can be erased if we introduce a breaking of the discrete symmetry.⁸

In the supersymmetric case, the lightest supersymmetric particle (LSP) in the MSSM contributes to the dark matter abundance. Even though the R-parity is broken in the case of the discrete Z_{5R} symmetry, the MSSM-LSP is stable due to the residual Z_{2B-L} since $U(1)_{B-L}$ is spontaneously broken only by Φ and Φ' with the B–L charge two. In order for the lightest sterile neutrino N_1 to be the dominant component of dark matter, the MSSM-LSP abundance must be suppressed. If the reheating temperature is as high as $\mathcal{O}(10^{13})$ GeV, the Universe becomes *gravitino-rich*, and the MSSM-LSPs tend to be overproduced by the gravitino decay [51]. The MSSM-LSP abundance can be suppressed if it is a Wino-like or Higgsino-like neutralino of mass $\mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV and the gravitino

⁸ In the case of the discrete R symmetry, the constant term in the superpotential provides such breaking terms. Unfortunately, however, its size is too small to make domain walls to annihilate before dominating the Universe.

mass is of order PeV. Since they comprise only a fraction of the total dark matter, the constraints from indirect dark matter searches are relaxed. It would be interesting if we could see the indirect dark matter signatures for both the sterile neutrino and the Wino-like or Higgsino-like neutralino. On the other hand, if the gravitino mass is of $\mathcal{O}(100)$ TeV, the MSSM-LSPs are overproduced by the gravitino decay. It is actually possible to make the MSSM-LSP unstable. Let us consider the case of the discrete R symmetry with $(k, p, q) = (5, 4, 3)$. Then, this can be achieved by introducing another vector-like pair of the B–L Higgs $\varphi(1, -1)$ and $\bar{\varphi}(-1, 1)$ where the B–L and R-charges are shown in the parenthesis, respectively. If φ and $\bar{\varphi}$ have a nonzero VEV, say, of $\mathcal{O}(10^6)$ GeV, the trilinear R-parity violating operators are allowed, and the MSSM-LSP decays before the big bang nucleosynthesis. The constraints from the proton decay can be safely satisfied [52]. Alternatively, if there is another production mechanism of the sterile neutrino dark matter which works at a temperature below 10^9 GeV, the Universe is not gravitino-rich, and we can avoid the overproduction of the MSSM-LSPs from the gravitino decay.

V. CONCLUSIONS

The sterile neutrino dark matter of mass $\mathcal{O}(1 - 10)$ keV generically decays into an active neutrino and an X-ray photon, but the non-observation of the X-ray line requires the sterile neutrino to be more long-lived than estimated based on the seesaw formula. Specifically, the neutrino Yukawa couplings $\lambda_{1\alpha}$ must be suppressed by more than two orders of magnitude than naively estimated for $M_1 = 10$ keV. We call this tension as the longevity problem for the sterile neutrino dark matter. It is worth noting that the longevity problem is not solved by the simple FN model and the split seesaw mechanism, both of which preserve the seesaw formula. In this paper we have quantified the longevity problem and proposed the split flavor mechanism as a possible solution. In this mechanism, we have introduced a single flavor symmetry (or discrete R symmetry) under which one or more of the B–L Higgs is charged. As a result, the split mass spectrum for the sterile neutrinos

as well as the longevity required for the lightest sterile neutrino dark matter are realized. The key is to combine the B–L symmetry with the flavor symmetry. We have provided several examples in which the lightest sterile neutrino of mass is $\mathcal{O}(1 - 10)$ keV and the predicted X-ray flux is just below the current bound. Therefore it may possible to test our models in the future X-ray observations.

Acknowledgment

This work was supported by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (C) (No. 23540283) [KSJ], Scientific Research on Innovative Areas (No.24111702 [FT], No. 21111006 [FT] , and No.23104008 [KSJ and FT]), Scientific Research (A) (No. 22244030 and No.21244033) [FT], and JSPS Grant-in-Aid for Young Scientists (B) (No. 24740135) [FT], and Inoue Foundation for Science [HI and FT]. This work was also supported by World Premier International Center Initiative (WPI Program), MEXT, Japan [FT].

-
- [1] A. Boyarsky, O. Ruchayskiy and M. Shaposhnikov, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **59**, 191 (2009) [arXiv:0901.0011 [hep-ph]].
 - [2] A. Kusenko, *Phys. Rept.* **481**, 1 (2009) [arXiv:0906.2968 [hep-ph]].
 - [3] K. N. Abazajian, M. A. Acero, S. K. Agarwalla, A. A. Aguilar-Arevalo, C. H. Albright, S. Antusch, C. A. Argüelles and A. B. Balantekin *et al.*, arXiv:1204.5379 [hep-ph].
 - [4] M. Drewes, *International Journal of Modern Physics E*, Vol. **22**, 1330019 (2013) [arXiv:1303.6912 [hep-ph]].
 - [5] A. Merle, arXiv:1302.2625 [hep-ph].
 - [6] B. W. Lee and R. E. Shrock, *Phys. Rev. D* **16**, 1444 (1977).
 - [7] W. J. Marciano and A. I. Sanda, *Phys. Lett. B* **67**, 303 (1977).
 - [8] S. T. Petcov, *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **25**, 340 (1977) [*Yad. Fiz.* **25**, 641 (1977)] [Erratum-ibid. **25**, 698 (1977)] [Erratum-ibid. **25**, 1336 (1977)].
 - [9] P. B. Pal and L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 766 (1982).

- [10] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, Nucl. Phys. B **147**, 277 (1979).
- [11] A. Kusenko, F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **693**, 144 (2010) [arXiv:1006.1731 [hep-ph]].
- [12] T. Yanagida, in Proceedings of the “*Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe*”, Tsukuba, Japan, Feb. 13-14, 1979, edited by O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto, KEK report KEK-79-18, p. 95, and “*Horizontal Symmetry And Masses Of Neutrinos*”, Prog. Theor. Phys. **64** (1980) 1103; M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in “*Supergravity*” (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979) eds. D. Z. Freedman and P. van Nieuwenhuizen, Print-80-0576 (CERN); see also P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 421 (1977).
- [13] L. J. Hall, H. Murayama and N. Weiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2572 (2000) [hep-ph/9911341].
- [14] N. Haba and H. Murayama, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 053010 (2001) [hep-ph/0009174].
- [15] T. Asaka, S. Blanchet and M. Shaposhnikov, Phys. Lett. B **631**, 151 (2005) [hep-ph/0503065].
- [16] A. Boyarsky, A. Neronov, O. Ruchayskiy and M. Shaposhnikov, JETP Lett. **83**, 133 (2006) [hep-ph/0601098].
- [17] T. Araki and Y. F. Li, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 065016 (2012) [arXiv:1112.5819 [hep-ph]].
- [18] K. Allison, JHEP **1305**, 009 (2013) [arXiv:1210.6852 [hep-ph]].
- [19] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **174**, 45 (1986).
- [20] M. Laine and M. Shaposhnikov, JCAP **0806**, 031 (2008) [arXiv:0804.4543 [hep-ph]].
- [21] S. Dodelson and L. M. Widrow, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 17 (1994) [hep-ph/9303287].
- [22] M. Loewenstein, A. Kusenko and P. L. Biermann, Astrophys. J. **700** (2009) 426 [arXiv:0812.2710 [astro-ph]].
- [23] M. Loewenstein and A. Kusenko, Astrophys. J. **714**, 652 (2010) [arXiv:0912.0552 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [24] M. Loewenstein and A. Kusenko, Astrophys. J. **751**, 82 (2012) [arXiv:1203.5229 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] A. Boyarsky, J. Lesgourgues, O. Ruchayskiy and M. Viel, JCAP **0905**, 012 (2009) [arXiv:0812.0010 [astro-ph]].

- [26] A. Kusenko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97** (2006) 241301 [hep-ph/0609081].
- [27] K. Petraki and A. Kusenko, Phys. Rev. D **77** (2008) 065014 [arXiv:0711.4646 [hep-ph]].
- [28] K. Nakayama and F. Takahashi, JCAP **1205**, 035 (2012) [arXiv:1203.0323 [hep-ph]]; see also K. Nakayama and F. Takahashi, JCAP **1110**, 033 (2011) [arXiv:1108.0070 [hep-ph]]; K. Nakayama and F. Takahashi, Phys. Lett. B **707**, 142 (2012) [arXiv:1108.3762 [hep-ph]].
- [29] K. Nakayama, F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **697**, 275 (2011) [arXiv:1010.5693 [hep-ph]].
- [30] S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 241301 (2013) [arXiv:1305.1971 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [31] R. Essig, E. Kuflik, S. D. McDermott, T. Volansky and K. M. Zurek, arXiv:1309.4091 [hep-ph].
- [32] K. Kurosawa, N. Maru and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **512**, 203 (2001) [hep-ph/0105136].
- [33] K. -I. Izawa and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **393**, 331 (1997) [hep-ph/9608359].
- [34] F. Takahashi, arXiv:1308.4212 [hep-ph].
- [35] M. Dine and J. Kehayias, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 055014 (2010) [arXiv:0909.1615 [hep-ph]].
- [36] M. Dine, F. Takahashi and T. T. Yanagida, JHEP **1007**, 003 (2010) [arXiv:1005.3613 [hep-th]].
- [37] K. Harigaya, M. Ibe, K. Schmitz and T. T. Yanagida, arXiv:1308.1227 [hep-ph].
- [38] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
- [39] S. Khalil and O. Seto, JCAP **0810**, 024 (2008) [arXiv:0804.0336 [hep-ph]]; G. Gelmini, S. Palomares-Ruiz and S. Pascoli, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 081302 (2004) [arXiv:astro-ph/0403323]; G. Gelmini, E. Osoba, S. Palomares-Ruiz and S. Pascoli, JCAP **0810**, 029 (2008) [arXiv:0803.2735 [astro-ph]].
- [40] K. Yamamoto, Phys. Lett. **B168**, 341 (1986); D. H. Lyth, E. D. Stewart, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 201-204 (1995). [hep-ph/9502417]; Phys. Rev. **D53**, 1784-1798 (1996). [hep-ph/9510204].
- [41] T. Endoh, S. Kaneko, S. K. Kang, T. Morozumi and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 231601 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0209020].
- [42] M. Raidal and A. Strumia, Phys. Lett. B **553**, 72 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0210021].

- [43] K. S. Jeong and F. Takahashi, JHEP **1207**, 170 (2012) [arXiv:1204.5453 [hep-ph]].
- [44] See M. Maggiore, Phys. Rept. **331**, 283 (2000), for a review.
- [45] M. Gleiser and R. Roberts, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 5497 (1998).
- [46] F. Takahashi, T. T. Yanagida and K. Yonekura, Phys. Lett. B **664**, 194 (2008) [arXiv:0802.4335 [hep-ph]].
- [47] T. Hiramatsu, M. Kawasaki and K. 'i. Saikawa, JCAP **1005**, 032 (2010) [arXiv:1002.1555 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [48] M. Kawasaki and K. 'i. Saikawa, JCAP **1109**, 008 (2011) [arXiv:1102.5628 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [49] T. Hiramatsu, M. Kawasaki and K. 'i. Saikawa, arXiv:1309.5001 [astro-ph.CO].
- [50] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5085 [astro-ph.CO].
- [51] K. S. Jeong and F. Takahashi, JHEP **1301**, 173 (2013) [arXiv:1210.4077 [hep-ph]].
- [52] I. Hinchliffe and T. Kaeding, Phys. Rev. D **47**, 279 (1993).