Minimal Left–Right Symmetric Dark Matter

Julian Heeck[1,*] and Sudhanwa Patra[2,3,†]

[1] *Service de Physique Théorique, Université Libre de Bruxelles, Boulevard du Triomphe, CP225, 1050 Brussels, Belgium*
[2] *Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany*
[3] *Center of Excellence in Theoretical and Mathematical Sciences, Siksha 'O' Anusandhan University, Bhubaneswar-751030, India*

We show that left–right symmetric models can easily accommodate stable TeV-scale dark matter particles without the need for an ad-hoc stabilizing symmetry. The stability of a newly introduced multiplet arises either accidentally as in the Minimal Dark Matter framework or comes courtesy of the remaining unbroken $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup of $B-L$. Only one new parameter is introduced: the mass of the new multiplet. As minimal examples we study left–right fermion triplets and quintuplets and show that they can form viable two-component dark matter. This approach is in particular valid for $SU(2)\times SU(2)\times U(1)$ models that explain the recent diboson excess at ATLAS in terms of a new charged gauge boson of mass 2 TeV.

PACS numbers: 12.60.Cn, 95.35.+d

arXiv:1507.01584v3 [hep-ph] 3 Sep 2015

I. INTRODUCTION

The discovery of a scalar boson at the LHC has fortified the credibility of the Standard Model (SM) that accounts for the fundamental interactions up to current accelerator energies. But its inadequacy in explaining non-zero neutrino masses, dark matter (DM), and the origin of the matter–antimatter asymmetry of the universe, compels us to extend its horizons.

In this regard, left–right (LR) symmetric models based on the gauge group $SU(2)_L\times SU(2)_R\times U(1)_{B-L}$ [1–6] seem appealing, as they provide a clear description of maximal parity violation and pave a path for naturally light neutrino masses. If the scale associated with the breaking of $SU(2)_R\times U(1)_{B-L}$ occurs at a few TeV, it leads to interesting collider signatures, neutrinoless double beta decay and lepton flavor violation. As of now, however, the mystery of DM still remains to be addressed within LR models. Lowering the mass of one of the right-handed neutrinos to the keV scale can potentially make it a valid long-lived warm DM candidate [7, 8] – with interesting signatures in neutrino-mass searches [9] – but the approach is far from natural in LR models and requires a delicate production mechanism in the early universe.

In this letter, we explore the possibilities of having stable TeV-scale DM in left–right models. This is easily possible by introducing new multiplets that are either accidentally stable [10] or stabilized by the remaining discrete symmetry $U(1)_{B-L}\to\mathbb{Z}_2$ [11]. We will focus on fermionic triplets and quintuplets and show that they can indeed account for the dark matter abundance we observe.

II. LEFT–RIGHT MODELS

Under the LR gauge group $SU(2)_L\times SU(2)_R\times U(1)_{B-L}$ – omitting the $SU(3)_C$ factor for simplicity – the usual fermion content of the SM, plus right-handed neutrinos ν_R, falls into the following representations:

$$\ell_L\sim(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},-1)\,,\qquad q_L\sim(\mathbf{2},\mathbf{1},1/3)\,, \tag{1}$$
$$\ell_R\sim(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},-1)\,,\qquad q_R\sim(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{2},1/3)\,. \tag{2}$$

To break the symmetry spontaneously down to $U(1)_{\rm EM}$ and provide fermion masses, one usually introduces a bi-doublet H and two triplet scalars $\chi_{L,R}$

$$H\sim(\mathbf{2},\overline{\mathbf{2}},0)\,,\quad \chi_L\sim(\mathbf{3},\mathbf{1},-2)\,,\quad \chi_R\sim(\mathbf{1},\mathbf{3},-2)\,. \tag{3}$$

A non-zero vacuum expectation value of the neutral component of χ_R, $\langle\chi_R^0\rangle=v_R/\sqrt{2}$, breaks $SU(2)_R\times U(1)_{B-L}\to U(1)_Y$ at a scale above TeV to generate large Majorana masses for the right-handed neutrinos – leading to seesaw neutrino masses for the active neutrinos – and masses for the new gauge bosons W_R and Z_R:

$$M_{W_R}\simeq\frac{g_R}{\sqrt{2}}v_R\,,\qquad M_{Z_R}\simeq\frac{g_Rc_W}{\sqrt{\cos2\theta_W}}v_R\,, \tag{4}$$

further modified due to mixing with the left-handed gauge bosons induced by $\langle H\rangle$. While one typically assumes $g_R=g_L$ due to an additional LR exchange symmetry (parity or charge conjugation), this depends on the full breaking scheme, and so does the ratio $M_{Z_R}/M_{W_R}\simeq 1.7$ [12–15]. The generator of electric charge is given by

$$Q=T_L^3+T_R^3+\tfrac{1}{2}(B-L)\,, \tag{5}$$

where T_X^3 denotes the diagonal generator of $SU(2)_X$.

With the quantum numbers from above we see that $U(1)_{B-L}$ is actually broken down to a non-trivial $\mathbb{Z}_2$ subgroup by $\langle\chi_R^0\rangle$, under which all fermions are odd and all bosons are even.[1] Introducing a new fermion (scalar) multiplet with even (odd) $B-L$ charge hence automatically stabilizes the lightest component [11]. Another option is to introduce multiplets that are stable only at the renormalizable level because it is not possible to write

*Electronic address: julian.heeck@ulb.ac.be
†Electronic address: sudhanwa@mpi-hd.mpg.de

[1] Actually, one obtains a $\mathbb{Z}_6\cong\mathbb{Z}_2\times\mathbb{Z}_3$ subgroup, but the $\mathbb{Z}_3$ part is related to baryon number and not of interest here.

down dimension-4 operators that lead to decay, an idea known as Minimal Dark Matter (MDM) [10].

Let us list the simplest possibilities for stable particles in LR models. The chiral fermion multiplets

$$\phi_L \sim (\boldsymbol{2n+1}, \mathbf{1}, 0)\,, \qquad \phi_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \boldsymbol{2n+1}, 0)\,, \tag{6}$$

for $n \in \mathbb{N}$, share a common "Majorana" mass M due to LR exchange symmetry, which is split by radiative corrections. The left-handed multiplet is simply a MDM candidate [10, 16], while ϕ_R can have a different phenomenology depending on the W_R and Z_R masses, to be discussed below. Another option is a chiral bi-multiplet $(\boldsymbol{n}, \boldsymbol{n}, 0)$, which again allows for a Majorana mass. In particular, $(\boldsymbol{2n+1}, \boldsymbol{2n+1}, 0)$ bi-multiplets contain neutral components without hypercharge and are thus potentially safe from the stringent bounds of direct-detection experiments. Putting *real scalars* into the representations of Eq. (6) will not make them absolutely stable for all n, but only for large enough n in the MDM spirit. For example, $n = 1$ would allow for a ηH^2 coupling of the triplet scalar η, $n = 2$ for a $\eta\Delta^2$ coupling, so $n > 2$ is required. Higher-dimensional operators of the form ηH^4 or $\eta^3 H^2$, even if suppressed by the Planck scale, can however make the scalar η unstable even for $n > 2$, similar to the MDM case [10, 17].

For Dirac/complex fields we can write down many more possibilities. For example, a scalar stabilized by the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ can be obtained from the multiplets

$$\eta_L \sim (\mathbf{2}, \mathbf{1}, -1)\,, \qquad \eta_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1)\,, \tag{7}$$

which have many non-trivial couplings and a potentially interesting phenomenology. One can extend this to

$$\eta_L \sim (\boldsymbol{2k}, \mathbf{1}, 2m+1)\,, \qquad \eta_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \boldsymbol{2k}, 2m+1)\,, \tag{8}$$

ensuring that it contains a neutral component.

A thorough study of all these candidates has to be postponed to a longer article [18]. Below we will study only the simplest possibility, fermion triplets and quintuplets.[2] We stress that the above approach works for quite general $SU(2)_1 \times SU(2)_2 \times U(1)'$ models, not necessarily LR symmetric. In those cases, the masses of the left- and right-handed multiplets need not be the same, nor does one need to introduce both. Since the gauge couplings are typically also unrestricted in more general models, there is a huge parameter space to be explored. We focus on the most restrictive case of LR symmetry in order to reduce the number of free parameters.

III. MINIMAL MODEL

Let us take a look at the LR fermion multiplets from Eq. (6). Seeing as it only introduces one additional parameter, the common mass M, it can be considered the minimal LR DM. For each multiplet ϕ_X one can write down a Majorana mass term, and due to the LR exchange symmetry (parity) $\phi_L \leftrightarrow \phi_R$, both multiplets are degenerate:

$$\mathcal{L}_\phi = \sum_{X=L,R} \left[i\overline{\phi}_X \not{D} P_X \phi_X - \frac{M}{2}\left(\overline{\phi}^c_X P_X \phi_X + \text{h.c.}\right)\right]. \tag{9}$$

Here, $P_{R,L} \equiv (1 \pm \gamma_5)/2$ are the usual chiral projection operators. The charged components of each multiplet ϕ_X form massive Dirac fermions $\Psi^m_X \equiv \phi^m_X + (-1)^m(\phi^{-m}_X)^c$, $m = 1, \ldots, n$ – where Ψ^m_X has electric charge m – while the neutral ones are Majorana $\Psi^0_X \equiv \phi^0_X + (\phi^0_X)^c$. (Note that one obtains two stable particles here, one from each $SU(2)$. In principle only the lightest of the two is absolutely stable – due to the $\mathbb{Z}_2^{B-L}$ – but since mixing terms only arise at the non-renormalizable level, e.g. $\phi_L H H \phi_R/\Lambda$, we accidentally end up with two-component DM.) The gauge couplings of the mass eigenstates are

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_\phi \supset \sum_{X=L,R} \Bigg[& g_X \sum_{m=1}^{n} \left(m \overline{\Psi}^m_X \not{W}^3_X \Psi^m_X \right) \\ & + \frac{g_X}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{n-1} c_{n,m} \overline{\Psi}^{m+1}_X \not{W}^+_X \Psi^m_X + \text{h.c.} \right) \Bigg],\end{aligned} \tag{10}$$

with $c_{n,m} \equiv \sqrt{(n+m+1)(n-m)}$. As always, the gauge eigenstates $W_{L,R}$ mix into the mass eigenstates $W^\pm_{1,2}$, $Z_{1,2}$, and γ [20].

A. Mass splitting

The masses within each multiplet Ψ_X will be split by radiative corrections. For the left-handed multiplet this is well known and increases the mass of the charged components by $166\,\text{MeV}\,Q^2$, so the lightest component of Ψ_L is neutral [21]. Neglecting the small LR gauge boson mixing angles, we find the mass-splitting formula for the right-handed multiplet Ψ_R

$$\begin{aligned}M_Q - M_0 \simeq \frac{\alpha_2 M}{4\pi} Q^2 \big[& f(r_{W_R}) - c^2_M f(r_{Z_2}) \\ & - s^2_W s^2_M f(r_{Z_1}) - s^2_W f(r_\gamma)\big]\,,\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

where $s_M = \sin\theta_M \equiv \tan\theta_W$ [20], $r_X = M_X/M$, and

$$f(r) \equiv 2\int_0^1 \mathrm{d}x\,(1+x)\log\left[x^2 + (1-x)r^2\right]. \tag{12}$$

The main difference to the left-handed mass splitting is the different ratio of $M_{Z_2}/M_{W_R} \simeq 1.7$ due to the dominant triplet vacuum expectation value – compared to the SM doublet case $M_{Z_1}/M_{W_L} \simeq 1.14$. This drives the mass splitting negative for $M \gtrsim 0.9\,M_{W_R}$ (see Fig. 1), which would lead to unwanted charged DM. In a model with $M_{Z_2}/M_{W_R} = 1.5$, the valid region would be extended to $M \lesssim 3.5\,M_{W_R}$, so the gauge boson mass ratio has a huge impact on the valid DM parameter space.

[2] Note that the embedding of the triplet into LR models makes it exactly stable. This is not the case in MDM, unless one imposes $B - L$ as a symmetry [19].




FIG. 1: Mass splitting for the right-handed triplet ϕ_R.

B. Relic density

Extending the LR model implementation for `CalcHep` of Ref. [22] by our new particles and interactions, we can evaluate the relic density Ω_R of Ψ_R^0 numerically using `micrOMEGAs` [23, 24]. The left-handed abundance Ω_L is more difficult to calculate because of strong Sommerfeld enhancement [25]; we will merely show the results from Refs. [26, 27], which should still be valid in our case provided the mixing between the left and right gauge bosons is small. The final abundance is then simply the sum

$$\Omega h^2 = \Omega_L h^2 + \Omega_R h^2 \,, \tag{13}$$

to be compared to the value measured by Planck [28]: $\Omega_{\rm obs} h^2 = 0.1199 \pm 0.0027$.

The results are shown for $n = 1$ (wino-like triplet) and for $n = 2$ (quintuplet) in Fig. 3 for various values of M_{W_R}. (Higher values of n will lower the Landau pole of the theory, but can be studied in the same way.) The left-handed abundance Ω_L provides an upper bound of $M \lesssim 3\,\text{TeV}$ (10 TeV) for the fermion triplet (quintuplet); clearly visible are the structures that arise due to Sommerfeld enhancement [25]. Additional resonances due to gauge boson mixing from W_R and Z_R would appear in a full analysis. While this can have some quantitative impact, it does not change the overall picture. (A resonance at the right place could for example allow for a heavier M than allowed in standard MDM.) Let us instead focus on the right-handed abundance to see the possible effects.

For $M \lesssim M_{W_R}/4$, the relevant annihilation channel is $\Psi_R^{+,++}\Psi_R^{-,--} \to$ SM; for $M \gtrsim M_{W_R}/4$, the depletion channel through s-channel co-annihilation via the W_R opens up (Fig. 2), clearly visible in Fig. 3 at the resonance $M \sim M_{W_R}/2$. Around $M \sim M_{Z_R}/2$ the s-channel Z_R resonance appears, which depletes the charged components of Ψ_R. Since the scattering $\Psi_R^0 f \leftrightarrow \Psi_R^+ f'$ (Fig. 2) is fast in this region, it effectively also depletes the neutral component. In the region $M \gtrsim 0.9\, M_{W_R}$ one would have charged DM because the mass splitting is negative, so it is not valid (dashed curves in Fig. 3). However, in models with $M_{Z_R}/M_{W_R} < 1.7$ one can consider larger M and eventually even reach a region $M > M_{Z_R}/\alpha_R$ where Sommerfeld enhancement will be important.

Overall, we see from Fig. 4 that one can easily realize the measured relic density in this minimal (two-component) LR DM scenario with $M_{Z_R}/M_{W_R} = 1.7$, provided $M_{W_R} \geq 2.35\,\text{TeV}$ for the triplet case ($M_{W_R} \geq$ 3.43 TeV for quintuplets). Lower values for M_{W_R} are possible for models with $M_{Z_R}/M_{W_R} < 1.7$, which look qualitatively similar. Additional constraints on M_{W_R} arise from collider searches [29], which are however more model dependent and thus not shown in Fig. 4.




FIG. 2: Co-annihilation channels $\Psi_R^m \bar{\Psi}_R^{m+1} \to f f'$. The rotated diagram is relevant for the scattering $\Psi_R^0 f \leftrightarrow \Psi_R^+ f'$.

DM detection signatures will be similar to the MDM case (see e.g. Ref. [26]), and one always has the subcomponent of left-handed MDM for which limits already exist. Loop-induced scattering of MDM off nucleons is rare [30, 31] and will not increase with the heavier gauge bosons of LR DM. Indirect detection via $\Psi_L^0 \Psi_L^0 \to \gamma\gamma$, γZ, WW is more promising and H.E.S.S. already excludes $M \gtrsim 1.6\,\text{TeV}$ for triplet MDM with an Einasto profile (much weaker bounds possible for other profiles) [27]. A similar analysis will constrain the quintuplet [32], but of course these bounds weaken if MDM is only a subcomponent of DM. The LHC implications of LR dark matter are particularly interesting in the case $M < M_{W_R}/2$, as they modify the W_R decay and allow for DM studies at the LHC if W_R is observed. All of this will be explored in a future study [18].

C. Diboson excess

Lastly, let us comment on the tantalizing diboson excess recently observed in ATLAS [33], which has spawned many explanations in terms of LR-related models [34–39].[3] In short, a new W' gauge boson with mass $M_{W'} \sim 2\,\text{TeV}$ and couplings to quarks $g_R \sim 0.4$–0.6 can explain the resonance observed in the $W' \to WZ \to$ jets channel, with signals in ZZ and WW due to jet misconstructions.[4] A potentially compatible small excess slightly below 2 TeV has also been seen in CMS [40, 41].

Any of the $SU(2)_1 \times SU(2)_2 \times U(1)'$ models aimed at explaining the diboson excess can be extended to include DM in the way outlined above. From Fig. 4 we see however that one needs to deviate from the relation $M_{Z_R} \simeq 1.7\, M_{W_R}$ in order to reach the measured abundance for $M_{W_R} = 2\,\text{TeV}$. This is possible in more general models and then allows for triplet DM with $M \simeq 2.3\,\text{TeV}$ or quintuplet DM with $M \simeq 4.2\,\text{TeV}$. The triplet case is actually already excluded by H.E.S.S. for all realistic DM profiles, because the mass falls exactly in the Sommerfeld enhanced region [27]. We are hence drawn to quintuplet DM, dominantly consisting of Ψ_R. Since the gauge couplings in such a generalized model deviate from $g_R = g_L$,

[3] Ref. [38] also commented on possible DM implications of the diboson solution, but very different from our full-model framework.

[4] The prediction of g_R close to 0.4–0.5 by embedding the LR model into an $SO(10)$ have been carried out recently in Refs. [12–15].




FIG. 3: Relic densities $\Omega_{L,R}$ for the LR fermion triplets (left) and quintuplets (right). Ω_L (black) includes the non-perturbative Sommerfeld enhancement and is taken from Refs. [26, 27]. Ω_R is shown for various M_{W_R} in red and blue; clearly visible are the W_R and Z_R resonances. The dashed part is invalid for the taken relation $M_{Z_R} = 1.7\, M_{W_R}$ because DM is electrically charged, but a smaller M_{Z_R}/M_{W_R} can make it valid. The horizontal green line corresponds to the measured value.

a model-dependent quantitative study is required to calculate the precise value of M and ensure a positive mass splitting.

A more exciting possibility arises when we consider the introduction of two or three generations of DM multiplets. For example, two ϕ_R triplets with mass around $M \sim 400\,\text{GeV}$ can give a valid relic density for $M_{W_R} = 2\,\text{TeV}$. Since they are lighter than the W_R, the decay channels $W_R^+ \to \Psi_R^0 \Psi_R^+$ open up, together yielding a large branching ratio of 40–50% (assuming $M_{\nu_R} \gg M_{W_R}$). This in effect weakens the bounds on g_R and allows for a true LR value $g_R = g_L$, as mentioned in Refs. [35, 38]. Not only do we then solve the DM problem, but the resolution of the diboson excess can be a step closer to a LR model.

With neutrino masses and dark matter taken care of, let us briefly mention the profound implications of a 2 TeV W_R gauge boson on leptogenesis (for details, see Refs. [42–46]). The observed baryon asymmetry of the universe could be explained via leptogenesis where a net lepton asymmetry is generated due to out-of-equilibrium decay of the heavy Majorana neutrinos. It has recently been noted [46] that the scattering processes $W_R^+ \ell_R^- \to W_R^- \ell_R^+$ through the doubly-charged scalar χ^{++} and heavy neutrinos ν_R – having few TeV masses – can be large enough to wash out any pre-existing lepton asymmetry.




FIG. 4: Valid relic density $\Omega_L + \Omega_R = \Omega_{\text{obs}}$ for fermion triplets (blue dots) and quintuplets (red diamonds). In the gray region the mass splitting is negative, so DM is electrically charged; this region would be allowed for $M_{Z_R}/M_{W_R} < 1.7$.

However, the lower bound on M_{W_R} can be 9.9 TeV with $g_L = g_R$ if flavored resonant leptogenesis is taken into account [47]. A fully flavor resonant leptogenesis might allow for a 2 TeV W_R gauge boson consistent with the diboson excess and other low scale constraints if one can consider smaller g_R values (e.g, $g_R/g_L \simeq 0.6$ [12–15]), as the prominent scattering process $W_R^+ \ell_R^- \to W_R^- \ell_R^+$ is now suppressed by at least a factor of $(g_R/g_L)^4 \simeq 8$. However, the detailed discussion is beyond the scope of this letter.

IV. CONCLUSION

Left–right symmetric models based on the gauge group $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ are theoretically appealing because they restore parity at high energies and naturally provide small neutrino masses. We have presented a simple approach to also obtain stable DM in these models. Our framework is very minimal, with only one additional parameter – the DM mass – and no need for an ad-hoc stabilizing symmetry. New fermion (boson) multiplets can be stable either because they are even (odd) under the remaining unbroken subgroup $\mathbb{Z}_2^{B-L}$, or because they are of high enough $SU(2)$ dimension that they can not decay using dimension-4 operators. The simplest examples are fermion multiplets $(\boldsymbol{2n+1}, \mathbf{1}, 0) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \boldsymbol{2n+1}, 0)$ with degenerate mass M due to LR exchange symmetry. The left-handed component then acts as standard MDM, while the right-handed multiplet can have a different phenomenology due to the unknown W_R and Z_R masses. The observed relic density can be obtained in a variety of ways with TeV-scale DM, with plenty of signatures to be explored in future work.

The recent diboson excess in ATLAS, as well as a handful other excesses around the same mass in various channels, has spawned many explanations in terms of LR models with $M_{W_R} \simeq 2\,\text{TeV}$. All of them can potentially be extended to solve the DM issue in the way outlined here. The observation of a 2 TeV W_R gauge boson implies low scale $B-L$ violation which could be the first direct evidence for baryon and lepton number violation in nature and can have a strong implications on the generation of neutrino masses and the observed baryon asymmetry of the Universe.

Acknowledgements

JH is very grateful to Camilo Garcia-Cely and Michel Tytgat for enlightening discussions and comments on the manuscript. The work of JH is funded in part by IISN and by Belgian Science Policy (IAP VII/37). The work of SP is partially supported by the Department of Science and Technology, Govt. of India under the financial grant SB/S2/HEP-011/2013 and by the Max Planck Society in the project MANITOP.

Note added: During the publication process of this letter new analyzes appeared that derive indirect detection constraints of the MDM quintuplet and hence also constrain the LR version discussed here [48, 49].

[1] R. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, "*A Natural Left-Right Symmetry*," Phys.Rev. **D11** (1975) 2558.

[2] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, "*Lepton Number as the Fourth Color*," Phys.Rev. **D10** (1974) 275–289.

[3] G. Senjanović and R. N. Mohapatra, "*Exact Left-Right Symmetry and Spontaneous Violation of Parity*," Phys.Rev. **D12** (1975) 1502.

[4] G. Senjanović, "*Spontaneous Breakdown of Parity in a Class of Gauge Theories*," Nucl.Phys. **B153** (1979) 334–364.

[5] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, "*Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Violation*," Phys.Rev.Lett. **44** (1980) 912.

[6] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, "*Neutrino Masses and Mixings in Gauge Models with Spontaneous Parity Violation*," Phys.Rev. **D23** (1981) 165.

[7] F. Bezrukov, H. Hettmansperger, and M. Lindner, "*keV sterile neutrino Dark Matter in gauge extensions of the Standard Model*," Phys.Rev. **D81** (2010) 085032, arXiv:0912.4415.

[8] M. Nemevsek, G. Senjanović, and Y. Zhang, "*Warm Dark Matter in Low Scale Left-Right Theory*," JCAP **1207** (2012) 006, arXiv:1205.0844.

[9] J. Barry, J. Heeck, and W. Rodejohann, "*Sterile neutrinos and right-handed currents in KATRIN*," JHEP **1407** (2014) 081, arXiv:1404.5955.

[10] M. Cirelli, N. Fornengo, and A. Strumia, "*Minimal dark matter*," Nucl.Phys. **B753** (2006) 178–194, arXiv:hep-ph/0512090.

[11] J. Heeck, "*Lepton Number Violation with and without Majorana Neutrinos*," arXiv:1503.07708.

[12] F. F. Deppisch, T. E. Gonzalo, S. Patra, N. Sahu, and U. Sarkar, "*Signal of Right-Handed Charged Gauge Bosons at the LHC?*," Phys.Rev. **D90** (2014) 053014, arXiv:1407.5384.

[13] M. Heikinheimo, M. Raidal, and C. Spethmann, "*Testing Right-Handed Currents at the LHC*," Eur.Phys.J. **C74** (2014) 3107, arXiv:1407.6908.

[14] F. F. Deppisch, T. E. Gonzalo, S. Patra, N. Sahu, and U. Sarkar, "*Double beta decay, lepton flavor violation, and collider signatures of left-right symmetric models with spontaneous D-parity breaking*," Phys.Rev. **D91** (2015) 015018, arXiv:1410.6427.

[15] S. Patra, F. S. Queiroz, and W. Rodejohann, "*Stringent Dilepton Bounds on Left-Right Models using LHC data*," arXiv:1506.03456.

[16] M. Cirelli and A. Strumia, "*Minimal Dark Matter: Model and results*," New J.Phys. **11** (2009) 105005, arXiv:0903.3381.

[17] L. Di Luzio, R. Gröber, J. F. Kamenik, and M. Nardecchia, "*Accidental matter at the LHC*," JHEP **07** (2015) 074, arXiv:1504.00359.

[18] C. Garcia-Cely, J. Heeck, and S. Patra, "*Phenomenology of left–right symmetric dark matter.*" In preparation.

[19] M. Cirelli, F. Sala, and M. Taoso, "*Wino-like Minimal Dark Matter and future colliders*," JHEP **10** (2014) 033, arXiv:1407.7058. [Erratum: JHEP01,041(2015)].

[20] P. Duka, J. Gluza, and M. Zrałek, "*Quantization and renormalization of the manifest left-right symmetric model of electroweak interactions*," Annals Phys. **280** (2000) 336–408, arXiv:hep-ph/9910279.

[21] J. L. Feng, T. Moroi, L. Randall, M. Strassler, and S.-f. Su, "*Discovering supersymmetry at the Tevatron in wino LSP scenarios*," Phys.Rev.Lett. **83** (1999) 1731–1734, arXiv:hep-ph/9904250.

[22] A. Roitgrund, G. Eilam, and S. Bar-Shalom, "*Implementation of the left-right symmetric model in FeynRules/CalcHep*," arXiv:1401.3345.

[23] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, "*MicrOMEGAs 2.0: A Program to calculate the relic density of dark matter in a generic model*," Comput.Phys.Commun. **176** (2007) 367–382, arXiv:hep-ph/0607059.

[24] G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, "*micrOMEGAs 3: A program for calculating dark matter observables*," Comput.Phys.Commun. **185** (2014) 960–985, arXiv:1305.0237.

[25] J. Hisano, S. Matsumoto, M. Nagai, O. Saito, and M. Senami, "*Non-perturbative effect on thermal relic abundance of dark matter*," Phys.Lett. **B646** (2007) 34–38, arXiv:hep-ph/0610249.

[26] M. Cirelli, A. Strumia, and M. Tamburini, "*Cosmology and Astrophysics of Minimal Dark Matter*," Nucl.Phys. **B787** (2007) 152–175, arXiv:0706.4071.

[27] T. Cohen, M. Lisanti, A. Pierce, and T. R. Slatyer, "*Wino Dark Matter Under Siege*," JCAP **1310** (2013) 061, arXiv:1307.4082.

[28] **Planck**, P. Ade *et al.*, "*Planck 2013 results. XVI. Cosmological parameters*," Astron.Astrophys. **571** (2014) A16, arXiv:1303.5076.

[29] **CMS**, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, "*Search for heavy neutrinos and* W *bosons with right-handed couplings in proton-proton collisions at* $\sqrt{s} = 8$ *TeV*," Eur.Phys.J. **C74** (2014) 3149, arXiv:1407.3683.

[30] J. Hisano, K. Ishiwata, N. Nagata, and T. Takesako, "*Direct Detection of Electroweak-Interacting Dark Matter*," JHEP **07** (2011) 005, arXiv:1104.0228.

[31] M. Cirelli, E. Del Nobile, and P. Panci, "*Tools for model-independent bounds in direct dark matter searches*," JCAP **1310** (2013) 019, arXiv:1307.5955.

[32] M. Aoki, T. Toma, and A. Vicente, "*Non-thermal Production of Minimal Dark Matter via Right-handed Neutrino Decay*," arXiv:1507.01591.

[33] **ATLAS**, G. Aad *et al.*, "*Search for high-mass diboson resonances with boson-tagged jets in proton-proton collisions at* $\sqrt{s} = 8$ *TeV with the ATLAS detector*," arXiv:1506.00962.

[34] K. Cheung, W.-Y. Keung, P.-Y. Tseng, and T.-C. Yuan, "*Interpretations of the ATLAS Diboson Anomaly*," arXiv:1506.06064.

[35] B. A. Dobrescu and Z. Liu, "*A* W' *boson near 2 TeV: predictions for Run 2 of the LHC*," arXiv:1506.06736.

[36] J. Aguilar-Saavedra, "*Triboson interpretations of the ATLAS diboson excess*," arXiv:1506.06739.

[37] Y. Gao, T. Ghosh, K. Sinha, and J.-H. Yu, "*G221 Interpretations of the Diboson and Wh Excesses*," arXiv:1506.07511.

[38] J. Brehmer, J. Hewett, J. Kopp, T. Rizzo, and J. Tattersall, "*Symmetry Restored in Dibosons at the LHC?*," arXiv:1507.00013.

[39] Q.-H. Cao, B. Yan, and D.-M. Zhang, "*Simple Non-Abelian Extensions and Diboson Excesses at the LHC*," arXiv:1507.00268.

[40] **CMS**, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, "*Search for massive resonances in dijet systems containing jets tagged as W or Z boson decays in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s}$ = 8 TeV*," JHEP **1408** (2014) 173, arXiv:1405.1994.

[41] **CMS**, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, "*Search for massive resonances decaying into pairs of boosted bosons in semi-leptonic final states at $\sqrt{s}$ = 8 TeV*," JHEP **1408** (2014) 174, arXiv:1405.3447.

[42] S. Carlier, J.-M. Frère, and F. Ling, "*Gauge dilution and leptogenesis*," Phys.Rev. **D60** (1999) 096003, arXiv:hep-ph/9903300.

[43] J.-M. Frère, T. Hambye, and G. Vertongen, "*Is leptogenesis falsifiable at LHC?*," JHEP **0901** (2009) 051, arXiv:0806.0841.

[44] F. F. Deppisch, J. Harz, and M. Hirsch, "*Falsifying High-Scale Leptogenesis at the LHC*," Phys.Rev.Lett. **112** (2014) 221601, arXiv:1312.4447.

[45] P. Bhupal Dev, C.-H. Lee, and R. Mohapatra, "*Leptogenesis Constraints on the Mass of Right-handed Gauge Bosons*," Phys.Rev. **D90** (2014) no. 9, 095012, arXiv:1408.2820.

[46] M. Dhuria, C. Hati, R. Rangarajan, and U. Sarkar, "*Falsifying leptogenesis for a TeV scale $W_R^{\pm}$ at the LHC*," Phys. Rev. **D92** (2015) 031701, arXiv:1503.07198.

[47] P. S. Bhupal Dev, C.-H. Lee, and R. N. Mohapatra, "*TeV Scale Lepton Number Violation and Baryogenesis*," J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **631** (2015) no. 1, 012007, arXiv:1503.04970.

[48] M. Cirelli, T. Hambye, P. Panci, F. Sala, and M. Taoso, "*Gamma ray tests of Minimal Dark Matter*," arXiv:1507.05519.

[49] C. Garcia-Cely, A. Ibarra, A. S. Lamperstorfer, and M. H. G. Tytgat, "*Gamma-rays from Heavy Minimal Dark Matter*," arXiv:1507.05536.