

Explaining the 3.5 keV X-ray Line in a $L_\mu - L_\tau$ Extension of the Inert Doublet Model

Anirban Biswas^{*,1,†} Sandhya Choubey^{1,2,‡} Laura Covi^{3,§} and Sarif Khan^{1,¶}

¹*Harish-Chandra Research Institute, HBNI,*

Chhatnag Road, Jhansi, Allahabad 211 019, India

²*Department of Physics, School of Engineering Sciences,*

KTH Royal Institute of Technology, AlbaNova University Center, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

³*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Georg-August University Göttingen,*

Friedrich-Hund-Platz 1, Göttingen, D-37077 Germany

Abstract

We explain the existence of neutrino masses and their flavour structure, dark matter relic abundance and the observed 3.5 keV X-ray line within the framework of a gauged $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ extension of the “scotogenic” model. In the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ symmetric limit, two of the RH neutrinos are degenerate in mass, while the third is heavier. The $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ symmetry is broken spontaneously. Firstly, this breaks the $\mu - \tau$ symmetry in the light neutrino sector. Secondly, this results in mild splitting of the two degenerate RH neutrinos, with their mass difference given in terms of the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ breaking parameter. Finally, we get a massive $Z_{\mu\tau}$ gauge boson. Due to the added Z_2 symmetry under which the RH neutrinos and the inert doublet are odd, the canonical Type-I seesaw is forbidden and the tiny neutrino masses are generated radiatively at one loop. The same Z_2 symmetry also ensures that the lightest RH neutrino is stable and the other two can only decay into the lightest one. This makes the two nearly-degenerate lighter neutrinos a two-component dark matter, which in our model are produced by the freeze-in mechanism via the decay of the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ gauge boson in the early universe. We show that the next-to-lightest RH neutrino has a very long lifetime and decays into the lightest one at the present epoch explaining the observed 3.5 keV line.

* Presently at Department of Physics, IIT Guwahati, Guwahati, Assam, India 781039

†Electronic address: anirban.biswas.sinp@gmail.com

‡Electronic address: sandhya@hri.res.in

§Electronic address: laura.covi@theorie.physik.uni-goettingen.de

¶Electronic address: sarifkhan@hri.res.in

I. INTRODUCTION

Experimental proof of non-zero neutrino masses and mixing as well as the dark matter in the universe remain the two most compelling evidences of the existence of physics beyond the standard model. Different neutrino oscillation experiments have confirmed the existence of flavour oscillations which can be explained only if neutrinos have tiny masses and mixing [1–3]. On the other hand, observations of the flatness of the galaxy rotation curve [4], gravitational lensing [5], cosmic microwave background anisotropy [6, 7] and more recently the observation of bullet cluster by NASA’s Chandra Satellite [8] demand that there must a non-baryonic component of matter in the universe, usually referred to as dark matter (DM). One of the most promising particle DM candidate is the Weakly Interacting Massive Particles (WIMP). However, the null result from the different earth and satellite-based direct and indirect DM searches have put severe constraints on the WIMP paradigm [9, 10]. One of the popular ways of shaking off the constraints from the direct and indirect DM searches is to postulate that the interaction strength of the DM with the standard model particles is extremely feeble. Such DM candidates go by the generic name Feebly Interacting Massive Particles (FIMP) [11–23]. Since their coupling with the standard model particles is feeble, they remain out of thermal equilibrium during the early universe when they are produced. Hence, these non-thermal particles are produced by the so-called freeze-in [11] mechanism instead of the freeze-out process which produces thermal relics.

More recently, the observation of an unknown 3.5 keV X-ray line in galaxies clusters [24, 25] and from the Galactic centre (GC) has been under much debate [26]. This excess has been confirmed by both the Chandra as well as NuSTAR satellites [26]. It has been argued that this signal can come from iron line background and S XVI charge exchange. Also such line has not been observed instead in stacked dwarf spheroidal galaxies [27], nor in galaxy spectra [28]. Nevertheless this signal has excited a lot of theoretical activity and can be explained by a plethora of theoretical models [29–58]. Generically it points towards a very weakly interacting Dark Matter like a light sterile neutrino, decaying into active neutrino and photon [59], but it can also arise from heavier DM particles in presence of mass degeneracy or from DM annihilation.

We address the issue of the observed neutrino masses and mixing, dark matter abundance of the universe and the 3.5 keV line within a BSM (Beyond SM) model, where we have naturally a two component Dark Matter and a nearly degenerate long-lived state. We extend the SM gauge group by an anomaly free local $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ symmetry [60–63]. We break this gauge symmetry spontaneously by introducing in the model a SM singlet scalar charged under $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$. The mass of the resultant neutral gauge boson is given in terms of the new gauge coupling and vacuum expectation value (VEV) of this scalar. Also included in the model are three RH neutrinos and a SM (inert) doublet scalar, both of which carry -1 charge with respect to an additional Z_2 symmetry, while all other particles carry charge $+1$. This forbids all Yukawa couplings of this

doublet with the SM fermions (thereby earning the name, inert doublet) and the only Yukawa term where it appears is the one with the RH neutrinos. The Z_2 symmetry also forbids the normal Yukawa coupling involving the lepton doublets, RH neutrinos and the SM Higgs doublet. On the other hand, the allowed Yukawa coupling between the lepton doublets, RH neutrinos and the inert doublet does not lead to a Dirac-like mass term since the inert doublet does not take a VEV. As a result, light neutrino masses via Type-I seesaw is forbidden. However, the light neutrinos get mass radiatively at one-loop, where the RH neutrinos and the inert doublet run in the loop [64]. The RH neutrinos protected by the Z_2 symmetry become the dark matter of the universe. The Z_2 symmetry allows the RH neutrinos to be coupled only to the Higgs sector and the $Z_{\mu\tau}$. We invoke a non-thermal production mechanism for the generation of DM in the early universe via the freeze-in mechanism [11] wherein the RH neutrinos are mainly produced by out-of-equilibrium decays of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ gauge bosons.

The 3.5 keV γ line can be explained by the decay of a heavy RH neutrino to another RH neutrino if the two states are nearly degenerate and the mass splitting is 3.5 keV [47, 49]. Moreover the lifetime of the next-to-lightest neutrino has to be sufficiently long. Both conditions are naturally realised in our scenario. Indeed we will see that in the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ symmetric limit, the $L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry enforces two completely degenerate states and one heavier state for the RH mass spectrum in our model. The two lighter degenerate RH neutrino states play the role of a two-component dark matter. The spontaneous breaking of $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ results in a small mass splitting between the two degenerate RH neutrinos, determined by the symmetry breaking scale and Yukawa couplings of the RH neutrinos. The lifetime of the heavier state is longer than the age of the Universe due both to the phase-space suppression and to the small parameters needed to explain the light neutrino masses.

The rest of the article is organised in the following way. In Section II we describe the model in detail. In Section III, we discuss the effect of $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ and its breaking on the RH neutrino mass spectrum. In Section IV we present our formalism for the freeze-in production of the RH neutrino DM. In section we show our results on the DM relic abundance and discuss all aspects related to it. In Section V and Section VI we will present our DM results and explain the origin of 3.5 keV line in our model from the RH neutrino decay respectively. We finally conclude in Section VII.

II. MODEL

The complete gauge group in our model is, $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$. In addition to the SM particles, we augment our model with a SM scalar doublet, a SM scalar singlet and three RH neutrinos. We also impose a \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry to make the additional doublet inert. The \mathbb{Z}_2 charge of the RH neutrinos are also taken to be -1 to keep them stable, such that they could be dark

matter candidates. The complete fermionic and scalar particle content of the model and their corresponding charges under the different symmetry groups are shown in Tables I and II:

Gauge	Baryon Fields			Lepton Fields			Scalar Fields		
Group	$Q_L^i = (u_L^i, d_L^i)^T$	u_R^i	d_R^i	$L_L^i = (\nu_L^i, e_L^i)^T$	e_R^i	N_R^i	ϕ_h	ϕ_H	η
$SU(2)_L$	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	1	2
$U(1)_Y$	1/6	2/3	-1/3	-1/2	-1	0	1/2	0	1/2
\mathbb{Z}_2	+	+	+	+	+	-	+	+	-

Table I: Particle contents and their corresponding charges under SM gauge group and discrete group \mathbb{Z}_2 .

Gauge	Baryonic Fields	Lepton Fields			Scalar Fields		
Group	(Q_L^i, u_R^i, d_R^i)	(L_L^e, e_R, N_R^e)	$(L_L^\mu, \mu_R, N_R^\mu)$	$(L_L^\tau, \tau_R, N_R^\tau)$	ϕ_h	ϕ_H	η
$U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$	0	0	1	-1	0	1	0

Table II: Particle contents and their corresponding charges under $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$.

The complete Lagrangian \mathcal{L} for the present model is as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} = & \mathcal{L}_{SM} + \mathcal{L}_N + (D_\mu \phi_H)^\dagger (D^\mu \phi_H) + (D_\mu \eta)^\dagger (D^\mu \eta) + \sum_{j=\mu, \tau} Q^j \bar{L}_j \gamma_\rho L_j Z_{\mu\tau}^\rho \\
& - \frac{1}{4} F_{\mu\tau\rho\sigma} F_{\mu\tau}^{\rho\sigma} - V(\phi_h, \phi_H, \eta),
\end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where ϕ_h and η are two $SU(2)_L$ doublets while ϕ_H is a scalar singlet. Moreover, $Q^j = 1(-1)$ for $j = \mu(\tau)$ where $L_j = (\nu_j \ j)^T$. Here, one of the scalar doublets namely η which is odd under \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry, does not have any Yukawa interaction involving only SM fermions and acts like an inert doublet. For the same symmetry reason it does not have any VEV. The field strength tensor for the extra neutral gauge field $Z_{\mu\tau}$ corresponding to gauge group $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ is denoted by $F_{\mu\tau}$. In principle we should include a mixing term between the SM neutral gauge boson Z and the new neutral gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$. The experimental bound restricts this mixing to be $< 10^{-3}$ br the LEP II [65, 66]. In this work we assume no mixing between the neutral gauge bosons of SM and $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$. Indeed, if such mixing is generated at the loop level, we expect it to be

suppressed not only by loop factors, but also by the gauge coupling $g_{\mu\tau}$ ¹ rendering it negligible in our discussion. The Lagrangian for the three RH neutrinos \mathcal{L}_N after obeying all the symmetry has the following form,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{L}_N = & \sum_{i=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{i}{2} \bar{N}_i \gamma^\mu D_\mu N_i - \frac{1}{2} M_{ee} \bar{N}_e^c N_e - \frac{1}{2} M_{\mu\tau} (\bar{N}_\mu^c N_\tau + \bar{N}_\tau^c N_\mu) \\ & - \frac{1}{2} h_{e\mu} (\bar{N}_e^c N_\mu + \bar{N}_\mu^c N_e) \phi_H^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} h_{e\tau} (\bar{N}_e^c N_\tau + \bar{N}_\tau^c N_e) \phi_H \\ & - \sum_{\alpha=e,\mu,\tau} h_\alpha \bar{L}_\alpha \tilde{\eta} N_\alpha + h.c. ,\end{aligned}\tag{2}$$

where $\tilde{\eta} = i\sigma_2 \eta^*$. The potential $V(\phi_h, \phi_H, \eta)$ in Eq. (1) contains all possible interaction terms involving the two SM scalar doublets and one SM scalar singlet,

$$\begin{aligned}V(\phi_h, \phi_H, \eta) = & -\mu_H^2 \phi_H^\dagger \phi_H - \mu_h^2 \phi_h^\dagger \phi_h + \mu_\eta^2 \eta^\dagger \eta + \lambda_1 (\phi_h^\dagger \phi_h)^2 + \lambda_2 (\eta^\dagger \eta)^2 + \lambda_3 (\phi_H^\dagger \phi_H)^2 \\ & + \lambda_{12} (\phi_h^\dagger \phi_h) (\eta^\dagger \eta) + \lambda_{13} (\phi_h^\dagger \phi_h) (\phi_H^\dagger \phi_H) + \lambda_{23} (\phi_H^\dagger \phi_H) (\eta^\dagger \eta) + \lambda_4 (\phi_h^\dagger \eta) (\eta^\dagger \phi_h) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_5 \left((\phi_h^\dagger \eta)^2 + h.c. \right) .\end{aligned}\tag{3}$$

After spontaneous breaking of $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ and $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$, the scalars take the following form,

$$\phi_h = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{v+H}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi_H = \begin{pmatrix} v_{\mu\tau} + H_{\mu\tau} \\ \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^+ \\ \frac{\eta_R^0 + i\eta_I^0}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} .\tag{4}$$

There is mixing between the neutral components of ϕ_h and ϕ_H , and the off diagonal elements of the mass matrix are proportional to the parameter λ_{13} . After diagonalising the mass matrix one obtains two physical scalar states h_1 and h_2 . Masses of h_1 , h_2 and mixing angle α are given by

$$M_{h_1}^2 = \lambda_1 v^2 + \lambda_3 v_{\mu\tau}^2 - \sqrt{(\lambda_3 v_{\mu\tau}^2 - \lambda_1 v^2)^2 + (\lambda_{13} v v_{\mu\tau})^2} ,\tag{5}$$

$$M_{h_2}^2 = \lambda_1 v^2 + \lambda_3 v_{\mu\tau}^2 + \sqrt{(\lambda_3 v_{\mu\tau}^2 - \lambda_1 v^2)^2 + (\lambda_{13} v v_{\mu\tau})^2} ,\tag{6}$$

$$\tan 2\alpha = \frac{\lambda_{13} v_{\mu\tau} v}{\lambda_3 v_{\mu\tau}^2 - \lambda_1 v^2} .\tag{7}$$

The lighter Higgs state h_1 , for small mixing angle α and $v_{\mu\tau} \gg v$, behaves as the Standard Model Higgs observed at the LHC [67, 68] and therefore we will take its mass to be 125.5 GeV. From the

¹ In this work, to maintain the nonthermal nature of our DM candidates we consider $g_{\mu\tau} \sim 10^{-11}$ (see Section V).

above Eq. (5)-(7), we can also write down the quartic couplings in terms of the physical masses of the Higgses M_{h_1} and M_{h_2} and the mixing angle α . The expressions are as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_3 &= \frac{M_{h_1}^2 + M_{h_2}^2 + (M_{h_2}^2 - M_{h_1}^2) \cos 2\alpha}{4 v_{\mu\tau}^2}, \\ \lambda_1 &= \frac{M_{h_1}^2 + M_{h_2}^2 + (M_{h_1}^2 - M_{h_2}^2) \cos 2\alpha}{4 v^2}, \\ \lambda_{13} &= \frac{(M_{h_2}^2 - M_{h_1}^2) \cos \alpha \sin \alpha}{v v_{\mu\tau}},\end{aligned}\tag{8}$$

In order to obtain a stable *vacuum*, the quartic couplings need to satisfy the following inequalities,

$$\begin{aligned}\lambda_1 &\geq 0, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \lambda_3 \geq 0, \\ \lambda_{12} &\geq -2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}, \\ \lambda_{13} &\geq -2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_3}, \\ \lambda_{23} &\geq -2\sqrt{\lambda_2 \lambda_3}, \\ \lambda_{12} + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5| &\geq -2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}, \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{13} + 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_3}} \sqrt{\lambda_{23} + 2\sqrt{\lambda_2 \lambda_3}} \sqrt{\lambda_{12} + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5| + 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}} \\ &+ 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3} + \lambda_{13} \sqrt{\lambda_2} + \lambda_{23} \sqrt{\lambda_1} + (\lambda_{12} + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5|) \sqrt{\lambda_3} \geq 0, \\ \sqrt{\lambda_{13} + 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_3}} \sqrt{\lambda_{23} + 2\sqrt{\lambda_2 \lambda_3}} \sqrt{\lambda_{12} + 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2}} \\ &+ 2\sqrt{\lambda_1 \lambda_2 \lambda_3} + \lambda_{13} \sqrt{\lambda_2} + \lambda_{23} \sqrt{\lambda_1} + \lambda_{12} \sqrt{\lambda_3} \geq 0.\end{aligned}\tag{9}$$

As we will see in the result section (Section V), in our analysis the value of the extra singlet scalar *vev* is around 10^{14} GeV, mass of BSM Higgs $M_{h_2} = 5$ TeV and the mixing angle between the neutral components of Higgses $\alpha = 0.01$. Hence, we get the following values for the quartic couplings by using the Eq. (8),

$$\lambda_1 = 0.15, \quad \lambda_3 = 1.25 \times 10^{-21} \text{ and } \lambda_{13} = 1.01 \times 10^{-11}.\tag{10}$$

All the values of the quartic couplings as shown above are positive and in the present case the quartic couplings which are related to the inert doublet are free parameters (except λ_5 , which we have considered $\sim 10^{-3}$ to obtain light neutrino masses in sub-eV range), hence all the inequalities as prescribed in Eq. (9) are inevitably satisfied.

On the other hand the masses of the inert doublet components after symmetry breaking can

be expressed in the following form,

$$\begin{aligned}
M_{\eta^\pm}^2 &= \mu_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{12} v^2 + \lambda_{23} v_{\mu\tau}^2) , \\
M_{\eta_R^0}^2 &= \mu_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{23} v_{\mu\tau}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{12} + \lambda_4 + \lambda_5) v^2 , \\
M_{\eta_I^0}^2 &= \mu_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{23} v_{\mu\tau}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{12} + \lambda_4 - \lambda_5) v^2 ,
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

The mass term for the extra neutral gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$ is also generated when ϕ_H acquires a nonzero VEV $v_{\mu\tau}$ such that

$$M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = g_{\mu\tau} v_{\mu\tau} , \tag{12}$$

where $g_{\mu\tau}$ is the gauge coupling corresponding to gauge group $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$. In this model all three RH neutrinos are odd under the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry. However, the mass of N_1 comes out to be higher than that of N_2 and N_3 , so that N_1 can decay to the lighter RH neutrinos. Also, we will see in Section III that the masses of N_2 and N_3 are nearly degenerate because of the $L_\mu - L_\tau$ symmetry, so that both can play the role of dark matter candidate. Furthermore, in Section IV we will show that the RH neutrinos can be produced by the freeze-in mechanism in the early Universe, which requires a tiny gauge coupling $g_{\mu\tau} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-11})$. Thus, in order to have a TeV scale gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$ we need large $v_{\mu\tau}$. Therefore, by choosing appropriate values of the relevant model parameters we can make the masses of inert doublet components higher than the reheat temperature of the universe so that their effect on the production of N_2 and N_3 can be safely neglected.

III. HEAVY AND LIGHT NEUTRINO MASSES

In this section we will show how the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ symmetry determines the mass spectrum and mixing angles of all the six neutrinos, the three heavy ones as well as the three light ones. The relevant part of the Lagrangian was given in Eq. (2) where the first term gives the kinetic part while the rest give the mass terms and Yukawa terms involving the neutrinos. After $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ and electroweak symmetry breaking the mass matrix for the RH neutrinos is given by

$$\mathcal{M}_R = \begin{pmatrix} M_{ee} & \frac{v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}} h_{e\mu} & \frac{v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}} h_{e\tau} \\ \frac{v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}} h_{e\mu} & 0 & M_{\mu\tau} e^{i\xi} \\ \frac{v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}} h_{e\tau} & M_{\mu\tau} e^{i\xi} & 0 \end{pmatrix} , \tag{13}$$

where the terms involving the VEV $v_{\mu\tau}$ appear after $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ breaking. In the limit that $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ is unbroken, the RH neutrino mass matrix is given by

$$\mathcal{M}_R = \begin{pmatrix} M_{ee} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & M_{\mu\tau} e^{i\xi} \\ 0 & M_{\mu\tau} e^{i\xi} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

Eigenvalues of Eq. (14) are

$$\begin{aligned} M'_{2/3} &= \pm M_{\mu\tau} e^{i\xi} \\ M'_1 &= M_{ee}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

giving very naturally two degenerate RH neutrinos with opposite parity. The $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ breaking terms in Eq. (13) brings corrections to the RH neutrino mass spectrum, breaking the degeneracy between N_2 and N_3 . The mass splitting between them is given at first order for $M_{ee} \gg M_{\mu\tau}$ by

$$\Delta M_{23} = \frac{(h_{e\mu} + h_{e\tau})^2 v_{\mu\tau}^2}{2M_{ee}}. \quad (16)$$

Hence, the mass splitting between N_2 and N_3 depends on the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ breaking VEV $v_{\mu\tau}$ and the Yukawa couplings $h_{e\mu}$ and $h_{e\tau}$. In what follows, we will see that $v_{\mu\tau}$ will be determined by the choice of the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ gauge boson. However, the Yukawa couplings $h_{e\mu}$ and $h_{e\tau}$ can be suitably adjusted to yield a mass splitting of 3.5 keV, needed to explain the 3.5 keV X-ray line from $N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma$ decay.

Despite having the RH neutrinos in this model, the masses for light neutrinos cannot be generated by the Type-I seesaw mechanism since the normal Yukawa term involving the RH neutrinos, lepton doublets and the standard model Higgs ϕ_h is forbidden by the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry. The other Yukawa term between the RH neutrinos, lepton doublets and inert doublet η is allowed, but η does not take any VEV. Hence, there is no mass term for the light neutrinos at the tree-level. However, masses for the light neutrinos gets generated radiatively at the one-loop level [64] through the diagram shown in Fig. 1, giving the following mass matrix for the light neutrinos [64]

$$M_{ij}^\nu = \sum_k \frac{y_{ik} y_{jk} M_k}{16 \pi^2} \left[\frac{M_{\eta_R}^2}{M_{\eta_R}^2 - M_k^2} \ln \frac{M_{\eta_R}^2}{M_k^2} - \frac{M_{\eta_I}^2}{M_{\eta_I}^2 - M_k^2} \ln \frac{M_{\eta_I}^2}{M_k^2} \right], \quad (17)$$

where M_k is the mass of k^{th} RH neutrino while M_{η_R, η_I}^0 is the mass of $\eta_{R, I}^0$. The quantities $y_{ji} = h_j U_{ji}$, where h_j are the Yukawa couplings in the last term of Eq. (2) and U_{ji} are the




Figure 1: Radiative neutrino mass generation by one loop.

elements of the RH neutrino mixing matrix since the flavour basis (N_α , $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$) of the RH neutrinos and their mass basis (N_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$) are related by a unitary transformation, $N_\alpha = \sum U_{\alpha i} N_i$. If we put this relation into the last term of Eq. (2), one can write the Yukawa term involving SM leptons and RH neutrinos in the following way

$$\mathcal{L}_N \supset h_j \bar{L}_j \tilde{\eta} U_{ji} N_i = y_{ji} \bar{L}_j \tilde{\eta} N_i. \quad (18)$$

If we consider the mass square difference between η_R^0 and η_I^0 i.e. $M_{\eta_R^0}^2 - M_{\eta_I^0}^2 = \lambda_5 v^2 \ll M_0^2$ where $M_0^2 = (M_{\eta_R^0}^2 + M_{\eta_I^0}^2)/2$ then the above expression reduces to the following form,

$$M_{ij}^\nu = \frac{\lambda_5 v^2}{16\pi^2} \sum_k \frac{y_{ik} y_{jk} M_k}{M_0^2 - M_k^2} \left[1 - \frac{M_k^2}{M_0^2 - M_k^2} \ln \frac{M_0^2}{M_k^2} \right]. \quad (19)$$

In this work we have considered the masses of inert scalars greater than the reheat temperature of the Universe, i.e. $M_{\eta_{R,I}^0} \sim 10^6$ GeV. The masses of RH neutrinos we consider to be around ~ 100 GeV. If we take the parameter $\lambda_5 \sim 10^{-3}$ and $v = 246$ GeV, then to obtain the neutrino masses of the order of $M_\nu \sim 10^{-11}$ GeV, we need $y_{ji}^2 \sim 10^{-1}$ which can be easily obtained. The $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ breaking ensures that the mixing angle θ_{13} is non-zero and θ_{23} is non-maximal.

IV. PRODUCTION OF DARK MATTER

We consider the non-thermal production of dark matter candidates. Hence, the initial number densities of these particles are assumed to be negligibly small and their interactions with the particles in the thermal bath are also extremely feeble. As mentioned before, the lighter RH neutrino states N_2 and N_3 are our dark matter candidates, stabilised by the Z_2 symmetry. Because of their gauge and Z_2 charges they could be produced only through the decay of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ and h_1 ² and h_2 bosons. In what follows, we will see that the dominant production channel

² Since the mass of the SM-like Higgs has to be kept at 125.5 GeV, the decay channel $h_1 \rightarrow N_i N_j$ will be kinematically allowed only for lighter N_i/N_j masses.

for the RH neutrinos is via the decay of $Z_{\mu\tau}$. In order for the total abundances of N_2 , N_3 to match the observed DM relic density at the present epoch, the gauge coupling has to be small $g_{\mu\tau} \lesssim 10^{-11}$. Since all the interactions of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ are proportional to the gauge coupling $g_{\mu\tau}$, the requirement of such a tiny gauge coupling makes the additional neutral gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$ also decoupled from the thermal bath. Therefore, before computing the DM number density we first need to know the distribution function of mother particle $Z_{\mu\tau}$ by solving the relevant Boltzmann equation. The most general form of the Boltzmann equation describing the distribution function of any species can be expressed as,

$$\hat{L}[f] = \mathcal{C}[f] \quad (20)$$

where \hat{L} is the Liouville operator and f is the distribution function which we want to compute while in the RHS the term \mathcal{C} contains interaction processes which are responsible for changing the number density of the species under considering. \mathcal{C} is known as the collision term. If one considers an isotropic and homogeneous Universe then using the FRW metric, the Liouville operator³ takes the following form,

$$\hat{L} = \frac{\partial}{\partial t} - H p \frac{\partial}{\partial p}, \quad (21)$$

where p is magnitude of three momentum and H is the Hubble parameter. Now, we change the variables (p, t) to a new set of variables (ξ_p, r) using a transformation as mentioned in Ref. [19]

$$r = \frac{M_{sc}}{T}, \quad \xi_p = \left(\frac{g_s(T_0)}{g_s(T)} \right)^{1/3} \frac{p}{T}. \quad (22)$$

M_{sc} is some reference mass scale. Using the time-Temperature relationship $\frac{dT}{dt} = -H T \left(1 + \frac{T g'_s(T)}{3 g_s(T)} \right)^{-1}$, the Liouville operator defined in Eq. (21) can be reduced to the following form containing a derivative with respect to a single variable, i.e.

$$\hat{L} = r H \left(1 + \frac{T g'_s}{3 g_s} \right)^{-1} \frac{\partial}{\partial r} \quad (23)$$

where $g_s(T)$ and $g'_s(T)$ are the effective number of degrees of freedom (d.o.f) related to entropy of the Universe and its derivative with respect to the temperature T .

The Boltzmann equation to determine the distribution function ($f_{Z_{\mu\tau}}$) of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ is then given by,

$$\hat{L} f_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = \sum_{i=1,2} \mathcal{C}^{h_i \rightarrow Z_{\mu\tau} Z_{\mu\tau}} + \mathcal{C}^{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow all}, \quad (24)$$

³ General form of the Liouville operator is, $\hat{L} = p^\alpha \frac{\partial}{\partial x^\alpha} - \Gamma_{\beta\gamma}^\alpha p^\beta p^\gamma \frac{\partial}{\partial p^\alpha}$ where p^α is the four momentum and $\Gamma_{\beta\gamma}^\alpha$ is the affine connection by which gravitational interaction enters in the equation.

where the first term in the RHS represents the production of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ from the decays of scalars h_1 and h_2 while the second term describing the depletion of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ due to its all possible decay modes. The expressions of collision terms $\mathcal{C}^{h_i \rightarrow Z_{\mu\tau} Z_{\mu\tau}}$ and $\mathcal{C}^{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow \text{all}}$ are given in Appendix A. Note that generically also scattering processes, which change the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ number, are present, but those give a subleading contribution compared to the decay (see e.g. the Appendix of [51] for a discussion).

Once we numerically evaluate the non thermal momentum distribution of the gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$, we can easily determine the number density of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ using following relation

$$n_{Z_{\mu\tau}}(r) = \frac{g T^3}{2\pi^2} \mathcal{B}(r)^3 \int d\xi_p \xi_p^2 f_{Z_{\mu\tau}}(\xi_p, r), \quad (25)$$

where

$$\mathcal{B}(r) = \left(\frac{g_s(T_0)}{g_s(T)} \right)^{1/3} = \left(\frac{g_s(M_{sc}/r)}{g_s(M_{sc}/r_0)} \right)^{1/3}. \quad (26)$$

Here T_0 is the initial temperature and M_{sc} is some reference mass scale. In this work we take $T_0 = 10$ TeV and $M_{sc} = M_{h_1} = 125.5$ GeV, the mass of SM Higgs boson. The entropy density of the Universe is given by [69],

$$s = \frac{2\pi^2}{45} g_s(T) T^3. \quad (27)$$

Therefore, after determining the number density of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ and the entropy of the Universe one can determine the comoving number density using the following relation,

$$Y_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = \frac{n_{Z_{\mu\tau}}}{s}. \quad (28)$$

Finally, to determine the comoving number densities of DM components N_2 and N_3 , we need to solve the relevant Boltzmann equation for N_2 and N_3 , which can be written in a generic form,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dY_{N_j}}{dr} = & \frac{V_{ij} M_{pl} r \sqrt{g_\star(r)}}{1.66 M_{sc}^2 g_s(r)} \left[\sum_{k=1,2} \sum_{i=1,2,3} \langle \Gamma_{h_k \rightarrow N_j N_i} \rangle (Y_{h_k} - Y_{N_j} Y_{N_i}) \right] \\ & + \frac{V_{ij} M_{pl} r \sqrt{g_\star(r)}}{1.66 M_{sc}^2 g_s(r)} \sum_{i=1,2,3} \langle \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_j N_i} \rangle_{NTH} (Y_{Z_{\mu\tau}} - Y_{N_j} Y_{N_i}), \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where M_{pl} is the Planck mass while $g_\star(r) = \frac{g_s(r)}{\sqrt{g_\rho(r)}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{3} \frac{d \ln g_s(r)}{d \ln r} \right)$ is a function of $g_\rho(r)$ and $g_s(r)$. The parameter $V_{ij} = 2$ for $i = j$ and equal to 1 otherwise. The first term in the above equation represents the production of N_j from the decays of scalar fields h_1 and h_2 . Since these scalar fields remain in thermal equilibrium throughout their cosmological evolution, one can consider

their distribution function as Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution. Therefore the thermal averaged decay width for a process $h(k) \rightarrow N_j N_i$ is given by [70]

$$\langle \Gamma_{h_k \rightarrow N_j N_i} \rangle = \Gamma_{h_k \rightarrow N_j N_i} \frac{K_1 \left(r \frac{M_{h_k}}{M_{sc}} \right)}{K_2 \left(r \frac{M_{h_k}}{M_{sc}} \right)}, \quad (30)$$

where K_i is the Modified Bessel function of i^{th} kind. As the neutral gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$ is not in




Figure 2: Thermal and Non-thermal distribution function of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ gauge boson.

thermal equilibrium (due to very small value of $g_{\mu\tau}$), one cannot assume a Maxwell-Boltzmann distribution function for $Z_{\mu\tau}$. The distribution $f_{Z_{\mu\tau}}$ of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ can be found by solving Eq. (24) and we have shown it in Fig. 2. Although the shape of the distribution is similar in both cases but they differ by magnitude because in the current case $Z_{\mu\tau}$ is always out of equilibrium and never attains equilibrium value. Once we get the distribution function $f_{Z_{\mu\tau}}$ the non-thermal average of decay width for the process $Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_j N_i$ can be computed as follows

$$\langle \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_j N_i} \rangle_{NTH} = M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_j N_i} \frac{\int \frac{f_{Z_{\mu\tau}}(p)}{\sqrt{p^2 + M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2}} d^3 p}{\int f_{Z_{\mu\tau}}(p) d^3 p}. \quad (31)$$

All the relevant decay widths of h_2 and $Z_{\mu\tau}$ needed in Eq. (29) are given in Appendix A in detail. After solving the above Boltzmann equations for $j=2$ and $j=3$, we can determine the comoving

number density of the DM candidates N_2 and N_3 . Therefore, one can easily determine the total DM relic density for N_2 and N_3 candidates by using the following relation [71],

$$\Omega_{DM} h^2 = 2.755 \times 10^8 \left(\frac{M_{N_2}}{\text{GeV}} \right) Y_{N_2}(T_{\text{Now}}) + 2.755 \times 10^8 \left(\frac{M_{N_3}}{\text{GeV}} \right) Y_{N_3}(T_{\text{Now}}). \quad (32)$$

V. RESULTS




Figure 3: Left panel: Variation of relic density with r and contributions from h_2 and $Z_{\mu\tau}$ in the DM production. Right panel: Variation of comoving number density of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ and N_2, N_3 with r for three different values of gauge boson mass. Other parameters have been kept fixed at $g_{\mu\tau} = 1.01 \times 10^{-11}$, mixing angle $\alpha = 0.01$, gauge boson mass $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = 1$ TeV, DM mass $M_{DM} = 100$ GeV, BSM Higgs mass $M_{h_2} = 5$ TeV and RH neutrinos masses $M_{N_1} = 150$ GeV and $M_{DM} = M_{N_2} \simeq M_{N_3} = 100$ GeV.

Using Eqs. (29), (30), (31) and (32) we numerically compute the DM abundance. In the left panel of Fig. 3 we show the time evolution of the DM relic density with $r (= M_{h_1}/T)$. The left panel of the this figure shows the comparative contribution for the two DM production channels, $Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_i N_j$ and $h_2 \rightarrow N_i N_j$. We have taken masses of the RH neutrinos N_2 and N_3 as 100 GeV and hence the decay of SM-like Higgs h_1 to a pair of RH neutrinos is kinematically forbidden. From the left panel we see that for the large value of BSM Higgs mass ($M_{h_2} \sim 5$ TeV), the DM production at low r (which corresponds to high T) is dominated by h_2 decay. However, as the temperature of the universe falls and goes below the mass of the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ gauge bosons, they get produced, and for high value of r (which corresponds to comparably lower temperature of the universe), the DM production via the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ decay channel dominates. The reason for this

dominance can be understood as follows. From Eqs. (A3) and (A7) given in Appendix A, we see that the decay width $\Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_i N_j} \propto M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} g_{\mu\tau}^2$ while $\Gamma_{h_2 \rightarrow N_i N_j} \propto M_{h_2} h_{e\alpha} h_{e\beta}$, where $h_{e\alpha} h_{e\beta}$ are products of two any of the Yukawa couplings $h_{e\mu}$ and $h_{e\tau}$ that appeared in Eq. (2). Since we have chosen $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} \sim M_{h_2}$ we can write

$$\frac{\Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_i N_j}}{\Gamma_{h_2 \rightarrow N_i N_j}} \propto \frac{g_{\mu\tau}^2}{h_{e\alpha} h_{e\beta}}, \quad (33)$$

Since the Yukawa couplings $h_{e\alpha}$ appear as the $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ breaking terms in the RH neutrino mass matrix which instruments the splitting of 3.5 keV between N_2 and N_3 we have from Eq. (13)

$$V_{e\alpha} = \frac{h_{e\alpha} v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}} \sim 0.1 \text{ GeV}. \quad (34)$$

Inserting this in Eq. (33) and using the relation $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = g_{\mu\tau} v_{\mu\tau}$ we get

$$\frac{\Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_i N_j}}{\Gamma_{h_2 \rightarrow N_i N_j}} \propto \frac{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2}{V_{e\alpha}^2}, \quad (35)$$

explaining the dominance of the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ decay channel.

In the right panel of Fig. 3 we show the variation of the comoving number densities of the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ gauge boson *vis-a-vis* that of the sum of N_2 and N_3 . We show this as function of r for three different values of the gauge boson mass $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}$.

The abundance $Y_{Z_{\mu\tau}}$ (indicated by the dash line) has an initial rise, then flattens and finally decays. One can see from Eq. (24) that there are two collision terms in the Boltzmann Equation, one for $Z_{\mu\tau}$ production and another one for its decay to all possible channels and they are active at different times. Note that the maximal abundance of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ can be easily estimated also by the analytic formula for FIMP production, i.e. for $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} \ll M_{h_2}$

$$\Omega^{FI} h^2 = 1.09 \times 10^{27} \frac{g}{g_S^{3/2}} \frac{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}}{M_{h_2}^2} \Gamma_{h_2 \rightarrow Z_{\mu\tau} Z_{\mu\tau}} \sim 2.18 \times 10^{24} \frac{g_{\mu\tau}^2 M_{h_2}}{32\pi M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}} = 8.54; , \quad (36)$$

where g counts the number of internal degrees of freedom of the mother particle. According to eq. (32) this corresponds to $Y_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = 0.3 \times 10^{-10}$ and is in perfect agreement with the plateau in Fig. 3. One interesting point to note is that as we increase the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ mass $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}$, keeping $g_{\mu\tau}$ fixed, the DM abundance decreases instead of increasing, as explained by the relation above. In the same figure also the production of dark matter as a result of the out-of-equilibrium decay of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ can be seen beautifully. Less production of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ results in lower DM abundance, since practically every $Z_{\mu\tau}$ produces two Dark Matter particles.

The left panel of Fig. 4 shows the variation of relic density with the parameter r for different initial temperature T_{ini} (temperature where DM relic density is taken as zero). Important point




Figure 4: Left (Right) panel: Variation of relic density with r for different initial temperature (for different gauge coupling values), while the other parameters have been kept fixed at $g_{\mu\tau} = 1.01 \times 10^{-11}$ ($T_{ini} = 10$ TeV), mixing angle $\alpha = 0.01$, gauge boson mass $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = 1$ TeV, BSM Higgs mass $M_{h_2} = 5$ TeV and RH neutrinos masses $M_{N_1} = 150$ GeV, $M_{N_2} \simeq M_{N_3} = 100$ GeV.

to note here that as long as the initial temperature is above the mass of the gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$, final relic density remains the same. However, when we reduce the initial temperature below the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ mass (shown by the cyan color curve) then final abundance reduces significantly due to the Boltzmann suppression factor. In the right panel we show the variation of DM relic density with r for different gauge coupling values ($g_{\mu\tau}$). One can see from the figure that if we increase the value of the gauge coupling, the DM production rate as well as the total DM abundance increases. The reason can be understood from Eq. (A3) which shows that the DM production rate, which is almost the same as the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ decay rate, is proportional to the second power of $g_{\mu\tau}$. In the present model for $g_{\mu\tau} = 1.01 \times 10^{-11}$ we achieve the correct DM relic density value of the universe. In both the panels of Fig. 4, the horizontal magenta line corresponds to the present day correct DM relic density value of the universe. For the rest of the analysis, we have fixed the initial temperature of the universe at 10 TeV.

In the left panel of Fig. 5, we present the variation of the DM relic density for three different values of the DM mass M_{DM} ($=M_{N_2}, M_{N_3}$). As shown in Eq. (32) that DM relic density is proportional to the DM mass M_{N_2} and M_{N_3} and this dependence is evident in the left panel of Fig. 5. For the chosen value of the parameters (mentioned in the caption), we have obtained correct relic density value (indicated by the horizontal line) of the universe for DM mass value $M_{DM} = M_{N_2} \simeq M_{N_3} = 100$ GeV, this value will be different for different set of values of the other parameters. In the right panel of Fig. 5, we show the decay contributions of $Z_{\mu\tau}$ in different




Figure 5: Left (Right) panel: Variation of relic density with r for different values of DM mass (Contributions in the relic density of DM from different channels of $Z_{\mu\tau}$), while the other parameters have been kept fixed at $g_{\mu\tau} = 1.01 \times 10^{-11}$, mixing angle $\alpha = 0.01$, gauge boson mass $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} = 1$ TeV ($M_{DM} = 100$ GeV), BSM Higgs mass $M_{h_2} = 5$ TeV and RH neutrinos masses $M_{N_1} = 150$ GeV, $M_{DM} = M_{N_2} \simeq M_{N_3} = 100$ GeV.

channels. The relative contributions among the different channels is seen to differ significantly and the decay rate into $N_2 N_3$ dominates naturally producing equal populations of the two Dark Matter candidates. Indeed, to produce degenerate neutrinos i.e. $M_{N_2} \simeq M_{N_3}$, we have considered relatively small values of $\frac{h_{e\mu} v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $\frac{h_{e\tau} v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}}$ (~ 0.1), as discussed before. Therefore, the elements of the unitary matrix which relate the flavour and mass basis of the RH neutrinos take the following form, $U_{11} \sim 1$, $U_{12}, U_{13}, U_{21}, U_{31} \sim 0.01$, $U_{22} = U_{23} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $U_{32} = -U_{33} = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. Therefore, it is clear from the couplings (as listed in Eq. (A4)) that the dominant channel for DM production is $Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_2 N_3$, while the other channels will be suppressed which is clearly visible in the right panel of Fig. 3. Similar considerations will also be true for the N_3 DM production channels.

VI. 3.5 KEV γ RAY LINE

Finally, we come to the explanation of the 3.5 keV γ -ray line from the RH neutrino radiative decay $N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma$. Since the photon flux for a decaying Dark Matter candidate is given by

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{4\pi M_{N_2} \tau_{N_2}} \int_{l.o.s.} \rho_{N_2}(\vec{r}) d\vec{r} \quad (37)$$

where the last integral over the N_2 density is computed along the line of sight and τ_{N_2} is the lifetime of the heavier DM particle N_2 . In order to explain the 3.5 keV line from a decay such




Figure 6: Radiative decay of RH neutrino ($N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma$) and 3.55 keV γ -line.

as $N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma$, we need not only a mass splitting between the two fermion states of ~ 3.5 keV, but also a decay width of the unstable DM given as,

$$\Gamma(N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma) = (0.72 - 6.6) \times 10^{-52} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{M_{N_2}}{3.5 \text{ keV}} \right) = (0.2 - 1.9) \times 10^{-44} \text{ GeV} \left(\frac{M_{N_2}}{100 \text{ GeV}} \right) \quad (38)$$

Here we are assuming that the density of N_2 is approximately half of the DM density and rescaled the result of [24] accordingly.

The relevant decay diagrams for N_2 are shown in Fig. 6. We consider N_2 to be slightly heavier than N_3 (~ 3.5 keV) so that it can produce the 3.5 keV γ -ray line. As discussed before, the 3.5 keV mass splitting between nearly-degenerate N_2 and N_3 can be easily achieved in our model via the $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ symmetry and its breaking parameters. So we take $V_{e\alpha} = \frac{h_{e\alpha} v_{\mu\tau}}{\sqrt{2}} \sim 0.1$ GeV ($\alpha = \mu, \tau$) and by suitably adjusting the $V_{e\alpha}$ parameters we can generate the 3.5 keV mass gap between N_2 and N_3 . For the $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ conserving leading terms in Eq. (13) we take the values $M_{ee} = 11$ TeV and $M_{\mu\tau} = 100$ GeV which gives us M_{N_2} and $M_{N_3} \sim 100$ GeV with opposite CP parities [59]. Ref. [59] has pointed out that if N_2 and N_3 have opposite CP, then the transition from N_2 to N_3 is governed only by the magnetic moment term (μ_{23}), generated at one loop level as shown in Figure 6. Therefore, the effective Lagrangian for the decay process $N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma$ is given as

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} \approx i \frac{\mu_{23}}{2} \bar{N}_2 \sigma^{\mu\nu} N_3 F_{\mu\nu}. \quad (39)$$

In determining the expression for the above decay process we consider the ratio of lepton mass to RH neutrino mass to be very small ($\frac{M_l}{M_{N_2}} \ll 1$). Also, the ratio of the RH neutrino mass and the inert doublet mass is very small i.e. $\frac{M_{N_2}}{M_\eta} \ll 1$. The decay width of N_2 comes out as [72],

$$\Gamma(N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma) = \frac{\mu_{23}^2}{4\pi} \delta^3 \left(1 - P \frac{M_{N_3}}{M_{N_2}} \right)^2, \quad (40)$$

where $\delta = \frac{M_{N_2}}{2}(1 - \frac{M_{N_3}^2}{M_{N_2}^2})$, P gives the relative CP of the two neutrino states, which in the present model is $P = -1$. The magnetic moment coefficient μ_{23} in our model is given by

$$\mu_{23} = \sum_i \frac{e}{2} \frac{1}{(4\pi)^2} \frac{M_{N_2}}{M_\eta^2} (y_{i2}y_{i3}), \quad (41)$$

where $y_{ij} = h_i U_{ij}$ being the derived Yukawa couplings given in Eq. (18). The values of the parameters appearing in the N_2 decay width are intimately related with those that determine the light neutrino masses. In Section III, we had set the parameter values to explain the tiny neutrino mass in the following order,

$$M_\eta = 10^6 \text{ GeV}, M_{N_2} = 100 \text{ GeV}, (y_{ij})^2 = 10^{-1}. \quad (42)$$

Using these in the Eq. (18) we get $\mu_{23} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-14}) \text{ GeV}^{-1}$. Using Eq. (40), for DM mass around 100 GeV, $\delta \simeq 3.5 \text{ keV}$ and $\mu_{23} \sim 10^{-14} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, we get the lifetime of N_2 of the order $\mathcal{O}(10^{-44}) \text{ GeV}$, which is exactly what is needed to give the 3.5 keV line. Note that the lifetime of N_2 is then around 10^{19} sec and hence greater than the age of the universe (10^{17} sec). Hence the present model can naturally explain the origin of the claimed 3.5 keV line.

VII. CONCLUSION

In the present work we extended the SM gauge group by a local $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ gauge group and a \mathbb{Z}_2 discrete symmetry. The particles spectrum was extended by three RH neutrinos, one inert doublet and one SM gauge singlet scalar. We showed that this model explains the observed 3.5 keV line consistently with the relic dark matter abundance in the framework of a model that generates light neutrino masses radiatively. The Type I seesaw in this model is forbidden by the \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry but tiny neutrino masses are generated via a one-loop diagram involving the RH neutrino and the inert doublet which does not take any VEV. We considered inert scalar masses $\sim 10^6 \text{ GeV}$, which is higher than the reheat temperature, and RH neutrino masses $\sim 100 \text{ GeV}$. Then for parameter choices $\lambda_5 \sim 10^{-3}$ and Yukawa couplings $y_{ji}^2 \sim 10^{-1}$ we can get light neutrino masses $M_\nu \sim 0.01 \text{ eV}$. The RH neutrino mass matrix in our model is non-diagonal and carries the $L_\mu - L_\tau$ flavour structure which ensures that two of the RH neutrino remain degenerate in the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ symmetric limit. The spontaneous breaking of the $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ gauge symmetry generates terms in the RH neutrino mass matrix that splits the two degenerate RH neutrinos by 3.5 keV, while the third one remains heavier. The two nearly degenerate neutrinos form the two-component DM in our model. We showed that the RH neutrinos are predominately produced by the decay of the extra neutral gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$, which are taken in the 1 TeV mass range in our model. The production of RH neutrinos from decay of the additional scalar h_2 is subdominant,

while the annihilation channels have negligible effect. We showed that the peculiar structure of the unitary matrix (U) which relates the flavour and mass basis of the RH neutrinos ensures that the decay mode $Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_2 N_3$ is the dominant one among the other channels. Since the associated gauge coupling $g_{\mu\tau}$ is taken to be very small here, the $Z_{\mu\tau}$ stays out of equilibrium in the early universe and the RH neutrinos are produced by the freeze-in mechanism. We solved the coupled Boltzmann equation numerically and showed the dependence of the DM relic abundance on initial temperature T_{ini} , $g_{\mu\tau}$, $M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}$ and M_{DM} . Finally, we showed that the heavier of the two DM component N_2 can decay into the lighter N_3 ($N_2 \rightarrow N_3 \gamma$) through one loop diagram, thus producing the 3.5 keV X-ray line that was observed by Chandra satellite. The model parameter values which determine the lifetime of N_2 were obtained through constraints from the light neutrino mass sector and gave a decay rate of 10^{-44} GeV for N_2 . So the lifetime of the heavier Dark Matter particle is consistent with both the age of the universe as well as the strength of the observed 3.5 keV line.

Regarding collider observables, this model unfortunately does not give many promising signatures. Indeed all the particles of the gauged $\mu - \tau$ sector interact with the Standard Model only via the very small coupling $g_{\mu\tau} \sim 10^{-11}$, so that their production at LHC or their effect on precision observables is very suppressed. If one would be able to produce those states, a long lifetime and possibly displaced vertices could be the characteristic signature [49, 51, 73]. On the other hand, more substantial can be the production cross-section for the heavier Higgs boson h_2 , depending on its mass the mixing angle α . Unfortunately in this case, its dominant decay channels are those in Standard Model states through the mixing with the Higgs doublet and so the connection of this heavy state with the neutrino sector and the $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ will be difficult to prove.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors would like to thank the Department of Atomic Energy (DAE) Neutrino Project under the XII plan of Harish-Chandra Research Institute. LC would like to thank the Harish-Chandra Research Institute for hospitality during the initial stages of this work. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme InvisiblesPlus RISE under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 690575. This project has received funding from the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme Elusives ITN under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 674896.

Appendix

Appendix A: Analytical Expression of relevant Decay width and Collision terms

If we consider a generic process $\chi(\tilde{p}) \rightarrow a(\tilde{p}_1) b(\tilde{p}_2)$ (where $\tilde{p} = (E_p, \vec{p})$) then the collision term will take the following form [69, 70],

$$\mathcal{C}[f_\chi(p)] = \frac{1}{2 E_p} \int \frac{g_a d^3 p_1}{(2\pi)^3 2E_{p1}} \frac{g_b d^3 p_2}{(2\pi)^3 2E_{p2}} (2\pi)^4 \delta^4(\tilde{p} - \tilde{p}_1 - \tilde{p}_2) \times \overline{|\mathcal{M}|^2} \times [f_a f_b (1 \pm f_\chi) - f_\chi (1 \pm f_a) (1 \pm f_b)]. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Now the full expressions of the collision terms in Eq. (24) are as follows [19, 21],

- $\mathcal{C}^{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow all}$: Collision term for the extra gauge boson $Z_{\mu\tau}$ decay can be written in the following way in terms of the parameters which we have introduced in Section IV.

$$\mathcal{C}^{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow all} = -f_{Z_{\mu\tau}}(\xi_p) \times \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow all} \times \frac{r_{Z_{\mu\tau}}}{\sqrt{\xi_p^2 \mathcal{B}(r)^2 + r_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2}}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow all} = \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow f\bar{f}} + \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_i N_j}$ and the expression for the each decay terms are as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow f\bar{f}} &= \frac{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} g_{\mu\tau}^2}{12 \pi} \left(1 + \frac{2M_f^2}{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2} \right) \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_f^2}{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2}} \\ \Gamma_{Z_{\mu\tau} \rightarrow N_i N_j} &= \frac{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} g_{Z_{\mu\tau} N_i N_j}^2}{12 \pi S_{ij}} \left(1 - \frac{(M_{N_i} + M_{N_j})^2}{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2} \right)^{3/2} \\ &\quad \times \left(1 - \frac{(M_{N_i} - M_{N_j})^2}{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2} \right)^{1/2} \times \left(1 - \frac{(M_{N_i} - M_{N_j})^2}{2 M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $f = \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau, \mu^\pm$ and τ^\pm because of the $(L_\mu - L_\tau)$ symmetry of the present model and the couplings take the following form depending on RH neutrinos,

$$\begin{aligned} g_{Z_{\mu\tau} N_2 N_2} &= -\frac{g_{\mu\tau}}{2} (U_{22}^2 - U_{32}^2) \\ g_{Z_{\mu\tau} N_3 N_3} &= -\frac{g_{\mu\tau}}{2} (U_{23}^2 - U_{33}^2) \\ g_{Z_{\mu\tau} N_1 N_2} &= -\frac{g_{\mu\tau}}{2} (U_{21} U_{22} - U_{31} U_{32}) \\ g_{Z_{\mu\tau} N_1 N_3} &= -\frac{g_{\mu\tau}}{2} (U_{21} U_{23} - U_{31} U_{33}) \\ g_{Z_{\mu\tau} N_2 N_3} &= -\frac{g_{\mu\tau}}{2} (U_{22} U_{23} - U_{32} U_{33}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

The statistical factor $S_{ij} = 2$ for $i = j$ and 1 for $i \neq j$.

- $\mathcal{C}^{h_2 \rightarrow Z_{\mu\tau} Z_{\mu\tau}}$: The collision term for the extra geuge boson production $Z_{\mu\tau}$ from the decay of BSM Higgs h_2 takes the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{C}^{h_2 \rightarrow Z_{\mu\tau} Z_{\mu\tau}} &= \frac{r}{8\pi M_{sc}} \frac{\mathcal{B}^{-1}(r)}{\xi_p \sqrt{\xi_p^2 \mathcal{B}(r)^2 + \left(\frac{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} r}{M_{sc}}\right)^2}} \frac{g_{h_2 Z_{\mu\tau} Z_{\mu\tau}}^2}{6} \left(2 + \frac{(M_{h_2}^2 - 2M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2)^2}{4M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^4}\right) \\ &\times \left(e^{-\sqrt{(\xi_k^{\min})^2 \mathcal{B}(r)^2 + \left(\frac{M_{h_2} r}{M_{sc}}\right)^2}} - e^{-\sqrt{(\xi_k^{\max})^2 \mathcal{B}(r)^2 + \left(\frac{M_{h_2} r}{M_{sc}}\right)^2}} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A5})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} g_{h_2 Z_{\mu\tau} Z_{\mu\tau}} &= \frac{2M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2 \cos \alpha}{v_{\mu\tau}}, \\ \xi_k^{\min}(\xi_p, r) &= \frac{M_{sc}}{2\mathcal{B}(r)rM_{Z_{\mu\tau}}} \left| \eta(\xi_p, r) - \frac{\mathcal{B}(r) \times M_{h_2}^2}{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} \times M_{sc}} \xi_p r \right|, \\ \xi_k^{\max}(\xi_p, r) &= \frac{M_{sc}}{2\mathcal{B}(r)rM_{Z_{\mu\tau}}} \left(\eta(\xi_p, r) + \frac{\mathcal{B}(r) \times M_{h_2}^2}{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} \times M_{sc}} \xi_p r \right), \\ \eta(\xi_p, r) &= \left(\frac{M_{h_2} r}{M_{sc}} \right) \sqrt{\frac{M_{h_2}^2}{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}}^2} - 4} \sqrt{\xi_p^2 \mathcal{B}(r)^2 + \left(\frac{M_{Z_{\mu\tau}} r}{M_{sc}}\right)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

- $\Gamma_{h_k \rightarrow N_i N_j}$: Decay width for the SM like Higgs (h_1) and BSM Higgs (h_2) take the following form,

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{h_k \rightarrow N_i N_j} &= \frac{M_{h_k} g_{h_k N_i N_j}^2}{8\pi S_{ij}} \left(1 - \frac{(M_{N_i} + M_{N_j})^2}{M_{h_k}^2} \right)^{3/2} \\ &\times \left(1 - \frac{(M_{N_i} - M_{N_j})^2}{M_{h_k}^2} \right)^{1/2} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

where the couplings take the following form,

$$\begin{aligned}
g_{h_2(1)N_1N_2} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}\cos\alpha(\sin\alpha)}{4}(U_{11}U_{22}h_{e\mu} + U_{12}U_{21}h_{e\mu} + U_{11}U_{32}h_{e\tau} + U_{12}U_{31}h_{e\tau}) \\
g_{h_2(1)N_1N_3} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}\cos\alpha(\sin\alpha)}{4}(U_{11}U_{23}h_{e\mu} + U_{13}U_{21}h_{e\mu} + U_{11}U_{33}h_{e\tau} + U_{13}U_{31}h_{e\tau}) \\
g_{h_2(1)N_2N_3} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}\cos\alpha(\sin\alpha)}{4}(U_{12}U_{23}h_{e\mu} + U_{13}U_{22}h_{e\mu} + U_{12}U_{33}h_{e\tau} + U_{13}U_{32}h_{e\tau}) \\
g_{h_2(1)N_2N_2} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}\cos\alpha(\sin\alpha)}{2}(U_{12}U_{22}h_{e\mu} + U_{12}U_{32}h_{e\tau}) \\
g_{h_2(1)N_3N_3} &= -\frac{\sqrt{2}\cos\alpha(\sin\alpha)}{2}(U_{13}U_{23}h_{e\mu} + U_{13}U_{33}h_{e\tau})
\end{aligned} \tag{A8}$$

-
- [1] Y. Fukuda *et al.* [Super-Kamiokande Collaboration], “*Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos*”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998) [hep-ex/9807003].
 - [2] Q. R. Ahmad *et al.* [SNO Collaboration], “*Direct evidence for neutrino flavor transformation from neutral current interactions in the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory*”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 011301 (2002) [nucl-ex/0204008].
 - [3] K. Eguchi *et al.* [KamLAND Collaboration], “*First results from KamLAND: Evidence for reactor anti-neutrino disappearance*”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021802 (2003) [hep-ex/0212021].
 - [4] Y. Sofue and V. Rubin, “*Rotation curves of spiral galaxies*”, Ann. Rev. Astron. Astrophys. **39**, 137 (2001) [astro-ph/0010594].
 - [5] M. Bartelmann and P. Schneider, “*Weak gravitational lensing*”, Phys. Rept. **340**, 291 (2001) [astro-ph/9912508].
 - [6] G. Hinshaw *et al.* [WMAP Collaboration], “*Nine-Year Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations: Cosmological Parameter Results*”, Astrophys. J. Suppl. **208**, 19 (2013) [arXiv:1212.5226 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [7] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], “*Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*”, Astron. Astrophys. **594** (2016) A13 [arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [8] D. Harvey, R. Massey, T. Kitching, A. Taylor and E. Tittley, “*The non-gravitational interactions of dark matter in colliding galaxy clusters*”, Science **347**, 1462 (2015) [arXiv:1503.07675 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [9] D. S. Akerib *et al.* [LUX Collaboration], “*Limits on spin-dependent WIMP-nucleon cross section obtained from the complete LUX exposure*”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **118**, no. 25, 251302 (2017) [arXiv:1705.03380 [astro-ph.CO]].

- [10] E. Aprile *et al.* [XENON Collaboration], “*First Dark Matter Search Results from the XENON1T Experiment*”, arXiv:1705.06655 [astro-ph.CO].
- [11] L. J. Hall, K. Jedamzik, J. March-Russell and S. M. West, “*Freeze-In Production of FIMP Dark Matter*”, JHEP **1003**, 080 (2010) [arXiv:0911.1120 [hep-ph]].
- [12] C. E. Yaguna, “*The Singlet Scalar as FIMP Dark Matter*”, JHEP **1108**, 060 (2011) [arXiv:1105.1654 [hep-ph]].
- [13] G. Arcadi and L. Covi, “*Minimal Decaying Dark Matter and the LHC*”, JCAP **1308** (2013) 005 [arXiv:1305.6587 [hep-ph]].
- [14] E. Molinaro, C. E. Yaguna and O. Zapata, “*FIMP realization of the scotogenic model*”, JCAP **1407**, 015 (2014) [arXiv:1405.1259 [hep-ph]].
- [15] A. Biswas, D. Majumdar and P. Roy, “*Nonthermal two component dark matter model for Fermi-LAT γ -ray excess and 3.55 keV X-ray line*”, JHEP **1504**, 065 (2015) [arXiv:1501.02666 [hep-ph]].
- [16] A. Merle and M. Totzauer, “*keV Sterile Neutrino Dark Matter from Singlet Scalar Decays: Basic Concepts and Subtle Features*”, JCAP **1506**, 011 (2015) [arXiv:1502.01011 [hep-ph]].
- [17] B. Shakya, “*Sterile Neutrino Dark Matter from Freeze-In*”, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **31**, no. 06, 1630005 (2016) [arXiv:1512.02751 [hep-ph]].
- [18] A. Biswas and A. Gupta, “*Freeze-in Production of Sterile Neutrino Dark Matter in $U(1)_{B-L}$ Model*”, JCAP **1609**, no. 09, 044 (2016) [arXiv:1607.01469 [hep-ph]].
- [19] J. König, A. Merle and M. Totzauer, “*keV Sterile Neutrino Dark Matter from Singlet Scalar Decays: The Most General Case*”, JCAP **1611**, no. 11, 038 (2016) [arXiv:1609.01289 [hep-ph]].
- [20] A. Biswas, S. Choubey and S. Khan, “*FIMP and Muon $(g - 2)$ in a $U(1)_{L_\mu - L_\tau}$ Model*”, JHEP **1702**, 123 (2017) [arXiv:1612.03067 [hep-ph]].
- [21] A. Biswas and A. Gupta, “*Calculation of Momentum Distribution Function of a Non-thermal Fermionic Dark Matter*”, JCAP **1703**, no. 03, 033 (2017) [arXiv:1612.02793 [hep-ph]].
- [22] A. Biswas, S. Choubey and S. Khan, “*Neutrino Mass, Leptogenesis and FIMP Dark Matter in a $U(1)_{B-L}$ Model*”, arXiv:1704.00819 [hep-ph].
- [23] N. Bernal, M. Heikinheimo, T. Tenkanen, K. Tuominen and V. Vaskonen, “*The Dawn of FIMP Dark Matter: A Review of Models and Constraints*”, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **32**, no. 27, 1730023 (2017) [arXiv:1706.07442 [hep-ph]].
- [24] E. Bulbul, M. Markevitch, A. Foster, R. K. Smith, M. Loewenstein and S. W. Randall, “*Detection of An Unidentified Emission Line in the Stacked X-ray spectrum of Galaxy Clusters*”, Astrophys. J. **789** (2014) 13 [arXiv:1402.2301 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [25] A. Boyarsky, O. Ruchayskiy, D. Iakubovskiy and J. Franse, “*Unidentified Line in X-Ray Spectra of the Andromeda Galaxy and Perseus Galaxy Cluster*”, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014) 251301 [arXiv:1402.4119 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [26] N. Cappelluti *et al.*, “*Searching for the 3.5 keV Line in the Deep Fields with Chandra: the 10 Ms*

- observations*” arXiv:1701.07932 [astro-ph.CO].
- [27] D. Malyshev, A. Neronov and D. Eckert, “*Constraints on 3.55 keV line emission from stacked observations of dwarf spheroidal galaxies*”, Phys. Rev. D **90** (2014) 103506 [arXiv:1408.3531 [astro-ph.HE]].
 - [28] M. E. Anderson, E. Churazov and J. N. Bregman, “*Non-Detection of X-Ray Emission From Sterile Neutrinos in Stacked Galaxy Spectra*”, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. **452** (2015) no.4, 3905 [arXiv:1408.4115 [astro-ph.HE]].
 - [29] S. Chakraborty, D. K. Ghosh and S. Roy, “*7 keV Sterile neutrino dark matter in $U(1)_R$ – lepton number model*”, JHEP **1410**, 146 (2014) [arXiv:1405.6967 [hep-ph]].
 - [30] H. Ishida, K. S. Jeong and F. Takahashi, “*7 keV sterile neutrino dark matter from split flavor mechanism*”, Phys. Lett. B **732**, 196 (2014) [arXiv:1402.5837 [hep-ph]].
 - [31] D. P. Finkbeiner and N. Weiner, “*X-ray line from exciting dark matter*”, Phys. Rev. D **94**, no. 8, 083002 (2016) [arXiv:1402.6671 [hep-ph]].
 - [32] T. Higaki, K. S. Jeong and F. Takahashi, “*The 7 keV axion dark matter and the X-ray line signal*”, Phys. Lett. B **733**, 25 (2014) [arXiv:1402.6965 [hep-ph]].
 - [33] J. Jaeckel, J. Redondo and A. Ringwald, “*3.55 keV hint for decaying axionlike particle dark matter*”, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 103511 (2014) [arXiv:1402.7335 [hep-ph]].
 - [34] H. M. Lee, S. C. Park and W. I. Park, “*Cluster X-ray line at 3.5 keV from axion-like dark matter*”, Eur. Phys. J. C **74**, 3062 (2014) [arXiv:1403.0865 [astro-ph.CO]].
 - [35] J. C. Park, S. C. Park and K. Kong, “*X-ray line signal from 7 keV axino dark matter decay*”, Phys. Lett. B **733**, 217 (2014) [arXiv:1403.1536 [hep-ph]].
 - [36] K. Y. Choi and O. Seto, “*X-ray line signal from decaying axino warm dark matter*”, Phys. Lett. B **735**, 92 (2014) [arXiv:1403.1782 [hep-ph]].
 - [37] S. Baek and H. Okada, “*7 keV Dark Matter as X-ray Line Signal in Radiative Neutrino Model*”, arXiv:1403.1710 [hep-ph].
 - [38] T. Tsuyuki, “*Neutrino masses, leptogenesis, and sterile neutrino dark matter*”, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 013007 (2014) [arXiv:1403.5053 [hep-ph]].
 - [39] F. Bezrukov and D. Gorbunov, “*Relic Gravity Waves and 7 keV Dark Matter from a GeV scale inflaton*”, Phys. Lett. B **736**, 494 (2014) [arXiv:1403.4638 [hep-ph]].
 - [40] C. Kolda and J. Unwin, “*X-ray lines from R-parity violating decays of keV sparticles*”, Phys. Rev. D **90**, 023535 (2014) [arXiv:1403.5580 [hep-ph]].
 - [41] R. Allahverdi, B. Dutta and Y. Gao, “*keV Photon Emission from Light Nonthermal Dark Matter*”, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 127305 (2014) [arXiv:1403.5717 [hep-ph]].
 - [42] K. S. Babu and R. N. Mohapatra, “*7 keV Scalar Dark Matter and the Anomalous Galactic X-ray Spectrum*”, Phys. Rev. D **89**, 115011 (2014) [arXiv:1404.2220 [hep-ph]].
 - [43] E. Dudas, L. Heurtier and Y. Mambrini, “*Generating X-ray lines from annihilating dark matter*”,

- Phys. Rev. D **90**, 035002 (2014) [arXiv:1404.1927 [hep-ph]].
- [44] C. El Aisati, T. Hambye and T. Scarnà, “*Can a millicharged dark matter particle emit an observable gamma-ray line?*”, JHEP **1408**, 133 (2014) [arXiv:1403.1280 [hep-ph]].
 - [45] K. P. Modak, “*3.5 keV X-ray Line Signal from Decay of Right-Handed Neutrino due to Transition Magnetic Moment*”, JHEP **1503**, 064 (2015) [arXiv:1404.3676 [hep-ph]].
 - [46] F. S. Queiroz and K. Sinha, “*The Poker Face of the Majoron Dark Matter Model: LUX to keV Line*”, Phys. Lett. B **735**, 69 (2014) [arXiv:1404.1400 [hep-ph]].
 - [47] C. W. Chiang and T. Yamada, “*3.5-keV X-ray line from nearly-degenerate WIMP dark matter decays*”, JHEP **1409** (2014) 006 [arXiv:1407.0460 [hep-ph]].
 - [48] G. Faisel, S. Y. Ho and J. Tandean, “*Exploring X-Ray Lines as Scotogenic Signals*”, Phys. Lett. B **738**, 380 (2014) [arXiv:1408.5887 [hep-ph]].
 - [49] A. Falkowski, Y. Hochberg and J. T. Ruderman, “*Displaced Vertices from X-ray Lines*”, JHEP **1411** (2014) 140 [arXiv:1409.2872 [hep-ph]].
 - [50] S. Patra, N. Sahoo and N. Sahu, “*Dipolar dark matter in light of the 3.5 keV x-ray line, neutrino mass, and LUX data*”, Phys. Rev. D **91**, no. 11, 115013 (2015) [arXiv:1412.4253 [hep-ph]].
 - [51] G. Arcadi, L. Covi and F. Dradi, “*3.55 keV line in Minimal Decaying Dark Matter scenarios*”, JCAP **1507** (2015) no.07, 023 [arXiv:1412.6351 [hep-ph]].
 - [52] A. Dutta Banik, M. Pandey, D. Majumdar and A. Biswas, “*Two component WIMP-FIMP dark matter model with singlet fermion, scalar and pseudo scalar*”, Eur. Phys. J. C **77**, no. 10, 657 (2017) [arXiv:1612.08621 [hep-ph]].
 - [53] K. N. Abazajian, “*Sterile neutrinos in cosmology*”, arXiv:1705.01837 [hep-ph].
 - [54] J. Heeck and D. Teresi, “*Cold keV dark matter from decays and scatterings*”, arXiv:1706.09909 [hep-ph].
 - [55] L. Roszkowski, E. M. Sessolo and S. Trojanowski, “*WIMP dark matter candidates and searches - current issues and future prospects*”, arXiv:1707.06277 [hep-ph].
 - [56] K. J. Bae, A. Kamada, S. P. Liew and K. Yanagi, “*Light Axinos from Freeze-in: production processes, phase space distributions, and Ly- α constraints*”, arXiv:1707.06418 [hep-ph].
 - [57] C. Cosme, J. G. Rosa and O. Bertolami, “*Scalar field dark matter with spontaneous symmetry breaking and the 3.5 keV line*”, arXiv:1709.09674 [hep-ph].
 - [58] V. Brdar, J. Kopp, J. Liu and X. P. Wang, “*Return of the X-rays: A New Hope for Fermionic Dark Matter at the keV Scale*”, arXiv:1710.02146 [hep-ph].
 - [59] P. B. Pal and L. Wolfenstein, “*Radiative Decays of Massive Neutrinos*”, Phys. Rev. D **25**, 766 (1982).
 - [60] X. G. He, G. C. Joshi, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, “*NEW Z-prime PHENOMENOLOGY*”, Phys. Rev. D **43**, 22 (1991).
 - [61] X. G. He, G. C. Joshi, H. Lew and R. R. Volkas, “*Simplest Z-prime model*”, Phys. Rev. D **44**, 2118

(1991).

- [62] E. Ma, D. P. Roy and S. Roy, “*Gauged $L(\mu)$ - $L(\tau)$ with large muon anomalous magnetic moment and the bimaximal mixing of neutrinos*”, Phys. Lett. B **525**, 101 (2002) [hep-ph/0110146].
- [63] S. Choubey and W. Rodejohann, “*A Flavor symmetry for quasi-degenerate neutrinos: $L(\mu)$ - $L(\tau)$* ”, Eur. Phys. J. C **40**, 259 (2005) [hep-ph/0411190].
- [64] E. Ma, “*Verifiable radiative seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass and dark matter*”, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 077301 (2006) [hep-ph/0601225].
- [65] M. Carena, A. Daleo, B. A. Dobrescu and T. M. P. Tait, “ *Z' gauge bosons at the Tevatron*”, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 093009 (2004) [hep-ph/0408098].
- [66] T. Appelquist, B. A. Dobrescu and A. R. Hopper, “*Nonexotic neutral gauge bosons*”, Phys. Rev. D **68**, 035012 (2003) [hep-ph/0212073].
- [67] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], “*Observation of a new particle in the search for the Standard Model Higgs boson with the ATLAS detector at the LHC*”, Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
- [68] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], “*Observation of a new boson at a mass of 125 GeV with the CMS experiment at the LHC*”, Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
- [69] E. W. Kolb and M. S. Turner, “*The Early Universe*”, Front. Phys. **69**, 1 (1990).
- [70] P. Gondolo and G. Gelmini, “*Cosmic abundances of stable particles: Improved analysis*”, Nucl. Phys. B **360**, 145 (1991).
- [71] J. Edsjo and P. Gondolo, “*Neutralino relic density including coannihilations*”, Phys. Rev. D **56**, 1879 (1997) [hep-ph/9704361].
- [72] M. Garny, A. Ibarra, D. Tran and C. Weniger, “*Gamma-Ray Lines from Radiative Dark Matter Decay*”, JCAP **1101**, 032 (2011) [arXiv:1011.3786 [hep-ph]].
- [73] G. Arcadi, L. Covi and F. Dradi, “*LHC prospects for minimal decaying Dark Matter*”, JCAP **1410** (2014) no.10, 063 [arXiv:1408.1005 [hep-ph]].