

Dark matter assisted lepton anomalous magnetic moments and neutrino masses

Sudip Jana^{1*}, Vishnu P.K.^{2†}, Werner Rodejohann^{1‡}, and Shaikh Saad^{2§}

¹*Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, 69117 Heidelberg, Germany*

²*Department of Physics, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK 74078, USA*

Abstract

We propose a framework that addresses the origin of neutrino mass, explains the observed discrepancies in the electron and the muon anomalous magnetic moments (AMMs) data, and incorporates the dark matter (DM) relic abundance. Both the neutrino mass and the lepton AMMs are generated at one-loop level mediated by a common set of beyond the Standard Model (SM) states. In this class of models, the SM is extended with vector-like charged fermion and scalar multiplets, all odd under an imposed Z_2 symmetry, which stabilizes the fermionic or scalar DM candidate residing in one of them. Two scalar multiplets appear in the AMM loops, thus allowing for different signs of their contributions, in agreement with the observed discrepancies which are of opposite sign for electron and muon. The vector-like fermions give rise to large new physics contributions to the lepton AMMs via chirally enhanced terms that are proportional to their mass. To demonstrate the viability of this framework, we perform a detailed study of a particular model for which a fit to the neutrino masses and mixing together with lepton AMMs are provided. Furthermore, DM phenomenology and collider signatures are explored.

* E-mail: sudip.jana@mpi-hd.mpg.de

† E-mail: vipadma@okstate.edu

‡ E-mail: werner.rodejohann@mpi-hd.mpg.de

§ E-mail: shaikh.saad@okstate.edu

Contents

1	Introduction	2
2	Framework	4
3	Details of Model-I	7
3.1	Scalar sector	8
3.2	Lepton anomalous magnetic moments	9
3.3	Neutrino mass	12
3.4	A combined fit to data	12
3.5	Dark matter phenomenology	14
3.6	Collider implications	19
4	Conclusions	21

1 Introduction

The origin of the neutrino mass is among the most crucial problems of the Standard Model (SM) of particle physics. On the other hand, the almost a century old dark matter (DM) problem is another tremendous puzzle yet to be solved. The most straightforward approach to this issue is the particle nature of the DM (for a review see Ref. [1]). One of the many popular mechanisms for neutrino mass is the radiative one (for a recent review see Ref. [2, 3]) due to the natural accessibility of the involved particles at colliders and low energy experiments.

There have been lots of attempts in the literature to combine these two seemingly uncorrelated issues, one of the most prominent example being the scotogenic model [4]. In such models, the particles mediating the loop(s) that generate neutrino mass are dark matter. Typically, new symmetries beyond the SM are required to stabilize the DM and in some cases to forbid the tree-level neutrino mass contributions, for systematic studies along this line, see for example Refs. [5–10]. The details of these models largely depend on the nature of the imposed symmetries and the needed particle content. However, common features of these models are: (i) neutrino mass is generated via quantum corrections at a given loop order, (ii) DM candidates naturally arise due to symmetry reasons, (iii) owing to the loop suppression, the new physics (NP) scale can be around the TeV scale without making the Yukawa couplings unnecessarily small, which provides a way to test these models at low energies.

Aside from neutrino mass and DM, there has been a longstanding tension between the

SM prediction [11] and the experimental measured value [12] of the muon anomalous magnetic moment (AMM). Additionally, the recently measured fine-structure constant α using Caesium atoms with unprecedented precision [13] implies a deviation of the electron AMM from the SM value [14] of opposite sign compared to the muon AMM. The experimental measurements point towards about 2.5σ and 3.7σ tensions for the electron and the muon AMMs, respectively. More precisely, the corresponding discrepancies are given as

$$\Delta a_e = a_e^{\text{exp}} - a_e^{\text{SM}} = -(8.7 \pm 3.6) \times 10^{-13}, \quad (1.1)$$

$$\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu^{\text{exp}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = (2.79 \pm 0.76) \times 10^{-9}. \quad (1.2)$$

Since the AMMs of light charged leptons ($a_\ell = (g - 2)_\ell/2$, $\ell = e, \mu$) are measured with excellent accuracy in the experiments, and their corresponding theory values are computed with outstanding precision, these observed tensions strongly point towards physics beyond the SM. Therefore, these results recently have entertained a lot of interest in the particle physics community, for attempts to simultaneously explain these discrepancies see Refs. [15–42]. For previous analyses of non-supersymmetric models that accommodate only DM and $(g - 2)_\mu$ see Refs. [43–50], and for studies that make a connection between radiative neutrino mass generation and $(g - 2)_\mu$, see Refs. [51–58].

To address both $(g - 2)_e$ and $(g - 2)_\mu$, NP may appear at low scale, see for example Ref. [33]. Models of these types are highly constrained from beam dump experiments, Belle and BaBar, which may eventually rule out such scenarios in the near future. We, on the other hand, are interested in scenarios where NP emerges at heavy scale.¹ To incorporate large deviations for Δa_ℓ given in Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2) from heavy NP, a chirality flip of a heavy state must take place inside the loop. This can be achieved with TeV scale scalar leptoquarks [32, 41] or vector-like fermions [17]. These studies however, made no connection with either neutrino mass or DM issues.

In this work, we bring the issues of the origin of neutrino mass, the DM problem, and the electron and muon AMM puzzles under the same umbrella, and propose a framework for their explanations in a minimalistic approach. In our proposed setup, the particle content of the SM is extended by three generations of vector-like fermions and three scalar multiplets. Furthermore, the model is supplemented with a \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry, under which only the BSM particles are assumed to be odd. Via the propagation of these BSM multiplets, neutrino mass generation as well as new physics contributions to the lepton anomalous magnetic moments of the correct order appear at one-loop level. Two scalar multiplets, and thus two sets of Yukawa couplings, appear in the AMM loops, thus allowing for different signs of their contributions, in agreement with the observed discrepancies which are of opposite sign for

¹Both heavy and light new physics is not expected to influence the MUonE experiment [59], which will directly measure the crucial hadronic vacuum polarization contribution to the muon AMM, see Refs. [60, 61].




Figure 1: Representative Feynman diagram for generating neutrino mass.

electron and muon. The lightest of the neutral BSM particles is stabilized by the imposed \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry, which serves as the DM candidate.

The paper is build up as follows: In Section 2 we address which model classes may solve the AMM discrepancies and at the same time generate neutrino mass radiatively with the same set of new multiplets. From the list of models, in Section 3 we perform a detailed analysis of one of them, analyzing the scalar sector, performing a fit to the AMM and neutrino mass observables, discussing the dark matter phenomenology, and outlining collider phenomenology. We conclude in Section 4.

2 Framework

Due to its simplicity, we start our discussion with the scotogenic model [4], which employs three generations of singlet Majorana fermions² $N(1, 1, 0)$ and an inert Higgs doublet $\phi(1, 2, 1/2)$, both odd under an imposed \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry. The neutrino mass is generated at the one-loop level via the generic diagram shown in Fig. 1, with $S_1 = S_2 \equiv \phi$ and $F_L = F_R \equiv N$ (Majorana fermion). However, a combined explanation of lepton AMMs along with reproducing realistic neutrino masses and mixings cannot be accommodated, since the proportionality relation $|a_\mu| \propto m_\mu^2$ requires large Yukawa couplings, which would generate too large rates for charged lepton flavor violating (cLVF) processes like $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$. Quantifying this tension very roughly is possible as follows. In the scotogenic model neutrino mass is given by (setting loop functions to one and assuming that all new particle masses are of order TeV)

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu \sim \frac{M_N y^2}{32\pi^2} \simeq 0.3 \left(\frac{M_N}{\text{TeV}} \right) \left(\frac{y}{10^{-5}} \right)^2 \text{ eV}, \quad (2.3)$$

²Our convention is $Q = I_3 + Y$.

where flavor indices are ignored and y is the Yukawa coupling of the singlet fermion N with lepton doublets and the inert scalar doublet. This shows that to get the correct order of neutrino mass one requires $y = \mathcal{O}(10^{-5})$. On the other hand, the contribution to the magnetic moment is

$$-\Delta a_\mu \sim m_\mu^2 \frac{|y|^2}{32\pi^2 M_S^2} \sim 10^{-21} \left(\frac{M_S}{\text{TeV}} \right)^{-2} \left(\frac{y}{10^{-5}} \right)^2. \quad (2.4)$$

Apart from the fact that the sign of Δa_μ is actually not correct in the scotogenic model, these estimates show that a simultaneous explanation of neutrino mass and the anomalous magnetic moment is not possible. Moreover, the branching ratio for $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ provides additional constraints, namely

$$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \sim \frac{3\alpha y^4}{32\pi G_F^2 M_S^4} \sim 10^{-26} \left(\frac{M_S}{\text{TeV}} \right)^{-4} \left(\frac{y}{10^{-5}} \right)^4, \quad (2.5)$$

with S a scalar particle of the model. Too large rates would appear for order one Yukawas. A detailed parameter scan confirms such statements [62, 63].

The sign of the muon AMM could be changed by a minimal addition of one more scalar, which provides a freedom to choose the sign of the product of the Yukawa coupling in the AMM contributions. This would utilize either of the two one-loop diagrams presented in Fig. 2. For the scotogenic model both these diagrams are identical and the loop can be completed by introducing a singly charged scalar, that is $S_3 = S_4 \equiv \eta(1, 1, 1)$. However, the smallness of the implied AMM contribution remains, which can be quantified as follows. The presence of η^+ , with different hypercharge than the inert doublet and Yukawa coupling y' , allows both left-handed and right-handed charged leptons in the external legs (unlike the scotogenic model that involves only left-handed charged fermions) and provides enhanced contribution to lepton AMM that is proportional to the mass of N_R . Then the formula given in Eq. (2.4) has the following modified form

$$-\Delta a_\mu \sim \frac{m_\mu}{8\pi^2 M_S^2} y y' \theta M_N \sim 10^{-12} \left(\frac{M_{\text{NP}}}{\text{TeV}} \right)^{-1} \left(\frac{y}{10^{-5}} \right) y' \theta, \quad (2.6)$$

where $\theta \leq 1$ represents the mixing angle between the two singly charged states, M_{NP} is common new physics scale of the new particles, and in the second line we have assume the dominance of one of the terms towards lepton AMM to maximize the effect. This implies that even with $y'_\ell \sim 1$, much higher values than $y \sim 10^{-5}$ are required to explain the AMM, which would be in conflict with neutrino mass and cLFV for TeV scale new particles. Such correlations can be avoided if the Yukawa coupling y does not participate in explaining $(g-2)_\ell$. This is precisely what we try to achieve in an economical fashion within our framework.




Figure 2: New physics contributions to $(g - 2)_\ell$. The outgoing photon can be emitted from the internal fermion or boson line (or both) depending on the model.

The same conclusion can be reached for any similar model with Majorana fermions running in the loop in Fig. 1 that transform non-trivially under the $SU(2)_L$ group, for example $F \sim (1, 3, 0)$ (for this choice, one again gets $S_1 = S_2 \equiv \phi$).

The above arguments are also changed if hypercharged vector-like Dirac fermions instead of Majorana fermions are introduced. This requirement still allows the Dirac fermions to have a bare mass term (vector-like under the SM), and simultaneously demands that $S_1 \neq S_2$ in Fig. 1, owing to the new fermions carrying $Y \neq 0$. Consequently, two different Yukawa coupling matrices play a role in generating neutrino mass, which resolves the above-mentioned issues. With only these two scalars present in a theory, a mass flip of the vector-like fermion can not be realized for lepton AMM contributions, hence a third scalar either S_3 or S_4 must be introduced for such purpose as shown in Fig. 2. The presence of at least three different Yukawa couplings allows to disentangle contributions to AMM, neutrino mass and cLFV, and as mentioned above, to control the sign of the AMM contributions. As aforementioned, in our setup all the BSM multiplets are assumed to be odd under \mathcal{Z}_2 , consequently the lightest among the neutral component fields can play the role of DM and successfully explain the DM relic abundance. It is to be pointed out that the requirement of the new fermions carrying non-zero hypercharge is an outcome of the DM-stabilizing \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry, if the diagrams in Figs. 1 and 2 are supposed to exist. This could be relaxed if a different discrete or continuous symmetry is chosen to build a model, which we do not pursue. In this work we strictly stick to \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry for the fixed topology as in Fig. 1 to generate neutrino mass. For general analyses of various topologies of neutrino mass arising by utilizing exotic vector-like fermions, see for example [64–66].

From these Feynman diagrams and the above discussion, one sees that a common set

Multiplets	Model-I	Model-II	Model-III	Model-IV	Model-V	Model-VI	Model-VII
$F_{L,R}$	(1,1,-1)	(1,1,-1)	(1,2,-1/2)	(1,2,-1/2)	(1,2,-3/2)	(1,3,1)	(1,3,1)
S_1	(1,2,1/2)	(1,2,1/2)	(1,1,0)	(1,1,0)	(1,1,1)	(1,2,3/2)	(1,2,3/2)
S_2	(1,2,3/2)	(1,2,3/2)	(1,3,1)	(1,3,1)	(1,3,-2)	(1,2,1/2)	(1,2,1/2)
S_3	(1,1,0)	-	(1,2,1/2)	-	(1,2,1/2)	(1,3,2)	-
S_4	-	(1,1,2)	-	(1,2,3/2)	-	-	(1,3,0)

Table I: Here we have listed only the viable models up to $SU(2)_L$ triplets that satisfy our required criteria, see text for details. By following our method, models involving higher dimensional representations can be constructed trivially. Multiplets containing a potential dark matter candidate are shown in red.

of multiplets, either $\{F_{L,R}, S_1\}$ or $\{F_{L,R}, S_2\}$ depending on the model, plays role in both the neutrino mass generation and in accommodating lepton AMMs data. With TeV scale vector-like fermions, the appropriate scale of neutrino masses can be naturally reproduced with Yukawa couplings that are comparable in order with the SM charged fermion Yukawa couplings. Furthermore, even with TeV scale vector-like fermions, the required large contributions towards both $(g-2)_e$ and $(g-2)_\mu$ can be promptly obtained via chirality enhancement.

Having stated our criteria, the exercise is now to find a set of vector-like fermions and scalars that allow for the topologies in Figs. 1 and 2. This leads to the models summarized in Table I. Here we have listed only the viable models up to $SU(2)_L$ triplets that satisfy our above-mentioned criteria. Multiplets that contain a neutral component and thus a potential DM candidate are shown in red. By following our methodology, models involving higher dimensional representations can be constructed trivially. It is beyond the scope of this work to study each of these models in detail. Instead, in the next section we perform a detailed analysis of the first model (Model-I) in the list.

3 Details of Model-I

In this section we perform a detailed analysis of Model-I. In this model, the SM particle content is extended by three singly charged vector-like fermions $F_{L,R}$, and three scalars: a singlet and two doublets under the $SU(2)_L$ group. One of the doublets has hypercharge 1/2 and the other has 3/2. As already mentioned, under the imposed \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry, the SM particles are even, whereas all the BSM states are odd. The full quantum numbers of the BSM multiplets are summarized in Table II.

With this particle content, the most general Yukawa Lagrangian consistent with all

Multiplets	$SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$	\mathcal{Z}_2
Scalars	$\phi_1(1, 2, \frac{1}{2})$	—
	$\phi_2(1, 2, \frac{3}{2})$	—
	$\eta(1, 1, 0)$	—
Vector-like fermion	$F_{L,R}(1, 1, -1)$	—

Table II: Quantum numbers of the BSM multiplets for Model-I. Both ϕ_1 and η contain a DM candidate.

symmetries is given as

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y = y_H \bar{L}_L \ell_R H + y_1 \bar{L}_L F_R \phi_1 + y_2 \bar{L}_L^c F_L i\tau_2 \phi_2 + \frac{y_3}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{\ell}_R F_L \eta + M_F \bar{F}_L F_R + h.c. \quad (3.7)$$

Here, L_L is a left-handed lepton doublet, ℓ_R is a right-handed lepton, and H is the SM Higgs doublet. In the above Eq. (3.7), for simplicity we have suppressed generation indices. Note that the third term violates lepton number. Yukawa couplings of the quarks remain unchanged compared to the SM, hence we only focus on the leptonic sector. We work in the basis where the Yukawa coupling y_H and the vector-like fermion mass matrix M_F are diagonal. The three new Yukawa couplings matrices $y_{1,2,3}$ are in general arbitrary.

3.1 Scalar sector

The scalar sector of the full model consists of three neutral CP-even states $h, S_{1,2}^0$, one neutral CP-odd A^0 , two singly charged $S_{1,2}^\pm$, and a doubly charged S^{++} . Here h is identified with the SM Higgs, which does not mix with the rest of the two states $S_{1,2}^0$ due to the imposed \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry. The lightest between these two states $S_{1,2}^0$ is identified as the DM. Moreover, we assume the BSM multiplets η and ϕ_1 do not accrue any VEV, hence, the Goldstone bosons G^0, G^\pm originate entirely from the SM Higgs doublet H . The complete scalar potential for Model-I is given as

$$\begin{aligned} V = & -\mu_H^2 H^\dagger H + \sum_{\varphi}^{\{\phi_1, \phi_2\}} \mu_\varphi^2 \varphi^\dagger \varphi + \mu_\eta^2 \eta^2 + (\mu_5 H^\dagger \phi_1 \eta + h.c.) + \sum_{\varphi}^{\{H, \phi_1, \phi_2\}} \lambda_\varphi (\varphi^\dagger \varphi)^2 + \lambda_\eta \eta^4 \\ & + \sum_{\varphi < \varphi'}^{\{H, \phi_1, \phi_2\}} \lambda_{\varphi\varphi'} (\varphi^\dagger \varphi) (\varphi'^\dagger \varphi') + \sum_{\varphi}^{\{H, \phi_1, \phi_2\}} \lambda_{\varphi\eta} (\varphi^\dagger \varphi) \eta^2 + \sum_{\varphi < \varphi'}^{\{H, \phi_1, \phi_2\}} \lambda'_{\varphi\varphi'} (\varphi^\dagger \varphi') (\varphi'^\dagger \varphi) \\ & + \left\{ \lambda''_{H\phi_1} (H^\dagger \phi_1)^2 + h.c. \right\} + \left\{ \lambda''_{\phi_1\phi_2} (H^\dagger \phi_1) (\phi_2^\dagger H) + h.c. \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.8)$$

We now derive the masses of the physical Higgs particles from the above potential. The mass-squared matrix $\mathcal{M}_{S^0}^2$ for the two CP-even states, written in the $\{\eta^0, \text{Re}(\phi_1^0)\}$ basis, is

$$\mathcal{M}_{S^0}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 2\mu_\eta^2 + \lambda_{H\eta}v_H^2 & \mu_5 v_H \\ \mu_5 v_H & \mu_{\phi_1}^2 + \frac{(\lambda_{H\phi_1} + \lambda'_{H\phi_1} + 2\lambda''_{H\phi_1})}{2} v_H^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.9)$$

The scalars that do not mix with any other fields are the SM Higgs, the CP-odd scalar, and the doubly charged scalar. The corresponding squared masses are

$$m_h^2 = 2\lambda_H v_H^2, \quad (3.10)$$

$$m_{A^0}^2 = \mu_{\phi_1}^2 + \frac{(\lambda_{H\phi_1} + \lambda'_{H\phi_1} - 2\lambda''_{H\phi_1})}{2} v_H^2, \quad (3.11)$$

$$m_{S^{\pm\pm}}^2 = \mu_{\phi_2}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{H\phi_2}}{2} v_H^2, \quad (3.12)$$

where ϕ_A is $\text{Im}(\phi_1^0)$. Finally, the mass-squared matrix for the singly charged scalars in a basis of (ϕ_1^\pm, ϕ_2^\pm) reads

$$\mathcal{M}_{S^\pm}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{\phi_1}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{H\phi_1}}{2} v_H^2 & -\frac{\lambda''_{\phi_1\phi_2}}{2} v_H^2 \\ -\frac{\lambda''_{\phi_1\phi_2}}{2} v_H^2 & \mu_{\phi_2}^2 + \frac{(\lambda_{H\phi_2} + \lambda'_{H\phi_2})}{2} v_H^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.13)$$

Moreover, the mixing angle α (γ) between the two mixed CP-even (singly charged) states can be calculated from

$$\begin{aligned} \tan 2\alpha &= \frac{2\mu_5 v_H}{(\mathcal{M}_{S^0}^2)_{11} - (\mathcal{M}_{S^0}^2)_{22}}, \\ \tan 2\gamma &= \frac{\lambda''_{\phi_1\phi_2} v_H^2}{(\mathcal{M}_{S^\pm}^2)_{22} - (\mathcal{M}_{S^\pm}^2)_{11}}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

We note that the presence of non-zero α is crucial for generating the AMMs and for the dark matter phenomenology. Non-zero γ is required to generate neutrino mass. Moreover, between the two neutral physical states $S_{1,2}^0$, we will assume S_1^0 to be the lighter one and identify it as the DM candidate. Its decomposition in terms of the original fields is given by $S_1^0 = \eta^0 \cos \alpha + \text{Re}(\phi_1^0) \sin \alpha$.

3.2 Lepton anomalous magnetic moments

In the present set-up, we assume the vector-like fermions to reside around the TeV scale. In contrast to the scotogenic case, having such a heavy mass does not require large Yukawa couplings to incorporate the Δa_ℓ data given in Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2). Large enough corrections to the lepton AMMs naturally arise due to a chirality flip of the vector-like fermions on the internal line, as can be seen from Fig. 2. Moreover, the sign difference for Δa_e and Δa_μ is obtained by appropriately choosing the sign of the product of the Yukawa couplings that

enter in this chirality enhanced AMM term. We derive the complete NP contributions towards $(g-2)_\ell$ that is given by [67]

$$\Delta a_\ell = \frac{m_\ell}{16\pi^2} \sum_{j=1}^3 \left[\sum_{k=1}^2 \text{Re} \left(Y_{L,k}^{*\ell j} Y_{R,k}^{\ell j} \right) \frac{M_{F_j}}{M_{S_k}^2} G \left(\frac{M_{F_j}^2}{M_{S_k}^2} \right) + \frac{m_\ell^2}{4\pi^2} \sum_{k=1}^3 \left(|Y_{L,k}^{\ell j}|^2 + |Y_{R,k}^{\ell j}|^2 \right) \frac{1}{M_{S_k}^2} \tilde{G} \left(\frac{M_{F_j}^2}{M_{S_k}^2} \right) + \frac{m_\ell^2}{4\pi^2} |Y_{L,4}^{\ell j}|^2 \frac{1}{M_{S_4}^2} \tilde{G} \left(\frac{M_{F_j}^2}{M_{S_4}^2} \right) \right], \quad (3.15)$$

where we have defined $S_1 = S_1^0$, $S_2 = S_2^0$, $S_3 = A^0$, and $S_4 = S^{\pm\pm}$. The expressions for the loop functions are

$$G(x) = \frac{3 - 4x + x^2 + 2 \ln(x)}{(x-1)^3}, \quad (3.16)$$

$$\tilde{G}(x) = \frac{2 + 3x - 6x^2 + x^3 + 6x \ln x}{24(1-x)^4}. \quad (3.17)$$

The re-scaled Yukawa couplings appearing in Eq. (3.15) are defined by

$$Y_{L,1}^{\ell j} = \frac{\sin \alpha}{\sqrt{2}} (y_1)_{\ell j}, \quad Y_{L,2}^{\ell j} = \frac{\cos \alpha}{\sqrt{2}} (y_1)_{\ell j}. \quad (3.18)$$

$$Y_{R,1}^{\ell j} = \frac{\cos \alpha}{\sqrt{2}} (y_3)_{\ell j}, \quad Y_{R,2}^{\ell j} = \frac{-\sin \alpha}{\sqrt{2}} (y_3)_{\ell j}. \quad (3.19)$$

$$Y_{L,3}^{\ell j} = i \frac{\sin \alpha}{\sqrt{2}} (y_1)_{\ell j}, \quad Y_{R,3}^{\ell j} = 0, \quad Y_{L,4}^{\ell j} = -(y_2)_{\ell j}. \quad (3.20)$$

It should be pointed out that the very first term (chirality flip term) in Eq. (3.15) dominates; the remaining contributions can be safely ignored for our case, which we have confirmed numerically. In our set-up, the contribution from the SM Higgs h remains unchanged, which is already part of a_ℓ^{SM} . We stress here that for $\alpha = 0$ the dominating first contribution to the AMMs would vanish. This can be understood from the expressions in (3.8) and (3.14). Vanishing α would correspond to vanishing μ_5 , and thus no triple-scalar coupling of ϕ_1 with η and the SM Higgs. This in turn would correspond to the absence of the AMM diagram in Fig. 2.

The off-diagonal elements in the Yukawa couplings $y_{1,3}$ will lead to cLFV processes such as $\ell \rightarrow \ell' \gamma$. Due to the same chirality enhancement effects via the vector-like fermions, these processes impose severe constraints on these off-diagonal Yukawa couplings. Amplitudes of these cLFV processes can be straightforwardly computed for our scenario, however, for the simplicity of our work, we assume the two Yukawa coupling matrices $y_{1,3}$ to be diagonal (meaning, small off-diagonal entries are omitted for our analysis). However, non-zero but small off-diagonal entries have no impact on the results obtained in this work. There are also very stringent constraints that arise from the lepton dipole moments (for a review see Ref. [68]) measurements for complex couplings. We avoid these constraints by demanding




Figure 3: The red (green) and orange (yellow) regions indicate the experimental 1σ and 2σ bands for the muon (electron) AMM Δa_μ (Δa_e). The parameter space in Yukawa coupling vs. vector-like fermion mass plane consistent with both the electron and muon AMMs. Here we choose the mass of scalars S_1^0 and S_2^0 to be 120 GeV and 360 GeV, respectively. The blue star corresponds to the benchmark point given in Eqs. (3.27) - (3.30).

these $y_{1,3}$ couplings to be real. For completeness, here we present the generic expressions for the cLFV process $\ell \rightarrow \ell' \gamma$ for our model

$$\text{BR}(\ell \rightarrow \ell' \gamma) = \frac{m_\ell^3 \tau_\ell \alpha}{4096 \pi^4} (|A^{\ell\ell'}|^2 + |A^{\ell'\ell}|^2), \quad (3.21)$$

$$A^{\ell\ell'} = \sum_{j=1}^3 \left[\sum_{k=1}^2 Y_{L,k}^{*\ell'j} Y_{R,k}^{\ell j} \frac{M_{F_j}}{M_{S_k}^2} G\left(\frac{M_{F_j}^2}{M_{S_k}^2}\right) - \sum_{k=1}^4 Y_{L,k}^{*\ell'j} Y_{L,k}^{\ell j} \frac{4m_\ell}{M_{S_k}^2} \tilde{G}\left(\frac{M_{F_j}^2}{M_{S_k}^2}\right) \right], \quad (3.22)$$

$$A^{\ell'\ell} = \sum_{j=1}^3 \left[\sum_{k=1}^2 Y_{L,k}^{*\ell j} Y_{R,k}^{\ell'j} \frac{M_{F_j}}{M_{S_k}^2} G\left(\frac{M_{F_j}^2}{M_{S_k}^2}\right) - \sum_{k=1}^4 Y_{R,k}^{*\ell j} Y_{R,k}^{\ell'j} \frac{4m_\ell}{M_{S_k}^2} \tilde{G}\left(\frac{M_{F_j}^2}{M_{S_k}^2}\right) \right], \quad (3.23)$$

here τ_ℓ is the lifetime of lepton ℓ , and the Yukawa couplings and the loop functions have been defined above.

In Fig. 3, we show the parameter space in Yukawa coupling vs. vector-like lepton mass plane which is consistent with the experimentally measured values of AMMs of the electron and muon. The red and orange regions correspond to the measured values of muon AMM within 1σ and 2σ allowed range respectively, whereas green and yellow regions depict the parameter space consistent with the measured value of electron AMM within 1σ and 2σ allowed range respectively. For illustration purpose, here we set the mass of the scalars S_1^0 (S_2^0) to be 120 GeV (360 GeV). The blue star in Fig. 3 indicates to the benchmark point

given in Eqs. (3.27) - (3.30).

3.3 Neutrino mass

The same vector-like fermions play a major role in generating radiative neutrino mass and the corresponding Feynman diagram is presented in Fig. 1. The loop is completed via the propagation of the singly charged scalars $S_{1,2}^+$, and we obtain the following expression for the neutrino mass matrix for Model-I

$$\mathcal{M}_{ij}^\nu = \frac{\sin 2\gamma}{16\pi^2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 [(y_1)_{i\alpha}(y_2)_{j\alpha} + (y_1)_{j\alpha}(y_2)_{i\alpha}] M_{F\alpha} \left[\frac{M_{S_1^+}^2 \ln \frac{M_{S_1^+}^2}{M_{F\alpha}^2}}{M_{S_1^+}^2 - M_{F\alpha}^2} - \frac{M_{S_2^+}^2 \ln \frac{M_{S_2^+}^2}{M_{F\alpha}^2}}{M_{S_2^+}^2 - M_{F\alpha}^2} \right]. \quad (3.24)$$

Here the mixing angle γ between the singly charged physical particles is defined in Eq. (3.14). We stress here that for $\gamma = 0$ the neutrino mass would vanish. This can be understood from the expressions in (3.8) and (3.14). Vanishing γ would correspond to vanishing $\lambda''_{\phi_1\phi_2}$, and thus no quartic scalar coupling of ϕ_1 with ϕ_2 and a SM Higgs pair. This in turn would correspond to the absence of the neutrino mass diagram in Fig. 1.

Note that to reproduce correct lepton mixing, one must have a non-trivial structure for the Yukawa coupling matrix y_2 , since y_1 is taken to be diagonal. This however, does not conflict with lepton flavor violating $\ell \rightarrow \ell' \gamma$ processes mediated by the doubly charged scalars, since $(y_2)_{ij} \sim 10^{-5}$ in order to generate the correct neutrino mass scale. In the next subsection, we provide a realistic fit to neutrino mass spectrum.

3.4 A combined fit to data

To demonstrate the viability of our proposed framework, here we present a combined fit to reproduce the experimental results. The expressions for $(g-2)_e$ and $(g-2)_\mu$ are given in Eq. (3.15), and their corresponding measured values can be found in Eqs. (1.1) and (1.2). Furthermore, from the neutrino mass formula Eq. (3.24), one needs to successfully incorporate two mass-squared differences, three mixing angles, and one Dirac CP phase. The associated measured values in the experiments are summarized in Table III. The neutrino mass matrix can be parameterized as follows

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = U_{\text{PMNS}} \text{diag}\{m_1, m_2, m_3\} U_{\text{PMNS}}^T, \quad (3.25)$$

$$U_{\text{PMNS}} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\frac{\alpha_{21}}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\frac{\alpha_{31}}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.26)$$

Parameter	Best fit $\pm 1\sigma$	Parameter	Best fit $\pm 1\sigma$
Δm_{21}^2 (10^{-5} eV ²)	$7.50^{+0.22}_{-0.20}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	0.318 ± 0.016
Δm_{31}^2 (10^{-3} eV ²)	$2.56^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	$0.566^{+0.016}_{-0.022}$
δ_{CP}	$1.20^{+0.23}_{-0.14}\pi$	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	$0.02225^{+0.00055}_{-0.00078}$

Table III: Current experimental values of the neutrino observables with their corresponding 1σ uncertainties taken from Ref. [69].

where m_i are real eigenvalues and we have defined $c_{ij} = \cos \theta_{ij}$, $s_{ij} = \sin \theta_{ij}$. In the PMNS mixing matrix there exist three physical phases, one Dirac phase $\delta \equiv \delta_{CP}$ and two Majorana phases $\alpha_{21,31}$, where we have used the particle data group (PDG) parametrization. In this work, we assume a normal ordering for neutrino masses that corresponds to $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$, which still is favored by oscillation data [69, 70].

With all these in hand, we perform a combined numerical analysis and provide a benchmark point in the following

$$M_{F_\alpha} = 1 \text{ TeV}; \quad M_{S_1^0} = 0.12 \text{ TeV}, \quad M_{S_2^0} = 3M_{S_1^0}; \quad M_{S_1^+} = 0.46 \text{ TeV}; \quad M_{S_2^+} = 3M_{S_1^+}, \quad (3.27)$$

$$\sin \alpha = 0.1, \quad \lambda''_{\phi_1 \phi_2} = 8.325 \times 10^{-6}, \quad (3.28)$$

$$y_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0.3662 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1.0141 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -0.43913 \end{pmatrix}, \quad y_3 = \begin{pmatrix} -0.19428 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1.07051 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0.14602 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.29)$$

$$y_2 = 10^{-5} \begin{pmatrix} -0.10116 + 0.07932i & -1.01099 + 0.62701i & -0.49019 - 0.30200i \\ -0.03471 - 0.04519i & 0.31733 - 0.69407i & 0.98401 + 0.8099i \\ 0.53005 - 0.9659i & -0.05210 + 0.67329i & -1.00145 + 0.82294i \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.30)$$

Yukawa couplings of order $y_2 \sim 10^{-5}$ automatically satisfy all experimental constraints, including cLFV processes. The values of the theory parameters corresponding to this benchmark point successfully reproduce all the observables both in the neutrino sector as well as AMMs of the electron and the muon, we list the predictions in Table IV. Since an explanation of the lepton AMMs demands Yukawa couplings of order unity (as can be seen from Eq. (3.29)), and the same Yukawa couplings enter in neutrino mass generation, it can be easily understood that $y_2 \lambda''_{\phi_1 \phi_2} \sim 10^{-10}$ (instead of $y_2^2 \sim 10^{-10}$ as in Eq. (2.3)) must be satisfied to reproduce the correct neutrino mass scale. Regarding the smallness of $\lambda''_{\phi_1 \phi_2}$, we recall that it is the coefficient of the quartic coupling $(H\epsilon\phi_1)(\phi_2^\dagger H)$ responsible for mixing the two singly charged states, as defined in Eq. (3.14). In the limit of $\lambda''_{\phi_1 \phi_2} \rightarrow 0$ neutrino masses are zero, because the theory regains the accidental lepton number conservation of the SM. The chosen DM (S_1^0) mass of 120 GeV and the associated mixing angle $\sin \alpha$ for

this benchmark point will be shown to be consistent with both DM detection bounds as well as DM relic abundance as detailed in the next section. It should be pointed out that in the DM analysis more parameters such as the Higgs portal coupling and lepton coupling portal play role, which are not fixed by the fit performed above. Moreover, the mass of the doubly charged scalar is not determined from the fit, which for simplicity, we choose to be degenerate in mass with its singly charged partner to be consistent with T parameter constraints. However a splitting of order $\mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV is still allowed [71].

Quantity	Fit value	Quantity	Fit value
Δa_e	-8.696×10^{-13}	m_1 (eV)	0.00812
Δa_μ	2.744×10^{-9}	m_2 (eV)	0.01188
Δm_{21}^2 (10^{-5} eV ²)	7.525	m_3 (eV)	0.05117
Δm_{31}^2 (10^{-3} eV ²)	2.552	m_{cos} (eV)	0.07118
$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	0.3171	m_β (eV)	0.01207
$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	0.5638	$m_{\beta\beta}$ (eV)	0.00167
$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	0.02216	α_{21}	188.8°
δ_{CP}	223.8°	α_{31}	311.9°

Table IV: Fit values of some of the observables for our benchmark points given in Eqs. (3.27) - (3.30). Here $m_{\text{cos}} = \sum_i m_i$, $m_\beta = \sqrt{\sum_i |U_{ei}|^2 m_i^2}$ is the effective mass parameter for beta decay, and $m_{\beta\beta} = |\sum_i U_{ei}^2 m_i|$ is the effective mass parameter for neutrinoless double beta decay.

3.5 Dark matter phenomenology

In this subsection, we analyze the Dark Matter (DM) phenomenology in Model-I, where lepton anomalous magnetic moments, neutrino masses and mixings are successfully generated. As aforementioned, in this model the presence of a discrete symmetry \mathcal{Z}_2 stabilizes the DM particle. The newly introduced scalars (ϕ_1, ϕ_2 and η) and vector-like leptons $F_{L,R}$ are odd under this discrete symmetry, whereas the SM particles are even. The lightest neutral particle among the new ones qualifies to be a DM candidate. In our setup for Model-I, the dark matter candidate will be an admixture of neutral components of the doublet ϕ_1 and the singlet η . As one can see from Eq. (3.15), one needs to introduce mixing between these two fields to successfully address electron and muon $g-2$ anomalies. Hence, the dark matter can be neither pure singlet type [72–84] nor pure inert doublet type [4, 85–92]. Rather, it will be singlet-doublet scalar dark matter [93]. While scalar singlet dark matter is tightly constrained from DM direct detection experiments [81, 83, 94–96], inclusion of mixing with an




Figure 4: Relevant Feynman diagrams that contribute to the annihilation of the DM.

additional doublet can introduce new additional interactions producing the right amount of relic density, and which can potentially allow for evasion of direct detection bounds [94–96] for a large region of parameter space.

The dominant processes that contribute to the annihilation of the DM particle are shown in Fig. 4. In our case, the DM can annihilate to SM particles through s -channel Higgs-mediated processes (Higgs-portal). These Higgs-portal processes can be particularly important when the DM mass is close to half of the Higgs boson mass. Above this mass regime, the DM annihilation to gauge bosons (possible because it is partly a doublet) contributes dominantly to the annihilation processes. In this mass region, the DM annihilation through the t -channel exchange is usually smaller than the contribution from the 4-point vertex shown in Fig. 4. Finally, the presence of the vector-like leptons opens up new annihilation modes for DM via the t -channel processes (lepton-portal) as shown in Fig. 4. In the low mass region, these leptonic portal processes become significant in addition to the Higgs-portal processes. For the DM analysis, we will denote the lepton portal coupling by λ_{LP} . Since the DM is identified to be the state S_1^0 , its lepton portal couplings with F_{L_j} (F_{R_j}) is $\sqrt{2}Y_{L,1}^{\ell j}$ ($\sqrt{2}Y_{R,1}^{\ell j}$) which can be read off from Eqs. (3.18) and (3.19). On the other hand, λ_{HP} represents the Higgs portal coupling, which is defined by $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = (\lambda_{H\phi_1} + \lambda'_{H\phi_1} + 2\lambda''_{H\phi_1}) \sin^2 \alpha + 2\lambda_{H\eta} \cos^2 \alpha$. That is, our DM particle S_1^0 couples via

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{\lambda_{\text{HP}}}{2} (S_1^0)^2 H^\dagger H + \frac{\lambda_{\text{LP}}}{\sqrt{2}} S_1^0 \bar{\ell}_{L,R} F_{R,L}. \quad (3.31)$$

Let us quantify the DM phenomenology further. For our DM analysis, we have inserted our model in `micrOMEGAs` [99, 100] and scan over the parameter space to analyze relic abundance and direct detection constraints. For the rest of the analysis we fix the vector-like




Figure 5: DM relic density (Ωh^2) as a function of DM mass (m_{DM}). *Top left*: for different choices of mixing angle: $\sin \alpha = 0.0$ (grey-dotted), $\sin \alpha = 0.01$ (light-green), $\sin \alpha = 0.1$ (green), $\sin \alpha = 0.3$ (violet) and $\sin \alpha = 0.7$ (red). Here we choose the Higgs-portal coupling $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 10^{-3}$ and the leptonic portal coupling $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 0.1$ for illustration. *Top right*: for various choices of the Higgs-portal coupling: $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 5 \times 10^{-2}$ (red), $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 10^{-2}$ (violet), $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 5 \times 10^{-3}$ (green), $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 10^{-3}$ (light-green), and $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 5 \times 10^{-4}$ (grey). The mixing angle $\sin \alpha = 0.3$ and the leptonic portal coupling $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 0.1$ are chosen for illustration. *Bottom*: for different choices of leptonic portal coupling: $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 0.1$ (grey), $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 0.5$ (light-green), $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 1.0$ (green), $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 1.5$ (violet), and $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 2.0$ (red). Here we choose the Higgs-portal coupling $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 10^{-3}$ and the mixing angle $\sin \alpha = 0.07$ for illustration. The yellow band indicates the WMAP-observed relic density bound [97]. For all the panels, we set the vector-like lepton mass to be 1 TeV.

lepton mass to be 1 TeV. As mentioned in the above paragraph, in our case the viable DM mass range which is consistent with the WMAP relic density constraint can be divided into three regions. In the low mass regime ($m_{\text{DM}} \lesssim 55$ GeV), the main annihilation channel of DM is via the leptonic t -channel processes, mediated by the vector-like leptons. Since the s -wave and p -wave contributions of this leptonic channels are helicity-suppressed [101, 102],




Figure 6: The parameter space in Higgs-portal coupling (λ_{HP}) vs. DM mass (m_{DM}) plane consistent with the WMAP relic density constraint. *Left:* regions are shown for different choices of leptonic portal coupling: $\lambda_{LP} = 0.5$ (cyan), $\lambda_{LP} = 1.0$ (orange), $\lambda_{LP} = 1.5$ (blue), and $\lambda_{LP} = 2.0$ (pink). Here the mixing angle $\sin \alpha = 0.3$ is kept fixed. *Right:* regions are shown for different choices of mixing angle: $\sin \alpha = 0.01$ (red), $\sin \alpha = 0.08$ (cyan), $\sin \alpha = 0.1$ (blue), $\sin \alpha = 0.3$ (green), and $\sin \alpha = 0.5$ (orange). Here we choose the leptonic portal coupling $\lambda_{LP} = 0.1$. The color shaded regions with solid boundary line denote the excluded parameter space by various current direct detection experiments: brown region from LUX-2017 [95]; blue region from PandaX-II [98]; yellow region from XENON1T (2018) [94]. We set the vector-like lepton mass to be 1 TeV.

the d -wave contribution becomes dominant for the case of DM annihilation into electron-positron and muon-antimuon pairs. For DM annihilation into tau leptons, the s -wave and p -wave contributions become dominant compared to the d -wave contribution [101]. In Fig. 5 (bottom), we analyze the DM relic density as a function of DM mass for various leptonic portal couplings (λ_{LP}). Here we set the Higgs portal coupling $\lambda_{HP} = 10^{-3}$ and the mixing angle $\sin \alpha = 0.07$ for illustration. For simplicity, we also choose the leptonic portal coupling to be same for all the three leptons. For illustrating this further, we have also scanned the parameter space in Higgs-portal coupling (λ_{HP}) vs. DM mass (m_{DM}) plane consistent with the WMAP relic density constraint for different choices of leptonic portal coupling in Fig. 6 (left). In the intermediate mass region ($55 \text{ GeV} \lesssim m_{DM} \lesssim 75 \text{ GeV}$), the dominant contribution to the DM annihilation comes from the s -channel Higgs mediated process. In Fig. 5 (top right), we analyze the DM relic density as a function of DM mass for various Higgs-portal couplings (λ_{HP}). The mixing angle $\sin \alpha = 0.3$ and leptonic portal coupling $\lambda_{LP} = 0.1$ are chosen for better illustration. In the high mass regime ($m_{DM} \gtrsim 75 \text{ GeV}$), the relic density of DM depends on the mixing angle. In this parameter space, the dominant




Figure 7: The parameter space in vector-like lepton mass (M_F) vs. DM mass (m_{DM}) plane consistent with both the electron and muon AMMs. The orange (yellow) region indicates the experimental 2σ band for the muon (electron) AMM Δa_μ (Δa_e). *Left*: the colored vertical bands represent the regions that are consistent with the WMAP relic density constraint for different choices of mixing angle: $\sin \alpha = 0.08$ (cyan), $\sin \alpha = 0.1$ (blue), and $\sin \alpha = 0.15$ (pink). Here we fix the Higgs-portal coupling λ_{HP} to be 10^{-3} . *Right*: the colored regions are shown for different choices of leptonic portal coupling that are consistent with the WMAP relic density constraint: $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 0.146$ (cyan), $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 1.5$ (blue), and $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 2.0$ (pink). Here we fix the mixing angle $\sin \alpha = 0.1$ and the Higgs-portal coupling $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 4 \times 10^{-4}$. For both the panels, we fix the product $(y_1)_{\ell\ell}(y_3)_{\ell\ell} \sin 2\alpha$ to be same as the benchmark value given in Eqs. (3.27) - (3.30). The horizontal dashed-line indicates the bound on the vector-like lepton mass from the 13 TeV LHC data [103].

contribution to the DM annihilation cross-section comes from the weak gauge bosons channels. In Fig. 5 (top left), we show the effect of varying the mixing angle on the relic density of DM for a fixed value of $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 10^{-3}$ and $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 0.1$. As the mixing angle increases, the annihilation cross-section of DM into weak gauge bosons also increases. Due to this, the WMAP relic density constraint for DM can be satisfied for higher DM masses as well. For illustrating this, we also show the parameter space in Higgs-portal coupling (λ_{HP}) vs. DM mass (m_{DM}) plane consistent with the WMAP relic density constraint for various choices of mixing angle in Fig. 6 (right).

In addition to the DM relic density study, we also consider the constraints from various DM direct detection experiments. In our model, the DM can interact with nuclei dominantly via t -channel Higgs boson exchange. The corresponding spin independent DM-nucleon scattering cross-section is estimated in [73, 83]. Using this, we recast the limits from




Figure 8: Feynman diagrams for the collider signal of DM at the LHC.

LUX-2017 [95], PandaX-II [98] and XENON1T (2018) [94] experiments for our model, which are shown as brown, blue and yellow region, respectively, in Fig. 6. As one can see, we can satisfy all the present bounds from DM direct detection experiments for a large region of the parameter space.

Finally, in Fig. 7, we show the correlation between the vector-like lepton mass and DM mass in order to obtain the correct experimental values of $(g - 2)_{e,\mu}$ as well as the DM relic abundance. The orange and yellow region in vector-like lepton mass (M_F) vs. DM mass (m_{DM}) plane depict the parameter space which can address electron and muon $g - 2$ anomalies respectively. The pink, blue and cyan shaded bands represent the parameter space consistent with the DM relic abundance ($0.094 \leq \Omega h^2 \leq 0.128$). To illustrate the correlation, in left panel of Fig. 7, we set the Higgs-portal coupling λ_{HP} to be 10^{-3} and vary the mixing angle: $\sin \alpha = 0.08$ (cyan), $\sin \alpha = 0.1$ (blue), and $\sin \alpha = 0.15$ (pink). On the other hand, in right panel of Fig. 7, the colored regions are shown for different choices of leptonic portal coupling that are consistent with the WMAP relic density constraint: $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 0.146$ (cyan), $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 1.5$ (blue), and $\lambda_{\text{LP}} = 2.0$ (pink), while fixing the mixing angle $\sin \alpha = 0.1$ and the Higgs-portal coupling $\lambda_{\text{HP}} = 4 \times 10^{-4}$. For both the panels, we fix the product $(y_1)_{\ell\ell}(y_3)_{\ell\ell} \sin 2\alpha$ to be same as the benchmark value given in Eqs. (3.27) - (3.30). The horizontal dashed-line indicates the bound on the vector-like lepton mass from the 13 TeV LHC data [103], cf. Section 3.6. As we can see from Fig. 7, there is a significant region of parameter space (intersection zones) which can accommodate the correct experimental values of $(g - 2)_{e,\mu}$ as well as the DM relic abundance.

3.6 Collider implications

Here we discuss the collider phenomenology associated with the dark matter in our model. Especially, the presence of doubly charged scalar $S^{\pm\pm}$ and vector like lepton F^{\pm} can give rise to rich phenomenological implications at the LHC. Generically, DM is searched for at the LHC in mono- X searches, e.g. in association with one or more additional SM particles,

preferably a high momentum object (jet, photon, vector boson etc.) radiated by the initial state quarks. Here, we want to highlight a few non-standard collider aspects of DM which naturally arise in our framework.³ The relevant Feynman diagram for this collider signal of DM are shown in Fig. 8. The charged vector like fermion F^\pm , which is responsible for lepton anomalous magnetic moments, will be pair-produced at the LHC via s -channel Z/γ exchange and it will further decay back to DM and SM charged leptons. This will lead to DM production in association with two charged leptons ($pp \rightarrow \ell^+ \ell^- + \cancel{E}_T$) at the LHC. This process is somehow similar to the standard slepton searches [104–106]. If kinematically allowed, the DM can also be produced in association with same-sign dileptons from the decay of doubly charged scalar $S^{\pm\pm}$ as shown in right panel of the Fig. 8. The dominant production mechanism of the doubly charged scalar $S^{\pm\pm}$ at the LHC is the standard Drell-Yan process via s -channel Z/γ exchange. It will further dominantly decay to $S^{\pm\pm} \rightarrow F^\pm \ell^\pm$ and the vector-like leptons F^\pm decay dominantly to DM and SM charged leptons. This will lead to DM production in association with four charged leptons ($pp \rightarrow 2\ell^+ 2\ell^- + \cancel{E}_T$) at the LHC. Recently, prospects of this type of DM signal with multi-lepton signature were analyzed in detail [107]. On the other hand, if the \mathcal{Z}_2 odd charged scalars $S^{\pm\pm}$ and fermions F^\pm are not kinematically allowed to decay to DM promptly, they will be long-lived. In this case the track originating from long-lived charged particles can disappear at a point inside the detector. There are dedicated searches for these stable charged particles at the LHC [103] using signatures of long time-of-flight measurements and anomalously high energy deposits in the silicon tracker. Non-observation of any signal impose severe constraints on these stable charged particles. Using the 13 TeV LHC data [103], we find that the mass of a (long-lived) charged vector-like fermion F^\pm is constrained up to 550 GeV, whereas the mass limit on (long-lived) doubly charged scalar $S^{\pm\pm}$ is 660 GeV. Recently, displaced vertex and disappearing track signature for long-lived singly-charged lepton were analyzed, see [108, 109]. Also, the prospect of discovery of long-lived doubly charged scalars was analyzed [110]. Thus, this model predicts several unique signals like displaced vertex signature, disappearing tracks at the collider and non-standard DM signals with multi-lepton signature. All these signals have unique discovery prospects which can be tested in the upcoming run of the LHC or other colliders. The investigation of these collider signals is beyond the scope of this article and shall be presented in a future work.

³Note that charged scalars in our benchmark point are chosen to be beyond TeV, as are the vector-like fermions. This implies that they are above current sensitivities, and we can keep the discussion largely qualitative.

4 Conclusions

In this work, we have proposed a class of models that intercorrelates and offers a simultaneous explanation of neutrino mass, dark matter, the long-standing puzzle of the muon anomalous magnetic moment, and the recently observed tension in the electron anomalous magnetic moment. In each of these models, the Standard Model is extended with a vector-like fermion and a set of scalars, which are odd under an added \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry. A common set of these BSM states run through the loops and generates neutrino mass as well as lepton AMMs at one-loop order. If the vector-like fermions are around the TeV scale, they provide large chirality enhanced contributions required to resolve the lepton AMMs. Different signs for the muon and electron magnetic moments are arranged easily because different sets of Yukawa couplings are involved. The lightest of the neutral members of our new multiplets, either fermionic or bosonic in nature, plays the role of the dark matter, which is stabilized by the unbroken \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry. Models belonging to this class are simple in their constructions and provide a framework to unify a number of various seemingly uncorrelated issues that cannot be solved with the Standard Model. After a generic discussion, we have focused on a particular model, and performed a detailed analysis that includes a fit to neutrino oscillation parameters as well as electron and muon AMMs, followed by a discussion of DM and collider phenomenology.

Acknowledgments

The work of VPK was in part supported by US Department of Energy Grant Number DE-SC 0016013. WR is supported by the DFG with grant RO 2516/7-1 in the Heisenberg program.

References

- [1] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk, “Particle dark matter: Evidence, candidates and constraints,” *Phys. Rept.* **405** (2005) 279–390, [arXiv:hep-ph/0404175 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [2] Y. Cai, J. Herrero-Garcia, M. A. Schmidt, A. Vicente, and R. R. Volkas, “From the trees to the forest: a review of radiative neutrino mass models,” *Front.in Phys.* **5** (2017) 63, [arXiv:1706.08524 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [3] K. S. Babu, P. S. B. Dev, S. Jana, and A. Thapa, “Non-Standard Interactions in Radiative Neutrino Mass Models,” [arXiv:1907.09498 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [4] E. Ma, “Verifiable radiative seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass and dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 077301, [arXiv:hep-ph/0601225 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [5] D. Restrepo, O. Zapata, and C. E. Yaguna, “Models with radiative neutrino masses and viable dark matter candidates,” *JHEP* **11** (2013) 011, [arXiv:1308.3655 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [6] S. Jana, P. Vishnu, and S. Saad, “Minimal realizations of Dirac neutrino mass from generic one-loop and two-loop topologies at $d = 5$,” *JCAP* **04** (2020) 018, [arXiv:1910.09537 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [7] Y. Farzan, S. Pascoli, and M. A. Schmidt, “Recipes and Ingredients for Neutrino Mass at Loop Level,” *JHEP* **03** (2013) 107, [arXiv:1208.2732 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [8] C. Simoes and D. Wegman, “Radiative Two-Loop Neutrino Masses with Dark Matter,” *JHEP* **04** (2017) 148, [arXiv:1702.04759 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [9] S. Centelles Chuliñá, R. Cepedello, E. Peinado, and R. Srivastava, “Systematic classification of two loop $d = 4$ Dirac neutrino mass models and the Diracness-dark matter stability connection,” *JHEP* **10** (2019) 093, [arXiv:1907.08630 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [10] S. Jana, V. P. K., and S. Saad, “Minimal dirac neutrino mass models from $U(1)_R$ gauge symmetry and left–right asymmetry at colliders,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79** no. 11, (2019) 916, [arXiv:1904.07407 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [11] T. Aoyama *et al.*, “The anomalous magnetic moment of the muon in the Standard Model,” [arXiv:2006.04822 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [12] **Muon g-2** Collaboration, G. Bennett *et al.*, “Final Report of the Muon E821 Anomalous Magnetic Moment Measurement at BNL,” *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 072003, [arXiv:hep-ex/0602035](#).
- [13] R. H. Parker, C. Yu, W. Zhong, B. Estey, and H. Mueller, “Measurement of the fine-structure constant as a test of the Standard Model,” *Science* **360** (2018) 191, [arXiv:1812.04130 \[physics.atom-ph\]](#).
- [14] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita, and M. Nio, “Revised and Improved Value of the QED Tenth-Order Electron Anomalous Magnetic Moment,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** no. 3, (2018) 036001, [arXiv:1712.06060 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] G. Giudice, P. Paradisi, and M. Passera, “Testing new physics with the electron g-2,” *JHEP* **11** (2012) 113, [arXiv:1208.6583 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [16] H. Davoudiasl and W. J. Marciano, “Tale of two anomalies,” *Phys. Rev.* **D98** no. 7, (2018) 075011, [arXiv:1806.10252 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [17] A. Crivellin, M. Hoferichter, and P. Schmidt-Wellenburg, “Combined explanations of $(g - 2)_{\mu,e}$ and implications for a large muon EDM,” *Phys. Rev.* **D98** no. 11, (2018) 113002, [arXiv:1807.11484 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [18] J. Liu, C. E. M. Wagner, and X.-P. Wang, “A light complex scalar for the electron and muon anomalous magnetic moments,” *JHEP* **03** (2019) 008, [arXiv:1810.11028 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] B. Dutta and Y. Mimura, “Electron $g - 2$ with flavor violation in MSSM,” *Phys. Lett.* **B790** (2019) 563–567, [arXiv:1811.10209 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] X.-F. Han, T. Li, L. Wang, and Y. Zhang, “Simple interpretations of lepton anomalies in the lepton-specific inert two-Higgs-doublet model,” *Phys. Rev.* **D99** no. 9, (2019) 095034, [arXiv:1812.02449 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [21] A. Crivellin and M. Hoferichter, “Combined explanations of $(g - 2)_{\mu}$, $(g - 2)_e$ and implications for a large muon EDM,” in *33rd Rencontres de Physique de La Vallée d’Aoste (LaThuile 2019) La Thuile, Aosta, Italy, March 10-16, 2019*. 2019. [arXiv:1905.03789 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] M. Endo and W. Yin, “Explaining electron and muon $g - 2$ anomaly in SUSY without lepton-flavor mixings,” *JHEP* **08** (2019) 122, [arXiv:1906.08768 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] M. Abdullah, B. Dutta, S. Ghosh, and T. Li, “ $(g - 2)_{\mu,e}$ and the ANITA anomalous events in a three-loop neutrino mass model,” *Phys. Rev.* **D100** no. 11, (2019) 115006, [arXiv:1907.08109 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] M. Bauer, M. Neubert, S. Renner, M. Schnubel, and A. Thamm, “Axion-like particles, lepton-flavor violation and a new explanation of a_{μ} and a_e ,” [arXiv:1908.00008 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] M. Badziak and K. Sakurai, “Explanation of electron and muon $g - 2$ anomalies in the MSSM,” *JHEP* **10** (2019) 024, [arXiv:1908.03607 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] G. Hiller, C. Hormigos-Feliu, D. F. Litim, and T. Steudtner, “Anomalous magnetic moments from asymptotic safety,” [arXiv:1910.14062 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. F. King, H. Lee, and S. J. Rowley, “Is it possible to explain the muon and electron $g - 2$ in a Z' model?,” [arXiv:1910.10734 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [28] C. Cornella, P. Paradisi, and O. Sumensari, “Hunting for ALPs with Lepton Flavor Violation,” [arXiv:1911.06279 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] M. Endo, S. Iguro, and T. Kitahara, “Probing $e\mu$ flavor-violating ALP at Belle II,” [arXiv:2002.05948 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, Y. H. Velásquez, S. Kovalenko, H. N. Long, N. A. Páez-Julve, and V. V. Vien, “Fermion masses and mixings and $g - 2$ anomalies in a low scale 3-3-1 model,” [arXiv:2002.07347 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [31] N. Haba, Y. Shimizu, and T. Yamada, “Muon and Electron $g - 2$ and the Origin of Fermion Mass Hierarchy,” [arXiv:2002.10230 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [32] I. Bigaran and R. R. Volkas, “Getting chirality right: top-philic scalar leptoquark solution to the $(g - 2)_{e,\mu}$ puzzle,” [arXiv:2002.12544 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [33] S. Jana, V. P. K., and S. Saad, “Resolving electron and muon $g - 2$ within the 2HDM,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020) 115037, [arXiv:2003.03386 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [34] L. Calibbi, M. Lpez-Ibaez, A. Melis, and O. Vives, “Muon and electron $g - 2$ and lepton masses in flavor models,” [arXiv:2003.06633 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [35] C.-H. Chen and T. Nomura, “Electron and muon $g - 2$, radiative neutrino mass, and $\ell' \rightarrow \ell\gamma$ in a $U(1)_{e-\mu}$ model,” [arXiv:2003.07638 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [36] J.-L. Yang, T.-F. Feng, and H.-B. Zhang, “Electron and muon $(g - 2)$ in the B-LSSM,” *J. Phys. G* **47** no. 5, (2020) 055004, [arXiv:2003.09781 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [37] C. Hati, J. Kriewald, J. Orloff, and A. Teixeira, “Anomalies in ^8Be nuclear transitions and $(g - 2)_{e,\mu}$: towards a minimal combined explanation,” [arXiv:2005.00028 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [38] B. Dutta, S. Ghosh, and T. Li, “Explaining $(g - 2)_{\mu,e}$, KOTO anomaly and MinibooNE excess in an extended Higgs model with sterile neutrinos,” [arXiv:2006.01319 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [39] F. J. Botella, F. Cornet-Gomez, and M. Nebot, “Electron and muon $g - 2$ anomalies in general flavour conserving two Higgs doublets models,” [arXiv:2006.01934 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [40] K.-F. Chen, C.-W. Chiang, and K. Yagyu, “An explanation for the muon and electron $g - 2$ anomalies and dark matter,” [arXiv:2006.07929 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [41] I. Dorsner, S. Fajfer, and S. Saad, “ $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ selecting scalar leptoquark solutions for the $(g - 2)_{e,\mu}$ puzzles,” [arXiv:2006.11624 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] C. ArbelÃąez, R. Cepedello, R. M. Fonseca, and M. Hirsch, “ $(g - 2)$ anomalies and neutrino mass,” [arXiv:2007.11007 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [43] C.-S. Chen and C.-H. Chou, “Neutrino masses, muon $g-2$, dark matter, lithium problem, and leptogenesis at TeV-scale,” *Phys. Lett. B* **699** (2011) 68–73, [arXiv:0905.3477 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [44] P. Agrawal, Z. Chacko, and C. B. Verhaaren, “Leptophilic Dark Matter and the Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Muon,” *JHEP* **08** (2014) 147, [arXiv:1402.7369 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [45] S. Baek, “Dark matter and muon $(g - 2)$ in local $U(1)_{L_\mu-L_\tau}$ -extended Ma Model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **756** (2016) 1–5, [arXiv:1510.02168 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [46] G. BÃąllanger, C. Delaunay, and S. Westhoff, “A Dark Matter Relic From Muon Anomalies,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** (2015) 055021, [arXiv:1507.06660 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [47] K. Kowalska and E. M. Sessolo, “Expectations for the muon $g-2$ in simplified models with dark matter,” *JHEP* **09** (2017) 112, [arXiv:1707.00753 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [48] L. Calibbi, R. Ziegler, and J. Zupan, “Minimal models for dark matter and the muon $g - 2$ anomaly,” *JHEP* **07** (2018) 046, [arXiv:1804.00009 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [49] C.-H. Chen and T. Nomura, “Influence of an inert charged Higgs boson on the muon $g - 2$ and radiative neutrino masses in a scotogenic model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 1, (2019) 015024, [arXiv:1903.03380 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [50] L. Calibbi, T. Li, Y. Li, and B. Zhu, “Simple model for large CP violation in charm decays, B-physics anomalies, muon $g-2$, and Dark Matter,” [arXiv:1912.02676 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [51] E. Ma and M. Raidal, “Neutrino mass, muon anomalous magnetic moment, and lepton flavor nonconservation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 011802, [arXiv:hep-ph/0102255](#). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.Lett.* 87, 159901 (2001)].
- [52] D. A. Dicus, H.-J. He, and J. N. Ng, “Neutrino - lepton masses, Zee scalars and muon $g-2$,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 111803, [arXiv:hep-ph/0103126](#).
- [53] K. Babu and J. Julio, “Two-Loop Neutrino Mass Generation through Leptoquarks,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **841** (2010) 130–156, [arXiv:1006.1092 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [54] T. Nomura, H. Okada, and Y. Orikasa, “ $SU(2)_L$ septet scalar linking to a radiative neutrino model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** no. 5, (2016) 055012, [arXiv:1605.02601 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [55] T. Nomura and H. Okada, “An Extended Colored Zee-Babu Model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** (2016) 075021, [arXiv:1607.04952 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [56] S. Lee, T. Nomura, and H. Okada, “Radiatively Induced Neutrino Mass Model with Flavor Dependent Gauge Symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **931** (2018) 179–191, [arXiv:1702.03733 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [57] C.-W. Chiang, H. Okada, and E. Senaha, “Dark matter, muon $g - 2$, electric dipole moments, and $Z \rightarrow \ell_i^+ \ell_j^-$ in a one-loop induced neutrino model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no. 1, (2017) 015002, [arXiv:1703.09153 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [58] S. Saad, “Combined explanations of $(g - 2)_\mu$, $R_{D^{(*)}}$, $R_{K^{(*)}}$ anomalies in a two-loop radiative neutrino mass model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 1, (2020) 015019, [arXiv:2005.04352 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [59] C. Carloni Calame, M. Passera, L. Trentadue, and G. Venanzoni, “A new approach to evaluate the leading hadronic corrections to the muon $g-2$,” *Phys. Lett. B* **746** (2015) 325–329, [arXiv:1504.02228 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [60] P. S. B. Dev, W. Rodejohann, X.-J. Xu, and Y. Zhang, “MUonE sensitivity to new physics explanations of the muon anomalous magnetic moment,” [arXiv:2002.04822 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [61] A. Masiero, P. Paradisi, and M. Passera, “New physics at the MUonE experiment at CERN,” [arXiv:2002.05418 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [62] T. Toma and A. Vicente, “Lepton Flavor Violation in the Scotogenic Model,” *JHEP* **01** (2014) 160, [arXiv:1312.2840 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [63] M. Lindner, M. Platscher, and F. S. Queiroz, “A Call for New Physics : The Muon Anomalous Magnetic Moment and Lepton Flavor Violation,” *Phys. Rept.* **731** (2018) 1–82, [arXiv:1610.06587 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [64] K. Babu and C. N. Leung, “Classification of effective neutrino mass operators,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **619** (2001) 667–689, [arXiv:hep-ph/0106054](#).
- [65] A. de Gouvea and J. Jenkins, “A Survey of Lepton Number Violation Via Effective Operators,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77** (2008) 013008, [arXiv:0708.1344 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [66] P. W. Angel, N. L. Rodd, and R. R. Volkas, “Origin of neutrino masses at the LHC: $\Delta L = 2$ effective operators and their ultraviolet completions,” *Phys. Rev.* **D87** no. 7, (2013) 073007, [arXiv:1212.6111 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [67] J. P. Leveille, “The Second Order Weak Correction to (G-2) of the Muon in Arbitrary Gauge Models,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B137** (1978) 63–76.
- [68] B. L. Roberts and W. J. Marciano, “Lepton dipole moments,” [Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys.20,pp.1(2009)].
- [69] P. de Salas, D. Forero, S. Gariazzo, P. Martínez-Miravet, O. Mena, C. Ternes, M. Tórtola, and J. Valle, “2020 Global reassessment of the neutrino oscillation picture,” [arXiv:2006.11237 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [70] I. Esteban, M. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz, and A. Zhou, “The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations,” [arXiv:2007.14792 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [71] S. Kanemura and K. Yagyu, “Radiative corrections to electroweak parameters in the Higgs triplet model and implication with the recent Higgs boson searches,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 115009, [arXiv:1201.6287 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [72] T. Steele, Z.-W. Wang, D. Contreras, and R. Mann, “Viable dark matter via radiative symmetry breaking in a scalar singlet Higgs portal extension of the standard model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** no. 17, (2014) 171602, [arXiv:1310.1960 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [73] J. M. Cline, K. Kainulainen, P. Scott, and C. Weniger, “Update on scalar singlet dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88** (2013) 055025, [arXiv:1306.4710 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 92, 039906 (2015)].
- [74] W.-L. Guo and Y.-L. Wu, “The Real singlet scalar dark matter model,” *JHEP* **10** (2010) 083, [arXiv:1006.2518 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [75] A. Bandyopadhyay, S. Chakraborty, A. Ghosal, and D. Majumdar, “Constraining Scalar Singlet Dark Matter with CDMS, XENON and DAMA and Prediction for Direct Detection Rates,” *JHEP* **11** (2010) 065, [arXiv:1003.0809 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [76] C. Burgess, M. Pospelov, and T. ter Veldhuis, “The Minimal model of nonbaryonic dark matter: A Singlet scalar,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **619** (2001) 709–728, [arXiv:hep-ph/0011335](#).

- [77] J. McDonald, “Gauge singlet scalars as cold dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **50** (1994) 3637–3649, [arXiv:hep-ph/0702143](#).
- [78] C. E. Yaguna, “The Singlet Scalar as FIMP Dark Matter,” *JHEP* **08** (2011) 060, [arXiv:1105.1654 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [79] G. Belanger, K. Kannike, A. Pukhov, and M. Raidal, “ Z_3 Scalar Singlet Dark Matter,” *JCAP* **01** (2013) 022, [arXiv:1211.1014 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [80] A. Drozd, B. Grzadkowski, J. F. Gunion, and Y. Jiang, “Extending two-Higgs-doublet models by a singlet scalar field - the Case for Dark Matter,” *JHEP* **11** (2014) 105, [arXiv:1408.2106 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [81] L. Feng, S. Profumo, and L. Ubaldi, “Closing in on singlet scalar dark matter: LUX, invisible Higgs decays and gamma-ray lines,” *JHEP* **03** (2015) 045, [arXiv:1412.1105 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [82] S. Bhattacharya, S. Jana, and S. Nandi, “Neutrino Masses and Scalar Singlet Dark Matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 5, (2017) 055003, [arXiv:1609.03274 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [83] S. Bhattacharya, P. Poulose, and P. Ghosh, “Multipartite Interacting Scalar Dark Matter in the light of updated LUX data,” *JCAP* **04** (2017) 043, [arXiv:1607.08461 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [84] G. Arcadi, A. Djouadi, and M. Raidal, “Dark Matter through the Higgs portal,” *Phys. Rept.* **842** (2020) 1–180, [arXiv:1903.03616 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [85] R. Barbieri, L. J. Hall, and V. S. Rychkov, “Improved naturalness with a heavy Higgs: An Alternative road to LHC physics,” *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 015007, [arXiv:hep-ph/0603188](#).
- [86] M. Gustafsson, E. Lundstrom, L. Bergstrom, and J. Edsjo, “Significant Gamma Lines from Inert Higgs Dark Matter,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99** (2007) 041301, [arXiv:astro-ph/0703512](#).
- [87] P. Agrawal, E. M. Dolle, and C. A. Krenke, “Signals of Inert Doublet Dark Matter in Neutrino Telescopes,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 015015, [arXiv:0811.1798 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [88] E. Nezri, M. H. Tytgat, and G. Vertongen, “ e^+ and anti- p from inert doublet model dark matter,” *JCAP* **04** (2009) 014, [arXiv:0901.2556 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [89] C. Arina, F.-S. Ling, and M. H. Tytgat, “IDM and iDM or The Inert Doublet Model and Inelastic Dark Matter,” *JCAP* **10** (2009) 018, [arXiv:0907.0430 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [90] J.-O. Gong, H. M. Lee, and S. K. Kang, “Inflation and dark matter in two Higgs doublet models,” *JHEP* **04** (2012) 128, [arXiv:1202.0288 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [91] L. Lopez Honorez, E. Nezri, J. F. Oliver, and M. H. Tytgat, “The Inert Doublet Model: An Archetype for Dark Matter,” *JCAP* **02** (2007) 028, [arXiv:hep-ph/0612275](#).
- [92] A. Goudelis, B. Herrmann, and O. Stål, “Dark matter in the Inert Doublet Model after the discovery of a Higgs-like boson at the LHC,” *JHEP* **09** (2013) 106, [arXiv:1303.3010 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [93] T. Cohen, J. Kearney, A. Pierce, and D. Tucker-Smith, “Singlet-Doublet Dark Matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85** (2012) 075003, [arXiv:1109.2604 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [94] **XENON** Collaboration, E. Aprile *et al.*, “Dark Matter Search Results from a One Ton-Year Exposure of XENON1T,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** no. 11, (2018) 111302, [arXiv:1805.12562 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [95] **LUX** Collaboration, D. Akerib *et al.*, “Results from a search for dark matter in the complete LUX exposure,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** no. 2, (2017) 021303, [arXiv:1608.07648 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [96] **PandaX-II** Collaboration, X. Cui *et al.*, “Dark Matter Results From 54-Ton-Day Exposure of PandaX-II Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** no. 18, (2017) 181302, [arXiv:1708.06917 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [97] G. Hinshaw, D. Larson, E. Komatsu, D. N. Spergel, C. L. Bennett, J. Dunkley, M. R.olta, M. Halpern, R. S. Hill, N. Odegard, and et al., “Nine-year wilkinson microwave anisotropy probe (wmap) observations: Cosmological parameter results,” *The Astrophysical Journal Supplement Series* **208** no. 2, (Sep, 2013) 19. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1088/0067-0049/208/2/19>.
- [98] Q. Wang *et al.*, “Results of Dark Matter Search using the Full PandaX-II Exposure,” [arXiv:2007.15469 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [99] G. B  llanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, “micrOMEGAs4.1: two dark matter candidates,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **192** (2015) 322–329, [arXiv:1407.6129 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [100] G. B  llanger, F. Boudjema, A. Goudelis, A. Pukhov, and B. Zaldivar, “micrOMEGAs5.0 : Freeze-in,” *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **231** (2018) 173–186, [arXiv:1801.03509 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [101] A. Gaviria, R. Longas, and A. Rivera, “Lepton dark matter portal in the inert Zee model,” [arXiv:2005.13687 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [102] A. Berlin, D. Hooper, and S. D. McDermott, “Simplified Dark Matter Models for the Galactic Center Gamma-Ray Excess,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** no. 11, (2014) 115022, [arXiv:1404.0022 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [103] **CMS** Collaboration, V. Khachatryan *et al.*, “Search for long-lived charged particles in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** no. 11, (2016) 112004, [arXiv:1609.08382 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [104] **CMS** Collaboration, A. M. Sirunyan *et al.*, “Search for supersymmetry in events with a τ lepton pair and missing transverse momentum in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *JHEP* **11** (2018) 151, [arXiv:1807.02048 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [105] **ATLAS** Collaboration, G. Aad *et al.*, “Search for the direct production of charginos, neutralinos and staus in final states with at least two hadronically decaying taus and missing transverse momentum in pp collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 8$ TeV with the ATLAS detector,” *JHEP* **10** (2014) 096, [arXiv:1407.0350 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [106] **CMS** Collaboration, A. M. Sirunyan *et al.*, “Search for supersymmetric partners of electrons and muons in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV,” *Phys. Lett. B* **790** (2019) 140–166, [arXiv:1806.05264 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [107] S. Chakraborti and R. Islam, “Implications of dark sector mixing on leptophilic scalar dark matter,” [arXiv:2007.13719 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [108] S. Jana, N. Okada, and D. Raut, “Displaced Vertex and Disappearing Track Signatures in type-III Seesaw,” [arXiv:1911.09037 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [109] B. Acharya, A. De Roeck, J. Ellis, D. Ghosh, R. Maseł ek, G. Panizzo, J. Pinfold, K. Sakurai, A. Shaa, and A. Wall, “Prospects of searches for long-lived charged particles with MoEDAL,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** no. 6, (2020) 572, [arXiv:2004.11305 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [110] P. Bhupal Dev and Y. Zhang, “Displaced vertex signatures of doubly charged scalars in the type-II seesaw and its left-right extensions,” *JHEP* **10** (2018) 199, [arXiv:1808.00943 \[hep-ph\]](#).