# Asymmetries in invisible Dark Matter mediator production associated with $t\bar{t}$ final states

E. Chalbaud <sup>1</sup><sup>\*</sup>, Rui M. Silva<sup>12</sup><sup>†</sup>, António Onofre<sup>2</sup><sup>‡</sup>, Ricardo Gonçalo <sup>1</sup><sup>§</sup>, Miguel C. N. Fiolhais<sup>134</sup><sup>¶</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Department of Physics, University of Coimbra, 3004-516 Coimbra, Portugal

<sup>2</sup> Centro de Física da Universidade do Minho e Universidade do Porto (CF-UM-UP), Universidade do Minho, 4710-057 Braga, Portugal

<sup>3</sup> Science Department, Borough of Manhattan Community College, The City University of New York, 199 Chambers St, New York, NY 10007, USA

<sup>4</sup>The Graduate School and University Center, The City University of New York, 365 Fifth Avenue, New York, New York 10016, USA

#### Abstract

In this paper, we propose two sets of different CP-sensitive observables inspired by the Higgs production in association with the top quark. We employ a Dark Matter simplified model that couples a scalar particle with three generation fermions with a mass equal to that of the top quark. The reconstruction of the kinematic variables is presented at NLO accuracy for events associated with this massive scalar particle, which is assumed to be vanishing to invisible decays in a detector such as ATLAS. We build these observables by taking advantage of the similarity between the scalar coupling with the top quark and the factorization theorem in the total scattering amplitude, in order to represent the basis in which the phase space is parameterized. A twofold approach employs the direct implementation of the four-momentum phase space measure in building CP sensitive observables such as  $b_2$  for the Higgs, and the spin polarization of the top-quark decays in the narrow width approximation for the employed model. We studied the asymmetries of these distributions to test for any improvement in increasing the exclusion region for the  $g_{u_{33}}^S - g_{u_{33}}^P$  parameters associated with this vanishing scalar particle. We have found no significant effect in the exclusion limits by using the forward-backward asymmetry distributions and the full shaped ones. The best limits obtained for  $g_{u_{33}}^S$  at NLO accuracy were obtained:  $b_2 : [-0.0425, 0.0475]$  $n_4 : [-0.0450, 0.0450]$  for an invisible scalar with a mass of  $10^{-2}$  GeV for a luminosity of 300  $fb^{-1}$  expected for the end of Run 3 of the LHC.

<sup>\*</sup>E-mail: e.chalbaud@cern.ch

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>+</sup>E-mail: rui.miguel.silva@coimbra.lip.pt

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>‡</sup>E-mail: antonio.onofre@cern.ch

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>§</sup>E-mail: jose.Goncalo@cern.ch

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>¶</sup>E-mail: miguel.fiolhais@cern.ch

### 1 Introduction

A plethora of phenomena in astrophysics, such as gravitational lensing, galaxies' rotational curves, collisions of intergalactic clusters, and the evolution of the large-scale structure of the Universe [1–6], offer persuasive indirect proof for the existence of dark matter (DM). However, the particle nature of DM is still not fully understood. Theoretical enlargements to the Standard Model suggest a "dark sector" comprising particles that interact minimally with known standard model particles, leading to the proposition of weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs) as a potential DM candidate. For example, the intriguing coincidence that a stable WIMP of a specific mass could naturally explain the observed relic density of DM observed by Planck measurements [7], is a fundamental element in the search for the identification of DM particles. Although the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) offers an unmatched opportunity to generate and analyze DM particles, conventional detection techniques encounter considerable difficulties due to the expected weak interactions of DM with regular matter [8].

Addressing the challenges linked to the weakly interactive character of DM particles, the Large Hadron Collider (LHC) has implemented novel methods for their identification. DM detection is not based on direct observation, but rather on missing transverse momentum in proton-proton collisions [9–11], suggesting the creation of undetectable particles. This approach has led to an emphasis on "mono-X" event topologies, with "X" representing an observable particle like a jet, Z/W boson, or photon, which can create the necessary contrast to the invisible DM particle [12, 13]. To make these studies more manageable, simplified DM models have gained popularity over the effective field theory approach [14]. By introducing a limited number of new particles and couplings, these simplified models allow for the examination of specific attributes and interactions of DM [15]. This focused method enables a more straightforward link between the experimental findings and the characteristics of the candidates for DM, thus optimizing the search and improving our understanding of where these elusive particles may fit within the cosmic framework [7, 16].

Numerous simplified models have been proposed, indicating that DM could be an isolated heavy entity that only weakly interacts with the recognized particles of the Standard Model (SM). These interactions are theorized to be enabled by a novel particle mediator. At lower energy scales, where the mediator mass is greater than the energy reach of the experiment, its interactions appear as point-like, thus permitting the use of effective field theory (EFT) to detail the interaction through a sequence of higher-dimensional operators [17, 18]. This method has been popular and validated by experiments such as ATLAS, CMS, and LHCb especially in the context of supersymmetry searches [19, 20]. On the other hand, at the LHC where the energy scales can match or exceed the mediator's mass, the tangible effects of the mediator require a detailed quantum field theory that explicitly includes the mediator in its particle scope. The ability of the LHC to investigate a wide range of DM and mediator masses, in addition to various intensities and spin configurations of their couplings, is crucial.

The primary objectives of this study are to rigorously investigate CP-violating observables in the context of dileptonic decays of the top quarks, drawn from established literature on the Higgs sector [15, 21–58], in order to improve the signal-to-background ratio in the context of DM detection. Secondly, a thorough analysis is presented covering the mass spectrum from  $10^{-2}$  GeV to 125 GeV (the Higgs mass scale), delineating a strategic detection window for DM particles. Finally, we determine the sensitivity of these observables with respect to the future luminosity scenarios expected at the LHC, both during Run 3 and at the projected end of its service. This offers a clearer understanding of the potential of LHC to probe the frontiers of DM in the years to come.

The composition of this paper is as follows. We outline the simplified DM model and define the relevant parameters and angular observables in Section 2. The methodology for event generation and simulation is detailed in Section 3. Section 4 shows the definitions for the CP sensitive observables. Section 5 explores the asymmetries of such observables. Exclusion limits are shown in Section 6 where we have included the results for the total cross-section as a function of the luminosity. We draw our central conclusions in Section 7.

#### 2 Simplified Dark Matter model

Since the production of DM in colliders is expected to appear in the s-channel, cross-sections derived from Lagrangians should be accessible in the context of heavy fermion's production, especially within the expected LHC luminosity from Run 3 of the LHC. However, depending on how the particle mediator couples with the SM particles, the discovery of such a sector can be challenging to separate from different backgrounds due to the small value of the cross-section. In general, the Lagrangian can be written in several forms, for example in the context of a DM simplified model [59], a vertex-like approach it is expected to capture much of the phenomenology in the interaction. In the case of scalar-like mediators, the coupling with fermionic DM and the DM mediator follows a Yukawa coupling of the form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \bar{X}_D (g^s + i g^p \gamma^5) X_D Y_0, \tag{2.1}$$

where  $g^s$  corresponds to the scalar coupling of the mediator,  $g^p$  is the pseudoscalar coupling constant with the DM fermion  $X_D$ . Additionally, the coupling with the SM, as is explored in the model proposed in [60], the DM mediators can be coupled with quarks in one or several generations as follows:

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{i,j} \left[ \bar{d}_i \frac{y_{i,j}^d}{\sqrt{2}} (g_{d_{ij}}^s + ig_{d_{ij}}^p \gamma^5) d_j + \bar{u}_i \frac{y_{i,j}^u}{\sqrt{2}} (g_{u_{ij}}^s + ig_{u_{ij}}^p \gamma^5) u_j \right] Y_0,$$
(2.2)

where  $y_{i,j}^{u/d}$  denotes the quark Yukawa-like coupling matrix with the scalar mediator,  $g_{d_{ij}}^s$  and  $g_{d_{ij}}^p$ . Notice that we can have models depending on the specification of the constants by including off-diagonal terms in the coupling matrix. The computation of the LO cross-section depends on the nature of this matrix where third generation of quark interactions can be imposed. Although scalar mediator models that employ 4 and 5 flavor schemes have been known in the literature, NLO computations of the cross-section do not change significantly irrespectively from the scheme employed. Even though the renormalizability of the coupling with the b-quark is expected to be challenging, due to the higher order uncertainties when switching schemes, regularization appears to be formally complete [18, 60, 61]. Given this limitation, and from the limits of the CP-violating phase due to the smallness of expected contributions coming from this sector, we can assume no doublet couplings with heavy generation fermions keeping the top quark coupling of the form:

$$\mathcal{L} = \frac{y_{3,3}}{\sqrt{2}}\bar{t}(g^s + ig^p\gamma^5)tY_0,$$
(2.3)

where  $y_{3,3}$  is the corresponding coupling constant with the top quark, and the  $g^s$  denotes the CP-even (scalar) coupling with the mediator and  $g^p$  the corresponding CP-odd (pseudoscalar) interaction. Additionally, lepton couplings for the mediator are left behind at this point due to the unitarity-violating effects in the leptonic sector being difficult to make compatible with these searches, which are out of scope of this paper. We introduce the intrinsic assumption of the simplified model from where no beyond the DM particle X and mediator Y at the weak scale is needed. In this work, we employ an implementation of the Lagrangian in equation 2.3, including LO and NLO corrections in the total cross-sections, by using FeynRules package [62]. The decaying fixation for the DM mediator particle is performed, in such a way that the particle can escape detectors, i.e., fix  $\Gamma = 0$ . This construction is analogous to the freely available DM simplified model DMsimp for scalar mediators in the s-channel interaction, but including the 5 flavor scheme. The main topologies obtained in the model for interaction of the top quark with the particle mediator are given in Figure 1, where corresponding NLO diagrams are the same as those obtained in [60] for the DMsimp package.



Figure 1: Representative Feynman digrams for the spin 0 mediator production, with the top quarks in the final state employed in the UFO model.

Due to the similar nature of the scalar coupling for the Higgs boson, and by assuming the narrow width approximation for the top and antitop quarks, we can approximate and define the unpolarized differential cross-section for the process  $gg \to t (\to b\ell^+\nu_\ell) \bar{t} (\to \bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell) Y$  in a "factorized" form:

$$d\sigma = \sum_{\substack{b\ell^+\nu_n\\\text{spins spins}\\\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell}} \left(\frac{2}{\Gamma_t}\right)^2 d\sigma \left(gg \to t\left(n_t\right)\bar{t}\left(n_{\bar{t}}\right)Y\right) d\Gamma \left(t \to b\ell^+\nu_\ell\right) d\Gamma \left(\bar{t} \to \bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell\right), \quad (2.4)$$

where  $d\sigma (gg \rightarrow t (n_t) \bar{t} (n_{\bar{t}}) Y)$  is the differential cross-section for the production of a top and antitop quarks, where the spin vectors  $n_t$  and  $n_{\bar{t}}$  are introduced for enhancing the relative sign sensitivity for the pseudoscalar component of the model in addition of the quadratic enhancement proposed in [63].

The factorized terms of the form:  $d\Gamma (t \to b\ell^+\nu_\ell)$  and  $d\Gamma (\bar{t} \to \bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell)$  are the partial differential decay widths for an unpolarized top and anti-top quark and such factorized form is valid within the narrow-width approximation. The spin basis is defined in such a way that  $t, \bar{t}, \ell^+$  and  $\ell^-$ , normalize the 4-vectors:

$$n_t = -\frac{p_t}{m_t} + \frac{m_t}{(p_t \cdot p_{\ell^+})} p_{\ell^+} \qquad n_{\bar{t}} = \frac{p_{\bar{t}}}{m_t} - \frac{m_t}{(p_{\bar{t}} \cdot p_{\ell^-})} p_{\ell^-}, \tag{2.5}$$

where  $p_{\ell^{\pm}}$  correspond to the momentum of the outgoing lepton coming from the top quark decay. The spatial components of these variables are used to define equations 4.2. Given that

the representation of the total differential cross-section is analogue to the CP-sensitive one, we can in principle construct analogue operators as in the Higgs case.

### 3 Simulation

In this section, it is shown the results of the event generation from an independent implementation of the DMsimp DM simplified model [60]. We have produced 1 million parton-level events using MadGraph5\_aMC@NLO [64] for both signal and background events at  $\sqrt{s} = 14$  TeV for  $pp \rightarrow t\bar{t}Y$  process. We have explored DM mediator masses set to  $m_{Y_0} = 0, 1, 10$  and 125GeV and 1 TeV. The top quark mass is set to  $m_t = 172.5$ GeV considering only the dileptonic decays of the  $t\bar{t}$  system, i.e.  $(t\bar{t} \rightarrow bW^+\bar{b}W^- \rightarrow b\ell^+\nu_\ell\bar{b}\ell^-\bar{\nu}_\ell)$ . The decay of the DM particle is fixed to zero to reproduce the situation of the particle escaping the detector. The analysis of signal and background events is performed within the MadAnalysis5 framework [65]. Standard Model (SM) backgrounds were also generated with NLO accuracy, and event hadronization was conducted using PYTHIA6Q [66], followed by detector simulation with Delphes [67]. For the kinematic fit associated to the reconstruction of the kinematic variables, we have followed the same approach in [46], but including NLO corrections in both signal and background events.

The event selection was based on jet and lepton identification with specific constraints, focusing on events with a pair of jets and isolated leptons. Reconstruction of the system  $(t\bar{t})$  involved assigning jets to their corresponding b-quarks and utilizing multivariate analysis for improved accuracy. This analysis included various likelihood discrimination estimators as those used in [52, 68], where the Boosted Decision Tree with Gradient boost (BDTG) showed superiority in classifying the events. In Figure 2, it is shown the reconstruction of the  $t\bar{t}Y$  events, presenting the impact in the reconstruction when a mediator particle with different masses is considered in the analysis. By using kinematic equations from [68], it is shown that heavy mediator particles with masses of the order of magnitude of 1 TeV contribute more to the total energy missing of the reconstruction, normally associated to the neutrinos, translating in an increasing bias in the reconstruction of the kinematic variables.



Figure 2: Two-dimensional distributions of  $p_T$  in  $t\bar{t}Y_0^+$  events. The impact of the mediator mass on the kinematic reconstruction of the  $t\bar{t}$  system for mediator masses of  $10^{-2}$  GeV (upper-left), 10 GeV (upper-right), 125 GeV (lower-left), and  $10^3$  GeV (lower-right).

## 4 CP sensitive obervables

In the study, the search of sensitive CP-observables starts by considering the total crosssection coming from a Yukawa interaction term in the DM simplified model. For scalar particles, it can be shown that a process of the form  $gg \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}Y$  and  $q\bar{q} \rightarrow Q\bar{Q}Y$  does not contain any mixed Yukawa couplings at the tree-level. This is considered for CP-even particles in [68], where in order to maximize the CP sensitivity for the Higgs CP couplings it is considered the following normalized  $\alpha$  constant:

$$\alpha \left[ \mathcal{O}_{CP} \right] \equiv \int \left[ \mathcal{O}_{CP} \right] \left\{ d\sigma (pp \to t\bar{t}Y) / dPS \right\} dPS .$$
(4.1)

The integral over the phase space PS, for a given differential observable  $\mathcal{O}_{CP}$  is such that in the case of the Higgs boson leads to the definition of the  $b_2$  observable that can be written in terms of the projections of the 4-momenta for the outgoing top quarks in a given event:

$$b_{2} = \frac{(\vec{p}_{t} \times \hat{z}) \cdot (\vec{p}_{t} \times \hat{z})}{|\vec{p}_{t}| |\vec{p}_{\bar{t}}|} \quad \tilde{b}_{2} = \frac{(\vec{p}_{t} \times \hat{y}) \cdot (\vec{p}_{t} \times \hat{y})}{|\vec{p}_{t}| |\vec{p}_{\bar{t}}|} \quad \tilde{b}_{2} = \frac{(\vec{p}_{t} \times \hat{d}) \cdot (\vec{p}_{t} \times \hat{d})}{|\vec{p}_{t}| |\vec{p}_{\bar{t}}|} n_{2}^{t\bar{t}Y} = \frac{(\vec{n}_{t} \times \hat{k}_{z}) \cdot (\vec{n}_{\bar{t}} \times \hat{k}_{z})}{(|\vec{n}_{t}| \cdot |\vec{n}_{\bar{t}}|)} \quad n_{4}^{t\bar{t}Y} = \frac{(n_{t}^{z} \cdot n_{\bar{t}}^{z})}{(|\vec{n}_{t}| \cdot |\vec{n}_{\bar{t}}|)} \quad d = (1, 1, 0)/\sqrt{2}$$

$$(4.2)$$

where  $\hat{n}$  corresponds to the projection direction of  $\vec{p}$  following the same definitions in [38]. This observable has been studied in the context of minimal pseudoscalar extensions of the Higgs boson, where it appears to have competitive sensitivity following this construction. However, given the nature of the DM simplified coupling with the scalar mediator, we can exploit this definition and its rotational symmetry to build two new angular observables. More specifically, a new approach involving orthogonal projections with respect to different axis. To test the hypothesis of these projections improving sensitivity for CP-odd components in the model, we extend the projections of the  $b_2$  variable from the  $\hat{z}$  axis, to the normalized (0, 1, 0) and  $(0, 1/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2})$  directions of projection.

In Figures 3 and 4, it is shown all the corresponding parton-level distributions after event selection and kinematic reconstruction, for a reference luminosity of  $100 \text{fb}^{-1}$  for all the considered observables. All SM backgrounds:  $t\bar{t}$  ( $t\bar{t}c\bar{c}$  and  $t\bar{t}$ + light jets),  $t\bar{t}b\bar{b}$ ,  $t\bar{t}V$ ,  $t\bar{t}H$ , single top quark production (t-, s - and Wt-channels), W/Z+ jets, and diboson (WW, ZZ, WZ) events are represented. The  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  scalar and pseudoscalar signals, with  $m_{Y_0} = 0$  GeV, are shown as well, scaled by factors of 2 and 500, respectively, for convenience. As expected, the main SM background contribution is the  $t\bar{t}$  due to its similarity with the signal final state topology. All other backgrounds are essentially residual to the overall SM contribution.

Differences in shapes of the background distributions can also be noticed when compared with the signals. In addition, selection cuts heavily impact the relative bin value of the distribution but preserve the shape of the parton-level distributions. In Figure 4, the  $b_4$  distribution for the scalar signal (in blue) is more populated in positive values rather than in the negative ones. This behavior is inverted for the pseudoscalar case (in orange).



Figure 3: Angular distributions at parton level before selection cuts (left) and after final selection cuts and full kinematic reconstruction, considering all the dominant backgrounds in  $t\bar{t}$  production (right) of: (top)  $x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} = b_2$ , (middle)  $x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} = \tilde{b}_2^{(0,1/\sqrt{2},1/\sqrt{2})}$  and (bottom)  $x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} = \tilde{b}_2^{(0,1,0)}$ . Mass reference is  $10^{-2}$  GeV for a luminosity of 100 fb<sup>-1</sup>.



Figure 4: Angular distributions at parton-level before selection cuts (left) and after final selection cuts and full kinematic reconstruction, considering all the dominant backgrounds in  $t\bar{t}$  production (right) of: (top)  $x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} = b_4$ , (middle)  $x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} = n_2$  and (bottom)  $x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} = n_4$ . Mass reference is  $10^{-2}$  GeV for a luminosity of 100 fb<sup>-1</sup>.

## **5** Asymmetries

As it is explored in Higgs production studies [52], an asymmetry in the distribution of the top and antitop quark production can provide an additional source of information for the study of the properties of DM mediator particles. In particular, the measurement of the forward-backward asymmetry, defined as the difference between the number of top-antitop pairs produced in the forward and backward directions in the top-quark rest frame, can provide important constraints on the couplings of the top quark to other particles. Furthermore, the study of the spin correlation in the top-antitop production, which is sensitive to the relative orientation of the spins of the top and antitop quarks, can provide additional insights into the production and decay dynamics of these particles.

Detailed studies of these asymmetries can provide valuable tests of the standard-model predictions and potentially reveal evidence of new physics and the reduced impact that systematic effects have in such measurements. As an example, the Higgs boson production in association with the top quark has been reported in the literature [69] showing interesting results in constraining the minimal extensions of the Higgs sector. In this work, the same forward-backward asymmetries approach is employed for testing the impact on the exclusions limits. The asymmetry in the distribution is defined as:

$$A_{FB}^{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} = \frac{\sigma(x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} > 0) - \sigma(x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} < 0)}{\sigma(x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} > 0) + \sigma(x_{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]} < 0)},$$
(5.1)

where the selection cut is established at the center of the distribution. The application of this cut is presented in Tables 1 and 2 at both parton-level distributions and after selection cuts are imposed during the reconstruction. It is noticeable that the application of selection cuts clearly distorts the asymmetry observed in the differential distributions at parton-level in comparison with the ones obtained after imposing the selection cuts in the events. Remarkably, these distortions exhibit minimal variation with the mass of the mediator particle, indicating a consistent impact across different mass scales. However, the variation observed between the different observables presented in the Tables (1) and (2) is substantial. This significant disparity among the observables could have critical implications for the exclusion limits, a topic that will be explored in detail in the forthcoming section.

Observable	$10^{-2}$ GeV	1 GeV	10 GeV	100 GeV	125 GeV
Observable	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$
$A_{FB}^{b_2(\hat{z})}$	-0.839/-0.579	-0.834/-0.579	-0.819/-0.568	-0.703/-0.409	-0.674/-0.377
$A_{FB}^{b_2(\hat{y})}$	+0.222/-0.042	+0.219/-0.041	+0.217/-0.049	+0.211/-0.156	+0.199/-0.180
$A_{FB}^{b_2(\hat{d})}$	+0.098/-0.110	+0.092/-0.109	+0.086/-0.116	+0.061/-0.185	+0.046/-0.199
$A_{FB}^{n_4}$	-0.243/-0.061	-0.245/-0.062	-0.246/-0.056	-0.250/+0.0298	-0.244/+0.050
$A_{FB}^{n_2}$	+0.278/+0.278	+0.242/+0.221	+0.234/+0.149	+0.262/0.117	+0.212/+0.178

Table 1: Parton level asymmetry values computed for the 5 benchmark masses employed in the model. Here we have defined the direction:  $\hat{d} = (1, 1, 0)/\sqrt{2}$  for the observable  $b_2$ .

Obcorrelato	$10^{-2}$ GeV	1 GeV	10 GeV	100 GeV	125 GeV
Observable	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$	$t\bar{t}Y^+/t\bar{t}Y^-$
$A_{FB}^{b_2(\hat{z})}$	-0.896/-0.697	-0.888/-0.697	-0.874/-0.690	-0.753/-0.512	-0.724/-0.454
$A_{FB}^{b_2(\hat{y})}$	-0.066/-0.281	-0.073/-0.276	-0.078/-0.293	-0.079/-0.363	-0.051/-0.369
$A_{FB}^{b_2(\hat{d})}$	-0.191/-0.360	-0.205/-0.349	-0.212/-0.370	-0.203/-0.386	-0.180/-0.383
$A_{FB}^{n_4}$	+0.132/-0.008	+0.131/-0.031	+0.140/-0.036	+0.129/-0.104	+0.122/-0.125
$A_{FB}^{n_2}$	-0.285/-0.286	-0.269/-0.283	-0.292/-0.270	-0.332/-0.228	-0.323/-0.222

Table 2: Asymmetry values after applying the selection criteria and kinematic reconstruction computed for the same benchmark masses.

## 6 Exclusion limits

Confidence levels (CLs) for excluding the scalar and pseudoscalar nature of the top quark couplings to the DM mediator are computed in two distinct scenarios:

- *Scenario* 1 : Exclusion of the SM plus the addition of a new CP-mixed DM mediator, assuming the SM. In this instance, *H*<sub>0</sub> is the SM-only hypothesis, while *H*<sub>1</sub> is the SM plus a new CP-mixed DM mediator;
- Scenario 2 : Exclusion of the SM plus the addition of a new CP-mixed DM mediator, assuming the SM plus a new pure CP-even DM mediator has already been discovered. Here,  $H_0$  is the SM plus a new CP-even DM mediator signal hypothesis, while  $H_1$  is the SM plus a new CP-mixed DM mediator signal.

For each scenario, these confidence levels (CLs) are computed for two different luminosities: one roughly corresponding to the expected integrated luminosity of the LHC Run 3, and the other to the High-Luminosity phase of the LHC (HL-LHC). In each analyzed scenario, one hundred thousand pseudo-experiments were generated by applying bin-by-bin Poisson fluctuations around a mean value. This mean value is set to the number of events in each individual bin of the angular distributions [70]. Evaluating whether a null hypothesis ( $H_0$ ) or an alternative hypothesis ( $H_1$ ) can effectively explain the pseudo-experiment involves assessing the probabilities associated with each hypothesis. The likelihood ratio of the probabilities linked to  $H_1$  and  $H_0$  serves as the test statistic for computing the confidence level at which hypothesis  $H_1$  can be excluded, assuming that  $H_0$  is true.

In Table 3, it is shown the impact of applying the asymmetry cuts in the differential distributions. The data presented provides insightful comparisons between full distribution shapes and post asymmetry cut distributions for various observables. It is remarkable to observe the consistency in exclusion limits across most observables, implying the robustness of these measurements despite computing such values using full shape distribution and their corresponding asymmetric 2-binned distribution. Notably, the minimal variations in the exclusion limits, particularly for the  $\tilde{b}_2(\hat{y})$  and  $n_2$  observables, reinforce the stability of these parameters against the applied cuts. However, the observable  $n_4$  stands out, showing a slight divergence in the scalar coupling exclusion limits post asymmetry cut.

The computation of the exclusion limits in the  $g_{u_{33}}^S - g_{u_{33}}^P$  plane are obtained using the distributions after the forward-backward cut. In Figure 5, it is presented the exclusion limits for

the  $b_2$  observable, an interesting trend is observed. Specifically, in Scenario 1, there is a notable improvement in the constraint of the pseudoscalar component as the mass of the mediator increases. This contrasts sharply with the results for Scenario 2, where no such improvement in the exclusion limits for the pseudoscalar component is evident. Similarly, Figure 6, focusing on the  $n_4$  observable, mirrors this pattern, with Scenario 1 showing improved constraints on the pseudoscalar component with increasing mediator mass, while Scenario 2 does not exhibit this enhancement. This discrepancy between the scenarios can be attributed to the minimal contribution of the pseudoscalar component's cross-section in Scenario 2, leading to results that are predominantly influenced by the scalar contributions.

Observable $(\alpha[\mathcal{O}])$	Full-shape ( $\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]$ )		Asymmetry $(A_{FB}^{\alpha[\mathcal{O}_{CP}]})$	
Observable ( $\alpha[O_{CP}]$ )	$g^S_{u_{33}}$	$g^P_{u_{33}}$	$g^S_{u_{33}}$	$g_{u_{33}}^P$
$b_2$	[-0.0475, 0.0425]	[-0.87, 0.87]	[-0.0425, 0.0475]	[-0.83, 0.83]
$ ilde{b}_2(\hat{y})$	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.87, 0.87]	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.87, 0.87]
$ ilde{b}_2(\hat{d})$	$\left[-0.0475, 0.0425 ight]$	[-0.89, 0.87]	[-0.0425, 0.0475]	[-0.89, 0.87]
$n_2$	[-0.0425, 0.0475]	[-0.89, 0.89]	[-0.0425, 0.0475]	[-0.89, 0.89]
$n_4$	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.87, 0.89]	[-0.0450, 0.0450]	[-0.89, 0.89]

Table 3: Exclusion limits at 68% for two different distribution shape scenarios studied in this paper: 9-bin distributions (Full-shape) compared with the 2-binned one post cut application in the distributions, namely symmetrically applied cut (Forward-Backwards). The values refer to a particle mediator mass of  $10^{-2}$  GeV.

In Table 4, which presents exclusion limits for the coupling constant  $g_{33}$  from  $b_2$  asymmetries in forward-backward (FB) scenarios, it is observed a consistent pattern across different mediator masses  $m_{Y_0}$  and luminosities. For both the scalar S and pseudoscalar P components of  $g_{u_{33}}$ , the exclusion limits tighten as the luminosity increases from 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> to 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>, as expected. However, what stands out is the relative stability of these limits across different mediator masses. For instance, at a 95% confidence level (CL), the exclusion limits for  $g_{u_{33}}^S$  at 0.01 GeV and 125 GeV are quite similar, especially at the higher luminosity of 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. This consistency suggests that the exclusion limits are not significantly sensitive to the mediator mass in this range, implying a robustness in the predictive power of the model under varying mass conditions. It also indicates that the physical phenomena driving these limits are not overly dependent on the mass of the mediator particle, which is an interesting observation from a theoretical standpoint.



Figure 5: Exclusion limits for the SM with a massive DM mediator in the low mass region,  $Y_0$  ( $m_{Y_0} = 1 \times 10^{-2}, 1$  and the Higgs benchmark case of 10GeV in the top, middle, and bottom rows, respectively). We have included the mixed scalar and pseudoscalar couplings against the SM as null hypothesis (left), for the spin observable  $b_2$  and their corresponding exclusion limit obtained from the SM plus a mixed DM mediator against the SM plus a pure scalar mediator as a null hypothesis (right). Limits are shown for the expected luminosity of the Run 3 of the LHC of (L = 300 fb<sup>-1</sup>).



Figure 6: Exclusion limits for the SM with a massive DM mediator in the low mass region,  $Y_0$  ( $m_{Y_0} = 1 \times 10^{-2}$ , 10 and the Higgs benchmark case of 125GeV in the top, middle, and bottom rows, respectively). We have included the mixed scalar and pseudoscalar couplings, against the SM as null hypothesis (left), for the spin observable  $n_4$  and their corresponding exclusion limit obtained from the SM plus a mixed DM mediator against the SM plus a pure scalar mediator as a nul hypothesis (right). Limits are shown for a luminosity of the Run 3 of the LHC of  $(L = 300 \text{fb}^{-1})$ .

		$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		3000	$fb^{-1}$
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
0.01 CoV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0425, 0.0475]	[-0.0875, 0.0875]	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	[-0.0475, 0.0475]
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.83, 0.83]	[-1.57, 1.57]	$\left[-0.4725, 0.4575\right]$	$\left[-0.8775, 0.8925 ight]$
$10  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2575, 0.2625 ight]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1425, 0.1475]
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.85, 0.85]	[-1.61, 1.61]	[-0.4725, 0.4725]	$\left[-0.8925, 0.8925 ight]$
$125  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.01, 1.015]	[-1.885, 1.89]	[-0.5625, 0.5625]	[-1.0575, 1.0575]
120 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P} \in$	[-1.29, 1.27]	[-2.41, 2.43]	[-0.725, 0.725]	[-1.35, 1.375]

#### Exclusion Limits from $b_2$ Asymmetries FB

Table 4: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $b_2$  observable.

Additionally, Table 5 details the exclusion limits from  $n_4$  asymmetries FB, tells a similar story. Despite being derived from a different physical basis than  $b_2$ , the results display a similar trend of minimal variation in exclusion limits with changes in mediator mass. The scalar and pseudoscalar components of  $g_{u_{33}}$  again show a tightening of limits with increased luminosity, but the impact of the mediator mass remains marginal. For example, at 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup> and a 95% CL, the exclusion limits for  $g_{u_{33}}^P$  at mediator masses of  $1 \times 10^{-2}$  GeV and 125 GeV are quite similar. This similarity in the behavior of the exclusion limits across different observables and mediator mass of the mediator particle. The consistency across different observables and mass scales is significant, as it underscores the model's broad applicability and robustness, providing confidence in its use for a range of scenarios in particle physics research.

		$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		3000	$fb^{-1}$
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
$0.01  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0450, 0.0450]	$\left[-0.0875, 0.0875 ight]$	-0.0225, 0.0225	$\left[-0.0475, 0.0475\right]$
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.8900, 0.8900]	[-1.6700, 1.6700]	[-0.5025, 0.5025]	$\left[-0.9375, 0.9375 ight]$
$10  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.135, 0.135\right]$	$\left[-0.255, 0.255\right]$	$\left[-0.075, 0.075 ight]$	$\left[-0.1475, 0.1425\right]$
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	$\left[-0.9100, 0.8900 ight]$	[-1.7100, 1.6900]	[-0.5025, 0.5025]	$\left[-0.9525, 0.9525 ight]$
125 CoV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.05, 1.05]	[-1.965, 1.965]	[-0.593, 0.593]	[-1.118, 1.118]
120 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P} \in$	[-1.53, 1.55]	[-2.89, 2.87]	[-0.85, 0.85]	[-1.63, 1.63]

# Exclusion Limits from $n_4$ Asymmetries FB

Table 5: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $n_4$  observable.

In summary, the analysis of the exclusion limits for the scenario 1 when fixing the coupling constant  $g_{33}$  from both  $b_2$  and  $n_4$  observables shows that: Across different mediator masses  $m_{Y_0}$  and luminosities, it is observed a consistent pattern of exclusion limits tightening by increasing luminosity, yet showing minimal sensitivity to changes in the mediator mass. This consistency is particularly notable as it persists across different physical bases of the  $b_2$  and  $n_4$  observables. The relative stability of exclusion limits across varying mediator masses suggests a robustness in the predictive power of the model for this specific scenario, indicating that the underlying physics driving these limits is not overly dependent on the mediator particle's mass.

However, for the scenario 2, it is shown that the  $n_4$  observable has a dependence in the exclusion limit for the pseudoscalar component that varies with the mediator mass. This is particularly visible in the case of the forward-backward asymmetry distributions. This depen-

dence with the mediator mass scale can be observed in Figure 6, where an improvement in the exclusion limit for the pseudoscalar is visible as the mediator mass approaches the Higgs mass scale.

#### 6.1 Exclusion limits in the total cross-section

In addition to the CLs for the different benchmark cases, the sensitivity of the coupling constants with the luminosity is investigated. As a first approach, this sensitivity is studied by changing the luminosity in the null hypothesis, i.e. by fixing the pseudoscalar coupling constant to a vanishing value. The focus is on determining exclusion limits in a scenario where a pure scalar mediator is produced. As we have discussed before, all the constructed CP observables should agree with their dependence on the luminosity because of their same assigned parity. Figure 7, shows the dependence of the observed 95% and 68% confidence regions as a function of the luminosity for a mediator mass of  $1 \times 10^{-2}$  GeV.

It is noticeable that, as the luminosity increases, the ability to constrain these constants improves by reducing the confidence interval by a factor of two for the expected luminosity in the HLLHC. In addition, a flattening is observed in the behavior of the exclusion limit with the luminosity, due to the enhanced background production with luminosity, which leads to a reduction of the exclusion limits for the same value of the cross-section. The same observation is appointed to the observables coming from the spin basis observables, i.e.  $n_4$ , where a similar behavior is obtained for the exclusion limits with the luminosity as the  $b_2$  (see Figure 7.)



Figure 7: Expected exclusion limits at 95% and 68% CL for the  $g_{u_{33}}^S$  scalar coupling assuming vanishing pseudoscalar component  $g_{u_{33}}^P = 0$  as a function of the luminosity in fb<sup>-1</sup> assuming the SM as the null hypothesis for the most sensitive observables in this work  $b_2$  (left) and  $n_4$  (right).

The  $b_2$  observable shows the small impact of the mass in the exclusion limits for the scalar mediator production cross-section as a function of the luminosity. In each case we have computed the cross-section, including NLO corrections, for the range of mass values. Despite increasing the luminosity beyond 2000 fb<sup>-1</sup>, the enhancement in the exclusion limit of the total cross-section is not as noticeable as the one observed in the interval from 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> to 600 fb<sup>-1</sup>. This finding suggests that a pure increase in luminosity is not sufficient to improve these limits.

Additionally, it is included the impact of the same calculation by employing a different observable, i.e.  $n_4$ , for the production of a pure-scalar mediator particle. Figure 8 shows the exclusion limit for the  $b_2$  and  $n_4$  observables, as a function of the luminosity, for the same benchmark mass values employed in this work.



Figure 8: Expected exclusion limits at 68% CL for the total cross-section  $\sigma_{ttY}$  for production of a pure scalar mediator particle  $Y_0$  as a function of the luminosity in fb<sup>-1</sup> assuming the SM as the null hypothesis for the most sensitive observables in this work  $b_2$  (left) and  $n_4$  (right).

The most sensitive spin basis observable shows an identical result as the  $b_2$  observable. As expected, the profile of the distribution is irrelevant in the improvement of the total crosssection exclusion limit, as it has already been shown from the forward backwards asymmetry study. The observed consistency across different mediator masses reinforces the robustness of the model and suggests that the understanding of the underlying physics is on solid ground. Nevertheless, it also implies that exploring a wider range of mediator masses might not yield new insights under the current experimental conditions.

#### 7 Conclusions

This study has conducted an in-depth examination of the 5 different DM mediator particle Y benchmark masses, i.e.  $1 \times 10^{-2}$ , 1, 10, 100 and 125 GeV, investigating its CP characteristics through scalar and pseudoscalar interactions with the top quark. The analysis presented in this paper spanned expected luminosities for Run 3 ( $\sim 300 \text{fb}^{-1}$ ) up to the HL-LHC era ( $3000 \text{fb}^{-1}$ ), and it was centered on  $t\bar{t}Y$  production in leptonic decay channels for the top-quark, in the presence of a mediator particle coupling with fermionic DM. From the reconstruction employed for DM particle mediator Y, as a front-end result we have doubled the exclusion limits in the scalar coupling of the model while going from the Run 3 luminosity to the 2000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. In addition, the approximation employed in the reconstruction showed robustness at all levels in the analysis, at least for the employed kinematic phase space with the imposed selection cuts on the events. This validates its applicability to any interaction Lagrangian with a DM mediator Y.

By introducing a suite of novel observables— $b_2, \tilde{b}_2$  with projections along  $\hat{z}, \hat{y}$ , and  $\hat{d}$ , as well as  $n_2^{t\bar{t}Y}$  and  $n_4^{t\bar{t}Y}$  the exclusion limits within the  $g_{u_{33}}^S - g_{u_{33}}^P$  framework was refined. It is shown that all the proposed observables in this work were sensitive to the CP-even and

CP-odd configurations. However, after imposing selection cuts and performing the exclusion limits computation for the relevant couplings in the model, no noticeable enhancement in the sensitivity of the  $g_{u_{33}}^P$  coupling through the application this set of observables has been found. Despite this comprehensive approach, no significant sensitivity in the pseudoscalar coupling  $g_{u_{33}}^P$  was found by using spin polarization basis observables, in contrast with previous studies involving the Higgs coupling to the top quark [38].

Remarkably, the analysis demonstrated that asymmetries derived from angular CP observables encapsulate the statistical significance of the dataset, obviating the need for full-shape distribution analysis at least for type I scenarios. This insight suggests that asymmetries alone are sufficient to encapsulate the CP-even and CP-odd statistical information coming from the DM mediator Y for this type of exclusion limits analysis. However, this conclusion does not apply for the spin observable  $n_4$  from where a dependence with the mass has been observed. This dependence with the mass for this observable implies that for the FB analysis proposed in this work, the shape of the distribution might be relevant for the exclusion of the CP nature of the mediator particle, as it is drawn in the type 2 scenario.

#### Acknowledgments

E.C. was supported by FCT, under the contract PRT/BD/154189/2022 and CERN/FIS-PAR/0037/2021. R.M.S. was partially supported by FCT Grant No CERN/FIS-PAR/0037/2021. The work of M.C.N.F. was supported by the PSC-CUNY Awards 65071-00 53 and 66073-00 54. A.O. was partially supported by FCT, under the contract CERN/FIS-PAR/0037/2021. R.G was partially supported by FCT, under the Contract CERN/FIS-PAR/0026/2021.

#### References

- [1] M. Drees and G. Gerbier, Mini-review of dark matter: 2012, 2012, 1204.2373.
- [2] K. G. Begeman, A. H. Broeils, and R. H. Sanders, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 249, 523 (1991).
- [3] E. Corbelli and P. Salucci, Monthly Notices of the Royal Astronomical Society 311, 441–447 (2000).
- [4] H. Hoekstra, H. Yee, and M. Gladders, New Astron. Rev. 46, 767 (2002), astro-ph/0205205.
- [5] V. C. Rubin and W. K. Ford Jr, The Astrophysical Journal **159**, 379 (1970).
- [6] L. A. Moustakas and R. B. Metcalf, Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc. 339, 607 (2003), astroph/0206176.
- [7] Planck, N. Aghanim et al., Astron. Astrophys. 641, A1 (2020), 1807.06205.
- [8] A. Collaboration, Combination and summary of atlas dark matter searches interpreted in a 2hdm with a pseudo-scalar mediator using 139 fb<sup>-1</sup> of  $\sqrt{s} = 13$  tev *pp* collision data, 2023, 2306.00641.
- [9] ATLAS, S. González Fernández, PoS ICHEP2020, 658 (2021).

- [10] CMS, D. Kumar, PoS ICHEP2022, 260 (2022).
- [11] ATLAS, Phys. Lett. B 842, 137963 (2023), 2301.10731.
- [12] U. Haisch, G. Polesello, and S. Schulte, JHEP 09, 206 (2021), 2107.12389.
- [13] J. Hermann and M. Worek, Eur. Phys. J. C 81, 1029 (2021), 2108.01089.
- [14] M. Schumann, Journal of Physics G: Nuclear and Particle Physics 46, 103003 (2019).
- [15] CMS, V. Milošević, PoS ICHEP2020, 070 (2021).
- [16] C. Weinheimer, Neutrino mass, 25 (2003).
- [17] J. Abdallah *et al.*, Phys. Dark Univ. **9-10**, 8 (2015), 1506.03116.
- [18] C. Degrande, Comput. Phys. Commun. 197, 239 (2015), 1406.3030.
- [19] N. Arkani-Hamed, G. L. Kane, J. Thaler, and L.-T. Wang, JHEP 08, 070 (2006), hepph/0512190.
- [20] ATLAS, G. Aad et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 83, 503 (2023), 2211.05426.
- [21] T. Biekötter and M. Pierre, Eur. Phys. J. C 82, 1026 (2022), 2208.05505.
- [22] W. Bernreuther and A. Brandenburg, Physical Review D 49, 4481 (1994).
- [23] J. F. Gunion and X.-G. He, Physical Review Letters 76, 4468 (1996).
- [24] P. S. B. Dev, A. Djouadi, R. M. Godbole, M. M. Mühlleitner, and S. D. Rindani, Physical Review Letters 100 (2008).
- [25] R. Frederix *et al.*, Physics Letters B **701**, 427 (2011).
- [26] J. Ellis, D. S. Hwang, K. Sakurai, and M. Takeuchi, Journal of High Energy Physics 2014 (2014).
- [27] S. Khatibi and M. M. Najafabadi, Physical Review D 90 (2014).
- [28] F. Demartin, F. Maltoni, K. Mawatari, B. Page, and M. Zaro, The European Physical Journal C 74 (2014).
- [29] A. Kobakhidze, L. Wu, and J. Yue, Journal of High Energy Physics 2014 (2014).
- [30] J. Bramante, A. Delgado, and A. Martin, Physical Review D 89 (2014).
- [31] F. Boudjema, D. Guadagnoli, R. M. Godbole, and K. A. Mohan, Physical Review D 92 (2015).
- [32] X.-G. He, G.-N. Li, and Y.-J. Zheng, International Journal of Modern Physics A 30, 1550156 (2015).
- [33] S. A. dos Santos *et al.*, Physical Review D **92** (2015).
- [34] A. V. Gritsan, R. Röntsch, M. Schulze, and M. Xiao, Physical Review D 94 (2016).

- [35] M. J. Dolan, M. Spannowsky, Q. Wang, and Z.-H. Yu, Physical Review D 94 (2016).
- [36] D. Gonç alves and D. López-Val, Physical Review D 94 (2016).
- [37] M. R. Buckley and D. Gonç alves, Physical Review D 93 (2016).
- [38] N. Mileo, K. Kiers, A. Szynkman, D. Crane, and E. Gegner, Journal of High Energy Physics **2016** (2016).
- [39] M. R. Buckley and D. Gonç alves, Physical Review Letters 116 (2016).
- [40] S. A. dos Santos et al., Physical Review D 96 (2017).
- [41] D. Gonçalves, J. H. Kim, and K. Kong, Journal of High Energy Physics 2018 (2018).
- [42] D. Azevedo, A. Onofre, F. Filthaut, and R. Gonç alo, Physical Review D 98 (2018).
- [43] J. Li, Z. guo Si, L. Wu, and J. Yue, Physics Letters B 779, 72 (2018).
- [44] A. Ferroglia, M. C. Fiolhais, E. Gouveia, and A. Onofre, Physical Review D 100 (2019).
- [45] D. A. Faroughy, J. F. Kamenik, N. Košnik, and A. Smolkovič, Journal of High Energy Physics **2020** (2020).
- [46] D. Azevedo, R. Capucha, A. Onofre, and R. Santos, JHEP 06, 155 (2020), 2003.09043.
- [47] D. Azevedo, R. Capucha, E. Gouveia, A. Onofre, and R. Santos, JHEP 04, 077 (2021), 2012.10730.
- [48] B. Bortolato, J. F. Kamenik, N. Košnik, and A. Smolkovič, Nuclear Physics B 964, 115328 (2021).
- [49] Q.-H. Cao, K.-P. Xie, H. Zhang, and R. Zhang, A new observable for measuring cp property of top-higgs interaction, 2020.
- [50] D. Gonçalves, J. H. Kim, K. Kong, and Y. Wu, Journal of High Energy Physics 2022 (2022).
- [51] R. K. Barman, D. Gonç alves, and F. Kling, Physical Review D 105 (2022).
- [52] D. Azevedo, R. Capucha, A. Onofre, and R. Santos, JHEP 06, 246 (2022), 2208.04271.
- [53] J. A. Aguilar-Saavedra, M. C. N. Fiolhais, P. Martín-Ramiro, J. M. Moreno, and A. Onofre, The European Physical Journal C 82 (2022).
- [54] H. Casler, M. Manganel, M. C. Fiolhais, A. Ferroglia, and A. Onofre, Physical Review D 99 (2019).
- [55] F. Déliot, M. C. N. Fiolhais, and A. Onofre, Modern Physics Letters A 34, 1950142 (2019).
- [56] E. Gouveia *et al.*, Probing the cp nature of the higgs coupling in *tt* events at the lhc, 2018, 1801.04954.
- [57] F. Déliot *et al.*, Physical Review D **97** (2018).
- [58] A. Broggio, A. Ferroglia, M. C. Fiolhais, and A. Onofre, Physical Review D 96 (2017).

- [59] M. Backović et al., Eur. Phys. J. C 75, 482 (2015), 1508.05327.
- [60] M. Backović et al., The European Physical Journal C 75, 1 (2015).
- [61] M. Botje et al., (2011), 1101.0538.
- [62] A. Alloul, N. D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr, and B. Fuks, Comput. Phys. Commun. 185, 2250 (2014), 1310.1921.
- [63] J. F. Gunion and X.-G. He, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4468 (1996), hep-ph/9602226.
- [64] J. Alwall, M. Herquet, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, and T. Stelzer, JHEP 06, 128 (2011), 1106.0522.
- [65] E. Conte, B. Fuks, and G. Serret, Comput. Phys. Commun. 184, 222 (2013), 1206.1599.
- [66] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna, and P. Z. Skands, JHEP 05, 026 (2006), hep-ph/0603175.
- [67] DELPHES 3, J. de Favereau et al., JHEP 02, 057 (2014), 1307.6346.
- [68] D. Azevedo et al., JHEP 11, 125 (2023), 2308.00819.
- [69] S. P. Amor dos Santos et al., Phys. Rev. D92, 034021 (2015), 1503.07787.
- [70] D. Azevedo, R. Capucha, A. Onofre, and R. Santos, Journal of High Energy Physics 2020 (2020).

## **A** Exclusion Limits

Figures 9 and 10 illustrate the exclusion limits for the  $g_{33}$  coupling constant, graphically representing data from the detailed tables. These plots provide a visual interpretation of the exclusion limits for different exclusion limits configurations.



Figure 9: Exclusion of the SM with a massless scalar DM mediator ,  $Y_0$ , including NLO effects with mixed scalar and pseudoscalar Yukawa-like coupling with the top quarks, against the SM as null hypothesis, for derived  $b_2$ observable (top left),  $\tilde{b}_2$  in the (0, 1, 1) direction of the momentum plane (top right),  $\tilde{b}_2$  in the (0, 1, 0) direction of the momentum plane (bottom). Limits are shown for a luminosity of L = 300 fb<sup>-1</sup>.



Figure 10: Exclusion of the SM with a massless scalar DM mediator, i.e.  $Y_0$ , including NLO effects with mixed scalar and pseudoscalar Yukawa-like coupling with the top quarks, against the SM as null hypothesis, for both spin observables:  $n_4$  (left), and  $n_2$  (right). Limits are shown for a luminosity of L = 300 fb<sup>-1</sup>.

## **B** Full observables constraints

The subsequent tables provide a more detailed examination of the  $g_{33}$  coupling constant's exclusion limits, covering a broader range of mediator masses and luminosities for the different observables proposed in this paper.

<b>Exclusion Limits from</b> $b_2$							
		300	$fb^{-1}$	3000	$fb^{-1}$		
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)		
$0.01  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.0475, 0.0425 ight]$	[-0.0875, 0.0875]	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	[-0.0475, 0.0475]		
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.87, 0.87]	[-1.63, 1.63]	[-0.485, 0.475]	[-0.92, 0.91]		
$1  \mathrm{CoV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.0725, 0.0725\right]$	[-0.1425, 0.1425]	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.0775, 0.0775]		
1 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.87, 0.87]	[-1.65, 1.63]	[-0.485, 0.49]	[-0.92, 0.925]		
$10  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	[-0.2575, 0.2625]	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1425, 0.1475]		
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.87, 0.89]	[-1.65, 1.67]	[-0.50, 0.49]	[-0.935, 0.94]		
100 CoV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.76, 0.74]	[-1.41, 1.415]	[-0.4125, 0.4275]	[-0.7875, 0.7875]		
100 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-1.25, 1.27]	[-2.37, 2.35]	[-0.70, 0.70]	[-1.325, 1.325]		
125  CeV	$g_{u_{33}}^{S} \in$	[-1.01, 1.015]	[-1.91, 1.915]	[-0.5775, 0.5775]	[-1.0725, 1.0725]		
120 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^{\circ}} \in$	[-1.37, 1.35]	[-2.57, 2.59]	[-0.775, 0.775]	[-1.45, 1.45]		

Table 6: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $b_2$  observable.

Exclusion Elinits from 0.9						
		300	fb <sup>-1</sup>	3000	$fb^{-1}$	
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)	
0.01 CoV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.0875, 0.0875]	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	[-0.0475, 0.0475]	
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.87, 0.87]	[-1.65, 1.65]	[-0.485, 0.49]	[-0.935, 0.925]	
$1  \mathrm{CoV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.0725, 0.0725\right]$	[-0.1425, 0.1425]	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	
1 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.89, 0.89]	[-1.67, 1.67]	[-0.50, 0.49]	[-0.935, 0.94]	
10  CeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2575, 0.2625 ight]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1475, 0.1425]	
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.89, 0.89]	[-1.69, 1.69]	[-0.50, 0.505]	[-0.95, 0.955]	
$100  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.76, 0.765]	[-1.435, 1.44]	[-0.4275, 0.4275]	[-0.8025, 0.8025]	
100 GCV	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-1.37, 1.39]	[-2.57, 2.59]	[-0.775, 0.775]	[-1.45, 1.45]	
125 GeV	$g_{\underline{u}_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.06, 1.04]	[-1.985, 1.965]	$\left[-0.5925, 0.5925 ight]$	[-1.1025, 1.1025]	
120 00 1	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-1.57, 1.55]	[-2.93, 2.91]	[-0.875, 0.875]	[-1.625, 1.625]	

## Exclusion Limits from $\tilde{b}_2^{(0,1,0)}$

Table 7: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the *Scenario* 1, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $\tilde{b}_2^{(0,1,0)}$  observable.

		$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		3000	$fb^{-1}$
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
0.01 CoV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.0475, 0.0425 ight]$	$\left[-0.0875, 0.0875 ight]$	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	$\left[-0.0475, 0.0475\right]$
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.89, 0.87]	[-1.65, 1.65]	[-0.485, 0.49]	$\left[-0.935, 0.925 ight]$
$1 \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0725, 0.0725]	[-0.1425, 0.1425]	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.0775, 0.0775]
1 66 V	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.89, 0.91]	[-1.67, 1.67]	[-0.50, 0.49]	[-0.935, 0.94]
10  CeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2625, 0.2575 ight]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1425, 0.1475]
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.89, 0.91]	[-1.69, 1.69]	[-0.50, 0.505]	$\left[-0.95, 0.955 ight]$
$100  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.76, 0.765]	[-1.435, 1.44]	[-0.4275, 0.4275]	$\left[-0.8025, 0.8025 ight]$
100 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-1.37, 1.39]	[-2.61, 2.59]	$\left[-0.775, 0.775\right]$	[-1.45, 1.45]
$125 \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.035, 1.04]	[-1.96, 1.965]	[-0.5925, 0.5925]	[-1.1025, 1.1025]
120 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-1.53, 1.55]	[-2.89, 2.91]	[-0.875, 0.875]	[-1.625, 1.625]

# Exclusion Limits from $\tilde{b}_2^{(0,1/\sqrt{2},1/\sqrt{2})}$

Table 8: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the *Scenario* 1, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $\tilde{b}_2^{(0,1/\sqrt{2},1/\sqrt{2})}$  observable.

		300	$fb^{-1}$	3000	$fb^{-1}$
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
$0.01  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0425, 0.0475]	[-0.0875, 0.0875]	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	[-0.0475, 0.0475]
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.8900, 0.8900]	[-1.6700, 1.6700]	[-0.4875, 0.4875]	[-0.9375, 0.9375]
$1  \mathrm{CoV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0725, 0.0725]	[-0.1425, 0.1425]	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.0775, 0.0775]
1 66 V	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.8900, 0.8900]	[-1.6700, 1.6700]	[-0.5025, 0.4875]	[-0.9375, 0.9375]
10  GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2575, 0.2575\right]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1425, 0.1425]
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	[-1.7100, 1.7100]	[-0.5025, 0.5175]	[-0.9525, 0.9675]
$100  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.7600, 0.7650]	[-1.4350, 1.4400]	[-0.4275, 0.4275]	[-0.8025, 0.8025]
100 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-1.4100, 1.3900]	[-1.4100, 1.3900]	[-0.7750, 0.8000]	[-1.4750, 1.4750]
125 CeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.0350, 1.0400]	[-1.9850, 1.990]	[-0.5925, 0.5925]	[-1.1025, 1.1175]
120 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-1.5700, 1.5900]	$\left[-2.9700, 2.9500 ight]$	[-0.8750, 0.8750]	[-1.6750, 1.6750]

#### **Exclusion Limits from** $n_2$

Table 9: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $n_2$  observable.

		$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		3000	$fb^{-1}$
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
0.01 CoV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.0875, 0.0875]	-0.0225, 0.0225	[-0.0475, 0.0475]
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	$\left[-0.8700, 0.8900 ight]$	[-1.6700, 1.6700]	[-0.5025, 0.4875]	$\left[-0.9375, 0.9375 ight]$
1 CoV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0725, 0.0725]	[-0.1425, 0.1425]	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	[-0.0775, 0.0775]
1 66 1	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.8700, 0.8900]	[-1.6500, 1.6500]	[-0.4875, 0.4875]	$\left[-0.9225, 0.9225 ight]$
10  CeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2575, 0.2575 ight]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1475, 0.1425]
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	$\left[-0.9100, 0.8900 ight]$	[-1.7100, 1.6900]	[-0.5025, 0.5025]	$\left[-0.9525, 0.9525 ight]$
$100  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.7600, 0.7650]	[-1.4350, 1.4400]	[-0.4275, 0.4275]	[-0.8025, 0.8025]
100 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-1.3700, 1.3500]	$\left[-2.5700, 2.5900 ight]$	[-0.7750, 0.7750]	[-1.4500, 1.4500]
$125 \mathrm{GeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.0600, 1.0400]	[-1.9850, 1.965]	[-0.5925, 0.5925]	[-1.1175, 1.1175]
120 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-1.5300, 1.5500]	[-2.8900, 2.8700]	[-0.8500, 0.8500]	[-1.6250, 1.6250]

#### Exclusion Limits from $n_{\rm 4}$

Table 10: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $n_4$  observable.

## C FB asymmetries cut

The subsequent Tables provide a more detailed examination of the  $g_{33}$  coupling constant's exclusion limits computed using the foward-backward symmetry cut in the distributions.

		Exclusion L	$mits$ from $o_2$ Asym	imetries rd	
		300	$fb^{-1}$	3000	$fb^{-1}$
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
0.01 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.0425, 0.0475\right]$	$\left[-0.0875, 0.0875 ight]$	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	[-0.0475, 0.0475]
	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.83, 0.83]	[-1.57, 1.57]	[-0.4725, 0.4575]	$\left[-0.8775, 0.8925 ight]$
$10  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2575, 0.2625 ight]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1425, 0.1475]
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.85, 0.85]	[-1.61, 1.61]	[-0.4725, 0.4725]	[-0.8925, 0.8925]
195  CeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.01, 1.015]	[-1.885, 1.89]	[-0.5625, 0.5625]	[-1.0575, 1.0575]
125 Ge v	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-1.29, 1.27]	[-2.41, 2.43]	[-0.725, 0.725]	[-1.35, 1.375]

### **Exclusion Limits from** b<sub>2</sub> Asymmetries FB

Table 11: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $b_2$  observable.

		$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		3000	$fb^{-1}$
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
$0.01  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0425, 0.0425]	$\left[-0.0875, 0.0875 ight]$	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	[-0.0475, 0.0475]
0.01 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.87, 0.87]	[-1.65, 1.67]	[-0.4875, 0.4875]	$\left[-0.9375, 0.9225 ight]$
$10  \mathrm{CeV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2575, 0.2625 ight]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1475, 0.1475]
10 Gev	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	[-0.89, 0.91]	[-1.71, 1.69]	[-0.5025, 0.5025]	$\left[-0.9525, 0.9525 ight]$
$125 \mathrm{CoV}$	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.06, 1.065]	[-1.985, 1.99]	[-0.5925, 0.5925]	[-1.1175, 1.1175]
120 Ge v	$g_{u_{22}}^{P^{\circ}} \in$	[-1.57, 1.55]	[-2.93, 2.91]	[-0.875, 0.875]	[-1.65, 1.65]

# Exclusion Limits from $\tilde{b}_2^{(0,1,0)}$ Asymmetries FB

Table 12: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $b_2$  observable.

		$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		$3000 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
0.01 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.0422, 0.0474\right]$	[-0.0876, 0.0876]	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	$\left[-0.0475, 0.0475\right]$
	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.87, 0.87]	[-1.67, 1.67]	[-0.4875, 0.4875]	$\left[-0.9375, 0.9375 ight]$
10 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.138, 0.138]	[-0.263, 0.263]	[-0.078, 0.078]	[-0.148, 0.148]
	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.92, 0.92]	[-1.71, 1.71]	[-0.5025, 0.5025]	$\left[-0.9525, 0.9525 ight]$
125 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.06, 1.065]	[-1.985, 1.99]	[-0.5925, 0.5925]	[-1.1175, 1.1175]
	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^{\circ}} \in$	[-1.57, 1.55]	[-2.93, 2.95]	$\left[-0.875, 0.875 ight]$	[-1.65, 1.65]

## Exclusion Limits from $ilde{b}_2^{(0,1/\sqrt{2},1/\sqrt{2})}$ Asymmetries FB

Table 13: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $b_2$  observable.

		$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$		$3000 \text{ fb}^{-1}$	
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)
0.01 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0425, 0.0475]	[-0.0875, 0.0875]	[-0.0225, 0.0225]	[-0.0475, 0.0475]
	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	[-0.8900, 0.8900]	[-1.6700, 1.6700]	[-0.4875, 0.4875]	$\left[-0.9375, 0.9375 ight]$
10 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	$\left[-0.1375, 0.1375\right]$	$\left[-0.2575, 0.2575\right]$	[-0.0775, 0.0775]	[-0.1425, 0.1425]
	$g_{u_{33}}^P \in$	$\left[-0.9100, 0.9100 ight]$	[-1.7100, 1.7100]	[-0.5025, 0.5175]	$\left[-0.9525, 0.9675 ight]$
125 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.0350, 1.0400]	[-1.9850, 1.990]	[-0.5925, 0.5925]	[-1.1025, 1.1175]
	$g^P_{u_{33}} \in$	[-1.5700, 1.5900]	$\left[-2.9700, 2.9500 ight]$	[-0.8750, 0.8750]	[-1.6750, 1.6750]

#### Exclusion Limits from $n_2$ Asymmetries FB

Table 14: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $n_2$  observable.

Exclusion Emilies from 164 Asymmetries i D							
	$300 \text{ fb}^{-1}$			$3000 \text{ fb}^{-1}$			
$m_{Y_0}$		(68% CL)	(95% CL)	(68% CL)	(95% CL)		
0.01 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.0450, 0.0450]	[-0.0875, 0.0875]	-0.0225, 0.0225	[-0.0475, 0.0475]		
	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	$\left[-0.8900, 0.8900 ight]$	[-1.6700, 1.6700]	$\left[-0.5025, 0.5025\right]$	$\left[-0.9375, 0.9375 ight]$		
10 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-0.135, 0.135]	[-0.255, 0.255]	[-0.075, 0.075]	[-0.1475, 0.1425]		
	$g_{u_{33}}^{P^*} \in$	$\left[-0.9100, 0.8900 ight]$	[-1.7100, 1.6900]	[-0.5025, 0.5025]	$\left[-0.9525, 0.9525\right]$		
125 GeV	$g_{u_{33}}^S \in$	[-1.05, 1.05]	[-1.965, 1.965]	[-0.593, 0.593]	[-1.118, 1.118]		
	$g_{u_{22}}^{P} \in$	[-1.53, 1.55]	[-2.89, 2.87]	[-0.85, 0.85]	[-1.63, 1.63]		

#### **Exclusion Limits from** *n*<sub>4</sub> **Asymmetries FB**

Table 15: Exclusion limits for the  $t\bar{t}Y_0$  CP-couplings, considering the CP-even component against irreducible backgrounds, are depicted for various  $Y_0$  masses under fixed luminosities of 300 fb<sup>-1</sup> and 3000 fb<sup>-1</sup>. The limits are presented at 68% and 95% confidence levels for the  $n_4$  observable.