

Large Neutrino Asymmetry from TeV Scale Leptogenesis in the Light of Helium Anomaly

Debasish Borah^{1,*} and Arnab Dasgupta^{2,†}

¹*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Assam 781039, India*

²*Pittsburgh Particle Physics, Astrophysics, and Cosmology Center,*

Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15206, USA

Abstract

Motivated by the growing evidence for a large neutrino asymmetry in the early universe from the recent ${}^4\text{He}$ measurements, we point out the class of leptogenesis scenarios with decay or scattering being the source of lepton asymmetry, simultaneously consistent with such a large neutrino asymmetry as well as the observed baryon asymmetry of the universe. Considering $1 \rightarrow 2, 1 \rightarrow 3$ as well as $2 \rightarrow 2$ processes to be responsible for generating the asymmetries, we show that only TeV scale leptogenesis preferably of $1 \rightarrow N (N \geq 3)$ type can generate the required lepton asymmetry around sphaleron temperature while also generating a large neutrino asymmetry $\sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ by the epoch of the big bang nucleosynthesis. This also offers the possibility of cogenesis if dark matter is in the form of a sterile neutrino resonantly produced in the early universe due to the presence of a large neutrino asymmetry. While such low scale leptogenesis has tantalising detection prospects at laboratory experiments, the indication of a large neutrino asymmetry provides a complementary indirect signature.

Introduction: The recent near-infrared observation of 10 extremely metal-poor galaxies by the Subaru Survey [1], along with 54 previously observed galaxies, have led to the determination of the primordial abundance of ${}^4\text{He}$ as $Y_P = 0.2379_{-0.0030}^{+0.0031}$. While this is slightly smaller than earlier estimates [2–4], inclusion of the primordial deuterium constraints lead to a $> 2\sigma$ tension between the predicted number of neutrino species $N_{\text{eff}} = 2.41_{-0.21}^{+0.19}$ and the standard model (SM) expectation $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.046$, referred to as the helium anomaly [1]. Allowing a large neutrino asymmetry, quantified in terms of the degeneracy parameter of the electron type neutrino $\zeta_e = 0.05_{-0.03}^{+0.03}$, it is however possible to obtain a large $N_{\text{eff}} = 3.22_{-0.30}^{+0.33}$ consistent with SM prediction within 1σ [1]. A more recent analysis of the big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) data jointly with information from the cosmic microwave background (CMB) also found evidence for a large neutrino asymmetry in the early universe at $\sim 2\sigma$ confidence level [5]. While we consider large neutrino asymmetry solution to this helium anomaly, there exists other solution too as considered in [6] proposing a modified gravity origin.

While these indications are only suggestive at this stage, it is tantalising to take these hints seriously and consider beyond standard model (BSM) scenarios which can create such large neutrino asymmetries. A recent attempt [7] along with a few related earlier works [8–10] have utilised the Affleck-Dine mechanism [11] to create such large asymmetry, no studies have been done to relate it to conventional leptogenesis scenarios, from out-of-equilibrium decay or scattering. We, for the first time, point out that even in out-of-equilibrium decay leptogenesis, it is possible to generate such large neutrino asymmetry at late epochs while producing the required lepton

asymmetry at sphaleron temperature (T_{sph}) consistent with the observed baryon asymmetry. Since there exists only a single source of lepton asymmetry in such minimal setups, one requires the yield in lepton asymmetry to continue over a long period $T \in (T_{\text{sph}}, T_{\text{BBN}})$. This also ensures that the small lepton asymmetry required for successful baryogenesis via leptogenesis [12] is produced by T_{sph} which later gets enhanced to a large neutrino asymmetry $\sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ by T_{BBN} . While it is possible to create a large neutrino asymmetry in electron neutrino type at high scale and be consistent with the observed baryon asymmetry by considering cancellation between lepton asymmetries of different flavours [8], we do not consider such a fine-tuned scenario here. The requirement of a prolonged yield in lepton asymmetry even below sphaleron temperature requires the scale of leptogenesis to be low and also the mother particle to be in out of equilibrium to avoid Boltzmann suppression.

Starting with a model independent approach, we first consider decays of heavy Majorana fermions or right handed neutrinos (RHN) as origin of lepton asymmetry by taking the mass of RHNs, their decay widths and the CP asymmetry parameter as free parameters. We then show that it is not possible to fulfill both the criteria mentioned above with this simple vanilla leptogenesis setup [12, 13], even with resonantly enhanced CP asymmetry parameter [14]. We then consider the RHNs to have additional scattering processes responsible for keeping them in equilibrium at early epochs followed by late freeze-out, a characteristic feature of (but not limited to) three-body decay origin of leptogenesis [15–24]. We also consider the possibility of leptogenesis from scattering, similar to the WIMP_y leptogenesis [19, 25–29] and find it to be unsuccessful in generating the required asymmetries. We show that TeV scale leptogenesis of $1 \rightarrow 2$ type decay having additional interactions responsible for producing the mother particle in equilibrium can, in principle, generate such large neutrino asymmetry with resonantly enhanced CP asymmetry while being

*Electronic address: dborah@iitg.ac.in

†Electronic address: arnabdasgupta@pitt.edu

consistent with the observer baryon asymmetry. On the other hand, in leptogenesis of $1 \rightarrow 3$ type decay which naturally leads to additional interactions keeping the mother particle in equilibrium in early universe, the desired asymmetries can be generated without any additional ingredients. Finally, we propose a concrete model for three-body decay leptogenesis consistent with successful leptogenesis, large neutrino asymmetry as well as light neutrino masses. While we do not discuss dark matter (DM) phenomenology in this work, such large neutrino asymmetry can lead to resonant production of sterile neutrino DM [30–32]. In fact, a recent work [33] has shown that such large neutrino asymmetry required for resonant DM production can be generated in a minimal setup where oscillation is the primary source of asymmetry. Thus, our proposal also offers a DM-baryonogenesis setup in the context of TeV scale leptogenesis and keV sterile neutrino DM.

Leptogenesis: Leptogenesis is an appealing framework to generate the observed baryon asymmetry of universe¹, denoted by baryon to photon ratio $\eta_B = \frac{n_B - n_{\bar{B}}}{n_\gamma} \simeq 6.2 \times 10^{-10}$ [35]. A non-zero lepton asymmetry is first generated through lepton number (L) violating decays or scatterings which can later be converted into the observed baryon asymmetry through $(B+L)$ -violating electroweak sphaleron transitions [36]. The sphaleron factor is given by

$$a_{\text{sph}} = \frac{8 N_F + 4 N_\Phi}{22 N_F + 13 N_\Phi} \quad (1)$$

where N_F is the number of fermion generations and N_Φ is the number of Higgs doublets. For the vanilla leptogenesis scenario, we have $N_F = 3, N_\Phi = 1$ leading to $a_{\text{sph}} = 28/79$, requiring the lepton asymmetry to be of same order as the observed baryon asymmetry.

In the absence of any fine-tuned cancellation between lepton asymmetries stored in different lepton flavours and considering only a single source of lepton asymmetry, one needs to ensure that a lepton asymmetry $\eta_{\Delta L} \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-9})$ around by sphaleron decoupling epoch ($T_{\text{sph}} \simeq 131$ GeV. In order to create a large neutrino asymmetry at later epochs, it is also necessary to ensure that the lepton asymmetry does not saturate at $T \geq T_{\text{sph}}$ but continues to increase during $T_{\text{BBN}} \leq T \leq T_{\text{sph}}$ to $\eta_{\Delta L\nu} \equiv \frac{\pi^2}{33\zeta(3)}\xi \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-2})$ required to explain the helium anomaly. Additionally, it is also important to ensure that no asymmetries are generated in charged lepton sector during this late epoch, which is ruled out from electric charge neutrality of early universe. In vanilla leptogenesis this can be naturally ensured as the charged component of the SM Higgs are no longer physical at sub-electroweak scale to appear in decay processes of type $N \rightarrow e^- H^+$.

In extended and non-minimal scenarios, this can be prevented kinematically by choosing the mass spectrum of BSM particles accordingly.

The most general Boltzmann equations for leptogenesis from decay can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\eta_N}{dz} &= - \left(z \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}}{\tilde{H}} \frac{K_1(z)}{K_2(z)} (\eta_N - \eta_N^{eq}) + \frac{\tilde{\eta}_\gamma \langle \sigma v \rangle}{z^2 \tilde{H}} (\eta_N^2 - (\eta_N^{eq})^2) \right) \\ \frac{d\eta_{\Delta L}}{dz} &= \left(\epsilon z \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}}{\tilde{H}} \frac{K_1(z)}{K_2(z)} (\eta_N - \eta_N^{eq}) - \eta_{\Delta L} z^3 K_1(z) \frac{\tilde{\Gamma}}{\tilde{H}} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $z = M/T$ with M being the mass of the mother particle, $\tilde{H} \equiv \sqrt{4\pi^3 g_*(T)/45} M/M_{\text{Pl}}$ (g_* is the relativistic number degrees of freedom), $\tilde{\eta}_\gamma \equiv 2/\pi^2$, $\langle \sigma v \rangle \equiv M^2 \langle \sigma v \rangle$ (which for simplicity we have taken to be $\sim g^4/M^2$) and $\tilde{\Gamma} \equiv \Gamma/M$. Interestingly, the CP asymmetry has quadratic dependence on Yukawa couplings even if the decay is two-body or more (i.e $\epsilon \sim y^2/(16\pi)$). Now assuming $y \sim 0.8$ the asymmetry is $\epsilon \sim 1 \times 10^{-2}$.




FIG. 1: Evolution for leptonic asymmetries for pure decay scenario considering benchmark points BP1 (solid), BP2 (dashed), BP3 (dash-dot) with $\epsilon \sim 0.5$ and $M = 10$ TeV. The other details are shown in table I.

	$\tilde{\Gamma} \times M_{\text{Pl}}/M$	$\langle \sigma v \rangle \times M_{\text{Pl}}/M$
BP1	0.1	0
BP2	0.01	0
BP3	0.001	0
BP4	5×10^{-10}	10
BP5	5×10^{-10}	100
BP6	5×10^{-10}	1000

TABLE I: Details of the benchmark points shown in Fig.1 and Fig.2.

In Fig.1, we show the evolution of leptonic asymmetry for different choices of $\tilde{\Gamma}/\tilde{H}$ tabulated in table I

¹ See [13, 34] for reviews of leptogenesis.




FIG. 2: Evolution for leptonic asymmetries for decay scenario with non-zero additional annihilation cross-section of mother particle considering benchmark points BP4 (solid), BP5 (dashed), BP6 (dash-dot) with $\epsilon \sim 0.015$ and $M = 10$ TeV. The other details are shown in table I.




FIG. 3: Evolution of leptonic asymmetries originating from $2 \rightarrow 2$ processes for benchmark points BP7 (solid), BP8 (dashed), BP9 (dash-dot) with the details shown in table III.

and considering maximal CP asymmetry parameter $\epsilon \sim \frac{1}{8\pi} y^2 \sin(2\phi) \sim 0.5$ with mother particle mass $M = 10$ TeV. While we do not impose any bounds from the neutrino mass criteria applicable for specific seesaw models, the requirement of producing enhanced neutrino asymmetry below the sphaleron decoupling epoch forces the decay width $\tilde{\Gamma}$ to be extremely small. For such small couplings, the mother particle is produced via freeze-in from the bath and decays later to produce the leptonic asymmetry. Once the decay is complete, the leptonic asymmetry gets frozen out leaving a saturated value. It can be seen from Fig. 1 that even for maximal CP asymmetry, we can not get the required leptonic asymmetry at $T = T_{\text{sph}}$ while producing a large neutrino asymmetry

by $T = T_{\text{BBN}}$. This is due to the limited freedom one has in such a minimal setup where the decay width of the mother particle decides its production from the bath as well as the subsequent generation of lepton asymmetry. If we decouple the interactions responsible for production and decay of the mother particle, it is possible to generate the desired asymmetries simultaneously, as shown in Fig. 2. Here, we have considered a non-vanishing cross-section of the mother particle which can lead to its production from the bath by virtue of scattering while the production from inverse decay can be sub-dominant. In such a case, the decay width can be chosen to be small in order to have a prolonged production of lepton asymmetry without compromising the production of the mother particle. Choosing the cross section appropriately lead to early decoupling of the mother particle from the bath, leaving a large freeze-out abundance without any Boltzmann suppression. A small decay width and a large CP asymmetry can then lead to the desired lepton asymmetry at $T = T_{\text{sph}}$ while producing a large neutrino asymmetry by $T = T_{\text{BBN}}$, as seen from Fig. 2. Since such a scenario can arise, in principle, for both two-body and many-body decays, we briefly comment on the viability of two-body and three-body decay leptogenesis below.

1. *Two-body decay:* For the two-body decay, as in the vanilla leptogenesis scenarios, the reduced decay width of the mother particle depends on the Yukawa coupling as $\tilde{\Gamma} \sim y^2/16\pi$. The decay widths chosen for benchmark points shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 correspond to Yukawa couplings shown in second column of table II assuming it to be a two-body decay. Clearly, for the benchmark points BP4-BP6 satisfying our criteria correspond to tiny Yukawa couplings. In a realistic scenario like type-I seesaw leptogenesis with RHN decaying into lepton and Higgs, this will not only create hindrance in generating the desired large CP asymmetry except in the resonant regime [14], but will also be inconsistent with the neutrino mass criteria for TeV scale RHN. Therefore, the two-body decay origin of such large neutrino asymmetry consistent with successful leptogenesis is highly disfavoured, at least within simple setups.

	y (2-body)	Λ (3-body decay, $y=0.8$)
BP1	6.4×10^{-8}	9.6×10^6 GeV
BP2	$2. \times 10^{-8}$	1.7×10^7 GeV
BP3	6.4×10^{-9}	3×10^7 GeV
BP4-BP6	4.5×10^{-12}	1.14×10^9 GeV

TABLE II: Yukawa couplings (y) and mediator scale Λ to get the desired decay width shown in table I considering two-body and three-body decay origin of leptogenesis.

2. *Three-body decay:* In the simplest realisation of three-body decay leptogenesis, the relevant process

involves a mother particle decaying into lighter particles via a heavy mediator with mass denoted by a scale Λ . Assuming the Yukawa coupling involved in the two vertices involved in the decay process to be equal ($\sim y$), the reduced decay width is $\tilde{\Gamma} \sim y^4/(192\pi^3)(M/\Lambda)^4$, assuming all final state particles to be massless. The decay widths chosen for benchmark points shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2 correspond to mediator mass shown in the third column of table II assuming it to be a three-body decay with Yukawa coupling $y \sim 0.8$. As we will show below, such Yukawa couplings and mediator mass can easily lead to the desired CP asymmetry without any resonant enhancement while being consistent with light neutrino masses if accommodated in a realistic seesaw scenario.

In order to complete the discussion, we finally consider the case where the leptonic asymmetry is generated via $2 \rightarrow 2$ scattering processes, similar to DM annihilations in WIMP leptogenesis scenarios. In such a scenario, one can satisfy all the Sakharov's conditions [37] with DM annihilations such that some of the processes responsible for WIMP freeze-out can also create a baryon or lepton asymmetry. In order to keep the washout scatterings under control, one has to ensure that the washout scatterings freeze out before WIMP freeze-out [38]. Adopting a model independent approach, the Boltzmann equations for comoving mother particle (denoted by N) and lepton number densities can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\eta_N}{dz} &= - \left(\frac{\tilde{\eta}_\gamma(\langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle + \langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_\epsilon)}{z^2 \tilde{H}} (\eta_N^2 - (\eta_N^{eq})^2) \right), \\ \frac{d\eta_{\Delta L}}{dz} &= \left(\epsilon \frac{\tilde{\eta}_\gamma \langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_\epsilon}{z^2 \tilde{H}} (\eta_N^2 - (\eta_N^{eq})^2) - \eta_{\Delta L} \frac{\tilde{\eta}_\gamma \langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_\epsilon}{\tilde{H}} z^2 K_2^2(z) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $z = M/T$ with M being the mass of the annihilating particle. We denote the annihilation cross section with leptonic final states by a subscript ϵ defined as

$$\langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_\epsilon = (\langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_L + \langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_{\bar{L}}); \quad \epsilon = \frac{(\langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_L - \langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_{\bar{L}})}{(\langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_L + \langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_{\bar{L}})}. \quad (4)$$

Choosing some benchmark values of this CP violating cross section as shown in table III, we show the evolution of N and lepton number densities in Fig. 3. Clearly, a WIMP leptogenesis setup can not generate the required lepton asymmetry and a large neutrino asymmetry simultaneously.

Therefore, only the scenario where the mother particle has a small decay width, additional production channel via scatterings and a sizeable CP asymmetry, the requirement of generating the correct lepton asymmetry by sphaleron decoupling temperature and a large neutrino asymmetry by BBN epoch can be satisfied simultaneously. We have also argued that it is more

	$\langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle_\epsilon \times M_{Pl}/M$
BP7	10^7
BP8	100
BP9	10
BP10	4.7×10^{-3}

TABLE III: CP violating annihilation cross sections used in the benchmark points of Fig. 3 with $\langle\widetilde{\sigma v}\rangle M_{Pl}/M \sim 1.5 \times 10^{17}$, $\epsilon \sim 0.5$ and $M = 1$ TeV.

Particles	$SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$	Z_2
$N_{1,2}$	(1, 1, 0)	1
ψ	(1, 1, 0)	-1
S	(1,1,0)	-1

TABLE IV: Particle content of the concrete three-body decay model.

natural to fulfill these requirements in a three-body decay scenario. We now give some examples of such three-body decay model.

Concrete model for 3-body decay: As a concrete realisation of three-body decay leptogenesis, we consider the BSM field content shown in table IV. The relevant part of the Yukawa Lagrangian is

$$- \mathcal{L}_Y \supset y_l \bar{L} \tilde{\Phi} N_i + y_\psi \bar{\psi} S N_i + \text{h.c.} \quad (5)$$

where Φ is the SM Higgs doublet. While two-body decay of the usual RHNs namely N_i can lead to lepton asymmetry, there exists new source of lepton asymmetry at lower scale due to three-body decay of ψ , as shown in Fig. 4 using the two spinor notation [39]. The non-zero CP asymmetry will arise from the imaginary part of the resummed propagator [24]. Additionally, the two RHNs $N_{1,2}$ can lead to the generation of light neutrino masses via type-I seesaw mechanism.

m_N	m_Ψ	y_ψ	y_l	ϵ
3.6×10^8 GeV	10 TeV	0.1	0.8	0.013

TABLE V: Benchmark values of key parameters to get the correct lepton asymmetries in three-body decay model.

The three-body decay width of ψ and the corresponding CP asymmetry, in the limit of massless particles apart from N_i, ψ come out to be

$$\Gamma = \frac{(y_\psi y_l)^2}{192\pi^3} \frac{m_\Psi^5}{m_N^4}; \quad \epsilon \sim \frac{y_l^2}{16\pi}. \quad (6)$$

On the other hand, the annihilation cross section of ψ via the process shown in Fig. 5 is

$$\langle\sigma v\rangle \simeq \frac{y_\psi^4}{m_N^2}. \quad (7)$$

Using the benchmark parameters shown in table V, we get

$$\begin{aligned} \widetilde{\Gamma} \frac{M_{P1}}{M_{\Psi}} &= \frac{\Gamma}{m_{\Psi}} \frac{M_{P1}}{M_{\Psi}} \sim 5 \times 10^{-10}, \\ \langle \widetilde{\sigma v} \rangle \frac{M_{P1}}{m_{\Psi}} &\equiv m_{\Psi}^2 \langle \sigma v \rangle \frac{M_{P1}}{m_{\Psi}} \sim 94 \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

which can lead to successful leptogenesis and a large neutrino asymmetry at late epochs.




FIG. 4: Process responsible for leptogenesis.




FIG. 5: Annihilation process of ψ .

It is also possible to have a scotogenic [40] realisation of this model by considering the presence of additional Z_2 symmetry under which the RHNs N_i and an additional scalar doublet η are odd while all other fields are even. This allows more freedom in choosing the values of m_N and y_l as the radiative origin of light neutrino mass involves additional free parameters.

Conclusion: Motivated by the recent hints favouring a large neutrino asymmetry in the early universe, we have studied the possibility of accommodating the same in conventional leptogenesis scenarios. Considering a single source of lepton asymmetry, we have first checked

if vanilla leptogenesis scenario with two-body decay can generate such asymmetries and arrived at a negative conclusion. We then consider additional interactions of the mother particle which keep it in the bath in early universe and show that for suitable scattering and decay rates with a maximal CP asymmetry parameter, it is possible to generate the required lepton asymmetry for baryogenesis and a large neutrino asymmetry at later epochs to explain the helium anomaly. We then argue in a model independent way that the required decay width and CP asymmetry can be naturally realised in a three-body decay without requiring any resonant enhancement. Additionally, such three-body decay scenario, when implemented within a realistic seesaw model, can lead to successful prediction of light neutrino data as well whereas the simple two-body decay scenario fails to do so. With growing evidences suggesting the presence of large neutrino asymmetry around the BBN epoch will lead to stronger hints at a TeV scale leptogenesis scenario with three-body decay origin of lepton asymmetry. Since only low scale leptogenesis scenarios are capable of producing such large neutrino asymmetry at late epochs while being consistent with the correct baryon asymmetry of the universe, other laboratory based experiments can offer complementary probes keeping it verifiable in near future. Additionally, if DM in the universe is composed of keV sterile neutrino, the proposed scenario can offer a DM-baryonogenesis setup by generating the required neutrino asymmetry for resonant production of DM [30].

Acknowledgments

DB would like to acknowledge the hospitality at PITT-PACC, University of Pittsburgh during May 2022 where this work was initiated.

-
- [1] A. Matsumoto et al. (2022), 2203.09617.
[2] T. Hsyu, R. J. Cooke, J. X. Prochaska, and M. Bolte, *Astrophys. J.* **896**, 77 (2020), 2005.12290.
[3] E. Aver, K. A. Olive, and E. D. Skillman, *JCAP* **07**, 011 (2015), 1503.08146.
[4] Y. I. Izotov, T. X. Thuan, and N. G. Guseva, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **445**, 778 (2014), 1408.6953.
[5] A.-K. Burns, T. M. P. Tait, and M. Valli (2022), 2206.00693.
[6] K. Kohri and K.-i. Maeda (2022), 2206.11257.
[7] M. Kawasaki and K. Murai (2022), 2203.09713.
[8] J. March-Russell, H. Murayama, and A. Riotto, *JHEP* **11**, 015 (1999), hep-ph/9908396.
[9] J. McDonald, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 4798 (2000), hep-ph/9908300.
[10] A. Casas, W. Y. Cheng, and G. Gelmini, *Nucl. Phys. B* **538**, 297 (1999), hep-ph/9709289.
[11] I. Affleck and M. Dine, *Nucl. Phys. B* **249**, 361 (1985).
[12] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, *Phys. Lett.* **B174**, 45 (1986).
[13] S. Davidson, E. Nardi, and Y. Nir, *Phys. Rept.* **466**, 105 (2008), 0802.2962.
[14] A. Pilaftsis and T. E. J. Underwood, *Nucl. Phys.* **B692**, 303 (2004), hep-ph/0309342.
[15] A. Masiero and A. Riotto, *Phys. Lett. B* **289**, 73 (1992), hep-ph/9206212.
[16] R. Adhikari and U. Sarkar, *Phys. Lett. B* **427**, 59 (1998), hep-ph/9610221.
[17] U. Sarkar and R. Adhikari, *Phys. Rev. D* **55**, 3836 (1997), hep-ph/9608209.
[18] T. Hambye, *Nucl. Phys. B* **633**, 171 (2002), hep-ph/0111089.

- [19] A. Dasgupta, P. S. Bhupal Dev, S. K. Kang, and Y. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 055009 (2020), 1911.03013.
- [20] W. Abdallah, A. Kumar, and A. K. Saha, *JHEP* **04**, 065 (2020), 1911.03363.
- [21] Y. Grossman, T. Kashti, Y. Nir, and E. Roulet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 251801 (2003), hep-ph/0307081.
- [22] G. D'Ambrosio, G. F. Giudice, and M. Raidal, *Phys. Lett. B* **575**, 75 (2003), hep-ph/0308031.
- [23] C. S. Fong, M. Gonzalez-Garcia, and E. Nardi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **26**, 3491 (2011), 1107.5312.
- [24] D. Borah, A. Dasgupta, and D. Mahanta, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 015015 (2022), 2008.10627.
- [25] J. Kumar and P. Stengel, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 055016 (2014), 1309.1145.
- [26] J. Racker and N. Rius, *JHEP* **11**, 163 (2014), 1406.6105.
- [27] A. Dasgupta, C. Hati, S. Patra, and U. Sarkar (2016), 1605.01292.
- [28] D. Borah, A. Dasgupta, and S. K. Kang, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 498 (2020), 1806.04689.
- [29] D. Borah, A. Dasgupta, and S. K. Kang, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 103502 (2019), 1903.10516.
- [30] X.-D. Shi and G. M. Fuller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 2832 (1999), astro-ph/9810076.
- [31] K. Abazajian, G. M. Fuller, and M. Patel, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 023501 (2001), astro-ph/0101524.
- [32] M. Drewes et al., *JCAP* **01**, 025 (2017), 1602.04816.
- [33] S. Eijima, M. Shaposhnikov, and I. Timiryasov, *JCAP* **04**, 049 (2022), 2011.12637.
- [34] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari, and M. Plumacher, *Annals Phys.* **315**, 305 (2005), hep-ph/0401240.
- [35] N. Aghanim et al. (Planck) (2018), 1807.06209.
- [36] V. A. Kuzmin, V. A. Rubakov, and M. E. Shaposhnikov, *Phys. Lett.* **155B**, 36 (1985).
- [37] A. D. Sakharov, *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **5**, 32 (1967), [*Usp. Fiz. Nauk*161,no.5,61(1991)].
- [38] Y. Cui, L. Randall, and B. Shuve, *JHEP* **04**, 075 (2012), 1112.2704.
- [39] H. K. Dreiner, H. E. Haber, and S. P. Martin, *Phys. Rept.* **494**, 1 (2010), 0812.1594.
- [40] E. Ma, *Phys. Rev.* **D73**, 077301 (2006), hep-ph/0601225.