

**New Interpretation of the Recent Result of AMS-02  
and  
Multi-component Decaying Dark Matters  
with non-Abelian Discrete Flavor Symmetry**

Yuji Kajiyama,<sup>a,1</sup> Hiroshi Okada,<sup>b,2</sup> Takashi Toma<sup>c,3</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Akita Highschool, Tegata-Nakadai 1, Akita, 010-0851, Japan*

<sup>b</sup>*School of Physics, KIAS, Seoul 130-722, Korea*

<sup>c</sup>*Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology University of Durham, Durham DH1 3LE, UK*

**Abstract**

Recently the AMS-02 experiment has released the data of positron fraction with much small statistical error. Because of the small error, it is no longer easy to fit the data with a single dark matter for a fixed diffusion model and dark matter profile. In this paper, we propose a new interpretation of the data that it originates from decay of two dark matter. This interpretation gives a rough threshold of the lighter DM component. When DM decays into leptons, the positron fraction in the cosmic ray depends on the flavor of the final states, and this is fixed by imposing non-Abelian discrete symmetry in our model. By assuming two gauge-singlet fermionic decaying DM particles, we show that a model with non-Abelian discrete flavor symmetry, *e.g.*  $T_{13}$ , can give a much better fitting to the AMS-02 data compared with single dark matter scenario. Few dimension six operators of universal leptonic decay of DM particles are allowed in our model since its decay operators are constrained by the  $T_{13}$  symmetry. We also show that the lepton masses and mixings are consistent with current experimental data, due to the flavor symmetry.

---

<sup>1</sup>kajiyama-yuuji@akita-pref.ed.jp

<sup>2</sup>hokada@kias.re.kr

<sup>3</sup>takashi.toma@durham.ac.uk

# 1 Introduction

The latest experiment of Planck [1] tells us that about 26.8 % of energy density of the universe consists of Dark Matter (DM). Many experiments are being performed to search DM signatures. The recent result of the indirect detection experiment of AMS-02 [2] is in favor of the previous experiments such as PAMELA [3,4] and Fermi-LAT [5], which had reported the excess of positron fraction in the cosmic ray. Moreover, it smoothly extends the anomaly line of positron fraction with energy up to about 350 GeV with small statistics error compared with the previous experiments. These observations can be, in general, explained by scattering and/or decay of the GeV/TeV-scale DM particles. In addition leptophilic DM is preferable since PAMELA observed no anti-proton excess [6]. Along this line of thought, several papers have been released [7–15]. Due to the smallness of statistics error of AMS-02, it became difficult to fit to the data as same as the previous experiments like PAMELA [14].

In this paper, we show that we can obtain a better fitting to the data with two component decaying DM. We introduce two kinds of fermionic DM particles with mass of  $\mathcal{O}(100)$  GeV and  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  TeV into the framework of  $T_{13}$  flavor symmetric model [16]. In our model, the flavor symmetry  $T_{13}$  works at least in two ways: (i) It constrains interactions between DM and the Standard Model (SM) particles. DM particles which are gauge singlet fermion  $X$  and  $X'$  couple with leptons by dimension six operators  $\bar{L}E\bar{L}X^{(\prime)}/\Lambda^2$  due to the  $T_{13}$  symmetry, thus these are leptophilic. DM particles decay into leptons via these operators with the suppression factor  $\Lambda \sim 10^{16}$  GeV, giving desired lifetime of DM particles,  $\Gamma^{-1} \sim ((\text{TeV})^5/\Lambda^4)^{-1} \sim 10^{26}$  s [17, 18]. (ii) Flavor of the final states of DM decay is determined by the  $T_{13}$  symmetry. We give a concrete example of the universal final states  $X/X' \rightarrow \nu_e e^+ e^- / \nu_\mu \mu^+ \mu^- / \nu_\tau \tau^+ \tau^-$ . Due to a specific selection rule by the flavor symmetry mentioned above, we show that two-component DM model is preferable for explanation of the precise AMS-02 result. In addition to that, we find a set of parameters that is consistent with the observed lepton masses and their mixings especially somewhat large angle of  $\theta_{13}$  recently reported by several experiments [19–25].

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we briefly mention the  $T_{13}$  symmetric model and construct mass matrices of the lepton sector in definite choice of  $T_{13}$  assignment of the fields. We show that there exists a consistent set of parameters. In section 3, we show that desirable dimension six DM decay operators are allowed by  $T_{13}$  symmetry and that leptonic decay of the two DM particles by those operators shows good agreement with the cosmic-ray anomaly experiments. Section 4 is devoted to the conclusions.

## 2 Lepton masses and mixings with $T_{13}$ flavor symmetry

First of all, we briefly review our model based on the non-Abelian discrete group  $T_{13}$ , which is isomorphic to  $Z_{13} \times Z_3$  [16, 26–28]. The  $T_{13}$  group is a subgroup of  $SU(3)$ , and known as the minimal non-Abelian discrete group having two complex triplets as the irreducible representations, see ref. [16] for details.

Lepton masses and mixings are derived from the setup shown in Table 1. Here,  $Q$ ,  $U$ ,  $D$ ,  $L$ ,  $E$ ,  $H(H')$  and  $X(X')$  denote left-handed quarks, right-handed up-type quarks, right-handed down-type quarks, left-handed leptons, right-handed charged leptons, Higgs bosons, and gauge singlet fermions, respectively<sup>1</sup>. Here one should notice that  $X$  and  $X'$  is Majorana- and Dirac-type DM, respectively that directly comes from the charge assignment of  $T_{13}$ . Due to the  $T_{13}$  flavor symmetry in addition to an appropriate choice of the additional  $Z_3$  symmetry, triplet Higgs bosons  $H(\mathbf{3}_1)$  and  $H(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2)$  couple only to leptons, while  $T_{13}$  singlet Higgs bosons  $H'(\mathbf{1}_{0,1,2})$  couple only to quarks. Hence a linear combination of  $H'$  is the SM-like Higgs boson and is created at LHC by gluon fusion. Therefore, the mass matrices of quark sector are not constrained, while those of lepton sector are determined by the  $T_{13}$  symmetry. For the neutrino sector, since the Yukawa couplings  $LHX$  and  $LHX'$  are forbidden by the  $T_{13}$  symmetry, the left-handed Majorana neutrino mass terms are derived from dimension five operators  $LHLH$ . Here notice that  $X$  and  $X'$  have dimension six operators  $\bar{L}E\bar{L}X$ ,  $\bar{L}ELX'$ , and mass terms  $m_X XX$ ,  $m_{X'} \bar{X}' X'$ . For the matter content and the  $T_{13}$  assignment given in Table 1, the charged-lepton and neutrino masses are generated from the  $T_{13}$  invariant operators

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{L}_Y &= \sqrt{2}a_e \bar{E}LH^c(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2) + \sqrt{2}b_e \bar{E}LH^c(\mathbf{3}_1) \\
 &+ \frac{a_\nu}{\Lambda} LH(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2)LH(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2) + \frac{b_\nu}{\Lambda} (LH(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2))_{\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2} (LH(\mathbf{3}_1))_{\mathbf{3}_2} \\
 &+ \frac{c_\nu}{\Lambda} (LH(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2))_{\mathbf{3}_1} (LH(\mathbf{3}_1))_{\bar{\mathbf{3}}_1} + \text{h.c.}, \tag{2.1}
 \end{aligned}$$

where  $H^c = \epsilon H^*$ , and  $LH(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2)LH(\mathbf{3}_1)$  is  $T_{13}$  invariant in two different products, corresponding to  $b_\nu$  and  $c_\nu$ . The fundamental scale  $\Lambda = 10^{11}$  GeV is needed for the certain neutrino mass scale ( $\Lambda/\sqrt{\lambda} \sim 10^{16}$  GeV is required to obtain the desired lifetime of DM, where  $\lambda$  is coupling constant of DM decay operators as we will discuss later). After the electroweak symmetry breaking, the

---

<sup>1</sup>All the assignment and particle contents are the same as our previous work [16] except the DM sector.

	$Q$	$U$	$D$	$L$	$E$	$H$	$H'$	$X$	$X'$
$SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$	$\mathbf{2}_{1/6}$	$\mathbf{1}_{2/3}$	$\mathbf{1}_{-1/3}$	$\mathbf{2}_{-1/2}$	$\mathbf{1}_{-1}$	$\mathbf{2}_{1/2}$	$\mathbf{2}_{1/2}$	$\mathbf{1}_0$	$\mathbf{1}_0$
$T_{13}$	$\mathbf{1}_{0,1,2}$	$\mathbf{1}_{0,1,2}$	$\mathbf{1}_{0,1,2}$	$\mathbf{3}_1$	$\mathbf{3}_2$	$\mathbf{3}_1, \bar{\mathbf{3}}_2$	$\mathbf{1}_{0,1,2}$	$\mathbf{1}_0$	$\mathbf{1}_1$
$Z_3$	1	$\omega$	$\omega^2$	1	1	1	$\omega$	1	1

Table 1: The  $T_{13}$  and  $Z_3$  charge assignment of the SM fields and the Majorana DM  $X$  and the Dirac DM  $X'$ , where  $\omega = e^{2i\pi/3}$ .

Lagrangian Eq. (2.1) gives rise to mass matrices of charged leptons  $M_e$  and neutrinos  $M_\nu$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
M_e &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b_e v_1 & a_e \bar{v}_2 \\ a_e \bar{v}_3 & 0 & b_e v_2 \\ b_e v_3 & a_e \bar{v}_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
M_\nu &= \frac{1}{\Lambda} \begin{pmatrix} c_\nu \bar{v}_3 v_2 & a_\nu \bar{v}_1^2 + b_\nu \bar{v}_3 v_1 & a_\nu \bar{v}_3^2 + b_\nu \bar{v}_2 v_3 \\ a_\nu \bar{v}_1^2 + b_\nu \bar{v}_3 v_1 & c_\nu \bar{v}_1 v_3 & a_\nu \bar{v}_2^2 + b_\nu \bar{v}_1 v_2 \\ a_\nu \bar{v}_3^2 + b_\nu \bar{v}_2 v_3 & a_\nu \bar{v}_2^2 + b_\nu \bar{v}_1 v_2 & c_\nu \bar{v}_2 v_1 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.2}$$

$$\tag{2.3}$$

where the vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of the Higgs bosons are defined as  $\langle H(\mathbf{3}_1)^i \rangle = v_i/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\langle H(\bar{\mathbf{3}}_2)^i \rangle = \bar{v}_i/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\langle H'(\mathbf{1}_{0,1,2}) \rangle = v'_i/\sqrt{2}$ ,  $\sum_{i=1}^3 (v_i^2 + \bar{v}_i^2 + v_{i-1}'^2) = (246 \text{ GeV})^2$ .

Now we give a numerical example. By the following choice of parameters,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_1 &= 0.4269 \text{ GeV}, \quad v_2 = 16.11 \text{ GeV}, \quad v_3 = 7.862 \text{ GeV}, \\
\bar{v}_1 &= 1 \text{ GeV}, \quad \bar{v}_2 = 16.82 \text{ GeV}, \quad \bar{v}_3 = 0.004836 \text{ GeV}, \\
a_e &= 0.1057, \quad b_e = 0, \quad a_\nu = -8.220 \times 10^{-3}, \\
b_\nu &= 8.439 \times 10^{-3}, \quad c_\nu = 3.632 \times 10^{-1},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.4}$$

the mass matrices Eq. (2.2) and (2.3) give rise to mass eigenvalues and related observables as

$$\begin{aligned}
m_e &= 0.511 \text{ MeV}, \quad m_\mu = 105.7 \text{ MeV}, \quad m_\tau = 1777 \text{ MeV}, \\
m_{\nu 1} &= 6.324 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}, \quad m_{\nu 2} = 1.078 \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV}, \quad m_{\nu 3} = 5.046 \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV}, \\
\Delta m_{21}^2 &= m_{\nu 2}^2 - m_{\nu 1}^2 = 7.62 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2, \\
\Delta m_{32}^2 &= m_{\nu 3}^2 - m_{\nu 2}^2 = 2.43 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2, \\
\langle m \rangle_{ee} &= 2.83 \times 10^{-4} \text{ eV}, \quad \sum_i m_{\nu i} = 5.49 \times 10^{-2} \text{ eV},
\end{aligned} \tag{2.5}$$

and the mixing matrices are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
U_{eL} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_{eR} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
U_{MNS} &= U_{eL}^\dagger U_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0.819 & 0.552 & -0.156 \\ -0.304 & 0.648 & 0.698 \\ -0.487 & 0.524 & -0.698 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\theta_{12} &= 34^\circ, \quad \theta_{23} = -45^\circ, \quad \theta_{13} = -9^\circ,
\end{aligned} \tag{2.6}$$

$$\tag{2.7}$$

which are all consistent with the present experimental data [29, 30]. In particular in the case of  $U_{eL} = 1$ , the mass matrices Eq. (2.2) and (2.3) require normal hierarchy  $m_{\nu 1} < m_{\nu 2} < m_{\nu 3}$  of the neutrino masses and  $(U_{MNS})_{e3} \neq 0$ . A comprehensive analyses of the  $T_{13}$  symmetric models have been done by several authors [31–34]. Although one can sweep whole range of parameters, we adopt those of Eq. (2.4) giving universal final states due to the mixing matrices Eq. (2.6) since such analysis is out of scope of the present paper.

As for the Higgs sector, since the present model contains nine Higgs doublets, it causes flavor changing neutral current processes such as  $\bar{K}^0 - K^0$  mixings. Therefore, extra Higgs bosons must be enough heavy. Moreover, additional massless bosons appear because the  $T_{13}$  symmetric Higgs potential has accidental  $U(1)$  symmetry. Therefore one can introduce soft  $T_{13}$  breaking terms such as  $H'_{10}^\dagger H'_{11} + H'_{10}^\dagger H'_{12} + H'_{12}^\dagger H'_{10}$  and  $H'_{10}^\dagger \sum_i H(\bar{3}_2)^i$  in order to avoid those problems.

### 3 Decaying dark matter in the $T_{13}$ model

It is well known that the cosmic-ray anomalies measured by PAMELA [3] and Fermi-LAT [5] can be explained by DM decay with lifetime of  $\Gamma^{-1} \sim 10^{26}$  s. If the DM ( $X$  and  $X'$  in our case) decays into leptons by dimension six operators  $\bar{L}E\bar{L}X^{(\prime)}/\Lambda^2$  with  $\Lambda \sim 10^{16}$  GeV, such long lifetime can be achieved. In general, however, there exist several gauge invariant decay operators of lower dimensions; dimension four operators inducing too rapid DM decay, and dimension six operators including quarks, Higgs and gauge bosons in the final states, which must be forbidden in a successful model. By the field assignment of Table 1, most of all the decay operators listed in Table 2 [35] are forbidden due to the  $T_{13}$  symmetry except for  $\bar{L}E\bar{L}X^{(\prime)2}$ . Therefore, one do not have to be worried about production

---

<sup>2</sup> Notice that  $H^\dagger H \bar{L} H^c X^{(\prime)}$  and  $H^\dagger H X X'$  cannot be forbidden by any symmetries that hold unitarity. Moreover, these interactions induce decay of one DM to the other DM. Here we assume these couplings of these surviving terms

Dimensions	DM decay operators
4	$\bar{L}H^cX^{(\prime)}$
5	–
6	$\bar{L}E\bar{L}X^{(\prime)}, H^\dagger H\bar{L}H^cX^{(\prime)}, (H^c)^t D_\mu H^c \bar{E}\gamma^\mu X^{(\prime)},$ $\bar{Q}D\bar{L}X^{(\prime)}, \bar{U}Q\bar{L}X^{(\prime)}, \bar{L}D\bar{Q}X^{(\prime)}, \bar{U}\gamma_\mu D\bar{E}\gamma^\mu X^{(\prime)},$ $D^\mu H^c D_\mu \bar{L}X^{(\prime)}, D^\mu D_\mu H^c \bar{L}X^{(\prime)},$ $B_{\mu\nu}\bar{L}\sigma^{\mu\nu}H^cX^{(\prime)}, W_{\mu\nu}^a\bar{L}\sigma^{\mu\nu}\tau^a H^cX^{(\prime)}$

Table 2: The higher dimensional operators which cause decay of  $X$  and  $X'$  up to dimension six [35].  $B_{\mu\nu}$ ,  $W_{\mu\nu}^a$ , and  $D_\mu$  are the field strength tensors of hypercharge gauge boson, weak gauge boson, and the electroweak covariant derivative.

of anti-proton and secondary positron by scattering with nucleon and interstellar medium. With the notation  $L_i = (\nu_i, \ell_i) = (U_{eL})_{i\alpha}(\nu_\alpha, \ell_\alpha)$  and  $E_i = (U_{eR})_{i\beta}E_\beta$  ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ,  $\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$ ), the four-Fermi decay interaction is explicitly written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_{\text{decay}} &= \frac{\lambda_X}{\Lambda^2} \sum_{i=1}^3 (\bar{L}_i E_i) \bar{L}_i X + \frac{\lambda_{X'}}{\Lambda^2} \sum_{i=1}^3 (\omega^{2(i-1)}) (\bar{L}_i E_i) \bar{L}_i X' + \text{h.c.} \\
&= \frac{\lambda_X}{\Lambda^2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma} (U_{eL})_{i\alpha}^* (U_{eR})_{i\beta} (U_{eL})_{i\gamma}^* \\
&\quad \times [(\bar{\nu}_\alpha P_R E_\beta) (\bar{\ell}_\gamma P_R X) - (\bar{\ell}_\gamma P_R E_\beta) (\bar{\nu}_\alpha P_R X)] + (X \rightarrow X') + \text{h.c.}, \tag{3.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where the factor  $(\omega^{2(i-1)})$  is only for the case of  $X'$  decay because of the multiplication rule of the  $T_{13}$  flavor symmetry. As seen from Eq. (3.1), decay mode of the DM particles  $X$  and  $X'$  depends on the mixing matrices  $U_{eL}$  and  $U_{eR}$ , which are given in Eq. (2.6).

Next, we consider the decay width of the decaying DM through the  $T_{13}$  invariant interaction Eq. (3.1). Due to the particular generation structure, the DM particles  $X$  and  $X'$  decay into several tri-leptons final state with the mixing-dependent rate. The decay width of DM  $X$  per each flavor is defined as  $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \equiv \Gamma(X \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \ell_\beta^+ \ell_\gamma^-) + \Gamma(X \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\alpha \ell_\beta^+ \ell_\gamma^-)$ , and the decay width  $\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  is calculated as

$$\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \frac{|\lambda_X|^2 m_X^5}{32 (4\pi)^3 \Lambda^4} (U_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + U_{\alpha\gamma\beta}), \tag{3.2}$$

to be enough tiny. The most stringent constraint process is  $X' \rightarrow X, h$  that comes from  $H^\dagger H X X'$ , where  $h$  is the standard model Higgs whose mass is 126 GeV [36]. We find that its coupling should be less than  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-18})$  in order to conservatively satisfy the no excess constraint of the antiproton with the lifetime of DM to be longer than  $\mathcal{O}(10^{28})$  s.

where

$$U_{\alpha\beta\gamma} = \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 (U_{eL})_{i\alpha}^* (U_{eR})_{i\beta} (U_{eL})_{i\gamma}^* \right|^2. \quad (3.3)$$

The decay width of  $X'$  named  $\Gamma'_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  is obtained by replacing  $X \rightarrow X'$ . The differential decay width is written as

$$\frac{d\Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}}{dx} = \frac{|\lambda_X|^2 m_X^5}{48 (4\pi)^3 \Lambda^4} x^2 \left( (6 - 2x) U_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + (15 - 14x) U_{\alpha\gamma\beta} \right), \quad (3.4)$$

where  $x = 2E_{e^\pm}/m_X$ . This is required to calculate the energy distribution function of injected  $e^\pm$  from DM decay,  $dN_{e^\pm}/dE$ . Here we have neglected the masses of charged leptons in the final states. In both  $X$  and  $X'$  DM cases, the flavor dependent factor  $U_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  gives a factor three when one takes the sum of flavor indices  $\alpha, \beta$  and  $\gamma$ . That is not by a particular choice of parameters Eq. (2.4), but by the  $T_{13}$  symmetry. Therefore, the branching fraction of each decay mode is given by  $\text{Br}(X \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \ell_\beta^+ \ell_\gamma^-, \bar{\nu}_\alpha \ell_\beta^+ \ell_\gamma^-) = (U_{\alpha\beta\gamma} + U_{\alpha\gamma\beta})/6$ . The DM mass  $m_X$  and the total decay width  $\Gamma_X = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\gamma} \Gamma_{\alpha\beta\gamma}$  are chosen to be free parameters in the following analysis since it can be always tuned with the coupling  $\lambda_X$  and the cut-off scale  $\Lambda$ .

Given the differential decay width and the branching ratios, the primary source term of the positron and electron coming from DM decay at the position  $r$  of the halo associated with our galaxy is expressed as

$$Q(E, r) = n_X(r) \Gamma_X \sum_f \text{Br}(X \rightarrow f) \left( \frac{dN_{e^\pm}}{dE} \right)_f + (X \rightarrow X'), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $(dN_{e^\pm}/dE)_f$  is the energy distribution of  $e^\pm$  coming from the DM decay with the final state  $f$ , and  $E$  is the energy of injected  $e^\pm$ . We use the PYTHIA 8 [37] to evaluate the energy distribution function. Although it is often assumed that the relic density of the DM is thermally determined, non-thermal production of the DM dark matter is also possible [38]. We thus do not specify the origin of the relic DM in the following analysis, and assume that the number densities of  $X$  and  $X'$  are the same for simplest case. The non-relativistic DM number density  $n_X(r)$  is rewritten by  $n_X(r) = \rho_X(r)/m_X$  with the DM profile  $\rho(r)$ . In this work, we adopt the Navarro-Frank-White (NFW) profile [39],

$$\rho_{\text{NFW}}(r) = \rho_\odot \frac{r_\odot (r_\odot + r_c)^2}{r (r + r_c)^2}, \quad (3.6)$$

where  $\rho_\odot \simeq 0.40 \text{ GeV}/\text{cm}^3$  is the local DM density at the solar system,  $r$  is the distance from the galactic center whose special values  $r_\odot \simeq 8.5 \text{ kpc}$  and  $r_c \simeq 20 \text{ kpc}$  are the distance to the solar system and the core radius of the profile, respectively. The diffusion equation must be solved to evaluate

the  $e^\pm$  flux observed at the Earth, and it depends on diffusion model. The observable  $e^\pm$  flux at the solar system  $d\Phi_{e^\pm}/dE$  which is produced by DM decay is given by

$$\frac{d\Phi_{e^\pm}}{dE} = \sum_{X, X'} \frac{v_{e^\pm}}{4\pi b(E)} \frac{\rho_\odot}{m_X} \Gamma_X \sum_f \text{Br}(X \rightarrow f) \int_E^{m_X} \left( \frac{dN_{e^\pm}}{dE'} \right)_f I_\odot(E, E') dE', \quad (3.7)$$

where  $b(E)$  is a space-independent energy loss coefficient written as  $b(E) = E^2/(\tau_\odot \cdot 1\text{GeV})$  with  $\tau_\odot = 5.7 \times 10^{15}$  s, and  $I_\odot(E, E')$  is the reduced halo function at the solar system which is expressed by Fourier-Bessel expansion [40]. A fitting function for the reduced halo function  $I(\lambda_D)$  is given in ref. [40] as a function of a single parameter  $\lambda_D$  which is called diffusion length. The diffusion length  $\lambda_D$  is given by

$$\lambda_D^2 = \frac{4K_0\tau_\odot}{1-\delta} \left[ E^{\delta-1} - E'^{\delta-1} \right], \quad (3.8)$$

where we use the following diffusion parameters:  $\delta = 0.70$ ,  $K_0 = 0.0112$  kpc<sup>2</sup>/Myr which is called MED. In addition, the diffusion zone is considered as a cylinder that sandwiches the galactic plane with height of  $2L$  and radius  $R$  where  $L = 4$  kpc and  $R = 20$  kpc.

As seen from Eq. (2.6) and (3.2), the DM decays into  $e^\pm$  as well as  $\mu^\pm$  and  $\tau^\pm$  in the equal rate. As a result, pure leptonic decays give dominant contributions, and it is consistent with no anti-proton excess of the PAMELA results [6]. We may take into account the gamma-ray constraint since a lot of gamma-ray is produced by the hadronization of  $\tau^\pm$ . As we see below, the obtained lifetimes of DM particles  $X$  and  $X'$  are roughly  $\tau_X, \tau_{X'} \gtrsim 5 \times 10^{26}$  s. Thus we do not need to consider the gamma-ray constraint seriously as long as comparing with ref. [41].

### Result for AMS-02

We use 31 data points of AMS-02 which are higher than 20 GeV for chi-square analysis. The only statistics error is taken into account as the experimental errors here [2]. The positron fraction for the scenario of the leptonically decaying DM with  $T_{13}$  symmetry is depicted in Figure 1 with the experimental data of AMS-02 and PAMELA. The flux coming from only one-component DM is also shown in the figure for comparison. The obtained best fit point for one-component DM is  $m_X = 521$  GeV,  $\Gamma_X^{-1} = 5.1 \times 10^{26}$  s with  $\chi_{\min}^2 = 172.2$  (29 d.o.f.). For the single DM, the positron fraction in the high energy cannot be fit well as one can see from the figure. This is because the experimental data in low energy region  $E \sim 20$  GeV has much higher precision, and the energy spectrum  $dN_{e^\pm}/dE$  is fixed by the imposed flavor symmetry, thus the predicted flux in the higher energy region is almost determined by the flavor symmetry. One should note that fitting with one-component DM would be better for different diffusion models or different DM halo profiles since the evaluated  $e^\pm$  flux has a large dependence of them.






Figure 1: The positron fraction [2] and [3] predicted in the leptonically-decaying two-component DM scenario with  $T_{13}$  symmetry (solid) and single-component scenario (dashed). For two-component DM, we have fixed to the best fit point:  $m_X = 208$  GeV,  $m_{X'} = 1112$  GeV,  $\Gamma_X^{-1} = 1.9 \times 10^{27}$  s and  $\Gamma_{X'} = 4.7 \times 10^{26}$  s.

On the other hand, the fitting parameters for two-component DM are

$$m_X = 208 \text{ GeV}, \quad \Gamma_X^{-1} = 1.9 \times 10^{27} \text{ s}, \quad (3.9)$$

$$m_{X'} = 1112 \text{ GeV}, \quad \Gamma_{X'}^{-1} = 4.7 \times 10^{26} \text{ s}, \quad (3.10)$$

with  $\chi_{\min}^2 = 22.62$  (27 d.o.f) at the best fit point. Therefore the much better fitting is obtained with two-component case. This is the result of multi-component DM and the fixed flavor of final states by  $T_{13}$  symmetry. That is not by a particular choice of parameters Eq. (2.4), but by the  $T_{13}$  symmetry as mentioned below Eq. (3.4). A sharper drop-off is expected if we have larger branching ratio for directly produced positron.

## 4 Conclusions

We revisited a decaying DM model with a non-Abelian discrete symmetry  $T_{13}$ , and extended it to the two-component DM scenario by adding an extra DM  $X'$ . We have shown that our model is consistent with all the observed masses and mixings in the lepton sector. Due to also the specific selection rule of  $T_{13}$ , we have found that both of DM particles have the universal decay coming from dimension six operators that gives a promising model in current indirect detection searches of DM.

Fitting to the positron fraction with a single DM under the assumption of MED diffusion model and NFW DM profile can no longer give a good interpretation of the positron excess by DM decay because of the precise measurement of AMS-02. However taking into account two-component DM as our model gives much better fitting to AMS-02 observation. The obtained parameters are  $m_X = 208$  GeV with  $\Gamma_X^{-1} = 1.8 \times 10^{27}$  s and  $m_{X'} = 1112$  GeV with  $\Gamma_{X'}^{-1} = 4.7 \times 10^{26}$  s, assuming that  $X$  and  $X'$  have equal number density.

### Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Prof. Shigeki Matsumoto for a crucial advice. T.T. acknowledges support from the European ITN project (FP7-PEOPLE-2011-ITN, PITN-GA-2011-289442-INVISIBLES). The numerical calculations were carried out on SR16000 at YITP in Kyoto University.

### References

- [1] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [ Planck Collaboration], arXiv:1303.5076 [astro-ph.CO].
- [2] M. Aguilar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 141102 (2013).
- [3] O. Adriani *et al.*, Nature **458** (2009) 607.
- [4] O. Adriani *et al.* [PAMELA Collaboration], Science **332**, 69 (2011) [arXiv:1103.4055 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [5] M. Ackermann *et al.* [Fermi LAT Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 011103 (2012) [arXiv:1109.0521 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [6] O. Adriani *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102** (2009) 051101.
- [7] P. -F. Yin, Z. -H. Yu, Q. Yuan and X. -J. Bi, arXiv:1304.4128 [astro-ph.HE].
- [8] Q. Yuan and X. -J. Bi, arXiv:1304.2687 [astro-ph.HE].
- [9] J. Kopp, arXiv:1304.1184 [hep-ph].
- [10] A. De Simone, A. Riotto and W. Xue, arXiv:1304.1336 [hep-ph].
- [11] Q. Yuan, X. -J. Bi, G. -M. Chen, Y. -Q. Guo, S. -J. Lin and X. Zhang, arXiv:1304.1482 [astro-ph.HE].
- [12] M. Ibe, S. Iwamoto, S. Matsumoto, T. Moroi and N. Yokozaki, arXiv:1304.1483 [hep-ph].
- [13] T. Linden and S. Profumo, arXiv:1304.1791 [astro-ph.HE].

- [14] I. Cholis and D. Hooper, Phys. Rev. D **88**, 023013 (2013) [arXiv:1304.1840 [astro-ph.HE]].
- [15] H. -B. Jin, Y. -L. Wu and Y. -F. Zhou, arXiv:1304.1997 [hep-ph].
- [16] Y. Kajiyama and H. Okada, Nucl. Phys. B **848**, 303 (2011) [arXiv:1011.5753 [hep-ph]].
- [17] N. Haba, Y. Kajiyama, S. Matsumoto, H. Okada and K. Yoshioka, Phys. Lett. B **695**, 476 (2011) [arXiv:1008.4777 [hep-ph]].
- [18] K. Hashimoto and H. Okada, arXiv:1110.3640 [hep-ph].
- [19] T2K Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **107**, 041801 (2011), [1106.2822].
- [20] J. K. Ahn *et al.* [RENO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 191802 (2012) [arXiv:1204.0626 [hep-ex]].
- [21] DAYA-BAY Collaboration, F. An *et al.*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012), [1203.1669].
- [22] DOUBLE-CHOOZ Collaboration, Y. Abe *et al.*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **108**, 131801 (2012), [1112.6353].
- [23] CHOOZ Collaboration, M. Apollonio *et al.*, Eur. Phys. J. **C27**, 331 (2003), [hep-ex/0301017].
- [24] Palo Verde Collaboration, F. Boehm *et al.*, Phys. Rev. **D64**, 112001 (2001), [hep-ex/0107009].
- [25] MINOS Collaboration, P. Adamson *et al.*, Phys.Rev.Lett. **107**, 181802 (2011), [1108.0015].
- [26] W. M. Fairbairn and T. Fulton, J. Math. Phys. **23** (1982) 1747.
- [27] S. F. King and C. Luhn, JHEP **0910**(2009) 093.
- [28] For a review of non-Abelian discrete symmetry, H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, Lect. Notes Phys. **858**, 1 (2012); H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **183** (2010) 1.
- [29] J. Beringer *et al.* [Particle Data Group Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [30] D. V. Forero, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 073012 (2012) [arXiv:1205.4018 [hep-ph]].
- [31] K. M. Parattu and A. Wingerter, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 013011 (2011) [arXiv:1012.2842 [hep-ph]];
- [32] G. -J. Ding, Nucl. Phys. B **853**, 635 (2011) [arXiv:1105.5879 [hep-ph]];
- [33] C. Hartmann and A. Zee, Nucl. Phys. B **853**, 105 (2011) [arXiv:1106.0333 [hep-ph]];
- [34] C. Hartmann, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 013012 (2012) [arXiv:1109.5143 [hep-ph]].
- [35] F. del Aguila, S. Bar-Shalom, A. Soni and J. Wudka, Phys. Lett. B **670**, 399 (2009) [arXiv:0806.0876 [hep-ph]].

- [36] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012); S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012).
- [37] T. Sjostrand, S. Mrenna and P.Z. Skands, JHEP **0605** (2006) 026; Comput. Phys. Commun. **178** (2008) 852.
- [38] T. Moroi and L. Randall, Nucl. Phys. B **570**, 455 (2000) [hep-ph/9906527].
- [39] J.F. Navarro, C.S. Frenk and S.D.M. White, Astrophys. J. **490** (1997) 493.
- [40] M. Cirelli, G. Corcella, A. Hektor, G. Hutsi, M. Kadastik, P. Panci, M. Raidal and F. Sala *et al.*, JCAP **1103**, 051 (2011) [Erratum-ibid. **1210**, E01 (2012)] [arXiv:1012.4515 [hep-ph]].
- [41] M. Ackermann *et al.* [LAT Collaboration], Phys. Rev. D **86**, 022002 (2012) [arXiv:1205.2739 [astro-ph.HE]].