

## Search for sub-GeV Scalars in $e^+e^-$ collisions

D. Cogollo<sup>1</sup>, Y.M. Oviedo-Torres<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Farinaldo S. Queiroz<sup>2,3,4</sup>, Yoxara Villamizar<sup>5</sup>, and J. Zamora-Saa<sup>2,3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Campina Grande, Campina Grande, PB, Brazil*

<sup>2</sup>*Millennium Institute for Subatomic Physics at High-Energy Frontier (SAPHIR), Fernandez Concha 700, Santiago, Chile.*

<sup>3</sup>*International Institute of Physics, Universidade Federal do Rio Grande do Norte, Campus Universitário, Lagoa Nova, Natal-RN 59078-970, Brazil*

<sup>4</sup>*Center for Theoretical and Experimental Particle Physics - CTEPP,*

*Facultad de Ciencias Exactas, Universidad Andres Bello, Fernandez Concha 700, Santiago, Chile*

<sup>5</sup>*Centro de Ciências Naturais e Humanas, Universidade Federal do ABC, Santo André, 09210-580 SP, Brazil*

Light scalars that couple to leptons are common figures in beyond the Standard Model endeavors. Considering a scalar that has universal and couplings to leptons only, we compute this leptophilic scalar contribution to the  $e^-e^+ \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$  production cross section with  $S \rightarrow \ell^+\ell^-$ . We later compare the expected signal with recent data from the Belle collaboration collected near the resonance  $\Upsilon(4S)$  with  $\mathcal{L} = 626fb^{-1}$  of integrated luminosity to place limits on the couplings-mass plane for the 4 MeV-6.5 GeV mass range to show that Belle stands a great laboratory for light scalars, particularly excluding part of the parameter space in which the muon g-2 anomaly is addressed.

### I. INTRODUCTION

The Standard Model (SM) has successfully reproduced the precision tests carried out thus far [1]. Understanding the origin of the masses of elementary particles has been one of the fundamental endeavors in particle physics for several decades. The Higgs mechanism, based on spontaneous symmetry breaking with the Higgs boson as a key figure, triumphed with the discovery of a new resonance with a mass of 125 GeV by both the ATLAS [2] and CMS collaborations [3]. Nevertheless, it is well known that the SM does not address neutrino masses [4] or dark matter [5], and there is a controversial new physics signal in the muon anomalous magnetic moment [6]. Because of this several new physics models have been proposed. Many of these models feature new scalar particles that are either heavier or, in some cases, much lighter than the Higgs boson [7–20]. It is often assumed that the new scalar particles mix with the Higgs, and consequently the new scalar couples to SM fermions proportionally to their masses in the context of minimal flavor violation [21–23]. Generally speaking, these light scalars are expected to couple to all SM fermions, but data on meson decays strongly constrain their couplings to quarks [24]. Therefore, models with leptophilic scalars where couplings are present only to leptons, have emerged in the literature in the context of dark matter [25–36], neutrino masses [37], and the muon anomalous magnetic moment [18, 38–42]. This has motivated the search for light scalars in low energy accelerators featuring lepton beams which offer a relatively

cleaner environment [43–45] compared to hadron colliders [46].

In particular, these collider searches are focused on real scalar particles that couple to leptons as governed by the Lagrangian,

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu S)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_s^2 S^2 + \sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} \xi_\ell \frac{m_\ell}{v} \bar{\ell} \ell S, \quad (1)$$

where  $\xi_\ell$  is the flavor-independent coupling to leptons ( $\ell$ ) with mass  $m_\ell$ . In Eq.(1), it is assumed that the new scalar mixes with the Higgs boson, which results in its coupling to SM fermions being proportional to their masses. This scenario can arise in simple extensions of the SM and in lepton-specific Two Higgs Doublet Models [41]. In recent years, several groups, using different statistical methods, have derived constraints on  $\xi_\ell$  as a function of the scalar mass  $S$ , henceforth called (S) [44, 47].




FIG. 1: Dominant Feynman diagram for production of the leptophilic scalar  $S$  in  $e^+e^-$  collisions following Belle analysis.

That said, Belle collaboration has carried out searches for light scalars in  $e^+e^-$  collisions, despite being origi-

\* Corresponding Author: mauricio.nitti@gmail.com

nally designed and optimized for the observation of CP violation in the B meson system [48]. Notably, in 2001, Belle, along with the BaBar experiment, observed CP asymmetries consistent with SM predictions, a milestone recognized with the 2008 Nobel Prize in Physics [48]. As the Belle detector features a spectrometer with reasonable solid coverage, high quality vertexing, and good charged particle tracking, and an excellent electromagnetic calorimeter, it has been able to make important contributions to charm physics, hadron spectroscopy, etc [49]. In particular, Belle collaboration has conducted searches for such a light leptophilic scalar using collisions between 8 GeV electrons and 3.5 GeV positrons at the KEKB collider [47]. The collision energy limits the maximum scalar mass that can be probed. The relevant Feynman diagram is exhibited in Fig.(1). The leptophilic scalar is produced through Drell-Yan processes. Due to the Drell-Yann production and the nature of the coupling in Eq.(1), the dominant production channel stems from the radiation of a leptophilic scalar from a tau-lepton, primarily because of its mass. Due to kinematics, the decay channels considered are the  $e^+e^-$  and  $\mu^+\mu^-$  pairs. The cross-section of  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$  sharply falls with the scalar mass [41]. The decay channel  $S \rightarrow e^+e^-$  was considered for  $2m_e < m_S \leq 2m_\mu$ , while the  $S$  decay into muon pairs was considered for  $2m_\mu < m_S \leq 6.5$  GeV. For  $m_S > 2m_\tau$  the cross section becomes too small. Although for  $m_S > 2m_\tau$ , the cross-section of the  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S, S \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  process decreases [41], we are still able to set competitive limits till  $m_S = 6.5$  GeV.

In this work, we used the latest upper limits derived by the Belle collaboration on the cross section of the asymmetric process  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$  ( $S \rightarrow \ell^-\ell^+$ ), to establish constraints on a truly universal coupling of a hypothetical scalar  $S$  with leptons. The model we investigate in this study differs subtly from the model in Eq. (1), as in our case, the scalar  $S$  couples to leptons with an universal coupling  $\lambda$ , and in fact, this generates a different phenomenology. Our main motivation to do so is the muon and electron anomalous magnetic moment.

The anomalous magnetic moment ( $g - 2$ ) exemplifies the predictive power of quantum field theory, as its precise measurement is vital for probing higher-order corrections in perturbation theory [50]. Moreover, it may hint the presence of new physics, once a discrepancy between the Standard Model (SM) prediction and the observed value is found, which is precisely the case of the muon anomalous magnetic moment. Taking a step back we remind the reader that the Dirac equation predicts a muon magnetic moment,  $\vec{M} = g_\mu \frac{e}{m_\mu} \vec{S}$ , with gyromagnetic ratio  $g_\mu = 2$ , where  $S$  is the spin. However, quantum loop corrections yield small deviations from  $g_\mu = 2$ , which are parameterized by the anomalous magnetic mo-

ment [51],

$$\Delta a_\ell = \frac{(g-2)_\ell}{2} \equiv \frac{\lambda^2}{8\pi^2} \int_0^1 dz \frac{(1-z)^2(1+z)}{(1-z)^2 + z(m_S/m_\ell)^2}, \quad (2)$$

where  $\ell = e, \mu$  and  $\lambda$  is coupling strength between a new scalar particle with leptons. The anomalous magnetic moment can be accurately measured taken advantage of the principle of Larmor precession, whose frequency is proportional to the magnetic field which the charged particle is immersed in [51, 52]. The muon  $g-2$  has intrigued the community because a discrepancy between theory and data has been witnessed in the past decades. The hint for new physics reaches  $5\sigma$ . The precise value of this anomaly is subject to larger uncertainties from hadronic corrections [53–55], nevertheless, we will adopt the value  $\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu^{exp} - a_\mu^{SM} = (2.49 \pm 0.48) \times 10^{-9}$  reported in [52, 56] from hereafter.

In a similar vein, the electron anomalous magnetic moment has been constrained to be  $\Delta a_e^{Rb} \equiv a_e^{Exp,Rb} - a_e^{SM} = (4.8 \pm 3.0) \times 10^{-13}$  [57]. The agreement between the SM prediction and the observations is much better. Anyway, our goal is to show that Belle has started cutting in the parameter space of new physics interpretations for the muon and electron anomalous magnetic moment.

Our paper is structured as follows: in Section I we describe Belle original analysis, in Section II we explain how our study differs from Belle's. In Section II we discuss our findings before concluding in Section IV.

## II. BELLE DATA ANALYSIS

The Belle collaboration reports results about the search for a new leptophilic scalar  $S$  [47]. The data used in this analysis was recorded by the Belle experiment, which was operated until June 2010, from the collision of 8 GeV electrons with 3.5 GeV positrons at the KEKB collider. The data-set corresponds to a luminosity of  $626 \text{ fb}^{-1}$  collected after the upgrade of the silicon vertex detector in October 2003. The processes analyzed by the collaboration were  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-l^+l^-$ , for which the number of events were measured for a given invariant mass of a pair of electrons or muons ( $l^\pm = e^\pm, \mu^\pm$ ). For these processes, a resonance of the invariant mass distribution compatible with the new scalar mass it was expected, however, no signal was seen different from the background. In absence of a signal, the Belle collaboration imposed upper limits on the cross section of the asymmetric collision  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$  ( $S \rightarrow \ell^-\ell^+$ ) at the 90% confidence level [47]. We emphasize that this analysis was based on Eq.(1). We are interested in exploring a different setup as we describe in the next section.

### III. OUR ANALYSIS

Following this strategy and using the data analysis from the Belle collaboration, we computed the production cross-section  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$  ( $S \rightarrow \ell^-\ell^+$ ) for a subtly different model, where the leptophilic scalar  $S$  couples uniquely and universally with the charged leptons of the standard model. The Lagrangian considered is given by,

$$\mathcal{L}_{eff} = \frac{1}{2}(\partial_\mu S)^2 - \frac{1}{2}m_S^2 S^2 + \sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} \lambda \bar{\ell} \ell S, \quad (3)$$

where  $\lambda$  is a free parameter representing the universal coupling of the scalar  $S$  with the SM-leptons. A coupling of this nature can arise if the new scalar does not develop a vacuum expectation value. In other words, it is an inert scalar. This lagrangian is often taken as a benchmark in experimental searches but one should bear in mind that is not invariant under the  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$  gauge symmetry, but it could arise from effective operators of dimension-5 of the type  $\frac{1}{\Lambda} \bar{L} H e_R S$ , where  $\Lambda$  would be the associated scale of new physics [58]. Anyway, we will set aside any particular UV completion to focus on a more model-independent approach based on the simplified lagrangian Eq.(3). Moreover, we will assume that this inert scalar has only diagonal couplings to avoid dangerous flavor changing interactions [51].

Hence, the inert scalar can decay into fermion pairs and photons with the following decay width,

$$\Gamma_S = \sum_{i=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{\lambda_i^2 m_S}{8\pi} \left(1 - \frac{4m_i^2}{m_S^2}\right)^{3/2} + \frac{\alpha^2 m_S^3}{256\pi^3} \left| \sum_{i=e,\mu,\tau} \frac{g_i}{m_i} F_{1/2} \left(\frac{4m_i^2}{m_S^2}, 0\right) \right|^2, \quad (4)$$

where  $F_{1/2}$  is defined in the Appendix.

With this information, we have implemented the model (3) in the Feynrules package, and then exported the UFO (Universal Feynman Output) files [59]. These UFO files were then used by the Madgraph Monte Carlo event generator to calculate the cross section of the processes of interest  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$ , with  $S \rightarrow l^+l^-$  [60].

The top panel in Fig. (2) shows the branching ratios of the decays of  $S$  as a function of its mass  $m_S$  in linear scale, highlighting the mass range used in this work for collider analyses ( $m_S \sim 0.04 - 20$  GeV). In this region, the channel  $S \rightarrow e^+e^-$  dominates for masses near 1 GeV, while  $S \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$  starts competing once  $m_S > 2m_\mu$ . For higher masses,  $m_S > 2m_\tau$ , the channel  $S \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$  becomes sizeable. Notice that the decay into  $\gamma\gamma$  is small




FIG. 2: Branching ratio (BR) of the scalar  $\lambda = 4.3 \times 10^{-3}$ .

reflecting the loop nature of the processes. The bottom panel of Fig. (2) uses a log-log scale to capture in greater detail the kinematic transitions and hierarchies of the channels over a broader range ( $m_S \sim 10^{-3} - 20$  GeV). In Fig. (2), it is clear that the  $S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  channel dominates for  $m_S \ll 2m_e$  due to kinematics. Once  $m_S > 2m_e$  the decay into  $e^+e^-$  dominates. Additional kinematic threshold happen when  $m_S > 2m_\mu$  and  $m_S > 2m_\tau$ . The oscillations observed in  $S \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$  are due to interferences in the loop calculation associated with the terms in Eq. (4).

Having that in mind, we have computed the cross section for different values as function of  $m_S$ , and compared with the upper limit reported in [47]. For concreteness, we plotted in Fig.(3) the production cross section for  $\lambda = 4.38 \times 10^{-3}$ . In Fig.(3) the exclusion upper limit is delimited by the blue curve, and the theo-

retical prediction driven by Eq.(3) is represented by the red curve. The presence of meson resonances around 40MeV and 75MeV weaken the Belle sensitivity around these masses. Setting aside these mass ranges, we conclude that  $m_S > 86$  MeV. This exclusion limit is highly sensitive to the Yukawa coupling  $\lambda$  because the smaller  $\lambda$  the smaller the production cross section.




FIG. 3: Production cross section of the light scalar,  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$ , with the scalar decaying into  $e^+e^-$ , for  $\lambda = 4.38 \times 10^{-3}$ .

Following this reasoning, we compute the production cross section above for different values of  $\lambda$  and find a lower mass bound for the leptophilic scalar. This repetitive procedure has been done for a large region of parameter space as shown in Fig.(4).

In Fig.(4), the orange region represents the exclusion limit from Belle, the blue (grey) regions delimit the parameter space in which the muon (electron) anomalous magnetic moments are reproduced in agreement with [52]. We point out that while the muon g-2 favors a hint for new physics, the electron g-2 features an excellent agreement with the SM prediction. Our reasoning, behind the regions in Fig.(4) was to find the values of  $\lambda$  vs  $m_S$  that reproduce  $\Delta a_\mu$  and  $\Delta a_e$  as reported in [52, 57], respectively. For  $m_S < 100$  MeV the favored region for the muon g-2 is in conflict with the electron g-2, regardless of the Belle bound. For  $m_S = 200 - 300$  MeV, interestingly, both muon g-2 and electron g-2 are addressed for  $\lambda \sim 7 \times 10^{-4}$ . For  $m_S > 1$  GeV Belle cuts into the parameter of the favored g-2. Hence, Belle represents a great laboratory to test possible new physics interpretations of the muon and electron anomalous magnetic mo-




FIG. 4: The Orange region represents the exclusion limit from Belle on the leptophilic scalar with universal couplings to leptons. The blue and grey shaded regions delimit the parameter space in which the muon (electron) anomalous magnetic moment are reproduced.

ments, particularly for  $m_S > 1$  GeV. We emphasize that our findings are applicable to light scalars that couple to leptons with equal strength according to Eq.(3).

In summary, we conclude that a sub-GeV scalar can nicely explain the g-2 anomaly in agreement with Belle bounds.

#### IV. CONCLUSIONS

Light scalars coupling to leptons has been considered as a possible solution to the muon g-2 anomaly. Collaborations typically assume that such scalar interact with leptons proportionally to  $\xi_\ell = g_\ell / \frac{m_\ell}{v}$ . In this case, the hypothetical light scalar  $S$  couples stronger with heavier leptons. Assuming that leptophilic scalar has universal coupling to leptons, i.e., the scalar couples equally to all charged leptons we computed its production cross section,  $e^+e^- \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-S$  with  $S$  decaying into  $\ell^+\ell^-$ , and compared our results with the experimental data from Belle. In the end, we were able to impose  $\lambda < 4 \times 10^{-3}$  across the mass range  $4 \text{ MeV} < m_S < 6.5 \text{ GeV}$ . In particular, our findings show that Belle excludes possible new physics interpretations for the muon and electron anomalous magnetic moment for  $m_S > 1$  GeV, highlighting its importance concerning new physics searches. However, in the mass region  $200 \text{ MeV} < m_S < 300 \text{ MeV}$ , such sub-GeV scalar can nicely accommodate both measurements of muon and electron anomalous magnetic moments.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Jacinto Neto and Carlos Pires for discussions. The work of Y.M. Oviedo-Torres and J. Zamora-Saa was funded by ANID - Millennium Science Initiative Program - ICN2019.044. J. Zamora-Saa was partially supported by FONDECYT grant 1240216 and 1240066. YV is supported by FAPESP grants no. 2018/25225-9 and 2023/01197-4. FSQ is supported by Simons Foundation (Award Number:1023171-RC), FAPESP Grant 2018/25225-9, 2021/01089-1, 2023/01197-4, ICTP-SAI FR FAPESP Grants 2021/14335-0, CNPq Grants 307130/2021-5, and ANID-Millennium Science Initiative Program ICN2019.044, and IIF-FINEP-FAPER N grant 01.24.0500.00.

## V. APPENDIX

In this appendix, we present the loop function relevant for the S decay into  $\gamma\gamma$ . The function  $F_{1/2}$  used in the

inert scalar decay rate can be derived using the Package X program [58, 61],

$$F_{1/2}(r, 0) = -2r \left[ 1 + (1-r) \left( \arcsin r^{-1/2} \right)^2 \right] \quad (5)$$

for  $r \geq 1$  or,

$$F_{1/2}(r, 0) = -2r \left[ 1 - \frac{(1-r)}{4} \left( -i\pi + \log \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{1-r}}{1 - \sqrt{1-r}} \right) \right)^2 \right] \quad (6)$$

for  $r < 1$ , where  $r = m_i/m_S$ .

## REFERENCES

- 
- [1] J. Beacham et al., *J. Phys. G* **47**, 010501 (2020), arXiv:1901.09966 [hep-ex].
- [2] G. Aad et al. (ATLAS), *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 1 (2012), arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex].
- [3] S. Chatrchyan et al. (CMS), *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 30 (2012), arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex].
- [4] S. Navas et al. (Particle Data Group), *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [5] G. Arcadi, D. Cabo-Almeida, M. Dutra, P. Ghosh, M. Lindner, Y. Mambrini, J. P. Neto, M. Pierre, S. Profumo, and F. S. Queiroz, (2024), arXiv:2403.15860 [hep-ph].
- [6] T. Albahri et al. (Muon g-2), *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 072002 (2021), arXiv:2104.03247 [hep-ex].
- [7] J. D. Clarke, R. Foot, and R. R. Volkas, *JHEP* **02**, 123 (2014), arXiv:1310.8042 [hep-ph].
- [8] R. Enberg, W. Klemm, S. Moretti, and S. Munir, *Phys. Lett. B* **764**, 121 (2017), arXiv:1605.02498 [hep-ph].
- [9] W.-F. Chang, T. Modak, and J. N. Ng, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 055020 (2018), arXiv:1711.05722 [hep-ph].
- [10] J. Liu, C. E. M. Wagner, and X.-P. Wang, *JHEP* **03**, 008 (2019), arXiv:1810.11028 [hep-ph].
- [11] T. Nomura and T. Shimomura, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 594 (2019), arXiv:1803.00842 [hep-ph].
- [12] L. Wang, X.-F. Han, and B. Zhu, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 035024 (2018), arXiv:1801.08317 [hep-ph].
- [13] M. W. Winkler, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 015018 (2019), arXiv:1809.01876 [hep-ph].
- [14] I. Boiarska, K. Bondarenko, A. Boyarsky, M. Ovchynnikov, O. Ruchayskiy, and A. Sokolenko, *JHEP* **05**, 049 (2020), arXiv:1908.04635 [hep-ph].
- [15] S. S. Chakrabarty and I. Jaeglé, (2019), arXiv:1903.06225 [hep-ph].
- [16] C. Gao and A. Stebbins, *JCAP* **07**, 025 (2022), arXiv:2110.07012 [hep-ph].
- [17] T. Hara, S. Kanemura, and T. Katayose, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 035035 (2022), arXiv:2109.03553 [hep-ph].
- [18] J. Liu, N. McGinnis, C. E. M. Wagner, and X.-P. Wang, *JHEP* **04**, 197 (2020), arXiv:2001.06522 [hep-ph].
- [19] T. Binder, S. Chakraborti, S. Matsumoto, and Y. Watanabe, *JHEP* **01**, 106 (2023), arXiv:2205.10149 [hep-ph].
- [20] M. E. Ramirez-Quezada, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 083022 (2023), arXiv:2212.09785 [hep-ph].
- [21] G. D'Ambrosio, G. F. Giudice, G. Isidori, and A. Strumia, *Nucl. Phys. B* **645**, 155 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0207036.
- [22] V. Cirigliano, B. Grinstein, G. Isidori, and M. B. Wise, *Nucl. Phys. B* **728**, 121 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0507001.
- [23] A. L. Kagan, G. Perez, T. Volansky, and J. Zupan, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 076002 (2009), arXiv:0903.1794 [hep-ph].
- [24] F. A. Alrahman et al. (ICARUS), (2024), arXiv:2411.02727 [hep-ex].
- [25] P. J. Fox and E. Poppitz, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 083528 (2009), arXiv:0811.0399 [hep-ph].
- [26] P. Agrawal, Z. Chacko, and C. B. Verhaaren, *JHEP* **08**, 147 (2014), arXiv:1402.7369 [hep-ph].
- [27] P. Bandyopadhyay, E. J. Chun, and R. Mandal, *Phys. Lett. B* **779**, 201 (2018), arXiv:1709.08581 [hep-ph].
- [28] S. Dutta, D. Sachdeva, and B. Rawat, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, 639 (2017), arXiv:1704.03994 [hep-ph].
- [29] A. Berlin, N. Blinov, G. Krnjaic, P. Schuster, and N. Toro, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 075001 (2019), arXiv:1807.01730 [hep-ph].



- ph].
- [30] S. Chakraborti and R. Islam, *JHEP* **03**, 032 (2021), arXiv:2007.13719 [hep-ph].
- [31] S. Kundu, A. Guha, P. K. Das, and P. S. B. Dev, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 015003 (2023), arXiv:2110.06903 [hep-ph].
- [32] B. Barman, S. Bhattacharya, S. Girmohanta, and S. Jahedi, *JHEP* **04**, 146 (2022), arXiv:2109.10936 [hep-ph].
- [33] G.-y. Huang, S. Jana, A. S. de Jesus, F. S. Queiroz, and W. Rodejohann, *J. Phys. G* **50**, 065001 (2023), arXiv:2207.01656 [hep-ph].
- [34] G. Bickendorf and M. Drees, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 1163 (2022), arXiv:2206.05038 [hep-ph].
- [35] I. John and T. Linden, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 103022 (2023), arXiv:2304.07317 [hep-ph].
- [36] C. Cesarotti and G. Krnjaic, (2024), arXiv:2404.02906 [hep-ph].
- [37] A. Batra, P. Bharadwaj, S. Mandal, R. Srivastava, and J. W. F. Valle, (2023), arXiv:2304.06080 [hep-ph].
- [38] G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher, and J. P. Silva, *Phys. Rept.* **516**, 1 (2012), arXiv:1106.0034 [hep-ph].
- [39] A. Freitas and S. Westhoff, *JHEP* **10**, 116 (2014), arXiv:1408.1959 [hep-ph].
- [40] C.-Y. Chen, H. Davoudiasl, W. J. Marciano, and C. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 035006 (2016), arXiv:1511.04715 [hep-ph].
- [41] B. Batell, N. Lange, D. McKeen, M. Pospelov, and A. Ritz, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 075003 (2017), arXiv:1606.04943 [hep-ph].
- [42] L.-B. Jia, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 321 (2022), arXiv:2105.13805 [hep-ph].
- [43] A. Abashian *et al.* (Belle), *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A* **479**, 117 (2002).
- [44] J. P. Lees *et al.* (BaBar), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **125**, 181801 (2020), arXiv:2005.01885 [hep-ex].
- [45] J. Alda, G. Levati, P. Paradisi, S. Rigolin, and N. Selimovic, (2024), arXiv:2407.18296 [hep-ph].
- [46] Y. Afik, P. S. Bhupal Dev, and A. Thapa, *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 015003 (2024), arXiv:2305.19314 [hep-ph].
- [47] D. Biswas *et al.* (Belle), *Phys. Rev. D* **109**, 032002 (2024), arXiv:2207.07476 [hep-ex].
- [48] J. Brodzicka *et al.* (Belle), *PTEP* **2012**, 04D001 (2012), arXiv:1212.5342 [hep-ex].
- [49] C. Kiesling, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **28**, 1330053 (2013).
- [50] R. L. Workman *et al.* (Particle Data Group), *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [51] M. Lindner, M. Platscher, and F. S. Queiroz, *Phys. Rept.* **731**, 1 (2018), arXiv:1610.06587 [hep-ph].
- [52] D. P. Aguillard *et al.* (Muon g-2), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 161802 (2023), arXiv:2308.06230 [hep-ex].
- [53] S. Borsanyi *et al.* (Budapest-Marseille-Wuppertal), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 022002 (2018), arXiv:1711.04980 [hep-lat].
- [54] F. Ignatov, R. N. Pilato, T. Teubner, and G. Venanzoni, *Phys. Lett. B* **848**, 138344 (2024), arXiv:2309.14205 [hep-ph].
- [55] T. Blum *et al.* (RBC, UKQCD), (2024), arXiv:2410.20590 [hep-lat].
- [56] T. Brune, T. W. Kephart, and H. Päs, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84**, 1254 (2024).
- [57] D. Hanneke, S. Fogwell, and G. Gabrielse, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 120801 (2008), arXiv:0801.1134 [physics.atom-ph].
- [58] C.-Y. Chen, J. Kozaczuk, and Y.-M. Zhong, *JHEP* **10**, 154 (2018), arXiv:1807.03790 [hep-ph].
- [59] A. Alloul, N. D. Christensen, C. Degrande, C. Duhr, and B. Fuks, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **185**, 2250 (2014), arXiv:1310.1921 [hep-ph].
- [60] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, H. S. Shao, T. Stelzer, P. Torrielli, and M. Zaro, *JHEP* **07**, 079 (2014), arXiv:1405.0301 [hep-ph].
- [61] H. H. Patel, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **197**, 276 (2015), arXiv:1503.01469 [hep-ph].