

Two-component Dark Matter and low scale Thermal Leptogenesis

Subhaditya Bhattacharya,^a Devabrat Mahanta,^{a,b} Niloy Mondal,^a Dipankar Pradhan^a

^aDepartment of Physics, Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, North Guwahati, Assam-781039, India.

^bDepartment of Physics, Pragjyotish College, Guwahati, Assam-781009, India.

E-mail: subhab@iitg.ac.in, devabrat@pragjyotishcollege.ac.in, niloy18@iitg.ac.in, d.pradhan@iitg.ac.in

Abstract. The observable cosmos exhibits sizable baryon asymmetry, small active neutrino masses, and the presence of dark matter (DM). To address these phenomena together, we propose a two component DM scenario in an extension of Scotogenic model, imposing $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ symmetry. The electroweak sphaleron process converts the Y_{B-L} yield, generated through the Leptogenesis mechanism, into the baryon asymmetry ($Y_{\Delta B}$) at $T_{\text{sph}} \sim 131.7$ GeV, the sphalerons decoupling temperature. In this framework, the CP asymmetry as well as the radiative neutrino mass generation explicitly involve the two DM particles, thus establishing a correlation between the baryon asymmetry, DM and observed active neutrino masses. We study in details the allowed parameter space available after considering all the constraints from the three phenomena as well as from the collider search limits, and outline the region which could potentially be tested in future DM detection experiments through direct or indirect detection searches, lepton flavor-violating decays, etc.

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	The Model and motivations	3
3	Constraints on model parameters	5
3.1	Collider constraints	5
3.2	Lepton Flavor constraints	5
4	Thermal Leptogenesis analysis	6
5	Dark Matter analysis	11
5.1	Direct detection limits	12
5.2	Indirect detection limits	14
6	Summary and Conclusions	17
A	Parameters before EWSB	18
B	Neutrino mass generation	18
C	CP-asymmetry calculation	22

1 Introduction

Particle physics is at a crucial juncture where there are at least three major issues that prompt us to probe physics beyond the Standard Model (SM); baryon asymmetry of the Universe (BAU), tiny but non-zero neutrino masses and the existence of a dark matter (DM). But with no experimental evidences of New Physics (NP) so far, the efforts are directed to several possibilities. Addressing all these issues together in an extension of SM has been done extensively in the literature, and ours is another effort to that direction. Why and how this is different and interesting will be elaborated as we go along.

The presence of baryon asymmetry in the Universe (BAU), or matter domination over antimatter, has been a long-standing problem in astroparticle physics. The baryon asymmetry is quantified in terms of the baryon-to-photon ratio, and the current measured value is [1],

$$\eta_B = \frac{n_b - n_{\bar{b}}}{n_\gamma} = (6.16 \pm 0.16) \times 10^{-10}. \quad (1.1)$$

Here, n_b , $n_{\bar{b}}$, and n_γ are the number densities of baryons, anti-baryons, and photons in the present Universe, respectively. The conditions to dynamically generate a baryon asymmetry out of a baryon symmetric Universe were first proposed by Sakharov [2]. Although achieving these conditions within the SM is possible, but never adequate. Baryogenesis through Leptogenesis, first proposed in [3], is a promising and viable idea that requires physics beyond the SM (BSM). When the temperature of the Universe drops below the $T_{\text{sph}} \sim 131.7$ GeV [4], sphalerons start to decouple from the thermal bath and the asymmetry conversion ceases; for some excellent reviews, see [5–8]. While Leptogenesis is generally a high-scale phenomenon

and lies beyond the reach of current and near-future experiments, there are ways of achieving low-scale Leptogenesis, see for example, [9–13]. Our work also addresses such a possibility.

The presence of a non-luminous dark matter (DM), as hinted from several astrophysical and cosmological experiments, has also been a puzzle since long. Anisotropies in CMBR suggests that DM is present in huge amount ($\sim 27\%$), while the energy content of the visible Universe is tiny ($\sim 5\%$) !! The abundance of DM is quantified in terms of the DM number density to the total critical energy density of the Universe, $\Omega_{\text{DM}} = \rho_{\text{DM}}/\rho_{\text{crit}}$, and the recent measured value is [1]

$$\Omega_{\text{DM}}h^2 = 0.1200 \pm 0.0012. \quad (1.2)$$

Here h is the reduced Hubble parameter $H/100 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ with $H = 67.4 \pm 0.5 \text{ km s}^{-1}\text{Mpc}^{-1}$ being the current Hubble constant. What constitutes DM is not known. No particle from the SM can describe the properties of a DM. Weakly interacting massive particle (WIMP) [14, 15], feebly interacting massive particle (FIMP) [16] provide some elegant explanations for producing DM in the early Universe. Although one neutral massive particle can explain the observed DM characteristics, the DM can comprise of multiple fundamental particles. This is especially motivating when looking at the large variety of fundamental particles in the visible sector that comprises only about 5% of the Universe’s energy density. The interplay of DM-DM interactions in such cases provide interesting phenomenology, see, [17–28].

It is intriguing to note further that $\Omega_{\text{DM}}h^2 \simeq 5\Omega_{\text{B}}h^2$. While it may be a numerical coincidence, and the production of DM and BAU may stem from different NP, it is often interesting to look for a common origin. In the Scotogenic model [29], baryon asymmetry can be generated using the leptogenesis mechanism at the TeV scale, left-handed neutrinos acquire small Majorana masses via a one-loop radiative seesaw mechanism, while the neutral component of the inert doublet can be a viable DM candidate. However, the lepton asymmetry generation remains decoupled from the DM production, as both the scenarios are effective at different scales. There are mainly two ways to connect BAU and DM, known as co-genesis scenarios. In one case, the DM is assumed asymmetric, similar to the visible sector, and the asymmetry in both visible and dark sectors is generated from the out-of-equilibrium decay of a heavy particle [30–37]. The other class of the co-genesis scenario generates a baryon asymmetry from the annihilation of DM [38–44].

In this work, we propose a two-component DM model where both DMs are directly responsible for the baryon asymmetry production in the Universe while being consistent with the neutrino oscillation data. To the best of our knowledge, this is attempted for the first time. Although there are efforts where DM particle generates the CP asymmetry by entering into the one-loop diagrams [10, 45], or co-genesis with two component DM [46], but the DM parameter space mostly remains independent of the leptogenesis. In the proposed model, the same DM coupling that generates diagrams for the CP asymmetry also determines the DM relic density and thus are correlated. The particle content of our model is an extension of the minimal scotogenic model that includes two inert doublets, two right-handed neutrinos (RHNs), and a real scalar. The low-scale leptogenesis requires the introduction of two new interaction vertices, along with the minimal scotogenic vertex, which doesn’t affect neutrino mass generation, giving rise to RHN mass relaxation. These new vertices can contain DMs after ensuring the particles’ stability by appropriate $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ symmetry assignments. A similar scenario was studied in [11, 47], where the CP asymmetry is generated by introducing a real scalar particle (not a DM) in type-I seesaw model. Additionally, few more studies [48–50] known as N_2 leptogenesis, assumes the decay of heavy RHN ($m_{N_2} > m_{N_1}$) relevant for asymmetry generation, but without direct involvement of DM. However, in our framework,

the asymmetry generated by the tree and 1-loop decays of the lightest RHN, contain two DMs, which are the lightest stable particles under each discrete symmetries $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$. By this choice, we were also able to prohibit the lepton number violating (LNV) decays involving the SM Higgs and only allow the symmetry singlet terms. For simplicity, we assume that all the model parameters are real, except for the Yukawa couplings related to the tree-level LNV decay to explain the observed BAU. In this way, the asymmetry generation directly involves the masses of two DMs and the couplings associated with interaction with DMs, which are also responsible for the DM analysis. Therefore, the BAU satisfied points are constrained by the DM bounds. Apart, the radiative diagrams for neutrino mass generation also have a strong connection with the DM, thus connecting all the three phenomena together.

There is also a phenomenological advantage for the presence of two DMs in this model. In an inert doublet model, the DM is tightly constrained and can't produce the correct relic density unless the DM mass is around the Higgs mass or approximately 600 GeV. Introducing an additional DM component shares the remaining relic density and enhances the allowed parameter space via DM-DM conversion.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section . 2, we provide a general discussion of the model and its motivations. In Section . 3, we explore the collider and lepton flavor constraints on the model parameters. The thermal leptogenesis and dark matter phenomenology, including DM relic density and direct (indirect) detection prospects, are discussed in detail in Sections . 4 and 5, respectively. Finally, we summarize and conclude in Section . 6. Several appendices provide the details of the relevant calculations.

2 The Model and motivations

The minimal scotogenic model [29], proposed to generate neutrino mass at one loop level, successfully addresses the BAU and DM in the universe. The one-loop neutrino mass generation relaxes the constraints coming from the neutrino masses to Leptogenesis. The well-known Davidson Ibarra (DI) bound lowers down to around $m_{N_1} \sim 10$ TeV [10, 50, 51] from $m_{N_1} \sim 10^{10}$ GeV in the type-I seesaw model [52]. However, with two right-handed neutrinos, the scale of Leptogenesis again pushes to $m_{N_2} \gtrsim 10^{10}$ GeV [10, 48]. Depending on the lightest \mathbb{Z}_2 odd state, the lightest neutral component of the inert doublet or the lightest right-handed neutrino can be a DM candidate in the scotogenic model. In the case of the scalar DM scenario, three RHNs participate in Leptogenesis. In such a case leptogenesis is possible at the TeV scale independent of DM parameters. In the case of the fermionic DM scenario, two RHNs participate in leptogenesis and the observed asymmetry can be generated around $m_{N_2} \sim 10^{10}$ GeV. With two RHNs responsible for CP asymmetry generation, the lightest RHN N_1 , being DM only enters the leptogenesis scenario by scattering washouts [48]. The scattering washouts are insignificant compared to the huge washout from the inverse decay of N_2 . Therefore the leptogenesis parameter space remains independent of DM parameter space. In this work, we propose an extension of the scotogenic model where a DM particle directly generates the CP asymmetry in LNV decays. A two-component DM scenario naturally emerges in the model.

We extend the SM with two copies of RHNs ($N_{1,2}$), two scalar inert doublets ($\eta_{1,2}$), and a real singlet scalar (ϕ). All the SM fields are even under an imposed $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ symmetry while the new fields transform non-trivially as shown in tab. 1. The neutrinos get mass by the scotogenic mechanism [29] as shown in fig. 12 of appendix . B. We keep the right-handed neutrinos N_i to be heavier than the doublet scalars η_i and the singlet scalar ϕ . A net

lepton asymmetry can be generated from the out-of-equilibrium decay of the lightest RHN ($N_1 \rightarrow l_\alpha \eta_1$). Due to the imposed $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ symmetry the singlet scalar enters the vertex correction diagram generating the required CP asymmetry. The additional \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry naturally leads to a two-component DM scenario. Under these circumstances, the lightest of the inert doublets could be a viable WIMP due to its gauge portal interaction. At the same time, the singlet scalar ϕ can be any DM, depending on the strength of its Higgs portal interaction and its interaction rate with the WIMP. Finally, we could get a WIMP-WIMP [53], WIMP-FIMP [54], WIMP-pFIMP [55–57], etc. However, this article focuses solely on the WIMP-WIMP scenario.

Fields	$SU(3)_c \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$	\mathbb{Z}_2	\mathbb{Z}'_2
N_1	(1,1,0)	-1	1
N_2	(1,1,0)	1	-1
η_1	(1,2,1/2)	-1	1
η_2	(1,2,1/2)	1	-1
ϕ	(1,1,0)	-1	-1

Table 1: Particle content of the extended model and their corresponding charges.

$$\mathcal{L} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \frac{1}{2} |\partial_\mu \phi|^2 + \sum_{k=1,2} (i \bar{N}_k \not{\partial} N_k + |\mathcal{D}_\mu \eta_k|^2) + \mathcal{L}_{Yuk} - \mathcal{V}. \quad (2.1)$$

Here the Lagrangian \mathcal{L}_{Yuk} contain the Yukawa couplings as well as the Majorana mass term for the RHNs and is given by,

$$\mathcal{L}_{Yuk} = - \sum_{i=1,2} (h_{ii\alpha} \bar{L}_\alpha \tilde{\eta}_i N_i + h.c.) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1,2} m_{N_i} \bar{N}_i^c N_i. \quad (2.2)$$

The scalar potential \mathcal{V} is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{V} = & \mu_{\eta_i}^2 (\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i) + \frac{1}{4} \lambda_{ij} |\eta_i^\dagger \eta_j + \eta_j^\dagger \eta_i|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \mu_\phi^2 \phi^2 + \frac{1}{4!} \lambda_\phi \phi^4 + \lambda_{iH} (H^\dagger \eta_i) (\eta_i^\dagger H) \\ & + \lambda'_{iH} (\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i) (H^\dagger H) + \frac{1}{2} [\lambda''_{iH} (\eta_i^\dagger H) (\eta_i^\dagger H) + h.c.] + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\phi H} \phi^2 (H^\dagger H) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{i\phi} (\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i) \phi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i \neq j} (y_{ij\phi} \bar{N}_i^c N_j \phi + \mu_{ij\phi} \eta_i^\dagger \eta_j \phi + h.c.). \end{aligned} \quad (2.3)$$

where, we assumed real $y_{ij\phi}$ and inert doublets (η_j s) has the following forms,

$$\eta_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} \eta_j^+ \\ \eta_{R_j}^0 + i \eta_{I_j}^0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.4)$$

After the electroweak symmetry breaking, the masses of the physical scalars would be,

$$m_\phi^2 = \mu_\phi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{\phi H} v^2, \quad (2.5)$$

$$m_{\eta_i^+}^2 = \mu_{\eta_i}^2 + \lambda'_{iH} v^2, \quad (2.6)$$

$$m_{\eta_{R_i}^0}^2 = m_{\eta_i^+}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{iH} + \lambda''_{iH}) v^2, \quad (2.7)$$

$$m_{\eta_{I_i}^0}^2 = m_{\eta_i^+}^2 + \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_{iH} - \lambda''_{iH}) v^2. \quad (2.8)$$

3 Constraints on model parameters

3.1 Collider constraints

LHC and LEP experiments put constraints on the decay of SM gauge bosons [58–60]. One such constraint on the model appears from $Z \rightarrow \eta_R \eta_I$ requiring $m_Z < m_{\eta_R} + m_{\eta_I}$.

$$\Gamma_{Z \rightarrow \text{invisible}} < \begin{cases} 506 \pm 13 \text{ MeV} & (\text{ATLAS}), \\ 523 \pm 16 \text{ MeV} & (\text{CMS}), \\ 498 \pm 17 \text{ MeV} & (\text{L3}). \end{cases} \quad (3.1)$$

In the parameter space $m_h/2 > m_{\eta_R}, m_{\eta_I}$ the constraints from the Higgs invisible decay is applied. The observed (expected) upper limit on the invisible branching fraction of the Higgs boson corresponds to an integrated luminosity of 138 fb^{-1} , at 95% confidence level [61, 62] with total decay width of 125.1 GeV Higgs is $3.2_{-2.2}^{+2.8} \text{ MeV}$ [63],

$$\mathcal{B}_{h \rightarrow \text{invisible}} < \begin{cases} 0.107 (0.077) & (\text{ATLAS}), \\ 0.15 (0.08) & (\text{CMS}). \end{cases} \quad (3.2)$$

This constrain our model parameters $(\lambda_{iiH} + \lambda'_{iiH} \pm \lambda''_{iiH}), \lambda_{\phi H}$ to be less than around 10^{-3} in the regime $m_{\eta_R}, m_{\eta_I}, m_\phi < m_h/2$. Additionally LEP precision data rule a parameter space $m_{\eta_R} < 80 \text{ GeV}$, $m_{\eta_I} < 100 \text{ GeV}$ and $m_{\eta_I} - m_{\eta_R} > 8 \text{ GeV}$ [64]. From LHC and LEP, [65–67], the charge scalar mass is constrained and $m_{\eta_j^\pm} > 90 \text{ GeV}$.

3.2 Lepton Flavor constraints

The MEG II experiment, which searches for the decay $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \gamma$, reports that no excess of events over the expected background has been observed, yielding an upper limit on the branching ratio [68, 69],

$$\mathcal{B}(\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+ \gamma) < 3.1 \times 10^{-13} \text{ (90\% C.L.)}, \quad (3.3)$$

The branching fraction corresponds to $\ell_\alpha \rightarrow \ell_\beta \gamma$ is given by [70–73],




Figure 1: 1-loop Feynman diagrams related to $\ell_\alpha \rightarrow \ell_\beta \gamma$.

* $\mu_{\eta_i}^2 > 0 \implies m_{\eta_i^\pm}^2 > \lambda'_{iiH} v^2$ required for the stability of inert doublets.

$$\mathcal{B}(\ell_\alpha \rightarrow \ell_\beta \gamma) = \frac{3(4\pi)^3 \alpha_{\text{em}}}{4G_F^2} |F_D|^2 \text{BR}(\ell_\alpha \rightarrow \ell_\beta \nu_\alpha \bar{\nu}_\beta), \quad (3.4)$$

where α_{em} and G_F are the electromagnetic fine structure and Fermi constant, respectively. For SM leptonic decay branching, $\ell_\alpha \rightarrow \ell_\beta \nu_\alpha \bar{\nu}_\beta$, see [74]. F_D is the dipole form factor, given by,

$$F_D = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{h_{ii\beta}^* h_{ii\alpha}}{2(4\pi)^2 m_{\eta_i^+}^2} G(x_i), \quad (3.5)$$

where, $x_i = \frac{m_{N_i}^2}{m_{\eta_i^+}^2}$ and $G(x) = \frac{1 - 6x + 3x^2 + 2x^3 - 6x^2 \log x}{6(1-x)^4}$.

During our analysis, we consistently account for this limit. Since the required Yukawa couplings are very small ($|h_{ii\alpha}| \sim 10^{-5}$), we don't need to be concerned about this limit. However, other limits, such as $\mu \rightarrow eee$, would be more suppressed, as the same couplings contribute to these processes.

4 Thermal Leptogenesis analysis

In the minimal scotogenic model, a net lepton asymmetry can be generated from the decay of the lightest right-handed neutrino. The Yukawa coupling involved in Leptogenesis is subjected to satisfy the light neutrino data through the Casas-Ibarra (CI) parametrization [75, 76]. The Yukawa couplings are determined by the scalar quartic coupling λ_{iiH}'' and the active and right-handed neutrino masses [10]. While for three right-handed neutrinos, the Yukawa couplings of the lightest right-handed neutrino can be made small by fixing the lightest active neutrino mass, we don't have such a choice with two right-handed neutrinos [48]. With two right-handed neutrinos, the Yukawa couplings of the lightest right-handed neutrino are always large, resulting in strong washouts of the lepton asymmetry. In fig. 2 we show the decay parameter $K_{N_1} = \Gamma_{N_1}/H(z=1)$ with mass of the lightest right handed neutrino (m_{N_1}). The left panel plot of fig. 2 show the decay parameter with two RHNs in the minimal scotogenic model is always greater than one, while the right panel corresponds to our model. This suggests that we are always in a strong washout region. Due to the strong washouts, the scale of Leptogenesis is pushed beyond $m_{N_1} \sim 10^9$ GeV. This lower bound for a vanilla leptogenesis mechanism is known as the Davidson Ibarra (DI) bound [52]. In the case of the minimal scotogenic model, the DI bound can be found in [10]. The singlet DM enters the one loop vertex correction diagram of $N_1 \rightarrow l_\alpha \eta_1$ in this model. Although we still are in a strong washout region with only two RHNs (see right panel of fig. 2), we now have a coupling in the leptogenesis loop free from the neutrino mass generation. One can sufficiently enhance the asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} by fixing the $y_{ij\phi}$. The DI bound for the minimal scotogenic model is no longer applicable in this case.

We calculate the CP asymmetry (ε_{N_1}) parameter arising from the decay $N_1 \rightarrow l_\alpha \eta_1$ in appendix. C. In fig. 3, we show the variation of the asymmetry parameter through the dark rainbow color bar ε_{N_1} in $m_{N_1} - \lambda_{iiH}''$ plane. On the left panel plot of the fig. 3, asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} is plotted for the minimal scotogenic model while, on the right panel plot, it is shown for the extended model. In the left panel plot, it can be seen that there exists a correlation of the asymmetry parameter with the quartic coupling λ_{iiH}'' as well as m_{N_1} . With the decrease in λ_{iiH} the Yukawa couplings $h_{11\alpha}$ increases increasing asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} .




Figure 2: We have used $\{m_{N_1} > \mu_{\eta_2} + m_\phi, \lambda'_{iiH} = 0.01, m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} = 0.5 \text{ TeV}, m_\phi = 0.4 \text{ TeV}, m_{\eta_{I_2}^0} = m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + m_\phi + 1 \text{ GeV}, \mu_{12\phi} = m_\phi, y_{12\phi} = 1, m_{N_2} = 3m_{N_1}, m_{\eta_i^+} = m_{\eta_{I_i}^0} + 3 \text{ GeV}, m_{\eta_{R_i}^0} = (m_{\eta_{I_i}^0}^2 + \lambda''_{iiH} v^2)^{1/2}, a = 0.1, b = 0.3\}$ to calculate the decay parameter, K_{N_1} .




Figure 3: Scan plot for the asymmetry parameter in $m_{N_1} - \lambda''_{iiH}$ plane. For the left panel plot, the other important parameters are mentioned in the figure inset (for 2 RHN and one inert). The figure on the right corresponds to our model and uses the same parameters as those in fig. 2.

However, one can not decrease the λ''_{iiH} to arbitrarily small values, as it would increase the washouts leading to a strong washout of the generated asymmetry. With the increase in the masses of the RHNs, the corresponding Yukawa couplings increase, increasing the asymmetry parameter. On the right panel plot, it is seen that the correlation of the asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} with λ''_{iiH} vanishes. The dependence of ε_{N_1} on λ''_{iiH} is through the Yukawa coupling $h_{ii\alpha}$, by the Casas Ibarra parameterization given in appendix B.14. Due to the presence of the Yukawa coupling $y_{12\phi}$ and $\mu_{12\phi}$ in the vertex correction diagram, the dependence of the asymmetry parameter on the Yukawa couplings $h_{11\alpha}$ vanishes.

In this model, we found that the asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} is independent of the scalar couplings λ_{11H} , unlike the minimal scotogenic model. Required kinematics for Leptogenesis:

$$m_{N_1} > \mu_{\eta_2} + m_\phi, \mu_{\eta_2} > \mu_{\eta_1} + m_\phi, m_{N_2} > m_{N_1} + m_\phi. \quad (4.1)$$

The relevant coupled Boltzmann Equations for Leptogenesis is written as,

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{dY_{N_1}}{dz} &= -D_{N_1} (Y_{N_1} - Y_{N_1,0}) - \frac{s}{H(z)z} (Y_{N_1}^2 - Y_{N_1,0}^2) \left[\langle \sigma v \rangle_{N_1 N_1 \rightarrow \phi\phi} + \langle \sigma v \rangle_{N_1 N_1 \rightarrow \eta_1 \eta_1^\dagger} + \langle \sigma v \rangle_{N_1 N_1 \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \bar{\ell}_\beta} \right], \\
&\quad - \frac{s}{H(z)z} (Y_{N_1} - Y_{N_1,0}) \left[Y_{\phi,0} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{N_1 \phi \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_2^\dagger} + Y_{\eta_1,0} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{N_1 \eta_1 \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \nu_\mu} + Y_{N_2,0} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{N_1 N_2 \rightarrow \eta_1 \eta_2^\dagger} \right] \\
\frac{dY_{B-L}}{dz} &= -\varepsilon_{N_1} D_{N_1} (Y_{N_1} - Y_{N_1,0}) - W_{\text{ID}} Y_{B-L} - \frac{s}{H(z)z} Y_{B-L} \left[2 \sum_{i=1,2} Y_{\eta_i,0} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\ell_\alpha \eta_i^\dagger \rightarrow \bar{\ell}_\beta \eta_i} \right. \\
&\quad \left. + 2Y_{L,0} \sum_{i=1,2} r_{\eta_i}^2 \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i^\dagger \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \ell_\beta} + Y_{L,0} \sum_{i \neq j} r_{N_i} r_\phi \langle \sigma v \rangle_{N_i \phi \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_j^\dagger} + Y_{L,0} \sum_{i=1,2} r_{N_i} r_{\eta_i} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\eta_i N_i \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \nu_\mu} \right]. \tag{4.2}
\end{aligned}$$

The Boltzmann equations are written in terms of the dimensionless variable $z = m_{N_1}/T$, i^{th} particle co-moving number density Y_i and equilibrium number density $Y_{i,0} = Y_i^{\text{eq}}$. Here D_{N_1} and W_{ID} are the decay and inverse decay terms for N_1 defined as

$$D_{N_1} = K_{N_1} z \frac{\kappa_1(z)}{\kappa_2(z)}, \tag{4.3}$$

$$W_{\text{ID}} = \frac{1}{4} K_{N_1} z^3 \kappa_1(z), \tag{4.4}$$

where $K_{N_1} = \Gamma_{N_1}/H(z=1)$ is known as the decay parameter and κ_i 's are the modified Bessel functions of second kind. $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{AB} \rightarrow \text{CD}}$ represents the thermal averaged cross-section for a given process $A + B \rightarrow C + D$. Here $r_j = Y_{j,0}/Y_{L,0}$. The detailed derivation of neutrino mass and asymmetry parameters (ε_{N_1}) is available in the appendix. B and C, respectively. The relevant Feynman diagrams corresponding to the leptogenesis scenarios are shown in fig. 11.

In fig. 4, we have represented the solution of cBEQ (eq. 4.2), yielding the Y_{B-L} and Y_{N_1} evaluation with z . In Leptogenesis, the observed baryon asymmetry is generated by the sphaleron process, where the sphaleron freeze-out occurs at T_{sph} , transform Y_{B-L} asymmetry to the $Y_{\Delta B}$ asymmetry. We solve it for two benchmark points in the left and right panel of fig. 4. The blue and green solid lines depict the evolution of $|Y_{B-L}|$ and Y_{N_1} , respectively, while the dark red and black dashed lines represent $Y_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}$ and $H/H(z=1)$, respectively. The figures in the bottom panel illustrate how the decay and inverse decay rates vary with z . The intersection of D_{N_1} and W_{ID} with $H/H(z=1)$, decide the asymmetry production and washout. At the first and second intersections, both are becoming in and out-equilibrium processes. Although the rates are equal at equilibrium, the production and washout are also influenced by Y_{N_1} and Y_{B-L} , leading to fascinating dynamics. In the bottom panel of fig. 4, we have not shown the scattering rate relevant for asymmetry evaluation, as they are less significant compared to the decay (D_{N_1}) and inverse decay (W_{ID}). However, some scattering processes significantly impact the number density of N_1 keeping it near its equilibrium abundance, reducing the asymmetry.

In fig. 4, we show two plots representing two different scenarios: the left plot assumes that N_1 is initially in equilibrium, while the right plot considers a case where N_1 is not in equilibrium and starts from a very small initial abundance. In the left panel of fig. 4, N_1 is initially in equilibrium so the decay ($N_1 \rightarrow \ell \eta_1$) and the inverse decay ($\ell \eta_1 \rightarrow N_1$) rates are almost close to each other at high temperature, $z \lesssim 9$. Because of this, at high temperatures, the produced asymmetry is washed out and the remaining asymmetry is negligible, $|Y_{B-L}| \lesssim$




Figure 4: The left figure corresponds to the initial condition $Y_{N_1} = Y_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}$, while for the right figure $Y_{N_1} \sim 10^{-20}$. The horizontal and vertical gray dashed lines indicate $Y_{\Delta B}^{\text{obs}}$ and T_{sph} , respectively. The other solid and dashed lines represent the variation of parameters with $z = m_{N_1}/T$, as indicated in the figure's inset. The masses of the real and charged components of the inert doublet are defined as $m_{\eta_{R_i}^0} = m_{\eta_{I_i}^0} + 2$ and $m_{\eta_i^+} = m_{\eta_{I_i}^0} + 3$, respectively.

10^{-14} . But, when the temperature falls below m_{N_1} , the inverse decay rate would start to fall and finally go below the Hubble rate. During this time ($9 < z < 20$), the decay will become dominant and the produced asymmetry will survive due to the gradual decrease in strength of the inverse decay washout. The gradual increase in asymmetry will not continue indefinitely. It will stop when $Y_{N_1}^{\text{eq}}$ falls to a very small value due to the decays and can no longer produce asymmetry at low temperatures ($z \gtrsim 20$) and it freezes in. A similar explanation applies to the right panel plots in fig. 4 when $z \gtrsim 2$. However, below it *i.e.* $z \lesssim 2$ the asymmetry is generated through the out-of-equilibrium decay of N_1 and strongly washed out when it comes into thermal equilibrium. Once it does, it mimics the behavior seen in the left panel plot.

Since numerous parameters play a significant role in Leptogenesis, we are fixing some at specific values and expressing others in terms of $\{m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}, m_\phi, m_{N_1}, y_{12\phi}, \mu_{12\phi}\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 m_{N_2} &= 3m_{N_1}, \quad m_{\eta_{R_i}^0} = m_{\eta_{I_i}^0} + 2 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\eta_i^+} = m_{\eta_{I_i}^0} + 3 \text{ GeV}, \quad a = 1, \quad b = 0.4, \\
 m_\phi &< \mu_{12\phi} < 2m_\phi, \quad \lambda'_{11H} = \lambda'_{22H} = 0.1, \quad m_{\eta_{I_2}^0} = m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + m_\phi + 1 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{N_1} > m_{\eta_{I_2}^0} + m_\phi.
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{4.5}$$

The choice of a, b is not unique, and the dependency is shown in fig. 14 for a sample benchmark.

In fig. 5 we show the points in $m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} - y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}$ plane that satisfies the neutrino mass and baryon asymmetry while respecting the current LEP constraints on the charged scalar. Since the free couplings $y_{12\phi}$ and $\mu_{12\phi}$ both positively contribute to the asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1}




Figure 5: In this figure, the dark rainbow-colored points represent the RHN mass m_{N_1} . All of these points respect the observed baryon asymmetry ($Y_{\Delta B}^{\text{obs}} \simeq 8.75_{-0.23}^{+0.23} \times 10^{-11}$) and account for the correct active neutrino masses.

we keep $y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}$ in the y-axis. The dimensionfull coupling $\mu_{12\phi}$ is defined as a function of m_ϕ and is varied within the range, $1 < \mu_{12\phi}/m_\phi < 2$. The different values of m_{N_1} are shown as a rainbow color bar. From fig. 5 it is seen that there exist a positive correlation between m_{N_1} and $y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}$. In eq. C.13, it is clear that, the asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} decreases with the increase in m_{N_1} and increases with the enhancement of η_1 ($\equiv m_{\eta_1^0}^2/m_{N_1}^2$). Therefore it is required to increase the free couplings $y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}$ to generate sufficient asymmetry. Hence a larger value of m_{N_1} require larger $y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}$ to satisfy the observed baryon asymmetry. Similarly, in fig. 5 it is seen that the points satisfying the observed asymmetry have a negative gradient with $m_{\eta_1^0}$. It is also due to the dependency of ε_{N_1} on η_1 . For a fixed m_{N_1} , with the increase in $m_{\eta_1^0}$ the asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} increases. To compensate for this, we need smaller values of $y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}$.

BM	$m_{\eta_1^0}$ [GeV]	m_ϕ [GeV]	m_{N_1} [TeV]	$\mu_{12\phi}$ [GeV]	$y_{12\phi}$
I	232.37	656.80	6.388	1037.20	2.555
II	786.91	124.31	3.670	222.43	2.603
III	355.11	365.58	2.205	384.67	2.608
IV	340.88	467.62	5.932	598.88	2.688
V	130.78	618.41	3.661	1220.52	3.001

Table 2: The sample benchmark (BM) points are giving the observed baryon asymmetry after addressing the active neutrino masses, while other parameters are considered following the eq. 4.5.

Before concluding this section, we have illustrated several points, in tab. 2, that meet the constraints on active neutrino masses and the observed baryon asymmetry. However, the LFV constraints are not applicable in this context, as the asymmetry-respecting parameter

$|h_{ii\alpha}|$ is effectively negligible.

5 Dark Matter analysis

The lightest particle under a discrete symmetry is stable and becomes a DM. In tab. 1, we have define the particles charges under $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ symmetry. We have chosen the $\eta_{I_1}^0$ (CP-odd part of inert doublet η_1) and ϕ (real scalar singlet) as our DMs by considering other parameter masses larger than these two. The required kinematics for the stabilisation of DMs ($\eta_{I_1}^0$, ϕ):

$$m_{\eta_{I_2}^0} > m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + m_\phi, \quad m_{N_2} > m_{\eta_{I_2}^0}, \quad m_{\eta_{R_i}^0} > m_{\eta_{I_i}^0}, \quad m_{\eta_i^+} > m_{\eta_{I_i}^0}, \quad m_{N_1} > m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}. \quad (5.1)$$

The heavier dark sector particles contribute to relics through co-annihilation channels. In this two-component real scalar DM scenario, both DMs interact with the visible sector via gauge and Higgs portal interactions. In eq. 2.3, we see that two inert doublets have gauge portal interactions, by which $\eta_{I_1}^0$ is in thermal equilibrium, and the lightest one acts as a viable thermal dark matter candidate. In contrast, ϕ interacts with the visible sector only via the Higgs portal interactions. It's also coupled to the inert doublets through $\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2 \phi$ and $\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i \phi^2$ terms. Interestingly, the mass coupling associated with $\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2 \phi$ is also contributed in baryon asymmetry along with DM masses $m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}$ and m_ϕ . However, Depending on the value of $\lambda_{\phi H}$, two scenarios arise: (i) WIMP-WIMP, for $\lambda_{\phi H} \sim 0.1$, and (ii) WIMP-pFIMP, for $\lambda_{\phi H} \sim 10^{-12}$, with dark matter masses in the GeV – TeV range. In this article, we exclusively focus on the WIMP-WIMP scenario; and we leave the alternate possibilities for future works.

In a two-component DM scenario, the relic density of DM is calculated by solving the coupled Boltzmann Equation (cBEQ). For simplicity, we can neglect some of the processes that are ineffective in DM freezeout. RHNs (N_i) masses (\sim TeV) are quite larger than DMs masses, necessary to account for both the correct baryon asymmetry and neutrino masses. So, (N_i)s remained out of thermal equilibrium and couldn't participate in DM freezeout, which occurs at T_{FO} is smaller than the sphaleron decoupling temperature, T_{sph} where the Y_{B-L} is transferred into $Y_{\Delta B}$. Finally, the coupled Boltzmann equations are written as,

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dY_{\eta_1}}{dz} &= -\frac{s}{H\left(\frac{m_{\eta_1}}{m_{N_1}}z\right)\left(\frac{m_{\eta_1}}{m_{N_1}}z\right)} \left[(Y_{\eta_1}^2 - Y_{\eta_{1,0}}^2) \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\eta_1 \eta_1 \rightarrow SM}^{eff} + \left(Y_{\eta_1}^2 - Y_\phi^2 \frac{Y_{\eta_{1,0}}^2}{Y_{\phi,0}^2} \right) \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\eta_1 \eta_1 \rightarrow \phi\phi}^{eff} \right], \\ \frac{dY_\phi}{dz} &= -\frac{s}{H\left(\frac{m_\phi}{m_{N_1}}z\right)\left(\frac{m_\phi}{m_{N_1}}z\right)} \left[(Y_\phi^2 - Y_{\phi,0}^2) \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\phi\phi \rightarrow SM}^{eff} + \left(Y_\phi^2 - Y_{\eta_1}^2 \frac{Y_{\phi,0}^2}{Y_{\eta_{1,0}}^2} \right) \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\phi\phi \rightarrow \eta_1 \eta_1}^{eff} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (5.2)$$

where $Y_{i,0} = Y_i^{eq}$, $z = m_{N_1}/T$, $\langle \sigma v \rangle^{eff}$ denoted the effective annihilation cross section because of the co-annihilating particles, which eventually decay into the DM [77, 78] and other parameters carried their usual meaning. We have solved the cBEQ using MicrOMEGAs-6.0 [79], and the results are presented in the subsequent sections. Although different cosmological and astrophysical observations confirm the existence of DM, its detection still has not been confirmed. We will also discuss its possible detection prospects via direct and indirect searches in the below sections.

Before delving into the discussion on DM detection, let us simplify the model by reducing the number of free parameters. To reduce the model parameters we fix the parameters

$\{m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}, m_\phi, \mu_{12\phi}, \lambda_{11\phi}, \lambda'_{11H}\}$ at specific values and express others in terms them:

$$\begin{aligned}
|h_{iil}| &= 7.2 \times 10^{-6} \quad (a = 0, b = 0.175), \quad \lambda_{ij} = 1, \quad \lambda_{22\phi} = \lambda_{11\phi}, \\
y_{12\phi} &= 1, \quad 0 < \mu_{12\phi} < 2m_\phi, \quad \lambda'_{22H} = 1, \quad m_{\eta_{I_2}^0} = m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + m_\phi + 1 \text{ GeV}, \\
m_{N_1} &= 2m_{\eta_{I_2}^0}, \quad m_{N_2} = 3m_{N_1}, \quad m_{\eta_{R_i}^0} = m_{\eta_{I_i}^0} + 5 \text{ GeV}, \quad m_{\eta_i^+} = m_{\eta_{I_i}^0} + 5 \text{ GeV}.
\end{aligned}
\tag{5.3}$$

5.1 Direct detection limits

The most sensible method to detect a thermal DM is by observing the DM-nuclear/electron scattering rate through inelastic scattering with SM particles in direct detection experiments. The unobserved DM direct detection signal, from different underground experiments like XENON1T [80], XENONnT [81], LUX-ZEPLIN [82], DARWIN/XLZD (projected) [83], PandaX-xT (projected) [84], puts an upper limit on the DM-nucleon scattering cross-section. There is a lower limit obtained from the coherent elastic neutrino-nucleus scatterings, known as neutrino-fog, where the discrimination of DM signal from neutrino background is challenging [85].




Figure 6: Feynman diagrams correspond to the direct detection of $\eta_{I_1}^0$ (left) and ϕ (right).

Here, the direct detection of $\eta_{I_1}^0$ and ϕ is possible via the Higgs mediated diagrams shown in fig. 6. In a two-component scalar DM setup, the effective spin-independent DM-nucleon scattering cross section is written as [53],

$$\sigma_{N\eta_{I_1}^0}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\Omega_{\eta_{I_1}^0}}{\Omega_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + \Omega_\phi} \sigma_{N\eta_{I_1}^0}^{\text{SI}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \sigma_{N\phi}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\Omega_\phi}{\Omega_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + \Omega_\phi} \sigma_{N\phi}^{\text{SI}}.
\tag{5.4}$$

In fig. 7, we have represented the relic allowed parameter space in $m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} - \sigma_{N\eta_{I_1}^0}^{\text{eff}}$ (left panel) and $m_\phi - \sigma_{N\phi}^{\text{eff}}$ plane (right panel). In one inert doublet scenario [86–88], the CP-odd scalar DM also acts as DM, the relic parameter space between $\sim m_h$ and 600 GeV, is purely underabundant. However, this range would be changed depending on the mass difference between the charged and neutral CP-even scalar. Here, in the presence of a second inert doublet, more co-annihilation will add up and become more underabundant. It's possible to evolve to the correct relic in the presence of another DM (ϕ) that has shared the remaining relic. Because of these, all plots in fig. 7 are filled with color points in between 25 GeV to 700 GeV. Following the eq. 5.3, we have shown the variation of relic and DD with Δm , $\lambda_{\phi H}$, λ'_{11H} , $\mu_{12\phi}$. The coupling associated with $h\phi\phi$ and $h\eta_{I_1}^0\eta_{I_1}^0$ is strongly constrained by the present observed SI DD constraint. So, It would be better to keep off the process containing these vertices in DM freeze-out by choosing sufficient small coupling so that DMs remain in DD allowed. In this scenario, the DM-DM conversion plays a crucial role in relic, especially in an underabundant regime of $\eta_{I_1}^0$. The gray-shaded regions in fig. 7 are excluded by the present SI direct detection experiments, while the stringent set by LUX-ZEPLIN experiments. The dashed lines




Figure 7: Figs. 7a, 7c, 7e and 7b, 7d, 7f, represents the relic allowed parameter space in $m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} - \sigma_{N\eta_{I_1}^0}^{\text{eff}}$ and $m_\phi - \sigma_{\phi N}^{\text{eff}}$ plane, respectively. The rainbow colorbar represents the variation of $\mu_{12\phi}$, $\Delta m = m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} - m_\phi$, and $\% \Omega_i h^2 = \Omega_i h^2 \left(\sum_i \Omega_i h^2 \right)^{-1} 100$, where $i = \eta_{I_1}^0$ and ϕ , has mentioned above the colorbar. The observed SI DD limit excludes the grey-shaded regions from XENON1T, XENONnT, and LUX-ZEPLIN, while the dashed lines correspond to projected limits from PandaX-xT and DARWIN/XLZD (200 t y). Light green represents the neutrino floor.

correspond to the future projection limits set by PandaX-xT and XLZD experiments. As we said, in the middle region is the total relic allowed shared by two DMs, and extreme regions are overabundant regimes. However, the lower and upper mass of $\eta_{I_1}^0$ depends on the mass

difference between the charged and neutral scalar of η_1 . The rainbow color bar represents the variation of Δm (top), $\mu_{12\phi}$ (middle), and $\% \Omega_i h^2$ (bottom).

In figs. 7a and 7b, we have shown the role of Δm coupling in the relic-allowed parameter space. The (effective) conversion processes, $\eta_i^\dagger \eta_i \rightarrow \phi\phi$, helps to ϕ come under relic as $\lambda_{\phi H}$ is small constrained by DD. For this, $m_\phi > m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}$ regime is fitted with relic otherwise in the opposite hierarchy ϕ becomes overabundant. The conversion rate depends on the ratio of the equilibrium number density of both DMs, which causes the small mass hierarchy ($\Delta m \lesssim 10$) to be needed for more conversion of ϕ to $\eta_{I_1}^0$. This has been clearly visible in the top panel figures. Another factor in conversion is the coupling $\mu_{12\phi}$. Although it has a proportional dependency on the conversion rate, simultaneously, it enhanced the effective annihilation cross-section and became more underabundant. For this reason, the parameter space in figs. 7c and 7d show mixed color points, which mostly depend on Δm . Finally, in figs. 7e and 7f, we show the effective contribution of DMs in total relic, depicted by the rainbow color bar. These two figures complement each other while the extreme regions are $\eta_{I_1}^0$ dominant, and the middle region is dominated by ϕ where $\eta_{I_1}^0$ is badly underabundant.

5.2 Indirect detection limits

The self-annihilation of DM particles at the galactic core can produce SM particles, like gamma rays, neutrinos, positrons, etc., which could be possible to detect by various telescopes and detectors. However, the non-observation of the excess in these signals, gamma rays (Fermi-LAT), cosmic rays (AMS-02), and neutrinos (Ice-Cube), etc., allows us to set an upper limit on the DM self-annihilation cross section guided us for the theoretical models and future searching for DM. In this framework, we have estimated the self-annihilation of




Figure 8: The Feynman diagrams represents the self annihilation of $\eta_{I_1}^0$ and ϕ into $b \bar{b}$ shown in figs. 8a, and 8b, respectively.

$\eta_{I_1}^0$ and ϕ , is possible via the Higgs mediated diagrams shown in fig. 8, into the bottom pair as it gives the most stringent constraint for DM annihilation set by Fermi-LAT observation. More interestingly, In a two-component scalar DM setup, the effective DM self-annihilation cross-sections are written as [53],

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\eta_{I_1}^0 \eta_{I_1}^0 \rightarrow b \bar{b}}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\Omega_{\eta_{I_1}^0}^2}{(\Omega_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + \Omega_\phi)^2} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\eta_{I_1}^0 \eta_{I_1}^0 \rightarrow b \bar{b}}, \quad \text{and} \quad \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\phi \phi \rightarrow b \bar{b}}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\Omega_\phi^2}{(\Omega_{\eta_{I_1}^0} + \Omega_\phi)^2} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\phi \phi \rightarrow b \bar{b}}. \quad (5.5)$$

where the cross-section is calculated at the WIMP freeze-out temperature, $T_{\text{FO}} \sim m_{\text{DM}}/25$. The annihilation cross-section, $\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\eta_{I_1}^0 \eta_{I_1}^0 \rightarrow b \bar{b}}$, proportionally depends on the parameters $m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}$




Figure 9: Figures are shown the Indirect detection limit on relic allowed parameter space in $m_i - \langle\sigma v\rangle_{i,i\to b\bar{b}}^{\text{eff}}$ plane, where $i = \eta_{I_1}^0$, and ϕ . The grey-shaded regions are excluded from the recent Fermi-LAT limit on the DM annihilation bottom pair. In this scan, we have taken: $\mu_{12\phi} \leq 2m_\phi$ and $\lambda_{11\phi} \leq 1.0$. The rainbow color shows the variation of the respective parameters mentioned above in the color bar.

and $\lambda_{h\eta_{I_1}^0\eta_{I_1}^0} = (\lambda_{11H} + \lambda'_{11H} - \lambda''_{11H})v = (2m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}^2 - 2m_{\eta_{I_1}^+}^2)/v + \lambda'_{11H}v$, on the contrary $\langle\sigma v\rangle_{\phi\phi\to b\bar{b}}$ depends on the m_ϕ and $\lambda_{h\phi\phi} = \lambda_{\phi H}v$. In fig. 9, we have shown the variation of these parameters through the rainbow colorbar. In all plots, the gray regions are excluded by the upper limit on the DM annihilation to the bottom pair from Fermi-LAT, and this is stringent compared to other indirect observations. In case of $\eta_{I_1}^0$, with the enhancement of λ'_{11H} the $\langle\sigma v\rangle_{\eta_{I_1}^0\eta_{I_1}^0\to b\bar{b}}$ is increased which depicted in fig. 9a. If the DM mass $m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} \sim m_h/2$, some points are excluded by Fermi-LAT due to the Higgs resonance enhancement in the cross-section, and the same explanation is also valid for the second DM ϕ which has been illustrated in fig. 9b. Below $m_h/2$, the cross-section gradually decreases, and some points go inside the Fermi-LAT exclusion regime. As these couplings are also involved in SI direct detection of $\eta_{I_1}^0$ and ϕ , so its decrement also decreases the DD cross-sections, as we see in figs. 9c and 9d. Here, the gradual decrement of both DD and ID cross-section with the vertex factor $\lambda_{h\eta_{I_1}^0\eta_{I_1}^0}$ and $\lambda_{h\phi\phi}$, is portrayed by the transition of color gradient from blue to red.

Summary

Here, we connect three frameworks, (i) Neutrino mass: $\{m_{\eta_{Rk}^0}, m_{\eta_{Ik}^0}, m_{N_k}, h_{kk\alpha}\}$, (ii) Baryon asymmetry: $\{m_{\eta_{Rk}^0}, m_{\eta_{Ik}^0}, m_{\eta_k^+}, m_{N_k}, m_\phi, y_{12\phi}, \mu_{12\phi}, h_{kk\alpha}\}$, and (iii) DM relic density and

its detection possibilities: $\{m_{\eta_{Rk}^0}, m_{\eta_{Ik}^0}, m_{\eta_k^+}, m_\phi, \lambda_{\phi H}, \lambda'_{kkH}, \mu_{12\phi}, \lambda_{mn}, \lambda_{kk\phi}\}$ in a one plane, where, $\{k, m, n = 1, 2\}$. RHNs are much heavier than DMs, and it doesn't play any role in the DM relic. All of these are directly connected by common parameters $\{m_{\eta_{Rk}^0}, m_{\eta_{Ik}^0}\}$. So, by fine-tuning other parameters, we can adjust the corresponding observed observables. If we start from neutrino mass is adjusted by $\{m_{\eta_{Rk}^0}, m_{\eta_{Ik}^0}, m_{N_k}, h_{kk\alpha}\}$ while along with these values fine-tuning the remaining terms, $\{m_{\eta_k^+}, m_{N_k}, m_\phi, y_{12\phi}, \mu_{12\phi}\}$, get observed BAU. Lastly, the DM relic is adjusted by $\{\lambda_{\phi H}, \lambda'_{kkH}, \lambda_{mn}, \lambda_{kk\phi}\}$ while $\lambda_{\phi H}$ is directly connected with DD and ID of DM. After all of these three constraints, the unobserved Lepton flavor-violating decays ($\ell_\alpha \rightarrow \ell_\beta \gamma$) put an upper limit on $h_{kk\alpha}$, it isn't applicable in our scenario. Only strong limits on charged scalar mass from LEP observation put a lower limit ~ 90 GeV.




Figure 10: The red points represent the total relic density satisfied by both DM candidates. The blue points correspond to the total relic density satisfied and allowed by the DD constraint from the LZ-2022 experiment for both DMs. Lastly, the rainbow color points indicate the regions where the relic density, DD, ID provided by Fermi-LAT, and LEP limits on charged scalars mass are satisfied by both DM candidates. The color bar shows the baryon asymmetry, $Y_{\Delta B}(z_{\text{sph}})$, corresponding to each point, while $Y_{\Delta B}^{\text{obs}}$ indicated by cyan line on the legendbar.

In fig. 10, we have shown the relic density of DM, neutrino mass, baryon asymmetry satisfied, and DD, ID, and flavor violating decays allowed parameter space in $m_{\eta_{I1}^0} - m_\phi$ plane. However, the analysis followed the methodology outlined in eq. 5.3. The red points in the left panel represent the parameter space allowed by the DM relic density, while the blue points correspond to regions consistent with both the relic density and DD constraints. Here, we have used the stringent exclusion limit from recently observed SI DM-nucleon scattering cross-sections provided by the LUX-ZEPLIN experiment. A real scalar singlet DM (under only one inert doublet model) results in an underabundant relic density in the range $m_h/2 < m_{\text{DM}} < 500$ GeV, which is here compensated by partner DM ϕ . Here, we restrict the DM mass ratio up to three for simplicity, but it could be relaxable, which has already been discussed in the above sections. The self-annihilation of ϕ into SM particles is possible only via the Higgs portal interactions, and its freeze-out point depends on the $\lambda_{\phi H}$, which DD also constrains. However, it could be relaxed in the presence of the DM-DM conversion processes, which help to become underabundant and left for future detection, as we see in the left figure.

The right figure in fig. 10, we show the variation of the baryon asymmetry in $m_{\eta_{I1}^0} - m_\phi$ plane, while all points respect the DM relic density and neutrino mass, and DD, ID and LEP constraint on charged scalar mass. The Fermi-LAT recent observation puts an upper limit on the DM annihilation to bottom pairs, which are less effective compared to DD constrained.

Due to this, the allowed parameter space remains unaltered after imposing ID constraints. However, the parameters $h_{kk\alpha}$, $y_{12\phi}$, m_{N_1} , m_{N_2} is responsible for Leptogenesis and related to active neutrino mass generation, but does not have any role in DM relic or its detections due to its heaviness. Using this freedom, we calculated the yield of baryon asymmetry ($Y_{\Delta B}$). The rainbow color bar shows the variation of $Y_{\Delta B}$ while the green line on the color bar represents the observed baryon asymmetry ($Y_{\Delta B}^{\text{obs}}$). But, still, the mass dependency of DMs is present via the decay of N_1 ($\rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_1$) in the asymmetry parameter, which is reflected in the plot. With the increase in the mass of $\eta_{I_1}^0$, the m_{N_1} (as described by eq. 5.3) also increases, leading to an increase in Γ_{N_1} , which in turn increases the asymmetry. Finally, we have implemented the LEP constrained on the charged scalar mass ($m_{\eta_1^+}$), which is ~ 90 GeV.

6 Summary and Conclusions

The simplest scenario that addresses neutrino mass generation and BAU is type-I seesaw model, where the right-handed neutrinos (RHNs) need to be heavy, $\sim 10^{10}$ TeV to satisfy the active neutrino masses and baryon asymmetry within the observed limit. On the contrary, the WIMP (mass \sim GeV) freeze out occurs much later. So, having a separate DM candidate added to such a framework won't correlate all the phenomena together. The simplest way to connect them is to consider the scotogenic model, where DM freeze-out and leptogenesis could happen nearly at the same scale, and the masses of RHNs get down to \sim TeV scale. However, the BAU and DM phenomena are not directly coupled in such a framework. Our primary focus was to find out a model setup with minimal particle content that not only addresses all of them together, but also provides an inter dependence, so that the prediction in one sector affects the other.

We find out that an extension of scotogenic model that includes two RHNs, two inert doublets, and one real scalar, stabilised appropriately under $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}'_2$ symmetry with two real scalar DM components, does the job, establishing a novel connection between the DM phenomenology and the matter-antimatter asymmetry. The asymmetry generation in leptogenesis strongly depends on the DM masses and coupling with the RHNs through the vertex correction of N_1 decays into $\ell\eta_1$. On the other hand, neutrino mass generation strongly depends on the inert doublet masses and $h_{kk\alpha}$ couplings, which also play a significant role in leptogenesis. Due to the presence of $N\ell\eta$ vertex, the radiative lepton flavor violating decay becomes possible, but the limit from MEG-II is less sensitive for the parameter space relevant for us. As the LEP experiments already put a stringent lower limit on the singly charged scalar ~ 90 GeV, excludes some of our parameter space.

Operationally, we perform all the detailed calculations to arrive at our final results. We have solved the cBEQ of Y_{N_1} and Y_{B-L} numerically for some chosen benchmark points that address the correct active neutrino mass limits. We also provide a scan plot in $m_{\eta_{I_1}^0} - (y_{12\phi} \times \mu_{12\phi})$ plane, where the points are explaining the observed baryon asymmetry and neutrino masses simultaneously. We do the DM calculation via solving coupled BEQs as well as scanning it via micrOmegas. The mass hierarchy between DM components plays a crucial role in leptogenesis, as both the DMs are considered as on-shell particles in the 1-loop vertex correction calculation. The parameters $\{m_{\eta_{I_1}^0}, m_\phi, \mu_{12\phi}\}$ relevant for Leptogenesis, also turns crucial for DM phenomenology. In the minimal scotogenic model, with one inert doublet, the relic density allowed parameter space is very restrictive, depends on the mass splitting between the charged and neutral components of the inert doublet, and most of the parameter space accessible to collider observation is under-abundant due to the presence of

gauge portal interactions. Here, on the contrary, in the presence of two DM components, the parameter space available for both leptogenesis and DM constraints, is enhanced, allowing a future detection of the charged component of the inert doublet in the collider, indicating to a specific parameter space relevant for DM, leptogenesis and neutrino mass generation. A summary plot also indicates the future detectability of DM in the Direct and Indirect searches after addressing the relevant constraints.

A Parameters before EWSB

$$\eta_i = \begin{pmatrix} \eta_i^+ \\ \eta_i^0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad H = \begin{pmatrix} H^+ \\ H^0 \end{pmatrix}; \quad \mathbb{L} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_\ell \\ \ell \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

$$\mathcal{D}_\mu = \partial_\mu + ig \frac{\tau^a}{2} W_\mu^a + ig' Y B_\mu = \partial_\mu + \frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu & \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^+ \\ \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^- & -gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} (\mathcal{D}^\mu \eta_i)^\dagger (\mathcal{D}_\mu \eta_i) &= \partial^\mu \eta_i^\dagger \partial_\mu \eta_i + \frac{1}{4} (\eta_i^- \ \eta_i^{0*}) \begin{pmatrix} gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu & \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^+ \\ \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^- & -gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu & \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^+ \\ \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^- & -gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta_i^+ \\ \eta_i^0 \end{pmatrix} \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2} \left[(\eta_i^- \ \eta_i^{0*}) \begin{pmatrix} gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu & \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^+ \\ \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^- & -gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \partial^\mu \eta_i^+ \\ \partial^\mu \eta_i^0 \end{pmatrix} - h.c. \right] \\ &= \partial^\mu \eta_i^\dagger \partial_\mu \eta_i + \frac{1}{4} \left[2g^2 W_\mu^+ W^{\mu-} (\eta_i^+ \eta_i^- + \eta_i^0 \eta_i^{0*}) + 2\sqrt{2}gg' (B_\mu W^{\mu-} \eta_i^+ \eta_i^{0*} + h.c.) \right] \\ &\quad - \frac{i}{2} \left[(gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu) (\partial^\mu \eta_i^+) \eta_i^- + \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^+ (\partial^\mu \eta_i^0) \eta_i^- + \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^- (\partial^\mu \eta_i^+) \eta_i^{0*} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (g'B_\mu - gW_\mu^3) (\partial^\mu \eta_i^0) \eta_i^{0*} - h.c. \right] + \frac{1}{4} \left[|g'B_\mu + gW_\mu^3|^2 \eta_i^+ \eta_i^- + |g'B_\mu - gW_\mu^3|^2 \eta_i^0 \eta_i^{0*} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$\begin{aligned} &\bar{\mathbb{L}}_L i\gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \mathbb{L}_L + \bar{\ell}_R i\gamma^\mu \mathcal{D}_\mu \ell_R \\ &= \bar{\mathbb{L}}_L i\gamma^\mu \left(\partial_\mu + ig \frac{\tau^a}{2} W_\mu^a - i \frac{g'}{2} B_\mu \right) \mathbb{L}_L + \bar{\ell}_R i\gamma^\mu (\partial_\mu - ig' B_\mu) \ell_R \\ &= (\bar{\nu}_{\ell L} \ \bar{\ell}_L) \left(i\not{\partial} - \frac{1}{2} \gamma^\mu \begin{pmatrix} gW_\mu^3 - g'B_\mu & \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^+ \\ \sqrt{2}gW_\mu^- & -gW_\mu^3 - g'B_\mu \end{pmatrix} \right) \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{\ell L} \\ \ell_L \end{pmatrix} + \bar{\ell}_R (i\not{\partial} + \gamma^\mu g' B_\mu) \ell_R \\ &= \bar{\ell} i\not{\partial} \ell - (gW_\mu^3 - g'B_\mu) \bar{\nu}_\ell \frac{1}{2} \gamma^\mu \mathbb{P}_L \nu_\ell + \bar{\ell} \gamma^\mu \left[\frac{1}{2} (gW_\mu^3 + g'B_\mu) \mathbb{P}_L + g'B_\mu \mathbb{P}_R \right] \ell - \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} (W_\mu^+ \bar{\nu}_\ell \gamma^\mu \mathbb{P}_L \ell + h.c.). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.4})$$

B Neutrino mass generation

In this scenario, neutrino mass is generated via a one-loop radiative diagram, as shown in fig. 12. and the 1-loop correction due to this self-energy graph is written as,

$$\bar{u}_{L\nu\alpha}(p) \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(p) u_{L\nu\beta}^c(p) = \bar{u}_{L\nu\alpha}(p) \sum_{k=1,2} (\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(p, \eta_{kR}^0) + \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(p, \eta_{kI}^0)) u_{L\nu\beta}^c(p). \quad (\text{B.1})$$

$$-i\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(p, \eta_{kR(I)}^0) = -C_{R(I)}^{\alpha k} \int \frac{d^4 l}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{i}{(p-l)^2 - m_{\eta_{kR(I)}^0}^2} \frac{i(l + M_k)}{l^2 - M_k^2} C_{R(I)}^{\beta k}. \quad (\text{B.2})$$




Figure 11: The relevant Feynman diagrams for Leptogenesis where $i = 1, 2$; $V_\mu = B_\mu, W_\mu^3, W_\mu^\pm$ [9, 89] and α define the lepton generation.




Figure 12: Radiative neutrino majorana mass generation where i, j are generation indices and $k = 1, 2$. The left and right figures correspond to before and after EWSB, respectively.

Here $C_{R(I)}^{\alpha k}$ and $C_{R(I)}^{\beta k}$ are the couplings, given by

$$C_{R(I)}^{\alpha k} = \frac{f_{R(I)}}{\sqrt{2}} h_{kk\alpha}^* \quad \text{and} \quad C_{R(I)}^{\beta k} = \frac{f_{R(I)}}{\sqrt{2}} h_{kk\beta}^*, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

with $f_R = 1$ and $f_I = i$.

$$\mathbb{M}_{\alpha\beta}^k = \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(0, \eta_{kR}^0) + \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(0, \eta_{kI}^0). \quad (\text{B.4})$$

Eq(7) is also valid for $p = 0$, so we set this limit during mass matrix calculation. The odd power of l should vanish after integration.

$$\begin{aligned}\Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(0, \eta_{kR(I)}^0) &= iC_{R(I)}^{\alpha k} \int \frac{d^4l}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{l^2 - m_{\eta_{kR(I)}^0}^2} \frac{(l + M_k)}{l^2 - M_k^2} C_{R(I)}^{\beta k} \\ &\equiv iC_{R(I)}^{\alpha k} C_{R(I)}^{\beta k} \int \frac{d^4l}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{1}{l^2 - m_{\eta_{kR(I)}^0}^2} \frac{M_k}{l^2 - M_k^2};\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B.5})$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{k=1,2} \mathbb{M}_{\alpha\beta}^k = \sum_{k=1,2} \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(0, \eta_{kR}^0) + \Sigma_{\alpha\beta}(0, \eta_{kI}^0); \quad (\text{B.6})$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{M}_{\alpha\beta}^k &= i \frac{h_{kk\alpha}^* h_{kk\beta}^* M_k}{2} \int \frac{d^4l}{(2\pi)^4} \left(\frac{1}{(l^2 - m_{\eta_{kR}^0}^2)(l^2 - M_k^2)} - \frac{1}{(l^2 - m_{\eta_{kI}^0}^2)(l^2 - M_k^2)} \right) \\ &= h_{kk\alpha}^* \left[\frac{M_k}{32\pi^2} \left(\frac{m_{\eta_{kR}^0}^2}{m_{\eta_{kR}^0}^2 - M_k^2} \ln \frac{m_{\eta_{kR}^0}^2}{M_k^2} - \frac{m_{\eta_{kI}^0}^2}{m_{\eta_{kI}^0}^2 - M_k^2} \ln \frac{m_{\eta_{kI}^0}^2}{M_k^2} \right) \right] h_{kk\beta}^*.\end{aligned}$$

The neutrino mass generated from the diagrams shown in fig. 12 is given by

$$(\mathcal{M})_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i=1}^2 \frac{h_{ii\alpha}^* h_{ii\beta}^* M_i}{32\pi^2} [L(m_{\eta_{iR}}^2) - L(m_{\eta_{iI}}^2)], \quad (\text{B.7})$$

where the function L has the following form

$$L(m^2) = \frac{m^2}{m^2 - M_i^2} \ln \left(\frac{m^2}{M_i^2} \right). \quad (\text{B.8})$$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbb{M}_{\alpha\beta} &= \sum_k h_{kk\alpha}^* (\Lambda_{kk})^{-1} h_{kk\beta}^* \\ &= h_{11\alpha}^* (\Lambda_{11})^{-1} h_{11\beta}^* + h_{22\alpha}^* (\Lambda_{22})^{-1} h_{22\beta}^* \\ &= (h_{11\alpha}^* \ h_{22\alpha}^*) \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\Lambda_{11}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\Lambda_{22}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_{11\beta}^* \\ h_{22\beta}^* \end{pmatrix};\end{aligned}\quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$\mathbb{M} = \begin{pmatrix} h_{111}^* & h_{221}^* \\ h_{112}^* & h_{222}^* \\ h_{113}^* & h_{223}^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\Lambda_{11}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\Lambda_{22}} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h_{111}^* & h_{112}^* & h_{113}^* \\ h_{221}^* & h_{222}^* & h_{223}^* \end{pmatrix} \equiv h^* \Lambda^{-1} (h^*)^T = h^* \Lambda^{-1} h^\dagger, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

where

$$h = \begin{pmatrix} h_{111} & h_{221} \\ h_{112} & h_{222} \\ h_{113} & h_{223} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } \Lambda^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\Lambda_{11}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{\Lambda_{22}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B.11})$$

and

$$\Lambda_{ii} = \frac{4\pi^2}{m_{\eta Ri}^2 - m_{\eta Li}^2} \xi_i M_i = \frac{4\pi^2}{\lambda''_{iiH}} \xi_i \frac{M_i}{v^2}. \quad (\text{B.12})$$

The loop functions ξ_i are given by

$$\xi_i = \left(\frac{1}{8} \frac{M_i^2}{m_{\eta Ri}^2 - m_{\eta Li}^2} [L(m_{\eta Ri}^2) - L(m_{\eta Li}^2)] \right)^{-1}. \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Now, the light neutrino mass is diagonalized using the usual PMNS matrix U , with Majorana and Dirac phases, which is determined from neutrino oscillation data and

$$\mathbb{M}_\nu = \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3) = U^\dagger \mathbb{M} U^* = U^\dagger \mathbf{h}^* \sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \mathbf{h}^\dagger U^*,$$

$$\mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu}} \mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu}} = U^\dagger \mathbf{h}^* \sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \mathbf{h}^\dagger U^*,$$

$$\mathbb{I} = \mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu^{-1}}} U^\dagger \mathbf{h}^* \sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \mathbf{h}^\dagger U^* \mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu^{-1}}} = \left[\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \mathbf{h}^\dagger U^* \mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu^{-1}}} \right]^\text{T} \left[\sqrt{\Lambda^{-1}} \mathbf{h}^\dagger U^* \mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu^{-1}}} \right] \equiv \mathbb{R}^\text{T} \mathbb{R}.$$

where \mathbb{R} is any 2×3 orthogonal matrix. Then, the Yukawa coupling matrix satisfying the neutrino data can be written as,

$$h = U^* \mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu}} \mathbb{R}^\dagger \sqrt{\Lambda} \quad (\text{B.14})$$

where [90],

$$\mathbb{M}_{\sqrt{\nu}} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{m_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{m_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{m_3} \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \sqrt{\Lambda} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\Lambda_{11}} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\Lambda_{22}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.15})$$

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.16})$$

Neutrino oscillation experiments only measure two neutrino mass squared differences [91, 92].

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} m_1 = 0 \\ m_2 = \sqrt{\Delta m_{21}^2} \\ m_3 = \sqrt{\Delta m_{31}^2} \end{array} \right\} \text{NO} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \theta_{12}/^\circ = 33.44, \theta_{23}/^\circ = 49.2, \theta_{13}/^\circ = 8.57, \delta_{CP} = 197 \\ \Delta m_{21}^2 = 7.42 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2 \\ \Delta m_{31}^2 = 2.517 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2 \end{array} \right.$$

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} m_1 = \sqrt{-\Delta m_{32}^2 - \Delta m_{21}^2} \\ m_2 = \sqrt{-\Delta m_{32}^2} \\ m_3 = 0 \end{array} \right\} \text{IO} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \theta_{12}/^\circ = 33.45, \theta_{23}/^\circ = 49.3, \theta_{13}/^\circ = 8.60, \delta_{CP} = 282 \\ \Delta m_{21}^2 = 7.42 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2 \\ \Delta m_{32}^2 = -2.498 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2 \end{array} \right.$$

$$\mathbb{R}^{\text{NO}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cos z & \sin z \\ 0 & -\sin z & \cos z \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathbb{R}^{\text{IO}} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos z & \sin z & 0 \\ -\sin z & \cos z & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

where $z = a + i b$ and $\{a, b\}$ are our free parameters. Also, one can find the relations

$$\sum_{\alpha=1}^3 h_{11\alpha} h_{11\alpha}^* = \text{Tr}(h' h^\dagger) \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 h_{22\alpha} h_{11\alpha}^* = \text{Tr}(h'' h^\dagger), \quad (\text{B.17})$$

where

$$h' = \begin{pmatrix} h_{111} & h_{221} \\ h_{112} & h_{222} \\ h_{113} & h_{223} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} h_{111} & 0 \\ h_{112} & 0 \\ h_{113} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{and} \quad h'' = \begin{pmatrix} h_{111} & h_{221} \\ h_{112} & h_{222} \\ h_{113} & h_{223} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} h_{221} & 0 \\ h_{222} & 0 \\ h_{223} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{B.18})$$

C CP-asymmetry calculation




Figure 13: Feynman diagrams corresponds to $N_1 \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_1$ is relevant for Leptogenesis.

The vertex factors for the processes in fig. 13 are,

$$N_j \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_j : -i h_{jj\alpha} P_R; \quad (\text{C.1})$$

$$N_2 \rightarrow N_1 \phi : i y_{12\phi} C^\dagger; \quad \eta_2 \rightarrow \eta_1 \phi : -i \mu_{12\phi}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$\Gamma_{N_1 \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \bar{\eta}_1} = \Gamma_{N_1 \rightarrow \bar{\ell}_\alpha \eta_1} = 2 \frac{h_{11\alpha} h_{11\alpha}^*}{32\pi m_{N_1}^3} (m_{N_1}^2 + m_\alpha^2 - m_{\eta_1}^2) \sqrt{(m_{N_1}^2 - m_\alpha^2 + m_{\eta_1}^2)^2 - 4m_{\eta_1}^2 m_{N_1}^2}. \quad (\text{C.3})$$

In the above equation, the factor 2 arises due to the presence of two potential decay channels, $N_1 \rightarrow \nu \eta_1^0$ and $N_1 \rightarrow l^- \eta_1^+$.

The cross term which related to CP asymmetry parameter $\varepsilon = \frac{2 \int_{\text{phase space}} \text{Im}[\mathcal{M}_{tree}\mathcal{M}_{loop}^\dagger]}{\Gamma_{N_1}}$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\text{vertex}} &= \int \frac{d^4 q_2}{(2\pi)^4} \bar{u}_\alpha(-ih_{22\alpha}P_R) \frac{-i(q_2 + m_{N_2})C}{q_2^2 - m_{N_2}^2 + i\epsilon} (iy_{12\phi}C^\dagger) \frac{u_{N_1}^c(-i\mu_{12\phi})}{q_3^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2 + i\epsilon} \frac{1}{q_1^2 - m_\phi^2 + i\epsilon} \underbrace{[\bar{u}_\alpha(-ih_{11\alpha}P_R)u_{N_1}^c]^\dagger}_{\mathcal{M}_{tree}^\dagger} \\ &= (-ih_{22\alpha}y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}h_{11\alpha}^*) \int \frac{d^4 q_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\bar{u}_\alpha P_R(q_2 + m_{N_2})}{q_2^2 - m_{N_2}^2 + i\epsilon} \frac{u_{N_1}^c}{q_3^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2 + i\epsilon} \frac{(u_{N_1}^T C^\dagger P_L u_\alpha)}{q_1^2 - m_\phi^2 + i\epsilon} \quad (\text{C.4}) \end{aligned}$$

After summing over final spins and averaging over initial spins, we get,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{I}_{\text{vertex}} &= (-ih_{22\alpha}y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}h_{11\alpha}^*) \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{d^4 q_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{\text{Tr}[P_R(q_2 + m_{N_2})(-\not{p} + m_{N_1})P_L(\not{p}_1 + m_\alpha)]}{(q_2^2 - m_{N_2}^2 + i\epsilon)(q_3^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2 + i\epsilon)(q_1^2 - m_\phi^2 + i\epsilon)} \\ &= (ih_{22\alpha}y_{12\phi}\mu_{12\phi}h_{11\alpha}^*) \int \frac{d^4 q_2}{(2\pi)^4} \frac{m_{N_2}p \cdot p_1 - m_{N_1}p_1 \cdot q_2}{(q_2^2 - m_{N_2}^2 + i\epsilon)(q_3^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2 + i\epsilon)(q_1^2 - m_\phi^2 + i\epsilon)} \quad (\text{C.5}) \end{aligned}$$

To calculate the imaginary part of the amplitude, which is related to the discontinuity of the amplitude, we use the cutting rule to calculate this. The proper cutting through the propagators associated with momenta q_1 and q_3 . Thus, we make the replacement,

$$\frac{1}{q_1^2 - m_\phi^2 + i\epsilon} \rightarrow -2\pi i \delta(q_1^2 - m_\phi^2) \Theta(E_\phi) = -2\pi i \delta((p - q_2)^2 - m_\phi^2) \Theta(m_{N_1} - E_{N_2}),$$

$$\frac{1}{q_3^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2 + i\epsilon} \rightarrow -2\pi i \delta((p_1 - q_2)^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2) \Theta(E_{\eta_2}),$$

where,

$$2p \cdot p_1 = m_{N_1}^2 + m_\alpha^2 - m_{\eta_1}^2.$$

$$p_1 \cdot q_2 = E_\alpha E_{N_2} - |\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2| \cos \theta \quad \text{and} \quad |\mathbf{p}_1| = |\mathbf{p}_2| = \frac{1}{2m_{N_1}} \sqrt{(m_{N_1}^2 + m_{\eta_1}^2 - m_\alpha^2)^2 - 4m_{N_1}^2 m_{\eta_1}^2}.$$

and θ is the angle between \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{q}_2 . Putting all of these together we obtain ($\epsilon \rightarrow 0$),

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Disc}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}}) &= \frac{-i}{4\pi^2} \int dE_{N_2} d^3 q_2 \frac{m_{N_2}p \cdot p_1 - m_{N_1}(E_\alpha E_{N_2} - |\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2| \cos \theta)}{q_2^2 - m_{N_2}^2} \\ &\quad \times \delta[(p - q_2)^2 - m_\phi^2] \delta[(p_1 - q_2)^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2] \Theta(m_{N_1} - E_{N_2}) \Theta(E_\alpha - E_{N_2}) \quad (\text{C.6}) \end{aligned}$$

$$\delta[(p - q_2)^2 - m_\phi^2] = \delta[E_{N_2}^2 - 2m_{N_1}E_{N_2} + m_{N_1}^2 - |\mathbf{q}_2|^2 - m_\phi^2] = -\frac{\delta[E_{N_2} - (m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2})]}{2\sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Disc}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}}) &= \frac{i}{4\pi^2} \int \frac{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2}{2\sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}} d|\mathbf{q}_2| d\Omega \frac{m_{N_2}p \cdot p_1 - m_{N_1}[E_\alpha(m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) - |\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2| \cos \theta]}{m_{N_1}^2 - m_{N_2}^2 + m_\phi^2 - 2m_{N_1}\sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}} \\ &\quad \times \delta[m_\alpha^2 + m_{N_1}^2 + m_\phi^2 - m_{\eta_2}^2 - 2E_\alpha(m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) - 2m_{N_1}\sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2} + 2|\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2| \cos \theta] \\ &\quad \times \Theta[(m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) - E_\alpha] \end{aligned}$$

$$\delta \left[\cos \theta - \frac{1}{2|\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2|} (-m_{N_1}^2 + m_{\eta_2}^2 - m_\phi^2 - m_\alpha^2 + \sqrt{|\mathbf{p}_1|^2 + m_\alpha^2} (m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) + 2m_{N_1} \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) \right] \frac{1}{2|\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2|} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Disc}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}}) &= \frac{i}{8\pi} \int \frac{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}} d|\mathbf{q}_2| \frac{m_{N_2} m_{N_1} E_\alpha - E_\alpha m_{N_1}^2 + E_\alpha m_{N_1} \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2} + m_{N_1} |\mathbf{p}_1| |\mathbf{q}_2| \cos \theta}{m_{N_1}^2 - m_{N_2}^2 + m_\phi^2 - 2m_{N_1} \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}} \\ &\quad \times \delta \left[\cos \theta - \frac{(-m_{N_1}^2 + m_{\eta_2}^2 - m_\phi^2 - m_\alpha^2 + \sqrt{|\mathbf{p}_1|^2 + m_\alpha^2} (m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) + 2m_{N_1} \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2})}{2|\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2|} \right] d \cos \theta \\ &\quad \times \frac{|\mathbf{p}_1||\mathbf{q}_2|}{\Theta[(m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) - E_\alpha]} \\ \text{Disc}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}}) &= \frac{-i}{8\pi} \int_0^A \frac{m_{N_1}^2 |\mathbf{q}_0| d|\mathbf{q}_0|}{\sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_0|^2 + m_\phi^2} \times \sqrt{(m_{N_1}^2 - m_\alpha^2 + m_{\eta_1}^2)^2 - 4m_{\eta_1}^2 m_{N_1}^2}} \\ &\quad \times \frac{(m_{N_1} - m_{\eta_1} + m_\alpha - \frac{m_{N_1}}{m_{N_2}} (m_{N_1}^2 + m_\alpha^2 - m_{\eta_1}^2) + m_\phi^2 - 2m_{N_1} \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_0|^2 + m_\phi^2})}{m_{N_1}^2 - m_{N_2}^2 + m_\phi^2 - 2m_{N_1} \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_0|^2 + m_\phi^2}}, \quad (\text{C.8}) \end{aligned}$$

where the upper limit of the integration

$$A = \sqrt{\left(m_{N_1} - \frac{(m_{N_1}^2 + m_\alpha^2 - m_{\eta_1}^2)}{2m_{N_1}} \right)^2 - m_\phi^2}$$

comes from the theta function $\Theta(m_{N_1} - \sqrt{|\mathbf{q}_2|^2 + m_\phi^2}) - E_\alpha$.

$$\text{Disc}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}}) = - \frac{m_{N_1} \left((\sqrt{5 - 2C + C^2 - 4G} - 2\sqrt{\sigma}) + (D - r + \sqrt{r} G) \ln \left[\frac{1 - r + \sigma - (2 - G)}{1 - r + \sigma - 2\sqrt{\sigma}} \right] \right)}{2\sqrt{(2 - G)^2 - 4\eta_1}}, \quad (\text{C.9})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} C &= (\eta_1 - l'), \quad D = (\eta_2 - l'), \quad G = (1 - \eta_1 + l'), \\ \eta_1 &= \frac{m_{\eta_1}^2}{m_{N_1}^2}, \quad \eta_2 = \frac{m_{\eta_2}^2}{m_{N_1}^2}, \quad \sigma = \frac{m_\phi^2}{m_{N_1}^2}, \quad r = \frac{m_{N_2}^2}{m_{N_1}^2}, \quad l' = \frac{m_\alpha^2}{m_{N_1}^2} \end{aligned}$$

Now the imaginary part of $\text{Im}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}}) = \frac{1}{2i} \text{Disc}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}})$

$$\Gamma_{\text{total}} = \Gamma + \bar{\Gamma} = 2\Gamma_{N_1 \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_1}$$

$$\text{2-body phase space factor } V_{N_1 \rightarrow \eta_1 l} = 2 \frac{|\mathbf{p}_1|}{8\pi E_{cm}^2} = 2 \frac{|\mathbf{p}_1|}{8\pi m_{N_1}^2}$$

$$\varepsilon_{N_1 \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_1} = -\frac{4}{\Gamma_{\text{tot}}} \text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{vertex}}) \text{Im}(\mathcal{I}'_{\text{vertex}}) V_{N_1 \rightarrow \ell \eta_1}, \quad (\text{C.10})$$

where $\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{vertex}})$ is the vertex factor of the loop integration written as

$$\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{vertex}}) = \text{Im}(h_{22\alpha} y_{12\phi} \mu_{12\phi} h_{11\alpha}^*). \quad (\text{C.11})$$

Finally the CP asymmetry from N_1 decay can be written as $\varepsilon_{N_1} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \varepsilon_{N_1 \rightarrow \ell_\alpha \eta_1}$

$$\varepsilon_{N_1} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{vertex}})}{8\pi M_{N_1}} \frac{\left((\sqrt{(1-C)^2 + 4(1-G)} - 2\sqrt{\sigma}) + (D-r + \sqrt{r}G) \ln \left[\frac{1-r+\sigma-(2-G)}{1-r+\sigma-2\sqrt{\sigma}} \right] \right)}{(h_{11\alpha} h_{11\alpha}^*) G \sqrt{(2-G)^2 - 4\eta_1}}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

With the approximation $l' \rightarrow 0$ this expression will look like

$$\varepsilon_{N_1} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{vertex}})}{8\pi M_1} \frac{\left[(1+\eta_1) - 2\sqrt{\sigma} + (\eta_2 - r + (1-\eta_1)\sqrt{r}) (\ln[\sigma - r - \eta_1] - \ln[1-r+\sigma-2\sqrt{\sigma}]) \right]}{(h_{11\alpha} h_{11\alpha}^*) (1-\eta_1)^2}. \quad (\text{C.13})$$

Further with additional approximations $\eta_1 \rightarrow 0$, $\eta_2 \rightarrow 0$ and $\sigma \rightarrow 0$, this expression will transform to

$$\varepsilon_{N_1} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \frac{\text{Im}(\mathcal{F}_{\text{vertex}})}{8\pi (h_{11\alpha} h_{11\alpha}^*) M_1} \left(1 + r \ln \left[1 - \frac{1}{r} \right] - \sqrt{r} \ln \left[1 - \frac{1}{r} \right] \right). \quad (\text{C.14})$$

We have verified our asymmetry parameter in the limit $m_{\eta_{1,2}} \rightarrow 0$ and $m_\phi \rightarrow 0$, comparing it with the results from [47].




Figure 14: This figure illustrates the dependency of the parameters a and b on the asymmetry (ε_{N_1}) after accounting for the constraints imposed by neutrino masses. We are fixing other parameters as: $m_{N_1} = 2$ TeV, $m_{N_2} = 6$ TeV, $m_\phi = 0.5$ TeV, $m_{\eta_{11}} = 0.4$ TeV, $m_{\eta_{12}} = m_{\eta_{11}} + m_\phi + 1$ GeV, $m_{\eta_{Rk}} = m_{\eta_{1k}} + 2$ GeV, $m_{\eta_k^+} = m_{\eta_{1k}} + 3$ GeV, $\mu_{12\phi} = m_\phi$, $y_{12\phi} = 1$, $\lambda_{kkH} = 0.01$, with $k = 1, 2$.

In fig. 14, we illustrate the role of the rotation angle $z = a + i b$ in the asymmetry parameter ε_{N_1} , taking into account the active neutrino masses. While a and b are unconstrained by theoretical or experimental limits, their influence on ε_{N_1} remains largely constant, with typical values around $\varepsilon_{N_1} \sim 10^{-2.5}$. However, a notable decrease in ε_{N_1} is observed within the yellow-shaded region, where it drops to $\lesssim 10^{-4}$. The maximum value of ε_{N_1} ($\sim 10^{-1}$) occurs for $\{a = 1, b = 0.4\}$. Beyond this point, increasing a results in periodic variations in ε_{N_1} .

References

- [1] PLANCK collaboration, *Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A6 [[1807.06209](#)].
- [2] A.D. Sakharov, *Violation of CP Invariance, C asymmetry, and baryon asymmetry of the universe*, *Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.* **5** (1967) 32.
- [3] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, *Baryogenesis Without Grand Unification*, *Phys. Lett. B* **174** (1986) 45.
- [4] M. D’Onofrio, K. Rummukainen and A. Tranberg, *Sphaleron Rate in the Minimal Standard Model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113** (2014) 141602 [[1404.3565](#)].
- [5] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher, *Some aspects of thermal leptogenesis*, *New J. Phys.* **6** (2004) 105 [[hep-ph/0406014](#)].
- [6] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher, *Leptogenesis for pedestrians*, *Annals Phys.* **315** (2005) 305 [[hep-ph/0401240](#)].
- [7] S. Davidson, E. Nardi and Y. Nir, *Leptogenesis*, *Phys. Rept.* **466** (2008) 105 [[0802.2962](#)].
- [8] A. Pilaftsis, *The Little Review on Leptogenesis*, *J. Phys. Conf. Ser.* **171** (2009) 012017 [[0904.1182](#)].
- [9] A. Pilaftsis and T.E.J. Underwood, *Resonant leptogenesis*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **692** (2004) 303 [[hep-ph/0309342](#)].
- [10] T. Hugle, M. Platscher and K. Schmitz, *Low-Scale Leptogenesis in the Scotogenic Neutrino Mass Model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 023020 [[1804.09660](#)].
- [11] T. Alanne, T. Hugle, M. Platscher and K. Schmitz, *Low-scale leptogenesis assisted by a real scalar singlet*, *JCAP* **03** (2019) 037 [[1812.04421](#)].
- [12] A. Dasgupta, P.S.B. Dev, S.K. Kang and Y. Zhang, *New mechanism for matter-antimatter asymmetry and connection with dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 055009.
- [13] D. Borah, A. Dasgupta and D. Mahanta, *Dark sector assisted low scale leptogenesis from three body decay*, *Phys. Rev. D* **105** (2022) 015015 [[2008.10627](#)].
- [14] M. Kamionkowski and M.S. Turner, *Thermal relics: Do we know their abundances?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **42** (1990) 3310.
- [15] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski and K. Griest, *Supersymmetric dark matter*, *Phys. Rept.* **267** (1996) 195 [[hep-ph/9506380](#)].
- [16] L.J. Hall, K. Jedamzik, J. March-Russell and S.M. West, *Freeze-In Production of FIMP Dark Matter*, *JHEP* **03** (2010) 080 [[0911.1120](#)].
- [17] S. Profumo, K. Sigurdson and L. Ubaldi, *Can we discover multi-component WIMP dark matter?*, *JCAP* **12** (2009) 016 [[0907.4374](#)].
- [18] A. Drozd, B. Grzadkowski and J. Wudka, *Multi-Scalar-Singlet Extension of the Standard Model - the Case for Dark Matter and an Invisible Higgs Boson*, *JHEP* **04** (2012) 006 [[1112.2582](#)].

- [19] Q.-H. Cao, E. Ma, J. Wudka and C.P. Yuan, *Multipartite dark matter*, [0711.3881](#).
- [20] D. Feldman, Z. Liu, P. Nath and G. Peim, *Multicomponent Dark Matter in Supersymmetric Hidden Sector Extensions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **81** (2010) 095017 [[1004.0649](#)].
- [21] J. Heeck and H. Zhang, *Exotic Charges, Multicomponent Dark Matter and Light Sterile Neutrinos*, *JHEP* **05** (2013) 164 [[1211.0538](#)].
- [22] Y. Tomozawa, *Two components of dark matter in the DAMA data*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **23** (2008) 4811 [[0806.1501](#)].
- [23] M. Malekjani, S. Rahvar and D.M.Z. Jassur, *Two Component Baryonic-Dark Matter Structure Formation in Top-Hat Model*, *New Astron.* **14** (2009) 398 [[0706.3773](#)].
- [24] Y. Daikoku, H. Okada and T. Toma, *Two Component Dark Matters in $S_4 \times Z_2$ Flavor Symmetric Extra $U(1)$ Model*, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **126** (2011) 855 [[1106.4717](#)].
- [25] A. Biswas, D. Majumdar, A. Sil and P. Bhattacharjee, *Two Component Dark Matter : A Possible Explanation of 130 GeV γ - Ray Line from the Galactic Centre*, *JCAP* **12** (2013) 049 [[1301.3668](#)].
- [26] M. Aoki, J. Kubo and H. Takano, *Two-loop radiative seesaw mechanism with multicomponent dark matter explaining the possible γ excess in the Higgs boson decay and at the Fermi LAT*, *Phys. Rev. D* **87** (2013) 116001 [[1302.3936](#)].
- [27] P.-H. Gu, *Multi-component dark matter with magnetic moments for Fermi-LAT gamma-ray line*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **2** (2013) 35 [[1301.4368](#)].
- [28] S. Bhattacharya, A. Drozd, B. Grzadkowski and J. Wudka, *Two-Component Dark Matter*, *JHEP* **10** (2013) 158 [[1309.2986](#)].
- [29] E. Ma, *Verifiable radiative seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass and dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **73** (2006) 077301 [[hep-ph/0601225](#)].
- [30] D.E. Kaplan, M.A. Luty and K.M. Zurek, *Asymmetric Dark Matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 115016 [[0901.4117](#)].
- [31] H. Davoudiasl and R.N. Mohapatra, *On Relating the Genesis of Cosmic Baryons and Dark Matter*, *New J. Phys.* **14** (2012) 095011 [[1203.1247](#)].
- [32] K.M. Zurek, *Asymmetric Dark Matter: Theories, Signatures, and Constraints*, *Phys. Rept.* **537** (2014) 91 [[1308.0338](#)].
- [33] B. Barman, D. Borah, S.J. Das and R. Roshan, *Non-thermal origin of asymmetric dark matter from inflaton and primordial black holes*, *JCAP* **03** (2022) 031 [[2111.08034](#)].
- [34] Y. Cui and M. Shamma, *WIMP Cogenesis for Asymmetric Dark Matter and the Baryon Asymmetry*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 046 [[2002.05170](#)].
- [35] H. Davoudiasl, D.E. Morrissey, K. Sigurdson and S. Tulin, *Hylogenesis: A Unified Origin for Baryonic Visible Matter and Antibaryonic Dark Matter*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** (2010) 211304 [[1008.2399](#)].
- [36] A. Falkowski, J.T. Ruderman and T. Volansky, *Asymmetric Dark Matter from Leptogenesis*, *JHEP* **05** (2011) 106 [[1101.4936](#)].
- [37] K. Petraki and R.R. Volkas, *Review of asymmetric dark matter*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **28** (2013) 1330028 [[1305.4939](#)].
- [38] Y. Cui, L. Randall and B. Shuve, *A WIMPY Baryogenesis Miracle*, *JHEP* **04** (2012) 075 [[1112.2704](#)].
- [39] N. Bernal, F.-X. Josse-Michaux and L. Ubaldi, *Phenomenology of WIMPY baryogenesis models*, *JCAP* **01** (2013) 034 [[1210.0094](#)].

- [40] J. Kumar and P. Stengel, *WIMP_y Leptogenesis With Absorptive Final State Interactions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 055016 [[1309.1145](#)].
- [41] J. Racker and N. Rius, *Helicitogenesis: WIMP_y baryogenesis with sterile neutrinos and other realizations*, *JHEP* **11** (2014) 163 [[1406.6105](#)].
- [42] A. Dasgupta, C. Hati, S. Patra and U. Sarkar, *A minimal model of TeV scale WIMP_y leptogenesis*, [1605.01292](#).
- [43] D. Borah, A. Dasgupta and S.K. Kang, *TeV Scale Leptogenesis via Dark Sector Scatterings*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) 498 [[1806.04689](#)].
- [44] A. Dasgupta, P.S. Bhupal Dev, S.K. Kang and Y. Zhang, *New mechanism for matter-antimatter asymmetry and connection with dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **102** (2020) 055009 [[1911.03013](#)].
- [45] D. Croon, H. Davoudiasl and R. Houtz, *Leptogenesis enabled by dark matter*, *Phys. Rev. D* **106** (2022) 035006 [[2204.07584](#)].
- [46] D. Borah, A. Dasgupta and S.K. Kang, *Two-component dark matter with cogenesis of the baryon asymmetry of the Universe*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 103502 [[1903.10516](#)].
- [47] M. Le Dall and A. Ritz, *Leptogenesis and the Higgs Portal*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 096002 [[1408.2498](#)].
- [48] D. Mahanta and D. Borah, *Fermion dark matter with N_2 leptogenesis in minimal scotogenic model*, *JCAP* **11** (2019) 021 [[1906.03577](#)].
- [49] Y. Abe, T. Ito and K. Yoshioka, *Leptonic CP asymmetry and Light flavored scalar*, *JHEP* **01** (2023) 019 [[2110.11096](#)].
- [50] D.K. Ghosh, P. Ghosh, K. Mukherjee and N. Narendra, *A singlet scalar assisted N_2 Leptogenesis and Pseudo-Scalar Dark Matter*, [2409.17067](#).
- [51] S. Bhattacharya, N. Mondal, R. Roshan and D. Vatsyayan, *Leptogenesis, dark matter and gravitational waves from discrete symmetry breaking*, *JCAP* **06** (2024) 029 [[2312.15053](#)].
- [52] S. Davidson and A. Ibarra, *A Lower bound on the right-handed neutrino mass from leptogenesis*, *Phys. Lett. B* **535** (2002) 25 [[hep-ph/0202239](#)].
- [53] S. Bhattacharya, P. Poulose and P. Ghosh, *Multipartite Interacting Scalar Dark Matter in the light of updated LUX data*, *JCAP* **04** (2017) 043 [[1607.08461](#)].
- [54] S. Bhattacharya, S. Chakraborti and D. Pradhan, *Electroweak symmetry breaking and WIMP-FIMP dark matter*, *JHEP* **07** (2022) 091 [[2110.06985](#)].
- [55] S. Bhattacharya, J. Lahiri and D. Pradhan, *Dynamics of the pseudo-FIMP in presence of a thermal Dark Matter*, [2212.07622](#).
- [56] S. Bhattacharya, J. Lahiri and D. Pradhan, *Detection possibility of a Pseudo-FIMP in presence of a thermal WIMP*, [2212.14846](#).
- [57] S. Bhattacharya, L. Kolay and D. Pradhan, *Multiparticle scalar dark matter with \mathbb{Z}_N symmetry*, [2410.16275](#).
- [58] ATLAS collaboration, *Measurement of the Z boson invisible width at $s=13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector*, *Phys. Lett. B* **854** (2024) 138705 [[2312.02789](#)].
- [59] CMS collaboration, *Precision measurement of the Z boson invisible width in pp collisions at $s=13$ TeV*, *Phys. Lett. B* **842** (2023) 137563 [[2206.07110](#)].
- [60] L3 collaboration, *Results from the L3 experiment at LEP*, *Phys. Rept.* **236** (1993) 1.
- [61] ATLAS collaboration, *Combination of searches for invisible decays of the Higgs boson using 139 fb^{-1} of proton-proton collision data at $s=13$ TeV collected with the ATLAS experiment*, *Phys. Lett. B* **842** (2023) 137963 [[2301.10731](#)].

- [62] CMS collaboration, *A search for decays of the Higgs boson to invisible particles in events with a top-antitop quark pair or a vector boson in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023) 933 [2303.01214].
- [63] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, *Review of Particle Physics*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [64] E. Lundstrom, M. Gustafsson and J. Edsjo, *The Inert Doublet Model and LEP II Limits*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 035013 [0810.3924].
- [65] A. Pierce and J. Thaler, *Natural Dark Matter from an Unnatural Higgs Boson and New Colored Particles at the TeV Scale*, *JHEP* **08** (2007) 026 [hep-ph/0703056].
- [66] M. Hashemi, M. Krawczyk, S. Najjari and A.F. Żarnecki, *Production of Inert Scalars at the high energy e^+e^- colliders*, *JHEP* **02** (2016) 187 [1512.01175].
- [67] J. Kalinowski, W. Kotlarski, T. Robens, D. Sokolowska and A.F. Zarnecki, *Benchmarking the Inert Doublet Model for e^+e^- colliders*, *JHEP* **12** (2018) 081 [1809.07712].
- [68] MEG collaboration, *Search for the lepton flavour violating decay $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+\gamma$ with the full dataset of the MEG experiment*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76** (2016) 434 [1605.05081].
- [69] MEG II collaboration, *A search for $\mu^+ \rightarrow e^+\gamma$ with the first dataset of the MEG II experiment*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024) 216 [2310.12614].
- [70] T. Toma and A. Vicente, *Lepton Flavor Violation in the Scotogenic Model*, *JHEP* **01** (2014) 160 [1312.2840].
- [71] A. Vicente and C.E. Yaguna, *Probing the scotogenic model with lepton flavor violating processes*, *JHEP* **02** (2015) 144 [1412.2545].
- [72] P.E. Valiente, *Neutrino Masses and Lepton Flavor Physics Beyond the Standard Model*, Ph.D. thesis, U. Valencia (main), 2023.
- [73] R.S. Hundi, *Lepton flavor violating Z and Higgs decays in the scotogenic model*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** (2022) 505 [2201.03779].
- [74] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, *Review of particle physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024) 030001.
- [75] J.A. Casas and A. Ibarra, *Oscillating neutrinos and $\mu \rightarrow e, \gamma$* , *Nucl. Phys. B* **618** (2001) 171 [hep-ph/0103065].
- [76] W.M. Alberico and S.M. Bilenky, *Neutrino oscillations, masses and mixing*, *Phys. Part. Nucl.* **35** (2004) 297 [hep-ph/0306239].
- [77] K. Griest and D. Seckel, *Three exceptions in the calculation of relic abundances*, *Phys. Rev. D* **43** (1991) 3191.
- [78] J. Edsjo and P. Gondolo, *Neutralino relic density including coannihilations*, *Phys. Rev. D* **56** (1997) 1879 [hep-ph/9704361].
- [79] G. Alguero, G. Belanger, F. Boudjema, S. Chakraborti, A. Goudelis, S. Kraml et al., *micrOMEGAs 6.0: N-component dark matter*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **299** (2024) 109133 [2312.14894].
- [80] XENON collaboration, *Dark Matter Search Results from a One Ton-Year Exposure of XENON1T*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (2018) 111302 [1805.12562].
- [81] XENON collaboration, *First Dark Matter Search with Nuclear Recoils from the XENONnT Experiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** (2023) 041003 [2303.14729].
- [82] LZ collaboration, *First Dark Matter Search Results from the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) Experiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131** (2023) 041002 [2207.03764].
- [83] L. Baudis, *DARWIN/XLZD: A future xenon observatory for dark matter and other rare interactions*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **1003** (2024) 116473 [2404.19524].

- [84] PANDAX collaboration, *PandaX-xT: a Multi-ten-tonne Liquid Xenon Observatory at the China Jinping Underground Laboratory*, [2402.03596](#).
- [85] J. Tang and B.-L. Zhang, *Asymptotic analysis of binned likelihoods and the neutrino floor*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 062004 [[2304.13665](#)].
- [86] L. Lopez Honorez, E. Nezri, J.F. Oliver and M.H.G. Tytgat, *The Inert Doublet Model: An Archetype for Dark Matter*, *JCAP* **02** (2007) 028 [[hep-ph/0612275](#)].
- [87] R. Barbieri, L.J. Hall and V.S. Rychkov, *Improved naturalness with a heavy Higgs: An Alternative road to LHC physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **74** (2006) 015007 [[hep-ph/0603188](#)].
- [88] L. Lopez Honorez and C.E. Yaguna, *The inert doublet model of dark matter revisited*, *JHEP* **09** (2010) 046 [[1003.3125](#)].
- [89] G.F. Giudice, A. Notari, M. Raidal, A. Riotto and A. Strumia, *Towards a complete theory of thermal leptogenesis in the SM and MSSM*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **685** (2004) 89 [[hep-ph/0310123](#)].
- [90] S. Antusch, P. Di Bari, D.A. Jones and S.F. King, *Leptogenesis in the Two Right-Handed Neutrino Model Revisited*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 023516 [[1107.6002](#)].
- [91] I. Esteban, M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia, A. Hernandez-Cabezudo, M. Maltoni and T. Schwetz, *Global analysis of three-flavour neutrino oscillations: synergies and tensions in the determination of θ_{23} , δ_{CP} , and the mass ordering*, *JHEP* **01** (2019) 106 [[1811.05487](#)].
- [92] I. Esteban, M.C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz and A. Zhou, *The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations*, *JHEP* **09** (2020) 178 [[2007.14792](#)].