

Type-III Scotogenic Model: Inflation, Dark Matter and Collider Phenomenology

Labh Singh,^{1,*} Rahul Srivastava,^{2,†} Surender Verma,^{1,‡} and Sushant Yadav^{2,§}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomical Science, Central University of Himachal Pradesh, Dharamshala 176215, INDIA*

²*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research - Bhopal, Bhopal Bypass Road, Bhauri, Bhopal 462066, INDIA*

We investigate an extension of the Type-III scotogenic model by incorporating a real singlet scalar. This scalar plays a crucial role as the inflaton due to its non-minimal coupling with the Ricci scalar. The inflaton field subsequently decays into other particles within the Type-III scotogenic framework. In this framework, the inert scalar doublet and fermion triplet are crucial for neutrino mass generation and present strong candidates for 25% energy budget or dark matter in the Universe. We study their relic abundance and potential for direct detection. Furthermore, we discuss possible observational signals that could be identified in future collider experiments.

* sainilabh5@gmail.com

† rahul@iiserb.ac.in

‡ s_7verma@hpcu.ac.in

§ sushant20@iiserb.ac.in

CONTENTS

I. Introduction	3
II. Model Set-up	5
III. Inflation	7
IV. Neutrino Mass	12
V. Dark Matter Phenomenology	13
A. Scalar Doublet Dark Matter (η_R)	14
B. Triplet Fermion Dark Matter (Σ_1)	16
VI. Collider Phenomenology	19
VII. Conclusions	25
VIII. Acknowledgments	26
A. Feynman diagrams for annihilation/co-annihilation, production and detection of DM	26
References	31

I. INTRODUCTION

The experiments in neutrino oscillation physics [1] and modern cosmology [2] have, among others, led to the establishment of two important facts about the working of nature (i) that neutrinos have non-zero mass and (ii) Dark Matter (DM) makes about 25% of the total energy density of the Universe. Standard Model (SM) of particle physics, though extremely successful in explaining interactions of elementary particles (except gravity), does not explain neutrino mass and DM, leading to interesting SM extensions in this direction. In particular, DM candidates with masses around the electroweak scale and interaction cross-sections comparable to those of the electroweak interactions can naturally account for the observed DM relic abundance. This intriguing alignment between theoretical expectations and observational evidence is often referred to as the WIMP (Weakly Interacting Massive Particle) Miracle [3–5]. It highlights, how particles with electroweak-scale properties provide a compelling and elegant explanation for DM, linking cosmology to particle physics. The WIMPs are produced thermally in the early universe, where their annihilation rate into SM particles balances the expansion of the Universe, leaving a relic density consistent with current observations when the expansion rate exceeds the annihilation rate, known as the *freeze-out* mechanism.

One of the most promising ways to generate tiny neutrino mass is the famous seesaw mechanism [6–10]. However, the Scotogenic model, an extension of the SM, provides a unified framework in which neutrino mass is generated radiatively through quantum loop diagrams and contains natural candidates for WIMP DM [11–14]. This interplay is crucial in understanding new physics beyond SM relevant for explaining two important unresolved issues: non-zero neutrino mass and DM. The inert doublet in the loop does not acquire vacuum expectation value (vev) and is odd under \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry making it a suitable DM candidate. Motivated by the requirement of producing consistent values of relic density of DM, baryon asymmetry of the Universe (BAU), and bounds on charged lepton flavor violation (cLFV), the minimal scotogenic model has been extended in a variety of ways [15–29]. Apart from these extensions, another possibility is that of the singlet-triplet scotogenic model [18, 30, 31].

In this work, we study an extension of the Type-III scotogenic model [13] incorporating a real scalar singlet from the viewpoint of cosmic inflation [32], an idea primarily proposed to deal with Horizon [33] and flatness problem [34]. Also, the observations of the Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) [2, 35, 36] reveal that the Universe experienced a period of rapid, exponential expansion known as Cosmic Inflation before entering the hot Big Bang phase. This inflationary period can be modelled using scalar fields within the SM that couple non-minimally to the Ricci scalar R , enabling accelerated expansion. A prominent scenario in this context is Higgs inflation, which has gained significant interest, especially in light of recent Planck data suggesting

its compatibility with cosmological observations. However, challenges arise in Higgs inflation models. If the Higgs scalar doublet serves as the inflaton, vacuum stability and unitarity issues may emerge, as scattering amplitudes among scalars with non-minimal couplings to R could lead to unitarity violation at scales lower than the inflation scale. These issues, as suggested in Ref. [37–41], can be addressed and potentially avoided. There exists a plethora of inflation models (for review, see Ref. [42]). In our model, the singlet scalar induces inflation similar to the Higgs inflation. The requirement of perturbative unitarity, also, imposes an upper bound on the non-minimal coupling of scalar singlet with Ricci scalar *i.e.* $\xi < 10^3$ [43]. The inflation in the scotogenic model has been studied in Ref. [44]. The inflation by singlet scalar in the scotogenic model has been studied in Ref. [45, 46]. After inflation, the inflaton field decays to the model’s particles and reheat the Universe. We consider the mass of the inflaton to be above the electroweak scale, as a result, the inflaton decays completely before DM freeze-out.

Both fermionic and scalar possibilities for dark matter are present in the model. The triplet fermion DM remains under-abundant below 2.5 TeV due to the large annihilation cross-section, however, if we consider coannihilation effects due to scalar doublet in the model, the relic density can be satisfied in the lower mass range of about 1.4 TeV.

The model exhibits rich collider phenomenology. The attempts to probe the triplet fermion at LHC have been carried out in Refs. [47–50]. CMS and ATLAS experiments set a lower bound on mass of the fermion triplet of about 790 GeV [49]. Further, the exclusion limit is extended up to 1140 GeV when the assumption of multiple mass-degenerate triplet fermions is considered [51]. At higher mass ranges, the production cross-section of the fermion triplet becomes too small to be effectively probed at the LHC. The e^+e^- colliders offer a cleaner environment and enhanced sensitivity for precision measurements, making them a promising avenue for investigating the properties of dark sector particles and interactions in scenarios where the LHC lacks sufficient reach. Also, the combination of beam polarization and control over longitudinal dynamics positions lepton colliders as complementary tools to hadron colliders. The inert doublet, lacking QCD interactions, can be probed at the International Linear Collider (ILC) [52] and the Compact Linear Collider (CLIC), a high-luminosity e^+e^- collider operating at 380 GeV, 1.5 TeV and 3 TeV [53]. The collider phenomenology of the inert doublet has been studied at e^+e^- colliders in Refs. [54, 55] (for review, see Ref. [56]), while signatures of the fermion triplet at colliders have been explored in Ref. [57–59]. In the present work, we focus on exploring the potential to probe the triplet fermion at both e^+e^- (ILC and CLIC) and pp (FCC-hh) colliders with scalar doublet as dark matter candidate.

The analyses performed in this paper are organized as follows. In Section II, we discuss the extension of the Type-III scotogenic model and mass term for dark sector particles and inflaton field. A scenario, within the present work, has been discussed, in Section III, to explain the role

of scalar singlet as inflaton. The one-loop generation of neutrino mass has been discussed in Section IV. The phenomenology of the DM sector, considering two possibilities, such as scalar doublet and fermion triplet DM in the model, is discussed in Section V. Section VI deals with the collider signature of the model. Finally, the main conclusions of the paper are summarized in Section VII.

II. MODEL SET-UP

The particle content of our model and their corresponding charge assignments are given in Table I. The SM particle content is extended by two generations of triplet fermions Σ , an inert scalar doublet η and a real singlet scalar χ . This particle content leads to mass generation of light majorana neutrinos at the one loop level. All internal particles in the loop transform as odd, while the SM particles transform as even under the \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry. Consequently, any possible effective operator leading to a decay of a particle of the dark sector necessarily implies another dark sector particle. Therefore, the lightest of them is completely stable and is the DM candidate.

	Fields	$SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y \otimes \mathcal{Z}_2$
Fermions	L_i	$(\mathbf{2}, -1/2, +)$
	ℓ_{R_j}	$(\mathbf{1}, -1, +)$
	Σ	$(\mathbf{3}, 0, -)$
Scalars	Φ	$(\mathbf{2}, 1/2, +)$
	η	$(\mathbf{2}, 1/2, -)$
	χ	$(\mathbf{1}, 0, +)$

TABLE I. Particle content and symmetry assignments under $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times \mathcal{Z}_2$ gauge symmetry.

The scalar potential of the model is written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 V = & \mu_\Phi^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \mu_\eta^2 \eta^\dagger \eta + \mu_\chi^2 \chi^2 + \lambda_1 (\Phi^\dagger \Phi)^2 + \lambda_2 (\eta^\dagger \eta)^2 + \lambda_3 (\eta^\dagger \eta) (\Phi^\dagger \Phi) \\
 & + \lambda_4 (\eta^\dagger \Phi) (\Phi^\dagger \eta) + \frac{\lambda_5}{2} [(\eta^\dagger \Phi)^2 + (\Phi^\dagger \eta)^2] + \frac{\lambda_6}{4} \chi^4 \\
 & + \frac{\lambda_7}{2} \chi^2 \Phi^\dagger \Phi + \frac{\lambda_8}{2} \chi^2 \eta^\dagger \eta.
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

The scalar fields Φ , η and χ denote the usual SM Higgs scalar doublet, the inert scalar doublet and real¹ scalar singlet, respectively. Expanding the $SU(2)_L$ components of the scalar fields, we

¹ Here, for sake of simplicity, we are taking the scalar singlet as real.

can express them as

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}G^+ \\ v_\Phi + h + iG^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \eta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\eta^+ \\ \eta_R + i\eta_I \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2)$$

Here h is the SM Higgs and G^+/G^0 are the charged/neutral Goldstones. Also η^+ represents the charged component, while η_R and η_I correspond to the neutral CP-even and CP-odd components of the inert scalar doublet η , respectively. After the Higgs takes the vev (v_Φ) and spontaneously breaks the electroweak symmetry, the SM Higgs (h) and Singlet scalar (χ) mix through the rotation matrix O_R as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_1 \\ h_2 \end{pmatrix} = O_R \begin{pmatrix} h \\ \chi \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & \sin \alpha \\ -\sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} h \\ \chi \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where α is the mixing angle between them. Then, we have that

$$O_R M_R^2 O_R^T = \text{diag} (m_{h_1}^2, m_{h_2}^2), \quad (4)$$

M_R^2 is the squared CP-even mass matrix whose eigenvalues are given by

$$m_{(h_1, h_2)}^2 = (\lambda_1 v_\Phi^2 + \lambda_6 v_\chi^2) \mp \sqrt{\lambda_7^2 v_\Phi^2 v_\chi^2 + (\lambda_1 v_\Phi^2 - \lambda_6 v_\chi^2)^2}, \quad (5)$$

where the ‘-’ (‘+’) sign corresponds to h_1 (h_2). Note that η does not mix with χ or Φ as it has odd Z_2 charge. Furthermore, the masses of the CP-even and CP-odd components of the inert doublet, η , turn out to be

$$m_{(\eta_R, \eta_I)}^2 = \mu_\eta^2 + \frac{\lambda_8}{2} v_\chi^2 + \frac{\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 \pm \lambda_5}{2} v_\Phi^2. \quad (6)$$

The mass of the charged scalar field is given by,

$$m_{\eta^\pm}^2 = \mu_\eta^2 + \frac{\lambda_3}{2} v_\Phi^2 + \frac{\lambda_8}{2} v_\chi^2. \quad (7)$$

Note that, the large value of v_χ necessitates choosing a small value for the λ_8 coupling.

The relevant Yukawa Lagrangian based on the particle content and symmetries (Table I) is given by

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y \supset Y_{ij}^\ell \bar{L}_i \Phi \ell_{Rj} + Y_{ij}^\nu \bar{L}_i \tilde{\eta} \Sigma_j + \frac{1}{2} Y^\Sigma \chi \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}^c \Sigma) + \frac{1}{2} M_\Sigma \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}^c \Sigma) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (8)$$

where $\tilde{\eta} = i\tau_2 \eta^*$, τ_2 is the 2nd Pauli matrix, $L_i = (\nu_{L_i}, \ell_{L_i})^T$ with $i, j = e, \mu$ and τ .

The triplet fermion can be expressed in its fundamental representation as

$$\Sigma = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Sigma^0 & \Sigma^+ \\ \Sigma^- & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\Sigma^0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

In the next section, we will delve into the inflationary dynamics driven by the singlet scalar field. This analysis will explore how the singlet scalar field couples to the Ricci scalar (in general relativity) and its role in shaping the inflationary potential. We will, also, discuss the slow-roll conditions, calculate the associated inflationary observables, and examine the parameter space that leads to successful inflation consistent with current cosmological data.

III. INFLATION

In our model, we take an approach where only the singlet scalar χ is allowed to couple significantly with the Ricci scalar. The singlet scalar inflation has been studied in Ref. [60–62]. Defining the field $\chi = \langle \chi \rangle + \tilde{\chi}$, where $\langle \chi \rangle$ is the vacuum expectation value and $\tilde{\chi}$ represents quantum fluctuations around vev , then χ can act as the inflaton, providing a viable inflationary mechanism without compromising unitarity at the relevant scales. We assume that only the field χ has a significant non-minimal coupling with the Ricci scalar.

In the limit where $v_\chi \gg v_\phi$, we can use the Binomial expansion to rewrite the Eqn. (5) as

$$m_{h_1}^2 \approx 2\lambda_1 - \frac{\lambda_7^2}{\lambda_6} v_\phi^2, \quad (10)$$

$$m_\chi^2 \approx 2\lambda_6 v_\chi^2. \quad (11)$$

Here, we consider m_χ as the mass of the inflaton field, which is responsible for driving cosmic inflation in the early Universe and generating the exponential expansion of space during the inflationary epoch, smoothing out initial irregularities and providing the initial conditions for the subsequent evolution of the Universe. In general relativity, the dynamics of gravity in the absence of other fields is described by the Einstein-Hilbert action, given as

$$S_{EH} = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[\frac{1}{2} M_P^2 R \right], \quad (12)$$

where M_P^2 is the reduced Planck mass, R is Ricci scalar which encodes the spacetime curvature. For the inflationary scenario in the Jordan frame, the relevant action is:

$$\chi_J = \int d^4x \sqrt{-g} \left[-\frac{1}{2} M_{\text{pl}}^2 R - \frac{1}{2} \xi \chi^2 R + \frac{1}{2} \partial^\mu \chi \partial_\mu \chi - V(\chi) \right], \quad (13)$$

where g is the determinant of the metric tensor $g^{\mu\nu}$ and $V(\chi)$ is the potential associated with the inflaton field χ . During inflation, other scalar fields assumed to have negligible values compared to χ . For large values of χ , the potential $V(\chi)$ can be approximated as $V(\chi) \simeq \lambda_6 \chi^4$, where λ_6 is a coupling constant that governs the inflaton self-interaction, making this model of inflation primarily driven by quartic self-interactions of the inflaton field. Further, to perform the conformal transformation from the Jordan frame to the Einstein frame, we need to rescale the metric such that the gravitational part of the action takes the standard Einstein-Hilbert form. The conformal transformation of the metric given as

$$g_{\mu\nu} = \Omega^2 \tilde{g}_{\mu\nu}, \quad \Omega^2 = 1 + \frac{\xi \chi^2}{M_{\text{pl}}^2}. \quad (14)$$

As a result of the conformal transformation, the action in the Einstein frame can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \chi_E = \int d^4x \sqrt{-\tilde{g}} \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} M_{\text{pl}}^2 R_E + \frac{1}{2\Omega^4} \left[1 + \frac{(\xi + 6\xi^2) \chi^2}{M_{\text{pl}}^2} \right] \right. \\ \left. \times \partial^\mu \chi \partial_\mu \chi - \frac{1}{\Omega^4} V(\chi) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The action in Eqn. (15) can be expressed by a canonically normalized field γ as

$$\frac{d\gamma}{d\chi} = \frac{\left[1 + (\xi + 6\xi^2) \frac{\chi^2}{M_{\text{pl}}^2} \right]^{1/2}}{1 + \frac{\xi \chi^2}{M_{\text{pl}}^2}}. \quad (16)$$

In the region with condition $\chi \ll M_{\text{pl}}/\sqrt{\xi}$ satisfied, the canonical normalized field γ coincides with χ . Alternately, in the region where $\chi \gg M_{\text{pl}}/\sqrt{\xi}$ is satisfied, the potential has the following form

$$V_{SR} = \frac{\lambda_6 \chi^4}{4 \left(1 + \frac{\xi \chi^2}{M_{\text{pl}}^2} \right)^2}. \quad (17)$$

This implies that in this region, χ may act as the slow-rolling inflation field. During this period, the potential energy V_χ of the inflaton field (χ) dominates over its kinetic energy, ensuring a quasi-exponential expansion of the universe. The slow-roll conditions are critical to ensuring that inflation lasts long enough (typically 50 – 60 e -foldings) and ends smoothly, as shown in Fig. 1.

From potential V_{SR} , the number of e -foldings can be estimated as

$$N = \int_\gamma^{\gamma_{\text{end}}} \frac{V_{SR}}{M_{\text{pl}}^2 dV_{SR}/d\gamma} d\gamma \simeq \frac{3(\gamma^2 - \gamma_{\text{end}}^2)\xi}{4 M_{\text{pl}}^2}. \quad (18)$$




FIG. 1. The schematic diagram of slow-roll inflation.

The slow-roll parameters² (ϵ, η) can be calculated from the potential V_{SR} as

$$\epsilon = \frac{M_{pl}^2}{2} \frac{dV_{SR}/d\gamma}{V_{SR}} \simeq \frac{4M_{pl}^4}{3\xi^2\chi^4}, \quad \eta = M_{pl}^2 \frac{d^2V_{SR}/d\gamma^2}{V_{SR}} \simeq -\frac{4M_{pl}^2}{3\xi\chi^2}. \quad (19)$$

For the successful inflation, the slow-roll parameters $\epsilon, \eta \ll 1$. The inflation will end at $\epsilon \simeq 1$, therefore, at this point $\gamma_{end} \simeq \sqrt{4/3}M_{pl}^2/\xi$, which can be neglected in Eqn. (18). Therefore the slow-roll parameters can be expressed in terms of the number of e -folding parameter N as

$$\epsilon \simeq \frac{3}{4N^2}, \quad \eta \simeq -\frac{1}{N}. \quad (20)$$

The spectral index n_s and tensor-to-scalar ratio r are represented by using the slow-roll parameters as

$$n_s = 1 - 6\epsilon + 2\eta, \quad r = 16\epsilon. \quad (21)$$

Also, the primordial power spectrum, which describes the distribution of initial density fluctuations in the early Universe, typically arising from quantum fluctuations during cosmic inflation, is given by

$$\mathcal{P}(k) = A_s \left(\frac{k}{k_*} \right)^{n_s-1} \quad \text{with} \quad A_s = \frac{V_{SR}}{24\pi^2 M_{pl}^2 \epsilon} \Big|_{k_*}, \quad (22)$$

² ϵ quantifies how slowly the inflaton is rolling down its potential while η measures the curvature of the potential and the acceleration of the inflaton

is amplitude of the spectrum at the pivot scale k_* and k is the spatial scale or wave number. By using Planck data, $A_s = (2.101_{-0.034}^{+0.031}) \times 10^{-9}$ at $k_* = 0.05 Mpc^{-1}$ [2], we find the relation

$$\lambda_6 \simeq 1.49 \times 10^{-6} \xi^2 N^{-2}. \quad (23)$$

For $N = 60$, the slow-roll parameters yields $n_s \sim 0.965$ and $r \sim 3.3 \times 10^{-3}$. The experimental value of n_s from Planck data is $n_s = 0.9649 \pm 0.0042$, with an upper bound on $r < 0.036$ set by combined data from BICEP, Keck Array, and Planck [2, 63]. The requirement of perturbative unitarity imposes an upper bound on the non-minimal coupling, i.e., $\xi < 10^3$ [43]. Consequently, from Eqn. (23), λ_6 cannot exceed 0.41 for the maximum value of ξ at an e -folding number of $N = 60$ to achieve the observed value of A_s . To ensure consistency, choosing $\xi = \mathcal{O}(10^2)$ reproduces the observed amplitude of the spectrum, A_s , for $\lambda_6 = \mathcal{O}(10^{-6})$.

Inflation concludes when the potential stabilizes at a minimum or equilibrium point. At this stage, the inflaton field starts oscillating around the minima of the potential, resembling a harmonic oscillator or the vacuum $\langle \chi \rangle$. These oscillations lead to the inflaton decaying into other particles within the model. This marks the onset of the reheating phase, a critical period where the Universe repopulated with particles and radiations. During reheating, energy is transferred from the inflaton field to the model particles, initiating the hot Big Bang and setting the stage for the subsequent evolution of the Universe. Within the model, the inflaton field decays into an inert doublet and a fermion triplet at the tree level, and it can further decay into SM particles such as gauge bosons, neutrinos and Higgs through one-loop processes, where η and Σ appear in the internal propagator lines, as depicted in Fig. 2. This decay mechanism provides a pathway for the inflaton to transfer its energy to SM particles, possibly influencing the reheating process and the subsequent evolution of the early Universe. The decay width could be estimated as³

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{\tilde{\chi}} &= \frac{(\lambda_7 \langle \chi \rangle)^2}{32\pi m_{\tilde{\chi}}} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_\eta^2}{m_{\tilde{\chi}}^2}} + \frac{y^\Sigma m_{\tilde{\chi}}}{8\pi} \left(1 - \frac{4M_\Sigma^2}{m_{\tilde{\chi}}^2}\right)^{3/2} \\ &+ \frac{(\lambda_7 \langle \chi \rangle)^2}{4096\pi^5 m_{\tilde{\chi}}} \left[\frac{(2c_w^4 + 1) g^4}{c_w^4} \left| \mathcal{I} \left(\frac{M_{\eta/\Sigma}^2}{m_{\tilde{\chi}}^2} \right) \right|^2 + \frac{1}{2} (4\lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4)^2 \left| \mathcal{J} \left(\frac{M_{\eta/\Sigma}^2}{m_s^2} \right) \right|^2 \right], \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where

$$\mathcal{I}(x) = 1 + x \left(\ln \frac{1 + \sqrt{1-4x}}{1 - \sqrt{1-4x}} + i\pi \right)^2, \quad (25)$$

$$\mathcal{J}(x) = \sqrt{1-4x} \left(\ln \frac{1 + \sqrt{1-4x}}{1 - \sqrt{1-4x}} + i\pi \right) - 2. \quad (26)$$

³ See Ref. [46] for analytical calculations.




FIG. 2. The decay modes of the inflaton field at tree and one-loop levels are considered. Here, G_ν represents W^\pm and Z gauge bosons. The SM Higgs boson (h) is, also, permitted as a possible final state.

Here, g denotes the $SU(2)$ gauge coupling, and c_w represents the cosine of the weak mixing angle. Additionally, the term $\sqrt{1 - \frac{4M_{\eta(\Sigma)}^2}{m_{\tilde{\chi}}^2}}$ is a kinematic factor, accounting for the phase space suppression during the inflaton's decay to the η (Σ) states. In the scenario where the inflaton field is significantly more massive than other fields in the model, this kinematic suppression factor approaches unity, effectively removing phase space constraints and allowing for efficient decay into these particles. Therefore, the Eqn. (24) becomes

$$\Gamma_{\tilde{\chi}} = \frac{(\lambda_7 \langle \chi \rangle)^2}{32\pi m_{\tilde{\chi}}} + \frac{y_{\Sigma}^2 m_{\tilde{\chi}}}{8\pi} + \frac{(\lambda_7 \langle \chi \rangle)^2}{4096\pi^5 m_{\tilde{\chi}}} \left[\frac{(2c_w^4 + 1) g^4}{c_w^4} + \frac{1}{2}(4\lambda_3 + 2\lambda_4)^2 \right]. \quad (27)$$

At $\Gamma_{\tilde{\chi}} = H$, the reheating temperature after the inflation is given by

$$T_R = \left(\frac{90}{\pi^2 g_*} \right)^{1/4} \sqrt{\Gamma_{\tilde{\chi}} M_{pl}}, \quad (28)$$

where $g_* = 121.75$ is the relativistic degree of freedom.

At the onset of inflaton oscillations, energy loss to particles is minimal compared to that from Hubble expansion rate (H). Only when the Hubble rate drops to about Γ does actual reheating become significant. We numerically computed the inflation parameters for the number of e -folding $N = 60$, varying λ_6 randomly over the range from 10^{-6} to 1. The benchmark values of various parameters such as ξ , λ_6 , λ_8 , $m_{\tilde{\chi}}$, y_{Σ}^2 and reheating temperature T_R is given in the Table II. We obtained the reheating temperature $T_R \approx \mathcal{O}(10^{11})$ GeV.

We assume that the vev of the singlet scalar is extremely larger than the electroweak scale. This leads to the inflaton field acquiring a mass much higher than any other particles in the

$m_{\tilde{\chi}}(\text{GeV})$	λ_6	λ_8	ξ	y^Σ	$T_R(\text{GeV})$
1.17×10^8	1.46×10^{-6}	3.0×10^{-6}	59.39	0.08	4.46×10^{11}
2.01×10^8	2.03×10^{-6}	9.7×10^{-5}	70.03	0.02	2.26×10^{11}
2.80×10^8	3.93×10^{-6}	8.6×10^{-6}	97.48	0.04	6.24×10^{11}
1.97×10^8	1.93×10^{-6}	4.8×10^{-5}	68.35	0.06	1.25×10^{12}
2.21×10^8	2.44×10^{-6}	8.6×10^{-6}	76.75	0.09	1.01×10^{12}

TABLE II. Five representative values of parameters and corresponding reheating temperature T_R .

model, ensuring that it decays completely into lighter particles, including SM particles. As a result, no relics of the inflaton remain after the reheating phase, and the χ field becomes fully decoupled from the rest of the model's particle interactions. This decoupling isolates χ from the post-reheating particle dynamics, allowing the model to evolve without additional influences from the inflaton.

IV. NEUTRINO MASS

In the model under consideration, the \mathcal{Z}_2 symmetry forbids neutrino masses at the tree level, however, they can be generated at the one-loop level. The relevant invariant Yukawa Lagrangian for neutrino mass generation is provided in Eqn. (8). Notably, the $Y^\Sigma \chi \text{Tr}(\bar{\Sigma}^c \Sigma)$ term in Eqn. (8) does not contribute to the neutrino mass, as the χ field decouples from the other model particles after the reheating process. Consequently, neutrino masses arise similar to the minimal




FIG. 3. The Feynman diagram used to generate neutrino masses at one-loop in Type-III scotogenic model.

Type-III scotogenic model [13], enabling the model to accommodate neutrino masses without

additional contributions from χ post-reheating. The Feynman diagram illustrating the one-loop mechanism for neutrino mass generation is shown in Fig. 3, and the corresponding equation is given by

$$(M_\nu)_{ij} = \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{Y_{ik}^\nu Y_{kj}^\nu m_{\Sigma_k}}{32\pi^2} \left[\frac{m_{\eta_R}^2}{m_{\eta_R}^2 - m_{\Sigma_k}^2} \log \frac{m_{\eta_R}^2}{m_{\Sigma_k}^2} - \frac{m_{\eta_I}^2}{m_{\eta_I}^2 - m_{\Sigma_k}^2} \log \frac{m_{\eta_I}^2}{m_{\Sigma_k}^2} \right], \quad (29)$$

$$= \sum_{k=1}^2 \frac{Y_{ik}^\nu Y_{kj}^\nu m_{\Sigma_k}}{32\pi^2} [L[\eta_R] - L[\eta_I]], \quad (30)$$

where $L[\eta_{R,I}]$ is the the loop function. In the following section, we explore the dark matter phenomenology, constraining the model's parameter space by utilizing neutrino oscillation data within the 3σ experimental range for normal hierarchy⁴ only [1]. The analysis is performed using the Casas-Ibarra parametrization [64, 65], which provides a framework to link neutrino masses and mixings to the underlying parameters of the model.

V. DARK MATTER PHENOMENOLOGY

In our model, we have two DM candidates: the real part of an inert scalar doublet (η_R) and the neutral component of the lightest triplet fermion (Σ_1^0). In this work, we shall phenomenologically explore both DM scenarios. We set m_{h_2} to be sufficiently large so that the inflaton decays well before DM freeze-out. In order to study the DM phenomenology, we implement the model in the SARAH 4.15.1[66]⁵ to generate the model files and subsequently employed in the SPheno 4.0.5 version [68] to calculate various mass matrices and vertices. Finally, in order to numerically solve the Boltzmann equation to calculate the DM relic density and spin-independent DM direct detection cross-section, we implement the model files in the micrOMEGAs-5.3.41[69].

Constraints

The numerical estimation of various parameters is put to the following theoretical and experimental constraints.

Boundedness from below:

Bounded from below scalar potential, ensured by the vacuum stability constraints [70, 71] such as

⁴ The results for the inverted hierarchy remain the same.

⁵ See [67] for a pedagogical introduction to the use of computational tools in the particle physics such as SARAH, SPheno, micrOMEGAs and MadGraph.

$$\lambda_1, \lambda_2 \geq 0, \quad (31)$$

$$\lambda_3 \geq -2\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}, \quad (32)$$

$$\lambda_3 + \lambda_4 - |\lambda_5| \geq -2\sqrt{\lambda_1\lambda_2}. \quad (33)$$

Electroweak precision data:

The various parameters in the model can be constrained by the data from electroweak precision data. Particularly, it is known that the oblique parameters S , T , and U represent the influence of heavy new fields on the gauge boson propagators. In numerical analysis, we utilize the bounds [1]

$$S = -0.04 \pm 0.10, \quad (34)$$

$$T = 0.01 \pm 0.12, \quad (35)$$

$$U = -0.01 \pm 0.09. \quad (36)$$

Higgs Boson mass: Dark matter particles interacting with the Higgs boson contribute to loop corrections that affect the Higgs boson mass [72]. Therefore, we are applying the experimental constraint based on the mass of the Higgs boson [1].

Neutrino oscillation data: We constrain the DM parameter space by using the neutrino oscillation data in the 3σ experimental range [1]. We obtained the Yukawa parameters by using Casas-Ibarra parameterisation [64, 65].

LEP Constraints:

The precise LEP-I measurements of the Z-boson decay width impose lower bounds on the masses of dark neutral scalar particles. This limit is simply $m_{\eta_R} + m_{\eta_I} > m_Z$ ensures that the decay $Z \rightarrow \eta_R\eta_I$ is kinematically forbidden. Also, reinterpreting LEP-II results from chargino searches, in the context of singly-charged scalar production, provides a conservative bound on the mass of dark charged scalar particles $m_{\eta^+} > 70$ GeV [73, 74].

A. Scalar Doublet Dark Matter (η_R)

We start our DM analysis by focusing on the case in which the lightest state of the dark sector is the neutral component of inert scalar doublet η_R . The left panel of Fig. 4 shows the dependence of the DM relic abundance on the mass of the doublet DM particle, taking into account its annihilation and co-annihilation diagrams into SM particles (Fig. 13 in Appendix A). The

Parameter	Range	Parameter	Range
λ_1	$[10^{-2}, 0.128]$	λ_2	$[10^{-8}, 4\pi]$
$ \lambda_3 $	$[10^{-8}, 4\pi]$	$ \lambda_4 $	$[10^{-8}, \sqrt{4\pi}]$
$ \lambda_5 $	$[10^{-8}, \sqrt{4\pi}]$	μ_η^2	$[10^2, 10^8] \text{ GeV}^2$
M_{Σ_1}	$[10, 10^4] \text{ GeV}$	M_{Σ_2}	$[10, 10^4] \text{ GeV}$

TABLE III. The ranges of input parameters used in the numerical analysis to calculate DM relic density and direct detection cross-section.




FIG. 4. Predictions for the doublet DM case. In both panels, yellow/grey points represent over/under abundant relic density [2], respectively. The orange-colored points are excluded by LEP constraints [73, 74]. The blue points satisfy the correct relic density. **Left panel:** Relic density vs mass of the doublet DM particle. **Right panel:** Spin-independent WIMP-nucleon direct detection cross section vs mass of the doublet DM particle. Red shaded region is ruled out by Higgs constraints similar to [72].

parameter space utilized for the numerical analysis is outlined in Table III. We are varying the value of λ_1 to fix the Higgs boson mass at $m_{h_1} = 125.20 \pm 0.11 \text{ GeV}$ [1]. We have selected the normal hierarchy for the neutrino spectrum and adopted the best-fit values for the neutrino oscillation parameters as determined by the global fit [75] employing Casas-Ibarra parametrization. In the left panel of Fig. 4, the narrow band represents the 3σ experimental range of DM relic density *i.e.* $\Omega h^2 = (0.1126 \leq \Omega h^2 \leq 0.1246)$ taken from the Planck satellite experiment [2]. The regions of under-abundant and over-abundant relic density are represented by cyan and yellow points, respectively. The orange-colored points are excluded by LEP constraints [73, 74].

The under-abundance is attributed to various dips, which result from different annihilation and co-annihilation channels. The first and second dips are due to the annihilation and coannihilation of η_R mediated by the exchange of W and Z bosons, which results in a reduction of the DM relic density. The third dip occurs when the relic density decreases at half the mass of the Higgs boson (h_1), where η_R annihilates *via* Higgs exchange. At masses near 90 GeV, the quartic interactions between the DM particle and SM particles become significant. These interactions lead to an increase in the DM annihilation cross-section, particularly into W boson pairs. Consequently, the effective thermal freeze-out temperature rises, resulting in a reduction of the DM relic density. This effect is noticeable as a fourth dip in the relic density plot. Similarly, when the DM particle reaches a mass of approximately 125 GeV, annihilation into Higgs boson pairs becomes a dominant channel due to the strengthened coupling between the DM particle and the Higgs boson. The blue points fall within the 3σ range of the cold DM relic density, as determined by the Planck collaboration measurements. These points are distributed across two distinct mass regions: the low mass range from 40 GeV to 85 GeV, and the high mass region from 550 GeV to approximately 4.5 TeV. We are not getting correct relic points after 4.5 TeV in the relic density plot. This is because the loop corrections to the Higgs mass become too large and cannot be counterbalanced by adjusting the tree-level Higgs-quartic (λ_1) coupling.

The right panel of Fig. 4 illustrates the spin-independent direct detection cross-section of DM, where the interaction between DM and nucleons is mediated by the h_1 and Z -bosons as shown in Fig. 17. The experimental bound on CDM-nucleon cross-sections from XENONnT [76], PandaX-4T [77] and LZ [78] are shown as distinct colored lines. The black line corresponds to the neutrino floor. The combination of all relevant constraints leads to an allowed mass range of $m_{\eta_R} \sim 40$ GeV – 85 GeV and $m_{\eta_R} \sim 550$ GeV – 4.5 TeV for scalar doublet DM. These results are consistent with those obtained in the canonical scotogenic model. However, they differ from the findings for scalar doublet dark matter in the Dirac Scotogenic model [29], where co-annihilation between η_R and η_I is absent. In the upcoming sub-section, we will focus on fermionic DM in the model.

B. Triplet Fermion Dark Matter (Σ_1)

In the second scenario, we consider the \mathcal{Z}_2 -odd neutral component of the fermion triplet (Σ_1) as the DM candidate. To be definite, we choose Σ_1 as the lightest dark sector particle. This implies that $m_{\Sigma_1} < m_{\Sigma_2}$ and it is lighter than both the neutral and charged component of the scalar doublet ($m_{\Sigma_1} < m_{\eta_R}, m_{\eta_I}, m_{\eta^+}$). Since the Σ_1 has a gauge invariant mass, we can easily take it to be lighter than other dark sector particles. Fig. 5 illustrates the variation of the DM relic density with the mass of the triplet fermion. In the top panel, both annihilation




FIG. 5. Relic density vs mass of the triplet fermion DM particle. **Top:** Considering both annihilation and co-annihilation channels, **Bottom Left:** Considering only annihilation channels, **Bottom Right:** Considering only co-annihilation channels. Color code is same as in Fig. 4.

and co-annihilation channels are considered, while the bottom left and bottom right panels focus on annihilation and co-annihilation channels separately. Regions of over-abundance and under-abundance are indicated by yellow and cyan colours, respectively. The annihilation and co-annihilation processes contributing to the DM relic density are detailed in Figs. 14, 15 and 16 in Appendix A. A dip occurs at $M_{DM} = M_{W,Z}/2$ due to annihilation processes mediated by the exchange of W or Z bosons. The correct relic density is obtained at around 2.4 TeV as shown in bottom left panel of Fig. 5, consistent with the findings reported in Ref. [13]. It is important to note that Higgs mass constraints are not applicable here as triplet fermion do not couple

Parameter	B1	B2	B3
λ_1	0.128	0.128	0.128
λ_2	7.67×10^{-3}	6.71×10^{-3}	1.46×10^{-5}
λ_3	9.5×10^{-2}	4.65×10^{-2}	-1.20×10^{-7}
λ_4	-7.4×10^{-2}	4.47×10^{-2}	-2.03×10^{-5}
λ_5	-1.5×10^{-8}	-8.95×10^{-2}	-1.4×10^{-3}
$\mu_\eta^2 [\text{GeV}^2]$	3.36×10^5	5.18×10^3	2.65×10^6
$m_h [\text{GeV}]$	125.42	125.31	125.34
$m_{\eta_R} [\text{GeV}]$	575.41	72.08	1616.20
$m_{\eta_I} [\text{GeV}]$	575.41	103.5	1616.23
$m_{\eta^\pm} [\text{GeV}]$	577.68	81.44	1616.47
$m_{\Sigma_1} [\text{GeV}]$	1273.46	1497.90	1544.34
$m_{\Sigma_2} [\text{GeV}]$	1650.89	4180.99	1545.69
$m_{\Sigma_1^+} [\text{GeV}]$	1273.50	1497.94	1544.38
$m_{\Sigma_2^+} [\text{GeV}]$	1650.93	4181	1545.73
Ωh^2	0.1230	0.1162	0.1164
$\sigma^{SI} [cm^2]$	6.32×10^{-48}	3.1×10^{-48}	0

TABLE IV. Relevant model parameters for three representative benchmark points, B1 (medium mass scalar doublet DM), B2 (low mass scalar doublet DM) and B3 (fermion triplet DM).

with Higgs boson. Alternatively, we can consider the DM candidates to have nearly degenerate masses. In this case, co-annihilation processes play a crucial role in determining the relic density of the triplet neutral fermion. The inclusion of co-annihilation effects with other dark sector particles significantly broadens the available parameter space for triplet fermion DM, allowing masses to range from approximately 1.4 TeV to 2.4 TeV as shown in the top panel of Fig. 5. This mechanism provides a viable pathway to achieve the correct relic abundance within this extended mass range. Various co-annihilation channels contributing to lowering the DM mass scale up to 1.4 TeV are summarized in Fig. 16 in Appendix A.

It is important to note that as the mass difference between the two \mathcal{Z}_2 -odd particles approaches zero, co-annihilation processes become more significant. As a result, the dark matter relic density is achieved at a slightly lower scale. In Table IV, we illustrate three benchmark points.




FIG. 6. The Feynman diagrams for the process $e^-e^+ \rightarrow \eta_R\eta_I$ and $e^-e^+ \rightarrow \eta^+\eta^-$.

VI. COLLIDER PHENOMENOLOGY

Numerous collider searches have been conducted to investigate the potential existence of the inert doublet [74, 79–93]. As in any model with a DM candidate, the generic signature is missing energy \cancel{E} , measured from the total transverse momentum recoil of the visible particles in the events. The inert doublet of our model can be tested at LHC through a variety of signatures, including mono-jet, mono-Z, mono-Higgs and vector boson fusion + \cancel{E} [88]. The inert scalar doublet of our model can also be explored at future high-energy electron-positron colliders, such as the Compact Linear Collider (CLIC) and the International Linear Collider (ILC). CLIC, a high-luminosity linear collider operating at the TeV scale, is designed to run at three center-of-mass energies: 380 GeV, 1.5 TeV, and 3 TeV [53], with respective integrated luminosities of 1 ab^{-1} , 2.5 ab^{-1} , and 5 ab^{-1} . Similarly, the ILC, planned to operate at a collision energy of 500 GeV [94], aims for an integrated luminosity of 4 ab^{-1} , offering another robust platform to investigate the phenomenology of the inert scalar doublet of our model.

To calculate production cross-sections of the various processes, we first generated the model’s UFO files using the SARAH package [66], which then implemented into MadGraph5 3.5.4 version [95] for further computation. To calculate the production cross-section, we examine two benchmark ranges (BR), BR1 and BR2, representing the medium-mass and low-mass regions of scalar DM, respectively, as shown in Fig. 4 and detailed in Table IV. At lepton colliders, the pair production of $\eta_R\eta_I$ can be possible by s -channel (t -channel) exchange of Z -boson (Σ^\pm). The s -channel production of inert pairs is shown in Fig. 6. Also, the pair production of charged $\eta^\pm\eta^\mp$ can be possible by s -channel (t -channel) exchange of Z -boson (Σ^0). Fig. 7 presents the variation in cross-sections for the pair production of the processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta_R\eta_I$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta^\pm\eta^\mp$ for centre of mass-energy $\sqrt{s} = 500 \text{ GeV}$ for BR2⁶ consistent with the LEP bound *i.e.* $m_{\eta_R} + m_{\eta_I} > m_Z$ and $m_{\eta^+} > 70$. The η^\pm decays predominantly into $W^\pm\eta_R$, where W^\pm to

⁶ Note that certain points in these ranges are also ruled out by dark matter constraints as discussed in Sec.V.




FIG. 7. Production cross-section of pair production of the inert scalar doublet at ILC with centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 500$ GeV for BR2.

be on-shell if $m_{\eta^\pm} - m_{\eta_R} > m_W$, which can further decay to quarks (jets) or/and mono or di-leptons. The η_R predominantly decays to $Z\eta_R$, which can further decay di-leptonically. Further, Fig. 8 illustrates the production cross-sections for the processes $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta^\pm\eta^\mp$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta_R\eta_I$ at centre-of-mass energies 1.5 TeV and 3 TeV of CLIC, shown for BR1 (upper panel) and BR2 (lower panel). The production cross-section is significantly larger for BR2 (low-mass DM region) compared to BR1 (medium-mass DM region) at the same center-of-mass energy. This difference arises because, at lower masses, the production process benefits from a larger available phase space, allowing for higher kinematic efficiency. Additionally, the reduced mass of the final-state particles in the BR2 scenario lowers the suppression from phase-space factors, further enhancing the cross-section. Conversely, in the BR1 case, the higher mass of the particles results in more constrained phase space, leading to a suppressed production rate. The various decay modes and the corresponding signatures of the particles are detailed in Table V. Additionally, the production of charged components of the triplet fermion is possible at lepton colliders through s -channel (t -channel) *via* exchange of Z -boson ($\eta_{I,R}$). The production of the triplet fermion is dominated by exchange of Z -boson because the Y^ν coupling is significantly small *i.e.* $\mathcal{O}(10^{-5,-6})$. Fig. 9 shows the production cross-section of charged triplet fermion at centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV. keeping in mind the current experimental lower bound on triplet fermion $M_\Sigma > 790$ GeV, the production cross-section decreases with an increase in the mass of triplet fermion. The pair production of $\Sigma^\pm\Sigma^\mp$ would manifest as events with two oppositely charged lepton jets and neutrinos along with missing energy due to undetected neutral particles as shown in Table V. Further, the produced heavy particles can decay to the SM particles with missing energy and




FIG. 8. Production cross-section of the pair production of scalar doublet at lepton collider for BR1 (upper panel) and BR2 (lower panel).

their collider signatures can be probed. The cross-section of a di-leptonic decay process with missing energy at ILC (CLIC), operating at a centre-of-mass energy of 500 GeV (1.5 TeV and 3 TeV) for BR2, is presented in Fig. 10 (upper panel). For this specific channel, the production cross-section is approximately $\mathcal{O}(10^{-2} \text{ fb})$. The smallness of the cross-section is primarily attributed to phase space suppression, which significantly reduces the probability of the process occurring in the kinematic regime under consideration. The lower panel of Fig. 10 shows the cross-section for the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Sigma_1^\pm \Sigma_1^\mp \rightarrow 2l + \cancel{E}_T$ at 3 TeV. Here, the cross-section is $\mathcal{O}(10 \text{ fb})$.

The model can also be probed at the future circular collider for hadron-hadron collision (FCC-hh) [96] with centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 100 \text{ TeV}$. At FCC-hh, the pair production of charged component $\Sigma^\pm \Sigma^\mp$ is possible through s -channel *via* exchange of Z, γ -boson, which is famously known as the Drell-Yan process. On the other hand, the pair production of $\Sigma^\pm \Sigma^0$ is possible

Process	Decay mode	Signature
$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta^\pm \eta^\mp$	$\eta^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \eta_R \rightarrow q_1 \bar{q}_2 \eta_R, \eta^\mp \rightarrow W^\mp \eta_R \rightarrow q_3 \bar{q}_4 \eta_R$	4 jets + \cancel{E}_T
	$\eta^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \eta_R \rightarrow l^\pm \nu_l \eta_R, \eta^\mp \rightarrow W^\mp \eta_R \rightarrow q_3 \bar{q}_4 \eta_R$	$1l + 2$ jets + \cancel{E}_T
	$\eta^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \eta_R \rightarrow l_1^\pm \nu_l \eta_R, \eta^\mp \rightarrow W^\mp \eta_R \rightarrow l_2^\mp \nu_l \eta_R$	$2l + \cancel{E}_T$
	$\eta^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \eta_R \rightarrow l_1^\pm \nu_l \eta_R, \eta^\mp \rightarrow l_2^\mp \Sigma_1 \rightarrow l_2^\mp \eta_R \nu_l$	$2l + \cancel{E}_T$
	$\eta^\pm \rightarrow W^\pm \eta_R \rightarrow q_1 \bar{q}_2 \eta_R, \eta^\mp \rightarrow l^\mp \Sigma_1 \rightarrow l^\mp \eta_R \nu_l$	$1l + 2$ jets + \cancel{E}_T
$e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta_R \eta_I$	$\eta_I \rightarrow Z \eta_R \rightarrow l_1^\pm l_2^\mp \eta_R$	$2l + \cancel{E}_T$
$pp, e^+e^- \rightarrow \Sigma_1^\pm \Sigma_1^\mp$	$\Sigma_1^\pm \rightarrow \eta^\pm \nu_l \rightarrow \eta_R l_1^\pm \nu_l, \Sigma_1^\mp \rightarrow \eta^\mp \nu_l \rightarrow \eta_R l_2^\mp \nu_l$	$2l + \cancel{E}_T$
$pp \rightarrow \Sigma_1^\pm \Sigma_1^0$	$\Sigma_1^\pm \rightarrow \eta^\pm \nu_l \rightarrow \eta_R l^\pm \nu_l, \Sigma_1^0 \rightarrow \eta_R \nu_l$	$1l + \cancel{E}_T$

TABLE V. Summary of various signatures of the inert doublet members and the lightest triplet fermion at the lepton colliders and FCC-hh.




FIG. 9. Production cross-section of pair production of charged triplet fermion at lepton collider CLIC with centre-of-mass energy $\sqrt{s} = 3$ TeV for BR2.

through s -channel *via* exchange of W^\pm boson, as shown in Fig. 11.

Current experimental constraints from ATLAS and CMS provide a lower bound on the mass of the triplet fermion *i.e.* 790 GeV. If the triplet fermion is assumed to be a DM candidate, it satisfies the relic density requirements within the mass range of approximately 1.4–2.4 TeV. However, at such high masses, the production cross-section of the triplet fermion becomes exceedingly small, rendering it challenging to probe at the LHC with 13 TeV center-of-mass energy. Therefore, we utilize BR2 where scalar doublet is our DM candidate keeping the triplet fermion mass




FIG. 10. **Upper Panel:** Cross-section of di-leptonic decay process at ILC (**Left**) and CLIC (**Right**) for BR2. **Lower Panel:** The cross-section for the process $e^+e^- \rightarrow \Sigma_1^\pm \Sigma_1^\mp \rightarrow 2l + \cancel{E}_T$.

above 790 GeV at future FCC-hh with center-of-mass energy 100 TeV. Fig. 12 (upper panel) shows the production cross-section of pair production of the process $pp \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm \Sigma^\mp$ (left panel) and $pp \rightarrow \Sigma^\pm \Sigma^0$ (right panel). While the production rates are relatively suppressed for higher masses due to phase-space limitations and the Yukawa coupling's dependence on mass, these processes remain crucial for investigating the triplet fermion sector. Further, the triplet fermion can decay $\Sigma_1^\pm \rightarrow \eta^\pm \nu_l \rightarrow \eta_R l^\pm \nu_l, \Sigma_1^0 \rightarrow \eta_R \nu_l$ giving mono-leptonic and di-leptonic signatures at LHC as shown in Table V. The pair produced $\Sigma^\pm \Sigma^0$ can further decay mono-leptonically with missing energy. Fig. 12 (lower panel) depicts the cross-section of mono-leptonic decay of pair produced $\Sigma^\pm \Sigma^0$. Future high-energy collider FCC-hh, with enhanced luminosities and collision energies, could significantly improve the sensitivity to such signatures, offering a robust test of the triplet fermion's role in DM phenomenology.




FIG. 11. Feynman diagrams for the primary production mechanism for $\Sigma^+\Sigma^-$ and $\Sigma^\pm\Sigma^0$ pairs at the LHC also known as Drell-Yan process.




FIG. 12. **Upper Panel:** Production cross-section of triplet fermion through Drell-Yan process at FCC-hh with $\sqrt{s} = 100$ TeV. **Lower Panel:** The cross-section for the process $pp \rightarrow \Sigma_1^\pm \Sigma_1^0 \rightarrow 1l + \cancel{E}_T$.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have extended the Type-III scotogenic neutrino mass model by incorporating a real singlet scalar field. This enhancement enables the model to address challenges associated with Higgs inflation while simultaneously providing a viable framework for *cold* cosmic inflation. The inflationary mechanism operates analogously to Higgs inflation. The model provides a framework wherein inflaton field decays into the scalar doublet and fermion triplet at tree level and into Standard Model particles at the one-loop level involving the scalar doublet and fermion triplet in the loop, thus generating a thermal bath of SM particles. Assuming an inflaton mass much larger than the electroweak scale, the inflaton undergoes complete decay before the DM freeze-out, ensuring that DM relic density is not diluted or enhanced by the inflaton field. The dark sector of the model consists of two DM candidates: the real part of the neutral component of the scalar doublet and the neutral component of the triplet fermion. For the scalar doublet DM case, two distinct mass regions are viable: a low mass region near half Higgs mass and a medium mass region ranging from 550 GeV - 4.5 TeV. In the triplet fermion case, the correct relic density is obtained at around 2.4 TeV by considering annihilation channels. However, if the mass of other dark sector particles is close to the mass of the triplet neutral fermion, in which case the co-annihilation channels become important, opening up an extra parameter space ranging from 1.4 TeV - 2.4 TeV.

We, also, discuss the collider phenomenology of the model by presenting the cross-sections for various processes corresponding to two benchmark ranges: BR1, representing medium-mass scalar dark matter, and BR2, representing low-mass scalar dark matter, which satisfies all the theoretical constraints on the model. We analyse the model for both leptonic and hadronic colliders. Various decay modes and respective signatures at colliders are shown in Table V. The e^+e^- colliders, such as ILC and CLIC, are ideal for precise studies of weakly interacting particles and processes like $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta^+\eta^-$ and $e^+e^- \rightarrow \eta_R\eta_I$ can be studied with minimal background noise. Given the small production cross-section of the triplet fermion at the LHC, we evaluated our model at FCC-hh and found that the mono-leptonic decay of the triplet fermion, accompanied by missing energy, is a significant signature, as shown in Fig. 12. We found that the leading order production cross-section of low-mass scalar dark matter can be probed at both leptonic and hadronic colliders.

VIII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

LS acknowledges the financial support provided by the Council of Scientific and Industrial Research (CSIR) vide letter No. 09/1196(18553)/2024-EMR-I. SY acknowledges the funding support by the CSIR NET-SRF fellowship.

Appendix A: Feynman diagrams for annihilation/co-annihilation, production and detection of DM

In Figs. 13 to 16, we list the possible diagrams for production/annihilation of DM, relevant in the early universe, for the cases in which the DM is a doublet scalar or a triplet fermion, respectively. In Fig. 17, we show the direct detection prospects of the scalar doublet DM by exchange of a Higgs or Z bosons.




FIG. 13. Relevant diagrams (annihilation/co-annihilation channels) for computing the relic density of doublet scalar DM candidate.




FIG. 14. Annihilation channels for computing the relic density of triplet fermion DM candidate.




FIG. 15. Co-annihilation channels (with Σ^+) for computing the relic density of triplet fermion DM candidate.




FIG. 16. Co-annihilation channels for computing the relic density of triplet fermion DM candidate.




FIG. 17. Relevant diagrams for the direct detection of the doublet scalar DM candidate.

-
- [1] S. Navas *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Review of particle physics, *Phys. Rev. D* **110**, 030001 (2024).
- [2] N. Aghanim *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters, *Astron. Astrophys.* **641**, A6 (2020), [Erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)], [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [3] P. Hut, Limits on Masses and Number of Neutral Weakly Interacting Particles, *Phys. Lett. B* **69**, 85 (1977).
- [4] G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski, and K. Griest, Supersymmetric dark matter, *Phys. Rept.* **267**, 195 (1996), [arXiv:hep-ph/9506380](#).
- [5] G. Bertone, D. Hooper, and J. Silk, Particle dark matter: Evidence, candidates and constraints, *Phys. Rept.* **405**, 279 (2005), [arXiv:hep-ph/0404175](#).
- [6] P. Minkowski, $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ at a Rate of One Out of 10^9 Muon Decays?, *Phys. Lett. B* **67**, 421 (1977).
- [7] T. Yanagida, Horizontal gauge symmetry and masses of neutrinos, *Conf. Proc. C* **7902131**, 95 (1979).
- [8] S. L. Glashow, The Future of Elementary Particle Physics, *NATO Sci. Ser. B* **61**, 687 (1980).
- [9] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, Complex Spinors and Unified Theories, *Conf. Proc. C* **790927**, 315 (1979), [arXiv:1306.4669 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [10] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Nonconservation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 912 (1980).
- [11] Z.-j. Tao, Radiative seesaw mechanism at weak scale, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 5693 (1996), [arXiv:hep-ph/9603309](#).
- [12] E. Ma, Verifiable radiative seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass and dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 077301 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ph/0601225](#).
- [13] E. Ma and D. Suematsu, Fermion Triplet Dark Matter and Radiative Neutrino Mass, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **24**, 583 (2009), [arXiv:0809.0942 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [14] A. Batra, S. K. A, S. Mandal, H. Prajapati, and R. Srivastava, CDF-II W Boson Mass Anomaly in the Canonical Scotogenic Neutrino-Dark Matter Model (2022), [arXiv:2204.11945 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] J. Kubo, E. Ma, and D. Suematsu, Cold Dark Matter, Radiative Neutrino Mass, $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$, and Neutrinoless Double Beta Decay, *Phys. Lett. B* **642**, 18 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ph/0604114](#).
- [16] D. Aristizabal Sierra, J. Kubo, D. Restrepo, D. Suematsu, and O. Zapata, Radiative seesaw: Warm dark matter, collider and lepton flavour violating signals, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 013011 (2009), [arXiv:0808.3340 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [17] D. Suematsu, T. Toma, and T. Yoshida, Reconciliation of CDM abundance and $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ in a radiative seesaw model, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 093004 (2009), [arXiv:0903.0287 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [18] M. Hirsch, R. A. Lineros, S. Morisi, J. Palacio, N. Rojas, and J. W. F. Valle, WIMP dark matter as radiative neutrino mass messenger, *JHEP* **10**, 149, [arXiv:1307.8134 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] C. Bonilla, E. Ma, E. Peinado, and J. W. F. Valle, Two-loop Dirac neutrino mass and WIMP dark matter, *Phys. Lett. B* **762**, 214 (2016), [arXiv:1607.03931 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] A. Ahriche, A. Jueid, and S. Nasri, Radiative neutrino mass and Majorana dark matter within an inert Higgs doublet model, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 095012 (2018), [arXiv:1710.03824 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [21] Y. Cai, J. Herrero-García, M. A. Schmidt, A. Vicente, and R. R. Volkas, From the trees to the forest: a review of radiative neutrino mass models, *Front. in Phys.* **5**, 63 (2017), [arXiv:1706.08524 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] C. Bonilla, S. Centelles-Chuliá, R. Cepedello, E. Peinado, and R. Srivastava, Dark matter stability and Dirac neutrinos using only Standard Model symmetries, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 033011 (2020), [arXiv:1812.01599 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] A. Ahriche, A. Arhrib, A. Jueid, S. Nasri, and A. de La Puente, Mono-Higgs Signature in the Scotogenic Model with Majorana Dark Matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, 035038 (2020), [arXiv:1811.00490 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] I. M. Ávila, V. De Romeri, L. Duarte, and J. W. F. Valle, Phenomenology of scotogenic scalar dark matter, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80**, 908 (2020), [arXiv:1910.08422 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] S. Centelles Chuliá, R. Cepedello, E. Peinado, and R. Srivastava, Scotogenic dark symmetry as a residual subgroup of Standard Model symmetries, *Chin. Phys. C* **44**, 083110 (2020), [arXiv:1901.06402 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] S. Centelles Chuliá, R. Srivastava, and S. Yadav, CDF-II W boson mass in the Dirac Scotogenic model, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **38**, 10.1142/S0217732323500499 (2023), [arXiv:2206.11903 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] Tapender, S. Verma, and S. Kumar, On Lepton Flavor Violation and Dark Matter in Scotogenic model with Trimaximal Mixing, (2024), [arXiv:2402.16491 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] R. Kumar, N. Nath, and R. Srivastava, Cutting the scotogenic loop: adding flavor to dark matter, *JHEP* **12**, 036, [arXiv:2406.00188 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] S. Centelles Chuliá, R. Srivastava, and S. Yadav, Comprehensive Phenomenology of the Dirac Scotogenic Model: Novel Low Mass Dark Matter, (2024), [arXiv:2409.18513 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] A. Batra, S. K. A., S. Mandal, and R. Srivastava, W boson mass in singlet-triplet scotogenic dark matter model, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **38**, 2340003 (2023), [arXiv:2204.09376 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [31] L. Singh, D. Mahanta, and S. Verma, Low scale leptogenesis in singlet-triplet scotogenic model, *JCAP* **02**, 041, [arXiv:2309.12755 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [32] A. H. Guth, The Inflationary Universe: A Possible Solution to the Horizon and Flatness Problems, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 347 (1981).
- [33] W. Rindler, Visual Horizons in World Models, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **116**, 662 (1956).

- [34] H. Bondi and T. Gold, The Steady-State Theory of the Expanding Universe, *Mon. Not. Roy. Astron. Soc.* **108**, 252 (1948).
- [35] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (Planck), Planck 2013 results. XXII. Constraints on inflation, *Astron. Astrophys.* **571**, A22 (2014), [arXiv:1303.5082 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [36] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (BICEP2, Planck), Joint Analysis of BICEP2/*KeckArray* and *Planck* Data, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **114**, 101301 (2015), [arXiv:1502.00612 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [37] M. Sher, Electroweak Higgs Potentials and Vacuum Stability, *Phys. Rept.* **179**, 273 (1989).
- [38] J. L. F. Barbon and J. R. Espinosa, On the Naturalness of Higgs Inflation, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 081302 (2009), [arXiv:0903.0355 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [39] M. P. Hertzberg, On Inflation with Non-minimal Coupling, *JHEP* **11**, 023, [arXiv:1002.2995 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [40] D. I. Kaiser, Conformal Transformations with Multiple Scalar Fields, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 084044 (2010), [arXiv:1003.1159 \[gr-qc\]](#).
- [41] R. N. Lerner and J. McDonald, Unitarity-Violation in Generalized Higgs Inflation Models, *JCAP* **11**, 019, [arXiv:1112.0954 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] A. Linde, Inflationary Cosmology after Planck 2013, in *100e Ecole d'Ete de Physique: Post-Planck Cosmology* (2015) pp. 231–316, [arXiv:1402.0526 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [43] O. Lebedev, Y. Mambrini, and J.-H. Yoon, On unitarity in singlet inflation with a non-minimal coupling to gravity, *JCAP* **08**, 009, [arXiv:2305.05682 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [44] D. Borah, P. S. B. Dev, and A. Kumar, TeV scale leptogenesis, inflaton dark matter and neutrino mass in a scotogenic model, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 055012 (2019), [arXiv:1810.03645 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [45] D. Suematsu, Low scale leptogenesis in a hybrid model of the scotogenic type I and III seesaw models, *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 055008 (2019), [arXiv:1906.12008 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [46] T. Hashimoto and D. Suematsu, Inflation and DM phenomenology in a scotogenic model extended with a real singlet scalar, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 115041 (2020), [arXiv:2009.13057 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [47] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS), Search for Evidence of the Type-III Seesaw Mechanism in Multilepton Final States in Proton-Proton Collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 221802 (2017), [arXiv:1708.07962 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [48] A. M. Sirunyan *et al.* (CMS), Search for physics beyond the standard model in multilepton final states in proton-proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV, *JHEP* **03**, 051, [arXiv:1911.04968 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [49] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS), Search for type-III seesaw heavy leptons in dilepton final states in *pp* collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 218 (2021), [arXiv:2008.07949 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [50] G. Aad *et al.* (ATLAS), Search for type-III seesaw heavy leptons in leptonic final states in *pp* collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV with the ATLAS detector, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82**, 988 (2022), [arXiv:2202.02039](#)

[hep-ex].

- [51] S. Ashanujjaman and K. Ghosh, Type-III see-saw: Phenomenological implications of the information lost in decoupling from high-energy to low-energy, *Phys. Lett. B* **819**, 136403 (2021), [arXiv:2102.09536 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [52] H. Baer *et al.*, The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report - Volume 2: Physics, (2013), [arXiv:1306.6352 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [53] The Compact Linear Collider (CLIC) - Project Implementation Plan 4/2018, [10.23731/CYRM-2018-004](#) (2018), [arXiv:1903.08655 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [54] J. Kalinowski, W. Kotlarski, T. Robens, D. Sokolowska, and A. F. Zarnecki, Benchmarking the Inert Doublet Model for e^+e^- colliders, *JHEP* **12**, 081, [arXiv:1809.07712 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [55] J. Kalinowski, W. Kotlarski, T. Robens, D. Sokolowska, and A. F. Zarnecki, Exploring Inert Scalars at CLIC, *JHEP* **07**, 053, [arXiv:1811.06952 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [56] A. Belyaev, A. Freegard, I. F. Ginzburg, D. Locke, and A. Pukhov, Decoding dark matter at future e^+e^- colliders, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 015016 (2022), [arXiv:2112.15090 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [57] F. von der Pahlen, G. Palacio, D. Restrepo, and O. Zapata, Radiative Type III Seesaw Model and its collider phenomenology, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 033005 (2016), [arXiv:1605.01129 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [58] A. Das and S. Mandal, Bounds on the triplet fermions in type-III seesaw and implications for collider searches, *Nucl. Phys. B* **966**, 115374 (2021), [arXiv:2006.04123 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [59] A. Das, S. Mandal, and T. Modak, Testing triplet fermions at the electron-positron and electron-proton colliders using fat jet signatures, *Phys. Rev. D* **102**, 033001 (2020), [arXiv:2005.02267 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [60] R. N. Lerner and J. McDonald, Gauge singlet scalar as inflaton and thermal relic dark matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 123507 (2009), [arXiv:0909.0520 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [61] R. N. Lerner and J. McDonald, Distinguishing Higgs inflation and its variants, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 123522 (2011), [arXiv:1104.2468 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [62] D. Suematsu, Extension of a radiative neutrino mass model based on a cosmological view point, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 073008 (2012), [arXiv:1202.0656 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [63] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* (BICEP2, Keck Array), BICEP2 / Keck Array x: Constraints on Primordial Gravitational Waves using Planck, WMAP, and New BICEP2/Keck Observations through the 2015 Season, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 221301 (2018), [arXiv:1810.05216 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#).
- [64] J. A. Casas and A. Ibarra, Oscillating neutrinos and $\mu \rightarrow e, \gamma$, *Nucl. Phys. B* **618**, 171 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ph/0103065](#).
- [65] A. Ibarra and G. G. Ross, Neutrino phenomenology: The Case of two right-handed neutrinos, *Phys. Lett. B* **591**, 285 (2004), [arXiv:hep-ph/0312138](#).

- [66] F. Staub, Exploring new models in all detail with SARAH, *Adv. High Energy Phys.* **2015**, 840780 (2015), [arXiv:1503.04200 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [67] A. Vicente, Computer tools in particle physics, (2015), [arXiv:1507.06349 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [68] W. Porod and F. Staub, SPheno 3.1: Extensions including flavour, CP-phases and models beyond the MSSM, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **183**, 2458 (2012), [arXiv:1104.1573 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [69] G. Bélanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov, and A. Semenov, micrOMEGAs4.1: two dark matter candidates, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **192**, 322 (2015), [arXiv:1407.6129 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [70] C. Bonilla, L. M. G. de la Vega, J. M. Lamprea, R. A. Lineros, and E. Peinado, Fermion Dark Matter and Radiative Neutrino Masses from Spontaneous Lepton Number Breaking, *New J. Phys.* **22**, 033009 (2020), [arXiv:1908.04276 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [71] V. De Romeri, J. Nava, M. Puerta, and A. Vicente, Dark matter in the scotogenic model with spontaneous lepton number violation, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 095019 (2023), [arXiv:2210.07706 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [72] P. Bharadwaj, R. Kumar, H. K. Prajapati, R. Srivastava, and S. Yadav, Dark Matter Escaping Direct Detection Runs into Higgs Mass Hierarchy Problem (2024), [arXiv:2412.13301 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [73] A. Belyaev, G. Cacciapaglia, I. P. Ivanov, F. Rojas-Abatte, and M. Thomas, Anatomy of the Inert Two Higgs Doublet Model in the light of the LHC and non-LHC Dark Matter Searches, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 035011 (2018), [arXiv:1612.00511 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [74] Q.-H. Cao, E. Ma, and G. Rajasekaran, Observing the Dark Scalar Doublet and its Impact on the Standard-Model Higgs Boson at Colliders, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 095011 (2007), [arXiv:0708.2939 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [75] P. F. de Salas, D. V. Forero, S. Gariazzo, P. Martínez-Miravé, O. Mena, C. A. Ternes, M. Tórtola, and J. W. F. Valle, 2020 global reassessment of the neutrino oscillation picture, *JHEP* **02**, 071, [arXiv:2006.11237 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [76] E. Aprile *et al.* (XENON), First Dark Matter Search with Nuclear Recoils from the XENONnT Experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 041003 (2023), [arXiv:2303.14729 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [77] Y. Meng *et al.* (PandaX-4T), Dark Matter Search Results from the PandaX-4T Commissioning Run, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 261802 (2021), [arXiv:2107.13438 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [78] J. Aalbers *et al.* (LZ), First Dark Matter Search Results from the LUX-ZEPLIN (LZ) Experiment, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 041002 (2023), [arXiv:2207.03764 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [79] L. Lopez Honorez, E. Nezri, J. F. Oliver, and M. H. G. Tytgat, The Inert Doublet Model: An Archetype for Dark Matter, *JCAP* **02**, 028, [arXiv:hep-ph/0612275](#).
- [80] E. Lundstrom, M. Gustafsson, and J. Edsjo, The Inert Doublet Model and LEP II Limits, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 035013 (2009), [arXiv:0810.3924 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [81] E. Dolle, X. Miao, S. Su, and B. Thomas, Dilepton Signals in the Inert Doublet Model, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 035003 (2010), [arXiv:0909.3094 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [82] E. M. Dolle and S. Su, The Inert Dark Matter, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 055012 (2009), [arXiv:0906.1609 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [83] L. Lopez Honorez and C. E. Yaguna, The inert doublet model of dark matter revisited, *JHEP* **09**, 046, [arXiv:1003.3125 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [84] X. Miao, S. Su, and B. Thomas, Trilepton Signals in the Inert Doublet Model, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 035009 (2010), [arXiv:1005.0090 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [85] M. Gustafsson, S. Rydbeck, L. Lopez-Honorez, and E. Lundstrom, Status of the Inert Doublet Model and the Role of multileptons at the LHC, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 075019 (2012), [arXiv:1206.6316 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [86] A. Arhrib, R. Benbrik, and N. Gaur, $H \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ in Inert Higgs Doublet Model, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 095021 (2012), [arXiv:1201.2644 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [87] B. Swiezewska and M. Krawczyk, Diphoton rate in the inert doublet model with a 125 GeV Higgs boson, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 035019 (2013), [arXiv:1212.4100 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [88] A. Arhrib, Y.-L. S. Tsai, Q. Yuan, and T.-C. Yuan, An Updated Analysis of Inert Higgs Doublet Model in light of the Recent Results from LUX, PLANCK, AMS-02 and LHC, *JCAP* **06**, 030, [arXiv:1310.0358 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [89] M. Krawczyk, D. Sokolowska, P. Swaczyna, and B. Swiezewska, Constraining Inert Dark Matter by $R_{\gamma\gamma}$ and WMAP data, *JHEP* **09**, 055, [arXiv:1305.6266 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [90] G. Belanger, B. Dumont, A. Goudelis, B. Herrmann, S. Kraml, and D. Sengupta, Dilepton constraints in the Inert Doublet Model from Run 1 of the LHC, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 115011 (2015), [arXiv:1503.07367 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [91] P. Poulose, S. Sahoo, and K. Sridhar, Exploring the Inert Doublet Model through the dijet plus missing transverse energy channel at the LHC, *Phys. Lett. B* **765**, 300 (2017), [arXiv:1604.03045 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [92] A. Datta, N. Ganguly, N. Khan, and S. Rakshit, Exploring collider signatures of the inert Higgs doublet model, *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 015017 (2017), [arXiv:1610.00648 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [93] A. Belyaev, T. R. Fernandez Perez Tomei, P. G. Mercadante, C. S. Moon, S. Moretti, S. F. Novaes, L. Panizzi, F. Rojas, and M. Thomas, Advancing LHC probes of dark matter from the inert two-Higgs-doublet model with the monojet signal, *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 015011 (2019), [arXiv:1809.00933 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [94] T. Behnke *et al.*, The International Linear Collider Technical Design Report - Volume 1: Executive Summary, (2013), [arXiv:1306.6327 \[physics.acc-ph\]](#).
- [95] J. Alwall, R. Frederix, S. Frixione, V. Hirschi, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer, H. S. Shao, T. Stelzer, P. Torrielli, and M. Zaro, The automated computation of tree-level and next-to-leading order differential cross sections, and their matching to parton shower simulations, *JHEP* **07**, 079,

[arXiv:1405.0301 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [96] A. Abada *et al.* (FCC), FCC-hh: The Hadron Collider: Future Circular Collider Conceptual Design Report Volume 3, *Eur. Phys. J. ST* **228**, 755 (2019).