

Common origin of dark matter, baryon asymmetry and neutrino masses in the standard model with extended scalars

Sin Kyu Kang^{*1} and Raymundo Ramos^{†2}

¹*School of Natural Sciences, Seoultech, Seoul 01811, Korea*

²*Institute of Convergence Fundamental Studies, Seoultech, Seoul 01811, Korea*

Abstract

We propose a model that simultaneously addresses the existence of a dark matter candidate, baryon asymmetry and tiny neutrino masses and mixing by introducing two $SU(2)$ triplet scalars and an inert $SU(2)$ doublet scalar on top of the standard model. The two triplet scalars serve as mediators in generation of lepton asymmetry and determination of relic density of dark matter. They also play an essential role in generation of tiny neutrino masses and inducing CP violation. The inert scalar is regarded as a dark matter candidate. The interference due to complex Breit-Wigner propagators for the triplets will result in CP -asymmetry that depends on the difference between their masses and a relative complex phase between their couplings to standard model leptons. Moreover, the production of lepton asymmetry will be closely tied to the evolution of dark matter, limiting the parameter space where the correct relic abundance and matter-antimatter asymmetry can be simultaneously accomplished.

^{*}skkang@seoultech.ac.kr

[†]rayramosang@gmail.com

1 Introduction

Significant progress has been made in recent decades in accumulating evidence suggesting the presence of a mysterious, non-luminous form of matter known as dark matter (DM) in the current universe. Its quantity is estimated to be approximately five times greater than that of ordinary luminous or baryonic matter, denoted as $\Omega_B \simeq 5\%$ [1]. Among various new physics proposals for DM, the paradigm of weakly interacting massive particles (WIMPs) remains the most extensively studied scenario. In this scenario, a DM candidate, typically with a mass on the electroweak (EW) scale and interaction rates similar to EW interactions, can account for the correct DM relic abundance.

On the other hand, the generation of baryon asymmetry [2] through the out-of-equilibrium decay of a heavy particle has long been a well-established mechanism for baryogenesis [3,4]. An intriguing approach to implement such a mechanism is through leptogenesis [5], where an initial net leptonic asymmetry is generated and subsequently converted into baryon asymmetry through $B + L$ -violating EW sphaleron transitions. Remarkably, this scenario has the advantage of producing the necessary lepton asymmetry within the framework of the seesaw mechanism, which also provides an explanation for the origin of the minuscule neutrino masses [6]. This represents yet another observed phenomenon that remains unaddressed by the Standard Model (SM).

Recently, it was proposed that non-zero asymmetry could also be generated by tree-level 2-to-2 scatterings mediated by unstable particles with interfering diagrams [7]. The main idea is to have CP -asymmetry generated by complex couplings and decay widths in the propagators. By taking two initial states to be DM and allowing the scattering process to violate lepton number, we can make the generation of baryon asymmetry via leptogenesis intimately correlated with the DM relic density.

In this work, we take this idea to bring together a DM candidate and baryon asymmetry by introducing an inert $SU(2)$ doublet (like in the inert Higgs doublet model(IDM) [8–11]) and two $SU(2)$ triplet scalars that will have Yukawa couplings with a relative non-zero complex phase. We show that the tiny neutrino masses can be generated via inverse type-II seesaw mechanism [16–20]. The inert doublet with Z_2 symmetry serves as a DM candidate and two triplets play essential roles in generation of neutrino masses and lepton asymmetry that is correlated with the DM relic density. The numerical study conducted in this work illustrates that the model we propose can explain a DM candidate, baryon asymmetry and neutrino masses

and mixing including CP violation, simultaneously.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows: in Sec. 2 we describe the main details of extending the SM with an inert doublet and two triplets, in Sec. 3 we present the contributions from the Yukawa couplings between triplets and leptonic doublets, in Sec. 4 the origin of asymmetry in this model and its relation to DM is demonstrated, while in Sec. 5 we present the corresponding numerical results for successful benchmark points, finally, in Sec. 6 we summarize and conclude. Other relevant details about the scalar potential of the model are given in Appendix A.

2 Two scalar triplets and an inert doublet in the standard model

We propose new physics beyond the SM by introducing two $SU(2)$ scalar triplets and an inert $SU(2)$ doublet, together with an additional Z_2 symmetry. Due to the odd charge of inert doublet under Z_2 , the dark sector is kept separated from the SM sector. The additional scalar triplets will have even charges under the new Z_2 symmetry. The triplets will also contribute to generate neutrino masses via a non-zero vacuum expectation value (VEV). The decomposition of the scalars of the model is as follows:

$$\Phi_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(h_1 + v) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi_2 = \begin{pmatrix} H^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(H^0 + iA^0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Delta_n = \begin{pmatrix} \delta_n^+/\sqrt{2} & \delta_n^{++} \\ \delta_n^0 + u_n/\sqrt{2} & -\delta_n^+/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

with $n \in \{1, 2\}$. More details about the scalar potential, including minimization, are given in Appendix A. The VEVs of Φ_1 and Δ_n are represented by v and u_n , respectively. Following the notation of Ref. [12], we will express the VEVs of Δ_1 and Δ_2 as $u_1 = u \cos \beta$ and $u_2 = u \sin \beta$, with $u = \sqrt{u_1^2 + u_2^2}$. One part of the scalar potential, of critical importance to the masses of neutrinos and leptogenesis, is the presence of trilinear terms between one doublet and two triplets

$$V \supset \sum_{n=1}^2 \left[M_n^2 \text{Tr} \left(\Delta_n^\dagger \Delta_n \right) + \left(\sum_{m=1}^2 \mu_{nm} \Phi_m^T i\sigma^2 \Delta_n^\dagger \Phi_m + \text{H.c.} \right) \right], \quad (2)$$

where the part between parenthesis breaks a global $U(1)$ symmetry in the potential. Minimization of the potential relates M_n^2 with μ_{n1} as

$$M_1^2 \approx \frac{\mu_{11}v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \cos \beta}, \quad M_2^2 \approx \frac{\mu_{21}v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \sin \beta}. \quad (3)$$

It is obvious from Eq. (3) that u can be small when M_n^2 is large and/or μ_{n1} is small. Taking μ_{n1} to be small is technically natural in the sense that the global $U(1)$ symmetry is recovered

in the limit of vanishing μ_{n1} . This is an *inverse type-II seesaw* generating tiny neutrino masses. The smallness of u is responsible for tiny neutrino masses. On the side of the couplings to Φ_2 , given by the terms with μ_{n2} , we find that these terms correspond to trilinear vertices that will appear in s -channel scatterings communicating the dark sector with the leptonic sector of the SM, with Δ_n as mediators.

3 Leptonic couplings to the scalar triplets

The scalar triplets can couple to left-handed lepton $SU(2)$ doublets, L_j . We can write the following Yukawa terms

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}} = \sum_{n=1}^2 \sum_{j,k} Y_{jk}^{\Delta_n} L_j^T \mathcal{C}^\dagger i\tau_2 \Delta_n L_k + \text{H.c.}, \quad (4)$$

where the indices j and k run over flavor indices $\{e, \mu, \tau\}$, and Y^{Δ_n} can be understood as 3×3 complex matrices of Yukawa couplings. The charge conjugation matrix is represented by \mathcal{C} , and τ_2 is the second Pauli matrix. Alas, this type of configuration is known to result in flavor changing neutral currents [13]. To alleviate this effect, we can apply an alignment condition to the Yukawa couplings, such that $Y^{\Delta_2} = \xi Y^{\Delta_1}$, with ξ a complex coefficient. For convenience, let us define $Y^\Delta \equiv Y^{\Delta_1} = Y^{\Delta_2} \xi^{-1}$. Then, we can rewrite Eq. (4) as

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}} = \sum_{j,k} Y_{jk}^\Delta L_j^T \mathcal{C}^\dagger i\tau_2 (\Delta_1 + \xi \Delta_2) L_k + \text{H.c.} \quad (5)$$

3.1 Neutrino masses

After the triplets Δ_n have acquired expectation values, the mass terms can be read off from \mathcal{L}_{Yuk} and can be expressed as elements of a 3×3 symmetric mass matrix

$$M_{jk}^\nu = \sqrt{2} Y_{jk}^\Delta u \cos \beta (1 + \xi \tan \beta). \quad (6)$$

In the basis where charged lepton masses are diagonal, this matrix can be diagonalized by the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) matrix, U_{PMNS}

$$U_{\text{PMNS}}^T M^\nu U_{\text{PMNS}} = \text{diag}(m_1^\nu, m_2^\nu, m_3^\nu) \equiv M_d^\nu. \quad (7)$$

Using Eqs. (6) and (7), we can use the measured oscillation parameters to constrain U_{PMNS} and M_d^ν and relate them to the model parameters in \mathcal{L}_{Yuk} with

$$\sqrt{2}Y_{jk}^\Delta u \cos \beta (1 + \xi \tan \beta) = \left(U_{\text{PMNS}}^* M_d^\nu U_{\text{PMNS}}^\dagger \right). \quad (8)$$

The right hand side of the equation above can be partially determined from measured mixing angles, CP -violating Dirac phase and neutrino squared mass differences. Additionally, two relative Majorana phases, ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , need to be set to fully determine U_{PMNS} . To fully determine M_d^ν , a value for the lightest neutrino mass needs to be assumed. Note that in Eq. (6), assuming the factor $\sqrt{2} \cos \beta (1 + \xi \tan \beta)$ is of $\mathcal{O}(1)$, for the Yukawa couplings Y_{jk}^Δ to be also $\mathcal{O}(1)$ we would rely on u to set the mass scale of the neutrinos. With this argument we can expect u to be below 1 eV.

3.2 Couplings between leptons and scalars

From Eq. (4), we also obtain couplings between components of the triplets and leptons. Neutral scalar fields couple to pairs of neutrinos, singly charged scalar fields couple to one charged lepton and one neutrino and doubly charged fields couple to pairs of charged leptons. Using the decomposition of the triplets shown in Eq. (1), we can write such couplings from \mathcal{L}_{Yuk}

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}} \supset Y_{jk}^\Delta \left[-\bar{\nu}_j^C \nu_k (\delta_1^0 + \xi \delta_2^0) + \sqrt{2} \bar{\nu}_j^C \ell_k (\delta_1^+ + \xi \delta_2^+) + \bar{\ell}_j^C \ell_k (\delta_1^{++} + \xi \delta_2^{++}) \right] + \text{H.c.} \quad (9)$$

These couplings, together with the trilinear couplings to Φ_2 , contained in Eq. (2), communicate the dark sector to the leptonic sector of the SM. The fields in Δ_1 and Δ_2 work as mediators in these scatterings. The way in which matter-antimatter asymmetry can be achieved from unstable Δ_1 and Δ_2 with different masses, and from the relative phase produced by ξ , will be described in the next section.

4 Origin of asymmetry

Following Ref. [7], lepton asymmetry in this model is achieved via interference effects between scatterings mediated by unstable fields. The case presented here corresponds to interference between two s -channel processes, labeled (i) in Sec. II of said reference. Consider the trilinear coupling of Eq. (2) and the couplings between triplet and leptons in Eq. (5). These couplings




Figure 1: Feynman diagrams for processes mediated by Δ_n with interference that contributes to matter asymmetry.

make possible the communication between the dark sector and the SM leptonic sector, via the Feynman diagrams displayed in Fig. 1. Two important elements to achieve asymmetry due to interference are the complex Yukawa coupling, most importantly through the relative phase contained in ξ , and the presence of non-zero decay width in the Breit-Wigner propagators of the triplets. From Ref. [7] we have a CP -asymmetry factor

$$\delta \equiv |\mathcal{M}|^2 - |\bar{\mathcal{M}}|^2 = -4\text{Im}[\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_2^*] \text{Im}[\mathcal{M}_1\mathcal{M}_2^*] |\mathcal{W}|^2, \quad (10)$$

where we can identify

$$\text{Im}[\mathcal{C}_1\mathcal{C}_2^*] = |Y_{jk}^\Delta|^2 \text{Im}[\mu_{12}\mu_{22}^*\xi^*], \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Im}[\mathcal{M}_1\mathcal{M}_2^*] \propto \frac{(s - M_{\Delta_1}^2) M_{\Delta_2} \Gamma_{\Delta_2} - (s - M_{\Delta_2}^2) M_{\Delta_1} \Gamma_{\Delta_1}}{\left[(s - M_{\Delta_1}^2)^2 + M_{\Delta_1}^2 \Gamma_{\Delta_1}^2 \right] \left[(s - M_{\Delta_2}^2)^2 + M_{\Delta_2}^2 \Gamma_{\Delta_2}^2 \right]}, \quad (12)$$

and \mathcal{W} contains wave functions for incoming and outgoing particles. As mentioned before, two critical characteristics that can be readily identified from Eqs. (11) and (12), are a non-zero $\text{Im}[\mu_{12}\mu_{22}^*\xi^*]$ —or at least for ξ if we assumed the scalar potential parameters to be real—and non-zero decay widths for mediators. Note also, that if the mediators shared the same masses and decay widths, δ would vanish and, with it, asymmetry. Moreover, this asymmetry is dependent on scatterings of the dark sector scalars and, therefore, it will be affected by the evolution of DM.

4.1 Lepton asymmetry and dark matter

As described in the last section, the generation of asymmetry in the leptonic sector of the SM requires 2-to-2 scatterings between dark sector particles and SM leptons. The contributing

processes are

$$\Phi_2^0 + \Phi_2^0 \rightarrow \delta_n^0 \rightarrow \nu_j + \nu_k, \quad (13)$$

$$H^+ + \Phi_2^0 \rightarrow \delta_n^+ \rightarrow \ell_j + \nu_k, \quad (14)$$

$$H^+ + H^+ \rightarrow \delta_n^{++} \rightarrow \ell_j + \ell_k, \quad (15)$$

where Φ_2^0 is used to represent neutral fields in Φ_2 . In principle, these processes can contribute to the evolution of DM, but we will find later that their contribution would be negligible. The rest of the processes contributing to DM annihilation are the usual annihilation to pairs of SM fermions and to vector bosons W^\pm and Z . The Boltzmann equations that describe the evolution of DM and leptonic asymmetry are

$$\frac{dY_{\Phi_2}}{dx} = \frac{-s}{H(x)x} (Y_{\Phi_2}^2 - Y_{\text{eq},\Phi_2}^2) \langle \sigma v \rangle (\Phi_2 \Phi_2 \rightarrow \text{SM SM}), \quad (16)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{dY_{\Delta L}}{dx} = & \frac{s}{H(x)x} [(Y_{\Phi_2}^2 - Y_{\text{eq},\Phi_2}^2) \langle \sigma v \rangle_\delta (\Phi_2 \Phi_2 \rightarrow LL) \\ & - 2Y_{\Delta L} Y_{\text{eq},\Phi_2}^2 Y_{\text{eq},\ell}^{-1} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{tot}} (\Phi_2 \Phi_2 \rightarrow LL) \\ & - 2Y_{\Delta L} Y_{\text{eq},\Phi_2} \langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{tot}} (\Phi_2 \bar{L} \rightarrow \Phi_2^* L)] \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $x = m_{L\Phi_2}/T$ with $m_{L\Phi_2}$ standing for the lightest component of Φ_2 , and $Y_{(eq),k} = n_{(eq),k}/s$ the (equilibrium) number densities normalized to entropy density, s , for particle k . The quantities $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ are thermally averaged cross sections times velocity. We also used

$$H(x) = \sqrt{\frac{8\pi^3 g_*(T)}{90}} \frac{m_{L\Phi_2}^2}{x^2 M_{\text{Pl}}} \quad (18)$$

where g_* is the number of relativistic degrees of freedom at temperature T and M_{Pl} is the Planck scale. Necessarily, coannihilations have to be considered in all $\langle \sigma v \rangle$ and Φ_2 stands for all the components taking part in the scatterings. The averaged cross sections used in Eq. (17) are defined as

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle_\delta (\Phi_2 \Phi_2 \rightarrow LL) \equiv \langle \sigma v \rangle (\Phi_2 \Phi_2 \rightarrow LL) - \langle \sigma v \rangle (\Phi_2^* \Phi_2^* \rightarrow \bar{L}\bar{L}), \quad (19)$$

$$\langle \sigma v \rangle_{\text{tot}} (\Phi_2 \Phi_2 \rightarrow LL) \equiv \langle \sigma v \rangle (\Phi_2 \Phi_2 \rightarrow LL) + \langle \sigma v \rangle (\Phi_2^* \Phi_2^* \rightarrow \bar{L}\bar{L}). \quad (20)$$

Parameter	BP1	BP2
u [10^{-11} GeV]	0.8598	1.129
$\tan\beta$	1.521	0.7533
μ_{11} [10^{-9} GeV]	1.317	4.391
μ_{21} [10^{-9} GeV]	1.421	2.231
μ_{12} [10^{-1} GeV]	1.534	2.650
μ_{22} [10^{-1} GeV]	1.868	3.255
$ \xi $	1.686	2.461
$\text{ang}(\xi)$ [rad]	1.434	1.666
ϕ_1 [rad]	-1.770	0.8743
ϕ_2 [rad]	0.5042	1.950
m_{H^0} [TeV]	1.5	2.0
m_{A^0} [TeV]	1.503	2.003
M_{H^\pm} [TeV]	1.506	2.006
λ_A	0.21	0.3
m_{ν_1} [eV]		10^{-3}
M_{12}^2 [GeV 2]		$(10^{-6})^2$

Table 1: Numerical parameters for two benchmark points, labeled BP1 and BP2, used to solve Eqs. (16) and (17). The corresponding solutions for Ωh^2 and $Y_{\Delta B} = -(28/51)Y_{\Delta L}$ are shown in Fig. 2. We have assumed normal hierarchy for the neutrino mass, i.e., ν_1 is the lightest neutrino mass eigenstate. In our calculation we have used $\lambda_A = \lambda_{\Phi 12} + \lambda'_{\Phi 12} - \lambda_5$.

Solving Eqs. (16) and (17) we obtain the evolution of the number density of DM and the evolution of the leptonic asymmetry, $Y_{\Delta L}$. Then we can convert the leptonic asymmetry to baryonic asymmetry, $Y_{\Delta B}$, via the standard electroweak sphaleron process [14], by considering the relationship $Y_{\Delta B} = -(28/51)Y_{\Delta L}$ [15] at the sphaleron temperature $T_{\text{sph}} = 131.7 \pm 2.3$ GeV [21]. Considering the requirement that the washout processes freeze-out before DM do, the most appropriate mass order for the lightest state of Φ_2 is above $\mathcal{O}(0.1)$ TeV, where the main annihilation channel is to W^\pm boson pair. In this mass range, annihilation into fermions is subleading and therefore expected to freeze-out before DM. This puts DM mass in the region where degeneracy is required to achieve the correct relic density. Recent measurements put the relic density at $\Omega h^2 = 0.120 \pm 0.001$, and the observed baryon number asymmetry at $Y_{\Delta B} = (8.718 \pm 0.004) \times 10^{-11}$ [1].

5 Numerical results

To test that it is possible to achieve correct relic density and baryon asymmetry simultaneously we implement the model presented in Secs. 2 and 3 in CalcHEP [22] to calculate squared amplitudes and decay widths. These are used to calculate the averaged cross sections required in Eqs. (16) and (17). Aformentioned equations are solved numerically for two benchmark points presented in Table 1, with the resulting evolution depicted in Fig. 2.

	BP1	BP2
$Y_{(1,1)}^\Delta$	$0.1589 + i0.01129$	$-0.0451 - i0.1547$
$Y_{(1,2)}^\Delta$	$-0.0145 + i0.3615$	$0.0630 + i0.08962$
$Y_{(1,3)}^\Delta$	$-0.2073 + i0.1130$	$0.1527 + i0.2377$
$Y_{(2,2)}^\Delta$	$0.358 - i1.348$	$-0.8976 - i0.8025$
$Y_{(2,3)}^\Delta$	$0.065 - i1.342$	$-0.6755 - i0.4886$
$Y_{(3,3)}^\Delta$	$0.2826 - i0.98834$	$-0.6686 - i0.6317$
M_{Δ_1} [GeV]	3458	4569
M_{Δ_2} [GeV]	2911	3753
σ_{SI} [cm ²]	6.984×10^{-46}	8.02×10^{-46}

Table 2: Relevant numerical results for the benchmark points of Table 1.




Figure 2: Evolution of the relic density, Ωh^2 , and the asymmetry $Y_{\Delta B} = -(28/51)Y_{\Delta L}$, for the benchmark points given in Table 1. Horizontal dotted lines represent the central values for current measurements, $\Omega h^2 = 0.120 \pm 0.001$ and $Y_{\Delta B} = (8.718 \pm 0.004) \times 10^{-11}$. The vertical dashed line is the central value for the sphaleron temperature, $T_{\text{sph}} = 131.7 \pm 2.3$ GeV.

While the number of parameters present in the scalar potential of Appendix A is enormous, in practice only a few parameters will actually have an important effect. In the case of the parameters μ_{nm} , they are expected to have strong effects due to their relationship to the masses of the components of Δ_1 and Δ_2 (for μ_{11} and μ_{21}), and the presence of μ_{12} and μ_{22} in Eq. (11). From that same equation, it is obvious that a non-zero phase for ξ will be necessary. It is also expected that u and β play an important role since they communicate the scalar sector and the neutrino masses. In the case of the parameters of U_{PMNS} , we have taken the Majorana phases ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 as free parameters, while $\sin^2 \theta_{12,13,23}$ and the Dirac CP -violating phase have been fixed to their central values given in the latest global fit by NuFIT (5.2) [23, 24]. To determine the values of M_d^ν , we fix the value of the lightest neutrino, which we have chosen to be ν_1 (normal




Figure 3: Interaction rates at equilibrium over Hubble parameter, $n_{\text{eq},\Phi_2}\langle\sigma v\rangle/H$, for the two benchmark points (BP1: dashed, BP2: dotted). The brown lines correspond to the interaction $(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow \text{SM SM})$, magenta lines are for the difference $(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow LL)_{\delta}$ and green lines are for the total $(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow LL)_{\text{tot}}$, with these last two interaction rates defined in Eqs. (19) and (20), respectively. Due to interference, the lines for $(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow LL)_{\delta}$ and $(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow LL)_{\text{tot}}$ are almost overlapping.

hierarchy), and obtain the other two using the central values of Δm_{21}^2 and Δm_{31}^2 from the same global fit. One can consider the case of inverted hierarchy, but no significant change in results is obtained.

One of the most notable features of the parameters in Table 1, is the size of u (10^{-11} GeV), the sizes of μ_{n1} (10^{-9} GeV) and the sizes of μ_{n2} (10^{-1} GeV). First of all, consider the processes depicted in Fig. 1, with vertices proportional to the Yukawa couplings, Y_{jk}^{Δ} , and μ_{n2} . By inspection of Eq. (6), achieving neutrino masses below $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ eV})$ without strongly suppressing Y_{jk}^{Δ} , requires a small value for u instead. On the same footing, the values for μ_{n2} have to be chosen in a mass scale where they allow for a sizable contribution from the interference of the processes in Fig. 1. The resulting values for Y_{jk}^{Δ} are given in Table 2. Considering that u has $\mathcal{O}(10^{-11} \text{ GeV})$, to avoid the suppression from massive Δ_n in the propagators of the same processes, from Eqs. (63) and (64) (or, equivalently, Eq. (3)) we know that the two values of μ_{n1} have to be small as well. In the case of the benchmark points of Table 2, μ_{n1} of $\mathcal{O}(10^{-9} \text{ GeV})$ results in masses of $\mathcal{O}(1 \text{ TeV})$, as shown in Table 2.

As can be seen in the left pane of Fig. 2, the evolution of DM relic density is quite standard. This is expected from the form of Eq. (16), which is standard by itself. We can see that the onset of freeze-out of DM is at a temperature around $T_f^{-1} \sim 10^{-2} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, which is consistent

with $x_f \approx 27$ for the two benchmark points. By looking at the brown taller lines in Fig. 3 we see that this x_f matches the expectation drawn from the size of $\langle\sigma v\rangle(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow \text{SM SM})$. On the right pane of Fig. 2 we show the evolution of $Y_{\Delta B} = -(28/51)Y_{\Delta L}$. One notable feature of this figure is the presence of an accelerated evolution when approaching the sphaleron temperature, $T_{\text{sph}} = 131.7$ GeV. This is due to the DM contribution in Eq. (17) as it starts deviating from Y_{eq,Φ_2} when approaching x_f . For both benchmark points, in Fig. 3 we can see that the interaction rates to lepton pairs become smaller than H before the cross section to pairs of all SM particles do. This is convenient since we want the washout process to fall behind the universe expansion before the freeze-out of DM. Note that, in Fig. 3, the $(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow LL)$ and $(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow \text{SM SM})$ interaction rates fall below H for temperatures that are very close. This ensures a larger contribution for $Y_{\Delta L}$ from DM falling out of chemical equilibrium. Next, we comment on the interaction rates over Hubble parameter $(n_{\text{eq},\Phi_2}\langle\sigma v\rangle/H)$, obtained with the benchmark points of Table 1 and displayed in Fig. 3. As pointed out in Sec. 4.1, the decay rate dominant for DM evolution, $\Phi_2 + \Phi_2 \rightarrow \text{SM} + \text{SM}$, is several orders of magnitude larger than the washout process, $\Phi_2 + \Phi_2 \rightarrow L + L$. Moreover, with the choice of μ_{nm} of Table 1, the $\langle\sigma v\rangle_{\delta}(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow LL)$ has almost the same value as the sum of contributions $\langle\sigma v\rangle_{\text{tot}}(\Phi_2\Phi_2 \rightarrow LL)$. This is due to the same interference effects that result in a non-zero CP -asymmetry in Eq. (10), and is what allows the large growth of $Y_{\Delta B}$, displayed in Fig. 2.

Lastly, the two main experimental probes on this model would be comprised of search for the decays of the doubly charged scalar and limits on direct detection of DM. On the side of searches for the doubly charged scalar, ATLAS and CMS report mass limits slightly below 1 TeV [25, 26]. Having all the components of Δ_1 and Δ_2 with masses above TeV puts them in a safe place for these searches. In the case of direct detection of DM, we use `micrOMEGAS` [27] to calculate spin independent direct detection cross sections, σ_{SI} , and report the values in Table 2. By comparing against limits from the XENON1T experiment [28, 29], we see that for DM masses of 1.5 TeV and 2 TeV, the obtained values for σ_{SI} are safely below exclusion limits.

6 Conclusion

Three of the most salient shortcomings of the SM are matter asymmetry, the presence of massive neutrinos and the existence of DM. In this work we have demonstrated that these three problems can be explained with a scalar sector extended by two $SU(2)$ triplets and one inert doublet, via

the inverse type-II seesaw mechanism. The two triplet scalars participate in producing light neutrino masses via the type-II seesaw mechanism, resulting in 2-to-2 scatterings that violate lepton number. The use of an inert doublet includes an explanation for DM while also aiding in the accumulation of lepton asymmetry that is later converted to baryon asymmetry via the standard sphaleron process. The accumulation of baryon asymmetry is mostly controlled by the four possible trilinear couplings between two doublets and one triplet. On one hand, the couplings to the SM-like doublet have to be quite small to avoid very massive triplets. On the other hand, the couplings to the inert doublet are required to be comparatively larger to allow enough communication between the dark sector and the lepton number violating processes that are responsible for matter asymmetry. Similarly, the Yukawa couplings that also appear in said processes, if assumed to be $\mathcal{O}(1)$, require a very small value for the VEVs of the triplets, in order to achieve very light masses for the neutrinos. For the benchmark points presented here, direct detection cross section is well in reach of future experiments [30–33], while the masses of the triplets may still be above the reach of near-future colliders [34].

Acknowledgments

The work of R.R. was supported by the National Research Foundation of Korea under grant NRF-2021R1A2C4002551.

A Extended scalar sector

The scalar potential we consider includes two $SU(2)_L$ triplets, Δ_1 and Δ_2 , and one inert $SU(2)_L$ doublet, Φ_2 , in addition to the Higgs doublet of the SM, Φ_1 . The decomposition of the scalar fields is given explicitly in Eq. (1). We also consider an additional Z_2 symmetry under which

Φ_2 is odd while the rest of the fields are even. The most general potential can be written as:

$$V = V_{\text{IDM}} + V_{\Delta} + V_{H\Delta} + V_{\text{SB}} \quad (21)$$

$$V_{\text{IDM}} = -m_{\Phi_1}^2 \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 + m_{\Phi_2}^2 \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 + \lambda_{\Phi_1} (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)^2 + \lambda_{\Phi_2} (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 \\ + \lambda_{\Phi_{12}} \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 + \lambda'_{\Phi_{12}} \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1 + \lambda_5 \text{Re} \left[(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 \right] \quad (22)$$

$$V_{\Delta} = \sum_{n=1}^2 \left\{ M_n^2 \text{Tr} \left(\Delta_n^\dagger \Delta_n \right) + \lambda_{\Delta_n} \text{Tr} \left[\left(\Delta_n^\dagger \Delta_n \right)^2 \right] + \lambda'_{\Delta_n} \left[\text{Tr} \left(\Delta_n^\dagger \Delta_n \right) \right]^2 \right\} \\ + \lambda_{\Delta_{12}} \text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_1 \Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_2) + \lambda'_{\Delta_{12}} \text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_1) \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_2) \\ + \lambda_{\Delta_{21}} \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_2 \Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_1) + \lambda'_{\Delta_{21}} \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_2) \text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_1) \quad (23)$$

$$V_{\Phi\Delta} = \sum_{n=1}^2 \sum_{k=1}^2 \left[\lambda_{\Phi_k \Delta_n} \Phi_k^\dagger \Phi_k \text{Tr} \left(\Delta_n^\dagger \Delta_n \right) + \lambda'_{\Phi_k \Delta_n} \Phi_k^\dagger \Delta_n \Delta_n^\dagger \Phi_k \right] \quad (24)$$

$$V_{\text{SB}} = \sum_{m=1}^2 \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^2 \mu_{nm} \Phi_m^T i \sigma^2 \Delta_n^\dagger \Phi_m + \lambda_{\Phi_k \Delta_{12}} \Phi_m^\dagger \Phi_m \text{Tr} \left(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_2 \right) + \lambda'_{\Phi_k \Delta_{12}} \Phi_m^\dagger \Delta_1 \Delta_2^\dagger \Phi_m \right\} \\ M_{12}^2 \text{Tr} \left(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_2 \right) + \sum_{ijkl} \left[\lambda_{ijkl} \text{Tr} \left(\Delta_i^\dagger \Delta_j \Delta_k^\dagger \Delta_l \right) + \lambda'_{ijkl} \text{Tr} \left(\Delta_i^\dagger \Delta_j \right) \left(\Delta_k^\dagger \Delta_l \right) \right] + \text{H.c.} \quad (25)$$

The terms in V_{SB} break a global $U(1)$ symmetry. The combination of indices (i, j, k, l) can take the values $(2,1,1,1)$, $(1,2,1,1)$, $(1,2,2,2)$, $(2,1,2,2)$ and $(1,2,1,2)$; other combinations belong to the H.c. part of the potential. After electroweak symmetry breaking, the scalar fields Φ_1 , Δ_1 and Δ_2 acquire VEVs of the form

$$\langle \Phi_1 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ v \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle \Delta_n \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ u_n & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (26)$$

similarly to Ref. [12], we will use $u_1^2 + u_2^2 = u^2$, with $u_1 = u \cos \beta$, $u_2 = u \sin \beta$ and $\tan \beta = u_2/u_1$. The VEVs must follow the condition $v^2 + 2u^2 \approx (246 \text{ GeV})^2$ which limits u to be below 8 GeV due to constraints on the ρ parameter. From the first derivatives of the potential we can find

the following conditions

$$0 = \lambda_{\Phi 1} v^2 - m_{\Phi 1}^2 + u^2 (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 1}^q \cos^2 \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 2}^q \sin^2 \beta + 2\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \cos \beta \sin \beta) - \sqrt{2}u (\mu_{11} \cos \beta + \mu_{21} \sin \beta) \quad (27)$$

$$0 = u^3 [(\lambda_{12}^q + \lambda_{1212}^q) \cos \beta \sin^2 \beta + \lambda_1^q \cos^3 \beta + 3(\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cos^2 \beta \sin \beta + (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \sin^3 \beta] + u [M_1^2 \cos \beta + M_{12}^2 \sin \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2 \sin \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 1}^q v^2 \cos \beta] - \frac{\mu_{11}}{\sqrt{2}} v^2 \quad (28)$$

$$0 = u^3 [(\lambda_{12}^q + \lambda_{1212}^q) \cos^2 \beta \sin \beta + \lambda_2^q \sin^3 \beta + 3(\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \cos \beta \sin^2 \beta + (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cos^3 \beta] + u [M_2^2 \sin \beta + M_{12}^2 \cos \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2 \cos \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 2}^q v^2 \sin \beta] - \frac{\mu_{21}}{\sqrt{2}} v^2 \quad (29)$$

where we used the following definitions

$$\lambda_n^q \equiv \lambda_{\Delta n} + \lambda'_{\Delta n}, \quad (30)$$

$$\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta n}^q \equiv (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta n} + \lambda'_{\Phi 1 \Delta n})/2, \quad (31)$$

$$\lambda_{12}^q \equiv (\lambda_{\Delta 12} + \lambda_{\Delta 21} + \lambda'_{\Delta 12} + \lambda'_{\Delta 21})/2, \quad (32)$$

$$\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \equiv (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12} + \lambda'_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12})/2, \quad (33)$$

$$\lambda_{1212}^q \equiv \lambda_{1212} + \lambda'_{1212} \quad (34)$$

$$\lambda_{2111}^q \equiv (\lambda_{2111} + \lambda_{1211})/2, \quad (35)$$

$$\lambda_{2111}^{q'} \equiv (\lambda'_{2111} + \lambda'_{1211})/2, \quad (36)$$

$$\lambda_{1222}^q \equiv (\lambda_{1222} + \lambda_{2122})/2, \quad (37)$$

$$\lambda_{1222}^{q'} \equiv (\lambda'_{1222} + \lambda'_{2122})/2. \quad (38)$$

From these conditions we can rewrite $m_{\Phi 1}^2$, M_1^2 and M_2^2 as

$$m_{\Phi 1}^2 = \lambda_{\Phi 1} v^2 + u^2 (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 1}^q \cos^2 \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 2}^q \sin^2 \beta + 2\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \cos \beta \sin \beta) - \sqrt{2}u (\mu_{11} \cos \beta + \mu_{21} \sin \beta) \quad (39)$$

$$M_1^2 = -u^2 \cos^2 \beta [\lambda_1^q + 3(\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \tan \beta + (\lambda_{12}^q + \lambda_{1212}^q) \tan^2 \beta + (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan^3 \beta] - v^2 (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 1}^q + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \tan \beta) - M_{12}^2 \tan \beta + \frac{\mu_{11} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \cos \beta} \quad (40)$$

$$M_2^2 = -u^2 \sin^2 \beta [\lambda_2^q + 3(\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \cot \beta + (\lambda_{12}^q + \lambda_{1212}^q) \cot^2 \beta + (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot^3 \beta] - v^2 (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 2}^q + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \cot \beta) - M_{12}^2 \cot \beta + \frac{\mu_{21} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \sin \beta} \quad (41)$$

A.1 Neutral states masses

Consider the following expansion of the neutral states:

$$\delta_n^0 = \frac{\rho_n + i\eta_n}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (42)$$

We can take the base of the neutral states as $S_{\text{even}}^0 = (h_1, \rho_1, \rho_2)$. In such a basis, we have a 3×3 mass matrix for the CP -even neutral scalars, M_{even}^2 , which is symmetric and has elements given by:

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{11} = 2\lambda_{\Phi 1} v^2 \quad (43)$$

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{12} = v \left[2u (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 1}^q \cos \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \sin \beta) - \sqrt{2}\mu_{11} \right] \quad (44)$$

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{13} = v \left[2u (\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 2}^q \sin \beta + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \cos \beta) - \sqrt{2}\mu_{21} \right] \quad (45)$$

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{22} = u^2 \cos^2 \beta \left[2\lambda_1^q + 3(\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \tan \beta - (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan^3 \beta \right] \\ + \frac{\mu_{11} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \cos \beta} - (M_{12}^2 + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2) \tan \beta \quad (46)$$

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{23} = u^2 \cos \beta \sin \beta \left[2(\lambda_{12}^q + \lambda_{1212}^q) + 3(\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan \beta + 3(\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot \beta \right] \\ + M_{12}^2 + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2 \quad (47)$$

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{33} = u^2 \sin^2 \beta \left[2\lambda_2^q + 3(\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \cot \beta - (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot^3 \beta \right] \\ + \frac{\mu_{21} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \sin \beta} - (M_{12}^2 + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2) \cot \beta. \quad (48)$$

For the CP -odd states we can take the basis $S_{\text{odd}}^0 = (\eta_1, \eta_2)$, obtaining the mass matrix elements

$$(M_{\text{odd}}^2)_{11} = -u^2 \sin^2 \beta \left[2\lambda_{1212}^q + (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan \beta + (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot \beta \right] \\ + \frac{\mu_{11} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \cos \beta} - (M_{12}^2 + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2) \tan \beta \quad (49)$$

$$(M_{\text{odd}}^2)_{12} = u^2 \cos \beta \sin \beta \left[2\lambda_{1212}^q + (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan \beta + (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot \beta \right] \\ + M_{12}^2 + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2 \quad (50)$$

$$(M_{\text{odd}}^2)_{22} = -u^2 \cos^2 \beta \left[2\lambda_{1212}^q + (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan \beta + (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot \beta \right] \\ + \frac{\mu_{21} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \sin \beta} - (M_{12}^2 + \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q v^2) \cot \beta. \quad (51)$$

The rest of the neutral scalars do not mix and the squared masses are given by the expressions

$$m_{H^0}^2 = u^2 \left[(\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 1} + \lambda'_{\Phi 2\Delta 1}) \frac{\cos^2 \beta}{2} + (\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 2} + \lambda'_{\Phi 2\Delta 2}) \frac{\sin^2 \beta}{2} + (\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 12} + \lambda'_{\Phi 2\Delta 12}) \cos \beta \sin \beta \right] - \sqrt{2}u(\mu_{12} \cos \beta + \mu_{22} \sin \beta) + m_{\Phi 2}^2 + \frac{v^2}{2} (\lambda_{\Phi 12} + \lambda'_{\Phi 12} + \lambda_5) \quad (52)$$

$$m_{A^0}^2 = u^2 \left[(\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 1} + \lambda'_{\Phi 2\Delta 1}) \frac{\cos^2 \beta}{2} + (\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 2} + \lambda'_{\Phi 2\Delta 2}) \frac{\sin^2 \beta}{2} + (\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 12} + \lambda'_{\Phi 2\Delta 12}) \cos \beta \sin \beta \right] + \sqrt{2}u(\mu_{12} \cos \beta + \mu_{22} \sin \beta) + m_{\Phi 2}^2 + \frac{v^2}{2} (\lambda_{\Phi 12} + \lambda'_{\Phi 12} - \lambda_5) \quad (53)$$

In this case, the difference between the masses of these two scalars is given by

$$m_{A^0}^2 - m_{H^0}^2 = -\lambda_5 v^2 + 2\sqrt{2}u(\mu_{12} \cos \beta + \mu_{22} \sin \beta) \quad (54)$$

which is positive (negative) when H_0 (A_0) is the DM candidate.

A.2 Charged states masses

In the scalar potential we have three single charged scalars, H^\pm , δ_1^\pm and δ_2^\pm ; and two doubly charged scalars, $\delta_1^{\pm\pm}$ and $\delta_2^{\pm\pm}$. The usual charged Higgs present in two Higgs doublet models does not mix with other charged scalars and its squared mass is given by

$$M_{H^\pm}^2 = m_{\Phi 2}^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\Phi 12} v^2}{2} + u^2 \sin \beta \cos \beta \left(\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 12} + \frac{\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 1}}{2} \cot \beta + \frac{\lambda_{\Phi 2\Delta 2}}{2} \tan \beta \right). \quad (55)$$

Note that the terms additional to the mass in the original IDM have a factor of u^2 . Since we expect $u^2 \ll v^2$ these extra terms can be considered small corrections. The two single-charge scalars from the triplets mix and the 2×2 matrix has the followings elements

$$(M_{\delta^\pm}^2)_{11} = u^2 \sin^2 \beta \left[\frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 12}}{4} - \frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 21}}{4} - \frac{\lambda_{12}^q}{2} - \lambda_{1212}^q - (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan \beta - (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot \beta \right] - M_{12}^2 \tan \beta - v^2 \left(\lambda_{\Phi 1\Delta 12}^q \tan \beta + \frac{\lambda'_{\Phi 1\Delta 1}}{4} \right) + \frac{\mu_{11} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \cos \beta}, \quad (56)$$

$$(M_{\delta^\pm}^2)_{12} = u^2 \sin \beta \cos \beta \left(-\frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 12}}{4} + \frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 21}}{4} + \frac{\lambda_{12}^q}{2} + \lambda_{1212}^q + (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan \beta + (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot \beta \right) + M_{12}^2 + v^2 \left(\lambda_{\Phi 1\Delta 12}^q - \frac{\lambda'_{\Phi 1\Delta 12}}{4} \right), \quad (57)$$

$$(M_{\delta^\pm}^2)_{22} = u^2 \cos^2 \beta \left(\frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 12}}{4} - \frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 21}}{4} - \frac{\lambda_{12}^q}{2} - \lambda_{1212}^q - (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \tan \beta - (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \cot \beta \right) - M_{12}^2 \cot \beta - v^2 \left(\lambda_{\Phi 1\Delta 12}^q \cot \beta + \frac{\lambda'_{\Phi 1\Delta 2}}{4} \right) + \frac{\mu_{21} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \sin \beta}. \quad (58)$$

The doubly charged scalars mix with each other resulting in the following matrix elements

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{\delta^{\pm\pm}}^2)_{11} &= u^2 \cos^2 \beta \left[\lambda'_{\Delta 1} - \lambda_1^q - \tan \beta (3\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) - \tan^2 \beta \left(\lambda_{12}^q + \lambda_{1212}^q - \frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 12}}{2} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \tan^3 \beta (\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) \right] + v^2 \left(\frac{\mu_{11}}{\sqrt{2}u \cos \beta} - \frac{\lambda'_{\Phi 1 \Delta 1}}{2} - \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \tan \beta \right) \\
&\quad - M_{12}^2 \tan \beta
\end{aligned} \tag{59}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{\delta^{\pm\pm}}^2)_{12} &= u^2 \sin \beta \cos \beta \left[\frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 21}}{2} + \lambda'_{1212} + \lambda_{1222}^{q'} \tan \beta + \lambda_{2111}^{q'} \cot \beta \right] \\
&\quad + M_{12}^2 + v^2 \left(\lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q - \frac{\lambda'_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}}{2} \right)
\end{aligned} \tag{60}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
(M_{\delta^{\pm\pm}}^2)_{22} &= u^2 \sin^2 \beta \left[\lambda'_{\Delta 2} - \lambda_2^q - \cot \beta (3\lambda_{1222}^q + \lambda_{1222}^{q'}) - \cot^2 \beta \left(\lambda_{12}^q + \lambda_{1212}^q - \frac{\lambda'_{\Delta 12}}{2} \right) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - \cot^3 \beta (\lambda_{2111}^q + \lambda_{2111}^{q'}) \right] + v^2 \left(\frac{\mu_{21}}{\sqrt{2}u \sin \beta} - \frac{\lambda'_{\Phi 1 \Delta 2}}{2} - \lambda_{\Phi 1 \Delta 12}^q \cot \beta \right) \\
&\quad - M_{12}^2 \cot \beta
\end{aligned} \tag{61}$$

A.3 The no-mixing limit

In the case where $u \ll v$ and assuming that the couplings in V_{SB} are smaller than other couplings in the potential, the non diagonal terms in mass matrices shown in this appendix become subleading contributions. We can call this *the no-mixing limit*. A small value for u can be justified by the need of having small neutrino masses while small couplings in V_{SB} can be considered due to naturalness [35]. The leading contributions to the diagonal elements are

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{11} = 2\lambda_{\Phi 1} v^2 \tag{62}$$

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{22} = (M_{\text{odd}}^2)_{11} = (M_{\delta^\pm}^2)_{11} = (M_{\delta^{\pm\pm}}^2)_{11} = \frac{\mu_{11} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \cos \beta} \tag{63}$$

$$(M_{\text{even}}^2)_{33} = (M_{\text{odd}}^2)_{22} = (M_{\delta^\pm}^2)_{22} = (M_{\delta^{\pm\pm}}^2)_{22} = \frac{\mu_{21} v^2}{\sqrt{2}u \sin \beta}, \tag{64}$$

With all the diagonal elements suppressed either by u or couplings from V_{SB} . The squared mass of the SM-like Higgs, m_h^2 , can be identified with $2\lambda_{\Phi 1} v^2$. In the case of the triplets, all the masses of the fields in each triplet become degenerated and we can write $M_{\Delta 1}^2 = \mu_{11} v^2 / \sqrt{2}u \cos \beta$ and $M_{\Delta 2}^2 = \mu_{21} v^2 / \sqrt{2}u \sin \beta$, for all the scalars contained in the triplets. In the case of the masses for the dark scalars, H_0 , A_0 and H^\pm , it is easy to see that their masses fallback to the values in the original IDM.

References

- [1] 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 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#)].
- [2] A. D. Sakharov, *Violation of CP Invariance, C asymmetry, and baryon asymmetry of the universe*, [Pisma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz.](#) **5**, 32-35 (1967).
- [3] S. Weinberg, *Cosmological Production of Baryons*, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](#) **42** (1979) 850–853.
- [4] E. W. Kolb and S. Wolfram, *Baryon Number Generation in the Early Universe*, [Nucl. Phys.](#) **B172** (1980) 224 [Erratum: [Nucl. Phys.](#) **B195**, 542(1982)].
- [5] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, *Baryogenesis Without Grand Unification*, [Phys. Lett.](#) **B174** (1986) 45–47.
- [6] R. L. Workman *et al.* [Particle Data Group], *Review of Particle Physics*, [PTEP](#) **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [7] 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**, no.5, 055009 (2020) [[arXiv:1911.03013 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [8] N. G. Deshpande and E. Ma, *Pattern of Symmetry Breaking with Two Higgs Doublets*, [Phys. Rev. D](#) **18**, 2574 (1978).
- [9] 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 (2007) [[arXiv:hep-ph/0612275 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [10] 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**, no.3, 035011 (2018) [[arXiv:1612.00511 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [11] M. Gustafsson, *The Inert Doublet Model and Its Phenomenology*, [PoS CHARGED2010](#), 030 (2010) [[arXiv:1106.1719 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [12] P. M. Ferreira, B. L. Gonçalves and F. R. Joaquim, *The hidden side of scalar-triplet models with spontaneous CP violation*, [JHEP](#) **05**, 105 (2022) [[arXiv:2109.13179 \[hep-ph\]](#)].

- [13] A. Pich and P. Tuzon, *Yukawa Alignment in the Two-Higgs-Doublet Model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 091702 (2009) [[arXiv:0908.1554 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [14] V. A. Kuzmin, V. A. Rubakov and M. E. Shaposhnikov, *On the Anomalous Electroweak Baryon Number Nonconservation in the Early Universe*, *Phys. Lett. B* **155**, 36 (1985)
- [15] J. A. Harvey and M. S. Turner, *Cosmological baryon and lepton number in the presence of electroweak fermion number violation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 3344-3349 (1990).
- [16] L. F. Li, Y. Liu and L. Wolfenstein, *Hidden Higgs Particles*, *Phys. Lett. B* **159** (1985), 45-48.
- [17] M. Lusignoli, A. Masiero and M. Roncadelli, *Spontaneous versus explicit breaking of a continuous global symmetry*, *Phys. Lett. B* **252** (1990), 247-250.
- [18] C. A. de S.Pires, *Explicitly broken lepton number at low energy in the Higgs triplet model*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **21** (2006), 971-978 [[arXiv:hep-ph/0509152 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [19] F. F. Freitas, C. A. de S. Pires and P. S. Rodrigues da Silva, *Inverse type II seesaw mechanism and its signature at the LHC and ILC*, *Phys. Lett. B* **769** (2017), 48-56 [[arXiv:1408.5878 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [20] C. A. de Sousa Pires, F. Ferreira De Freitas, J. Shu, L. Huang and P. Wagner Vasconcelos Olegário, *Implementing the inverse type-II seesaw mechanism into the 3-3-1 model*, *Phys. Lett. B* **797** (2019), 134827 [[arXiv:1812.10570 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [21] M. D'Onofrio, K. Rummukainen and A. Tranberg, *Sphaleron Rate in the Minimal Standard Model*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, no.14, 141602 (2014) [[arXiv:1404.3565 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [22] A. Belyaev, N. D. Christensen and A. Pukhov, *CalcHEP 3.4 for collider physics within and beyond the Standard Model*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **184**, 1729-1769 (2013) [[arXiv:1207.6082 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [23] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni and T. Schwetz, *NuFIT: Three-Flavour Global Analyses of Neutrino Oscillation Experiments*, *Universe* **7**, no.12, 459 (2021) [[arXiv:2111.03086 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [24] NuFIT, <http://www.nu-fit.org/>

- [25] [CMS], *A search for doubly-charged Higgs boson production in three and four lepton final states at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, [CMS-PAS-HIG-16-036](#).
- [26] M. Aaboud *et al.* [ATLAS], *Search for doubly charged Higgs boson production in multi-lepton final states with the ATLAS detector using proton–proton collisions at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, no.3, 199 (2018) [[arXiv:1710.09748 \[hep-ex\]](#)].
- [27] G. Belanger, A. Mjallal and A. Pukhov, *Recasting direct detection limits within micrOMEGAs and implication for non-standard Dark Matter scenarios*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, no.3, 239 (2021) [[arXiv:2003.08621 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [28] E. Aprile *et al.* [XENON], *First Dark Matter Search Results from the XENON1T Experiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, no.18, 181301 (2017) [[arXiv:1705.06655 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#)].
- [29] E. Aprile *et al.* [XENON], *Dark Matter Search Results from a One Ton-Year Exposure of XENON1T*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, no.11, 111302 (2018) [[arXiv:1805.12562 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#)].
- [30] D. S. Akerib *et al.* [LZ], *Projected WIMP sensitivity of the LUX-ZEPLIN dark matter experiment*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101**, no.5, 052002 (2020) [[arXiv:1802.06039 \[astro-ph.IM\]](#)].
- [31] H. Zhang *et al.* [PandaX], *Dark matter direct search sensitivity of the PandaX-4T experiment*, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.* **62**, no.3, 31011 (2019) [[arXiv:1806.02229 \[physics.ins-det\]](#)].
- [32] E. Aprile *et al.* [XENON], *Projected WIMP sensitivity of the XENONnT dark matter experiment*, *JCAP* **11**, 031 (2020) [[arXiv:2007.08796 \[physics.ins-det\]](#)].
- [33] J. Billard, M. Boulay, S. Cebrián, L. Covi, G. Fiorillo, A. Green, J. Kopp, B. Majorovits, K. Palladino and F. Petricca, *et al.* *Direct detection of dark matter—APPEC committee report**, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **85**, no.5, 056201 (2022) [[arXiv:2104.07634 \[hep-ex\]](#)].
- [34] T. B. de Melo, F. S. Queiroz and Y. Villamizar, *Doubly Charged Scalar at the High-Luminosity and High-Energy LHC*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **34**, no.27, 1950157 (2019) [[arXiv:1909.07429 \[hep-ph\]](#)].
- [35] G. 't Hooft, *Naturalness, chiral symmetry, and spontaneous chiral symmetry breaking*, *NATO Sci. Ser. B* **59**, 135-157 (1980).