

# Loop corrections to dark matter direct detection in a pseudoscalar mediator dark matter model

Tomohiro Abe,<sup>a,b</sup> Motoko Fujiwara<sup>c</sup> and Junji Hisano<sup>b,c,d</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Institute for Advanced Research, Nagoya University,  
Furo-cho Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi, 464-8602 Japan*

<sup>b</sup>*Kobayashi-Maskawa Institute for the Origin of Particles and the Universe,  
Nagoya University,  
Furo-cho Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi, 464-8602 Japan*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics, Nagoya University,  
Furo-cho Chikusa-ku, Nagoya, Aichi, 464-8602 Japan*

<sup>d</sup>*Kavli IPMU (WPI), UTIAS, University of Tokyo,  
Kashiwa, Chiba 277-8584, Japan*

*E-mail:* [abetomo@kmi.nagoya-u.ac.jp](mailto:abetomo@kmi.nagoya-u.ac.jp), [motoko@eken.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp](mailto:motoko@eken.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp),  
[hisano@eken.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp](mailto:hisano@eken.phys.nagoya-u.ac.jp)

**ABSTRACT:** If dark matter (DM) is a fermion and its interactions with the standard model particles are mediated by pseudoscalar particles, the tree-level amplitude for the DM-nucleon elastic scattering is suppressed by the momentum transfer in the non-relativistic limit. At the loop level, on the other hand, the spin-independent contribution to the cross section appears without such suppression. Thus, the loop corrections are essential to discuss the sensitivities of the direct detection experiments for the model prediction. The one-loop corrections were investigated in the previous works. However, the two-loop diagrams give the leading order contribution to the DM-gluon effective operator ( $\bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}$ ) and have not been correctly evaluated yet. Moreover, some interaction terms which affect the scattering cross section were overlooked. In this paper, we show the cross section obtained by the improved analysis and discuss the region where the cross section becomes large.

**KEYWORDS:** Beyond Standard Model, Cosmology of Theories beyond the SM, Effective Field Theories

ARXIV EPRINT: [1810.01039](https://arxiv.org/abs/1810.01039)

---

**Contents**

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Model</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>3</b>	<b>Direct detection</b>	<b>6</b>
3.1	Triangle diagrams	8
3.2	Box diagrams	9
3.2.1	DM-quark scalar operators from box diagrams	9
3.2.2	DM-gluon scalar operator from box diagrams	10
<b>4</b>	<b>Numerical analysis</b>	<b>11</b>
4.1	Determination of $g_\chi$ through the DM thermal relic abundance	12
4.2	Comparison with the previous results	13
4.3	The DM-nucleon scattering cross section	14
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>18</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Scalar trilinear couplings</b>	<b>20</b>
<b>B</b>	<b>Details of the calculations of the box diagrams</b>	<b>21</b>
B.1	The derivation of $C_q^{\text{box}}$ , $C_q^{(1)\text{box}}$ , and $C_q^{(2)\text{box}}$	21
B.2	The derivation of $C_G^{\text{box}}$	23
<b>C</b>	<b>Loop functions</b>	<b>24</b>
C.1	$B$ functions	24
C.2	$X$ functions	25
C.3	$Y$ functions	26
C.4	$C_2, D_3$ functions	26
C.5	$\partial F(m_a^2)/\partial m_a^2$ in loop functions	27

---

**1 Introduction**

Weakly Interacting Massive Particles (WIMPs) are popular dark matter (DM) candidates and often appear in models beyond the standard model (BSM). A variety of models have been studied in the literature. They typically predict scattering processes between DM and nucleon with a sizable cross section which can be detected experimentally. There are many DM direct detection experiments such as the LUX [1], PandaX-II [2], and XENON1T experiments [3]. The significant DM signals have not been reported yet, and these experiments give severe upper bounds on the DM-nucleon spin-independent (SI) scattering cross

section ( $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$ ). This fact gives a strong constraint for the parameter space of the models which predict a WIMP as a DM candidate.

A pseudoscalar coupling with fermion DM is a simple way to avoid these strong constraints from the DM direct detection experiments [4, 5],

$$\bar{\chi}i\gamma^5\chi s, \tag{1.1}$$

where  $\chi$  is a fermion as a DM candidate and  $s$  is a scalar mediator connecting the DM and the standard model (SM) sector. In the non-relativistic limit, this interaction term predicts the suppression of the tree-level DM-nucleon scattering amplitude by the momentum transfer. On the other hand, the amplitude for DM annihilation processes is predicted as  $s$ -wave. Therefore the interaction term in eq. (1.1) has desirable features for WIMP models, namely models can evade the strong constraints from the DM direct detection experiments while keeping the annihilation cross section to explain the amount of the DM in our universe as a thermal relic abundance.

A pseudoscalar mediator model [6] is one of the simplest models which predict the interaction term in eq. (1.1), and its phenomenology has been widely studied [7–14]. In the model,  $\chi$  is a gauge singlet fermion, and  $s$  is a gauge singlet pseudoscalar. The Higgs sector is extended into the two-Higgs doublet models (THDMs) to make the gauge singlet pseudoscalar interact with the SM sector at the renormalizable level. CP invariance is assumed in the DM and the mediator sectors.<sup>1</sup>

In this model,  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is generated at the loop level [6, 11, 13, 14]. Although  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is suppressed by the loop factors and is smaller than the current upper bounds from the direct detection experiments, it can be larger than the neutrino floor [19] and can be detected by the future DM direct detection experiments. Therefore it is essential to evaluate the cross section at the loop level. However,  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  has been calculated without including some relevant interaction terms in [6, 11, 13, 14]. Moreover, two-loop diagrams which induce the DM-gluon effective operator,  $\bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}$ , have not been correctly calculated as was mentioned in [11].

In this paper, we give a complete set for the leading order calculations in the pseudoscalar mediator DM model.<sup>2</sup> We take into account all of the renormalizable interaction terms. We find that quartic interaction terms between the pseudoscalar and the SM Higgs bosons, which have been ignored in [6, 11], are important to enhance  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$ . As a result of the enhancement, the model can be detected by the XENONnT [20], LZ [21], and DARWIN experiments [22] in some parameter regions. We also calculate the relevant two-loop diagrams for the DM-gluon effective operators. In [11], the contribution was estimated from the one-loop box diagrams by using a relation between a heavy quark scalar-type operator and a gluon scalar-type operator [23] without justification. We find that the contributions from the charm and bottom quarks were underestimated, while the contribution from the

---

<sup>1</sup>If the DM and/or the mediator sector breaks the CP invariance, the mediator can have renormalizable interactions with the SM sector without extending the Higgs sector into the THDMs, see for example [15–18].

<sup>2</sup> $\chi$  is a Dirac fermion in [6, 11, 13, 14]. In this paper, however, we consider  $\chi$  as a Majorana fermion to make the model much simpler. Qualitative features are the same both in the Dirac and the Majorana cases.

top quark was overestimated in [11]. In the end, we clarify that the contribution from the box diagrams is subdominant and the triangle diagrams dominate the scattering process.

The structure of this paper is as follows: in section 2, we introduce the gauge invariant renormalizable model which contains the pseudoscalar mediators [6]. In section 3, we derive the effective operators which induce the DM-nucleon SI scattering. In section 4, we show our numerical results. We compare our result with the previous one in [11], and then search the parameter space where  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  becomes large enough to reach the prospects of the direct detection experiments. Our conclusions are in section 5. In appendix A, we show explicit formulas for scalar trilinear couplings which are defined in section 2. In appendix B, we write the details of the derivation of the effective operators for SI scattering between DM and quarks/gluon. In appendix C, we define the loop functions used in section 3.

## 2 Model

In this section, we briefly review the pseudoscalar mediator DM model [6]. The model contains a gauge singlet Majorana fermion  $\chi$  as a DM candidate and a gauge singlet pseudoscalar boson  $a_0$  as a mediator field. The DM can be expressed using Weyl spinor  $\psi$  as follows:

$$\chi = \begin{pmatrix} \psi \\ \psi^\dagger \end{pmatrix}. \tag{2.1}$$

The Higgs sector is also extended into a THDM, which contains two  $SU(2)_L$  doublet scalar fields  $H_j$  ( $j = 1, 2$ ) with a hypercharge  $Y = 1/2$ .

We assume a  $Z_2$  symmetry to stabilize the DM candidate. Under this  $Z_2$  symmetry,  $\chi$  is odd, and all the other fields are even. The interaction terms of the DM and scalar fields are given by

$$\mathcal{L} \supset + i \frac{g_\chi}{2} a_0 \bar{\chi} \gamma^5 \chi - (V_{\text{THDM}} + V_{a_0} + V_{\text{port}}), \tag{2.2}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{THDM}} = & m_1^2 H_1^\dagger H_1 + m_2^2 H_2^\dagger H_2 - m_3^2 (H_1^\dagger H_2 + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \frac{\lambda_1}{2} (H_1^\dagger H_1)^2 + \frac{\lambda_2}{2} (H_2^\dagger H_2)^2 + \lambda_3 (H_1^\dagger H_1)(H_2^\dagger H_2) + \lambda_4 (H_1^\dagger H_2)(H_2^\dagger H_1) \\ & + \frac{\lambda_5}{2} [(H_1^\dagger H_2)^2 + \text{h.c.}], \end{aligned} \tag{2.3}$$

$$V_{a_0} = \frac{1}{2} m_{a_0}^2 a_0^2 + \frac{\lambda_{a_0}}{4} a_0^4, \tag{2.4}$$

$$V_{\text{port}} = \kappa (i a_0 H_1^\dagger H_2 + \text{h.c.}) + c_1 a_0^2 H_1^\dagger H_1 + c_2 a_0^2 H_2^\dagger H_2. \tag{2.5}$$

Here we assume CP invariance in eq. (2.2), and therefore all the parameters in eq. (2.2) are real. We also assume a softly broken  $Z_4$  symmetry to avoid flavor changing Higgs couplings at the tree-level. This symmetry is an extension of the softly broken  $Z_2$  symmetry often

	$Q_L^i, L_L^i$	$u_R^i$	$d_R^i$	$e_R^i$
Type-I	+	-	-	-
Type-II	+	-	+	+
Type-X	+	-	-	+
Type-Y	+	-	+	-

**Table 1.** The charge assignments of the  $Z_4$  symmetry for the SM fermions, where  $Q_L^i, L_L^i, u_R^i, d_R^i$ , and  $e_R^i$  are the  $i$ -th generation of the left-handed quark, the left-handed lepton, the right-handed up-type quark, the right-handed down-type quark, and the right-handed charged lepton, respectively ( $i = 1, 2, 3$ ).

assumed in studies of the THDMs [24–26] to avoid flavor changing scalar couplings [27].<sup>3</sup> Under this  $Z_4$  symmetry, each field is transformed as follows:

$$\psi \mapsto i\psi, \tag{2.6}$$

$$a_0 \mapsto -a_0, \tag{2.7}$$

$$H_1 \mapsto H_1, \tag{2.8}$$

$$H_2 \mapsto -H_2. \tag{2.9}$$

For the SM fermions, there are four variations in charge assignments as summarized in table 1. This  $Z_4$  symmetry is softly broken by the DM mass term as well as the  $m_3^2$  term in  $V_{\text{THDM}}$ .<sup>4</sup>

As can be seen from the scalar potential,  $a_0$  is mixed with the CP-odd scalar in the THDM sector after the electroweak symmetry breaking, and thus the DM interacts with the SM particles by exchanging the pseudoscalar particles. This interaction structure is crucial to evade the direct detection constraints as we mentioned in the introduction.

Note that the interaction terms proportional to  $c_i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ) were not included in the analysis of [6] and [11]. Although the existence of these interaction terms was pointed out in [13], they also neglected these terms in their analysis. As we will see in later, however, the effect of the  $c_2$  term plays an important role in a DM-nucleon scattering process for the DM direct detection experiments.

The field definitions of the Higgs doublets are as follows:

$$H_j = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_j^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v_j + \rho_j + i\eta_j) \end{pmatrix} \quad (j = 1, 2), \tag{2.10}$$

where  $v_j$  is the vacuum expectation value of each doublet field. We introduce  $\tan \beta$  as the ratio of  $v_1$  and  $v_2$ ,

$$\tan \beta = \frac{v_2}{v_1}, \quad v^2 = v_1^2 + v_2^2, \tag{2.11}$$

<sup>3</sup>For the analysis without any discrete symmetry to forbid the flavor changing scalar couplings, see [28].

<sup>4</sup>This  $Z_4$  symmetry is different from the  $Z_2$  symmetry for the DM stability which we mentioned above.

where  $v \simeq 246$  GeV, the vacuum expectation value of the SM Higgs boson. For simplicity, we use  $t_\beta$  as an abbreviation for  $\tan \beta$ . We assume that  $a_0$  has no vacuum expectation value. Then, the scalar mass eigenstates are given from the weak eigenstates as follows:

$$\begin{pmatrix} G^\pm \\ H^\pm \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & \sin \beta \\ -\sin \beta & \cos \beta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^\pm \\ \phi_2^\pm \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.12)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} H \\ h \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \alpha & \sin \alpha \\ -\sin \alpha & \cos \alpha \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \rho_1 \\ \rho_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.13)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} G_0 \\ A \\ a \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ 0 & -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \cos \beta & \sin \beta & 0 \\ -\sin \beta & \cos \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ a_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.14)$$

where  $G^\pm$  and  $G_0$  are would-be Nambu Goldstone bosons for  $W^\pm$  and  $Z$ , respectively. There is the following relation between  $\theta$  and  $\kappa$ .<sup>5</sup>

$$\sin 2\theta = \frac{-2\kappa v}{m_A^2 - m_a^2}, \quad (2.15)$$

where  $m_a$  and  $m_A$  are the mass eigenvalues of the pseudoscalar states  $a$  and  $A$ , respectively.

In the following discussion, we take the alignment limit  $\sin(\beta - \alpha) \rightarrow 1$  where arbitrary values of  $t_\beta$  are allowed from the latest LHC constraints [29, 30].<sup>6</sup> Under this limit, the interactions of  $h$  are similar to those of the SM-Higgs boson. We also assume  $m_H = m_{H_\pm} = m_A$  to avoid constraints from the electroweak precision measurements by enhancing the custodial symmetry. Under this setup, the free parameters of this model are as follows:

$$\{m_\chi, g_\chi, m_a, m_A, \theta, t_\beta, c_1, c_2\}. \quad (2.16)$$

In the following, we briefly review the constraints on these parameters. In this paper, we focus on the parameter regions which are allowed for all the THDM types. The lower bound on the charged Higgs boson mass is  $m_{H_\pm} > 580$  GeV from  $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$  for the type-II THDM [31], and thus we take  $m_H = m_{H_\pm} = m_A = 600$  GeV as the benchmark point. With this choice, we find that  $8 \lesssim t_\beta \lesssim 15$  [32, 33] and take  $t_\beta = 10$  as the benchmark point. As for the light pseudoscalar mass, we find  $m_a > m_h/2$  from the constraint on the Higgs branching ratio [29, 34] as discussed in section 4.3. Since the loop corrections to  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is smaller for the larger  $m_a$ , we focus on  $m_a \lesssim 100$  GeV. We have checked that  $\theta$  is not constrained with these parameters [9] and simply take the same value as in [11].

<sup>5</sup>Note that the overall sign disagrees with the expression shown in [6] and [11] when  $\sin 2\theta$  is rearranged to be  $\tan 2\theta$ .

<sup>6</sup>A large difference of  $\beta - \alpha$  from  $\pi/2$  is disfavored. The measurements of the Higgs couplings give the most stringent bound on  $\beta - \alpha$ . For example,  $|\cos(\beta - \alpha)| \lesssim 0.01$  is allowed for all the types of the THDM with  $t_\beta = 10$  [29]. We evaluated  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  for  $|\cos(\beta - \alpha)| \lesssim 0.01$  and found that  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  takes the maximum value in the alignment limit. We also found that  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  can be 0.4 times smaller than that of the alignment limit for the type-II case. Since we are interested in the parameter points where  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  becomes large, we took the alignment limit throughout our analysis.

$m_a$	$m_A$	$\theta$	$t_\beta$	$c_1$	$c_2$
$m_h/2 \sim 100 \text{ GeV}$	600 GeV	0.1	10	0	$-1 \sim 1$

**Table 2.** The parameter values and regions discussed in this paper. These values are allowed from the bounds of the Higgs and flavor observables, LHC searches, and electroweak precision measurements for all the THDM-types.

We also assume  $c_1 = 0$  and  $-1 < c_2 < 1$  in our analysis. In table 2, we summarize the parameter values and regions considered in this paper. As discussed above, these values are consistent with the current bounds from the Higgs and flavor-observables, LHC searches, and electroweak precision measurements for all the THDM-types. In section 4, we show the cross section as a function of  $m_\chi$  by determining  $g_\chi$  to realize the thermal relic and search the parameter region where the cross section is enhanced.

There are two pseudoscalar mediators,  $a$  and  $A$ . The interaction terms between the DM and the mediators are

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{dark}} = i\frac{\xi_a^\chi}{2}a\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi + i\frac{\xi_A^\chi}{2}A\bar{\chi}\gamma^5\chi, \quad (2.17)$$

where

$$\xi_a^\chi = g_\chi \cos \theta, \quad \xi_A^\chi = g_\chi \sin \theta. \quad (2.18)$$

The scalar trilinear couplings appear from both  $V_{\text{THDM}}$  and  $V_{\text{port}}$  as

$$V_{\text{THDM}} + V_{\text{port}} \supset \sum_{\phi=h,H} \left( -\frac{1}{2}g_{\phi aa}\phi aa - g_{\phi aA}\phi aA - \frac{1}{2}g_{\phi AA}\phi AA \right). \quad (2.19)$$

These couplings induce the DM-nucleon SI scattering at the loop level as we will see in section 3. The expressions of these couplings are shown in appendix A.

There are four types of the Yukawa structures depending on the  $Z_4$  charge assignments of the SM fermions.

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yukawa}} \supset \sum_f \left( -\frac{m_f}{v} \right) \left( \xi_h^f h \bar{f} f + \xi_H^f H \bar{f} f + \xi_a^f a \bar{f} i \gamma^5 f + \xi_A^f A \bar{f} i \gamma^5 f \right), \quad (2.20)$$

where  $f$  indicates the SM fermion and  $m_f$  is its mass. The rescaling factors  $\xi_\phi^f$  ( $\phi = h, H, a, A$ ) under the alignment limit are shown in table 3. As can be seen, the THDM-type dependence appears through the Yukawa couplings of  $H, a$ , and  $A$ .

### 3 Direct detection

If DM is a Majorana fermion, the relevant effective operators for the evaluation of the DM-nucleon SI scattering cross section are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = & \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=u,d,s} C_q m_q \bar{\chi} \chi \bar{q} q + \frac{1}{2} C_G \left( -\frac{9\alpha_s}{8\pi} \bar{\chi} \chi G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu} \right) \\ & + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=u,d,s,c,b} \left[ C_q^{(1)} \bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu \chi \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q + C_q^{(2)} \bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu i \partial^\nu \chi \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q \right], \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

	$\xi_h^u$	$\xi_h^d$	$\xi_h^e$	$\xi_H^u$	$\xi_H^d$	$\xi_H^e$	$\xi_a^u$	$\xi_a^d$	$\xi_a^e$	$\xi_A^u$	$\xi_A^d$	$\xi_A^e$
Type-I	1	1	1	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$
Type-II	1	1	1	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$t_\beta$	$t_\beta$	$\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$t_\beta s_\theta$	$t_\beta s_\theta$	$-\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-t_\beta c_\theta$	$-t_\beta c_\theta$
Type-X	1	1	1	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$t_\beta$	$\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$t_\beta s_\theta$	$-\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-t_\beta c_\theta$
Type-Y	1	1	1	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$t_\beta$	$-\frac{1}{t_\beta}$	$\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$t_\beta s_\theta$	$-\frac{s_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$	$-t_\beta c_\theta$	$\frac{c_\theta}{t_\beta}$

**Table 3.** The rescaling factors of the Yukawa couplings under the alignment limit, where  $s_\theta = \sin \theta$  and  $c_\theta = \cos \theta$ .

For proton		For neutron	
$f_{T_u}^p$	0.0153	$f_{T_u}^n$	0.0110
$f_{T_d}^p$	0.0191	$f_{T_d}^n$	0.0273
$f_{T_s}^p$	0.0447	$f_{T_s}^n$	0.0447

**Table 4.** Numerical values of matrix elements which are taken from the default value of micrOMEGAs [36]. The left panel shows the value for the proton, and the right for the neutron.

where  $\mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q$  is the twist-2 operator for quark  $q$ ,

$$\mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q = \frac{i}{2} \bar{q} \left( D_\mu \gamma_\nu + D_\nu \gamma_\mu - \frac{1}{2} g_{\mu\nu} \not{D} \right) q. \quad (3.2)$$

We use the following relations to evaluate the SI cross section from these operators [35],

$$\langle N | m_q \bar{q} q | N \rangle = m_N f_{T_q}^N, \quad (3.3)$$

$$-\frac{9\alpha_s}{8\pi} \langle N | G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu} | N \rangle = m_N f_{T_G}^N, \quad (3.4)$$

$$\langle N | \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q | N \rangle = \frac{1}{m_N} \left( p_\mu p_\nu - \frac{1}{4} m_N^2 g_{\mu\nu} \right) \left( q^N(2) + \bar{q}^N(2) \right), \quad (3.5)$$

where  $N$  stands for a nucleon ( $p, n$ ), and  $m_N$  is its mass. The numerical values of the matrix elements ( $f_{T_q}^N$ ) and the second moments of the parton distribution functions (PDFs) for the quark and anti-quark ( $q^N(2)$  and  $\bar{q}^N(2)$ ) are given in tables 4 and 5, respectively. The gluon matrix element ( $f_{T_G}^N$ ) is given as follows: [23]

$$f_{T_G}^N = 1 - \sum_{q=u,d,s} f_{T_q}^N. \quad (3.6)$$

The values of  $q^N(2)$  and  $\bar{q}^N(2)$  are calculated at the scale  $\mu = m_Z$ , where  $m_Z$  is  $Z$  boson mass. The DM-nucleon SI scattering cross section is given by

$$\sigma_{\text{SI}} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \frac{m_\chi m_N}{m_\chi + m_N} \right)^2 |C_N|^2, \quad (3.7)$$



Second moment at $\mu = m_Z$			
$u^p(2)$	0.22	$\bar{u}^p(2)$	0.034
$d^p(2)$	0.11	$\bar{d}^p(2)$	0.036
$s^p(2)$	0.026	$\bar{s}^p(2)$	0.026
$c^p(2)$	0.019	$\bar{c}^p(2)$	0.019
$b^p(2)$	0.012	$\bar{b}^p(2)$	0.012

**Table 5.** Numerical values of the second moments for quark distribution functions for proton. These values are evaluated at the scale  $\mu = m_Z$  by using the CTEQ PDFs [37]. The values for neutron are given by exchanging up and down quarks in the table.

where

$$C_N = m_N \left[ \sum_{q=u,d,s} C_q f_{T_q}^N + C_G f_{T_G}^N + \frac{3}{4} \sum_{q=u,d,s,c,b} (m_\chi C_q^{(1)} + m_\chi^2 C_q^{(2)}) (q^N(2) + \bar{q}^N(2)) \right]. \quad (3.8)$$

The Wilson coefficients ( $C_q$ ,  $C_G$ ,  $C_q^{(1)}$ , and  $C_q^{(2)}$ ) are model dependent parts. In the rest of this section, we calculate these Wilson coefficients at the leading order.

In the pseudoscalar mediator DM model, all of the Wilson coefficients in eq. (3.1) are zero at the tree-level. Diagrams at the one-loop level give the leading order contributions to  $C_q$ ,  $C_q^{(1)}$ , and  $C_q^{(2)}$ . For  $C_G$ , the leading order contribution arises at the two-loop level. Note that the gluon matrix element is defined with the one-loop factor in eq. (3.4), and thus the contribution from  $C_G$  to  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is the same order of magnitude as the contributions from the other Wilson coefficients. For the later convenience, we divide  $C_q$  and  $C_G$  into the contributions from triangle and box diagrams. We introduce the following notations.

$$C_q = C_q^{\text{tri}} + C_q^{\text{box}}, \quad (3.9)$$

$$C_G = C_G^{\text{tri}} + C_G^{\text{box}}, \quad (3.10)$$

$$C_q^{(1)} = C_q^{(1)\text{box}}, \quad (3.11)$$

$$C_q^{(2)} = C_q^{(2)\text{box}}. \quad (3.12)$$

### 3.1 Triangle diagrams


In the following, we show the effective operators from the triangle diagrams shown in figure 1.

First, we consider the triangle diagrams with the light quark ( $q = u, d, s$ ) in the external line. Each diagram generates the following effective interaction between DM and quark  $q$ ,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} \supset \frac{1}{2} \sum_{q=u,d,s} C_q^{\text{tri}} m_q \bar{\chi} \chi \bar{q} q, \quad (3.13)$$

where

$$C_q^{\text{tri}} = - \sum_{\phi=h,H} \frac{\xi_\phi^q}{m_\phi^2 v} C_{\phi\chi\chi}. \quad (3.14)$$



**Figure 1.** Triangle diagrams which contribute to the DM-nucleon SI scattering.  $a_i$  indicates the pseudoscalar mediators,  $a$  and  $A$ .  $q$  in the external line stands for quarks. The diagrams with each of the light quarks ( $u, d, s$ ) contribute to  $\bar{\chi}\chi\bar{q}q$ . The diagrams with heavy quarks ( $c, b, t$ ) contribute to  $\bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}$ .

The expression of the effective  $\phi\bar{\chi}\chi$  coupling coefficient ( $\phi = h, H$ ),  $C_{\phi\chi\chi}$ , is as follows:

$$C_{\phi\chi\chi} = \frac{-m_\chi}{(4\pi)^2} \left\{ g_{\phi aa} (\xi_a^\chi)^2 \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_0(p^2, m_a^2, m_\chi^2) \right]_{p^2=m_\chi^2} + g_{\phi AA} (\xi_A^\chi)^2 \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_0(p^2, m_A^2, m_\chi^2) \right]_{p^2=m_\chi^2} + \frac{2g_{\phi aA} \xi_A^\chi \xi_a^\chi}{m_A^2 - m_a^2} [B_1(m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_\chi^2) - B_1(m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_\chi^2)] \right\}. \quad (3.15)$$

The definitions of the loop functions  $B_0$  and  $B_1$  are given in appendix C.1.

Next, we calculate the triangle diagrams which contribute to the effective DM-gluon coupling,  $C_G$ . There is the relation between  $\bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}$  and  $\bar{\chi}\chi\bar{Q}Q$  via [23]

$$m_Q\bar{Q}Q = -\frac{\alpha_s}{12\pi} G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}, \quad (3.16)$$

where  $Q$  indicates the heavy quark ( $c, b, t$ ). Using this relation,  $C_G^{\text{tri}}$  can be expressed with  $C_Q^{\text{tri}}$  as follows:

$$C_G^{\text{tri}} = \sum_{Q=c,b,t} \frac{2}{27} C_Q^{\text{tri}}, \quad (3.17)$$

where  $C_Q^{\text{tri}}$  is obtained by substituting  $q$  to  $Q$  in eq. (3.14).


## 3.2 Box diagrams

In the following, we show the effective operators from the box diagrams.

### 3.2.1 DM-quark scalar operators from box diagrams

We derive the contributions to  $C_q$ ,  $C_q^{(1)}$ , and  $C_q^{(2)}$  in eq. (3.1) from the box diagrams shown in figure 2. Because the quark in the external line is non-relativistic, we expand the amplitude by the external quark momentum and derive the effective operators. After that, we decompose these effective operators into the scalar and twist-2 operators as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} \supset \frac{1}{2} C_q^{\text{box}} m_q \bar{\chi}\chi\bar{q}q + \frac{1}{2} \left[ C_q^{(1)\text{box}} \bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu \chi \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q + C_q^{(2)\text{box}} \bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu i \partial^\nu \chi \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q \right]. \quad (3.18)$$



**Figure 2.** The box diagrams which induce the DM-quark effective operators, where  $a_i = a, A$ .

The Wilson coefficients are

$$C_q^{\text{box}} = \frac{-m_\chi}{(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{m_q}{v}\right)^2 \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \frac{(\xi_a^\chi \xi_a^q)^2}{m_a^2} [G(m_\chi^2, 0, m_a^2) - G(m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \\ & + \frac{(\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^q)^2}{m_A^2} [G(m_\chi^2, 0, m_A^2) - G(m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0)] \\ & + 2 \frac{\xi_A^\chi \xi_a^\chi \xi_A^q \xi_a^q}{m_A^2 - m_a^2} [G(m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0) - G(m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \end{aligned} \right\}, \quad (3.19)$$

$$C_q^{(1)\text{box}} = \frac{-8}{(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{m_q}{v}\right)^2 \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \frac{(\xi_a^\chi \xi_a^q)^2}{m_a^2} [X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_a^2) - X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \\ & + \frac{(\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^q)^2}{m_A^2} [X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_A^2) - X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0)] \\ & + 2 \frac{\xi_A^\chi \xi_a^\chi \xi_A^q \xi_a^q}{m_A^2 - m_a^2} [X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0) - X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \end{aligned} \right\}, \quad (3.20)$$

$$C_q^{(2)\text{box}} = \frac{-4m_\chi}{(4\pi)^2} \left(\frac{m_q}{v}\right)^2 \left\{ \begin{aligned} & \frac{(\xi_a^\chi \xi_a^q)^2}{m_a^2} [X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_a^2) - X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \\ & + \frac{(\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^q)^2}{m_A^2} [X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_A^2) - X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0)] \\ & + 2 \frac{\xi_A^\chi \xi_a^\chi \xi_A^q \xi_a^q}{m_A^2 - m_a^2} [X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0) - X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \end{aligned} \right\}, \quad (3.21)$$


where

$$G(m_\chi^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) = 6X_{001}(m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) + m_\chi^2 X_{111}(m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, m_1^2, m_2^2). \quad (3.22)$$

The definitions of the loop functions  $X_{001}$  and  $X_{111}$  are given in appendix C.2. The details of the derivation of the coefficients in eqs. (3.19)–(3.21) are given in appendix B.1.

### 3.2.2 DM-gluon scalar operator from box diagrams

We calculate the contribution from the box diagrams to  $C_G$ . For the box diagrams, the procedure of the triangle diagrams cannot be applied due to the following reasons: first, for  $m_Q > m_\chi, m_a, m_A$ , we cannot obtain the effective operators with the heavy quark  $\bar{\chi}\chi\bar{Q}Q$  by expanding the amplitude by the quark momentum as done in section 3.2.1. In particular,



**Figure 3.** The two-loop diagrams for the DM-gluon effective operator, where  $Q = c, b, t$ .

the loop calculation is mandatory for  $m_t > m_a$  as we will see in later. Second, even if  $m_Q \ll m_\chi, m_a, m_A$ , the second diagrams in figure 3 are not included if we derive  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  from  $C_Q^{\text{box}}$  by using eq. (3.16). Thus, it is necessary to calculate the two-loop diagrams shown in figure 3 and to read out the effective operator  $\bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}$  directly. We use the Fock-Schwinger gauge for the gluon field [38]. This gauge enables us to calculate the effective operator much more transparently [39]. In the end, we find the following effective operator from these two-loop diagrams [40].

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} \supset \frac{1}{2} C_G^{\text{box}} \left( \frac{-9\alpha_s}{8\pi} \bar{\chi}\chi G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu} \right). \quad (3.23)$$

The Wilson coefficient is given by

$$C_G^{\text{box}} = \sum_{Q=c,b,t} \frac{-m_\chi}{432\pi^2} \left( \frac{m_Q}{v} \right)^2 \left[ (\xi_a^\chi \xi_a^Q)^2 \frac{\partial F(m_a^2)}{\partial m_a^2} + (\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^Q)^2 \frac{\partial F(m_A^2)}{\partial m_A^2} + 2\xi_A^\chi \xi_a^\chi \xi_A^Q \xi_a^Q \frac{[F(m_A^2) - F(m_a^2)]}{m_A^2 - m_a^2} \right], \quad (3.24)$$


where

$$F(m_a^2) = \int_0^1 dx \left\{ 3Y_1(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_Q^2) - m_Q^2 \frac{(2+5x-5x^2)}{x^2(1-x)^2} Y_2(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_Q^2) - 2m_Q^4 \frac{(1-2x+2x^2)}{x^3(1-x)^3} Y_3(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_Q^2) \right\}. \quad (3.25)$$


The definitions of the loop functions  $Y_1$ ,  $Y_2$ , and  $Y_3$  are shown in appendix C.3. The expression for  $\partial F(m_a^2)/\partial m_a^2$  is shown in appendix C.5. The details of the derivation of  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  are given in appendix B.2.

## 4 Numerical analysis

In this section, we show our numerical analysis for the DM-nucleon SI scattering cross section ( $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$ ). We focus on the region of the parameter space where the DM thermal relic abundance matches the measured value of the DM energy density,  $\Omega h^2 = 0.1198 \pm 0.0015$  [41]. In section 4.1, we show that it is easy to realize the correct DM energy density by choosing  $g_\chi$  appropriately. Using the value of  $g_\chi$ , we calculate  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$ . In section 4.2, we



**Figure 4.** The dominant annihilation diagrams at the tree-level, where  $f$  indicates the SM fermion.



**Figure 5.** The DM-pseudoscalar coupling  $g_\chi$  as a function of  $m_\chi$ . The left panel shows  $g_\chi$  for  $m_a = 70$  GeV and  $t_\beta = 10$ , and the right for  $m_a = 100$  GeV and  $t_\beta = 40$ . The other parameters are  $m_A = 600$  GeV,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $c_1 = 0$ ,  $c_2 = 1$  for both of the panels. The black solid, red dashed, blue dot-dashed, and cyan dotted lines show the type-I, II, X, and Y, respectively. The red horizontal line indicates  $g_\chi = 1$ . The coupling of the type-Y turns out to be almost the same result as that of the type-II.

show the comparison of our result with the previous one [11]. We find that the gluon contribution through the box diagrams was drastically changed from the results in [11]. In section 4.3, we discuss the effect of the scalar quartic coupling which enhances  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$ . We find that some parameter points are within the reach of the XENONnT [20] and LZ experiments [21].

#### 4.1 Determination of $g_\chi$ through the DM thermal relic abundance

We discuss the DM pair annihilation and determine  $g_\chi$  to realize the measured value of the DM energy density by the thermal relic abundance. The dominant annihilation processes are shown in figure 4. Note that the  $f\bar{f}$  channel, where  $f$  is the SM fermion, depends on the THDM-types through the rescaling factors of the Yukawa couplings,  $\xi_a^f$  and  $\xi_A^f$ . On the other hand, the scalar channel is independent of the THDM-type.

Figure 5 shows  $g_\chi$  as a function of  $m_\chi$  for the four THDM-types. Here we use micrOMEGAS [36] to calculate the DM thermal relic abundance for the determination of  $g_\chi$ . We find that  $g_\chi$  becomes suddenly small around the funnel position where  $m_\chi \sim m_{a_i}/2$  ( $a_i = a, A$ ). In these regions, the s-channel amplitude becomes very large because it is proportional to  $(s - m_{a_i}^2 + im_{a_i}\Gamma_{a_i})^{-1}$ , where  $s$  is the invariant mass square and  $\Gamma_{a_i}$  is the decay width of  $a_i$ . As a result,  $g_\chi$  has to be small to obtain  $\Omega h^2 \sim 0.12$ , otherwise the relic abundance becomes too small. The coupling also becomes small after the new annihilation channel  $\chi\bar{\chi} \rightarrow ha$  opens. As can be seen in figure 5,  $g_\chi$  suddenly begins to decrease at

	$m_\chi \sim 50 \text{ GeV}$	$m_\chi \sim 300 \text{ GeV}$
Type-I	$b\bar{b}$	$ha$
Type-II	$b\bar{b}$	$b\bar{b}$
Type-X	$\tau^-\tau^+$	$\tau^-\tau^+$
Type-Y	$b\bar{b}$	$b\bar{b}$

**Table 6.** The dominant annihilation channels of each THDM-type near the funnel positions. The parameters are  $m_a = 100 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 40$ ,  $c_1 = 0$ ,  $c_2 = 1$ .

$m_\chi \sim (m_h + m_a)/2$ . For the larger  $m_\chi$ , the annihilation amplitude is suppressed by  $m_\chi^{-2}$ , and  $g_\chi$  increases in proportion to  $m_\chi^2$ . We find that  $g_\chi > 1$  for  $m_\chi \geq 690 \text{ GeV}$ .

Figure 5 also shows the THDM-type dependence of  $g_\chi$ . The type dependence appears in the region where the annihilation channel  $\chi\bar{\chi} \rightarrow f\bar{f}$  is dominant. For  $m_\chi \leq (m_h + m_a)/2$ , the channel  $\chi\bar{\chi} \rightarrow ha$  is kinematically forbidden, and thus the type dependence appears in  $g_\chi$ . For the type-I, all of the Yukawa couplings are suppressed by large  $t_\beta$ , and  $g_\chi$  tends to be large to keep  $\Omega h^2 \sim 0.12$ . For the type-II and the type-Y,  $g_\chi$  is almost the same. This is because the difference in the charged lepton sector is negligible if the down-type quark Yukawa couplings have  $t_\beta$  enhancement. The annihilation channel  $\chi\bar{\chi} \rightarrow ha$  dominates the process once allowed kinematically, and thus  $g_\chi$  becomes type independent for  $m_\chi > (m_h + m_a)/2$ . Around  $m_\chi \sim m_A/2$ , however, we find the type dependence of  $g_\chi$  again. This is because the annihilation channel to  $f\bar{f}$  through the mediator  $A$  again dominates the annihilation process by  $t_\beta$  enhancement. In table 6, we show the dominant annihilation channels near the funnel positions for each of the THDM-types.

## 4.2 Comparison with the previous results

In the following, we compare our result with the previous one in [11] at the benchmark point with  $m_a = 100 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 40$ ,  $g_\chi = 1$ , and the Yukawa structure is the type-II.<sup>7</sup> We also choose  $c_1 = c_2 = 0$  for the comparison. If the heavy scalar masses are degenerated and  $c_1 = c_2 = 0$  under the alignment limit, then  $g_{Ha_i a_j} = 0$  where  $a_i = a, A$  (see, appendix A). We use `LoopTools` [42] in the numerical calculations of the loop functions. Unless otherwise noted, the previous work means [11] in this section 4.2.

There are two improvements in our analysis of the triangle diagrams. First, we read out the scalar trilinear couplings not only from  $V_{\text{port}}$  but also from  $V_{\text{THDM}}$ . We find that the values of  $g_{haa}$  and  $g_{haA}$  do not change drastically at the benchmark point. On the other hand, the value of  $g_{hAA}$  changes largely. However, the diagram with  $g_{hAA}$  gives the smaller contribution than the diagrams with  $g_{haa}$  and  $g_{haA}$ . As a result, the numerical impact of this improvement is negligible. Second, we include all of the triangle diagrams into our analysis. The diagrams with  $g_{haA}$  and  $g_{hAA}$  were not included in the previous work. However, these diagrams are also important as pointed out in [13]. In figure 6, we show the contributions from each of the triangle diagrams to  $C_G^{\text{tri}}$ . The red dashed, blue dot-dashed, and green dotted lines are the contributions from the  $haa$ -diagram, the  $haA$ -diagram, and

<sup>7</sup>Note that this combination of the value of  $t_\beta$  and  $m_A$  with the type-II THDM is already excluded by LHC experiments [33]. We take this point only for the comparison.

the  $hAA$ -diagram, respectively. The black solid line shows the total contribution from these three triangle diagrams. As can be seen from the figure, the effect from the  $haa$ -diagram is dominant. We also find that the effect from the  $haA$ -diagram cannot be negligible because  $|g_{haa}| < |g_{haA}|$  at the benchmark point. Moreover, the relative sign between the  $haa$ -diagram and the  $haA$ -diagram is opposite, and they partially cancel each other. At  $m_\chi = 1$  TeV, for example, we find that the total coefficient turns out to be 0.6 times that of the  $haa$ -diagram. Therefore, the contribution from the triangle diagrams is overestimated in the previous work.


As for the box diagrams, there are also two improvements. First, as we mentioned in section 3.2.1, we perform the irreducible decomposition into the scalar and twist-2 operators. After this decomposition, we find new contributions to  $C_q^{\text{box}}$  which were not included in the previous work. See, appendix B.1 for the details. We show the numerical impact of the irreducible decomposition in the first two panels in figure 7. The black solid line in the upper (central) panel shows  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  derived from  $C_c^{\text{box}}$  ( $C_b^{\text{box}}$ ) without irreducible decomposition by using the relation in eq. (3.16), which was done in the previous work. The blue dotted lines are the same but with the irreducible decomposition. We find that the difference between the black and blue lines is small numerically. Second, we evaluate  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  by calculating the two-loop diagrams shown in figure 3. The red dashed lines in figure 7 show the contributions to  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  which are derived by the two-loop calculations. As for the contributions from the charm and bottom quarks, we find that  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  read out by using eq. (3.16) is 40% of the full two-loop calculations. Therefore, the previous work underestimated the contributions from the box diagrams with the charm and bottom quarks to  $C_G$ . The contribution from the top quark is shown in the last panel in figure 7. The black solid line shows  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  derived from  $C_t^{\text{box}}$  without irreducible decomposition by using the relation in eq. (3.16), which was done in the previous work. We use eq. (A.3) in [11] to evaluate  $C_t^{\text{box}}$ .<sup>8</sup> The last panel clearly shows that the contribution from the top quark was overestimated in the previous work. Thus, it is not justified to relate  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  with  $C_Q^{\text{box}}$  using eq. (3.16).

As can be seen from figure 7, the scattering diagrams with the bottom loop give the dominant contribution to  $C_G^{\text{box}}$ , and thus  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  was underestimated in the previous work. Comparing figures 6 and 7, we find that the contribution from the box diagrams is smaller than that from the triangle diagrams in spite of taking the large  $t_\beta$  and the type-II THDM.

### 4.3 The DM-nucleon scattering cross section

We discuss the DM-nucleon scattering cross section numerically. In the following, we focus on the triangle diagrams with  $h$  and search the parameter region where the amplitude of these diagrams becomes large. Note that these diagrams are independent of the THDM-types under the alignment limit, and thus the cross section is type independent quantitatively. As shown in figure 1, there are also the triangle diagrams with  $H$  instead of  $h$ , but the amplitude of these diagrams is suppressed by  $(m_h/m_H)^2$ .

<sup>8</sup>We have found that the overall sign of  $C_Q^{\text{box}}$  shown in section 3.2.1 disagrees with the previous work. In figure 7, we show the comparison with the absolute value of the coefficient.



**Figure 6.** The contributions from each of the triangle diagrams to  $C_G^{\text{tri}}$ . The parameters are  $m_a = 100 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 40$ ,  $c_1 = c_2 = 0$ , and  $g_\chi = 1$ . The THDM-type is the type-II. The red dashed, blue dot-dashed, and green dotted lines show the contributions from the  $haa$ -diagram, the  $haA$ -diagram, and the  $hAA$ -diagram, respectively. The black solid line shows the total of these contributions.

A possible way to enhance  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is to make  $g_{haa}$  large. As can be seen from the expression of  $g_{haa}$  in eq. (A.8), the contributions from  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  terms to  $g_{haa}$  are essential for small  $\theta$ . In particular, the  $c_2$  term gives a crucial contribution to  $g_{haa}$  for the large  $t_\beta$  regime. Another possibility to enhance  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is to make  $m_a$  as light as possible. If  $m_a$  is light, the suppression from the loop functions of the triangle diagrams with  $a$  is weakened. However, we cannot make  $m_a$  arbitrary small. We find that  $m_a \geq m_h/2$ . The constraint on  $m_a$  comes from the bound on the branching ratio of the SM Higgs boson. In the region  $m_a \leq m_h/2$ , this model has a new decay channel of the Higgs boson,  $h \rightarrow 2a$ . The decay width is given by [6]

$$\Gamma_{h \rightarrow 2a} = \frac{g_{haa}^2}{32\pi m_h} \sqrt{1 - \frac{4m_a^2}{m_h^2}}. \quad (4.1)$$


This decay width is proportional to  $g_{haa}^2$ . Note that we are considering the large  $g_{haa}$  region to enhance  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$ . Consequently, this decay width becomes large and gives a strong constraint on  $m_a$ . For example, we find that  $\Gamma_{h \rightarrow 2a} = 4.59 \text{ GeV}$  at the point  $m_a = 60 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 10$ ,  $c_1 = 0$ , and  $c_2 = 1$ . This value is much larger than the SM Higgs width. The current bound on the Higgs branching ratio into BSM particles is given by the ATLAS experiment [29],

$$\text{BR}(\text{BSM}) < 0.26. \quad (4.2)$$


The result from the CMS experiment also disfavors the large branching ratio of the Higgs boson into new particles [34]. We conclude that the parameter region  $m_a \leq m_h/2$  is excluded.

In figure 8, we show the predicted cross section in this model. We take  $m_a = 100 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 10$ ,  $c_1 = 0$ , and  $c_2 = 1$  and show the plot in  $10 \text{ GeV} <$





**Figure 7.** The contributions from each of the box diagrams to  $C_G^{\text{box}}$ . The parameters are  $m_a = 100 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 40$ ,  $c_1 = c_2 = 0$ , and  $g_\chi = 1$ . The THDM-type is the type-II. The upper, central, and bottom panels show the contributions from the charm, bottom, and top quarks, respectively. The black solid lines show the contributions which are derived from  $C_Q^{\text{box}}$  ( $Q = c, b, t$ ) without irreducible decomposition by using the relation in eq. (3.16). The blue dotted lines are the same but with the irreducible decomposition. The red dashed lines show the contributions which are derived from the two-loop calculations.




**Figure 8.** The red solid line shows the predicted SI cross section of this model with  $m_a = 100 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 10$ ,  $c_1 = 0$ , and  $c_2 = 1$ . The regions where  $g_\chi > 1$  are shown as the gray region. The blue region is excluded by the latest result of the XENON1T experiment [3]. The purple, brown, and gray dotted lines indicate the future sensitivities of the XENONnT [20], LZ [21], and DARWIN experiments [22], respectively. The yellow region is below the neutrino floor [19].

$m_\chi < 1 \text{ TeV}$ . In the discontinuous part of the plot, we cannot find the solution of  $g_\chi$  which realizes  $\Omega h^2 \sim 0.12$ . The region where  $g_\chi > 1$  is shown as the gray region. The current bound, future prospects, and neutrino floor of the direct detection experiments are also shown in the figure. The blue regions are already excluded by the latest result of the XENON1T experiment [3]. The purple, brown, and gray dotted lines indicate the future sensitivities of the XENONnT [20], LZ [21], and DARWIN experiments [22], respectively. The yellow regions are below the neutrino floor [19].

As can be seen, we find that  $g_\chi > 1$  and the cross section is larger than the upper bound from the XENON1T experiment [3] in almost all of the region where  $m_\chi < (m_h + m_a)/2$  except for the funnel position of the light pseudoscalar,  $m_\chi \sim m_a/2$ . In addition, the previous work [11] has pointed out that the light DM mass region is excluded by the indirect detection experiments. From above reasons, we focus on the heavier DM mass region,  $100 \text{ GeV} < m_\chi < 1 \text{ TeV}$ , and search the parameter space where the cross section becomes large.

In figure 9, we show the four benchmark points which have the different combinations of  $c_2$  and  $m_a$ . Here, we fix the parameters at  $m_A = 600 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 10$ , and  $c_1 = 0$ . These benchmark points are all allowed from the current constraints as we mentioned in section 2.

We show the case for  $|c_2| = 0.5$  in the upper panels, and for  $|c_2| = 1$  in the lower panels. In each panel, the red line shows the positive  $c_2$ , the blue line shows the negative  $c_2$ , and the black line shows  $c_2 = 0$ . We show the case for  $m_a = 70 \text{ GeV}$  in the left panels,



**Figure 9.** The SI cross section at the four benchmark points. The upper panels show the case for  $|c_2| = 0.5$ , and the lower for  $|c_2| = 1$ . The left panels show the case for  $m_a = 70$  GeV, and the right for  $m_a = 100$  GeV. The other parameters are  $m_A = 600$  GeV,  $\theta = 0.1$ ,  $t_\beta = 10$ ,  $c_1 = 0$  for all the panels. The regions where  $g_\chi > 1$  are shown as the gray region. The blue regions are excluded by the latest result of the XENON1T experiment [3]. The purple, brown, and gray dotted lines indicate the future sensitivities of the XENONnT [20], LZ [21], and DARWIN experiments [22], respectively. The yellow regions are below the neutrino floor [19].

and  $m_a = 100$  GeV in the right panels. The DM coupling  $g_\chi$  becomes larger than 1 in the gray region. The current bound, future prospects, and background of the direct detection experiments shown in figure 9 are the same as those shown in figure 8.

From the figure, we find that  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  strongly depends on  $c_2$ . In particular,  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  becomes large for  $m_\chi \gtrsim 400$  GeV if  $c_2$  is nonzero. This is because  $g_{haa}$  becomes large by the effect of  $c_2$  as we mentioned above. We also find that  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  for  $m_a = 70$  GeV is larger than that for  $m_a = 100$  GeV as is expected. At these benchmark points, we find the large region where  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is above the neutrino floor while keeping  $g_\chi \leq 1$ . For  $c_2 = 1$ ,  $m_a = 70$  GeV, and  $600 \text{ GeV} \leq m_\chi \leq 690 \text{ GeV}$ ,  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  is above the future prospect lines of the XENONnT [20] and LZ experiments [21] with  $g_\chi \leq 1$ .

We also have checked the cross section of the different types of the THDM and found that  $\sigma_{\text{SI}}$  in the large  $m_\chi$  region is type independent.

## 5 Conclusions

In this paper, we have discussed the physics of the DM direct detection in the pseudoscalar mediator DM model. The tree-level amplitude of the DM-nucleon elastic scattering in

this model is negligible because it is proportional to the momentum transfer in the non-relativistic limit. At the loop level, however, there are the diagrams which induce the DM-nucleon SI scattering. Thus, it is necessary to calculate the loop corrections to compare the model prediction with the direct detection experiments.

We have revisited the loop corrections to the cross section calculated in [11] and improved their analysis with the following points. For the triangle diagrams, we read out the scalar trilinear couplings not only from  $V_{\text{port}}$  but also from  $V_{\text{THDM}}$  as shown in eq. (2.19). We also included the diagrams with the heavy mediator  $A$  into our analysis as pointed out in [13]. As a result, we found that the scattering amplitude of the triangle diagrams was overestimated in [11]. This is because the cancellation between the  $haa$ -diagram and the  $haA$ -diagram is not negligible numerically. For the box diagrams, we decomposed the effective operators into the scalar and twist-2 operators. This decomposition gives the new contributions to the scalar operator, but we found that their effects are not significant. In addition, we read out the DM-gluon scalar operator by calculating all the relevant two-loop diagrams. We found that the contributions from the charm and bottom quarks to  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  were underestimated in [11]. On the other hand, the contribution from the top quark was overestimated. These results clearly show that it is no longer justified to relate  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  with  $C_Q^{\text{box}}$  using eq. (3.16).

In section 4.3, we searched the region where the DM-nucleon scattering cross section becomes large. We found the two interesting cases. First, if  $c_2$  is nonzero, the cross section is enhanced in the large  $m_\chi$  region. This is because the contribution from  $c_2$  to  $g_{haa}$  appears without the suppression of the mixing angle and  $t_\beta$ . The interaction term proportional to  $c_2$  is not included in the previous works, [6], [11] and [13]. Thus, our analysis has revealed the new possibility to detect the DM model with pseudoscalar mediators. Second, if  $m_a$  is light, the cross section also becomes large because the suppression of the loop functions is weakened. In figure 9, we showed the cross section at the four benchmark points. There are large regions where the cross section is above the neutrino floor while keeping the DM-pseudoscalar coupling perturbative.

The loop corrections in the scattering processes are often crucial. The DM model of winos, the superpartner of  $SU(2)_L$  gauge bosons, is one of the examples [43–45]. In this model, the tree-level contribution is suppressed, and there are box diagrams which induce the SI scattering effects at the loop level. As pointed out in [13], the same situation also happens in inelastic DM models which contain DM candidates with a tiny mass splitting. In these models, the two-loop calculations are necessary to evaluate the cross section and the same technique shown in this paper is available.

## Acknowledgments

This work was supported by JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number 16K17715 [T.A.] and by Grant-in-Aid for Scientific research from the Ministry of Education, Science, Sports, and Culture (MEXT), Japan, No. 16H06492 [J.H.]. The work of J.H. is also supported by World Premier International Research Center Initiative (WPI Initiative), MEXT, Japan.

## A Scalar trilinear couplings

The expressions of the scalar trilinear couplings in eq. (2.19) are as follows :

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{haa} = & -\frac{2m_a^2}{v}s_{\beta-\alpha}\sin^2\theta - \frac{m_h^2}{v}\sin^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2)}{t_\beta} \\
 & + \frac{M^2}{v}\sin^2\theta\frac{2s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2)}{t_\beta} \\
 & - 2c_1v\cos^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha} - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{1+t_\beta^2} - 2c_2v\cos^2\theta\frac{t_\beta(s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha})}{1+t_\beta^2}, \tag{A.1}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{haA} = & \frac{m_A^2}{2v}s_{\beta-\alpha}\sin 2\theta + \frac{m_a^2}{2v}s_{\beta-\alpha}\sin 2\theta + \frac{m_h^2}{2v}\sin 2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2)}{t_\beta} \\
 & - \frac{M^2}{2v}\sin 2\theta\frac{2s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2)}{t_\beta} \\
 & - c_1v\sin 2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha} - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{1+t_\beta^2} - c_2v\sin 2\theta\frac{t_\beta(s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha})}{1+t_\beta^2}, \tag{A.2}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{hAA} = & -\frac{2m_A^2}{v}s_{\beta-\alpha}\cos^2\theta - \frac{m_h^2}{v}\cos^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2)}{t_\beta} \\
 & + \frac{M^2}{v}\cos^2\theta\frac{2s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2)}{t_\beta} \\
 & - 2c_1v\sin^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha} - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{1+t_\beta^2} - 2c_2v\sin^2\theta\frac{t_\beta(s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha})}{1+t_\beta^2}, \tag{A.3}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{Haa} = & -\frac{2m_a^2}{v}c_{\beta-\alpha}\sin^2\theta + \frac{m_H^2}{v}\sin^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2) - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{t_\beta} \\
 & - \frac{M^2}{v}\sin^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2) - 2c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{t_\beta} \\
 & - 2c_1v\cos^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}}{1+t_\beta^2} + 2c_2v\cos^2\theta\frac{t_\beta(s_{\beta-\alpha} - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta)}{1+t_\beta^2}, \tag{A.4}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{HaA} = & \frac{m_A^2}{2v}c_{\beta-\alpha}\sin 2\theta + \frac{m_a^2}{2v}c_{\beta-\alpha}\sin 2\theta - \frac{m_H^2}{2v}\sin 2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2) - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{t_\beta} \\
 & + \frac{M^2}{2v}\sin 2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2) - 2c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{t_\beta} \\
 & - c_1v\sin 2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta + c_{\beta-\alpha}}{1+t_\beta^2} + c_2v\sin 2\theta\frac{t_\beta(s_{\beta-\alpha} - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta)}{1+t_\beta^2}, \tag{A.5}
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{HAA} = & -\frac{2m_A^2}{v}c_{\beta-\alpha}\cos^2\theta + \frac{m_H^2}{v}\cos^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2) + c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{t_\beta} \\
 & - \frac{M^2}{v}\cos^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}(1-t_\beta^2) - 2c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta}{t_\beta} \\
 & - 2c_1v\sin^2\theta\frac{s_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta - c_{\beta-\alpha}}{1+t_\beta^2} + 2c_2v\sin^2\theta\frac{t_\beta(s_{\beta-\alpha} - c_{\beta-\alpha}t_\beta)}{1+t_\beta^2}, \tag{A.6}
 \end{aligned}$$

where

$$M^2 = \frac{m_3^2}{\sin \beta \cos \beta}, \quad s_{\beta-\alpha} = \sin(\beta - \alpha), \quad c_{\beta-\alpha} = \cos(\beta - \alpha). \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Taking the alignment limit,  $\sin(\beta - \alpha) \rightarrow 1$ , we find

$$g_{haa} = (2M^2 - 2m_a^2 - m_h^2) \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{v} - 2v \frac{c_1 + c_2 t_\beta^2}{1 + t_\beta^2} \cos^2 \theta, \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$g_{haA} = -(2M^2 - m_a^2 - m_A^2 - m_h^2) \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2v} - v \frac{c_1 + c_2 t_\beta^2}{1 + t_\beta^2} \sin 2\theta, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$g_{hAA} = (2M^2 - 2m_A^2 - m_h^2) \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{v} - 2v \frac{c_1 + c_2 t_\beta^2}{1 + t_\beta^2} \sin^2 \theta, \quad (\text{A.10})$$

$$g_{Haa} = (M^2 - m_H^2) \frac{\sin^2 \theta}{v} \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_\beta}\right) - 2v(c_1 - c_2) \frac{t_\beta}{1 + t_\beta^2} \cos^2 \theta, \quad (\text{A.11})$$

$$g_{HaA} = (m_H^2 - M^2) \frac{\sin 2\theta}{2v} \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_\beta}\right) - v(c_1 - c_2) \frac{t_\beta}{1 + t_\beta^2} \sin 2\theta, \quad (\text{A.12})$$

$$g_{HAA} = (M^2 - m_H^2) \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{v} \left(1 - \frac{1}{t_\beta}\right) - 2v(c_1 - c_2) \frac{t_\beta}{1 + t_\beta^2} \sin^2 \theta. \quad (\text{A.13})$$

In the previous work [11], they set  $m_H^2 = m_A^2 = M^2$  and  $c_1 = c_2 = 0$ . In this case, we find  $g_{Ha_i a_j} = 0$  where  $a_i = a, A$ .

## B Details of the calculations of the box diagrams

In the following, we show how to derive the effective operators from the box diagrams.


### B.1 The derivation of $C_q^{\text{box}}$ , $C_q^{(1)\text{box}}$ , and $C_q^{(2)\text{box}}$

We show the details of the calculations of  $C_q^{\text{box}}$ ,  $C_q^{(1)\text{box}}$ , and  $C_q^{(2)\text{box}}$  shown in section 3.2.1. Note that we calculate the amplitude of the DM-quark scattering process in the zero momentum transfer limit. Summing up the amplitude of the box diagrams shown in figure 10, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} i\mathcal{M} &= \left(\frac{m_q}{v}\right)^2 \xi_{a_i}^\chi \xi_{a_j}^\chi \xi_{a_i}^q \xi_{a_j}^q \left[\bar{u}_\chi(p_\chi) \gamma^\mu u_\chi(p_\chi)\right] \left[\bar{u}_q(p_q) \gamma^\nu u_q(p_q)\right] \\ &\times \int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu \ell_\nu}{[(\ell + p_\chi)^2 - m_\chi^2] (\ell^2 - m_{a_i}^2) (\ell^2 - m_{a_j}^2)} \\ &\times \left[ \frac{-1}{(\ell - p_q)^2 - m_q^2} + \frac{1}{(\ell + p_q)^2 - m_q^2} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

where  $u_\chi(p_\chi)$  is the DM wave function with its momentum  $p_\chi$ , and  $u_q(p_q)$  is the quark wave function with its momentum  $p_q$ . We expand the terms in the bracket in eq. (B.1) by the quark momentum and keep the leading term as follows:

$$\frac{-1}{(\ell - p_q)^2 - m_q^2} + \frac{1}{(\ell + p_q)^2 - m_q^2} = -\frac{4\ell \cdot p_q}{\ell^4} + \mathcal{O}(p_q^2). \quad (\text{B.2})$$



**Figure 10.** The box diagrams and their momentum assignments.

Here we have used  $p_q^2 = m_q^2$ . After this expansion, the amplitude of these diagrams is

$$\begin{aligned}
 i\mathcal{M} = & iA_1 m_\chi m_q \left[ \bar{u}_\chi(p_\chi) u_\chi(p_\chi) \right] \left[ \bar{u}_q(p_q) u_q(p_q) \right] \\
 & + iA_1 (p_\chi \cdot p_q) \left[ \bar{u}_\chi(p_\chi) \gamma^\mu u_\chi(p_\chi) \right] \left[ \bar{u}_q(p_q) \gamma_\mu u_q(p_q) \right] \\
 & + iA_1 \left[ \bar{u}_\chi(p_\chi) \not{p}_q u_\chi(p_\chi) \right] \left[ \bar{u}_q(p_q) \not{p}_\chi u_q(p_q) \right] \\
 & + iA_2 m_\chi (p_\chi \cdot p_q) \left[ \bar{u}_\chi(p_\chi) u_\chi(p_\chi) \right] \left[ \bar{u}_q(p_q) \not{p}_\chi u_q(p_q) \right], \quad (\text{B.3})
 \end{aligned}$$


where

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_1 = & \frac{-4}{(4\pi)^2} \left( \frac{m_q}{v} \right)^2 \times \left\{ \frac{(\xi_a^\chi \xi_a^q)^2}{m_a^2} [X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_a^2) - X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \right. \\
 & + \frac{(\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^q)^2}{m_A^2} [X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_A^2) - X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0)] \\
 & \left. + 2 \frac{\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^\chi \xi_a^q \xi_a^q}{m_A^2 - m_a^2} [X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0) - X_{001}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \right\}, \quad (\text{B.4})
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 A_2 = & \frac{-4}{(4\pi)^2} \left( \frac{m_q}{v} \right)^2 \times \left\{ \frac{(\xi_a^\chi \xi_a^q)^2}{m_a^2} [X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_a^2) - X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \right. \\
 & + \frac{(\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^q)^2}{m_A^2} [X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, 0, m_A^2) - X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0)] \\
 & \left. + 2 \frac{\xi_A^\chi \xi_A^\chi \xi_a^q \xi_a^q}{m_A^2 - m_a^2} [X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, 0) - X_{111}(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, 0)] \right\}. \quad (\text{B.5})
 \end{aligned}$$

Loop functions  $X_{001}$  and  $X_{111}$  are defined in appendix C.2. From this amplitude, we find the following effective operators.

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = & \frac{1}{2} (m_\chi A_1) m_q \bar{\chi} \chi \bar{q} q + \frac{1}{2} A_1 (\bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu \chi) (\bar{q} i \partial_\mu \gamma_\nu q) + \frac{1}{2} A_1 (\bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu \chi) (\bar{q} i \partial_\nu \gamma_\mu q) \\
 & + \frac{1}{2} (m_\chi A_2) (\bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu i \partial^\nu \chi) (\bar{q} i \partial_\mu \gamma_\nu q). \quad (\text{B.6})
 \end{aligned}$$



**Figure 11.** The diagrams which contribute to the effective operators  $a_i a_j G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}$ , where  $a_i = a, A$ .

Then, we perform the irreducible decomposition to these operators.

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{q} i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu q &= \bar{q} \left[ \frac{i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu + i \partial^\nu \gamma^\mu}{2} - \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} i \not{\partial} \right] q + \bar{q} \left[ \frac{i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu - i \partial^\nu \gamma^\mu}{2} \right] q + \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} \bar{q} i \not{\partial} q \\ &= \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q + \frac{1}{4} g^{\mu\nu} m_q \bar{q} q. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.7})$$

Note that we drop the anti-symmetric term in the last line because it does not contribute to the nucleon matrix element. The last term in eq. (B.7) gives the contribution to the scalar operator  $\bar{\chi} \chi \bar{q} q$ . After this decomposition, we find

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{eff}} = \frac{1}{2} C_q^{\text{box}} m_q \bar{\chi} \chi \bar{q} q + \frac{1}{2} C_q^{(1)\text{box}} \bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu \gamma^\nu \chi \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q + \frac{1}{2} C_q^{(2)\text{box}} \bar{\chi} i \partial^\mu i \partial^\nu \chi \mathcal{O}_{\mu\nu}^q, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where

$$C_q^{\text{box}} = \frac{m_\chi}{4} (6A_1 + m_\chi^2 A_2), \quad (\text{B.9})$$

$$C_q^{(1)\text{box}} = 2A_1, \quad (\text{B.10})$$

$$C_q^{(2)\text{box}} = m_\chi A_2. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

These coefficients correspond to the Wilson coefficients in eqs. (3.19)–(3.21).

## B.2 The derivation of $C_G^{\text{box}}$

We show the details of the derivation of  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  shown in section 3.2.2.

First, we calculate the heavy quark loops in the two-loop diagrams. In figure 11, we show the pseudoscalar-gluon scattering diagrams. We calculate the amplitude of these diagrams in the gluon background field theory. We use the Fock-Schwinger gauge for the gluon field. The amplitude with the external pseudoscalar momentum  $\ell$  is as follows:

$$i\mathcal{M} = i \Pi_{a_i a_j}(\ell^2) \left[ G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu} \right], \quad (\text{B.12})$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \Pi_{a_i a_j}(\ell^2) &= \frac{\alpha_s}{24\pi} \left[ G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu} \right] \sum_{Q=c,b,t} \left( \frac{m_Q}{v} \right)^2 \xi_{a_i}^Q \xi_{a_j}^Q \\ &\times \int_0^1 dx \left[ \frac{3x(1-x)}{[m_Q^2 - x(1-x)\ell^2]} + \frac{m_Q^2 \cdot (2+5x-5x^2)}{[m_Q^2 - x(1-x)\ell^2]^2} - \frac{2m_Q^4(1-2x+2x^2)}{[m_Q^2 - x(1-x)\ell^2]^3} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.13})$$

Note that the gluon in eq. (B.12) is the external field.



Next, we read out the effective operator  $a_i a_j G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu}$  from eq. (B.12) and calculate the amplitude of the two-loop diagrams shown in figure 3. The amplitude can be expressed using  $\Pi_{a_i a_j}(\ell^2)$  as follows:

$$i\mathcal{M} = \sum_{a_i=a,A} (-\xi_{a_i}^\chi \xi_{a_j}^\chi) \left[ \bar{u}_\chi(p_\chi) \gamma^\rho u_\chi(p_\chi) \right] \left[ G_{\mu\nu}^a G^{a\mu\nu} \right] \\ \times \int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\rho}{[(\ell + p_\chi)^2 - m_\chi^2](\ell^2 - m_{a_i}^2)(\ell^2 - m_{a_j}^2)} \Pi_{a_i a_j}(\ell^2). \quad (\text{B.14})$$

Reading out the effective operator from this amplitude, we obtain  $C_G^{\text{box}}$  in eq. (3.24).

### C Loop functions

In the following, we show the expressions of the loop functions used in section 3. For the later convenience, we define  $\tilde{\epsilon}$  as follows:

$$\frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}} = \frac{2}{\epsilon} - \gamma_E + \log(4\pi), \quad (\text{C.1})$$

where  $\epsilon = 4 - D$  and  $\gamma_E$  is the Euler-Mascheroni constant.

#### C.1 B functions

We show the definitions of  $B$  functions ( $B_0, B_1, B_{00}, B_{11}, B_{001}, B_{111}$ ) which are the same as those in LoopTools [42].

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{1}{(\ell^2 - m^2)[(\ell + p)^2 - M^2]} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2), \quad (\text{C.2})$$

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu}{(\ell^2 - m^2)[(\ell + p)^2 - M^2]} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} p_\mu B_1(p^2, m^2, M^2), \quad (\text{C.3})$$

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu \ell_\nu}{(\ell^2 - m^2)[(\ell + p)^2 - M^2]} \\ = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} [g_{\mu\nu} B_{00}(p^2, m^2, M^2) + p_\mu p_\nu B_{11}(p^2, m^2, M^2)], \quad (\text{C.4})$$

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu \ell_\nu \ell_\rho}{(\ell^2 - m^2)[(\ell + p)^2 - M^2]} \\ = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} \left[ (g_{\mu\nu} p_\rho + g_{\nu\rho} p_\mu + g_{\rho\mu} p_\nu) B_{001}(p^2, m^2, M^2) + p_\mu p_\nu p_\rho B_{111}(p^2, m^2, M^2) \right]. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

The expressions of the  $B$  functions are

$$B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx \left[ \frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \log \left( \frac{\mu^2}{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)} \right) \right], \quad (\text{C.6})$$

$$B_1(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx [-(1-x)] \left[ \frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \log \left( \frac{\mu^2}{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)} \right) \right], \quad (\text{C.7})$$

$$B_{00}(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx \frac{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)}{2} \times \left[ \frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + 1 + \log \left( \frac{\mu^2}{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)} \right) \right], \quad (\text{C.8})$$

$$B_{11}(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx (1-x)^2 \left[ \frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \log \left( \frac{\mu^2}{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)} \right) \right], \quad (\text{C.9})$$

$$B_{001}(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx \frac{-(1-x)[m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)]}{2} \times \left[ \frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + 1 + \log \left( \frac{\mu^2}{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)} \right) \right], \quad (\text{C.10})$$

$$B_{111}(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx [-(1-x)^3] \left[ \frac{2}{\tilde{\epsilon}} + \log \left( \frac{\mu^2}{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)} \right) \right]. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

The derivative of  $B_0$  with respect to  $p^2$  are

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx \frac{x(1-x)}{m^2 x + M^2(1-x) - p^2 x(1-x)}. \quad (\text{C.12})$$

## C.2 X functions

The definitions of  $X$  functions ( $X_{001}, X_{111}$ ) are as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} & \int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu \ell_\nu \ell_\rho}{[(\ell+p)^2 - M^2](\ell^2 - m_1^2)(\ell^2 - m_2^2)} \\ &= \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} \left[ (g_{\mu\nu} p_\rho + g_{\nu\rho} p_\mu + g_{\rho\mu} p_\nu) X_{001}(p^2, M^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) + p_\mu p_\nu p_\rho X_{111}(p^2, M^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.13})$$

$X$  functions can be expressed using Feynman parameter integrals, and using  $B$  functions.

$$\begin{aligned} X_{001}(p^2, M^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) &= \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy \frac{\frac{1}{2}x(1-x-y)}{M^2 x + m_1^2 y + m_2^2(1-x-y) - p^2 x(1-x)} \\ &= \frac{1}{(m_1^2 - m_2^2)^2} [B_{001}(p^2, m_1^2, M^2) - B_{001}(p^2, m_2^2, M^2)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{m_1^2 - m_2^2} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_{00}(p^2, m_2^2, M^2) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.14})$$

$$\begin{aligned} X_{111}(p^2, M^2, m_1^2, m_2^2) &= \int_0^1 dx \int_0^{1-x} dy \frac{-x^3(1-x-y)}{[M^2 x + m_1^2 y + m_2^2(1-x-y) - p^2 x(1-x)]^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{(m_1^2 - m_2^2)^2} [B_{111}(p^2, m_1^2, M^2) - B_{111}(p^2, m_2^2, M^2)] \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{m_1^2 - m_2^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_{11}(p^2, m_2^2, M^2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.15})$$

### C.3 Y functions

The definitions of  $Y$  functions ( $Y_1, Y_2, Y_3$ ) are as follows:

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu}{[(\ell+p)^2 - m_\chi^2](\ell^2 - m_A^2) \left[ \ell^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)} \right]} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} p_\mu Y_1(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2), \quad (\text{C.16})$$

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu}{[(\ell+p)^2 - m_\chi^2](\ell^2 - m_A^2) \left[ \ell^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)} \right]^2} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} p_\mu Y_2(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2), \quad (\text{C.17})$$

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu}{[(\ell+p)^2 - m_\chi^2](\ell^2 - m_A^2) \left[ \ell^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)} \right]^3} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} p_\mu Y_3(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2). \quad (\text{C.18})$$

$Y$  functions can be expressed using Feynman parameter integrals, and using  $B, C, D$  functions.

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2) &= \int_0^1 dy \int_0^{1-y} dz \frac{-2y}{\left[ m_\chi^2 y^2 + \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)} z + m_A^2 (1-y-z) \right]} \\ &= \frac{1}{m_A^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}} \left[ B_1(m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_\chi^2) - B_1\left(m_\chi^2, \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}, m_\chi^2\right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.19})$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_2(m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2) &= \int_0^1 dy \int_0^{1-y} dz \frac{2yz}{\left[ m_\chi^2 y^2 + \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)} z + m_A^2 (1-y-z) \right]^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{m_A^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}} \left[ Y_1(m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2) - C_2\left(m_\chi^2, \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}, m_\chi^2\right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

$$\begin{aligned} Y_3(m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2) &= \int_0^1 dy \int_0^{1-y} dz \frac{-4yz^2}{\left[ m_\chi^2 y^2 + \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)} z + m_A^2 (1-y-z) \right]^3} \\ &= \frac{1}{m_A^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}} \left[ Y_2(m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, m_A^2, m_q^2) - D_3\left(0, 0, m_\chi^2, m_\chi^2, \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}, \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}, \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}, m_\chi^2\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

The definitions of  $C_2, D_3$  are in appendix C.4.

### C.4 $C_2, D_3$ functions

The definitions of  $C_2$  and  $D_3$  functions are as follows:

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu}{(\ell^2 - m^2)^2 [(\ell+p)^2 - M^2]} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} p_\mu C_2(p^2, m^2, M^2), \quad (\text{C.22})$$

$$\int \frac{d^D \ell}{(2\pi)^D} \frac{\ell_\mu}{(\ell^2 - m^2)^3 [(\ell+p)^2 - M^2]} = \frac{i}{(4\pi)^2} p_\mu D_3(p^2, m^2, M^2). \quad (\text{C.23})$$

We have some variations to express  $C_2, D_3$  functions [40].

$$C_2(p^2, m^2, M^2) = \int_0^1 dx \frac{x(1-x)}{m^2x + M^2x - p^2x(1-x)} = \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2), \quad (\text{C.24})$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_3(p^2, m^2, M^2) &= \int_0^1 dx \frac{-\frac{1}{2}x^2(1-x)}{[m^2x + M^2x - p^2x(1-x)]^2} \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial m^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial m^2} \right)^2 B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2) \\ &= \frac{-p^2 + m^2 + M^2}{(p^4 + m^4 + M^4 - 2p^2m^2 - 2p^2M^2 - 2m^2M^2)^2} \\ &\quad \times \left[ (M^2 - m^2 + p^2) [-B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2) + B_0(0, m^2, m^2) + 2] - 2M^2 \log \frac{M^2}{m^2} \right] \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{(p^4 + m^4 + M^4 - 2p^2m^2 - 2p^2M^2 - 2m^2M^2)} \\ &\quad \times \left[ -B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2) + B_0(0, m^2, m^2) + 2 - (p^2 - m^2 - M^2) \frac{\partial}{\partial p^2} B_0(p^2, m^2, M^2) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.25})$$

### C.5 $\partial F(m_a^2)/\partial m_a^2$ in loop functions

$\partial Y_n(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2)/\partial m_a^2$  ( $n = 1, 2, 3$ ) can be expressed in the loop functions introduced above.

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_1(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) = \frac{1}{m_a^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial m_\chi^2} B_0(m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_\chi^2) - Y_1(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) \right], \quad (\text{C.26})$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_2(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) = \frac{1}{m_a^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_1(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) - Y_2(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) \right], \quad (\text{C.27})$$

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_3(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) = \frac{1}{m_a^2 - \frac{m_q^2}{x(1-x)}} \left[ \frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_2(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) - Y_3(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) \right]. \quad (\text{C.28})$$

The expression for  $\partial F(m_a^2)/\partial m_a^2$  using the loop functions is

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial F(m_a^2)}{\partial m_a^2} &= \int_0^1 dx \left\{ 3 \frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_1(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) \right. \\ &\quad - m_q^2 \frac{(2 + 5x - 5x^2)}{x^2(1-x)^2} \frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_2(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) \\ &\quad \left. - 2m_q^4 \frac{(1 - 2x + 2x^2)}{x^3(1-x)^3} \frac{\partial}{\partial m_a^2} Y_3(p^2, m_\chi^2, m_a^2, m_q^2) \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.29})$$

**Open Access.** This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License ([CC-BY 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/)), which permits any use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author(s) and source are credited.

## References

- [1] LUX collaboration, *Limits on spin-dependent WIMP-nucleon cross section obtained from the complete LUX exposure*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118** (2017) 251302 [[arXiv:1705.03380](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [2] PANDAX-II collaboration, *Dark Matter Results From 54-Ton-Day Exposure of PandaX-II Experiment*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119** (2017) 181302 [[arXiv:1708.06917](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [3] XENON collaboration, *Dark Matter Search Results from a One Ton-Year Exposure of XENON1T*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** (2018) 111302 [[arXiv:1805.12562](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [4] M. Escudero, A. Berlin, D. Hooper and M.-X. Lin, *Toward (Finally!) Ruling Out Z and Higgs Mediated Dark Matter Models*, *JCAP* **12** (2016) 029 [[arXiv:1609.09079](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [5] M. Escudero, D. Hooper and S.J. Witte, *Updated Collider and Direct Detection Constraints on Dark Matter Models for the Galactic Center Gamma-Ray Excess*, *JCAP* **02** (2017) 038 [[arXiv:1612.06462](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [6] S. Ipek, D. McKeen and A.E. Nelson, *A Renormalizable Model for the Galactic Center Gamma Ray Excess from Dark Matter Annihilation*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 055021 [[arXiv:1404.3716](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [7] J.M. No, *Looking through the pseudoscalar portal into dark matter: Novel mono-Higgs and mono-Z signatures at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 031701 [[arXiv:1509.01110](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [8] D. Goncalves, P.A.N. Machado and J.M. No, *Simplified Models for Dark Matter Face their Consistent Completions*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 055027 [[arXiv:1611.04593](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [9] M. Bauer, U. Haisch and F. Kahlhoefer, *Simplified dark matter models with two Higgs doublets: I. Pseudoscalar mediators*, *JHEP* **05** (2017) 138 [[arXiv:1701.07427](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [10] P. Tunney, J.M. No and M. Fairbairn, *Probing the pseudoscalar portal to dark matter via  $bbZ(\rightarrow \ell\ell)+\cancel{E}_T$ : From the LHC to the Galactic Center excess*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 095020 [[arXiv:1705.09670](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [11] G. Arcadi, M. Lindner, F.S. Queiroz, W. Rodejohann and S. Vogl, *Pseudoscalar Mediators: A WIMP model at the Neutrino Floor*, *JCAP* **03** (2018) 042 [[arXiv:1711.02110](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [12] P. Pani and G. Polesello, *Dark matter production in association with a single top-quark at the LHC in a two-Higgs-doublet model with a pseudoscalar mediator*, *Phys. Dark Univ.* **21** (2018) 8 [[arXiv:1712.03874](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [13] N.F. Bell, G. Busoni and I.W. Sanderson, *Loop Effects in Direct Detection*, *JCAP* **08** (2018) 017 [*Erratum ibid.* **01** (2019) E01] [[arXiv:1803.01574](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [14] T. Li, *Revisiting the direct detection of dark matter in simplified models*, *Phys. Lett. B* **782** (2018) 497 [[arXiv:1804.02120](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [15] K. Ghorbani, *Fermionic dark matter with pseudo-scalar Yukawa interaction*, *JCAP* **01** (2015) 015 [[arXiv:1408.4929](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [16] T. Abe, R. Kitano and R. Sato, *Discrimination of dark matter models in future experiments*, *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 095004 [*Erratum ibid.* **D 96** (2017) 019902] [[arXiv:1411.1335](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [17] S. Baek, P. Ko and J. Li, *Minimal renormalizable simplified dark matter model with a pseudoscalar mediator*, *Phys. Rev. D* **95** (2017) 075011 [[arXiv:1701.04131](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].

- [18] T. Abe, *Effect of CP-violation in the singlet-doublet dark matter model*, *Phys. Lett. B* **771** (2017) 125 [[arXiv:1702.07236](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [19] J. Billard, L. Strigari and E. Figueroa-Feliciano, *Implication of neutrino backgrounds on the reach of next generation dark matter direct detection experiments*, *Phys. Rev. D* **89** (2014) 023524 [[arXiv:1307.5458](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [20] XENON collaboration, *Physics reach of the XENON1T dark matter experiment*, *JCAP* **04** (2016) 027 [[arXiv:1512.07501](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [21] LUX and LZ collaborations, *The Present and Future of Searching for Dark Matter with LUX and LZ*, *PoS(ICHEP2016)220* (2016) [[arXiv:1611.05525](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [22] DARWIN collaboration, *DARWIN: towards the ultimate dark matter detector*, *JCAP* **11** (2016) 017 [[arXiv:1606.07001](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [23] M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Remarks on Higgs Boson Interactions with Nucleons*, *Phys. Lett.* **78B** (1978) 443 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [24] V.D. Barger, J.L. Hewett and R.J.N. Phillips, *New Constraints on the Charged Higgs Sector in Two Higgs Doublet Models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **41** (1990) 3421 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [25] Y. Grossman, *Phenomenology of models with more than two Higgs doublets*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **426** (1994) 355 [[hep-ph/9401311](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [26] M. Aoki, S. Kanemura, K. Tsumura and K. Yagyu, *Models of Yukawa interaction in the two Higgs doublet model and their collider phenomenology*, *Phys. Rev. D* **80** (2009) 015017 [[arXiv:0902.4665](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [27] S.L. Glashow and S. Weinberg, *Natural Conservation Laws for Neutral Currents*, *Phys. Rev. D* **15** (1977) 1958 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [28] X. Liu, L. Bian, X.-Q. Li and J. Shu, *Type-III two Higgs doublet model plus a pseudoscalar confronted with  $h \rightarrow \mu\tau$ , muon  $g - 2$  and dark matter*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **909** (2016) 507 [[arXiv:1508.05716](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [29] ATLAS collaboration, *Combined measurements of Higgs boson production and decay using up to  $80\text{fb}^{-1}$  of proton-proton collision data at  $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{ TeV}$  collected with the ATLAS experiment*, *ATLAS-CONF-2018-031* [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [30] CMS collaboration, *Combined measurements of Higgs boson couplings in proton-proton collisions at  $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{ TeV}$* , [arXiv:1809.10733](#) [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [31] M. Misiak and M. Steinhauser, *Weak radiative decays of the B meson and bounds on  $M_{H^\pm}$  in the Two-Higgs-Doublet Model*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** (2017) 201 [[arXiv:1702.04571](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [32] ATLAS collaboration, *Search for heavy resonances decaying into a W or Z boson and a Higgs boson in final states with leptons and b-jets in  $36\text{fb}^{-1}$  of  $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{ TeV}$  pp collisions with the ATLAS detector*, *JHEP* **03** (2018) 174 [*Erratum ibid.* **11** (2018) 051] [[arXiv:1712.06518](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [33] CMS collaboration, *Search for a heavy pseudoscalar boson decaying to a Z boson and a Higgs boson at  $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{ TeV}$* , *CMS-PAS-HIG-18-005* [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [34] CMS collaboration, *Combined measurements of the Higgs boson's couplings at  $\sqrt{s} = 13\text{ TeV}$* , *CMS-PAS-HIG-17-031* [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [35] J. Hisano, *Effective theory approach to direct detection of dark matter*, [arXiv:1712.02947](#) [[INSPIRE](#)].

- [36] G. Bélanger, F. Boudjema, A. Pukhov and A. Semenov, *MicrOMEGAs<sub>3</sub>: A program for calculating dark matter observables*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **185** (2014) 960 [[arXiv:1305.0237](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [37] J. Pumplin, D.R. Stump, J. Huston, H.L. Lai, P.M. Nadolsky and W.K. Tung, *New generation of parton distributions with uncertainties from global QCD analysis*, *JHEP* **07** (2002) 012 [[hep-ph/0201195](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [38] V.A. Novikov, M.A. Shifman, A.I. Vainshtein and V.I. Zakharov, *Calculations in External Fields in Quantum Chromodynamics. Technical Review*, *Fortsch. Phys.* **32** (1984) 585 [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [39] J. Hisano, K. Ishiwata and N. Nagata, *Gluon contribution to the dark matter direct detection*, *Phys. Rev. D* **82** (2010) 115007 [[arXiv:1007.2601](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [40] T. Abe and R. Sato, *Quantum corrections to the spin-independent cross section of the inert doublet dark matter*, *JHEP* **03** (2015) 109 [[arXiv:1501.04161](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [41] PLANCK collaboration, *Planck 2015 results. XIII. Cosmological parameters*, *Astron. Astrophys.* **594** (2016) A13 [[arXiv:1502.01589](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [42] T. Hahn and M. Pérez-Victoria, *Automatized one loop calculations in four-dimensions and D-dimensions*, *Comput. Phys. Commun.* **118** (1999) 153 [[hep-ph/9807565](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [43] J. Hisano, S. Matsumoto, M.M. Nojiri and O. Saito, *Direct detection of the Wino and Higgsino-like neutralino dark matters at one-loop level*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 015007 [[hep-ph/0407168](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [44] J. Hisano, K. Ishiwata and N. Nagata, *A complete calculation for direct detection of Wino dark matter*, *Phys. Lett. B* **690** (2010) 311 [[arXiv:1004.4090](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].
- [45] J. Hisano, K. Ishiwata and N. Nagata, *QCD Effects on Direct Detection of Wino Dark Matter*, *JHEP* **06** (2015) 097 [[arXiv:1504.00915](#)] [[INSPIRE](#)].