The Anomalous Magnetic Moment of the Muon: Beyond the Standard Model via Chiral Enhancement
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Summary. — The anomalous magnetic moment of the muon displays a 4.2σ tension with the Standard-Model prediction, if $e^+e^- \rightarrow $ hadrons data are used for hadronic vacuum polarization. In these proceedings we review possible explanations of this anomaly in terms of heavy new particles. As the necessary effect is of the order of the electroweak Standard-Model contribution, viable explanations with TeV-scale physics must involve an enhancement factor; in particular, one can obtain the chirality flip of the dipole operator via a sizable coupling to the Higgs doublet instead of the small muon Yukawa coupling. Such Standard-Model extensions then also predict effects in Higgs and $Z$-boson decays to muons, with details depending on the $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ representations of the new particles. We first review the general case of chirally enhanced new physics, before discussing in more detail the concrete example of leptoquark models.

1. – Introduction

The Run 1 result of the Fermilab Muon $g - 2$ experiment [1] confirmed the previous measurement at Brookhaven National Laboratory [2], leading to a combined world average of

\begin{equation}
\alpha_\mu^{\exp} = 116.592.061(41) \times 10^{-11},
\end{equation}

which differs from the Standard-Model (SM) theory prediction [3] (mainly based on Refs. [4-23])

\begin{equation}
\alpha_\mu^{\SM} = 116.591.810(43) \times 10^{-11},
\end{equation}
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by 4.2σ.\(^{(1)}\) If this tension is indeed a signal of physics beyond the SM, the most pressing
challenge is unraveling its nature.

Given that \(\Delta a_\mu = a_\mu^{\text{exp}} - a_\mu^{\text{SM}} = 251(59) \times 10^{-11}\) is larger than the electroweak (EW)
contribution of the SM, \(a_\mu^{\text{EW}} = 153.6(1.0) \times 10^{-11}\) [6, 7], any BSM explanation must
be able to provide such a sizable effect. Apart from light new physics, which we will
not consider here (see Ref. [33] for an extensive review of new physics in \((g - 2)_\mu\)), this
can be achieved by a chirality flip originating from a large coupling to the SM Higgs
instead of the small muon Yukawa coupling in the SM. This chiral enhancement allows
for viable solutions for particle masses up to tens of TeV [34-40]. However, the same
mechanism also produces sizable effects in other processes, in particular
\(h \to \mu^+\mu^-\) and \(Z \to \mu^+\mu^-\), albeit in general not probing the exact same combination of couplings. These
correlations are therefore not model independent, but require at least the specification
of the \(SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y\) representations of the new particles. Here, we first review the
general argument, before presenting concrete examples in leptoquark (LQ) models.

2. – Generic New Physics Effects

The effective Hamiltonian governing dipole transitions of charged leptons is given by
\(\mathcal{H}_{\text{eff}} = c_{\ell f} \bar{\ell}_f \ell_i \sigma_{\mu\nu} \gamma^\mu \ell_i F^{\mu\nu} + \text{h.c.}\),
with
\[\begin{align*}
a_\ell &= \frac{(g - 2)\ell_i}{2} = \frac{-2m_\ell}{e} \left( c_{\ell_R}^{\ell_i} + c_{\ell_R}^{\ell_i \ast} \right) = -\frac{4m_\ell}{e} \text{Re} c_{\ell_R}^{\ell_i}, \\
d_\ell &= i\left( c_{\ell_R}^{\ell_i} - c_{\ell_R}^{\ell_i \ast} \right) = -2 \text{Im} c_{\ell_R}^{\ell_i},
\end{align*}\]
where \(\ell_i, \ell_f \in \{e, \mu, \tau\}\). This emphasizes that the Wilson coefficients (3) are not neces-
sarily subject to minimal flavor violation, i.e., \(a_\ell\) is linear (rather than quadratic) in \(m_\ell\)
and the phase of the Wilson coefficient for each flavor can be different.

In general, the dipole operator (3) does not imply immediate correlations with other
processes, but such connections can still be established for a wide range of simplified
models, i.e., we can parameterize the couplings of new scalars/vectors to SM leptons \(\ell_i\)
contributing to the dipole operators as
\[\begin{align*}
\mathcal{L}_\Phi &= \bar{\Psi} \left( \Gamma_L^{\ell_R} P_L + \Gamma_R^{\ell_R} P_R \right) \ell_i \Phi^* + \text{h.c.}, \\
\mathcal{L}_V &= \bar{\Psi} \left( \Gamma_L^{\ell_R} \gamma^\mu P_L + \Gamma_R^{\ell_R} \gamma^\mu P_R \right) \ell_i \nu^\ast + \text{h.c.},
\end{align*}\]
where a sum over all fermions \(\Psi\) and scalars (vectors) \(\Phi\) \((V^\mu)\) is implicitly understood.
With these conventions at hand the contribution to the Wilson coefficients (for heavy

\(\text{(1)}\) The lattice-QCD results for hadronic vacuum polarization [24-26] indicate a smaller tension
than the SM prediction in Ref. [3], but display a tension with \(e^+e^-\) data that for the intermediate
region in center-of-mass energy reaches 4σ [24-27], see also Refs. [28-31] for the consequences
of this emerging tension. Note, however, that the lattice-QCD calculation of Ref. [32] agrees
with \(e^+e^-\) data for this intermediate “window” quantity, and further calculations are required
to draw firm conclusions.
new physics) are [39] (see also Refs. [41,42])

\[
\begin{align*}
\epsilon_{fR} & = \frac{e}{16\pi^2} \Gamma_{\Phi iL} \Gamma_{V iR} M_\Phi \frac{f_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right) + Q g_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right)}{M_\Phi^2} \\
& + \frac{e}{16\pi^2} (m_\ell, \Gamma_{\Phi iL} \Gamma_{V iR} + m_\ell, \Gamma_{\Phi iR} \Gamma_{V iL}) \times \frac{\tilde{f}_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right) + Q \tilde{g}_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right)}{M_\Phi^2}, \\
\epsilon_{fV} & = \frac{e}{16\pi^2} \Gamma_{\Phi iL} \Gamma_{V iR} M_\Phi \frac{f_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right) + Q g_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right)}{M_\Phi^2} \\
& + \frac{e}{16\pi^2} (m_\ell, \Gamma_{\Phi iL} \Gamma_{V iR} + m_\ell, \Gamma_{\Phi iR} \Gamma_{V iL}) \times \frac{\tilde{f}_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right) + Q \tilde{g}_\Phi \left( \frac{M_\Phi^2}{M_\Phi^2} \right)}{M_\Phi^2},
\end{align*}
\]

with loop functions

\[
\begin{align*}
f_\Phi (x) &= 2\tilde{g}_\Phi (x) = \frac{x^2 - 1 - 2x \log x}{4(x-1)^4}, \\
g_\Phi (x) &= \frac{x - 1 - \log x}{2(x-1)^2}, \\
f_\Phi (x) &= \frac{2x^3 + 3x^2 - 6x + 1 - 6x^2 \log x}{24(x-1)^4}, \\
f_\Phi (x) &= \frac{x^3 - 12x^2 + 15x - 4 + 6x^2 \log x}{24(x-1)^4}, \\
g_\Phi (x) &= \frac{x^2 - 5x + 4 + 3x \log x}{2(x-1)^2}, \\
f_\Phi (x) &= \frac{-4x^4 + 49x^3 - 78x^2 + 43x - 10 - 18x^3 \log x}{24(x-1)^4}, \\
f_\Phi (x) &= \frac{-3(x^3 - 6x^2 + 7x - 2 + 2x^2 \log x)}{8(x-1)^4},
\end{align*}
\]

where \( Q \) is the electric charge of the fermion. We calculated the contribution of the massive vector boson in unitary gauge, so that the effects of Goldstone bosons are automatically included, which is possible since the matching on dipole operators gives a finite result. The terms proportional to the heavy fermion mass are the ones that can be chirally enhanced. These contributions have an arbitrary phase also for \( i = f \) while, due to Hermiticity of the Lagrangian, the terms that are not chirally enhanced, i.e., proportional to \( \Gamma_{V iL} \Gamma_{V iL} \Phi \) and \( \Gamma_{V iR} \Gamma_{V iR} \Phi \) (included here for completeness), are real for flavor-conserving dipole transitions. Importantly, this means that in case of a chirally enhanced new physics effect, the Wilson coefficients of the corresponding dipole operators are in general complex. While the real part generates an effect in the anomalous magnetic moment, the imaginary part is related to the electric dipole moment of the muon, and absent further restrictions can thus be sizable [39, 43], potentially within reach of future experiments [44, 45].
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\[ \Psi, \Phi, \Phi_L, \Psi_L, \Phi_E, \Psi_E, \phi \ell e \]

SU(2)\n
\[ Y \]

\[
\begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
R & \Psi, \Phi & \Phi_L, \Psi_L & \Phi_E, \Psi_E & \phi & \ell & e \\
\hline
SU(2)_L & 121 & 1 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 1 \\
 & 212 & 2 & 1 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
 & 323 & 3 & 2 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 & 3 \\
 & 232 & 2 & 3 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 & 2 \\
Y & X & -\frac{1}{2} - X & -1 - X & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & -1 & & \\
\hline
\end{array}
\]

Table I. – Charge assignments and representations under SU(2)_L × U(1)_Y for the SM fields and the different new particles. Hypercharge is parameterized by a free parameter X.

Fig. 1. – Effects in \( h \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- \) (left, case I with \( R = 121 \)) and \( Z \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^- \) (right, case II with \( R = 232 \)), when imposing the constraint to reproduce \( \Delta a_\mu \). In both cases, in the blue regions the effect is too small to be observable, in the red region the couplings become non-perturbative, but the parameter space in between can be probed at future colliders. Taken from Ref. [58].

3. – SU(2)_L invariance

The relations in Eqs. (5)–(7) are not manifestly SU(2)_L invariant, but only invariant with respect to U(1)_{EM}. However, for new physics realized above the EW scale, SU(2)_L gauge symmetry must be respected. Therefore, let us consider a class of models with new scalars and fermions that display the minimal features required to implement chiral enhancement, allowing for a wide range of SU(2)_L representations and hypercharges. We can match these models onto the relevant set of dimension-6 effective operators in SMEFT [46,47], based on which correlations have been pointed out in Refs. [48-50].

In order to achieve chiral enhancement in \( a_\mu \) with new particles in the loop, at least three fields (two scalars and one fermion or two fermions and one scalar) are needed, some of which, as, e.g., in LQ models, can be taken from the SM. As a first step, we classify the possible representations of three new fields under SU(2)_L × U(1)_Y and perform the matching onto the relevant SMEFT operators.

There are two classes of models that display chiral enhancement for \( a_\mu \): (I) two scalars \( \Phi_{L,E} \) and one fermion \( \Psi \) and (II) two fermions \( \Psi_{L,E} \) and one scalar \( \Phi \). We thus define the Lagrangians in these two cases as

\[
L_I = \lambda^I_L \bar{\ell} \Psi \Phi_L + \lambda^I_E \bar{e} \Psi \Phi_E + A \Phi^I_L \Phi_E \phi, \\
L_{II} = \lambda_{II}^L \bar{\ell} \Psi_L \Phi + \lambda_{II}^E \bar{e} \Psi_E \Phi + \kappa \Psi_L \Psi_E \phi.
\]
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Fig. 2. – Correlations between BR($h\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$/SM, normalized to its SM value, and the new-physics contribution to $a_{\mu}$ ($\delta a_{\mu}$) for scenario $\Phi_1$ (left) and $\Phi_2$ (right) with $m_{1,2} = 1.5 \text{ TeV}$. The predictions for different values of the LQ couplings to the Higgs are shown, where for $\Phi_1 Y = Y_1$ and for $\Phi_2 Y = Y_2 + Y_{22}$. Even though the current ATLAS and CMS results are not yet constraining this model, sizable effects are predicted, which can be tested at future colliders. Furthermore, $\Phi_1$ yields a constructive effect in $h\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$, while the one of $\Phi_2$ is destructive, such that they can be clearly distinguished with increasing experimental precision. Taken from Ref. [57].

where $\ell$, $e$, and $\phi$ are the lepton doublet, singlet, and Higgs field of the SM (throughout, we follow the notation of Ref. [47]). The conventions for the SM particles and the $SU(2)_L$ quantum numbers and hypercharges $Y$ are given in Table I. We consider the four combinations of $SU(2)_L$ representations ($R$) up-to-and-including triplets (see also Ref. [51]), while the hypercharge assignment can be parameterized in terms of a general variable $X$. We further assume a $Z_2$ symmetry to avoid mixing with SM fields, which could generate tree-level effects in $h\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ and $Z\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ that are at least strongly disfavored [39, 52-57]. Moreover, $a_{\mu}$ is only generated at loop level, further motivating the study of loop effects in $h\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ and $Z\rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ as well. The full results for all cases discussed above can be found in Ref. [58], in Fig. 1 we show two examples for the numerical analysis. In particular, the general case also covers the LQ models $S_1$ and $S_2$ within case II with $R = 121$ and $212$, respectively, and upon identifying $\Psi_L = t_L$, $\Psi_E = t_R$, and $\kappa = Y_t$, which is the special case we discuss in more detail in the following section.

4. – Leptoquarks

In LQ models one adds in their minimal version only one new field to the SM. Therefore, they are, with respect to their particle content, minimal models with chiral enhancement. In constructing these models one demands that the couplings to quarks and leptons respect SM gauge invariance, resulting in 5 vector LQs and 5 scalar LQs [59]. Therefore, in Eqs. (6) and (7) $M_{\Psi}$ corresponds to the quark mass, $M_{\Phi}$ and $M_{\Phi}$ to the LQ mass, respectively, and a factor $N_c = 3$ has to be added to take into account the fact that quarks and LQs are colored.

There are two representations of scalar LQs that can easily accommodate $a_{\mu}$ via a chiral enhancement by the top mass of $m_t/m_{\mu} \approx 1600$ [60-67], so that even for TeV-scale
masses one can easily explain the tension in $a_\mu$. As in the generic case, sizable effects in $h \to \mu^+\mu^-$ and $Z \to \mu^+\mu^-$ are observed [68]. However, the predictions are even more direct as $\kappa$ is given by the top Yukawa coupling. The predictions for $h \to \mu^+\mu^-$ are given in Fig. 2, where the only free parameters are the trilinear Higgs–LQ couplings. Neglecting the effects of these couplings in $Z \to \mu^+\mu^-$, where they only lead to dim-8 effects, the predictions are shown in Fig. 3.

5. – Conclusions

In these proceedings we reviewed the consequences of explaining $g - 2$ of the muon in terms of heavy new physics. In practice, chiral enhancement is a necessary condition for such an explanation, otherwise, direct LHC mass limits exclude most of the available parameter space. In the general case, chiral enhancement requires at least three different fields in the loop, and we worked out the matching onto SMEFT as well as the resulting effects in $h \to \mu^+\mu^-$ and $Z \to \mu^+\mu^-$ for a wide range of such simplified models. Minimal scenarios can be constructed by using SM particles in the loop, e.g., if one identifies two of these fields with left- and right-handed top quarks, the third field becomes a scalar LQ, defining a minimal model with chiral enhancement. For such a concrete setup, the correlations with $h \to \mu^+\mu^-$ and $Z \to \mu^+\mu^-$ become even more predictive. In this way, precision measurements of these processes at future colliders provide valuable complementary information on explanations of $a_\mu$ in terms of new degrees of freedom above the EW scale.

* * *

AC thanks the organizers, especially Gino Isidori, for the invitation to “Les Rencontres de Physique de la Valle d’Aoste” and the opportunity to present these results. This work is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation, under Project Nos. PP00P21_76884 and PCEFP2_181117.
REFERENCES

[1] B. Abi et al. [Muon $g-2$], Phys. Rev. Lett. 126 (2021) 141801 [arXiv:2104.03281 [hep-ex]].
[2] G. W. Bennett et al. [Muon $g-2$], Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 072003 [arXiv:hep-ex/0602035 [hep-ex]].
[3] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[4] T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 111808 [arXiv:1205.5370 [hep-ph]].
[5] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Atoms 7 (2019) 28.
[6] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 073006 [Erratum: Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 119901] [hep-ph/0212229].
[7] T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 111808 [arXiv:1205.5370 [hep-ph]].
[8] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Atoms 7 (2019) 28.
[9] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 073006 [Erratum: Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 119901] [hep-ph/0212229].
[10] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[11] T. Aoyama, M. Hayakawa, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109 (2012) 111808 [arXiv:1205.5370 [hep-ph]].
[12] T. Aoyama, T. Kinoshita and M. Nio, Atoms 7 (2019) 28.
[13] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 073006 [Erratum: Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 119901] [hep-ph/0212229].
[14] A. Czarnecki, W. J. Marciano and A. Vainshtein, Phys. Rev. D 67 (2003) 073006 [Erratum: Phys. Rev. D 73 (2006) 119901] [hep-ph/0212229].
[15] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[16] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[17] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[18] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[19] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[20] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[21] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[22] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[23] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[24] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[25] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[26] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[27] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[28] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[29] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[30] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[31] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[32] T. Aoyama et al., Phys. Rept. 887 (2020) 1 [arXiv:2006.04822 [hep-ph]].
[33] P. Athron et al., JHEP 09 (2021) 080 [arXiv:2104.03691 [hep-ph]].
[34] A. Czarnecki and W. J. Marciano, Phys. Rev. D 64 (2001) 013014 [arXiv:hep-ph/0102122 [hep-ph]].
[35] D. Stöckinger, Adv. Ser. Direct. High Energy Phys. 20 (2009) 393.
[36] G. F. Giudice, P. Paradisi and M. Passera, JHEP 11 (2012) 113 [arXiv:1208.6583 [hep-ph]].
[37] W. Altmannshofer, M. Carena and A. Crivellin, Phys. Rev. D 94 (2016) 095026 [arXiv:1604.08221 [hep-ph]].
[38] K. Kowalska and E. M. Sessolo, JHEP 09 (2017) 112 [arXiv:1707.00753 [hep-ph]].
[39] A. Crivellin, M. Hoferichter and P. Schmidt-Wellenburg, Phys. Rev. D 98 (2018) 113002 [arXiv:1807.11484 [hep-ph]].
[40] R. Capdevilla, D. Curtin, Y. Kahn and G. Krajaic, Phys. Rev. D 105 (2022) 015026 [arXiv:2101.10334 [hep-ph]].
[41] A. Adelmann et al., arXiv:2102.08838 [hep-ex].
[42] M. Aiba et al., arXiv:2111.05788 [hep-ex].
[43] W. Altmannshofer, M. Carena and A. Crivellin, Phys. Rev. D 104 (2021) 075021 [arXiv:2012.02769 [hep-ph]].
[44] B. Grzadkowski, M. Iskrzyński, M. Misiak and J. Rosiek, JHEP 10 (2010) 085 [arXiv:1008.4884 [hep-ph]].
[45] D. Buttazzo and P. Paradisi, Phys. Rev. D 104 (2021) 075021 [arXiv:2012.02769 [hep-ph]].
[46] W. Yin and M. Yamaguchi, arXiv:2102.08838 [hep-ex].
[47] A. Adelmann et al., arXiv:2104.03202 [hep-ph].
[48] A. Freitas, J. Lykken, S. Kell and S. Westhoff, JHEP 05 (2014) 145 [Erratum: JHEP 09 (2014) 155 [arXiv:1402.7065 [hep-ph]].
[49] D. Stöckinger, J. Phys. G 34 (2007) R45 [arXiv:hep-ph/0609168 [hep-ph]].
[50] A. Crivellin and M. Hoferichter, PoS ALPS2019 (2020) 009 [arXiv:1905.03789 [hep-ph]].
[51] A. Crivellin and M. Hoferichter, PoS ALPS2019 (2020) 009 [arXiv:1905.03789 [hep-ph]].
[52] A. Crivellin, M. Hoferichter and P. Schmidt-Wellenburg, Phys. Rev. D 98 (2018) 113002 [arXiv:1807.11484 [hep-ph]].
[53] A. Crivellin, D. Muller and F. Saturnino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127 (2021) 021801 [arXiv:2008.02643 [hep-ph]].
[54] A. Crivellin and M. Hoferichter, JHEP 07 (2021) 135 [arXiv:2104.03202 [hep-ph]].
[55] A. Crivellin, D. Muller and F. Saturnino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127 (2021) 021801 [arXiv:2008.02643 [hep-ph]].
[56] A. Djouadi, T. Köhler, M. Spira and J. Tutas, Z. Phys. C 46 (1990) 679.
[57] S. Davidson, D. C. Bailey and B. A. Campbell, Z. Phys. C 61 (1994) 613 [arXiv:hep-ph/9309310 [hep-ph]].
[58] G. Aad et al. [ATLAS], Phys. Lett. B 812 (2021) 135980 [arXiv:2007.07830 [hep-ex]].
[59] A. M. Sirunyan et al. [CMS], JHEP 01 (2021) 148 [arXiv:2009.04363 [hep-ex]].
[60] A. Crivellin, D. Müller and F. Saturnino, Phys. Rev. Lett. 127 (2021) 021801 [arXiv:2008.02643 [hep-ph]].
[61] A. Crivellin and M. Hoferichter, JHEP 07 (2021) 135 [arXiv:2104.03202 [hep-ph]].
[62] A. Crivellin, C. Greub, D. Müller and F. Saturnino, JHEP 02 (2019) 109 [arXiv:1901.06315 [hep-ph]].