GLOBAL CONSTRAINTS ON HEAVY NEUTRINO MIXING

E. FERNANDEZ-MARTINEZ, J. HERNANDEZ-GARCIA, J. LOPEZ-PAVON & M. LUCENTE

JHEP 1510 (2015) 130

INTRODUCTION

We use EW observables to constrain the mixing of the extra neutrino mass eigenstates in a Seesaw model:

$$\mathscr{L} = \mathscr{L}_{\rm SM} - \frac{1}{2} \overline{N_{\rm R}^{i}} (M_N)_{ij} N_{\rm R}^{cj} - (Y_N)_{i\alpha} \overline{N_{\rm R}^{i}} \phi^{\dagger} \ell_{\rm L}^{\alpha} + \text{H.c.}$$

The full neutrino mass matrix is diagonalized by the unitary 6×6 mixing matrix U_{tot} :

$$U_{\text{tot}}^T \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D^T \\ m_D & M_N \end{pmatrix} U_{\text{tot}} = \begin{pmatrix} m & 0 \\ 0 & M \end{pmatrix}$$

OBSERVABLES

We compute the EW observables at 1 loop in the Equivalence Theorem [3] regime, i.e. $M_N \gg M_{Z,W}$, in terms of M_Z , α and G_{μ} .

The new degrees of freedom correct the W and Z boson propagators that will enter in the observable amplitudes at tree level.

$$\frac{W}{N} = \frac{W}{N} + \frac{W}{N} \underbrace{\int_{N}^{l} W}_{N} \sum_{WW} \frac{Z}{N} = \frac{Z}{N} + \frac{Z}{N} \underbrace{\int_{N}^{N} Z}_{N} \sum_{ZZ} \frac{Z}{N}$$

For phenomenological impact, $M_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\text{EW scale})$ and $Y_N \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ while $m_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\text{eV})$ are required \Rightarrow a mass matrix with an approximate L symmetry is needed [1]:

$$m_{D} = \frac{v_{\text{EW}}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} Y_{e} & Y_{\mu} & Y_{\tau} \\ \epsilon_{1}Y'_{e} & \epsilon_{1}Y'_{\mu} & \epsilon_{1}Y'_{\tau} \\ \epsilon_{2}Y''_{e} & \epsilon_{2}Y''_{\mu} & \epsilon_{2}Y''_{\tau} \end{pmatrix} \text{ and } M_{N} = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_{1} & \Lambda & \mu_{3} \\ \Lambda & \mu_{2} & \mu_{4} \\ \mu_{3} & \mu_{4} & \Lambda' \end{pmatrix} \overset{\epsilon_{i}}{t} \text{ terms}$$

$$\text{If } \epsilon_{i} = \mu^{\alpha} = 0 \Rightarrow L \text{ is recovered} \Rightarrow \begin{cases} m_{\nu_{i}} = 0 (3 \text{ massless } \nu) \\ M_{N_{1}} = M_{N_{2}} = \Lambda (a \text{ Dirac pair}) \\ M_{N_{3}} = \Lambda' (a \text{ decoupled singlet}) \\ \text{Arbitrarily large } \Theta (\text{mixing between } \nu \text{ and } \Lambda) \end{cases}$$

$$\text{In this configuration } U_{\text{tot}} \text{ is:}$$

$$U_{\text{tot}} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \left(1 - \frac{\Theta\Theta^{\dagger}}{2}\right) U_{\text{PMNS}} & \Theta \\ -\Theta^{\dagger}U_{\text{PMNS}} & 1 - \frac{\Theta\Theta^{\dagger}}{2} \end{pmatrix} \text{ where } \Theta \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} -i\theta_{e} & \theta_{e} & 0 \\ -i\theta_{\mu} & \theta_{\mu} & 0 \\ -i\theta_{\tau} & \theta_{\tau} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\text{Eiving neutrino oscillation data [2]: } \theta \subseteq \Delta m_{2}^{2} \text{ and } \Delta m_{2}^{2} \Rightarrow Y = Y (m_{1} \delta \ \alpha_{2} \ \alpha_{2})$$

Fixing neutrino oscillation data [2]: θ_{ij} ,

The set of observables will be written in terms of these 9 parameters that will vary in the following ranges:

Parameter	$ Y_e \ \& \ Y_\mu $	$m_1 \; [eV]$	$\Lambda [\text{GeV}]$	Phases: $\alpha_e, \alpha_\mu, \delta, \alpha_1 \& \alpha_2$	Osc. data
Range	(0, 4)	$(10^{-5}, 1)$	$(10^3, 10^4)$	$(0,2\pi)$	fixed $[2]$

• Universality ratios: $R^{\pi}_{\mu e}$, $R^{\pi}_{\tau \mu}$, $R^W_{e\mu}$, $R^W_{\tau \mu}$, $R^K_{\mu e}$, $R^K_{\tau \mu}$, $R^l_{\mu e}$ and $R^l_{\tau \mu}$



• Invisible Z decay:

 $\Gamma_{\text{inv}} = \left| Z \sim \left(\sum_{n_i}^{n_i} + Z \sim \left(\sum_{H=1}^{\phi} \sum_{n_i}^{n_i} + Z \sim \left(\sum_{H=1}^{h_i} \sum_{n_i}^{n_i} + Z \sim \left(\sum_{H=1}^{h_i} \sum_{n_i}^{n_i} \right)^2 \right) \right|^2$

• M_W through G_F in μ decay:

 $\Gamma_{\mu} = \left| \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{\mu}} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}}^{e} + \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{\mu}} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\phi}^{\phi} \underbrace{\mathcal{N}}_{\nu_{e}}^{e} + \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\phi}^{\phi} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}}^{e} + \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}}^{e} + \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}}^{e} + \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\mu} \underbrace{\mathcal{W}}_{\nu_{e}}^{e} \right|^{2}$

• Rare decays: $\mu \to e\gamma, \tau \to \mu\gamma$ and $\tau \to e\gamma$

 $\Gamma_{\mu \to e\gamma} = \left| \begin{array}{cc} \mu & \overbrace{\qquad N \\ \hline \end{array} \\ \mu & \overbrace{\qquad N \\ \hline \end{array} \\ e \end{array} + \cdots \right|^2$

A partial cancellation between the tree and the loop contributions could be possible in some observables [4]:

obs.
$$\sim \frac{|\theta_e|^2}{2} + \frac{|\theta_\mu|^2}{2} + 2\alpha T$$
 where



RESULTS: GLOBAL FIT & CONSTRAINTS

MCMC with the 13 observables scanning over the 9 parameters.

Frequentist constraints and values of the mixing in the BF:

• Normal hierarchy

In

 $U_{\rm t}$



RESULTS: LOOP EFFECT

If L is mildly broken $\Rightarrow T \ge 0 \Rightarrow$ no cancellation allowed. T < 0 only possible for large \mathcal{L} . $m_i^{\text{tree}} \sim v_{EW}^2 Y^2 \left(\frac{1}{\Lambda} \mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon_1, \frac{\mu_2}{2\Lambda}\right) + \frac{1}{\Lambda'} \mathcal{O}\left(\epsilon_2^2, \frac{\mu_4}{4\Lambda^2}\right) \right) \Rightarrow \not\!\!L \text{ driven by } \mu_1 \text{ and } \mu_3$

$$T \simeq \frac{v_{\rm EW}^4}{64\pi s_w^2 M_W^2} \left(\sum_{\alpha} |Y_{\alpha}|^2\right)^2 f(\mu_1, \mu_3)$$

But loop level correction to m_{ν} should be taken into account [5]:

 10^{-20}

 10^{-13}

 $\Delta m_{\nu_{\alpha}}$

 10^{-5}

 10^{-10}

 10^{-15}

 10^{-20}

 10^{-16}

 $2\alpha T$

$$= \frac{Y_{\alpha}Y_{\beta}}{32\pi^2} \left(3M_Z^2 f(\mu_1, \mu_3, M_Z) + M_h^2 f(\mu_1, \mu_3, M_h) \right)$$

 10^{-11}

 $\Delta m_{\nu}[GeV]$

 10^{-10}

 10^{-8}

 $10^{-\Delta m_0} GeV$

REFERENCES

[1] A. Abada, C. Biggio, F. Bonnet, M. B. Gavela, and T. Hambye, JHEP 12, 061 (2007), 0707.4058 [4] E. Akhmedov, A. Kartavtsev, M. Lindner, L. Michaels and J. Smirnov, JHEP 1305, 081 (2013) [arXiv:1302.1872 [hep-ph]] [2] M. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, and T. Schwetz, JHEP **1411**, 052 (2014), 1409.5439 [5] A. Pilaftsis, Z. Phys. C 55, 275 (1992) [hep-ph/9901206] [3] J.M. Cornwall, D.N. Levin, and G. Tiktopoulos, Phys. Rev. **D10** (1974) 1145; (E) **11** (1975) 972









• $\mu_3 = 10^{-1}$

• μ₃=10 [GeV]

 10^{-2}

 $\mu_3 = 10^2$

• $\mu_3 = 10^3$

 $m_{\nu} \sim 100 \text{ MeV}!!$

 10^{-5}

since no symmetry protects it

• µ₃=1