ISHEP-2024

Oct 18 – 21, 2024

Antalya-Turkey

On the connection between mixing matrices in the quark and neutrino sectors

Davide Meloni Dipartimento di Matematica e Fisica, Roma Tre

The Standard Model of Particle Physics

S.King, talk at Bethe Forum on Modular Flavor Symmetries

The Flavor Problem

$$
m_d \ll m_s \ll m_b
$$
, $\frac{m_d}{m_s} = 5.02 \times 10^{-2}$,

$$
m_u \ll m_c \ll m_t, \ \frac{m_u}{m_c} = 1.7 \times 10^{-3},
$$

$$
\frac{m_s}{m_b} = 2.22 \times 10^{-2}, \ m_b = 4.18 \text{ GeV};
$$

 $\bar{1}$

$$
\frac{m_c}{m_t} = 7.3 \times 10^{-3}, \ m_t = 172.9 \text{ GeV};
$$

The Flavor Problem

$$
m_d \ll m_s \ll m_b
$$
, $\frac{m_d}{m_s} = 5.02 \times 10^{-2}$,

$$
m_u \ll m_c \ll m_t
$$
, $\frac{m_u}{m_c} = 1.7 \times 10^{-3}$,

$$
\frac{m_s}{m_b} = 2.22 \times 10^{-2}, \ m_b = 4.18 \text{ GeV};
$$

$$
\frac{m_c}{m_t} = 7.3 \times 10^{-3}, \ m_t = 172.9 \text{ GeV};
$$

 ν_1

 ν_e

 ν_μ

 $\boldsymbol{\nu}$

The Flavor Problem

 ν_e

 ν_μ

 $\boldsymbol{\nu}$

$$
m_d \ll m_s \ll m_b
$$
, $\frac{m_d}{m_s} = 5.02 \times 10^{-2}$,

$$
m_u \ll m_c \ll m_t
$$
, $\frac{m_u}{m_c} = 1.7 \times 10^{-3}$,

$$
\frac{m_s}{m_b} = 2.22 \times 10^{-2}, \ m_b = 4.18 \text{ GeV};
$$

$$
\frac{m_c}{m_t} = 7.3 \times 10^{-3}, \ m_t = 172.9 \text{ GeV};
$$

Suggested solutions

* Hierarchical Pattern

> Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism

$$
L \sim \overline{\Psi_L} H \Psi_R \left(\frac{\theta}{\Lambda}\right)^n
$$

Too many O(1) coefficients

Works better for small mixing: good for quarks, no for neutrinos

Suggested solutions

* Hierarchical Pattern

> Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism

 $L \sim \overline{\Psi_L} H \Psi_R \Big(\frac{\theta}{\Lambda}\Big)$ $\overline{\Lambda}$) *n*

Too many O(1) coefficients

Works better for small mixing: good for quarks, no for neutrinos * mixing angles

elegant explanation: non-Abelian discrete flavour symmetries

Complicated scalar sector. Good for neutrinos, not for quarks

Suggested solutions

* Hierarchical Pattern

> Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism

 $L \sim \overline{\Psi_L} H \Psi_R \Big(\frac{\theta}{\Lambda}\Big)$ $\overline{\Lambda}$) *n*

Too many O(1) coefficients

Works better for small mixing: good for quarks, no for neutrinos * mixing angles

elegant explanation: non-Abelian discrete flavour symmetries

Complicated scalar sector. Good for neutrinos, not for quarks

Mixings in the lepton and hadron sector are unrelated?

Quark-Lepton complementarity

Quark-Lepton complementarity

- appealing from a theoretical and phenomenological point of view
- no clue on which kind of symmetry could be responsible for them

Quark-Lepton complementarity

- appealing from a theoretical and phenomenological point of view
- no clue on which kind of symmetry could be responsible for them

we need to replace the bad relation with a promising one:

 $\theta_{13}^{PMNS} = O(1) \cdot \theta_{12}^{C}$

same order of magnitude

we need to replace the bad relation with a promising one:

$$
\theta_{13}^{\text{PMNS}} = O(1) \cdot \theta_{12}^{\text{CKM}} \qquad \text{same order of} \\ \text{magnitude} \\ \text{neutrino mass} \\ \begin{pmatrix} x & y & y \\ y & z & x-z \\ \text{matrix} \end{pmatrix} \xrightarrow{\text{diagonalized by}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} = U_v
$$

Flavor symmetries

Altarelli et al., 0903.1940

Corrections are needed from charged lepton diagonalization

$$
U^{PMNS} = U_{cl}^{+} \cdot U_{v} \qquad U_{cl} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \lambda_{c} & \lambda_{c} \\ \lambda_{c} & 1 & 0 \\ \lambda_{c} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}
$$

$$
\frac{\text{introduced by hand (me/mu - \lambda_{c}^{2})}}{\theta_{12} = \frac{1}{2} - O(\lambda_{c})}
$$

good results:

$$
\begin{cases}\n\sin^2 \theta_{12} = \frac{1}{2} - O(\lambda_C) \\
\sin^2 \theta_{23} = \frac{1}{2} \\
\sin \theta_{13} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} O(\lambda_C)\n\end{cases}
$$

$$
[\theta_{13}^{PMNS} = O(1) \cdot \theta_{12}^{CKM}]
$$

GUT: simple example from SU(5)

Let us take the electron and down quark relation: *m^e*

$$
m_e = m_D^T
$$

$$
U^{PMNS} = U_{cl}^* \cdot U_{v} \qquad \qquad V^{CKM} = U_{u}^* \cdot U_{d}
$$

GUT: simple example from SU(5)

Let us take the electron and down quark relation: *m^e*

$$
m_e = m_D^T
$$

$$
U^{PMNS} = U_{cl}^* \cdot U_{v} \qquad \qquad V^{CKM} = U_{u}^* \cdot U_{d}
$$

Let us diagonalize the matrices:

relations involve unobservable right-handed rotations

Our approach

Our point of view: assume a dependence of neutrino mixing on the CKM

$$
U^{PMNS} = V_{CKM}^* \cdot T^*
$$

 $T = U_{23} (\widetilde{\theta}_{23}) U_{13} (\widetilde{\theta}_{13}) U_{12} (\widetilde{\theta}_{12})$

Our approach

Our point of view: assume a dependence of neutrino mixing on the CKM

$$
U^{PMNS} = V_{CKM}^* \cdot T^*
$$

$$
T\!=\!{\boldsymbol{U}}_{23}(\,\widetilde{\theta_{23}})\,{\boldsymbol{U}}_{13}(\,\widetilde{\theta_{13}})\,{\boldsymbol{U}}_{12}(\,\widetilde{\theta_{12}})
$$

Strategy:

- take T as the well know leading order results
- correct them to match the experimental values of angles and phases
- check for neutrino mass predictions as well

 $J_{\rm CP}={\rm Im}\,\left[(U_{PMNS})_{11}(U_{PMNS})_{12}^*(U_{PMNS})_{21}^*(U_{PMNS})_{22}\right]$

Is the ansatz successfull?

No CKM corrections

$$
U^{PMNS} = V^*_{CKM} \cdot T^*
$$

$$
T = U_{23}(\widetilde{\theta}_{23}) U_{13}(\widetilde{\theta}_{13}) U_{12}(\widetilde{\theta}_{12})
$$

No CKM corrections

$$
U^{PMNS} = V^*_{CKM} \cdot T^*
$$

$$
T = U_{23}(\widetilde{\theta}_{23}) U_{13}(\widetilde{\theta}_{13}) U_{12}(\widetilde{\theta}_{12})
$$

no CKM corrections

 $\sin(\theta_{13})=0$ $\sin(\theta_{13})=0$ $\sin(\theta_{13})=0$ $\tan(\theta_{23})=1$ $\tan(\theta_{23})=1$ $\tan(\theta_{23})=1$ $\tan(\theta_{12})=1$ $\tan(\theta_{12})=$ 1 $\sqrt{2}$ $\tan(\theta_{12})=$ $2\sqrt{5}$ $\sqrt{5}+\sqrt{5}$

no CP violation !

$$
U^{PMNS} = V^*_{CKM} \cdot T^*
$$

ALL

 $-0.5 \sin(\theta_{13})$

after CKM corrections

$$
U^{PMNS} = V^*_{CKM} \cdot T^*
$$

maximal atmospheric mixing

$$
U^{PMNS} = V^*_{CKM} \cdot T^*
$$

good for BM only

too small CP violation

 χ^2 4 parameter-fit of u, ω and z: all patterns agree with experiments \rightarrow our ansatz $\;U\;{}^{PMNS}\!=\!V^*_{\;\;CKM}\!\cdot\!T^*\;$ is phenomenological viable

Backup slides

Neutrino masses

$$
U^{PMNS} = V^*_{CKM} \cdot T^*
$$

$$
T_{BM} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \quad T_{TBM} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} \quad T_{GR} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{c_{12}}{5} & \frac{s_{12}}{5} & 0 \\ \frac{s_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{c_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{s_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{c_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}
$$

1 sigma experimental band

after CKM corrections

