Quark-lepton complementarity with quasidegenerate Majorana neutrinos
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A basis independent formulation of quark-lepton complementarity is implemented at a high scale for quasidegenerate Majorana neutrinos. It is shown that even with the renormalization group evolution in the minimal supersymmetric standard model, the scenario can be consistent with the data provided a nontrivial role is played by the Majorana phases. Correlated constraints are found on these phases and the neutrino mass scale using the current data. We also indicate how future accurate measurements of the mixing angles can serve as tests of this scenario and restrict the values of the Majorana phases.
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Neutrinos provide a fertile ground for novel and testable ideas due to the present availability and future prospects of more precise information on their masses and mixing angles. We aim to combine three such ideas in this letter: (a) quark-lepton complementarity (QLC) $^{[2,3,4,5,6,7]}$, (b) quasidegenerate neutrinos (QDN) $^8$, and (c) nontrivial Majorana phases. The possibility of such a combination was mentioned in $^8$, but we explicitly demonstrate its feasibility by use of the renormalization group (RG) evolution in a transparently analytic way.

QLC links the difference between the maximal (45$^\circ$) and the measured (33.8$^{+2.4}_{-1.8}$ degrees) value of the neutrino mixing angle $\theta_{12}$ to the Cabibbo angle $\theta_c = 12.6^\circ \pm 0.1^\circ$ $^3$. This can be done by postulating the relation $\theta_{12} + \theta_c = 45^\circ$. However, the various implementations of this relation in the literature (e.g. in $^8$) are fraught with basis ambiguities $^{10}$ and issues of scale $^8$. In this letter, we follow a basis independent formulation of QLC from $^3$:

$$U_{PMNS} = V_{CKM}^\dagger U_\nu^{bimax},$$

where $U_{PMNS}$ is the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix unitarily transforming mass eigenstates of neutrinos to their flavor eigenstates, $V_{CKM}$ is the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix $^6$ and $U_\nu^{bimax}$ is the unitary matrix which diagonalizes the bimaximal form $^{11}$ of the neutrino Majorana mass matrix $M_\nu^{bimax}$. Eq. $^{11}$ yields

$$\theta_{12} + \theta_c/\sqrt{2} = 45^\circ + O(\theta_c^2).$$

The identification of eq. $^{11}$ as a statement of QLC becomes more transparent in the basis with $U_u = 1$, where $U_f$ represents the unitary (mass → flavor) transformation of the left chiral components of the $f$ $(= u, d, l)$ type of charged fermions which diagonalize the Yukawa coupling matrix combination $Y_f^\dagger Y_f$ $^{12}$. Thus, in this basis, $Y_u^\dagger Y_u$ is diagonal in flavor space. It follows that $V_{CKM} (\equiv U_u^\dagger U_d)$ now equals $U_d$, so that a comparison between eq. $^{11}$ and the definition of $U_{PMNS} (\equiv U_\nu^\dagger U_\nu)$, with the assumption of $U_\nu$ being $U_\nu^{bimax}$, now yields the quark-lepton symmetry relation $U_d = U_l$. Eq. $^{11}$, as it stands, is basis independent, however.

A quark-lepton symmetry relation such as $^{12}$ is expected to be valid at the GUT scale $\sim 10^{16}$ GeV. In our scenario, neutrino masses are generated by an effective dimension-5 operator $(l \cdot h)(l \cdot h)/\Lambda$ at the scale $\Lambda$ and the mechanism that gives rise to this operator is immaterial. The mechanism may include right handed neutrinos, in which case we have to assume that the threshold effects $^{13}$ do not spoil the relation till $\Lambda \sim 10^{12}$ GeV, above which all the right handed neutrinos are expected to lie. All the other threshold effects are taken to be flavor blind. We thus postulate the relation $^{12}$ to hold at a scale $\Lambda \sim 10^{12}$ GeV. Our results are only logarithmically sensitive to the exact choice of scale.

Quasidegenerate neutrinos are very much allowed by present cosmological constraints $^{14}$ as well as neutrino-less double $\beta$-decay experiments $^{15}$. From the model building point of view, the quasidegenerate spectrum can be obtained rather naturally through type II seesaw mechanism by invoking discrete symmetries like flavor $SO(3)$ $^8$. It can also be produced in models with Abelian family symmetries $^{16}$, or with flavor symmetries like $L_\mu - L_\tau$ $^{17}$. In the minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), the neutrino masses and mixing angles may evolve significantly from $\Lambda$ to the SUSY breaking scale $\lambda$ via the RG equations $^{18,19}$. This evolution can potentially spoil the QLC signatures in the low energy data $^8$. In this letter, we study the evolution of the QLC equation $^{11}$ analytically as well as numerically, including the effect of Majorana phases $^{12,20}$, and show its consistency with the observed mixing angles in the QDN scenario.

We take the neutrino masses $m_{1,2,3}$ to be complex in general and parametrize their absolute values in terms of three real parameters $m_0, \rho_A$ and $\epsilon_S$ as

$$|m_1| = m_0(1 - \rho_A)(1 - \epsilon_S),$$
$$|m_2| = m_0(1 - \rho_A)(1 + \epsilon_S),$$
$$|m_3| = m_0(1 + \rho_A),$$

with $m_0$, the parameter setting the neutrino mass scale,
and $\epsilon_S$ being required to be positive, while a positive (negative) $\rho_A$ implies a normal (inverted) neutrino mass ordering. These parameters may be related to the solar and atmospheric mass squared differences ($\delta m^2_S \sim 8 \times 10^{-5}$ eV$^2$ and $|\delta m^2_{\text{A, sol}}| \sim 2 \times 10^{-3}$ eV$^2$) and the sum of the neutrino absolute masses through

$$
\delta m^2_2 = |m_2|^2 - |m_1|^2 \approx 4m^2_0(1-\rho_A)^2\epsilon_S, \\
|\delta m^2_A| = |m_3|^2 - (|m_3|^2/2 + |m_2|^2/2)^2 = 4m^2_0|\rho_A|, \\
\Sigma|m_i| = 3m_0(1-\rho_A/3). 
$$

In (4) we have made use of $|\epsilon_S| \ll 1$ (for instance, if $m_0 \approx 0.2$ eV, one has $|\rho_A| \approx 1.8 \times 10^{-2}$ and $\epsilon_S \approx 5 \times 10^{-4}$) while neglecting terms which are $O(\epsilon^2_S)$.

The RG evolution of the hierarchical charged fermion masses is known to be small [21], and we neglect it. The bimaximal neutrino mass matrix emerging at a high scale $\Lambda$ gets modified at the low scale $\lambda$ to yield [12,22]

$$
M_\lambda = I_K T^K_\lambda M_{\nu\text{bimax}} I_\lambda, 
$$

where $I_K \equiv \exp[-\int_{t(\Lambda)}^{t(\lambda)} K(t)dt]$ is the scalar factor that arises from the RG evolution due to the gauge couplings and the fermion-antifermion loops. In MSSM, we have $K(t) = -6g_2^2 - 2g_1^2 + 6T r(Y^3_1Y^3_2)$. Here $t(Q)$ is defined to be $t(Q) \equiv (16\pi^2)^{-1} \ln|Q/\theta|_0$ with $\theta_0$ an arbitrary scale.

The other factor $I_\lambda$ in (5) is given by

$$
I_\lambda \equiv \exp[-\int_{\bar{t}(\lambda)}^{\bar{t}(\lambda)} (Y^3_t)^I (Y^3_t)^I (t)dt]. 
$$

In the basis chosen for our QLC scenario,

$$
Y^3_t = V_{\text{CKM}} \text{Diag}(y_3, y_3, y_3^2) V^\dagger_{\text{CKM}}. 
$$

Since $y_3^2 \ll y_3^2 \ll y_3^2$, we can neglect $y_3$ and $y_3^2$. If, in addition, we neglect the elements of the CKM matrix that are of the order of $\theta^2$ or smaller, only the $\{3-3\}$ element of $Y^3_t Y^3_t$ survives. Then we have

$$
I_\lambda \approx \text{Diag}(1,1,-e^{-\Delta_\tau}), 
$$

where in the MSSM, one has

$$
\Delta_\tau = m^2_3(\tan^2 \beta + 1)(16\pi^2 v^2)^{-1} \ln(\Lambda/\lambda). 
$$

Here $v \equiv \sqrt{v_u^2 + v_d^2}$ where $v_u$ and $v_d$ are the vevs of the two neutral Higgs scalars, with $\tan \beta \equiv v_u/v_d$. For $\Lambda \sim 10^{12}$ GeV, $\lambda \sim 10^3$ GeV, $\tan \beta \sim 30$ and $v \sim 246$ GeV, we find that $\Delta_\tau \sim 6 \times 10^{-3}$. Therefore, unless the coefficients of $\Delta_\tau$ are $O(10^2)$ or higher, we can neglect terms that involve two or more powers of $\Delta_\tau$. Henceforth, we keep only the linear term in $\Delta_\tau$.

The mass matrix (5) in the flavor basis takes the following form at the low scale:

$$
M_\lambda = \begin{pmatrix} A & B & -BX \\ B & C + A/2 & (C - A/2)X \\ -BX & (C - A/2)X & (C + A/2)Y \end{pmatrix} I_K, 
$$

where we have used the notation $A \equiv (m_1 + m_2)/2$, $B \equiv (-m_1 + m_2)/(2\sqrt{2})$, $C \equiv m_3/2$, $X \equiv (1 - \Delta_\tau)$, and $Y \equiv (1 - 2\Delta_\tau)$.

We parametrize the unitary matrix $U_\lambda$ that diagonalizes $M_\lambda$ by

$$
U_\lambda = \text{Diag}(e^{i\phi_1}, e^{i\phi_2}, e^{i\phi_3}) \times \\
\text{Diag}(1,1,e^{i\delta})R_{32}(\pi/4 + k_{32}\Delta_\tau) \times \\
R_{12}(\pi/4 + k_{12}\Delta_\tau) \times \\
\text{Diag}(e^{i\alpha_1/2}, e^{i\alpha_2/2}, e^{i\alpha_3/2})(11),
$$

where $R_{ij}$ is the rotation matrix in the $ij$ plane, $\alpha_i$’s are the Majorana phases, and the phases $\phi_1, \phi_3$ are required to diagonalize a general neutrino mass matrix [23]. Thus the new mixing angles are

$$
\theta_{12} = \pi/4 + k_{12}\Delta_\tau, \theta_{23} = \pi/4 + k_{23}\Delta_\tau, \theta_{13} = k_{13}\Delta_\tau.
$$

For $\Delta_\tau = 0$, we have $U_\lambda = U_{\nu\text{bimax}}$. We approximate the deviation of $U_\lambda$ from $U_{\nu\text{bimax}}$ by keeping terms that are linear in $\Delta_\tau$. The current allowed ranges of the mixing angles are such that the deviations from QLC values without RG running are very small. Therefore, the approximation $|k_{ij}\Delta_\tau| \ll 1$ should be always valid so that we can neglect the higher order terms in $k_{ij}\Delta_\tau$.

Furthermore, the Dirac phase $\delta$, which is vanishing at the high scale, and is generated only through the RG evolution, is retained only to the first order, and consequently plays no role in our $O(\Delta_\tau)$ analysis.

The values of $k_{ij}$ found to be

$$
k_{12} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{|m_1 + m_2|^2}{(|m_2|^2 - |m_1|^2)^2}, \\
k_{23} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{|m_2 + m_3|^2}{(|m_3|^2 - |m_2|^2)^2 + (|m_1|^2 - |m_2|^2)^2}, \\
k_{13} = \frac{1}{4} \frac{|m_2 + m_3|^2}{(|m_3|^2 - |m_2|^2)^2 - (|m_1|^2 - |m_2|^2)^2}. 
$$

The above expressions are valid as long as the values of $m_i$’s and $\delta m^2_{S/A}$’s are described accurately by the $O(\Delta_\tau)$ terms in their RG evolution. Though this condition always holds with the $m_i$’s, for $\Delta_\tau \lesssim \delta m^2_{S/A}/m_0^2$, the $O(\Delta^2_\tau)$ terms dominate over the $O(\Delta_\tau)$ terms in $\delta m^2_{S/A}$ [13] and eqs. (12) are no longer a good approximation. They are valid only for $\Delta_\tau \lesssim \delta m^2_{S/A}/m_0^2$, i.e. for $m_0 \tan \beta \lesssim 3$ eV. Higher $\Delta_\tau$ values also lead to $|k_{12}\Delta_\tau| \gg 1$, so that the evolution of $\theta_{12}$ is too large to be naturally accommodated with the current data.

Equations (12) are consistent with the running of angles computed in the general case [10], though they have been computed here in a much simpler way for the special case of bimaximal neutrino mixing. In terms of the parameters $m_0, \rho_A, \epsilon_S$ defined in eq. (8), the expressions (12) become

$$
k_{12} = \frac{1}{8} \frac{(1 + \cos 2\alpha_2 + \epsilon_S^2 (1 - \cos 2\alpha_2))}{(8 \epsilon_S)}, \\
k_{23} = \frac{\Gamma}{8} \frac{[2 + \cos (2\alpha_2 - \alpha_3) + \cos \alpha_3] + 2 \rho_A}{2} + O(\epsilon_S), \\
k_{13} = \frac{\Gamma}{8} \frac{[\cos (2\alpha_2 - \alpha_3) - \cos \alpha_3]}{2} + O(\epsilon_S),
$$

where
where \( \Gamma \equiv (1/\rho_A) - \rho_A \). One of the three Majorana phases \( \alpha_{1,2,3} \) can be rotated away and we have chosen that to be \( \alpha_1 \).

The following observations can now be made:

- Quasi-degeneracy of the neutrinos \( (m_0^2 \gg \delta m^2_{SUSY}) \) is required for any significant enhancement of all \( k_{ij} \)'s: the magnitude of \( k_{12} \) is enhanced when \( \epsilon_S = \delta m^2_S/[4m^2_0(1-\rho_A)^2] \ll 1 \), whereas the magnitudes of \( k_{23} \) and \( k_{13} \) are enhanced for \( \rho_A \delta m^2_A/(4m^2_0) \ll 1 \).
- The values of the Majorana phases are crucial in deciding the values of \( k_{ij} \)'s: as \( \alpha_2 \to 0 \) we have \( k_{12} \approx 1/(4\epsilon_S) \). When \( \alpha_2 \) is nonzero, the value of \( k_{12} \) decreases rapidly. At \( \alpha_2 = \pi \), we have \( k_{12} \) to be nearly as small as \( \epsilon_S/4 \). Both \( |k_{23}| \) and \( |k_{13}| \) are enhanced when \( \alpha_3 = 0 \) or \( \alpha_3 = \alpha_2 \). However, when \( \alpha_2 = 0 \), the magnitude of \( k_{13} \) is highly suppressed.
- \( k_{12} \) is independent of \( m_3 \) as well as \( \alpha_3 \), and is always positive. \( k_{23} \) is positive (negative) for the normal (inverted) neutrino mass ordering. The sign of \( k_{13} \) depends on the ordering as well as the Majorana phases.

The net leptonic mixing matrix at the low scale is \( V_{PMNS} = V^T_{\text{CKM}} U_{\alpha} \) with the mixing angles given by \( \theta_{ij} = \theta^0_{ij} + k_{ij} \Delta_\tau \), where \( \theta^0_{12} \approx 35.4^\circ, \theta^0_{23} \approx 42.5^\circ, \theta^0_{13} \approx 8.9^\circ \) are their QLC values at the high scale. Whereas \( \theta^0_{12} \) and \( \theta^0_{13} \) are known to an accuracy of \( \pm 0.1^\circ \), the exact value of \( \theta^0_{23} \) depends on the value of the CP violating phase \( \delta \) in the CKM matrix \( \mathcal{R} \), and is currently uncertain by nearly \( \pm 1^\circ \). The “deviations” \( \Delta \theta_{ij} = \theta_{ij} - \theta^0_{ij} \approx k_{ij} \Delta_\tau \) are observable quantities. From the earlier discussions \( \Delta \theta_{12} > 0 \), so that \( \theta_{12} > 35.4^\circ \) is a test for our scenario. Another test is the compulsion of normal (inverted) mass ordering for \( \theta_{23} > \theta^0_{23} (\theta_{23} < \theta^0_{23}) \). Regarding \( \theta_{13} \), though the high scale value is \( \theta^0_{13} = 8.9^\circ \), allowed RG evolution in our scenario can make it anywhere between 0° and the extant upper bound of 13°.

The 3σ allowed range of \( \theta_{12} \) is \( \theta_{12} \in (29.3^\circ, 39.8^\circ) \). With \( \Delta \theta_{12} \Delta_\tau \) necessarily positive, this implies \( 0 < k_{12} \Delta_\tau < 4.4^\circ \). Strong constraints then ensue on \( m_0 \) and \( \alpha_2 \), since \( \Delta \theta_{12} \) is inversely proportional to the small quantity \( \epsilon_S \). In Fig. 4 we show the 3σ allowed values of \( m_0 \) and \( \alpha_2 \) for two \( \tau \beta \) values. The figure is obtained by solving the RG equations numerically with \( \theta^0_{ij} \)'s as the initial conditions at the high scale, and marginalizing over \( \alpha_3 \) and \( \delta \). The figure may be understood easily with our analytic expressions (13). At large \( \tau \beta \), the value of \( \alpha_2 \) has to be close to \( \pi \) in order to avoid an excessive \( k_{12} \) enhancement \( \mathcal{R} \) (even this will not work if \( m_0 \) is too large). A nontrivial Majorana phase is thus essential. For smaller values of \( \tau \beta \), however, no such tuning is required (see Fig. 1).

The ratios \( r_1 \equiv \Delta \theta_{23}/\Delta \theta_{12} \) and \( r_2 \equiv \Delta \theta_{13}/\Delta \theta_{12} \) can be used to constrain the Majorana phases \( \alpha_2 \) and \( \alpha_3 \). In the QDN scenario, where \( \rho_A \ll 1 \ll 1/\rho_A \), these constraints are independent of \( \Delta_\tau \), and hence \( \tau \beta \). We show in Fig. 2 the contours of constant \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) in the \( \alpha_2-\alpha_3 \) plane, for normal hierarchy. With inverted hierarchy, the signs of \( r_1 \) and \( r_2 \) are reversed. Note that \( \alpha_2 = \alpha_3 = 0 \) necessitates \( r_1 \approx 2.5 \rho_A^2/(8m^2_0) \approx 0.06 \) and \( r_2 = 0 \), which implies \( \theta_{23} \approx \theta^0_{23} \), \( \theta_{13} \approx \theta^0_{13} \). Any deviation from this prediction will indicate non-zero Majorana phases. However, for these relations to be practically useful as a test, measurements of these angles accurate to within a couple of degrees are essential.
If $\alpha_2 \approx \pi$, which would be the case if $\theta_{12}$ is found to be very close to $\theta_{13}$, the ratio $r_2/r_1 \approx -2 \cos \alpha_3$ gives a direct measurement of $\alpha_3$, with $|r_2/r_1| < 2$ serving as a weak test of this scenario.

Even without any knowledge of the Majorana phases, the measurements of the mixing angles can put a lower bound on $\Delta_\tau$, and hence on $\tan \beta$. With QDN we have the relations $|\Delta \theta_{12}| < \Delta r/(4s_\alpha s_\beta)$, $|\Delta \theta_{23}| < \Delta r/|2p_A|$, $|\Delta \theta_{13}| < \Delta r/|4p_A|$ and additionally the combinations $|\Delta \theta_{23} \pm \Delta \theta_{13}| < \Delta r/|2p_A|$. Once $m_\emptyset$ is known, the best of the above lower bounds on $\Delta_r$ may be chosen to restrict $\tan \beta$ from below via eq. (3).

In conclusion, a basis independent formulation of QLC at a high scale can be consistent with the data even for the QDN scenario provided a nontrivial role is played by the Majorana phases. We have explicitly shown this numerically as well as through transparent analytic approximations for the RG evolutions of the mixing angles. Our new results are correlated constraints on the neutrino mass scale and the Majorana phases, as well as correlations among the neutrino mixing angles which can be tested by their precise measurements. Specifically, one of the major predictions of our scenario is $\theta_{12} > 35.4^\circ$. Currently the data is consistent with this prediction to within $1\sigma$. A further reduction of the error in $\theta_{12}$ will clarify the situation.
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