# Global constraints on heavy neutrino mixing

#### Josu Hernandez-Garcia

Based on:

- JHEP 1510 (2015) 130: E. Fernandez-Martinez, JHG, J. Lopez-Pavon, and M. Lucente
- Work in progress: E. Fernandez-Martinez, JHG, J. Lopez-Pavon







# MOTIVATION

Neutrino masses are one of the most promising open windows to physics beyond the Standard Model (SM).

By adding heavy  $\nu_R$  to SM particle content, neutrino masses arise in a simple and natural way.

A set of EW and flavor observables are going to be used to constrain the additional neutrino mixing.

Once the new heavy states are integrated out, the SM-Seesaw can be considered as a low energy effective theory:

• dim-5 Weinberg op. gives masses to the light  $\nu$ :

$$\frac{c_{\alpha\beta}^{\dim-5}}{\Lambda} \left( \overline{L^c}_{\alpha} \tilde{\phi}^* \right) \left( \tilde{\phi}^{\dagger} L_{\beta} \right) \longrightarrow \hat{m} = m_D^t M_N^{-1} m_D$$

S. Weinberg, Phys.Rev.Lett. 43, 1566 (1979)

Once the new heavy states are integrated out, the SM-Seesaw can be considered as a low energy effective theory:

- dim-5 Weinberg op. gives masses to the light  $\nu$ :  $\frac{c_{\alpha\beta}^{\dim-5}}{\Lambda} \left( \overline{L^c}_{\alpha} \tilde{\phi}^* \right) \left( \tilde{\phi}^{\dagger} L_{\beta} \right) \longrightarrow \hat{m} = m_D^t M_N^{-1} m_D$ 
  - dim-6 op. induces non-unitarity in the mixing matrix Nof lepton charged current interactions:  $\frac{c_{\alpha\beta}^{\dim-6}}{\Lambda^2} \left(\overline{L}_{\alpha}\tilde{\phi}\right) i\gamma^{\mu}\partial_{\mu} \left(\tilde{\phi}^{\dagger}L_{\beta}\right) \longrightarrow \eta = \frac{1}{2}m_D^{\dagger}M_N^{-2}m_D$

A. Broncano, M.B. Gavela, and E.E. Jenkins, Phys. Lett. **B552**, 177 (2003)

Once the new heavy states are integrated out, the SM-Seesaw can be considered as a low energy effective theory:

- dim-5 Weinberg op. gives masses to the light  $\nu$ :  $\frac{c_{\alpha\beta}^{\dim-5}}{\Lambda} \left( \overline{L^c}_{\alpha} \tilde{\phi}^* \right) \left( \tilde{\phi}^{\dagger} L_{\beta} \right) \longrightarrow \hat{m} = m_D^t M_N^{-1} m_D$
- dim-6 op. induces non-unitarity in the mixing matrix Nof lepton charged current interactions:  $\frac{c_{\alpha\beta}^{\dim-6}}{\Lambda^2} \left(\overline{L}_{\alpha}\tilde{\phi}\right) i\gamma^{\mu}\partial_{\mu} \left(\tilde{\phi}^{\dagger}L_{\beta}\right) \longrightarrow \eta = \frac{1}{2}m_D^{\dagger}M_N^{-2}m_D$  $N = (I - \eta) U_{\text{PMNS}}$

since  $\eta$  is Hermitian  $\Rightarrow$  the most general parametrization for N.

dim-5:  $\hat{m} = m_D^t M_N^{-1} m_D$  dim-6:  $\eta = \frac{1}{2} m_D^{\dagger} M_N^{-2} m_D$ Meaningful bounds imply  $\begin{cases} M_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\rm EW}) \\ Y_N \sim \mathcal{O}(1) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \hat{m} \text{ too large}$ unless the lightness of  $\hat{m}$  explained by an approximate L.

R. Mohapatra and J. Valle, Phys.Rev. D34, 1642 (1986)
J. Bernabeu, A. Santamaria, J. Vidal, A. Mendez, and J. Valle, Phys. Lett. B187, 303 (1987)
G.C. Branco, W. Grimus, and L. Lavoura, Nucl. Phys. B312, 492 (1989)

dim-5:  $\hat{m} = m_D^t M_N^{-1} m_D$  dim-6:  $\eta = \frac{1}{2} m_D^{\dagger} M_N^{-2} m_D$ Meaningful bounds imply  $\begin{cases} M_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\rm EW}) \\ Y_N \sim \mathcal{O}(1) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \hat{m}$  too large unless the lightness of  $\hat{m}$  explained by an approximate L. In particular:  $L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$  $L = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ 

$$m_D = \frac{v_{\rm EW}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \bar{Y}_e & \bar{Y}_\mu & \bar{Y}_\tau \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_1 \\ -1 & N_2 & M_N \\ 0 & N_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_1 \\ \Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_1 \\ -1 & N_2 \\ 0 & N_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_1 \\ \Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_1 \\ -1 & N_2 \\ 0 & N_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $N_i$  is an arbitrary number of extra heavy fields.

R. Alonso, M. Dhen, M. Gavela, and T. Hambye, JHEP **1301**, 118 (2013)
A. Abada, D. Das, A. Teixeira, A. Vicente, and C. Weiland, JHEP **1302**, 048 (2013)

$$m_{D} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ Y_{e} & Y_{\mu} & Y_{\tau} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_{1} \\ -1 & N_{2} & M_{N} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \Lambda & 0 \\ \Lambda & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_{1} \\ -1 & N_{2} \\ 0 & N_{3} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_{1} \\ -1 & N_{2} \\ 0 & N_{3} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_{1} \\ -1 & N_{2} \\ 0 & 0 & \Lambda' \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & N_{1} \\ -1 & N_{2} \\ 0 & N_{3} \end{pmatrix}$$

where  $N_i$  is an arbitrary number of extra heavy fields. If L is exact:  $\hat{m} = 0$  while  $\eta \neq 0$  and arbitrarily large.

dim-5:  $\hat{m} = m_D^t M_N^{-1} m_D$  dim-6:  $\eta = \frac{1}{2} m_D^\dagger M_N^{-2} m_D$ Meaningful bounds imply  $\begin{cases} M_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\text{EW}}) \\ Y_N \sim \mathcal{O}(1) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \hat{m}$  too large unless the lightness of  $\hat{m}$  explained by an approximate L. In particular:

$$m_D = \frac{v_{\rm EW}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} Y_e & Y_\mu & Y_\tau \\ \epsilon_1 Y'_e & \epsilon_1 Y'_\mu & \epsilon_1 Y'_\tau \\ \epsilon_2 Y''_e & \epsilon_2 Y''_\mu & \epsilon_2 Y''_\tau \end{pmatrix} \qquad M_N = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & \Lambda & \mu_3 \\ \Lambda & \mu_2 & \mu_4 \\ \mu_3 & \mu_4 & \Lambda' \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\left. \begin{array}{c} \hat{m} \neq 0 \\ m_i \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\text{eV}\right) \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow L \text{ mildly broken} \Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \epsilon_i \text{ and } \mu_j \text{ small } \not{L} \\ \text{terms introduced} \end{array}$ 

while  $\eta \neq 0$  and arbitrarily large.

dim-5:  $\hat{m} = m_D^t M_N^{-1} m_D$  dim-6:  $\eta = \frac{1}{2} m_D^\dagger M_N^{-2} m_D$ Meaningful bounds imply  $\begin{cases} M_i \sim \mathcal{O}(\Lambda_{\text{EW}}) \\ Y_N \sim \mathcal{O}(1) \end{cases} \Rightarrow \hat{m} \text{ too large}$ unless the lightness of  $\hat{m}$  explained by an approximate L. In particular:

$$m_D = \frac{v_{\rm EW}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} Y_e & Y_\mu & Y_\tau \\ \epsilon_1 Y'_e & \epsilon_1 Y'_\mu & \epsilon_1 Y'_\tau \\ \epsilon_2 Y''_e & \epsilon_2 Y''_\mu & \epsilon_2 Y''_\tau \end{pmatrix} \qquad M_N = \begin{pmatrix} \mu_1 & \Lambda & \mu_3 \\ \Lambda & \mu_2 & \mu_4 \\ \mu_3 & \mu_4 & \Lambda' \end{pmatrix}$$

 $\left. \begin{array}{c} \hat{m} \neq 0 \\ m_i \sim \mathcal{O}\left(\text{eV}\right) \end{array} \right\} \Rightarrow L \text{ mildly broken} \Rightarrow \begin{array}{c} \epsilon_i \text{ and } \mu_j \text{ small } \not{L} \\ \text{terms introduced} \end{array}$ 

while  $\eta \neq 0$  and arbitrarily large.

#### PARAMETRIZATIONS

We have studied in 2 different scenarios:

• Completely general scenario:

 $N = (I - \eta) U_{\rm PMNS}$ 

the more general one since  $\eta$  is Hermitian.

• 3-heavy-neutrino scenario:

A more restrictive one with only 3 heavy states that implies correlations among the  $\eta$  elements so as to recover  $\hat{m}$ .

#### OBSERVABLES

The 29 observables are computed in terms of  $\alpha$ ,  $G_{\mu}$  and  $M_Z$ .

- The W boson mass  $M_W$
- The effective weak mixing angle  $\theta_{W}$ :  $s_{W \text{ eff}}^{2 \text{ lep}} \& s_{W \text{ eff}}^{2 \text{ had}}$
- LFC Z fermionic decays:  $R_l$ ,  $R_c$ ,  $R_b$  &  $\sigma_{had}^0$
- The invisible Z width  $\Gamma_{inv}$
- Universality ratios:  $R^{\pi}_{\mu e}, R^{\pi}_{\tau \mu}, R^{W}_{\mu e}, R^{W}_{\tau \mu}, R^{K}_{\mu e}, R^{K}_{\tau \mu}, R^{l}_{\mu e} \& R^{l}_{\tau \mu}$
- The weak charge:  $Q_{\mathrm{W}}^{p}$  &  $Q_{\mathrm{W}}^{Cs}$
- 8 decays constraining the CKM unitarity
- 3 rare LFV decays:  $\mu \to e\gamma, \, \tau \to \mu\gamma \ \& \ \tau \to e\gamma$

# Results

MCMC with the 29 observables scanning over the free parameters. Frequentist contours and values of the mixing in the BF:



# Results

MCMC with the 29 observables scanning over the free parameters. Frequentist contours and values of the mixing in the BF:



3-heavy-neutrino scenario:



# SUMMARY

A set of EW and flavor observables have been used to constrain the additional mixing in two different scenarios. The results of the global fit:

General scenario:

$\eta_{ee}$	=	$0.00128\substack{+0.00064\\-0.00066}$
$\eta_{\mu\mu}$	=	< 0.00012
$\eta_{\tau\tau}$		< 0.0007

3-heavy-neutrino scenario:

$\eta_{ee}$	—	$0.00064\substack{+0.00033\\-0.00034}$	
$\eta_{\mu\mu}$	=	$< 4 \times 10^{-8}$	NH
$\eta_{\tau\tau}$	—	< 0.0004	
$\eta_{ee}$	=	$0.00064\substack{+0.00034\\-0.00031}$	
$\eta_{\mu\mu}$	=	$< 4 \times 10^{-8}$	IH
$\eta_{\tau\tau}$	—	< 0.0004	

#### THANKS

#### BACK-UP

Correlations among the  $\eta$  elements in 3HN case:

 $M_1 \sim M_2 \sim \Lambda$  (pseudo Dirac pair),  $M_3 \sim \Lambda'$  (decoupled) but large mixing:

$$\eta = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} |\theta_e|^2 & \theta_e \theta_\mu^* & \theta_e \theta_\tau^* \\ \theta_\mu \theta_e^* & |\theta_\mu|^2 & \theta_\mu \theta_\tau^* \\ \theta_\tau \theta_e^* & \theta_\tau \theta_\mu^* & |\theta_\tau|^2 \end{pmatrix} \text{ with } \theta_\alpha \equiv \frac{vY_\alpha}{\sqrt{2}\Lambda}$$

Fixing  $\nu$  oscillation data:  $\theta_{ij}$ ,  $\Delta m_{21}^2$  and  $\Delta m_{31}^2 \Rightarrow$ 

 $Y_{\tau} = Y_{\tau}(m_1, \delta, \phi_1, \phi_2) \Rightarrow 9$  free parameters

Parameter	$ Y_e  \times  Y_\mu $	$ Y_e  -  Y_\mu $	$m_1 \; [eV]$	$\Lambda \; [{ m GeV}]$	Phases: $\alpha_e, \alpha_\mu, \delta, \phi_1 \& \phi_2$
Range	$(0, 10^{-4})$	(-0.1, 0.1)	$(10^{-5}, 1)$	$(10^3, 10^4)$	$(0,2\pi)$

#### BACK-UP

CP-phases correlations in the 3HN scenario with a NH:



$$\theta_{\mu} \ll \theta_{e} \text{ and } \theta_{\tau} \Rightarrow$$

$$\frac{Y_{\tau}}{Y_{e}} \simeq -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{t_{12}} \pm i \frac{e^{\frac{i(\phi_{1}-\phi_{2})}{2}}}{s_{12}^{2}} \sqrt{\frac{2m_{1}}{\sqrt{\Delta m_{12}^{2}}}}$$

Since  $\theta_{\tau} \gg \theta_{e}$  disfavored by data

 $\phi_1 - \phi_2 \simeq 2n\pi$ 

disfavored



#### BACK-UP

CP-phases correlations in the 3HN scenario with a NH:

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{\mu} &\ll \theta_{e} \text{ and } \theta_{\tau} \Rightarrow \\ \frac{Y_{\tau}}{Y_{e}} &\simeq -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{t_{12}} \pm i \frac{e^{\frac{i(\phi_{1}-\phi_{2})}{2}}}{s_{12}^{2}} \sqrt{\frac{2m_{1}}{\sqrt{\Delta m_{12}^{2}}}} \end{aligned}$$

Moreover,  $\theta_{\tau} < \theta_{e}$  preferred by data  $\Rightarrow \alpha_{\tau} - \alpha_{e} \simeq (2n+1)\pi$ 

