## 57th Rencontres de Moriond

## Impact of CPV phases on flavour violating H & Z decays

### based on 2207.10109, with A. Abada, J. Kriewald, S. Rosauro and A. M. Teixeira

#### **Emanuelle Pinsard**

## **LPC Clermont**











SM lepton sector: neutrinos are strictly massless ⇒ no source of CP Violation & charged Lepton Flavour Violation

Neutrino oscillations: 1st laboratory evidence of NP

 $\checkmark$  neutrinos are **massive** & leptons mix  $\mathscr{U}_{\alpha i}^{\text{PMNS}}$ 



SM lepton sector: neutrinos are strictly massless

⇒ no source of CP Violation & charged Lepton Flavour Violation

Neutrino oscillations: 1st laboratory evidence of NP

 $\checkmark$  neutrinos are **massive** & leptons mix  $\mathscr{U}_{ai}^{\text{PMNS}}$ 

 $\implies$  Need New Physics

✓ Need new fields: Majorana? LNV? New sources of CPV?

Which model? At which scale? **~~~~ Searches for NP** in the lepton sector



SM lepton sector: neutrinos are strictly massless

⇒ no source of CP Violation & charged Lepton Flavour Violation

Neutrino oscillations: 1st laboratory evidence of NP

 $\checkmark$  neutrinos are **massive** & leptons mix  $\mathscr{U}_{qi}^{\text{PMNS}}$ 

 $\implies$  Need New Physics

✓ Need new fields: Majorana? LNV? New sources of CPV?

Which model? At which scale? **~~~~ Searches for NP** in the lepton sector

If new Majorana states exist, what is the **impact** of the new interactions (mixings & CPV) on **flavour observables**?

Minimal "toy model" for phenomenological analyses: SM + 2 Majorana ⇒ Explore the low-energy phenomenology common to complete models (type I seesaw, ISS, ...)

Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC

# Minimal $3 + 2\nu_s$



- → Ad-hoc construction: extend the SM with 2 Majorana massive states leading to new mixings and CPV phases (Dirac & Majorana)
- No assumption on the mass generation mechanism but well-defined interactions in physical basis



# Minimal $3 + 2\nu_s$



- → Ad-hoc construction: extend the SM with 2 Majorana massive states leading to new mixings and CPV phases (Dirac & Majorana)
- No assumption on the mass generation mechanism but well-defined interactions in physical basis



Sizeable contributions to cLFV observables
Interference effects between heavier states expected

**Constructive & destructive interference effects** in cLFV leptonic and boson decays!

Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC



Minimal "toy model" for phenomenological analyses: SM +  $2\nu_s$ 

2 heavy sterile states with masses  $m_4$  and  $m_5$ , leptonic mixing  $\mathscr{U}_{5\times 5}$ and CPV phases (Dirac  $\delta$  and/or Majorana  $\varphi$ )

Full phenomenological study

⇒ Take into account all available experimental constraints

- Limits on active-sterile mixings
- ✓ Negative results of searches for sterile states
- Electroweak precision tests
- ✓ Bounds on searches for other cLFV transitions

⇒ No assumptions on active-sterile mixings

& all CPV phases randomly varied

Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC

## **CPV and cLFV boson decays**



**Gauge bosons (***Z*, *W***) and Higgs decays** are sensitive to New Physics  $\Rightarrow$  What is the impact of CPV phases on  $H \rightarrow \mu \tau$  and  $Z \rightarrow \mu \tau$ ?



Full computation of cLFV widths; both unitary & Feynman gauges for complete HNL models

## **CPV and cLFV boson decays**



**Gauge bosons (***Z*, *W***) and Higgs decays** are sensitive to New Physics  $\Rightarrow$  What is the **impact** of **CPV phases** on  $H \rightarrow \mu \tau$  and  $Z \rightarrow \mu \tau$ ?



Full computation of cLFV widths; both unitary & Feynman gauges for complete HNL models

Randomly varying all CPV phases associated with the sterile states



Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC

## CP-asymmetries in Z decays



- $Z \rightarrow \mu \tau$  decays potentially observable AND impacted by CPV phases
  - $\implies$  Consider **CP-asymmetries**

$$\mathscr{A}_{CP}(Z \to \ell_{\alpha} \ell_{\beta}) = \frac{\Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{-} \ell_{\beta}^{+}) - \Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{+} \ell_{\beta}^{-})}{\Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{-} \ell_{\beta}^{+}) + \Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{+} \ell_{\beta}^{-})}$$

If sizeable, ultimate probes of the presence of CPV

## CP-asymmetries in Z decays



- $Z \rightarrow \mu \tau$  decays potentially observable **AND** impacted by **CPV phases** 
  - $\implies$  Consider **CP**-asymmetries

$$\mathscr{A}_{CP}(Z \to \ell_{\alpha} \ell_{\beta}) = \frac{\Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{-} \ell_{\beta}^{+}) - \Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{+} \ell_{\beta}^{-})}{\Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{-} \ell_{\beta}^{+}) + \Gamma(Z \to \ell_{\alpha}^{+} \ell_{\beta}^{-})}$$

If sizeable, ultimate probes of the presence of CPV



By at least 2 heavy Majorana fermions

## **Disentangling scenarios?**



#### Impact of (potential) **measurement** of the **CP** asymmetries

|         | $m_4 = 5 \text{ TeV}, m_5 = 5.1 \text{ TeV},$  | $P_A = CP$ Conserving                   |
|---------|--|---|
| $P_A$   | $s_{14} = -0.0028$ , $s_{15} = 0.0045$ , $s_{24} = -0.0052$ , $s_{25} = -0.0037$ , $s_{25} = -0.0037$          | $s_{34} = -0.052$ , $s_{35} = -0.028$ , |
|         | $\delta_{ij} = \varphi_i = 0 ,$  |   |
|         |  |   |
| (       | $m_4 = 5 \text{ TeV}, m_5 = 5.1 \text{ TeV},$  | $P_B = CP$ Violating                    |
| $P_{B}$ | $s_{14} = 0.00020$ , $s_{15} = -7.1 \times 10^{-5}$ , $s_{24} = -0.0024$ , $s_{25} = 0.029$ , $s_{25} = 0.029$ | $s_{34} = -0.073$ , $s_{35} = -0.037$ , |
|         | s = 0.71 $s = 5.21$ $s = 2.06$ $s = 4.79$ $s = 2.90$ $s = -$   | 4.74 - 1.77 - 4.22                      |

Both benchmark points  $P_A$  and  $P_B$  lead to **common cLFV predictions**: all leading to  $\mu \to 3e$ ,  $\mu - e$  conversion,  $\tau \to 3\mu$  and  $Z \to \mu\tau$  within future sensitivity

**Indistinguishable** if **cLFV** signals are observed

## **Disentangling scenarios**?



### Impact of (potential) **measurement** of the **CP** asymmetries

 $P_{A} = 5 \text{ TeV}, m_{5} = 5.1 \text{ TeV}, \qquad P_{A} = \text{CP Conserving}$   $P_{A} = 0.0028, s_{15} = 0.0045, s_{24} = -0.0052, s_{25} = -0.0037, s_{34} = -0.052, s_{35} = -0.028, s_{15} = \phi_{i} = 0,$   $m_{4} = 5 \text{ TeV}, m_{5} = 5.1 \text{ TeV}, \qquad P_{B} = \text{CP Violating}$   $P_{B} = s_{14} = 0.00020, s_{15} = -7.1 \times 10^{-5}, s_{24} = -0.0024, s_{25} = 0.029, s_{34} = -0.073, s_{35} = -0.037, s_{35} = -0.03$ 

 $\delta_{14} = 0.71 , \delta_{15} = 5.21 , \delta_{24} = 2.06 , \delta_{25} = 4.78 , \delta_{34} = 3.80 , \delta_{35} = 4.74 , \varphi_4 = 1.77 , \varphi_5 = 4.33 .$ 

Both benchmark points  $P_A$  and  $P_B$  lead to **common cLFV predictions**: all leading to  $\mu \to 3e$ ,  $\mu - e$  conversion,  $\tau \to 3\mu$  and  $Z \to \mu\tau$  within future sensitivity

#### **Indistinguishable** if **cLFV** signals are observed

**BUT CP asymmetries** in Z - boson decays offer a clear distinction:  $P_B$  leads to  $\mathscr{A}_{CP}(Z \to \mu \tau) = 30\%$ 

⇒ Can **disentangle between CP conserving** et **CPV** scenarios!

Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC



Minimal and simple BSM construction:
SM + 2 heavy Majorana fermions
First steps towards low-energy phenomenological studies of complete models

CERV boson decays sensitive to the presence of HNL:
CPV phases have a clear impact on the decay rates

→  $Z \rightarrow \mu \tau$  within future sensitivity and large associated  $\mathscr{A}_{CP}$ ⇒ Importance of taking **multiple observables** into account to probe CPV or CP conserving scenarios!

**CP** asymmetry key to establish the presence of **CP** violation!





**CP** asymmetry key to establish the presence of CP violation!

# Thank you for your attention

## **Modified lepton currents**



,

$$\begin{split} \mathcal{L}_{W^{\pm}} &= -\frac{g_{w}}{\sqrt{2}} W_{\mu}^{-} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \sum_{j=1}^{3+n_{S}} \mathcal{U}_{\alpha j} \bar{\ell}_{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} P_{L} \nu_{j} + \text{H.c.} , \\ \mathcal{L}_{Z^{0}}^{\nu} &= -\frac{g_{w}}{4 \cos \theta_{w}} Z_{\mu} \sum_{i,j=1}^{3+n_{S}} \bar{\nu}_{i} \gamma^{\mu} \left( P_{L} C_{ij} - P_{R} C_{ij}^{*} \right) \nu_{j} , \\ \mathcal{L}_{Z^{0}}^{\ell} &= -\frac{g_{w}}{2 \cos \theta_{w}} Z_{\mu} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{3} \bar{\ell}_{\alpha} \gamma^{\mu} \left( \mathbf{C}_{V} - \mathbf{C}_{A} \gamma_{5} \right) \ell_{\alpha} , \\ \mathcal{L}_{H^{0}} &= -\frac{g_{w}}{4 M_{W}} H \sum_{i \neq j=1}^{3+n_{S}} \bar{\nu}_{i} \left[ C_{ij} \left( P_{L} m_{i} + P_{R} m_{j} \right) + C_{ij}^{*} \left( P_{R} m_{i} + P_{L} m_{j} \right) \right] \nu_{j} \end{split}$$

$$C_{ij} = \sum_{\rho=1}^{3} \mathcal{U}_{i\rho}^{\dagger} \mathcal{U}_{\rho j}$$

Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC

## Including CPV phases





Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC





Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC



## Constraints



Active mixings  $(\theta_{\alpha\beta})$  and Dirac CPV  $\delta_{13}$ : Central values of NuFIT 5.1 results

Active-sterile mixing angles  $\theta_{\alpha 4,5}$  constrain from low- and high-energy observables:

 $\begin{array}{l} \text{(Semi-)leptonic } \tau \text{ decays} \\ \text{Light mesons leptonic decays} \end{array} \end{array} \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{Construct ratios;} \\ \text{sensitivity to modified } W \ell \nu \text{ vertex} \\ R_W^{\ell_1 \ell_2} = \frac{\Gamma(W \to \ell_1 \nu)}{\Gamma(W \to \ell_2 \nu)} \\ \end{array} \right. \\ \Gamma(Z \to \text{inv}) \end{array}$ 

Upper bounds on the entries of  $\eta$  indirectly taking into account constrains from modifications of  $G_F$ ,  $\sin^2 \theta_w$  and  $M_W$ 

Bound on HNL decay width to comply with perturbative unitarity  $\implies$  bound on sterile masses and couplings to active states

 $0\nu 2\beta$ : upper limit on the effective mass  $m_{ee}$  from KamLAND-ZEN

For TeV-scale HNL, collider searches and cosmological bounds are not competitive



Heavier masses: assumed to be sufficiently close to allow for interferences  $\checkmark$  Fix  $m_4$  and take random values of  $m_5$  from half-normal distributions (scale representative of the sterile states width)

Active-sterile mixing angles: independently varied & randomly varying signs

For  $m_4 = 5 \text{ TeV}$ , the range of parameters to be explored is:

 $\begin{aligned} m_5 - m_4 &\in [10 \text{ MeV}, 1 \text{ TeV}],\\ |\sin \theta_{14,15}| &\in [6.0 \times 10^{-5}, 6.0 \times 10^{-3}],\\ |\sin \theta_{24,25}| &\in [1.9 \times 10^{-4}, 0.036],\\ |\sin \theta_{34,35}| &\in [8.3 \times 10^{-4}, 0.13]. \end{aligned}$ 

 $\implies$  Correspond to regimes complying with experimental data for the CP conserving case

**Analysis**: Select randomly 10<sup>4</sup> points (consistent with experimental data), vary all **CPV phases** associated with sterile states  $\delta_{\alpha 4,5}$ ,  $\varphi_{4,5}$  for each tuple of mixing angles.

Consider only regimes that do not lead to cLFV predictions far away from the corresponding **future experimental sensitivity** 

Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC



cLFV:  $\mu - e$  conversion in nuclei with CPV Dirac and Majorana phases toy model 3 + 2 heavy sterile, simplified approach  $\sin \theta_{\alpha 4} = \sin \theta_{\alpha 5}$ ,  $m_4 = m_5 = 1$  TeV



Emanuelle Pinsard - LPC

57th Rencontre de Moriond



Ratios of cLFV observables to identify mediators & constrain their masses

VS.

## $\mu - e$ conversion





But **CP violating phases do matter**! And impact naïve expectations....

