

CERN-PH-TH/2007-125

The Seesaw with Many Right-Handed Neutrinos

John Ellis and Oleg Lebedev

TH Division, PH Department, CERN, CH-1211 Geneva 23, Switzerland

Abstract

There are no upper limits on the possible number of massive, singlet (right-handed) neutrinos that may participate in the seesaw mechanism, and some string constructions motivate seesaw models with up to $\mathcal{O}(100)$ right-handed neutrinos. In this case, the seesaw mass scale can be significantly *higher* than that in the traditional scheme with just 3 right-handed neutrinos. We consider the possible phenomenological implications of such models, in particular, for lepton-flavour violation and electric dipole moments. Since the neutrino masses depend on the Majorana mass scale linearly, while supersymmetric loop corrections depend on it logarithmically, the magnitude of lepton-flavour- and CP-violating transitions may *increase* with the multiplicity of the right-handed neutrinos and may be enhanced by orders of magnitude. We also point out that, in the context of leptogenesis, the bounds on the reheating temperature and the lightest neutrino mass get *relaxed* compared to those in the case of 3 right-handed neutrinos.

1 Introduction

The seesaw mechanism is arguably the most attractive way to explain the smallness of neutrino masses [1]–[4]. In its conventional form, the seesaw invokes 3 heavy singlet (right-handed) neutrinos ν_R . However, the number 3 is not sacred. On the one hand, the 2 non-zero light-neutrino mass differences required by experiment could be explained with just 2 heavy right-handed neutrinos. On the other hand, 3 non-zero masses could be explained with the participation of any number $N \geq 3$ right-handed neutrinos. From the bottom-up perspective, there are no experimental constraints on the number of right-handed neutrinos. For example, since they are singlets of the Standard Model (SM) gauge group, their presence below the GUT scale would not perturb the unification of the SM gauge couplings. It is certainly possible, and even appears quite plausible, that such SM singlets do not follow the family pattern of the SM fermions.

Specific examples of scenarios with many right-handed neutrinos are provided by string models, and some recent string constructions motivate seesaw models with up to $\mathcal{O}(100)$ right-handed neutrinos [5], [6]. The reason is that string models contain abundant SM singlets that often have (non-renormalizable) couplings to the SM lepton doublets and large Majorana masses, which are the ingredients necessary for the seesaw mechanism. This is just one of many scenarios that motivates a generalization of the conventional seesaw to models with many right-handed neutrinos.

In this Letter, we explore some of the phenomenological features of such scenarios. Specifically, we comment that the seesaw mass scale may rise to *larger* values than in minimal schemes, that the magnitudes of lepton-flavour- and CP-violating effects may *increase*, and that leptogenesis bounds on the reheating temperature and the lightest neutrino mass may be *relaxed*.

2 Formulating the Seesaw with many Right-Handed Neutrinos

The supersymmetric seesaw mechanism is described by the superpotential (see e.g. [7])

$$W = Y_e^{ij} \phi^d e_i \ell_j + Y_\nu^{ij} \phi^u N_i \ell_j + \frac{1}{2} M_{jk} N_j N_k, \quad (2.1)$$

where $\phi^{u,d}$ and ℓ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are the Higgs and lepton doublets, e_i are the charged SU(2)-singlet leptons and N_j ($1 \leq j \leq n$) are some heavy Standard Model (SM) singlets with Majorana mass terms M_{jk} . The Yukawa couplings form an $n \times 3$ matrix, while the Majorana mass terms form an $n \times n$ matrix. The resulting effective mass matrix for the left-handed neutrinos is given by

$$M_{\text{eff}} = - (v \sin \beta)^2 Y_\nu^T M^{-1} Y_\nu \equiv - \frac{(v \sin \beta)^2}{M_*} S, \quad (2.2)$$

where $v = 174 \text{ GeV}$, $\tan \beta$ is the ratio of the Higgs VEVs, M_* is the “effective seesaw scale” and S is a 3×3 texture whose largest entry is of order one.

As we now discuss, low-energy physics is quite sensitive to the number of right-handed neutrinos n participating in the seesaw mechanism. In particular, the effective seesaw mass scale M_* may depend on n :

$$M_* \propto n^{-x}, \quad (2.3)$$

where $0 \leq x \leq 2$ is a function of the texture. We consider the following limiting cases (in a particular basis defined, for example, by the Froggatt–Nielsen charges):

- (1) all entries of M and Y_ν contribute coherently to M_{eff} with similar magnitudes, so that $M_* \propto n^{-2}$;
- (2) the magnitudes of the different entries of M , Y_ν are similar, but the complex phases are random¹, so that $M_* \propto n^{-1}$;
- (3) only a limited number of right-handed neutrinos provide significant contributions, so that $M_* \propto n^0$.

Typical realistic scenarios correspond to intermediate situations. For instance, if M is approximately diagonal with similar eigenvalues and all the Y_ν^{ij} are similar in magnitude but have arbitrary phases, $M_* \propto n^{-1/2}$. As a specific example, we note that the stringy model of Ref. [5] corresponds to x between 0 and 1.

In most cases, the masses of the left-handed neutrinos grow with n . Therefore, in order to keep them at the same values as in the conventional seesaw with 3 right-handed neutrinos, one has either to *increase* the Majorana masses or to *decrease* the Yukawa couplings. These possibilities differ in their phenomenological implications.

Consider, for simplicity, an MSSM scenario with universal soft supersymmetry-breaking scalar masses at the GUT scale, as motivated by minimal supergravity (mSUGRA), complemented by such a seesaw with n right-handed neutrinos. The renormalization-group (RG) running between the GUT scale and the scale at which the heavy neutrinos decouple that is due to the neutrino Yukawa couplings induces additional flavour-violating soft terms [8],

$$m_l^2 = \begin{pmatrix} m_L^2 & m_{LR}^{2\dagger} \\ m_{LR}^2 & m_R^2 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{mSUGRA}} + \begin{pmatrix} \delta m_L^2 & \delta m_{LR}^{2\dagger} \\ \delta m_{LR}^2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.4)$$

where m_l^2 is the slepton mass-squared matrix. These corrections are given by [9]–[14]

$$\delta m_L^2 \simeq -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} (3m_0^2 + A_0^2) Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu,$$

¹In this case, the dependence of M_* on n is obtained using the “random walk” result that

$$\sum_{i=1}^N (-1)^{a_i} \sim \sqrt{N},$$

where a_i is a random integer.

$$\delta m_{LR}^2 \simeq -\frac{3A_0 v \cos \beta}{16\pi^2} Y_l Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu . \quad (2.5)$$

Here $L_{ij} \equiv \ln(M_{\text{GUT}}/M_i) \delta_{ij}$ with M_i being the heavy neutrino mass eigenvalues.

We first note that the dependence on the Majorana masses is only logarithmic. Thus, increasing the scale of the Majorana masses does not affect these corrections significantly. On the other hand, $Y_\nu^\dagger Y_\nu$ in general grows with the multiplicity of the heavy neutrinos, plausibly as a power law. Therefore, ignoring the logarithmic piece, we have

$$\delta m_L^2, \delta m_{LR}^2 \propto n^y, \quad (2.6)$$

where the power $0 \leq y \leq 1$ depends on the texture. In the extreme case of n “coherent” contributions, $y = 1$ ²; for a case with random phases, $y = 1/2$; finally, $y = 0$ when only a few heavy neutrinos contribute significantly. Clearly, flavour-violating effects are expected to be enhanced, in general. In particular, the branching ratio for radiative $l_i \rightarrow l_j \gamma$ decays [9], [11],

$$\Gamma(l_i \rightarrow l_j \gamma) \propto \alpha^3 m_{l_i}^5 \frac{|(\delta m_L^2)_{ij}|^2}{\tilde{m}^8} \tan^2 \beta, \quad (2.7)$$

where \tilde{m} characterizes the typical sparticle masses in the loop and α is the fine structure constant, is enhanced by n^{2y} which can be a large factor (up to 4 orders of magnitude)³.

Alternatively, if instead of increasing the scale of the Majorana masses, one decreases the Yukawa couplings, no enhancement of lepton-flavour-violating (LFV) is expected, in general. This is because M_{eff} and $\delta m_{L,LR}^2$ both depend on Y_ν quadratically.

3 Phenomenological Constraints

The requirement of *perturbativity* restricts the magnitude of the loop corrections, which translates into

$$\frac{(Y_\nu^\dagger Y_\nu)_{ij}}{4\pi^2}, \frac{(Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu)_{ij}}{4\pi^2} \leq \mathcal{O}(1). \quad (3.1)$$

This is a rather weak constraint and leaves open the possibility that some entries of $Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu$ could be as large as 10. We note that there are no (very) large logarithms in the loop corrections since the seesaw scale is quite high.

² Unlike in Eq.(2.3), here we work in the basis where the Majorana mass matrix is diagonal. Thus, there are n contributions in the sum which we assume to be similar in magnitude in this basis. Note that the basis change may, in the case of many ν_R 's, change the orders of magnitude of the couplings.

³We also note that, since $Y_\nu^\dagger Y_\nu$ is larger than in the usual case, the presence of many right-handed neutrinos improves the MSSM gauge coupling unification at two loops [15].

The main constraints are imposed by the *lepton-flavour-violating* branching ratios [16]- [18]

$$\begin{aligned}\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) &< 1.2 \times 10^{-11} , \\ \text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow e\gamma) &< 1.2 \times 10^{-7} , \\ \text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma) &< 6.8 \text{ (4.5)} \times 10^{-8} .\end{aligned}\tag{3.2}$$

Supersymmetric flavour-violating effects can be expressed in terms of the “mass insertions” $\delta_{LR} \equiv \delta m_{LR}^2/m^2$ and $\delta_{LL} \equiv \delta m_L^2/m^2$ [19], where m is the average slepton mass, such that [20]

$$\text{BR}(l_i \rightarrow l_j \gamma) = \left| \xi_1 \delta_{LL}^{ij} + \xi_2 \delta_{LR}^{ij} \right|^2 + (L \leftrightarrow R) .\tag{3.3}$$

Here $\xi_{1,2}$ are functions of SUSY masses whose explicit form is given in Ref. [20]. For electroweak-scale sparticle masses, the resulting constraints on the mass insertions are [20]:

$$\begin{aligned}|\delta_{LL}^{12}| &< \text{few} \times 10^{-3} , \quad |\delta_{LR}^{12}| < 10^{-6} , \\ |\delta_{LR}^{13}| &< 10^{-2} , \quad |\delta_{LR}^{23}| < 10^{-2} .\end{aligned}\tag{3.4}$$

By means of Eq.(2.5), these bounds are translated at low $\tan \beta$ into

$$(Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu)_{12} < 0.1 ,\tag{3.5}$$

with the other entries being essentially unconstrained.

The interpretation of this constraint depends strongly on the magnitudes of the Yukawa couplings and the details of the texture. For smaller Yukawa couplings, the number of RH neutrinos can be very large. However, for couplings of order unity, only a few RH neutrinos are allowed, unless there are cancellations. In general, even though $(Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu)_{12}$ is rather small, other matrix elements can be significant and lead to observable effects.

4 CP–Violating Phases and Electric Dipole Moments

The Yukawa couplings and the Majorana mass terms are in general complex, leading in general to CP violation. The number of physical CP–violating phases in the high-energy theory can be determined by parameter counting. Initially, Y_e has 9 complex phases, Y_ν has $3n$ phases, and M has $n(n+1)/2$ phases. On the other hand, the “flavour” rotation symmetry

$$U_l \times U_e \times U_N,\tag{4.1}$$

acting as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_e &\rightarrow U_e^\dagger Y_e U_l , \\ Y_\nu &\rightarrow U_N^\dagger Y_\nu U_l , \\ M &\rightarrow U_N^\dagger M U_N^* , \end{aligned} \tag{4.2}$$

allows one to eliminate some of these phases by field redefinitions. We note that U_l and U_e contain 6 phases each, while U_N has $n(n+1)/2$ phases⁴. Thus, this flavour rotation leaves $3(n-1)$ physical phases, which we can identify explicitly in a specific basis. Consider the basis where

$$\begin{aligned} Y^e &= \text{real diagonal} , \\ M &= \text{real diagonal} , \\ Y^\nu &= \text{arbitrary} . \end{aligned} \tag{4.3}$$

This basis is defined only up to a diagonal phase transformation

$$U_l = U_e = \text{diag}(e^{i\phi_1}, e^{i\phi_2}, e^{i\phi_3}) , \tag{4.4}$$

which acts on the neutrino Yukawa couplings as $Y_\nu^{ij} \rightarrow Y_\nu^{ij} e^{i\phi_j}$. The physical phases are invariant under this residual symmetry and are given by

$$\text{Arg}(Y_\nu^{ij} Y_\nu^{kj*}) , \tag{4.5}$$

(where no summation over j should be understood). Clearly, there are exactly $3(n-1)$ such phases, and each one may play the role of a ‘‘Jarlskog invariant’’ (see [21], [22] for a discussion).

Complex phases in the neutrino Yukawa couplings induce CP-violating phases in the soft terms due to the RG running, which in turn contribute to lepton electric dipole moments (EDMs) at low energies [23]- [27]. The relevant flavour objects are the 3×3 matrices $Y_\nu^\dagger Y_\nu$ and $Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu$, such that [23], [27]

$$d_i \propto [Y_\nu^\dagger Y_\nu , Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu]_{ii} , \tag{4.6}$$

where d_i is the EDM of the i -th charged lepton. This expression is proportional to $\text{Im} [Y_\nu^{jk} Y_\nu^{j'k*} Y_\nu^{j'i} Y_\nu^{ji*} L^{j'}]$ (no summation over i) which makes it clear that only the reparametrization-invariant phases (4.5) are involved. Since the summation over n RH neutrinos appears twice, the EDMs grow as

$$d_i \propto n^{2y} . \tag{4.7}$$

Thus, they may be enhanced by several orders of magnitude in the multi-neutrino case.

⁴In the pure Dirac case, one of these phases is irrelevant since an overall phase redefinition leaves all flavour objects invariant.

At large $\tan \beta$, a different flavour structure appears [26], [27], namely:

$$d_i \propto \text{Im} \left(Y_\nu^\dagger f Y_\nu \, m_l^2 \, Y_\nu^\dagger g Y_\nu \right)_{ii}, \quad (4.8)$$

where f, g are diagonal matrices depending on the Majorana masses and m_l are the charged lepton masses. The conclusion, however, remains the same, and the EDMs grow with the multiplicity of the states as $d_i \propto n^{2y}$.

The order of magnitude of the induced EDMs can be estimated using [27]:

$$d_i \sim 10^{-29} \left(\frac{200 \text{ GeV}}{M_{\text{SUSY}}} \right)^2 \left(\frac{m_{l_i}}{m_e} \right) (Y_\nu^\dagger Y_\nu)_{ii}^2 e \text{ cm}, \quad (4.9)$$

where we have taken $\ln(M_i/M_j) = \mathcal{O}(1)$ and CP-violating phases that are of order unity. The current experimental limit on the electron EDM of $10^{-27} e \text{ cm}$ is saturated for $(Y_\nu^\dagger Y_\nu)_{11} \sim 10$ if the superpartners of SM particles have masses at the electroweak scale. For large $\tan \beta$, the above expression acquires an additional factor $(\tan \beta/10)^3$ which leads to a further enhancement of the EDMs.

It is important to remember that these estimates are very sensitive to other CP-violating phases. For example, if the phase of the μ -term is as small as $10^{-4} - 10^{-5}$, it will dominate the SUSY contributions to the EDMs (for a recent discussion, see [28]).

5 Numerical Example

In this Section, we illustrate the multi-neutrino scenario with a numerical example. We suppose that, in the basis where the charged lepton mass matrix is diagonal and positive, the mass matrix for the light neutrinos is given by

$$M_{\text{eff}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.003 & 0.003 & 0.003 \\ 0.003 & 0.028 & -0.022 \\ 0.003 & -0.022 & 0.028 \end{pmatrix}$$

in eV units. This mass matrix has eigenvalues $(0.05, 0.01, 0)$ eV and is diagonalized by a tri-bimaximal [29] PMNS transformation. In our convention, the $(1,1)$ entry of M_{eff} corresponds to the τ -neutrino, $(2,2)$ – to the muon neutrino and so on.

We consider two seesaw realizations of this light-neutrino mass matrix: one with 10 right-handed neutrinos and another with 2 right-handed neutrinos. The corresponding heavy-neutrino mass matrices are generated randomly under the conditions that the Yukawa couplings be of order one and that most of the entries of M^{-1} be similar in magnitude, while reproducing the correct M_{eff} . For simplicity, we choose real matrices.

In the case of 10 right-handed neutrinos, the inverse Majorana mass matrix M^{-1}

is given by ⁵

$$\begin{pmatrix} 2.1 & -1.58 & 0.02 & 0. & 0.02 & 0.92 & 0.15 & 3.17 & 0.22 & 1.65 \\ -1.58 & 0.13 & 5.09 & 0.14 & -0.33 & 3.51 & -0.16 & -0.35 & -3.41 & 1.61 \\ 0.02 & 5.09 & 0.83 & -0.09 & 2.85 & -0.97 & -0.91 & 2.4 & -0.25 & 4.45 \\ 0. & 0.14 & -0.09 & -4.19 & -3.79 & 1.11 & -1.03 & 0.45 & -1.5 & 2.79 \\ 0.02 & -0.33 & 2.85 & -3.79 & -4.6 & -0.12 & -4.42 & 1.91 & -0.45 & -0.31 \\ 0.92 & 3.51 & -0.97 & 1.11 & -0.12 & 0.25 & 0.35 & 0.41 & 0.74 & 2.58 \\ 0.15 & -0.16 & -0.91 & -1.03 & -4.42 & 0.35 & -3.07 & 2.61 & 2.24 & -2.64 \\ 3.17 & -0.35 & 2.4 & 0.45 & 1.91 & 0.41 & 2.61 & 1.9 & 4.51 & -0.15 \\ 0.22 & -3.41 & -0.25 & -1.5 & -0.45 & 0.74 & 2.24 & 4.51 & 4.91 & 0.33 \\ 1.65 & 1.61 & 4.45 & 2.79 & -0.31 & 2.58 & -2.64 & -0.15 & 0.33 & 2.15 \end{pmatrix}$$

in units of $-3.3 \times 10^{-16} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, where we have assumed $\sin \beta \approx 1$. The corresponding Yukawa couplings Y_ν^T are

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0.51 & 0.06 & -0.32 & 0.32 & -0.83 & -0.36 & 1.23 & 0.41 & -0.35 & 0.48 \\ 0.37 & 0.1 & 1.36 & 0.62 & -0.82 & -0.66 & 0.06 & -0.02 & -0.78 & 0.11 \\ -0.09 & 0.89 & 0.13 & -0.55 & 0.08 & -0.25 & -0.04 & 0.68 & 0.11 & -1.1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Majorana mass eigenvalues are $M_i = (2.6, 2.7, 3.1, 4.0, 5.0, 8.1, 9.3, 10.5, 18, 58) \times 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$ with the geometric average scale $7.2 \times 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$. In the basis where the Majorana mass matrix is diagonal, the Yukawa couplings remain of order one.

In the case of 2 right-handed neutrinos, we nevertheless use a 3×3 matrix notation, keeping in mind that M^{-1} has rank two, so that only two right-handed neutrinos contribute. We take

$$M^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 11.28 & -8.82 & 21.86 \\ -8.82 & 6.91 & -17.21 \\ 21.86 & -17.21 & 44.39 \end{pmatrix}$$

in units of $-3.3 \times 10^{-16} \text{ GeV}^{-1}$, and

$$Y_\nu^T = \begin{pmatrix} -0.02 & -1.19 & -0.43 \\ 0.83 & -0.66 & -0.88 \\ 0.54 & 0.39 & 0.13 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The Majorana mass eigenvalues are $M_i = (0.5, 56) \times 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$ with the geometric average scale $5.2 \times 10^{14} \text{ GeV}$.

As expected, the Majorana mass scale is somewhat higher in the first case, while the Yukawa couplings are similar in magnitude. For the comparison of their lepton-flavour- and CP-violating effects, the relevant quantity is $Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu$, where $L = \text{diag}[\ln(M_{\text{GUT}}/M_i)]$. Ignoring the RG running of Y_ν [30], we have

$$Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 7.47 & -0.39 & -1.65 \\ -0.39 & 9.77 & -0.58 \\ -1.65 & -0.58 & 8.4 \end{pmatrix}$$

⁵More precise numbers are available from the authors.

for the 10 right-handed neutrinos case and

$$Y_\nu^\dagger L Y_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0.67 & 1.19 & 0.15 \\ 1.19 & 2.37 & 0.01 \\ 0.15 & 0.01 & 0.29 \end{pmatrix}$$

if there are 2 right-handed neutrinos. Here, as before, the (1,1) entry corresponds to the τ - τ matrix element and so on.

We find that not all of the entries are enhanced by the same factor in the 10 right-handed neutrino case, but the phenomenological consequences are dramatic! For example, the $\tau \rightarrow e\gamma$ branching ratio increases by a factor of 100 compared to the 2 right-handed neutrino case, while that for $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ is enhanced by a factor of 10^3 . This result is of course specific to the above texture, however it is generally true that the lepton-flavour-violating transitions are more significant in the multi-neutrino case. Although here we have considered a CP-conserving Ansatz, similar statements apply in general to the EDMs as well. Since the magnitudes of the diagonal entries increase by factors of 10 or so, the insertion of CP phases of order unity would result in increases of EDMs by two orders of magnitude.

The above example illustrates the main features of the multi-neutrino scenario. This particular, the 10 right-handed ν texture would be consistent with the $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$ constraint only for slepton masses of ~ 500 GeV or more. The corresponding predictions for $\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow e\gamma)$ and $\text{BR}(\tau \rightarrow \mu\gamma)$ are at the $10^{-10} - 10^{-11}$ level. For low $\tan\beta$ and CP-violating phases of order unity, the electron EDM is expected to be of order 10^{-29} e-cm and the muon EDM a factor of 10^2 larger. Thus, the most promising observables for this texture would be $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$ and d_e (see [31] for a discussion of the experimental prospects). These flavour-dependent effects would be accentuated further for more right-handed neutrinos.

6 Comments on Leptogenesis

A number of features of leptogenesis [32] with many right-handed neutrinos have been studied by Eisele in Ref. [33]. Here we discuss only a few of the most important differences of this scenario compared with the standard scheme ⁶.

The out-of-equilibrium decay of the lightest right-handed neutrino creates a lepton asymmetry

$$\eta_L = \frac{n_N + n_{\tilde{N}}}{s} \epsilon \delta, \quad (6.1)$$

where n and s are the number and entropy densities, respectively; δ is the washout parameter characterizing the fraction of the lepton asymmetry surviving the washout

⁶Recent reviews of leptogenesis can be found in Ref. [34].

effects, and ϵ is the CP-violating asymmetry:

$$\epsilon = \frac{\Gamma - \bar{\Gamma}}{\Gamma + \bar{\Gamma}}, \quad (6.2)$$

with Γ being the decay rate of the singlet right-handed neutrino into light leptons plus the Higgs boson, and $\bar{\Gamma}$ being the decay rate for the CP-conjugate process. In the case of hierarchical Majorana masses, the CP asymmetry is dominated by the decays of the lightest singlet, and

$$\epsilon_1 \simeq -\frac{3}{8\pi} \frac{M_1}{\langle \phi^u \rangle^2} \frac{\text{Im}[Y_\nu M_{\text{eff}}^\dagger Y_\nu^T]_{11}}{[Y_\nu Y_\nu^\dagger]_{11}}, \quad (6.3)$$

where M_1 is the lightest Majorana mass. Davidson and Ibarra have derived an upper bound on ϵ_1 in the 3×3 case [35]. Here we consider the corresponding bound in the multi-neutrino scenario. Working in the basis where M_{eff} is diagonal and real, we first note that the asymmetry is maximized for $Y_{1i}^2 = i|Y_{1i}|^2$. Then, the relevant ratio satisfies

$$\frac{\sum_i m_i |Y_{1i}|^2}{\sum_i |Y_{1i}|^2} \leq m_3, \quad (6.4)$$

where m_3 is the mass of the heaviest left-handed neutrino. The maximum is achieved for $Y_{11}, Y_{12} = 0$. Thus, we obtain a generalized bound for an arbitrary number of right-handed neutrinos:

$$|\epsilon_1| \leq \frac{3}{8\pi} \frac{M_1}{\langle \phi^u \rangle^2} m_3. \quad (6.5)$$

This is identical to the “weaker” version of the Davidson–Ibarra bound in [35], which was also found in Ref. [36]. For the 3×3 case, a stronger bound is valid, which is obtained from the above expression by replacing m_3 with $m_3 - m_1$. This stronger form does not apply to the $n \times n$ case, and one can construct examples with $Y_{11,12} = 0$, $\text{Arg}(Y_{13}) = \pi/4$ which saturate (6.5). Technically, this happens because the Casas–Ibarra parametrization [11] involving *orthogonal* matrices does not apply to $n \times 3$ Yukawa couplings⁷.

Thus, only the weaker version of the Davidson–Ibarra bound holds in the general case. Needless to say, this distinction is only relevant for a degenerate light-neutrino spectrum. In the 3×3 case, the bound on ϵ tightens as the overall scale of light neutrino masses increases because $m_3 - m_1 \simeq \Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 / 2m_3$. For many right-handed neutrinos, the only relevant bound is (6.5) which relaxes as m_3 increases. This inequality can be interpreted as a lower bound on M_1 , which in turn implies a lower bound on the reheating temperature T_{reh} [35]. If we take $m_3 \sim 0.5$ eV, the Davidson–Ibarra bound on T_{reh} relaxes by an order of magnitude⁸,

$$T_{\text{reh}} \geq 10^7 - 10^9 \text{ GeV}. \quad (6.6)$$

⁷The $n \times 3$ matrix R entering the Casas–Ibarra parametrization satisfies $R^T R = \mathbf{1}$ but not $RR^T = \mathbf{1}$.

⁸For systematic studies of bounds on T_{reh} , see [37], [38].

This ameliorates somewhat the problems of gravitino over-production [39] and moduli destabilization at high temperature [40].

Another interesting consequence of the multi- ν_R scenario is the relaxation of the cosmological bound on the lightest neutrino mass m_1 . The requirement of out-of-equilibrium decay of the lightest right-handed neutrino ⁹ [42], $\Gamma_1 < H|_{T \simeq M_1}$, implies

$$\tilde{m}_1 = (Y_\nu Y_\nu^\dagger)_{11} \frac{\langle \phi^u \rangle^2}{M_1} \leq 5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV} . \quad (6.7)$$

In the 3×3 case, $m_1 \leq \tilde{m}_1$ (see, for example, [43], [35]). In the multi- ν_R case, this is no longer true, since m_1 receives n contributions, $m_1 \propto (Y_\nu^T Y_\nu / M_1)_{11}$, and one can easily have $m_1 > \tilde{m}_1$. Thus, the constraint on the lightest neutrino mass is relaxed.

We see that the presence of more than 3 right-handed neutrinos disrupts the usual relations between the light neutrino masses and leptogenesis. In the above arguments, we have made the usual assumption that the lightest ν_R dominates in leptogenesis. We have assumed that the extra ν_R 's play a passive role, in the sense that they do not contribute to leptogenesis, yet affect the light neutrino masses.

Further possible effects of many right-handed neutrinos have been discussed in Ref. [33]. These include, for example, the possibility that more ν_R 's are responsible for leptogenesis. Such effects can be studied on a model-by-model basis.

7 Conclusions

We have explored some of the phenomenological features of the seesaw mechanism with many right-handed neutrinos. Such a generalization is allowed by the absence of experimental constraints on the number of heavy right-handed neutrinos, and is motivated by string constructions. We find that, in such models, the Majorana mass scale can be significantly *higher* than that in the traditional scheme with 3 right-handed neutrinos, and have demonstrated with a specific example that the magnitudes of lepton-flavour- and CP-violating transitions can be *enhanced* by orders of magnitude. We also find that certain constraints on leptogenesis are sensitive to the number of ν_R and can be relaxed. This applies, in particular, to the bounds on the reheating temperature and the lightest neutrino mass.

Acknowledgements.

O.L. is indebted to M.-T. Eisele, M. Ratz and, especially, to A. Ibarra for enlightening discussions and useful correspondence.

⁹This requirement is lifted in the strong wash-out regime. See [41] for a discussion and the neutrino mass bounds.

References

- [1] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. B **67**, 421 (1977).
- [2] T. Yanagida, *In Proceedings of the Workshop on the Baryon Number of the Universe and Unified Theories, Tsukuba, Japan, 13-14 Feb 1979*.
- [3] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, “Complex Spinors And Unified Theories,” *In Supergravity, P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D.Z. Freedman (eds.), North Holland Publ. Co., 1979*.
- [4] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
- [5] W. Buchmuller, K. Hamaguchi, O. Lebedev, S. Ramos-Sanchez and M. Ratz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 021601 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0703078].
- [6] For earlier string models with many singlets, see I. Antoniadis, J. R. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **205** (1988) 459; Phys. Lett. B **208** (1988) 209 [Addendum-ibid. B **213** (1988) 562]; Phys. Lett. B **231** (1989) 65. For field-theoretic models, see J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2227 (1980).
- [7] R. N. Mohapatra and A. Y. Smirnov, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **56**, 569 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0603118]; A. Strumia and F. Vissani, arXiv:hep-ph/0606054; R. N. Mohapatra *et al.*, arXiv:hep-ph/0510213; J. W. F. Valle, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **53**, 473 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0608101].
- [8] F. Borzumati and A. Masiero, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 961 (1986).
- [9] J. Hisano and D. Nomura, Phys. Rev. D **59**, 116005 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9810479].
- [10] J. R. Ellis, M. E. Gomez, G. K. Leontaris, S. Lola and D. V. Nanopoulos, Eur. Phys. J. C **14**, 319 (2000) [arXiv:hep-ph/9911459].
- [11] J. A. Casas and A. Ibarra, Nucl. Phys. B **618**, 171 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0103065].
- [12] F. Deppisch, H. Pas, A. Redelbach, R. Ruckl and Y. Shimizu, Eur. Phys. J. C **28**, 365 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0206122].
- [13] T. Blazek and S. F. King, Nucl. Phys. B **662**, 359 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0211368].
- [14] S. T. Petcov, W. Rodejohann, T. Shindou and Y. Takanishi, Nucl. Phys. B **739**, 208 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0510404].
- [15] J. A. Casas, J. R. Espinosa, A. Ibarra and I. Navarro, Phys. Rev. D **63**, 097302 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0004166].
- [16] M. L. Brooks *et al.* [MEGA Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 1521 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ex/9905013].

- [17] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 041801 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ex/0508012].
- [18] B. Aubert *et al.* [BABAR Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 041802 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ex/0502032].
- [19] L. J. Hall, V. A. Kostelecky and S. Raby, Nucl. Phys. B **267**, 415 (1986).
- [20] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, Nucl. Phys. B **477**, 321 (1996) [arXiv:hep-ph/9604387].
- [21] H. K. Dreiner, J. S. Kim, O. Lebedev and M. Thormeier, “Supersymmetric Jarlskog invariants: The neutrino sector,” arXiv:hep-ph/0703074.
- [22] For non-SUSY models, see G. C. Branco, L. Lavoura and M. N. Rebelo, Phys. Lett. B **180**, 264 (1986); G. C. Branco and M. N. Rebelo, New J. Phys. **7**, 86 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0411196]; Y. Farzan and A. Y. Smirnov, JHEP **0701**, 059 (2007) [arXiv:hep-ph/0610337].
- [23] J. R. Ellis, J. Hisano, S. Lola and M. Raidal, Nucl. Phys. B **621**, 208 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0109125].
- [24] J. R. Ellis, J. Hisano, M. Raidal and Y. Shimizu, Phys. Lett. B **528**, 86 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0111324].
- [25] J. R. Ellis and M. Raidal, Nucl. Phys. B **643**, 229 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0206174].
- [26] I. Masina, Nucl. Phys. B **671**, 432 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0304299]; F. R. Joaquim, I. Masina and A. Riotto, arXiv:hep-ph/0701270.
- [27] Y. Farzan and M. E. Peskin, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 095001 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0405214].
- [28] S. Abel and O. Lebedev, JHEP **0601**, 133 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0508135]; K. A. Olive, M. Pospelov, A. Ritz and Y. Santoso, Phys. Rev. D **72**, 075001 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0506106]; D. A. Demir, O. Lebedev, K. A. Olive, M. Pospelov and A. Ritz, Nucl. Phys. B **680**, 339 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ph/0311314].
- [29] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B **530**, 167 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0202074].
- [30] S. Antusch, J. Kersten, M. Lindner, M. Ratz and M. A. Schmidt, JHEP **0503**, 024 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0501272].
- [31] Y. K. Semertzidis, Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **131**, 244 (2004) [arXiv:hep-ex/0401016].
- [32] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **174**, 45 (1986).
- [33] M. T. Eisele, arXiv:0706.0200 [hep-ph].
- [34] W. Buchmuller, R. D. Peccei and T. Yanagida, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci. **55**, 311 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0502169]; W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher,

- Annals Phys. **315**, 305 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0401240]; S. F. King, Phys. Scripta **T121**, 178 (2005) [arXiv:hep-ph/0411345].
- [35] S. Davidson and A. Ibarra, Phys. Lett. B **535**, 25 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0202239].
 - [36] T. Asaka, K. Hamaguchi, M. Kawasaki and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **464**, 12 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9906366].
 - [37] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher, Nucl. Phys. B **643**, 367 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0205349].
 - [38] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher, in [34].
 - [39] M. Y. Khlopov and A. D. Linde, Phys. Lett. B **138**, 265 (1984); J. R. Ellis, J. E. Kim and D. V. Nanopoulos, Phys. Lett. B **145**, 181 (1984); J. R. Ellis, D. V. Nanopoulos and S. Sarkar, Nucl. Phys. B **259**, 175 (1985).
 - [40] W. Buchmuller, K. Hamaguchi, O. Lebedev and M. Ratz, Nucl. Phys. B **699**, 292 (2004) [arXiv:hep-th/0404168]; JCAP **0501**, 004 (2005) [arXiv:hep-th/0411109].
 - [41] W. Buchmuller, P. Di Bari and M. Plumacher, Nucl. Phys. B **665**, 445 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0302092].
 - [42] W. Fischler, G. F. Giudice, R. G. Leigh and S. Paban, Phys. Lett. B **258**, 45 (1991).
 - [43] M. Fujii, K. Hamaguchi and T. Yanagida, Phys. Rev. D **65**, 115012 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0202210].