

\mathbb{Z}_2 Symmetry Prediction for the Leptonic Dirac CP Phase

Shao-Feng Ge^{1,*}, Duane A. Dicus^{2,†}, and Wayne W. Repko^{3,‡}

¹Center for High Energy Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, China

²Physics Department, University of Texas, Austin, TX 78712

³Department of Physics and Astronomy, Michigan State University, East Lansing MI 48824

(Dated: February 17, 2022)

Model-independent consequences of applying a generalized hidden horizontal \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry to the neutrino mass matrix are explored. The Dirac CP phase δ_D can be expressed in terms of the three mixing angles as $4c_a s_a c_s s_s \cos \delta_D = (s_s^2 - c_s^2 s_x^2)(c_a^2 - s_a^2)$ where the s_i, c_i are sines and cosines of the atmospheric, solar, and reactor angles. This relation is independent of neutrino masses and whether neutrinos are Dirac- or Majorana-type. Given the present constraints on the angles, δ_D is constrained to be almost maximal, a result which can be explored in experiments such as NO ν A and T2K. The Majorana CP phases do not receive any constraint and are thus model-dependent. Also a distribution of θ_x with a lower limit is obtained without specifying δ_D .

PACS numbers: 14.60.Pq

Phys. Let. B **702**, 220-223 (2011)

Introduction – The lepton sector has a quite different mixing pattern from that of the quarks. In the PMNS parameterization [1], the atmospheric mixing angle $\theta_a \equiv \theta_{23}$ is almost maximal and the solar mixing angle $\theta_s \equiv \theta_{12}$ is also large. The reactor mixing angle $\theta_x \equiv \theta_{13}$ is small with an upper bound of about 10 degrees at the 1σ level. The current global fit is summarized in Table I.

	$\sin^2 \theta_s (\theta_s)$	$\sin^2 \theta_a (\theta_a)$	$\sin^2 \theta_x (\theta_x)$
CV	0.312 (34.0°)	0.466 (43.0°)	0.016 (7.3°)
1σ Range	0.294-0.331 (32.8-35.1°)	0.408-0.539 (39.7-47.2°)	0.006-0.026 (4.4-9.3°)

TABLE I: The global fit for the neutrino mixing angles [2]. The first row gives the central values.

Upcoming neutrino experiments (Daya Bay [3], Double CHOOZ [4], and Reno [5]) will make precise measurements of the three mixing angles, especially θ_x , and the Dirac CP phase δ_D which will be indirectly measured by experiments such as NO ν A [6] and T2K [7]. A sizeable θ_x [2, 8, 9] is crucial for pinning down δ_D since they always appear as the product $\sin \theta_x e^{i\delta_D}$.

A model independent sign from experiment is μ - τ symmetry [10] in the diagonal basis of the charged leptons [11]. Under μ - τ symmetry θ_x vanishes and θ_a is

maximal. This is incorporated in the widely accepted *tribimaximal mixing* [12].

The essential point of μ - τ symmetry is that it is a *residual symmetry* which directly determines the mixing pattern. Nevertheless, having one residual symmetry is not sufficient since μ - τ symmetry can determine just two of the three mixing angles. Another \mathbb{Z}_2^s symmetry, which determines the solar mixing angle, has been proposed in [13].

However, deviations from the tribimaximal pattern are still allowed and need not be small [2, 14, 15]. First, it is not accurate enough, especially for θ_x . It can serve as a zeroth-order approximation but should receive higher order corrections. Also, if tribimaximal mixing were exact, there would be no effect of the Dirac CP phase. This is not what we would prefer, especially from the perspective of leptogenesis. Thus, μ - τ symmetry should be abandoned. Secondly, the solar mixing angle deviates from the tribimaximal one by more than one degree. A generalization with θ_s being set free is explored in [16, 17]. Also, in one model, θ_s is expressed in terms of a golden ratio [18] while another scheme is realized with dodeca-symmetry [19]. We will explore the model-independent consequences of this generalized \mathbb{Z}_2^s symmetry without assuming μ - τ symmetry.

Symmetry and Mixing – The neutrino mixing matrix can be determined by two \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetries [13] of which the solar mixing angle θ_s is constrained by

$$G_1(k) = \frac{1}{2+k^2} \begin{pmatrix} 2-k^2 & 2k & 2k \\ 2k & k^2 & -2 \\ 2k & -2 & k^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

the generator of the generalized \mathbb{Z}_2^s symmetry [16]. Tribimaximal mixing corresponds to $k = -2$. Another choice

*Electronic address: gesf02@gmail.com

†Electronic address: dicus@physics.utexas.edu

‡Electronic address: repko@pa.msu.edu

is $k = -3/\sqrt{2}$ with $\theta_s \approx 33.7^\circ$ which fits the data better. The following discussion will concentrate on imposing only G_1 .

In general, there are three possible horizontal symmetries [13], G_i , $i = 1, 2, 3$, which satisfy $G_i U_\nu = U_\nu d_\nu^{(i)}$ where U_ν is the mixing matrix of the neutrino mass matrix and the $d_\nu^{(i)}$ are diagonal rephasing matrices. We can write this relation in two equivalent forms,

$$U_\nu^\dagger G_i U_\nu = d_\nu^{(i)} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad G_i = U_\nu d_\nu^{(i)} U_\nu^\dagger. \quad (2)$$

For Majorana neutrinos, the diagonal elements of $d_\nu^{(i)}$ are ± 1 and thus there are only eight possibilities for $d_\nu^{(i)}$ spanning a product group $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2$. But only $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ is effective because the third \mathbb{Z}_2 just contributes an overall $+1$ or -1 factor. Since the G_i are similarity transformed representations of the corresponding $d_\nu^{(i)}$ through U_ν , they are equivalent to $d_\nu^{(i)}$. In other words, *the effective residual symmetry of lepton mixing is $\mathbb{Z}_2 \otimes \mathbb{Z}_2$ for Majorana neutrinos*. We call $d_\nu^{(i)}$ the **kernel** of $G_\nu^{(i)}$.

From the first form of (2) we see that U_ν is a diagonalization matrix of G_i with corresponding diagonalized matrix $d_\nu^{(i)}$. Given a group representation, the mixing matrix can be obtained by diagonalizing the representation matrix without resorting to the mass matrix. This provides a very convenient and direct way of determining the mixing matrix. As no explicit mass matrix, and hence no mass eigenvalues, are involved, the relation between the horizontal symmetry and the mixing matrix is mass-independent [20]. Also, the second form tells us that the residual symmetries can be constructed in terms of the mixing matrix. In this sense, the symmetry can be determined phenomenologically.

For the generalized $G_1(k)$, with $d_\nu^{(1)} = \text{diag}(-1, 1, 1)$, there is a special form of the mixing matrix,

$$U_k \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \frac{-k}{\sqrt{2+k^2}} & \frac{-\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{2+k^2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2+k^2}} & \frac{-k}{\sqrt{2(2+k^2)}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2+k^2}} & \frac{-k}{\sqrt{2(2+k^2)}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

with maximal θ_a and vanishing θ_x .

Reconstruction of Mixing Matrix – Since there is a degeneracy between the eigenvalues of G_1 , its diagonalization matrix is not unique. From (2) and (3) we get,

$$G_1 = U_\nu d_\nu^{(1)} U_\nu^\dagger = U_k U_T d_\nu^{(1)} U_T^\dagger U_k^\dagger, \quad (4)$$

where U_ν denotes the physical neutrino mixing matrix. Thus the physical neutrino mixing matrix U_ν can be expressed as $U_\nu \equiv U_k U_T$. The freedom of rotating between

the degenerate eigenstates is represented by a 2–3 unitary rotation parameterized as,

$$U_T \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & & \\ & c_T & -s_T e^{i\beta_4} \\ & s_T e^{-i\beta_4} & c_T \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\beta_1} & & \\ & e^{i\beta_2} & \\ & & e^{i\beta_3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

with $c_T \equiv \cos \theta_T$ and $s_T \equiv \sin \theta_T$. The diagonal rephasing matrix $d_\nu^{(1)}$ is invariant under U_T , namely $d_\nu^{(1)} = U_T d_\nu^{(1)} U_T^\dagger$.

Also, the physical mixing matrix U_ν can be generally parameterized as $\mathcal{P}_\nu \mathcal{U}_\nu \mathcal{Q}_\nu$ where \mathcal{U}_ν is the standard parametrization of MNS matrix,

$$\mathcal{U}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} c_s c_x & -s_s c_x & -s_x e^{i\delta_D} \\ s_s c_a - c_s s_a s_x e^{-i\delta_D} & c_s c_a + s_s s_a s_x e^{-i\delta_D} & -s_a c_x \\ s_s s_a + c_s c_a s_x e^{-i\delta_D} & c_s s_a - s_s c_a s_x e^{-i\delta_D} & c_a c_x \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

while $\mathcal{P}_\nu \equiv \text{diag}(e^{i\alpha_1}, e^{i\alpha_2}, e^{i\alpha_3})$ and $\mathcal{Q}_\nu \equiv \text{diag}(e^{i\phi_1}, e^{i\phi_2}, e^{i\phi_3})$ are two diagonal rephasing matrices [16]. The phases ϕ_i in \mathcal{Q}_ν are Majorana CP phases while \mathcal{P}_ν is a diagonal rephasing matrix which does not have any direct physical significance.

These two expressions for the physical mixing matrix U_ν must be equal,

$$U_k U_T = \mathcal{P}_\nu \mathcal{U}_\nu \mathcal{Q}_\nu. \quad (7)$$

The Majorana CP phases ϕ_i in \mathcal{Q}_ν could be absorbed by the phases β_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) of U_T .

Dirac CP Phase and Mixing Angles – We will first compare the elements of the first row of the two matrices on either side of Eq.(7). They give

$$\phi_1 - \beta_1 = -\alpha_1, \quad c_s c_x = \frac{-k}{\sqrt{2+k^2}}, \quad (8a)$$

$$\phi_2 - \beta_2 = -\alpha_1, \quad s_s c_x = \frac{\sqrt{2}c_T}{\sqrt{2+k^2}}, \quad (8b)$$

$$\phi_3 - \beta_3 = \beta_4 - \delta_D - \alpha_1, \quad s_x = \frac{-\sqrt{2}s_T}{\sqrt{2+k^2}}. \quad (8c)$$

The matching of overall CP phases leaves some freedom which gives, at most, minus signs. These signs will not affect the final physical result so, for simplicity, we will omit them. From (8) we can see that only the differences $\phi_i - \beta_i$ are relevant. Majorana phases ϕ_i can not be uniquely determined. The mixing angles, θ_x and θ_s can be expressed as functions of k and θ_T . Of the three relations for the mixing angles only two are independent because of unitarity. Conversely, k and θ_T can be expressed as functions of mixing angles,

$$k^2 = \frac{2c_s^2 c_x^2}{1 - c_s^2 c_x^2}, \quad s_T^2 = \frac{s_x^2}{1 - c_s^2 c_x^2}. \quad (9)$$

From (9) we can estimate the approximate value of the fitting parameters. Since s_x^2 is tiny, so is s_T^2 , and $k^2 \approx 2 \cot^2 \theta_s$. We see that the value of k is close to 2 but with some deviation. According to (9), s_T^2 is approximately $3 s_x^2$. The central value of θ_x we used is about 7.3° rendering $\theta_T \approx 13^\circ$.

The (21) and (31) elements of Eq.(7) give the differences between α_i in terms of mixing angles and δ_D ,

$$e^{i(\alpha_2 - \alpha_1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 + k^2} (s_s c_a - c_s s_a s_x e^{-i\delta_D})}, \quad (10a)$$

$$e^{i(\alpha_3 - \alpha_1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2 + k^2} (s_s s_a + c_s c_a s_x e^{-i\delta_D})}. \quad (10b)$$

The sum of the (23) and (33) elements gives,

$$[e^{i\delta_3} c_a - e^{i\delta_2} s_a] c_x = \sqrt{\frac{2k^2}{2 + k^2}} s_T e^{i\beta_4}, \quad (11)$$

with $\delta_i \equiv \alpha_i - \alpha_1 + \beta_4 - \delta_D$. The common β_4 cancels.

By comparing (11) with (8c) we can eliminate θ_T . Then (10a) and (10b) can be used to remove the Majorana phases α_i . The parameter k can be expressed in terms of the mixing angles through (8a). When all of these are combined a relation between δ_D and the three mixing angles emerges,


$$\cos \delta_D = \frac{(s_s^2 - c_s^2 s_x^2)(c_a^2 - s_a^2)}{4c_a s_a c_s s_s s_x}. \quad (12)$$

Note that this correlation between the mixing angles and δ_D is independent of unphysical parameters and thus it can be used to compare with experimental results directly. With vanishing δ_D (12) will reduce to the result of [21].


As θ_x is small and θ_a is nearly maximal, we can define $\theta_x \equiv 0^\circ + \delta_x$ and $\theta_a \equiv 45^\circ + \delta_a$. To leading order (12) reduces to,

$$\frac{\delta_x}{\delta_a} = -\frac{\tan \theta_s}{\cos \delta_D}, \quad (13)$$

which is the main result of [16] obtained from the minimal seesaw model. In that model, both μ - τ and G_1 symmetries are imposed at leading order and a soft mass term is used to break μ - τ without affecting G_1 . This is similar to our treatment here where only G_1 is applied to constrain the mixing angles and the Dirac CP phase without involving μ - τ symmetry. The difference is that an expansion method was used in [16] while the discussion in the current work is more general and, most importantly, model-independent.



(a) θ_x Histogram



(b) θ_x v.s. θ_a

FIG. 1: Predictions of θ_x in terms of δ_D , θ_a , and θ_s at the 90% C.L.

Phenomenological Consequences – The relation (12) can be used to put limits on θ_x from,

$$\sin \theta_x = \left[\mp \sqrt{c_D^2 + \cot^2 2\theta_a - c_D} \right] \tan 2\theta_a \tan \theta_s, \quad (14)$$

with $c_D \equiv \cos \delta_D$. The result for the lower sign is shown in Fig.1(a) where δ_D is assumed to be uniformly distributed in the range $(0, 2\pi)$ and normal distributions for θ_a and θ_s are used with central values and standard deviations given by Table I. Alternately we can use the limits $1 \geq \cos \delta_D \geq -1$ to get limits on s_x ,

$$\frac{s_s}{c_s} \frac{c_a + s_a}{|c_a - s_a|} \geq \sin \theta_x \geq \frac{s_s}{c_s} \frac{|c_a - s_a|}{c_a + s_a}. \quad (15)$$

The upper limit is of no use but the lower limit is clearly shown in Fig.1(b).

Since the three mixing angles have been measured, a prediction of δ_D can be obtained using (12). This is plotted in Fig.2(a) where there exists a corresponding distribution in the range of $(-180^\circ, 0^\circ)$. We can see that




FIG. 2: Normalized differential probability distribution of (a) the Dirac CP phase δ_D and (b) Jarlskog Invariant J_ν at 90% C.L. The distribution of δ_D is symmetric with respect to 0° so there would be another peak near -90° . The distribution of J_ν is also symmetric around 0.

δ_D is constrained to be almost maximal which is a direct consequence of the fact that θ_a is closer to its zeroth-order approximation than θ_x . From (12) we see that if δ_a vanishes, namely $c_a = s_a$, $\cos \delta_D$ would also vanish. A similar result is obtained in [22] in a model-dependent way.

Experimentally, δ_D is measured through the Jarlskog invariant [23] $J_\nu \equiv c_a s_a c_s s_s c_x^2 s_x \sin \delta_D$ whose distribution is shown in Fig. 2(b). There is an explicit upper limit around 0.04. The distribution peaks at $|J_\nu| \approx 0.03$ which can be estimated with the best fit values listed in Table I. This will be tested by future experiments [6, 7].

Generalization to Dirac Type Neutrino – The direct relation between G_i and U_ν shown in (2) is the same for Dirac- and Majorana-type fermions [13]. The only difference comes from the kernel $d_\nu^{(i)}$. For Majorana neutrinos $d_\nu^{(i)} d_\nu^{(i)} = I$, while for Dirac neutrinos the kernel can be complex, $d_\nu^{(i)} d_\nu^{(i)\dagger} = I$.

As long as G_1 is the same, its kernel $d_\nu^{(1)}$ is still $(-1, 1, 1)$ for either Majorana or Dirac neutrinos. Thus, all the above results also apply for Dirac neutrinos. This result is quite general and has not been noticed before. In [13] the author considered the group S_4 generated by subgroups \mathcal{F} and \mathcal{G} for the charged lepton and neutrino sectors respectively with the neutrinos being Majorana-type. The element G_i of the subgroup \mathcal{G} has a kernel with diagonal elements being $-1, +1, +1$ in some order. This satisfies the constraint on not only Majorana but also Dirac-type kernels. Thus \mathcal{G} is also true for the case of Dirac-type neutrinos. The generated S_4 symmetry applies to both Dirac- and Majorana-type neutrinos, not just the Majorana-type as discussed in [13].

Conclusions – Model-independent consequences of a generalized G_1 symmetry are explored. Due to degeneracy between the eigenvalues of G_1 , the mixing matrix cannot be uniquely determined. Nevertheless, G_1 invariance gives a relation (12) between the mixing angles and the Dirac CP phase δ_D for both Majorana and Dirac neutrinos. This can be used to predict δ_D , and consequently the Jarlskog invariant J_ν , in terms of the measured mixing angles leading to an almost maximal δ_D as shown in Fig. 2. This appears to be the first time that a direct relation between a horizontal symmetry and the leptonic Dirac CP phase has been established in a model-independent way. These results will be tested by next generation of neutrino experiments [3–7]. Comparison between this prediction of δ_D and experiment can tell us whether or not there is a horizontal symmetry and, if so, what type of symmetry it is. Since the prediction is independent of model assignments, its conformation should be robust and conclusive. The Majorana CP phases are not constrained; they are model-dependent and must be studied case by case. In addition a clear lower limit on θ_x is obtained as shown in Fig. 1.

Acknowledgments – SFG is grateful to Hong-Jian He for useful discussions and kind support. DAD was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under grant No. DE-FG03-93ER40757. WWR was supported in part by the National Science Foundation under Grant PHY-0555544.

-
- [1] B. Pontecorvo, Sov. Phys. JETP **6**, 429 (1957) [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **33**, 549 (1957)]; Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28**, 870 (1962).
 - [2] G. L. Fogli, E. Lisi, A. Marrone, A. Palazzo and A. M. Rotunno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 141801 (2008) [arXiv:0806.2649 [hep-ph]].
 - [3] X. Guo *et al.* [Daya-Bay Collaboration], arXiv:hep-

- ex/0701029; M. C. Chu [Daya Bay Collaboration], arXiv:0810.0807 [hep-ex]; W. Wang [Daya Bay Collaboration], AIP Conf. Proc. **1222**, 494 (2010) [arXiv:0910.4605 [hep-ex]].
- [4] F. Ardellier *et al.* [Double Chooz Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0606025.
- [5] J. K. Ahn *et al.* [RENO Collaboration], arXiv:1003.1391 [hep-ex].
- [6] D. S. Ayres *et al.* [NO ν A Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0503053; O. Mena, S. Palomares-Ruiz and S. Pascoli, Phys. Rev. D **73**, 073007 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0510182]; D. S. Ayres *et al.* [NO ν A Collaboration], “*The NO ν A Technical Design Report*.”
- [7] Y. Itow *et al.* [The T2K Collaboration], arXiv:hep-ex/0106019.
- [8] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni and J. Salvado, JHEP **1004**, 056 (2010) [arXiv:1001.4524 [hep-ph]].
- [9] M. Mezzetto and T. Schwetz, J. Phys. G **37**, 103001 (2010) [arXiv:1003.5800 [hep-ph]].
- [10] R. N. Mohapatra and S. Nussinov, Phys. Rev. D **60**, 013002 (1999) [arXiv:hep-ph/9809415]; C. S. Lam, Phys. Lett. B **507**, 214 (2001) [arXiv:hep-ph/0104116]; T. Fukuyama and H. Nishiura, arXiv:hep-ph/9702253.
- [11] D. A. Dicus, S.-F. Ge and W. W. Repko, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 033005 (2010) arXiv:1004.3266 [hep-ph].
- [12] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. B **530**, 167 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0202074]; Z. Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **533**, 85 (2002) [arXiv:hep-ph/0204049]; X. G. He and A. Zee, Phys. Lett. B **560**, 87 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0301092].
- [13] C. S. Lam, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 073015 (2008) [arXiv:0809.1185 [hep-ph]].
- [14] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 2701 (2010) [arXiv:1002.0211 [hep-ph]].
- [15] C. H. Albright and W. Rodejohann, Phys. Lett. B **665**, 378 (2008) [arXiv:0804.4581 [hep-ph]]; M. Abbas and A. Y. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. D **82**, 013008 (2010) [arXiv:1004.0099 [hep-ph]]; C. H. Albright, A. Dueck and W. Rodejohann, Eur. Phys. J. C **70**, 1099 (2010) [arXiv:1004.2798 [hep-ph]].
- [16] S.-F. Ge, H. J. He and F. R. Yin, JCAP **1005**, 017 (2010) [arXiv:1001.0940 [hep-ph]].
- [17] D. A. Dicus, S.-F. Ge and H.-J. He, in preparation.
- [18] A. Datta, F. S. Ling and P. Ramond, Nucl. Phys. B **671**, 383 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0306002]; Y. Kajiyama, M. Raidal and A. Strumia, Phys. Rev. D **76**, 117301 (2007) [arXiv:0705.4559 [hep-ph]]; L. L. Everett and A. J. Stuart, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 085005 (2009) [arXiv:0812.1057 [hep-ph]]; A. Adulpravitchai, A. Blum and W. Rodejohann, New J. Phys. **11**, 063026 (2009) [arXiv:0903.0531 [hep-ph]]; F. Feruglio and A. Paris, arXiv:1101.0393 [hep-ph].
- [19] J. E. Kim and M. S. Seo, arXiv:1005.4684 [hep-ph].
- [20] C. S. Lam, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 113004 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0611017].
- [21] D. A. Dicus, S. F. Ge and W. W. Repko, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 093007 (2011) arXiv:1012.2571 [hep-ph].
- [22] S. Antusch, S. F. King, C. Luhn and M. Spinrath, arXiv:1103.5930 [hep-ph].
- [23] C. Jarlskog, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1039 (1985).