

T_7 Flavor Model in Three Loop Seesaw and Higgs Phenomenology

Yuji Kajiyama,^{1,*} Hiroshi Okada,^{2,†} and Kei Yagyu^{3,‡}

¹*Akita Highschool, Tegata-Nakadai 1, Akita, 010-0851, Japan*

²*School of Physics, KIAS, Seoul 130-722, Korea*

³*Department of Physics, National Central University, Chungli, Taiwan 32001, ROC*

We propose a new type of radiative seesaw model in which observed neutrino masses are generated through a three-loop level diagram in combination with tree-level type-II seesaw mechanism in a renormalizable theory. We introduce a Non-abelian flavor symmetry T_7 in order to constrain the form of Yukawa interactions and Higgs potential. Although several models based on a Non-abelian flavor symmetry predict the universal coupling constants among the standard model like Higgs boson and charged leptons, which is disfavored by the current LHC data, our model can avoid such a situation. We show a benchmark parameter set that is consistent with the current experimental data, and we discuss multi-muon events as a key collider signature to probe our model.

PACS numbers:

*Electronic address: kajiyama-yuuji@akita-pref.ed.jp

†Electronic address: hokada@kias.re.kr

‡Electronic address: keiyagyu@ncu.edu.tw

I. INTRODUCTION

A new boson has been discovered at Large Hadron Collider (LHC), whose properties of the production and decay are consistent with those of the Higgs boson in the standard model (SM) [1, 2]. *This fact, the observed particle is the SM-like Higgs boson (h), could seriously affect to models for the charged lepton with flavor symmetries [3–5], since some models could be ruled out.* As a typical example, we show models based on Non-abelian discrete symmetries such as A_4 ¹, T_N [9], $\Delta(27)$ [10, 11], $\Sigma(81)$ [12, 13], that only have the irreducible representations of singlets (typically introduced as Higgs fields) and triplets (typically as leptons). The Lagrangian is then given by

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{k=1}^3 y_k \Phi_k (\bar{L}_e e_R + \omega^k \bar{L}_\mu \mu_R + \omega^{2k} \bar{L}_\tau \tau_R) + \text{h.c.}, \quad (\text{I.1})$$

where Φ_k , L_i and (e_R, μ_R, τ_R) are the isospin Higgs doublet, isospin lepton doublet and isospin lepton singlet fields, respectively, and $\omega = \exp(2\pi i/3)$. The mass matrix for the charged leptons M_ℓ are then calculated from Eq. (I.1) as

$$\begin{aligned} M_\ell &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \text{diag}(y_1 v_1 + y_2 v_2 + y_3 v_3, y_1 v_1 + \omega y_2 v_2 + \omega^2 y_3 v_3, y_1 v_1 + \omega^2 y_2 v_2 + \omega y_3 v_3) \\ &= \text{diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.2})$$

where $\langle \Phi_k \rangle = v_k/\sqrt{2}$. By solving Eq. (I.2), the Yukawa couplings can be derived as

$$\begin{aligned} y_1 v_1 &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (m_e + m_\mu + m_\tau), \quad y_2 v_2 = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (m_e + \omega^2 m_\mu + \omega m_\tau), \\ y_3 v_3 &= \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (m_e + \omega m_\mu + \omega^2 m_\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{I.3})$$

Although the Lagrangian shown in Eq. (I.1) gives the simple structure for the generation of the charged lepton masses as we see in Eqs. (I.2) and (I.3), this results that all the coupling constants among the charged leptons and the CP-even scalar component of Φ_k are determined by the same Yukawa coupling y_k . That makes the branching fractions of $h \rightarrow \tau^+ \tau^-$, $h \rightarrow \mu^+ \mu^-$ and $h \rightarrow e^+ e^-$ modes to be the same with each other, where h is the mass eigenstate of the CP-even states with the mass of 126 GeV identified to any of Φ_k .

¹ The A_4 flavor symmetry was initially applied to the lepton sector in Ref. [6, 7], in which the structure of the charged lepton does not have the universal coupling. However [8] has those.

Such a situation is extremely disfavored by the current results of the Higgs boson search at LHC, namely, the event rate for $pp \rightarrow h \rightarrow \tau^+\tau^-$ is almost the same as that in the SM, while the event of $pp \rightarrow h \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ has not been observed yet².

In the present paper, we clarify the relation between the lepton sector and the Higgs sector in the T_7 flavor symmetry [14–17]. As for the neutrino sector, two mechanisms of type-II seesaw [18] and radiative seesaw with several loops³ are involved to induce the neutrino observables. Especially, our scenario requires up to a specific three-loop diagram that gives diagonal components to neutrino mass matrix, while the off-diagonal components are obtained through the type-II seesaw mechanism at tree level. As for the Higgs sector, we consider the whole Higgs potential and derive all the masses of the Higgs bosons. We then analyze the behavior of the SM-like Higgs boson, by fixing a benchmark point. Our analyses of the Higgs fields could be applied to many models, *e.g.* lepton flavor models with Non-abelian discrete symmetries. Since the Higgs sector in the present model is similar to that of the Type-X or lepton specific two Higgs doublet model (THDM) [19, 20], constraints from hadron collider experiments are rather weak. We give a numerical example, in which decay modes of the second lightest CP-odd, -even and charged Higgs bosons are mainly muons. This will be signals of the present model.

This paper is organized as follows. In Section 2, we show particle contents of our model, and discuss Higgs boson masses and neutrino masses generated at tree and three-loop level. In Section 3, we analyze phenomenology of Higgs bosons. We summarize and conclude in Section 4. In appendices, some results of detailed calculations for the Higgs sector and radiatively induced neutrino masses are given.

II. THREE LOOP RADIATIVE SEESAW MODEL

In this section, we propose a three-loop radiative seesaw model which is an extension of the minimal Higgs triplet model motivated from the type-II seesaw mechanism [18]. First, we give particle contents and Yukawa interactions. After that, masses for the Higgs bosons and neutrinos are discussed.

² From the current LHC data, $\sigma(pp \rightarrow h \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)_{\text{SM}} \times 10$ has been excluded at 95 % confidence level [21].

³ As for the other radiative seesaw models, see Refs. [22–56].

A. Model setup

Particle	L_a	e_{aR}	Q_i	d_{iR}	u_{iR}	Φ_a	Δ_a	η_a	Φ_q
$(SU(2)_L, U(1)_Y)$	$(\mathbf{2}, -1/2)$	$(\mathbf{1}, -1)$	$(\mathbf{2}, 1/6)$	$(\mathbf{1}, -1/3)$	$(\mathbf{1}, 2/3)$	$(\mathbf{2}, 1/2)$	$(\mathbf{3}, 1)$	$(\mathbf{2}, 1/2)$	$(\mathbf{2}, 1/2)$
T_7	$\bar{\mathbf{3}}_a$	$\mathbf{3}_a$	$\mathbf{1}_0$	$\mathbf{1}_0$	$\mathbf{1}_0$	$\bar{\mathbf{3}}_a$	$\bar{\mathbf{3}}_a$	$\mathbf{3}_a$	$\mathbf{1}_0$
\mathbb{Z}_2	+	+	+	+	+	+	+	-	+
\mathbb{Z}_3	0	0	0	-1	+1	0	0	0	+1

TABLE I: The particle contents, where a runs 1 to 3.

The particle contents are shown in Tab. I. We add three $SU(2)_L$ triplet scalar fields Δ_a , three $SU(2)_L$ doublet scalar fields η_a , Φ_a ($a = \tau, e, \mu$), and an $SU(2)_L$ doublet scalar field Φ_q , where η_a do not have the vacuum expectation values (VEVs). The \mathbb{Z}_2 parity is imposed so as to forbid terms such as $\bar{L}\eta e_R$. The \mathbb{Z}_3 parity is introduced in order to avoid couplings among Φ_q and leptons. The renormalizable Lagrangian of Yukawa interactions is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = y_\ell[\bar{L}_e\Phi_e e_R + \bar{L}_\mu\Phi_\mu\mu_R + \bar{L}_\tau\Phi_\tau\tau_R] + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{II.1})$$

$$+ y_d^{ij}\bar{Q}^i\Phi_q d_R^j + y_u^{ij}\bar{Q}^i\tilde{\Phi}_q u_R^j + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{II.2})$$

$$+ y_\Delta[(\bar{L}_\mu^c i\tau_2\Delta_\tau + \bar{L}_\tau^c i\tau_2\Delta_\mu)L_e + (\bar{L}_\tau^c i\tau_2\Delta_e + \bar{L}_e^c i\tau_2\Delta_\tau)L_\mu + (\bar{L}_e^c i\tau_2\Delta_\mu + \bar{L}_\mu^c i\tau_2\Delta_e)L_\tau] + \text{h.c.} \quad (\text{II.3})$$

Four doublet Higgs fields and three triplet Higgs fields can be parameterized as

$$\Phi_q = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_q^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(h_q + v_q + iz_q) \end{bmatrix}, \quad \Phi_a = \begin{bmatrix} \phi_a^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(h_a + v_a + iz_a) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{II.4})$$

$$\Delta_a = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\Delta_a^+}{\sqrt{2}} & \Delta_a^{++} \\ \Delta_a^0 & -\frac{\Delta_a^+}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad \text{with } \Delta_a^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Delta_a^R + v_{\Delta a} + i\Delta_a^I), \quad a = e, \mu, \tau, \quad (\text{II.5})$$

where v_a and v_q are the VEVs for the doublet fields and $v_{\Delta a}$ are those for the triplet fields, which satisfy the sum relation

$$\sum_a (v_a^2 + 2v_{\Delta a}^2) + v_q^2 = v^2 = (246 \text{ GeV})^2. \quad (\text{II.6})$$

The VEVs of the doublet Higgs fields Φ_a are related to the charged lepton mass matrix from Eq. (II.1) as

$$M_\ell = \frac{y_\ell}{\sqrt{2}} \text{diag}(v_e, v_\mu, v_\tau) = \text{diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau), \quad (\text{II.7})$$

which is already diagonal and has the common Yukawa coupling y_ℓ due to T_7 symmetry. Mass hierarchy between charged leptons should be explained by the hierarchy of VEVs. We note that the masses of quarks are generated by v_q in the same way as in the SM. On the other hand, the triplet VEVs generate neutrino masses. Non-zero values for the triplet VEVs cause the deviation in the electroweak rho parameter ρ from unity as

$$\rho = \frac{v^2}{v^2 + 2 \sum_a v_{\Delta a}^2} \simeq 1 - \frac{2 \sum_a v_{\Delta a}^2}{v^2}. \quad (\text{II.8})$$

Because the experimental value of ρ is given as $\rho_{\text{exp}} = 1.0004_{-0.0004}^{+0.0003}$, the triplet VEVs are constrained by $\sum_a v_{\Delta a}^2$ to be about $(3.8 \text{ GeV})^2$ at the 95% confidence level. Thus, the sum relation given in Eq. (II.6) can be approximately rewritten by

$$v^2 \simeq v_\tau^2 + v_q^2. \quad (\text{II.9})$$

The ratio of the above two VEVs can be described as $\tan \beta \equiv v_q/v_\tau$.

B. Higgs boson masses

Next, we discuss the Higgs potential, especially for the \mathbb{Z}_2 even scalar sector assuming CP conservation. The T_7 invariant Higgs potential is given by

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{Higgs}} = & m_1^2 \Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a + m_2^2 \Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q + m_3^2 \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) \\ & + \mu (\Phi_\mu^T i\tau_2 \Delta_\tau^\dagger \Phi_\mu + \Phi_\tau^T i\tau_2 \Delta_e^\dagger \Phi_\tau + \Phi_e^T i\tau_2 \Delta_\mu^\dagger \Phi_e + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \mu_\eta (\eta_1^T i\tau_2 \Delta_2^\dagger \eta_3 + \eta_2^T i\tau_2 \Delta_3^\dagger \eta_1 + \eta_3^T i\tau_2 \Delta_1^\dagger \eta_2 + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \lambda_{\ell 1} (\Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a)^2 + \lambda_q (\Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q)^2 + \lambda_{q\ell 1} (\Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a) (\Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q) \\ & + \lambda_\pm (|\Phi_\tau^\dagger \Phi_e|^2 + |\Phi_e^\dagger \Phi_\mu|^2 + |\Phi_\mu^\dagger \Phi_\tau|^2) + \lambda_{q\ell 2} |\Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_q|^2 \\ & + \lambda_{\ell 2} (\Phi_\tau^\dagger \Phi_\tau + \omega^2 \Phi_e^\dagger \Phi_e + \omega \Phi_\mu^\dagger \Phi_\mu) (\Phi_\tau^\dagger \Phi_\tau + \omega \Phi_e^\dagger \Phi_e + \omega^2 \Phi_\mu^\dagger \Phi_\mu), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.10})$$

where terms with the index a should be summed over $a = \tau, e, \mu$. In addition to the above terms, we introduce the following soft terms which break the T_7 symmetry into \mathbb{Z}_3 symmetry;

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{soft}} = & \tilde{m}_{1a}^2 \Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a + \tilde{m}_{3a}^2 \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) + \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 (\Phi_e^\dagger \Phi_\mu + \Phi_\mu^\dagger \Phi_\tau + \Phi_\tau^\dagger \Phi_e + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \tilde{\mu} (\Phi_q^T i\tau_2 \Delta_a^\dagger \Phi_q + \text{h.c.}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{II.11})$$

The potential given in Eqs. (II.10) and (II.11) is not the most general form, where we only write down terms which are relevant to the following phenomenological studies⁴. The complete expressions for the Higgs potential are given in Appendix A. We note that the $\tilde{\mu}$ term is necessary to break an accidental $U(1)$ symmetry of the phase rotation $\Phi_q \rightarrow e^{i\theta}\Phi_q$, otherwise there exists an additional massless Nambu-Goldstone (NG) boson that cannot be absorbed by a gauge field. It implies that the mass scale of $\tilde{\mu}$ must be $\mathcal{O}(100)$ GeV at most, since $\tilde{\mu}$ plays an important role in obtaining mass of the lightest CP-odd Higgs boson in Eq. (II.16). The LHC experiment tells us that its mass must be more than 100 GeV as we will discuss in the section III.

From the tadpole condition, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
\tilde{m}_{1e}^2 + m_1^2 &= -\frac{v_\mu + v_\tau}{v_e} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2} [\lambda_{q\ell} v_q^2 + 2\lambda_\ell v_e^2 + (2\lambda_{\ell 1} - \lambda_{\ell 2} + \lambda_\pm) (v_\mu^2 + v_\tau^2)] + \sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta\mu}, \\
\tilde{m}_{1\mu}^2 + m_1^2 &= -\frac{v_\tau + v_e}{v_\mu} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2} [\lambda_{q\ell} v_q^2 + 2\lambda_\ell v_\mu^2 + (2\lambda_{\ell 1} - \lambda_{\ell 2} + \lambda_\pm) (v_\tau^2 + v_e^2)] + \sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta\tau}, \\
\tilde{m}_{1\tau}^2 + m_1^2 &= -\frac{v_e + v_\mu}{v_\tau} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2} [\lambda_{q\ell} v_q^2 + 2\lambda_\ell v_\tau^2 + (2\lambda_{\ell 1} - \lambda_{\ell 2} + \lambda_\pm) (v_e^2 + v_\mu^2)] + \sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta e}, \\
m_2^2 &= -\lambda_q v_q^2 - \frac{1}{2} \lambda_{q\ell} (v_\tau^2 + v_e^2 + v_\mu^2) + \sqrt{2}\tilde{\mu} (v_{\Delta\tau} + v_{\Delta e} + v_{\Delta\mu}), \\
\tilde{m}_{3e}^2 + m_3^2 &= \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_\tau^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta e}}, \\
\tilde{m}_{3\mu}^2 + m_3^2 &= \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_e^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta\mu}}, \\
\tilde{m}_{3\tau}^2 + m_3^2 &= \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_\mu^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta\tau}},
\end{aligned} \tag{II.12}$$

where $\lambda_\ell \equiv \lambda_{\ell 1} + \lambda_{\ell 2}$ and $\lambda_{q\ell} \equiv \lambda_{q\ell 1} + \lambda_{q\ell 2}$.

There are seven (six) physical CP-even (CP-odd) scalar bosons, six pairs of singly-charged scalar bosons and three pairs of the doubly-charged scalar bosons in addition to the neutral G^0 and the charged G^\pm NG bosons which are obtained after the diagonalization and absorbed by the longitudinal component of the Z and W bosons, respectively. The mass matrix for

⁴ Most of terms which are not displayed in Eqs. (II.10) and (II.11) are not important from the following reasons. First, they can contribute to masses for scalar bosons with the magnitude of $\mathcal{O}(v_\Delta^2)$. Such a contribution can be negligible, because of $v_\Delta \ll v$. Second, they give masses for \mathbb{Z}_2 odd scalar bosons, which are not related to the following discussions.

the CP-even Higgs bosons in the basis of $(h_q, h_\tau, h_\mu, h_e, \Delta_\tau^R, \Delta_\mu^R, \Delta_e^R)$ is given by

$$M_R^2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{\Phi_R}^2 & M_{\Phi_R \Delta_R}^2 \\ (M_{\Phi_R \Delta_R}^2)^T & M_{\Delta_R}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{II.13})$$

where $M_{\Phi_R}^2$, $M_{\Delta_R}^2$ and $M_{\Phi_R \Delta_R}^2$ are the sub-matrices of M_R^2 , which are 4×4 , 3×3 and 4×3 forms, respectively. They can be expressed as

$$M_{\Phi_R}^2 \simeq v^2 \begin{bmatrix} 2s_\beta^2 \lambda_q & s_\beta c_\beta \lambda_{ql} & s_\beta c_\beta \epsilon_\mu \lambda_{ql} & s_\beta c_\beta \epsilon_e \lambda_{ql} \\ s_\beta c_\beta \lambda_{ql} & -\frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} \epsilon_\mu + 2c_\beta^2 \lambda_\ell & \frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} & \frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} \\ s_\beta c_\beta \epsilon_\mu \lambda_{ql} & \frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} & -\frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} \frac{1}{\epsilon_\mu} & \frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} \\ s_\beta c_\beta \epsilon_e \lambda_{ql} & \frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} & \frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} & -\frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{v^2} \frac{1}{\epsilon_e} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$M_{\Delta_R}^2 \simeq v^2 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2 \epsilon_\mu^2}{\sqrt{2} v_{\Delta\tau}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2 \epsilon_e^2}{\sqrt{2} v_{\Delta\mu}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2}{\sqrt{2} v_{\Delta e}} \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_{\Phi_R \Delta_R}^2 \simeq -v^2 \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} s_\beta}{v} & \frac{\sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} s_\beta}{v} & \frac{\sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} s_\beta}{v} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2} \mu c_\beta}{v} \\ \frac{\sqrt{2} \mu c_\beta \epsilon_\mu}{v} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{2} \mu c_\beta \epsilon_e}{v} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{II.14})$$

where $\epsilon_{\mu,e} = m_{\mu,e}/m_\tau$. Similarly, each of the mass matrix for the CP-odd scalar bosons and that for the singly-charged scalar bosons in the basis of $(z_q, z_\tau, z_\mu, z_e, \Delta_\tau^I, \Delta_\mu^I, \Delta_e^I)$ and $(\phi_q^\pm, \phi_\tau^\pm, \phi_\mu^\pm, \phi_e^\pm, \Delta_\tau^\pm, \Delta_\mu^\pm, \Delta_e^\pm)$ can be expressed by

$$M_I^2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{\Phi_I}^2 & M_{\Phi_I \Delta_I}^2 \\ (M_{\Phi_I \Delta_I}^2)^T & M_{\Delta_I}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad M_\pm^2 = \begin{bmatrix} M_{\Phi^\pm}^2 & M_{\Phi^\pm \Delta^\pm}^2 \\ (M_{\Phi^\pm \Delta^\pm}^2)^T & M_{\Delta^\pm}^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (\text{II.15})$$

where $M_{\Phi_I}^2$ ($M_{\Phi^\pm}^2$), $M_{\Delta_I}^2$ ($M_{\Delta^\pm}^2$) and $M_{\Phi_I \Delta_I}^2$ ($M_{\Phi^\pm \Delta^\pm}^2$) are the sub-matrix for M_I^2 (M_\pm^2) which are 4×4 , 3×3 and 4×3 , respectively. Each sub-matrix can be obtained as

$$M_{\Phi_I}^2 \simeq \begin{bmatrix} 2\sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} \sum_a^{\epsilon,\mu,\tau} v_{\Delta a} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 \epsilon_\mu + 2\sqrt{2} \mu v_{\Delta e} & \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 & \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 \\ 0 & \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 & -\frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{\epsilon_\mu} + 2\sqrt{2} \mu v_{\Delta\tau} & \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 \\ 0 & \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 & \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 & -\frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{\epsilon_e} + 2\sqrt{2} \mu v_{\Delta\mu} \end{bmatrix},$$

$$M_{\Delta_I}^2 = M_{\Delta_R}^2, \quad M_{\Phi_I \Delta_I}^2 = M_{\Phi_R \Delta_R}^2, \quad (\text{II.16})$$

and

$$M_{\Phi^+}^2 \simeq \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{\pm}v^2 \begin{bmatrix} -c_{\beta}^2(1 + \epsilon_{\mu}^2 + \epsilon_e^2) & \frac{1}{2}s_{2\beta} & \frac{1}{2}s_{2\beta}\epsilon_{\mu} & \frac{1}{2}s_{2\beta}\epsilon_e \\ \frac{1}{2}s_{2\beta} & -s_{\beta}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}s_{2\beta}\epsilon_{\mu} & 0 & -s_{\beta}^2 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2}s_{2\beta}\epsilon_e & 0 & 0 & -s_{\beta}^2 \end{bmatrix} + M_{\Phi_I}^2(\mu \rightarrow \mu/2, \tilde{\mu} \rightarrow \tilde{\mu}/2),$$

$$M_{\Delta^+}^2 = M_{\Delta_R}^2, \quad M_{\Phi^+\Delta^+}^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}M_{\Phi_R\Delta_R}^2. \quad (\text{II.17})$$

One can find that the eigenvectors belonging to the NG modes G^0 and G^{\pm} are given as

$$\vec{v}_{G^0} = (v^2 + 2 \sum_a v_{\Delta a}^2)^{-1/2}(v_q, v_{\tau}, v_{\mu}, v_e, 2v_{\Delta\tau}, 2v_{\Delta\mu}, 2v_{\Delta e}), \quad (\text{II.18})$$

$$\vec{v}_{G^+} = v^{-1}(v_q, v_{\tau}, v_{\mu}, v_e, \sqrt{2}v_{\Delta\tau}, \sqrt{2}v_{\Delta\mu}, \sqrt{2}v_{\Delta e}). \quad (\text{II.19})$$

We can construct the unitary matrices which make M_I^2 and M_+^2 to be the block diagonal forms by using \vec{v}_{G^0} , \vec{v}_{G^+} and those orthogonal vectors, in which the NG modes are decoupled from the physical scalar states. We do not show explicitly these unitary matrices, because their analytic formulae are too complicated to show in the paper.

Under $v_{\Delta} \ll v$ which is required by the rho parameter data, the diagonal elements of $M_{\Delta_R}^2$ become much larger than elements in $M_{\Phi_R\Delta_R}^2$. In that case, the diagonalization matrices for M_R^2 , M_I^2 and M_+^2 are given as a block diagonal form like 4×4 and 3×3 , so that we can separately consider the mass eigenstates which are mainly composed of doublets from those of triplets. We then define the mass eigenstates for the CP-even, CP-odd and singly-charged scalar bosons as follows

$$\begin{pmatrix} h_q \\ h_{\tau} \\ h_{\mu} \\ h_e \end{pmatrix} = U_R \begin{pmatrix} h \\ H_{\tau} \\ H_{\mu} \\ H_e \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} z_q \\ z_{\tau} \\ z_{\mu} \\ z_e \end{pmatrix} = U_I \begin{pmatrix} G^0 \\ A_{\tau} \\ A_{\mu} \\ A_e \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \phi_q^+ \\ \phi_{\tau}^+ \\ \phi_{\mu}^+ \\ \phi_e^+ \end{pmatrix} = U_+ \begin{pmatrix} G^+ \\ H_{\tau}^+ \\ H_{\mu}^+ \\ H_e^+ \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{II.20})$$

The masses for the Higgs bosons can be calculated as

$$U_R^T M_{\Phi_R}^2 U_R = \text{diag}(m_h^2, m_{H_{\tau}}^2, m_{H_{\mu}}^2, m_{H_e}^2), \quad (\text{II.21})$$

$$U_I^T M_{\Phi_I}^2 U_I = \text{diag}(0, m_{A_{\tau}}^2, m_{A_{\mu}}^2, m_{A_e}^2), \quad (\text{II.22})$$

$$U_+^T M_{\Phi^+}^2 U_+ = \text{diag}(0, m_{H_{\tau}^+}^2, m_{H_{\mu}^+}^2, m_{H_e^+}^2). \quad (\text{II.23})$$

Approximately, the masses for the Higgs bosons can be expressed in the case of $v_{\Delta\tau} = v_{\Delta\mu} = v_{\Delta e} = v_{\Delta}$ as

$$m_h^2 \simeq (\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{11}c_\alpha^2 + (\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{22}s_\alpha^2 + 2(\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{12}c_\alpha s_\alpha, \quad (\text{II.24})$$

$$m_{H_\tau}^2 \simeq (\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{11}s_\alpha^2 + (\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{22}c_\alpha^2 - 2(\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{12}c_\alpha s_\alpha, \quad (\text{II.25})$$

$$m_{A_\tau}^2 \simeq 2\sqrt{2}\mu v_\Delta \left[1 - \frac{\mu c_\beta^2}{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2} \right], \quad (\text{II.26})$$

$$m_{H_\tau^\pm}^2 \simeq \sqrt{2}\mu v_\Delta - \frac{\lambda_\pm}{2}v^2 s_\beta^2 - \frac{\sqrt{2}v_\Delta}{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2} \left[\frac{\lambda_\pm^2}{8}v^2 s_\beta^4 + \mu^2 c_\beta^2 \right], \quad (\text{II.27})$$

$$m_{H_{\mu,e}}^2 \simeq m_{A_{\mu,e}}^2 \simeq m_{H_{\mu,e}^\pm}^2 \simeq -\frac{\tilde{m}_\Phi^2}{\epsilon_{\mu,e}}, \quad (\text{II.28})$$

with

$$(\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{11} = 2v^2 s_\beta^2 \left[\lambda_q - \sqrt{2}v_\Delta (s_\beta^2 \lambda_q^2 + \frac{\tilde{\mu}^2}{v^2}) \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2} + \frac{2}{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2} \right) \right], \quad (\text{II.29})$$

$$(\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{22} = -\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 \epsilon_\mu + 2v^2 c_\beta^2 \left[\lambda_\ell - \sqrt{2}v_\Delta \frac{c_\beta^2 \lambda_\ell^2 + \mu^2/v^2}{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2} \right], \quad (\text{II.30})$$

$$(\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{12} = v^2 c_\beta s_\beta \left[\lambda_{q\ell} - \sqrt{2}v_\Delta \left(\frac{1}{2} s_\beta c_\beta \lambda_{q\ell}^2 + \frac{2\tilde{\mu}^2 t_\beta}{v^2} \right) \left(\frac{1}{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2 + \mu c_\beta^2} + \frac{2}{\tilde{\mu} s_\beta^2} \right) \right], \quad (\text{II.31})$$

$$\tan 2\alpha = -\frac{2(\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{12}}{(\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{11} - (\bar{M}_{\Phi_R}^2)_{22}}. \quad (\text{II.32})$$

In addition, first 2×2 part of the unitary matrices are written as

$$U_R^{11} \simeq c_\alpha, \quad U_R^{12} \simeq s_\alpha, \quad U_R^{21} \simeq -s_\alpha, \quad U_R^{22} \simeq c_\alpha \quad (\text{II.33})$$

$$U_{I,+}^{11} \simeq s_\beta, \quad U_{I,+}^{12} \simeq c_\beta, \quad U_{I,+}^{21} \simeq c_\beta, \quad U_{I,+}^{22} \simeq -s_\beta. \quad (\text{II.34})$$

We note that $m_{A_\tau}^2$ is dominantly proportional to μv_Δ , so that μ should be taken to be as large as $\mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV and v_Δ to be of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ GeV to compensate the tiny triplet VEV. Moreover, if one assumes that the mass of Δ is of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, μ should be at most of $\mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, because there is strong correlation between v_Δ and μ , $v_\Delta \sim \mu v^2/m_\Delta^2$, as is often the case with the usual type-II seesaw.

The mass matrix for the doubly-charged scalar states is expressed by the 3×3 form, because they purely come from the triplet Higgs fields. In the basis of $(\Delta_\tau^{\pm\pm}, \Delta_\mu^{\pm\pm}, \Delta_e^{\pm\pm})$, the mass matrix is the same as $M_{\Delta_R}^2$ given in Eq. (II.14). Their squared mass eigenvalues are typically determined by $(\mu + \tilde{\mu})v^2/v_\Delta$, so that these are $(\mathcal{O}(1) \text{ TeV})^2$ as long as we take $v_\Delta = \mathcal{O}(1)$ GeV and $\mu, \tilde{\mu} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV.




FIG. 1: Neutrino mass generation via the three-loop level diagram. The particles indicated by a red font have the opposite \mathbb{Z}_2 charge to those by a black font.

In the following discussion, we treat h as the SM-like Higgs boson which should be identified to be a new boson discovered at LHC with the mass of 126 GeV.

C. Neutrino mass matrix

In this subsection, we discuss neutrino masses which are induced at three-loop level as well as at tree level. First, the tree-level mass matrix for neutrinos $M_\nu^{(0)}$ is given through Eq.(II.3) as

$$M_\nu^{(0)} = \frac{y_\Delta}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_{\Delta\tau} & v_{\Delta\mu} \\ v_{\Delta\tau} & 0 & v_{\Delta e} \\ v_{\Delta\mu} & v_{\Delta e} & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{II.35})$$

When $v_{\Delta\tau} = v_{\Delta\mu}$, the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata matrix at the tree level $U^{(0)}$ is given by

$$U^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} -(a_e + \sqrt{a_{e\tau}})/\sqrt{+} & -(a_e - \sqrt{a_{e\tau}})/\sqrt{-} & 0 \\ 2a_\tau/\sqrt{+} & 2a_\tau/\sqrt{-} & -1/\sqrt{2} \\ 2a_\tau/\sqrt{+} & 2a_\tau/\sqrt{-} & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{II.36})$$

and it diagonalizes $M_\nu^{(0)}$ as

$$U^{(0)T} M_\nu^{(0)} U^{(0)} = \text{diag}((a_e - \sqrt{a_{e\tau}})/2, (a_e + \sqrt{a_{e\tau}})/2, -a_e), \quad (\text{II.37})$$

where

$$a_\ell = \frac{y_\Delta}{\sqrt{2}} v_{\Delta\ell}, \quad a_{e\tau} \equiv a_e^2 + 8a_\tau^2, \quad \sqrt{\pm} = \sqrt{8a_\tau^2 + (a_e \pm \sqrt{a_{e\tau}})^2}. \quad (\text{II.38})$$

$U_{e3}^{(0)} = 0$ and the maximal mixing are originated from the condition $v_{\Delta\tau} = v_{\Delta\mu}$. However, this condition can be relaxed to obtain non-zero U_{e3} and observed value of $\theta_{12(23)}$ at 3σ range. As mentioned before, we take $v_{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ GeV to obtain the phenomenologically enough large mass for A_{τ} , so that $y_{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}(10^{-10})$ is required to reproduce $m_{\nu} = \mathcal{O}(0.1)$ eV. Since there exist only three parameters in Eq. (II.35), one cannot derive all observables in neutrino sector. Therefore, one has to take loop-level mass matrices into account.

Next, we discuss loop level neutrino masses. The tree level mass matrix does not have non-zero diagonal entries and neutrino observables cannot be derived at tree level. Therefore we focus on diagonal elements induced by loop diagrams. To achieve it, we summarize how to generate Majorana neutrino mass matrix by Yukawa interactions given in Eqs. (II.1) and (II.3) as listed in the following:

- (i) Each Δ attached on the fermion line gives one $y_{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}(10^{-10})$.
- (ii) Odd number of Δ s should be attached on the fermion line for lepton number violation.
- (iii) At least, three Δ s should be attached on the fermion line in order to generate diagonal elements of neutrino mass matrix, because Δ changes the lepton flavor, while Φ does not. If only one Δ is attached, it always gives off-diagonal elements of neutrino mass matrix.
- (iv) On fermion line between Φ and Δ , chirality suppression occurs.

Along these lines of thought, one finds that the sizable contributions to diagonal elements are given at three-loop level shown in Fig. 1, and its magnitude can be estimated as⁵

$$M_{\nu}^{(3)} \sim \frac{1}{(16\pi^2)^3} y_{\Delta}^3 \mu_{\eta}^3 \frac{m_{\eta}^2}{m_{\Delta}^4} = \mathcal{O}(0.1) \text{ eV}, \quad (\text{II.39})$$

where μ_{η} is the dimensionful coupling associated with the T_7 invariant term defined in Eq. (II.10), and m_{η} and m_{Δ} are the typical η and Δ masses; $m_{\eta} = \mathcal{O}(10^8)$ GeV and $m_{\Delta} = \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, respectively. Notice here that the mass parameter μ_{η} , which is taken to be $\mathcal{O}(10^8)$ GeV, contributes only to the η masses, since η do not mix with Φ and Δ due to the inert property. Hence one can take arbitrarily large value for μ_{η} with no effects to masses

⁵ The exact form is found in Appendix B.

of Φ and Δ ⁶. As a result, we can reproduce observed neutrino masses $\sim \mathcal{O}(0.1)$ eV and the mixing data because of many parameters, as can be seen in Appendix B. As for the other contributions up to three-loops, see Appendix C.

III. HIGGS PHENOMENOLOGIES

In this section, we discuss the collider phenomenology of the Higgs bosons. This model can be effectively regarded as the so-called Type-X or lepton specific THDM [19, 20], in which one of the two Higgs doublets couples to quarks and the other one couples to leptons. To see this, we write down the interaction terms in the Yukawa Lagrangian given in Eqs. (II.1) and (II.2) in terms of the mass eigenstates of the Higgs bosons as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_Y = & \\
& \frac{m_\tau}{v c_\beta} \sum_{\ell=e,\mu,\tau} \left[\bar{\ell} \ell (h U_R^{\ell 1} + H_\tau U_R^{\ell 2} + H_\mu U_R^{\ell 3} + H_e U_R^{\ell 4}) + i \bar{\ell} \gamma_5 \ell (A_\tau U_I^{\ell 2} + A_\mu U_I^{\ell 3} + A_e U_I^{\ell 4}) \right] \\
& + \frac{\sqrt{2} m_\tau}{v c_\beta} [\bar{\nu}_\ell P_R \ell (H_\tau^+ U_+^{\ell 2} + H_\mu^+ U_+^{\ell 3} + H_e^+ U_+^{\ell 4}) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \frac{m_q}{v s_\beta} \left[\bar{q} q (h U_R^{11} + H_\tau U_R^{12} + H_\mu U_R^{13} + H_e U_R^{14}) + \text{Sign}(q) i \bar{q} \gamma_5 q (A_\tau U_I^{12} + A_\mu U_I^{13} + A_e U_I^{14}) \right] \\
& + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{v s_\beta} \left[\bar{u} (m_d P_R - m_u P_L) d (H_\tau^+ U_+^{12} + H_\mu^+ U_+^{13} + H_e^+ U_+^{14}) + \text{h.c.} \right], \tag{III.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\text{Sign}(q)=1$ (-1) for $q = d$ ($q = u$), and the projection operators are $P_L = (1 - \gamma_5)/2$ and $P_R = (1 + \gamma_5)/2$. From the above expression, the ratio of the Yukawa coupling in our model to that in the SM, c_{hff} , and the similar rate of the gauge coupling c_{hVV} for h can be calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}
c_{hq\bar{q}} = \frac{U_R^{11}}{s_\beta} \simeq \frac{c_\alpha}{s_\beta}, \quad c_{h\tau\tau} = \frac{U_R^{21}}{c_\beta} \simeq -\frac{s_\alpha}{c_\beta}, \quad c_{h\mu\mu} = \frac{U_R^{31}}{c_\beta \epsilon_\mu}, \quad c_{hee} = \frac{U_R^{41}}{c_\beta \epsilon_e}, \\
c_{hVV} = s_\beta U_R^{11} + c_\beta U_R^{21} \simeq \sin(\beta - \alpha). \tag{III.2}
\end{aligned}$$

⁶ This is, in a sense, a fine-tuning that one has to tune the bare mass of Δ to cancel the large loop contribution from η in order to obtain the small physical mass of Δ . This is similar to the renormalization of the Higgs boson mass in the SM if the cutoff scale is assumed to be a large scale such as the grand unification scale or Planck scale. We expect that such a fine-tuning problem may be able to be solved by extending our model to the supersymmetric theory. We would like to thank the referee to draw our attention to such kind of matter.

The SM-like limit, in which the coupling constants of h are the same as those in the SM Higgs boson, can be obtained by taking the following limit

$$U_R^{11} \rightarrow s_\beta, \quad U_R^{21} \rightarrow c_\beta. \quad (\text{III.3})$$

By using α , this limit can also be approximately expressed as $\sin(\beta - \alpha) \rightarrow 1$ which is the same form known in the THDMs with a softly broken discrete \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetry. In the SM-like limit, factors of the vertices among the lightest extra Higgs bosons (H_τ , A_τ and H_τ^\pm) and fermions are calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} (H_\tau \tau \tau) &: \frac{U_R^{22}}{c_\beta} \simeq \tan \beta, & (H_\tau u \bar{u}) &: -\frac{U_R^{12}}{c_\beta} \simeq \cot \beta, & (H_\tau d \bar{d}) &: \frac{U_R^{12}}{c_\beta} \simeq -\cot \beta, \\ (A_\tau \tau \tau) &: \frac{U_I^{22}}{c_\beta} \simeq -\tan \beta, & (A_\tau u \bar{u}) &: -\frac{U_I^{12}}{c_\beta} \simeq -\cot \beta, & (A_\tau d \bar{d}) &: \frac{U_I^{12}}{c_\beta} \simeq \cot \beta, \\ (H_\tau^+ \tau^- \nu) &: \frac{U_+^{22}}{c_\beta} \simeq -\tan \beta, & (H_\tau^+ d \bar{u}) &: \frac{U_+^{12}}{s_\beta} \simeq \cot \beta. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{III.4})$$

It can be seen from the above expressions that the lepton (quark) couplings can be enhanced (suppressed) in the case with large $\tan \beta$. This feature in our model is very similar to that of the Type-X THDM.

A. Current experimental constraints

We here consider constraints from the current experimental data. As we discussed in the previous subsection, phenomenology of the lightest extra Higgs bosons (H_τ , A_τ and H_τ^\pm) can be regarded as that in the Type-X THDM, so that the current experimental bound can be applied to our model in the similar way as that in the Type-X THDM. We take into account the following constraints.

1. At the LEP direct search experiment, masses for extra CP-odd, CP-even and charged Higgs bosons have been constrained from below by 93.4 GeV, 92.8 GeV and 79.3 GeV, respectively, with the 95% confidence level in supersymmetric (SUSY) models [57].
2. From the B physics experiments, the mass of charged Higgs bosons m_{H^+} is strongly constrained in multi-doublet models. For example, from the $B \rightarrow X_s \gamma$ data, the lower limit of m_{H^+} has been given by 295 GeV [58] with the 95% confidence level in the Type-II THDM with $\tan \beta \gtrsim 2$. However, this constraint turns out to be quite weak in

the Type-I and Type-X THDMs; *i.e.*, $m_{H^+} = 100$ GeV with $\tan\beta \gtrsim 3$ is allowed with the 95% confidence level as shown in Ref. [19, 20, 59]. The other processes including the B meson such as $B \rightarrow \tau\nu$, $B \rightarrow D\tau\nu$, etc. give milder bounds compared to that from the $B \rightarrow X_s\gamma$ process⁷ in the Type-X THDM.

3. At LHC, the ATLAS and the CMS Collaborations have reported the signal strength for a Higgs boson like particle with the mass of around 126 GeV. So far, five decay modes of the Higgs boson have been mainly analyzed, those are $h \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$, $h \rightarrow ZZ^*$, $h \rightarrow WW^*$, $h \rightarrow b\bar{b}$ and $h \rightarrow \tau\tau$. Their signal strengths are consistent with the prediction in the SM within the two-sigma level [61, 62]. Thus, the parameter regions which give the SM-like limit explained in Eq. (III.3) are also allowed in our model.
4. The extra neutral Higgs bosons in the minimal SUSY SM (MSSM); *i.e.*, the CP-even Higgs boson H and the CP-odd Higgs boson A have been searched by using the τ pair decay mode in the gluon fusion process $gg \rightarrow H/A \rightarrow \tau\tau$ and the bottom quark associated process $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}H/A \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tau\tau$ [63, 64] by using the data collected at LHC with the collision energy to be 7 TeV. When the mass of the CP-odd Higgs boson m_A is taken to be from 110 GeV to 150 GeV, the 95% confidence level lower limit for $\tan\beta$ has been obtained to be about 10 in Ref. [63]. Although the Higgs sector in the MSSM corresponds to the Type-II THDM, this constraint cannot be simply applied to the non-SUSY Type-II THDM due to SUSY relations. Understanding this, let us assume that the 95% confidence level upper limit for the cross section of $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}H/A \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tau\tau$ and $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}H/A \rightarrow b\bar{b}\tau\tau$ is given by these cross sections calculated in the Type-II THDM with the case of $110 < m_A(= m_H) < 150$ GeV, $\sin(\beta - \alpha) = 1$ and $\tan\beta = 10$. The cross section can be calculated by

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_{95}^{\text{Type-II}} &= \sum_{\Phi^0=H,A} [\sigma_{gg \rightarrow \Phi^0} + \sigma_{gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}\Phi^0}] \times \text{BR}(\Phi^0 \rightarrow \tau\tau) \\ &= \sum_{\Phi^0=H,A} \left[\sigma_{gg \rightarrow h_{\text{SM}}} \frac{\Gamma_{\Phi^0 \rightarrow gg}}{\Gamma_{h_{\text{SM}} \rightarrow gg}} + \sigma_{gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}h_{\text{SM}}} \tan^2\beta \right] \times \text{BR}(\Phi^0 \rightarrow \tau\tau), \quad (\text{III.5}) \end{aligned}$$

⁷ Recently, BaBar Collaboration has reported data on the ratios $\text{BR}(B \rightarrow D^*\tau\nu)/\text{BR}(B \rightarrow D^*\ell\nu)$ and $\text{BR}(B \rightarrow D\tau\nu)/\text{BR}(B \rightarrow D\ell\nu)$ ($\ell = e, \mu$) that deviate from the SM expectations by 2.7σ and 2.0σ , respectively, and their combined deviation is 3.4σ [60]. These deviations cannot be simultaneously explained by the contributions of the charged Higgs boson in the softly-broken \mathbb{Z}_2 symmetric THDMs.

m_{Φ^0} [GeV]	$\sigma_{gg \rightarrow h_{\text{SM}}}$ [pb] [67]	$\sigma_{gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}h_{\text{SM}}}$ [pb]	$\sigma_{95}^{\text{Type-II}}$ [pb]	$\tan \beta$
110	19.8	0.212	5.60	2.5
120	16.7	0.155	4.00	2.9
130	14.2	0.116	2.93	3.2
140	12.2	0.089	2.20	3.6
150	10.6	0.068	1.67	3.8

TABLE II: Cross sections with the collision energy to be 7 TeV at LHC and the lower limit for $\tan \beta$ in the Type-X THDM. In the Second and third columns, the cross sections of $gg \rightarrow h_{\text{SM}}$ and $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}h_{\text{SM}}$ processes in the SM are given in the case where the SM Higgs boson mass is taken to be m_{Φ^0} . The former cross section is referred from [67], and the latter one is calculated by using `MadGraph5` [68]. In each m_{Φ^0} , $\sigma_{95}^{\text{Type-II}}$ is calculated by using Eq. (III.5) in the Type-II THDM with $\tan \beta = 10$. The numbers displayed in the last column show the lower limit for $\tan \beta$ in the Type-X THDM by using $\sigma_{95}^{\text{Type-II}}$ at the 95% confidence level.

where each of $\sigma_{gg \rightarrow \Phi^0}$ ($\sigma_{gg \rightarrow h_{\text{SM}}}$) and $\sigma_{gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}\Phi^0}$ ($\sigma_{gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}h_{\text{SM}}}$) is the cross sections of the $gg \rightarrow \Phi^0(h_{\text{SM}})$ and $gg \rightarrow b\bar{b}\Phi^0(b\bar{b}h_{\text{SM}})$ processes with h_{SM} being the SM Higgs boson whose mass is taken to be the same as the mass of Φ^0 . In the Type-X THDM, $\text{BR}(\Phi^0 \rightarrow \tau\tau)$ can be almost 100% when $\tan \beta \gtrsim 2$. On the other hand, the quark couplings with H and A are proportional to $\cot \beta$, so that the cross section can be the maximal value at around $\tan \beta \simeq 2$ [19]. In Tab. II, the lower limit for the value of $\tan \beta$ in the Type-X THDM in the case with $\sin(\beta - \alpha) = 1$ and $m_A = m_H = m_{\Phi^0}$ is listed, which is obtained by imposing the upper limit for the cross section given in Eq. (III.5). We note that this constraint for $\tan \beta$ can be relaxed when the mass degeneracy in A and H is not assumed.

5. The charged Higgs boson H^\pm in the MSSM has been searched from the top quark decay $t \rightarrow H^\pm b$ at LHC. In Refs. [65, 66], the excluded regions at the 95% confidence level in the $\tan \beta$ - m_{H^+} plane are shown. However, in the Type-X THDM, the decay rate of $t \rightarrow H^\pm b$ is suppressed by the factor of $\cot^2 \beta$ [19, 20], so that the constraint from the top decay becomes much weaker than that obtained in the MSSM.

According to the above constraints, we here give an example of the allowed parameter set as

$$v_{\Delta\tau} = v_{\Delta\mu} = v_{\Delta e} = 2.2 \text{ GeV}, \quad \mu = 3 \text{ TeV}, \quad \tilde{\mu} = 300 \text{ GeV}, \quad \tilde{m}_{\Phi}^2 = -(100 \text{ GeV})^2, \quad (\text{III.6})$$

$$\lambda_q = 0.19, \quad \lambda_\ell = 5, \quad \lambda_{q\ell} = -0.035, \quad \lambda_{\pm} = -1, \quad \tan\beta = 3.98. \quad (\text{III.7})$$

We then obtain the following outputs

$$(m_h, m_{H_\tau}, m_{H_\mu}, m_{H_e}) = (126 \text{ GeV}, 172 \text{ GeV}, 411 \text{ GeV}, 6076 \text{ GeV}), \quad (\text{III.8})$$

$$U_R = \begin{pmatrix} 0.966 & -0.257 & 4.69 \times 10^{-4} & 0 \\ 0.256 & 0.964 & 0.0713 & 2.71 \times 10^{-4} \\ 0.0187 & 0.0688 & -0.997 & 2.72 \times 10^{-4} \\ 7.43 \times 10^{-5} & 2.80 \times 10^{-4} & -2.52 \times 10^{-4} & -1. \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{III.9})$$

$$(m_{G^0}, m_{A_\tau}, m_{A_\mu}, m_{A_e}) = (0, 110 \text{ GeV}, 433 \text{ GeV}, 6077 \text{ GeV}), \quad (\text{III.10})$$

$$U_I = \begin{pmatrix} 0.969 & 0.244 & 0.000646 & 0 \\ 0.244 & -0.968 & 0.0568 & 2.71 \times 10^{-4} \\ 0.0145 & -0.0550 & -0.998 & 2.72 \times 10^{-4} \\ 6.70 \times 10^{-5} & -2.77 \times 10^{-4} & -2.56 \times 10^{-4} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{III.11})$$

$$(m_{G^+}, m_{H_\tau^+}, m_{H_\mu^+}, m_{H_e^+}) = (0, 191 \text{ GeV}, 455 \text{ GeV}, 6079 \text{ GeV}), \quad (\text{III.12})$$

$$U_+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0.969 & -0.244 & 0.000333 & 0 \\ 0.244 & 0.968 & 0.0580 & 2.71 \times 10^{-4} \\ 0.0145 & 0.0562 & -0.998 & 2.72 \times 10^{-4} \\ 7.00 \times 10^{-5} & 2.77 \times 10^{-4} & -2.56 \times 10^{-4} & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{III.13})$$

As it can be seen the value of elements in U_R , this set is one of the realizations of the SM-like limit defined in Eq. (III.3). The masses of the triplet-like Higgs bosons whose components are mainly from the triplet Higgs field (Δ_τ , Δ_μ and Δ_e) including the doubly-charged Higgs bosons are around 2-3 TeV. These magnitudes are typical in our model, because the (squared) triplet-like Higgs boson masses are given like $(\mu + \tilde{\mu})v^2/v_\Delta$ as we discussed in the previous section, and $\mu, \tilde{\mu}$ (v_Δ) have to be of order 1 TeV (1 GeV) to raise the A_τ mass.

Finally, we comment on collider signatures of extra Higgs bosons. Although the existence of the doubly-charged Higgs bosons can be a clear signature of the model, their masses are

too heavy to directly produce at LHC. Thus, we focus on the extra CP-even, CP-odd and singly-charged Higgs bosons. Phenomenology of these lightest Higgs bosons are similar to those in the Type-X THDM, and detailed studies of their collider signatures have been analyzed in Ref. [19, 69] at LHC and the International Linear Collider, based on the τ specific nature of them. Therefore, we consider the collider signature of the second lightest extra Higgs bosons; namely, A_μ , H_μ and H_μ^\pm at LHC. They can dominantly couple to the muon, because their magnitude are determined by $U_{R,I,+}^{33}$ whose values are almost unity; *e.g.*, in the parameter sets given in the above, we obtain $U_R^{33} = -0.997$, $U_I^{33} = -0.998$ and $U_+^{33} = -0.998$. When we neglect decay modes of a scalar to lighter two scalars such as $H_\mu \rightarrow hh$, the decay branching fractions of $H_\mu \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$, $A_\mu \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ and $H_\mu^\pm \rightarrow \mu^\pm\nu$ are almost 100%. In such a case, the tetra-muon process $pp \rightarrow Z^* \rightarrow A_\mu H_\mu \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\mu^+\mu^-$, the tri-muon process $pp \rightarrow W^* \rightarrow A_\mu/H_\mu H_\mu^\pm \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\mu^\pm\nu$ and the di-muon process $pp \rightarrow Z^*/\gamma^* \rightarrow H_\mu^+ H_\mu^- \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-\nu\nu$ can be signals of the model. At LHC with the collision energy of 14 TeV, the cross sections are 0.87 fb for the tetra-muons, 2.8 fb for the tri-muon and 0.68 fb for the di-muon processes in the case with the above parameter sets, which are obtained by using CalcHEP3.4.2 [70] and the CTEQ6L parton distribution functions. We would like to emphasize that simultaneous observations of the signature expected in the Type-X THDM and multi-muon signatures from the muon specific Higgs bosons (H_μ , A_μ and H_μ^\pm) are important to test our model.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have constructed a loop-induced neutrino mass model and analyzed Higgs phenomenologies with T_7 flavor symmetry in a renormalizable theory. In our model, we have shown that observed neutrinos and their mixings can be generated through a three-loop level diagram (that derives their diagonal elements) in combination with the type-II seesaw (that derives their off-diagonal elements). Also we have analyzed the Higgs phenomenology which can be reduced to that in the Type-X THDM, and found a benchmark point which is consistent with several constraints by the current experiments at such as LHC. Since the second lightest CP-odd, -even and charged Higgs bosons mainly decay into muons, our model is testable by observing multi-muon signatures.

Acknowledgments

H.O. thanks to Prof. Eung-Jin Chun for fruitful discussion. Y.K. thanks Korea Institute for Advanced Study for the travel support and local hospitality during some parts of this work. K.Y. was supported in part by the National Science Council of R.O.C. under Grant No. NSC-101-2811-M-008-014.

Appendix A: Details for the Higgs sector

In this appendix, we give the detailed expressions for the Higgs potential, tadpole conditions and mass matrices for the Higgs bosons in the flavor indices $(1, 2, 3)$, which correspond to (τ, e, μ) in the main text.

1. Higgs potential

The most general T_7 invariant Higgs potential is given as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
V_{\text{Higgs}} = & m_1^2 \Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a + m_2^2 \Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q + m_3^2 \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) + m_4^2 \eta_a^\dagger \eta_a \\
& + \mu (\Phi_3^T i\tau_2 \Delta_1^\dagger \Phi_3 + \Phi_1^T i\tau_2 \Delta_2^\dagger \Phi_1 + \Phi_2^T i\tau_2 \Delta_3^\dagger \Phi_2 + \text{h.c.}) \\
& + \mu_\eta (\eta_1^T i\tau_2 \Delta_2^\dagger \eta_3 + \eta_2^T i\tau_2 \Delta_3^\dagger \eta_1 + \eta_3^T i\tau_2 \Delta_1^\dagger \eta_2 + \text{h.c.}) \\
& + \lambda_1^{(1)} (\Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a)^2 + \lambda_1^{(2)} (\omega^{2(a-1)} \Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a) (\omega^{b-1} \Phi_b^\dagger \Phi_b) + \lambda_1^{(4)} (|\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2|^2 + |\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_3|^2 + |\Phi_3^\dagger \Phi_1|^2) \\
& + \lambda_2^{(1)} (\eta_a^\dagger \eta_a)^2 + \lambda_2^{(2)} (\omega^{2(a-1)} \eta_a^\dagger \eta_a) (\omega^{b-1} \eta_b^\dagger \eta_b) + \lambda_2^{(4)} (|\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2|^2 + |\eta_2^\dagger \eta_3|^2 + |\eta_3^\dagger \eta_1|^2) \\
& + \lambda_3^{(1)} (\Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a) (\eta_b^\dagger \eta_b) + \lambda_3^{(2)} [(\omega^{2(a-1)} \Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a) (\omega^{b-1} \eta_b^\dagger \eta_b) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \lambda_3^{(4)} [(\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) (\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2) + (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_3) (\eta_2^\dagger \eta_3) + (\Phi_3^\dagger \Phi_1) (\eta_3^\dagger \eta_1) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \lambda_4^{(1)} (\Phi_a^\dagger \eta_b) (\eta_b^\dagger \Phi_a) + \lambda_4^{(2)} [\omega^{2(a-1)} \omega^{b-1} (\Phi_a^\dagger \eta_b) (\eta_b^\dagger \Phi_a) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \lambda_4^{(4)} [(\Phi_2^\dagger \eta_1) (\eta_2^\dagger \Phi_1) + (\Phi_3^\dagger \eta_2) (\eta_3^\dagger \Phi_2) + (\Phi_1^\dagger \eta_3) (\eta_3^\dagger \Phi_3) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \lambda_5^{(1)} [(\Phi_1^\dagger \eta_2) (\eta_2^\dagger \Phi_2) + (\Phi_2^\dagger \eta_3) (\eta_3^\dagger \Phi_3) + (\Phi_3^\dagger \eta_1) (\eta_1^\dagger \Phi_1) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \lambda_5^{(2)} [(\Phi_2^\dagger \eta_1) (\eta_2^\dagger \Phi_2) + (\Phi_3^\dagger \eta_2) (\eta_3^\dagger \Phi_3) + (\Phi_1^\dagger \eta_3) (\eta_3^\dagger \Phi_1) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \lambda_6^{(1)} [\text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a)]^2 + \lambda_6^{(2)} \text{Tr}(\omega^{2(a-1)} \Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) \text{Tr}(\omega^{b-1} \Delta_b^\dagger \Delta_b) \\
& + \lambda_6^{(4)} [\text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_1) \text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_2) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_3^\dagger \Delta_2) \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_3) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_3) \text{Tr}(\Delta_3^\dagger \Delta_1)] + \lambda_7 \text{Det}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) \\
& + \lambda_8^{(1)} (\Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a) (\Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q) + \lambda_8^{(2)} (\Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_q) (\Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_a) + \lambda_9^{(1)} (\eta_a^\dagger \eta_a) (\Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q) + \lambda_9^{(2)} (\eta_a^\dagger \Phi_q) (\Phi_q^\dagger \eta_a) + \lambda_{10} (\Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q)^2 \\
& + a_1^{(1)} \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) (\eta_b^\dagger \eta_b) + a_1^{(2)} [\text{Tr}(\omega^{2(a-1)} \Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) (\omega^{b-1} \eta_b^\dagger \eta_b) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + a_1^{(4)} [\text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_2) (\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_3) (\eta_2^\dagger \eta_3) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_3^\dagger \Delta_1) (\eta_3^\dagger \eta_1) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + a_2^{(1)} \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \cdot \Delta_a) (\eta_b^\dagger \cdot \eta_b) + a_2^{(2)} [\text{Tr}(\omega^{2(a-1)} \Delta_a^\dagger \cdot \Delta_a) (\omega^{b-1} \eta_b^\dagger \cdot \eta_b) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + a_2^{(4)} [\text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \cdot \Delta_2) (\eta_1^\dagger \cdot \eta_2) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \cdot \Delta_3) (\eta_2^\dagger \cdot \eta_3) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_3^\dagger \cdot \Delta_1) (\eta_3^\dagger \cdot \eta_1) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + b_1^{(1)} \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) (\Phi_b^\dagger \Phi_b) + b_1^{(2)} [\text{Tr}(\omega^{2(a-1)} \Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) (\omega^{b-1} \Phi_b^\dagger \Phi_b) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + b_1^{(4)} [\text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_2) (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_3) (\Phi_3^\dagger \Phi_2) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_3^\dagger \Delta_1) (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_3) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + b_2^{(1)} \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \cdot \Delta_a) (\Phi_b^\dagger \cdot \Phi_b) + b_2^{(2)} [\text{Tr}(\omega^{2(a-1)} \Delta_a^\dagger \cdot \Delta_a) (\omega^{b-1} \Phi_b^\dagger \cdot \Phi_b) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + b_2^{(4)} [\text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \cdot \Delta_2) (\Phi_2^\dagger \cdot \Phi_1) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \cdot \Delta_3) (\Phi_3^\dagger \cdot \Phi_2) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_3^\dagger \cdot \Delta_1) (\Phi_1^\dagger \cdot \Phi_3) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + c_1 \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) (\Phi_q^\dagger \Phi_q) + c_2 \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \cdot \Delta_a) (\Phi_q^\dagger \cdot \Phi_q), \tag{A.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $\cdot \equiv \tau_i$. When terms with indices a and b appear in the potential, they are summed over $a, b = 1, 2, 3$. We give the correspondence between the dimensionless coupling constants

defined in Eq. (A.1) and those defined in the main text as

$$\lambda_1^{(1)} = \lambda_{\ell 1}, \lambda_1^{(2)} = \lambda_{\ell 2}, \lambda_1^{(4)} = \lambda_{\pm}, \lambda_8^{(1)} = \lambda_{q\ell 1}, \lambda_8^{(2)} = \lambda_{q\ell 2}, \lambda_{10} = \lambda_q. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

In addition to this, we introduce the following soft breaking terms

$$\begin{aligned} V_{\text{soft}} = & \tilde{m}_{1a}^2 \Phi_a^\dagger \Phi_a + \tilde{m}_{3a}^2 \text{Tr}(\Delta_a^\dagger \Delta_a) + \tilde{m}_{4a}^2 \eta_a^\dagger \eta_a \\ & + \tilde{m}_{\Phi}^2 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 + \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_3 + \Phi_3^\dagger \Phi_1 + \text{h.c.}) + \tilde{m}_{\eta}^2 (\eta_1^\dagger \eta_2 + \eta_2^\dagger \eta_3 + \eta_3^\dagger \eta_1 + \text{h.c.}) \\ & + \tilde{\mu} (\Phi_q^T i\tau_2 \Delta_a^\dagger \Phi_q + \text{h.c.}), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.3})$$

which reduce the T_7 symmetry to \mathbb{Z}_3 . Although the general soft breaking terms of the T_7 symmetry contain more mass terms⁸, we assume the minimal breaking of T_7 to \mathbb{Z}_3 that corresponds to cyclic permutation $\varphi_1 \rightarrow \varphi_2 \rightarrow \varphi_3 \rightarrow \varphi_1$ of each T_7 triplet.

2. Tadpole conditions

Hereafter we define linear combinations of coupling constants as

$$\lambda_1^{(124)} \equiv 2\lambda_1^{(1)} - \lambda_1^{(2)} + \lambda_1^{(4)}, \lambda_8^{(1+2)} \equiv \lambda_8^{(1)} + \lambda_8^{(2)}, c_{1+2} \equiv c_1 + c_2, \text{ etc.}$$

⁸ Notice that Eq. (A.3) is not general \mathbb{Z}_3 symmetric term. For instance, $[\Phi_q^\dagger(\Phi_1 + \Phi_2 + \Phi_3) + \text{h.c.}]$ and $[\text{Tr}(\Delta_1^\dagger \Delta_2) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_2^\dagger \Delta_3) + \text{Tr}(\Delta_3^\dagger \Delta_1) + \text{h.c.}]$ are allowed by the \mathbb{Z}_3 symmetry.

Neglecting terms of $\mathcal{O}(v_\Delta^2)$, the tadpole conditions for each VEVs defined by Eqs. (II.4) and (II.5) are written as follows

$$\begin{aligned}
m_2^2 &\simeq -\lambda_{10}v_q^2 - \frac{1}{2}\lambda_8^{(1+2)}(v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \sqrt{2}\tilde{\mu}(v_{\Delta 1} + v_{\Delta 2} + v_{\Delta 3}), \\
\tilde{m}_{11}^2 + m_1^2 &\simeq -\frac{v_2 + v_3}{v_1}\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left[\lambda_8^{(1+2)}v_q^2 + 2\lambda_1^{(1+2)}v_1^2 + \lambda_1^{(124)}(v_2^2 + v_3^2)\right] + \sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 2}, \\
\tilde{m}_{12}^2 + m_1^2 &\simeq -\frac{v_3 + v_1}{v_2}\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left[\lambda_8^{(1+2)}v_q^2 + 2\lambda_1^{(1+2)}v_2^2 + \lambda_1^{(124)}(v_3^2 + v_1^2)\right] + \sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 3}, \\
\tilde{m}_{13}^2 + m_1^2 &\simeq -\frac{v_1 + v_2}{v_3}\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2}\left[\lambda_8^{(1+2)}v_q^2 + 2\lambda_1^{(1+2)}v_3^2 + \lambda_1^{(124)}(v_1^2 + v_2^2)\right] + \sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 1}, \\
\tilde{m}_{31}^2 + m_3^2 &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_3^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 1}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\left[c_{1+2}v_q^2 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} + 2b_{1+2}^{(2)}\right)v_1^2 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)}\right)(v_2^2 + v_3^2) + b_{1+2}^{(4)}v_1\frac{v_2v_{\Delta 2} + v_3v_{\Delta 3}}{v_{\Delta 1}}\right], \\
\tilde{m}_{32}^2 + m_3^2 &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_1^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 2}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\left[c_{1+2}v_q^2 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} + 2b_{1+2}^{(2)}\right)v_2^2 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)}\right)(v_3^2 + v_1^2) + b_{1+2}^{(4)}v_2\frac{v_3v_{\Delta 3} + v_1v_{\Delta 1}}{v_{\Delta 2}}\right], \\
\tilde{m}_{33}^2 + m_3^2 &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_2^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 3}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2}\left[c_{1+2}v_q^2 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} + 2b_{1+2}^{(2)}\right)v_3^2 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)}\right)(v_1^2 + v_2^2) + b_{1+2}^{(4)}v_3\frac{v_1v_{\Delta 1} + v_2v_{\Delta 2}}{v_{\Delta 3}}\right].
\end{aligned}$$

3. Scalar mass matrices

We write down the explicit form of scalar mass matrices. Although Φ and Δ mix with each other except the doubly charged components $\Delta^{\pm\pm}$, the inert doublets η do not. Again we neglect terms of $\mathcal{O}(v_\Delta^2)$. The symbol (i, j) represents the (i, j) element of mass matrix.

$$\underline{\phi_{(1,2,3,q)R}^0}, \quad \underline{\Delta_{(1,2,3)R}^0}$$

The elements for the CP-even scalar states are calculated as

$$\begin{aligned}
(1, 1) &\simeq -\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 \frac{v_2 + v_3}{v_1} + 2\lambda_1^{(1+2)} v_1^2, & (2, 2) &\simeq -\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 \frac{v_3 + v_1}{v_2} + 2\lambda_1^{(1+2)} v_2^2, \\
(3, 3) &\simeq -\tilde{m}_\Phi^2 \frac{v_1 + v_2}{v_3} + 2\lambda_1^{(1+2)} v_3^2, & (4, 4) &= 2\lambda_{10} v_q^2, \\
(1, 2) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + \lambda_1^{(124)} v_1 v_2, & (1, 3) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + \lambda_1^{(124)} v_1 v_3, & (2, 3) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + \lambda_1^{(124)} v_2 v_3, \\
(1, 4) &= \lambda_8^{(1+2)} v_1 v_q, & (2, 4) &= \lambda_8^{(1+2)} v_2 v_q, & (3, 4) &= \lambda_8^{(1+2)} v_3 v_q, \\
(5, 5) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_3^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 1}} - \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 \frac{v_2 v_{\Delta 2} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}}{v_{\Delta 1}}, \\
(6, 6) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_1^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 2}} - \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 \frac{v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}}{v_{\Delta 2}}, \\
(7, 7) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_2^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 3}} - \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_3 \frac{v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_2 v_{\Delta 2}}{v_{\Delta 3}}, \\
(5, 6) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_2, & (5, 7) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_3, & (6, 7) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 v_3, \\
(1, 5) &\simeq \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} + 2b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} (v_2 v_{\Delta 2} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}), \\
(1, 6) &\simeq -\sqrt{2} \mu v_1 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_1 v_{\Delta 2} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 v_{\Delta 1}, \\
(1, 7) &\simeq \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_1 v_{\Delta 3} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_3 v_{\Delta 1}, \\
(2, 5) &\simeq \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_2 v_{\Delta 1} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_{\Delta 2}, \\
(2, 6) &\simeq \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} + 2b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_2 v_{\Delta 2} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} (v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}), \\
(2, 7) &\simeq -\sqrt{2} \mu v_2 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_2 v_{\Delta 3} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_3 v_{\Delta 2}, \\
(3, 5) &\simeq -\sqrt{2} \mu v_3 + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_3 v_{\Delta 1} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_{\Delta 3}, \\
(3, 6) &\simeq + \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} - b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_3 v_{\Delta 2} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 v_{\Delta 3}, \\
(3, 7) &\simeq \left(b_{1+2}^{(1)} + 2b_{1+2}^{(2)} \right) v_3 v_{\Delta 3} + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} (v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_2 v_{\Delta 2}), \\
(4, 5) &= v_q \left(c_{1+2} v_{\Delta 1} - \sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} \right), & (4, 6) &= v_q \left(c_{1+2} v_{\Delta 2} - \sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} \right), & (4, 7) &= v_q \left(c_{1+2} v_{\Delta 3} - \sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{\phi_{(1,2,3,q)I}^0}, \quad \underline{\Delta_{(1,2,3)I}^0}$$

The mass matrix for the CP-odd scalar states has a zero eigenvalue which corresponds to

NG boson eaten by the Z boson. Each element is calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}
(1, 1) &\simeq -\frac{v_2 + v_3}{v_1} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + 2\sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 2}, & (2, 2) &\simeq -\frac{v_3 + v_1}{v_2} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + 2\sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 3}, \\
(3, 3) &\simeq -\frac{v_1 + v_2}{v_3} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + 2\sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 1}, & (4, 4) &= 2\sqrt{2}\tilde{\mu} (v_{\Delta 1} + v_{\Delta 2} + v_{\Delta 3}), \\
(1, 2) &\simeq (1, 3) \simeq (2, 3) \simeq \tilde{m}_\Phi^2, & (1, 4) &= (2, 4) = (3, 4) = 0, \\
(5, 5) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_3^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 1}} - \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 \frac{v_2 v_{\Delta 2} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}}{v_{\Delta 1}}, \\
(6, 6) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_1^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 2}} - \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 \frac{v_3 v_{\Delta 3} + v_1 v_{\Delta 1}}{v_{\Delta 2}}, \\
(7, 7) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_2^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 3}} - \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_3 \frac{v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_2 v_{\Delta 2}}{v_{\Delta 3}}, \\
(5, 6) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_2, & (5, 7) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_3, & (6, 7) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 v_3, \\
(1, 5) &\simeq -\frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} (v_2 v_{\Delta 2} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}), & (1, 6) &\simeq -\sqrt{2}\mu v_1 + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 v_{\Delta 1}, & (1, 7) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_3 v_{\Delta 1}, \\
(2, 5) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_{\Delta 2}, & (2, 6) &\simeq -\frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} (v_3 v_{\Delta 3} + v_1 v_{\Delta 1}), & (2, 7) &\simeq -\sqrt{2}\mu v_2 + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_3 v_{\Delta 2}, \\
(3, 5) &\simeq -\sqrt{2}\mu v_3 + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_1 v_{\Delta 3}, & (3, 6) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} v_2 v_{\Delta 3}, & (3, 7) &\simeq -\frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} (v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_2 v_{\Delta 2}), \\
(4, 5) &= (4, 6) = (4, 7) = -\sqrt{2}\tilde{\mu} v_q.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{\phi_{(1,2,3,q)}^\pm, \Delta_{(1,2,3)}^\pm}$$

Similar to the mass matrix for the CP-odd scalar states, that for the singly-charged scalar states has a zero eigenvalue which corresponds to NG boson eaten by the W boson. Each

element is calculated by

$$\begin{aligned}
(1, 1) &\simeq -\frac{v_2 + v_3}{v_1} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_1^{(4)} (v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \lambda_8^{(2)} v_q^2 - 2\sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 2} \right], \\
(2, 2) &\simeq -\frac{v_3 + v_1}{v_2} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_1^{(4)} (v_3^2 + v_1^2) + \lambda_8^{(2)} v_q^2 - 2\sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 3} \right], \\
(3, 3) &\simeq -\frac{v_1 + v_2}{v_3} \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_1^{(4)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2) + \lambda_8^{(2)} v_q^2 - 2\sqrt{2}\mu v_{\Delta 1} \right], \\
(4, 4) &\simeq -\frac{1}{2} \lambda_8^{(2)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \sqrt{2} \tilde{\mu} (v_{\Delta 1} + v_{\Delta 2} + v_{\Delta 3}), \\
(1, 2) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^{(4)} v_1 v_2, \quad (1, 3) \simeq \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^{(4)} v_3 v_1, \quad (2, 3) \simeq \tilde{m}_\Phi^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1^{(4)} v_2 v_3, \\
(1, 4) &= \frac{1}{2} \lambda_8^{(2)} v_1 v_q, \quad (2, 4) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_8^{(2)} v_2 v_q, \quad (3, 4) = \frac{1}{2} \lambda_8^{(2)} v_3 v_q, \\
(5, 5) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_3^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 1}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_1^2 + b_2^{(1-2)} (v_2^2 + v_3^2) + b_{1+2}^{(4)} \frac{v_1}{v_{\Delta 1}} (v_2 v_{\Delta 2} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}) + c_2 v_q^2 \right], \\
(6, 6) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_1^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 2}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_2^2 + b_2^{(1-2)} (v_3^2 + v_1^2) + b_{1+2}^{(4)} \frac{v_2}{v_{\Delta 2}} (v_3 v_{\Delta 3} + v_1 v_{\Delta 1}) + c_2 v_q^2 \right], \\
(7, 7) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_2^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 3}} \\
&\quad - \frac{1}{2} \left[\left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_3^2 + b_2^{(1-2)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2) + b_{1+2}^{(4)} \frac{v_3}{v_{\Delta 3}} (v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_2 v_{\Delta 2}) + c_2 v_q^2 \right], \\
(5, 6) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_1^{(4)} v_1 v_2, \quad (5, 7) \simeq \frac{1}{2} b_1^{(4)} v_3 v_1, \quad (6, 7) \simeq \frac{1}{2} b_1^{(4)} v_2 v_3, \\
(1, 5) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_1 v_{\Delta 1}, \quad (1, 6) = -\mu v_1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[b_2^{(1-2)} v_1 v_{\Delta 2} + b_2^{(4)} v_2 v_{\Delta 1} \right], \\
(1, 7) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[b_2^{(1-2)} v_1 v_{\Delta 3} + b_2^{(4)} v_3 v_{\Delta 1} \right], \\
(2, 5) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[b_2^{(1-2)} v_2 v_{\Delta 1} + b_2^{(4)} v_1 v_{\Delta 2} \right], \quad (2, 6) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_2 v_{\Delta 2}, \\
(2, 7) &= -\mu v_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[b_2^{(1-2)} v_2 v_{\Delta 3} + b_2^{(4)} v_3 v_{\Delta 2} \right], \\
(3, 5) &= -\mu v_3 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[b_2^{(1-2)} v_3 v_{\Delta 1} + b_2^{(4)} v_1 v_{\Delta 3} \right], \quad (3, 6) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[b_2^{(1-2)} v_3 v_{\Delta 2} + b_2^{(4)} v_2 v_{\Delta 3} \right], \\
(3, 7) &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_3 v_{\Delta 3}, \\
(4, 5) &= v_q \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_2 v_{\Delta 1} - \tilde{\mu} \right), \quad (4, 6) = v_q \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_2 v_{\Delta 2} - \tilde{\mu} \right), \quad (4, 7) = v_q \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} c_2 v_{\Delta 3} - \tilde{\mu} \right).
\end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{\Delta_{(1,2,3)}^{\pm\pm}}$$

The elements of the mass matrix for the doubly-charged scalar states which are purely from the triplet Higgs fields are given by

$$\begin{aligned} (1, 1) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_3^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 1}} \\ &\quad - \left[\left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_1^2 + b_2^{(1-2)} (v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} \frac{v_1}{v_{\Delta 1}} (v_2 v_{\Delta 2} + v_3 v_{\Delta 3}) \right], \\ (2, 2) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_1^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 2}} \\ &\quad - \left[\left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_2^2 + b_2^{(1-2)} (v_3^2 + v_1^2) + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} \frac{v_2}{v_{\Delta 2}} (v_3 v_{\Delta 3} + v_1 v_{\Delta 1}) \right], \\ (3, 3) &\simeq \frac{\sqrt{2}(\mu v_2^2 + \tilde{\mu} v_q^2)}{2v_{\Delta 3}} \\ &\quad - \left[\left(b_2^{(1)} + 2b_2^{(2)} \right) v_3^2 + b_2^{(1-2)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2) + \frac{1}{2} b_{1+2}^{(4)} \frac{v_3}{v_{\Delta 3}} (v_1 v_{\Delta 1} + v_2 v_{\Delta 2}) \right], \\ (1, 2) &\simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1-2}^{(4)} v_1 v_2, \quad (1, 3) \simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1-2}^{(4)} v_3 v_1, \quad (2, 3) \simeq \frac{1}{2} b_{1-2}^{(4)} v_2 v_3. \end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{\eta_{(1,2,3)R}^0}$$

Since there are no tadpole conditions for η_a , the mass parameter m_4^2 is not vanished. The elements are given with $m_{4a}^2 = m_4^2 + \tilde{m}_{4a}^2$ by

$$\begin{aligned} (1, 1) &\simeq m_{41}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_{3+4}^{(1)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \lambda_{3+4}^{(2)} (2v_1^2 - v_2^2 - v_3^2) + 2\lambda_5^{(1)} v_3 v_1 + \lambda_9^{(1+2)} v_q^2 \right], \\ (2, 2) &\simeq m_{42}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_{3+4}^{(1)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \lambda_{3+4}^{(2)} (-v_1^2 + 2v_2^2 - v_3^2) + 2\lambda_5^{(1)} v_1 v_2 + \lambda_9^{(1+2)} v_q^2 \right], \\ (3, 3) &\simeq m_{43}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_{3+4}^{(1)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \lambda_{3+4}^{(2)} (-v_1^2 - v_2^2 + 2v_3^2) + 2\lambda_5^{(1)} v_2 v_3 + \lambda_9^{(1+2)} v_q^2 \right], \\ (1, 2) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_{3+4}^{(4)} v_1 v_2 + \lambda_5^{(2)} v_2^2 - \sqrt{2} \mu_\eta v_{\Delta 3} \right], \\ (1, 3) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_{3+4}^{(4)} v_3 v_1 + \lambda_5^{(2)} v_1^2 - \sqrt{2} \mu_\eta v_{\Delta 2} \right], \\ (2, 3) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_{3+4}^{(4)} v_2 v_3 + \lambda_5^{(2)} v_3^2 - \sqrt{2} \mu_\eta v_{\Delta 1} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

$$\underline{\eta_{(1,2,3)I}^0}$$

The mass matrix for CP-odd components of η^0 is given by replacing $\lambda_5^{(1,2)} \rightarrow -\lambda_5^{(1,2)}$ and $\mu_\eta \rightarrow -\mu_\eta$, in the mass matrix of CP-even components given above.

$$\underline{\eta_{(1,2,3)}^\pm}$$

The elements for the singly-charged component of η_a are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
(1, 1) &\simeq m_{41}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_3^{(1)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \lambda_3^{(2)} (2v_1^2 - v_2^2 - v_3^2) + \lambda_9^{(1)} v_q^2 \right], \\
(2, 2) &\simeq m_{42}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_3^{(1)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \lambda_3^{(2)} (-v_1^2 + 2v_2^2 - v_3^2) + \lambda_9^{(1)} v_q^2 \right], \\
(3, 3) &\simeq m_{43}^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left[\lambda_3^{(1)} (v_1^2 + v_2^2 + v_3^2) + \lambda_3^{(2)} (-v_1^2 - v_2^2 + 2v_3^2) + \lambda_9^{(1)} v_q^2 \right], \\
(1, 2) &\simeq \tilde{m}_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_3^{(4)} v_1 v_2, \quad (1, 3) \simeq \tilde{m}_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_3^{(4)} v_3 v_1, \quad (2, 3) \simeq \tilde{m}_\eta^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_3^{(4)} v_2 v_3.
\end{aligned}$$

Appendix B: Three-loop Neutrino mass formula

Here we give the diagonal elements of neutrino mass matrix through three-loop level diagram depicted in Fig.1 in the original flavor basis. Defining $\phi_{\beta,\gamma}^+$ to be singly-charged bosons, it is written as

$$(M_\nu)_{ii}^{(3)} = -\frac{4}{(16\pi^2)^3} y_\Delta^3 \mu_\eta^3 \sum_{j,k,\ell=1}^3 \sum_{\alpha=1}^3 \sum_{\beta,\gamma=1}^7 |U|^2 \frac{1}{m_{\phi_\beta^+}^2 - m_{e_{i+2}}^2} \frac{1}{m_{\phi_\gamma^+}^2 - m_{e_{i+1}}^2} I,$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
I &= \int_0^1 dx dy dz \delta(x+y+z-1) \int_0^1 ds dt du \delta(s+t+u-1) \left(1 - t - \frac{y}{1-z} u \right) \frac{1}{z(1-z)A} \\
&\times \sum_{a=\phi_\beta^+, e_{i+2}} \sum_{b=\phi_\gamma^+, e_{i+1}} (-1)^{a,b} \left[(V_R)_{i\ell}^2 \Delta_{R,i\ell}^{ab} \ln \Delta_{R,i\ell}^{ab} - (V_I)_{i\ell}^2 \Delta_{I,i\ell}^{ab} \ln \Delta_{I,i\ell}^{ab} \right], \\
\Delta_{R(I),i\ell}^{ab} &= \frac{1}{2} m_a^2 - \frac{1}{2A} \left[s m_{\Delta_\alpha^+}^2 + t m_b^2 + \frac{u}{z(1-z)} \left(x m_{\eta_j^+}^2 + y m_{\eta_{R(I)\ell}}^2 + z m_{\eta_k^+}^2 \right) \right], \\
A &= \left(t + \frac{y}{1-z} u \right)^2 - t - \frac{y(1-y)}{z(1-z)} u, \\
U &= (U'_+)_{5+i,\beta} (U'_+)_{6+i,\gamma} (U_\Delta)_{i,\alpha} (V_+)_{i+1,k} (V_+)_{i+2,j},
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
(-1)^{a,b} &= +1 \text{ for } (a,b) = (\phi_\beta^+, \phi_\gamma^+), (e_{i+2}, e_{i+1}), \\
&= -1 \text{ for } (a,b) = (\phi_\beta^+, e_{i+1}), (e_{i+2}, \phi_\gamma^+).
\end{aligned}$$

The matrices U_Δ , $V_{R(I)}$ and V_+ are diagonalization matrix of $\Delta^{\pm\pm}$, $\eta_{R(I)}$ and η^\pm , respectively.

U'_+ is 7×7 diagonalization matrix of singly-charged bosons.




FIG. 2: Neutrino mass generation via one-loop radiative seesaw. There exist similar diagram with replacing $e \rightarrow \nu$, $\Delta^+ \rightarrow \Delta^0$, $\Phi^+ \rightarrow \Phi^0$.




FIG. 3: Zee-Babu like neutrino mass via two-loop radiative seesaw [22].

Appendix C: Other loops of Neutrino mass

In general, there exist several diagrams even up to two-loop level which generate neutrino masses of our model. Representative diagrams are shown in Figs.2-5. Throughout these figures, the same flavor indices of the two external neutrinos give the diagonal elements of neutrino mass matrix. Otherwise they give the off-diagonal elements.

As a simple example, let us consider the one-loop level diagram shown in Fig.2. One can obtain similar diagram by replacing $e \rightarrow \nu$, $\Delta^+ \rightarrow \Delta^0$, $\Phi^+ \rightarrow \Phi^0$ in the loop. These diagrams contribute only to off-diagonal elements of M_ν , and its magnitude is at most about $(1/(16\pi^2))y_\Delta y_\ell m_\tau = \mathcal{O}(10^{-4})$ eV. This is enough smaller than the tree-level contribution $y_\Delta v_\Delta = \mathcal{O}(0.1)$ eV because chirality suppression occurs. As a result, one finds that it is




FIG. 4: Rainbow-(lower panel) [31] and ring-(upper panel) [25] like neutrino mass via two-loop radiative seesaw.




FIG. 5: Cocktail like Neutrino mass via three-loop radiative seesaw [53]. We restrict ourselves the representative diagram.

negligible.

As another example, let us consider a contribution to diagonal elements from the two-loop diagrams depicted in Fig.3 and Fig.4, in which the dominant one comes from the upper-right panel in Fig.3. However the magnitude is at most $(1/(16\pi^2)^2)y_\Delta^3\mu = \mathcal{O}(10^{-22})$ eV if $\mu = \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, which is also tiny enough. Therefore we neglect contributions from those diagrams at all. Lastly, we have a three-loop contribution shown by Fig.5 that gives off-diagonal elements, and we find that this is also too tiny to generate neutrino masses. See Ref.[53] for details.

-
- [1] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
- [2] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
- [3] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, Lect. Notes Phys. **858**, 1 (2012).
- [4] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, Y. Shimizu, H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **183**, 1 (2010) [arXiv:1003.3552 [hep-th]].
- [5] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 2701 (2010) [arXiv:1002.0211 [hep-ph]].
- [6] K. S. Babu, E. Ma and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. B **552**, 207 (2003) [hep-ph/0206292].
- [7] E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, Phys. Rev. D **64**, 113012 (2001) [hep-ph/0106291].
- [8] P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura and P. O. Ludl, arXiv:1306.1500 [hep-ph].
- [9] C. Luhn, S. Nasri and P. Ramond, Phys. Lett. B **652**, 27 (2007) [arXiv:0706.2341 [hep-ph]].
- [10] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. B **660**, 505 (2008) [arXiv:0709.0507 [hep-ph]].
- [11] E. Ma, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **21**, 1917 (2006) [hep-ph/0607056].
- [12] H. Ishimori and T. Kobayashi, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 125004 (2012) [arXiv:1201.3429 [hep-ph]].
- [13] E. Ma, Phys. Lett. B **649**, 287 (2007) [hep-ph/0612022].
- [14] H. Ishimori, S. Khalil and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 013008 (2012) [arXiv:1204.2705 [hep-ph]].
- [15] Q. -H. Cao, S. Khalil, E. Ma and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 071302 (2011) [arXiv:1108.0570 [hep-ph]].
- [16] Q. -H. Cao, S. Khalil, E. Ma and H. Okada, Phys. Rev. Lett. **106**, 131801 (2011) [arXiv:1009.5415 [hep-ph]].
- [17] C. Hagedorn, M. A. Schmidt and A. Y. Smirnov, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 036002 (2009) [arXiv:0811.2955 [hep-ph]].
- [18] T. P. Cheng and L. F. Li, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2860 (1980); J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 2227 (1980); G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi and C. Wetterich, Nucl. Phys. B **181**, 287 (1981); R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 165 (1981); M. Magg and C. Wetterich, Phys. Lett. B **94**, 61 (1980).
- [19] M. Aoki, S. Kanemura, K. Tsumura and K. Yagyu, Phys. Rev. D **80**, 015017 (2009) [arXiv:0902.4665 [hep-ph]].

- [20] V. Barger, H. E. Logan and G. Shaughnessy, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 115018 (2009) [arXiv:0902.0170 [hep-ph]]; H. E. Logan and D. MacLennan, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 115022 (2009) [arXiv:0903.2246 [hep-ph]]; H. E. Logan and D. MacLennan, *Phys. Rev. D* **81**, 075016 (2010) [arXiv:1002.4916 [hep-ph]]; G. C. Branco, P. M. Ferreira, L. Lavoura, M. N. Rebelo, M. Sher and J. P. Silva, *Phys. Rept.* **516**, 1 (2012) [arXiv:1106.0034 [hep-ph]].
- [21] ATLAS-CONF-2013-010.
- [22] A. Zee, *Nucl. Phys. B* **264**, 99 (1986); K. S. Babu, *Phys. Lett. B* **203**, 132 (1988).
- [23] E. Ma, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 077301 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0601225].
- [24] N. Sahu and U. Sarkar, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 115013 (2008) [arXiv:0804.2072 [hep-ph]].
- [25] M. Aoki, J. Kubo and H. Takano, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, **116001** (2013) [arXiv:1302.3936 [hep-ph]].
- [26] L. M. Krauss, S. Nasri and M. Trodden, *Phys. Rev. D* **67**, 085002 (2003) [arXiv:hep-ph/0210389].
- [27] M. Aoki, S. Kanemura and O. Seto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 051805 (2009) [arXiv:0807.0361]; M. Aoki, S. Kanemura and O. Seto, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 033007 (2009) [arXiv:0904.3829 [hep-ph]]; M. Aoki, S. Kanemura and K. Yagyu, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 075016 (2011) [arXiv:1102.3412 [hep-ph]].
- [28] D. Schmidt, T. Schwetz and T. Toma, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 073009 (2012) [arXiv:1201.0906 [hep-ph]].
- [29] R. Bouchand and A. Merle, arXiv:1205.0008 [hep-ph].
- [30] E. Ma, A. Natale and A. Rashed, arXiv:1206.1570 [hep-ph].
- [31] Y. Kajiyama, H. Okada and K. Yagyu, *Nucl. Phys. B* **874**, 1 (2013) arXiv:1303.3463 [hep-ph].
- [32] M. Aoki, J. Kubo, T. Okawa and H. Takano, *Phys. Lett. B* **707**, 107 (2012) [arXiv:1110.5403 [hep-ph]].
- [33] Y. H. Ahn and H. Okada, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 073010 (2012) [arXiv:1201.4436 [hep-ph]].
- [34] Y. Farzan and E. Ma, arXiv:1204.4890 [hep-ph].
- [35] F. Bonnet, M. Hirsch, T. Ota and W. Winter, arXiv:1204.5862 [hep-ph].
- [36] K. Kumericki, I. Picek and B. Radovic, arXiv:1204.6597 [hep-ph].
- [37] K. Kumericki, I. Picek and B. Radovic, arXiv:1204.6599 [hep-ph].
- [38] E. Ma, arXiv:1206.1812 [hep-ph].
- [39] G. Gil, P. Chankowski and M. Krawczyk, arXiv:1207.0084 [hep-ph].
- [40] H. Okada and T. Toma, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 033011 (2012) arXiv:1207.0864 [hep-ph].

- [41] D. Hehn and A. Ibarra, Phys. Lett. B **718**, 988 (2013) [arXiv:1208.3162 [hep-ph]].
- [42] P. S. B. Dev and A. Pilaftsis, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 113001 (2012) [arXiv:1209.4051 [hep-ph]].
- [43] Y. Kajiyama, H. Okada and T. Toma, arXiv:1210.2305 [hep-ph].
- [44] H. Okada, arXiv:1212.0492 [hep-ph].
- [45] M. Aoki, S. Kanemura, T. Shindou and K. Yagyu, JHEP **1007**, 084 (2010) [Erratum-ibid. **1011**, 049 (2010)] [arXiv:1005.5159 [hep-ph]].
- [46] S. Kanemura, O. Seto and T. Shimomura, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 016004 (2011) [arXiv:1101.5713 [hep-ph]].
- [47] M. Lindner, D. Schmidt and T. Schwetz, Phys. Lett. B **705**, 324 (2011) [arXiv:1105.4626 [hep-ph]].
- [48] S. Kanemura, T. Nabeshima and H. Sugiyama, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 033004 (2012) [arXiv:1111.0599 [hep-ph]].
- [49] S. Kanemura, T. Nabeshima and H. Sugiyama, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 033004 (2012) [arXiv:1111.0599 [hep-ph]].
- [50] S. Kanemura and H. Sugiyama, Phys. Rev. D **86**, 073006 (2012) [arXiv:1202.5231 [hep-ph]].
- [51] P. -H. Gu and U. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 105031 (2008) [arXiv:0712.2933 [hep-ph]].
- [52] P. -H. Gu and U. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 073012 (2008) [arXiv:0807.0270 [hep-ph]].
- [53] M. Gustafsson, J. M. No and M. A. Rivera, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110**, 211802 (2013) arXiv:1212.4806 [hep-ph].
- [54] Y. Kajiyama, H. Okada and T. Toma, arXiv:1303.7356 [hep-ph].
- [55] S. Kanemura, T. Matsui and H. Sugiyama, arXiv:1305.4521 [hep-ph].
- [56] S. S. C. Law and K. L. McDonald, arXiv:1305.6467 [hep-ph].
- [57] Beringer et al. (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
- [58] M. Misiak, H. M. Asatrian, K. Bieri, M. Czakon, A. Czarnecki, T. Ewerth, A. Ferroglia and P. Gambino *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 022002 (2007) [hep-ph/0609232].
- [59] F. Mahmoudi and O. Stal, Phys. Rev. D **81**, 035016 (2010) [arXiv:0907.1791 [hep-ph]].
- [60] J. P. Lees *et al.* [BaBar Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 101802 (2012) [arXiv:1205.5442 [hep-ex]].
- [61] ATLAS-CONF-2013-012; ATLAS-CONF-2013-013; ATLAS-CONF-2013-030; ATLAS-CONF-2012-170.
- [62] CMS-PAS-HIG-13-005; CMS-PAS-HIG-13-001; CMS-PAS-HIG-13-002; CMS-PAS-HIG-13-

003; CMS-PAS-HIG-13-004.

- [63] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], JHEP **1302**, 095 (2013) [arXiv:1211.6956 [hep-ex]].
- [64] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], JHEP **1302**, 095 (2013) [arXiv:1211.6956 [hep-ex]].
- [65] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], JHEP **1206**, 039 (2012).
- [66] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], JHEP **1207**, 143 (2012).
- [67] <https://twiki.cern.ch/twiki/bin/view/LHCPhysics/CERNYellowReportPageAt7TeV>
- [68] J. Alwall, M. Herquet, F. Maltoni, O. Mattelaer and T. Stelzer, JHEP **1106**, 128 (2011).
- [69] S. Kanemura, K. Tsumura and H. Yokoya, Phys. Rev. D **85**, 095001 (2012) [arXiv:1111.6089 [hep-ph]]; S. Kanemura, K. Tsumura and H. Yokoya, arXiv:1305.5424 [hep-ph].
- [70] A. Pukhov, [hep-ph/0412191].