

Interplay between exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries, four-zero texture and universal texture

Masaki J. S. Yang^{1,*}

¹*Department of Physics, Saitama University, Shimo-okubo, Sakura-ku, Saitama, 338-8570, Japan*

In this letter, we consider exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries for quarks and leptons. Fermion mass matrices are assumed to be four-zero textures for charged fermions $f = u, d, e$ and a symmetric matrix for neutrinos ν_L . By a bi-maximal transformation, all the mass matrices lead to $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetric forms, which separately satisfy $T_u m_{u,\nu}^* T_u = m_{u,\nu}$ and $T_d m_{d,e}^* T_d = m_{d,e}$.

Reconciliation between the $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries and observed $\sin \theta_{13}$ predicts $\delta_{CP} \simeq \sin^{-1}[\sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} \frac{c_{13}s_{23}}{s_{13}}] \simeq 203^\circ$. Moreover, imposition of universal texture $(m_f)_{11} = 0$ for $f = u, d, \nu, e$ predicts the normal hierarchy with the lightest neutrino mass $|m_1| = 6.26$ or 2.54 meV.

I. INTRODUCTION

The T2K experiment recently indicates a nonzero CP violating Dirac phase δ_{CP} [1, 2]. Then CP violation (CPV) in the lepton sector draws strong attention. Among studies of flavor structures, $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetry [3, 4] is widely studied [5–22] because it predicts bi-maximal mixing $\theta_{23} = 45^\circ$ and the maximal CPV Dirac phase $\delta_{CP} = \pm\pi/2$.

In this context, universal texture [23–26] that imposes $\mu - \tau$ permutation symmetry or 2–3 symmetry for all the SM fermions is appealing. However, universal $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetry naively fails because it predicts zero CP phase $\delta_{CP} = 0$.

In this letter, we consider exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries for quarks and leptons. By a bi-maximal transformation, four-zero textures [27–38] lead to a $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetric form in a particular basis. In this basis, up- and down-type quark mass matrices from four-zero textures separately satisfy exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries, $T_{u,d} m_{u,d}^* T_{u,d} = m_{u,d}$. These symmetries realize the maximal CP violation in the Fritzsch–Xing parameterization [39].

The same symmetries also hold in the lepton sector, $T_{u,d} m_{\nu,e}^* T_{u,d} = m_{\nu,e}$. In order to reconcile the $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries and observed $\sin \theta_{13}$, the maximal CP violation is discarded and it predicts $\delta_{CP} \simeq \sin^{-1}[\sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} \frac{c_{13}s_{23}}{s_{13}}] \simeq 203^\circ$. This value is rather close to the best fit for the normal hierarchy and in the 1σ region $\delta_{CP}/^\circ = 217_{-28}^{+40}$ [40]. This result does not depend on the mass ordering of neutrinos.

Moreover, assuming universal texture $(m_f)_{11} = 0$ for $f = u, d, \nu, e$ and small 2-3 mixing of the lepton mass matrix, we obtain the lightest neutrino mass $|m_1| = 6.26$ or 2.54 meV. Each value corresponds to the Majorana phases $|\alpha_3 - \alpha_2| = 0$ or π , and the result only holds in the case of the normal hierarchy (NH). Besides, for the inverted hierarchical case, the solutions do not have real

values and then contradict with the reflection symmetries.

This paper is organized as follows. In the next section, we review four-zero textures and $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetry. In Sec. 3, $\mu - \tau$ symmetries are imposed on the lepton sector. The final section is devoted to conclusions.

II. FOUR-ZERO TEXTURE AND $\mu - \tau$ REFLECTION SYMMETRY

In this section, we review four-zero textures and its interplay of the $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetry [3, 4]. First of all, the phenomenological mass matrices of the SM fermions $f = u, d, e$ and neutrinos ν_L are defined by

$$\mathcal{L} \ni \sum_f -\bar{f}_L m_{fij} f_{Rj} - \bar{\nu}_L m_{\nu ij} \nu_{Lj}^c + \text{h.c.} \quad (1)$$

Diagonalization of the mass matrices $m_f = U_{Lf} m_f^{\text{diag}} U_{Rf}^\dagger$ leads to the following CKM and MNS mixing matrices

$$V_{\text{CKM}} = U_{Lu}^\dagger U_{Ld}, \quad U_{\text{MNS}} = U_{Le}^\dagger U_{L\nu}. \quad (2)$$

Since both the matrices have a large Dirac phase, the maximal CP violation have been discussed [27, 41]. CP phases depend on the basis of the fermions. In particular, the phase of the CKM matrix becomes almost maximal in the Fritzsch–Xing parameterization [39]:

$$V_{\text{CKM}} = \begin{pmatrix} c_u & s_u & 0 \\ -s_u & c_u & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i\delta_{\text{FZ}}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_q & s_q \\ 0 & -s_q & c_q \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_d & -s_d & 0 \\ s_d & c_d & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where $c_f \equiv \cos \theta_f$, $s_f \equiv \sin \theta_f$. The best fit values are calculated by the way of Ref. [42]

$$s_u = 0.0863, \quad s_d = 0.212, \quad s_q = 0.0423, \quad \delta_{\text{FZ}} = 87.9^\circ. \quad (4)$$

Although the original Kobayashi–Maskawa parameterization [43] has a similar result $\delta_{\text{KM}} \simeq \pi/2$ [44], the

*Electronic address: yang@krishna.th.phy.saitama-u.ac.jp

Fritzsch – Xing parameterization has a reasonable physical view because it factorizes the large mixing in 1-2 generations and the small one in 2-3 generations.

If we assume $m_{u,d}$ are Hermitian matrices, Eq. (3) strongly suggests that the mass matrices of quarks have “four-zero texture” or “modified Fritzsch texture” [27],

$$m_u = \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C_u & 0 \\ C_u & \tilde{B}_u & B_u \\ 0 & B_u & A_u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

$$m_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C_d & 0 \\ C_d & \tilde{B}_d & B_d \\ 0 & B_d & A_d \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

with real parameters $A_f > B_f > \tilde{B}_f \gg C_f$. For the later convenience, the relative phase is pressed on m_u . The forms of mass matrices (5) and (6) are almost consistent with the latest full parameter scan of four-zero textures [36, 38]. In this case, the rotation matrices $V_{u,d}$ at leading order is written by the mass eigenvalues and parameters $r_{u,d} \equiv A_{u,d}/m_{t,b}$ [38];

$$V_u \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{r_u} & \sqrt{1-r_u} \\ 0 & -\sqrt{1-r_u} & \sqrt{r_u} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

$$V_d \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{r_d} & \sqrt{1-r_d} \\ 0 & -\sqrt{1-r_d} & \sqrt{r_d} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Then, an approximate form of the CKM matrix $V_{\text{CKM}} = U_u^\dagger U_d$ is found to be

$$V_{\text{CKM}} = V_u^T \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} V_d. \quad (9)$$

In the Fritzsch–Xing parameterization (3), one directly obtains

$$s_u \simeq \sqrt{\frac{m_u}{m_c}}, \quad s_d \simeq \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}}, \quad (10)$$

$$s_q \simeq \sqrt{r_u(1-r_d)} - \sqrt{r_d(1-r_u)}, \quad \delta_{\text{FZ}} \equiv \pi/2. \quad (11)$$

It predicts V_{cb} and V_{ts} at leading order as follows

$$|V_{cb}| \simeq |V_{ts}| \simeq s_q. \quad (12)$$

A bi-maximal transformation of the mass matrices by the following U_{BM} ,

$$m_f^{BM} \equiv U_{BM}^\dagger m_f U_{BM}, \quad U_{BM} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

leads to

$$m_u^{BM} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{C_u}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{C_u}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{C_u}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\tilde{B}_u}{2} + \frac{A_u}{2} & \frac{\tilde{B}_u}{2} - \frac{A_u}{2} - iB_u \\ -\frac{C_u}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\tilde{B}_u}{2} - \frac{A_u}{2} + iB_u & \frac{\tilde{B}_u}{2} + \frac{A_u}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

$$m_d^{BM} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{iC_d}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{iC_d}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{iC_d}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\tilde{B}_d}{2} + \frac{A_d}{2} & \frac{\tilde{B}_d}{2} - \frac{A_d}{2} - iB_d \\ -\frac{iC_d}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\tilde{B}_d}{2} - \frac{A_d}{2} + iB_d & \frac{\tilde{B}_d}{2} + \frac{A_d}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

These matrices (14), (15) separately satisfy exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries:

$$T_u(m_u^{BM})^* T_u = m_u^{BM}, \quad T_d(m_d^{BM})^* T_d = m_d^{BM}, \quad (16)$$

where

$$T_u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_d = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

The form of matrices (14), (15) has been indicated a study of universal texture [23]. However, they considered no symmetry and these forms were treated as a phenomenological description.

III. $\mu - \tau$ REFLECTION SYMMETRY IN THE LEPTON SECTOR

In this section, we impose the symmetries (16) on the lepton sector and research some predictions. If the MNS matrix has the same form to the CKM matrix (9),

$$U_0 = V_e^T \begin{pmatrix} +i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} V_{\nu 0}, \quad (18)$$

where

$$V_e \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{r_e} & \sqrt{1-r_e} \\ 0 & -\sqrt{1-r_e} & \sqrt{r_e} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

$$V_{\nu 0} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & -s_{12} & 0 \\ s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (20)$$

with $r_e \equiv A_e/m_\tau$ in Eq. (30). It predicts the maximal CP violation $\delta^{PDG} \equiv -\pi/2$ and

$$s_{23}^{PDG} \simeq 1/\sqrt{2}, \quad s_{13}^{PDG} \simeq s_{23}^{PDG} \sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} \simeq 0.05, \quad (21)$$

in the standard PDG parameterization. However, the small $\sin\theta_{13}$ disagrees with the observation. They are well known results in the universal texture [23, 24].

In order to derive a proper $\sin\theta_{13}$, we change the mixing matrix Eqs. (18) and (20) in the following way.

$$U = V_e^T \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} V_\nu, \quad (22)$$

$$V_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (23)$$

In Eqs. (22) and (23), the sign of the phase and s_{12} are changed in the same way to the PDG parameterization (the sign of J^{PDG} (35) is not changed). The Majorana phases are omitted here and discussed later. The 2-3 mixing of the V_e can be absorbed to that of the V_ν . Then,

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} & 0 \\ -\sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \times \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

It leads to

$$|U_{e3}| = |s_{13}^{PDG}| \simeq |is_{13} - \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} c_{13} s_{23}|. \quad (25)$$

From the parameter $\sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} \simeq 0.07$ and the following values from the latest global fit [40],

$$\theta_{23}^{PDG} = 49.7^\circ, \quad \theta_{12}^{PDG} = 33.82^\circ, \quad \theta_{13}^{PDG} = 8.61^\circ, \quad (26)$$

one obtains $c_{13} \simeq c_{13}^{PDG}$, $s_{23} \simeq s_{23}^{PDG}$ and

$$s_{13} = \pm \sqrt{(s_{13}^{PDG})^2 - \frac{m_e}{m_\mu} (c_{13}^{PDG})^2 (s_{23}^{PDG})^2} = \pm 0.140. \quad (27)$$

The sign \pm in Eq. (27) corresponds to the sign of $\cos\delta_{CP}$. We adopt $s_{13} = -0.140$ because the latest global fit found $\cos\delta_{CP} < 0$ [40].

The absolute values of elements in reconstructed U_{MNS} are found to be

$$|U_{MNS}| = \begin{pmatrix} 0.821 & 0.550 & 0.149 \\ 0.275 & 0.596 & 0.754 \\ 0.500 & 0.584 & 0.640 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

All of the components is in the range of 3σ .

On the analogy of quark masses, the lepton mass matrices $m_{\nu,e}$ which predict the mixing matrix (23) will be the following forms

$$m_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} a_\nu & b_\nu & c_\nu \\ b_\nu & d_\nu & e_\nu \\ c_\nu & e_\nu & f_\nu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

$$m_e = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & C_e & 0 \\ C_e & \tilde{B}_e & B_e \\ 0 & B_e & A_e \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

with real parameters $a_\nu \sim f_\nu$. These matrices have no symmetry at first glance. However, the bi-maximal transformation in Eq. (13)

$$m_\nu^{BM} \equiv U_{BM}^\dagger m_\nu U_{BM}^*, \quad m_e^{BM} \equiv U_{BM}^\dagger m_e U_{BM}, \quad (31)$$

leads to

$$m_\nu^{BM} = \begin{pmatrix} -a_\nu & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_\nu - ic_\nu) & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_\nu + ic_\nu) \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_\nu - ic_\nu) & \frac{f_\nu}{2} - \frac{d_\nu}{2} + ie_\nu & -\frac{f_\nu}{2} - \frac{d_\nu}{2} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(b_\nu + ic_\nu) & -\frac{f_\nu}{2} - \frac{d_\nu}{2} & \frac{f_\nu}{2} - \frac{d_\nu}{2} - ie_\nu \end{pmatrix}, \quad (32)$$

$$m_e^{BM} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{iC_e}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{iC_e}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{iC_e}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\tilde{B}_e}{2} + \frac{A_e}{2} & \frac{\tilde{B}_e}{2} - \frac{A_e}{2} - iB_e \\ -\frac{iC_e}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\tilde{B}_e}{2} - \frac{A_e}{2} + iB_e & \frac{\tilde{B}_e}{2} + \frac{A_e}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (33)$$

Eqs. (32) and (33) also separately satisfy exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries (16):

$$T_u(m_\nu^{BM})^* T_u = m_\nu^{BM}, \quad T_d(m_e^{BM})^* T_d = m_e^{BM}. \quad (34)$$

Therefore, in this basis, all of quarks and leptons satisfy the exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries. Note that the $\mu - \tau$ symmetry is not imposed on m_ν in the basis of four-zero texture (29).

A. Dirac phase δ_{CP}

In order to show the Dirac phase δ_{CP} , we evaluate the Jaroskog invariant [45],

$$J^{PDG} = \sin\delta_{CP} s_{12}^{PDG} c_{12}^{PDG} s_{13}^{PDG} (c_{13}^{PDG})^2 s_{23}^{PDG} c_{23}^{PDG}. \quad (35)$$

Since the phase δ_{CP} vanishes in a limit of $\sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} \rightarrow 0$, the invariant should be proportional to the parameter. The invariant is evaluated from Eq. (24) as

$$J = -\text{Im}[U_{\mu 3} U_{\tau 2} U_{\mu 2}^* U_{\tau 3}^*] \quad (36)$$

$$\simeq \sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} c_{13} c_{23} [-c_{12} s_{12} s_{23}^2 + s_{13} c_{23} s_{23} (c_{12}^2 - s_{12}^2) + s_{13}^2 c_{12} s_{12} c_{23}^2] = -0.0130, \quad (37)$$

$$\simeq -\sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} c_{13} c_{23} c_{12} s_{12} s_{23}^2 = (-0.0120). \quad (38)$$

The value with (without) parentheses is induced from full calculation (only leading order). Since $s_{13} = -0.14$ is small, J^{PDG} (35) and the perturbative expansion (38) gives an approximate formula of $\sin \delta_{CP}$,

$$\sin \delta_{CP} \simeq \sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} \frac{c_{13}s_{23}}{s_{13}} \simeq -0.390 \text{ } (-0.360). \quad (39)$$

$\cos \delta_{CP}$ is obtained as

$$\cos \delta_{CP} = \frac{|U_{22}^{PDG}|^2 - (s_{12}^{PDG} s_{13}^{PDG} s_{23}^{PDG})^2 - (c_{12}^{PDG} c_{23}^{PDG})^2}{-2s_{12}^{PDG} s_{13}^{PDG} s_{23}^{PDG} c_{12}^{PDG} c_{23}^{PDG}} \quad (40)$$

$$= \frac{|U_{22}|^2(1 - |U_{13}|^2)^2 - |U_{13}|^2|U_{12}|^2|U_{23}|^2 - |U_{11}|^2|U_{33}|^2}{-2|U_{13}||U_{12}||U_{23}||U_{11}||U_{33}|} \quad (41)$$

$$= -0.920. \quad (42)$$

Therefore

$$\delta_{CP} \simeq 203^\circ \text{ } (201^\circ). \quad (43)$$

This value is rather close to the best fit for the normal hierarchy and in the 1σ region $\delta_{CP}/^\circ = 217_{-28}^{+40}$ [40]. This result does not depend on the mass ordering of neutrinos.

B. Majorana phases, universal zero texture and masses

The standard PDG convention of the Majorana phases is

$$U_{MNS} = UP, \quad P \equiv \text{diag}(1, e^{i\alpha_2/2}, e^{i\alpha_3/2}). \quad (44)$$

The neutrino mass matrix m_ν reconstructed in the four-zero basis is obtained as

$$m_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} V_\nu P \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} P V_\nu^T \begin{pmatrix} -i & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (45)$$

If this mass matrix with Majorana phases satisfies the symmetry Eq. (16), $\alpha_{2,3}/2 = n\pi/2$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$) should be hold. This result agrees to the previous studies by Xing *et al.* [19, 21].

Note that the 2-3 mixing of V_ν and V_e cannot be determined independently. We assume that of V_e is small (equivalently, $\sqrt{1-r_e} \simeq m_\mu/m_\tau$ in Eq. (19)). Moreover, imposition of universal texture $(m_f)_{11} = 0$ for $f = u, d, \nu, e$ [23] determines the mass eigenvalues $m_{1,2,3}$ from a condition

$$m_1 = \frac{-e^{i\alpha_2} m_2 s_{12}^2 - e^{i\alpha_3} m_3 t_{13}^2}{c_{12}^2}, \quad (46)$$

where $t_{13} \equiv \tan \theta_{13}$. For the normal hierarchical case,

$$|m_1| = 6.20 \text{ meV for } (\alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (0, 0) \text{ or } (\pi, \pi) \quad (47)$$

$$= 2.54 \text{ meV for } (\alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (0, \pi) \text{ or } (\pi, 0). \quad (48)$$

Here, we used the mass differences from the global fit [40]

$$\Delta m_{21}^2 = 73.9 [\text{meV}^2], \quad \Delta m_{31}^2 = 2525 [\text{meV}^2]. \quad (49)$$

Besides, for the inverted hierarchical case, the solutions of Eq. (46) do not have real values and then contradict with the reflection symmetries.

Finally, the effective mass m_{ee} of the double beta decay is obtained as [46]

$$|m_{ee}| = \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i U_{ei}^2 \right| \quad (50)$$

$$= |(c_{13}^{PDG})^2 [m_1 (c_{12}^{PDG})^2 + m_2 (s_{12}^{PDG})^2 e^{i\alpha_2}] + m_3 (s_{13}^{PDG})^2 e^{i(\alpha_3 - 2\delta)}|, \quad (51)$$

$$= 0.17 \text{ meV for } (\alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (0, 0) \text{ or } (\pi, \pi), \quad (52)$$

$$= 1.24 \text{ meV for } (\alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (0, \pi) \text{ or } (\pi, 0). \quad (53)$$

These values are rather small than other models because it vanishes in a limit of $(m_\nu)_{11} = \sqrt{m_e/m_\mu} = 0$. In particular, the phase factor $-i$ in Eq. (45) generates destructive interferences for $\alpha_2 = \alpha_3$.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this letter, we consider exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries for quarks and leptons. By a bi-maximal transformation, up- and down-type quark mass matrices with four-zero textures separately satisfy exact $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries, $T_{u,d} m_{u,d}^* T_{u,d} = m_{u,d}$.

The same symmetries also hold in the lepton sector, $T_{u,d} m_{\nu,e}^* T_{u,d} = m_{\nu,e}$. Reconciliation between the $\mu - \tau$ reflection symmetries and observed $\sin \theta_{13}$ predicts $\delta_{CP} \simeq \sin^{-1}[\sqrt{\frac{m_e}{m_\mu}} \frac{c_{13}s_{23}}{s_{13}}] \simeq 203^\circ$. This value is rather close to the best fit for the normal hierarchy and in the 1σ region $\delta_{CP}/^\circ = 217_{-28}^{+40}$.

Moreover, assuming universal texture $(m_f)_{11} = 0$ for $f = u, d, \nu, e$ and small 2-3 mixing of the lepton mass matrix, we obtain the lightest neutrino mass $|m_1| = 6.26$ or 2.54 meV. This result only holds in the case of the normal hierarchy, because the solutions contradict with the reflection symmetries for the inverted hierarchical case.

Acknowledgement

This study is financially supported by the Iwanami Fujukai Foundation, and JSPS KAKENHI Grants No. 20K14459.

-
- [1] K. Abe et al. (T2K), Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 181801 (2014), 1403.1532.
 - [2] K. Abe et al. (T2K), Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 171802 (2018), 1807.07891.
 - [3] P. F. Harrison and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. **B547**, 219 (2002), hep-ph/0210197.
 - [4] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, Phys. Lett. **B579**, 113 (2004), hep-ph/0305309.
 - [5] T. Kitabayashi and M. Yasue, Phys. Lett. **B621**, 133 (2005), hep-ph/0504212.
 - [6] W. Grimus, S. Kaneko, L. Lavoura, H. Sawanaka, and M. Tanimoto, JHEP **01**, 110 (2006), hep-ph/0510326.
 - [7] Y. Farzan and A. Yu. Smirnov, JHEP **01**, 059 (2007), hep-ph/0610337.
 - [8] A. S. Joshipura and B. P. Kodrani, Phys. Lett. **B670**, 369 (2009), 0706.0953.
 - [9] B. Adhikary, A. Ghosal, and P. Roy, JHEP **10**, 040 (2009), 0908.2686.
 - [10] Z.-z. Xing and Y.-L. Zhou, Phys. Lett. **B693**, 584 (2010), 1008.4906.
 - [11] S.-F. Ge, H.-J. He, and F.-R. Yin, JCAP **1005**, 017 (2010), 1001.0940.
 - [12] S. Gupta, A. S. Joshipura, and K. M. Patel, Phys. Rev. **D85**, 031903 (2012), 1112.6113.
 - [13] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, Fortsch. Phys. **61**, 535 (2013), 1207.1678.
 - [14] A. S. Joshipura and K. M. Patel, Phys. Lett. **B749**, 159 (2015), 1507.01235.
 - [15] Z.-z. Xing and Z.-h. Zhao, Rept. Prog. Phys. **79**, 076201 (2016), 1512.04207.
 - [16] X.-G. He, Chin. J. Phys. **53**, 100101 (2015), 1504.01560.
 - [17] P. Chen, G.-J. Ding, F. Gonzalez-Canales, and J. W. F. Valle, Phys. Lett. **B753**, 644 (2016), 1512.01551.
 - [18] R. Samanta, P. Roy, and A. Ghosal, JHEP **06**, 085 (2018), 1712.06555.
 - [19] Z.-z. Xing and J.-y. Zhu, Chin. Phys. **C41**, 123103 (2017), 1707.03676.
 - [20] C. C. Nishi, B. L. Sánchez-Vega, and G. Souza Silva, JHEP **09**, 042 (2018), 1806.07412.
 - [21] N. Nath, Z.-z. Xing, and J. Zhang, Eur. Phys. J. **C78**, 289 (2018), 1801.09931.
 - [22] R. Sinha, P. Roy, and A. Ghosal, Phys. Rev. **D99**, 033009 (2019), 1809.06615.
 - [23] Y. Koide, H. Nishiura, K. Matsuda, T. Kikuchi, and T. Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. **D66**, 093006 (2002), hep-ph/0209333.
 - [24] Y. Koide, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 093001 (2004), hep-ph/0312207.
 - [25] A. S. Joshipura, Eur. Phys. J. **C53**, 77 (2008), hep-ph/0512252.
 - [26] A. S. Joshipura, B. P. Kodrani, and K. M. Patel, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 115017 (2009), 0903.2161.
 - [27] H. Fritzsch and Z.-z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B353**, 114 (1995), hep-ph/9502297.
 - [28] Z.-z. Xing, J. Phys. **G23**, 1563 (1997), hep-ph/9609204.
 - [29] K. Kang and S. K. Kang, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 1511 (1997), hep-ph/9704253.
 - [30] A. Mondragon and E. Rodriguez-Jauregui, Phys. Rev. **D59**, 093009 (1999), hep-ph/9807214.
 - [31] H. Nishiura, K. Matsuda, and T. Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. **D60**, 013006 (1999), hep-ph/9902385.
 - [32] K. Matsuda, T. Fukuyama, and H. Nishiura, Phys. Rev. **D61**, 053001 (2000), hep-ph/9906433.
 - [33] H. Fritzsch and Z.-z. Xing, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, 1 (2000), hep-ph/9912358.
 - [34] H. Fritzsch and Z.-z. Xing, Phys. Lett. B **555**, 63 (2003), hep-ph/0212195.
 - [35] Z.-z. Xing and H. Zhang, Phys. Lett. **B569**, 30 (2003), hep-ph/0304234.
 - [36] Z.-z. Xing and H. Zhang, J. Phys. G **30**, 129 (2004), hep-ph/0309112.
 - [37] M. Bando, S. Kaneko, M. Obara, and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. **112**, 533 (2004), hep-ph/0405071.
 - [38] Z.-z. Xing and Z.-h. Zhao, Nucl. Phys. B **897**, 302 (2015), 1501.06346.
 - [39] H. Fritzsch and Z.-Z. Xing, Phys. Lett. **B413**, 396 (1997), hep-ph/9707215.
 - [40] I. Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, A. Hernandez-Cabezudo, M. Maltoni, and T. Schwetz, JHEP **01**, 106 (2019), 1811.05487.
 - [41] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Rev. **D32**, 3058 (1985).
 - [42] F. Parodi, P. Roudeau, and A. Stocchi, Nuovo Cim. **A112**, 833 (1999), hep-ex/9903063.
 - [43] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
 - [44] Y. Koide, Phys. Lett. **B607**, 123 (2005), hep-ph/0411280.
 - [45] C. Jarlskog, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 1039 (1985).
 - [46] J. D. Vergados, Phys. Rept. **133**, 1 (1986).