

Chiral perturbative analysis for an almost massless neutrino in the type-I seesaw mechanism

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

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

In this paper, we perform chiral perturbative analysis of an approximate lepton number symmetry associated with a sufficiently light neutrino in the type-I seesaw mechanism. For the Dirac mass matrix $m_D = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$, linearly independent components of \mathbf{C} from \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are treated as symmetry-breaking parameters. A deviation in the eigenvector of the massless mode $\delta\mathbf{u}$ occurs in the first-order perturbation and the lightest mass $m_{1\text{ or }3} \propto \det m_D^2/M_3$ emerges in the second-order. By solving the perturbation theory, we obtained specific expressions of $\delta\mathbf{u}$ and $m_{1\text{ or }3}$. As a result, two complex parameters in m_D are bounded to some extent from the eigenvector. These constraints are associated with the chiral symmetry and are not susceptible to renormalization.

I. INTRODUCTION

The type-I seesaw mechanism [1–4] is one of the key subjects in the study of lepton mixing and mass matrix of neutrinos m_ν . While flavor symmetries of m_ν have been actively discussed [5, 6], there are many studies on textures that explore the structure of mass matrices themselves. In particular, in the (constrained) sequential dominance [7–19], the smallness of the lightest neutrino mass $m_{1\text{ or }3}$ is explained by the mass of the heaviest right-handed neutrino M_3 .

A $U(1)_L$ lepton number symmetry is restored in the limit of zero mass for the lightest neutrino [20–22]. Relations between such a massless neutrino and flavor symmetries have also been studied to some extent [23–25]. In particular, Ref. [26] discussed general constraints of this symmetry.

In this paper, we explore slightly broken $U(1)_L$ symmetry by a very light neutrino in the type-I seesaw mechanism. Chiral perturbative analysis for finite $m_{1\text{ or }3}$ shows that two complex parameters of the Dirac mass matrix are bounded to some extent by the eigenvectors of the lightest neutrino mass.

This paper is organized as follows. The next section gives a discussion of the $U(1)_L$ lepton

*Electronic address: mjsyang@mail.saitama-u.ac.jp

number symmetry. In Sec. 3, we discuss a chiral perturbative analysis of m_ν in several methods. The final section is devoted to a summary.

II. THE MASSLESS LIGHTEST NEUTRINO AND $U(1)_L$ LEPTON NUMBER SYMMETRY

In this section, we consider general constraints by the $U(1)_L$ symmetry associated with only one massless neutrino in the type-I seesaw mechanism. A similar analysis exists in Ref. [26]. The Dirac mass matrix m_D and the symmetric Majorana mass matrix M_R of the right-handed neutrinos ν_{Ri} are defined as

$$m_D = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & C_1 \\ A_2 & B_2 & C_2 \\ A_3 & B_3 & C_3 \end{pmatrix} \equiv (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}), \quad M_R = \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & M_{13} \\ M_{12} & M_{22} & M_{23} \\ M_{13} & M_{23} & M_{33} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1)$$

These matrix elements A_i, B_i, C_i and M_{ij} are general complex parameters. In the type-I seesaw mechanism, the mass matrix of light neutrinos m_ν is given by

$$m_\nu = m_D M_R^{-1} m_D^T. \quad (2)$$

To discuss the situation where the lightest neutrino mass $m_{1 \text{ or } 3}$ is very light, we first consider the massless limit $m_{1 \text{ or } 3} = 0$. The singular value decomposition (SVD) of m_ν is defined as

$$m_\nu = U m_\nu^{\text{diag}} U^T \equiv (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}) \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} (\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w})^T, \quad (3)$$

where $\{\mathbf{u}, \mathbf{v}, \mathbf{w}\}$ is a three-dimensional orthonormal basis that constitutes the unitary matrix U .

The massless lightest neutrino $m_{1 \text{ or } 3} = 0$ leads to the normal hierarchy (NH) or the inverted hierarchy (IH), respectively. For example, in the case of $m_1 = 0$, the diagonalized mass matrix m_ν^{diag} has the following $U(1)_L$ lepton number symmetry for the massless mode [22]

$$(m_\nu^{\text{diag}})' = R_1 m_\nu^{\text{diag}} R_1 \equiv \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = m_\nu^{\text{diag}}, \quad (4)$$

where R_1 is a phase matrix. Returning to the basis of original m_ν by U ,

$$U R_1 U^\dagger m_\nu U^* R_1 U^T = m_\nu. \quad (5)$$

This UR_1U^\dagger is a unitary matrix such that

$$UR_1U^\dagger = e^{i\theta}\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}^\dagger + \mathbf{v} \otimes \mathbf{v}^\dagger + \mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{w}^\dagger = 1 - (1 - e^{i\theta})\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}^\dagger. \quad (6)$$

Similarly, for $m_3 = 0$, there is a $U(1)_L$ symmetry by $UR_3U^\dagger = 1 - (1 - e^{i\theta})\mathbf{w} \otimes \mathbf{w}^\dagger$. Since this chiral symmetry is not necessarily a symmetry of the entire theory, it is treated as a kind of remnant symmetry.

The condition that m_ν is invariant under the symmetry can be rewritten as

$$(1 - P + e^{i\theta}P)m_\nu(1 - P + e^{i\theta}P)^T = m_\nu, \quad (7)$$

where $P = \mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}^\dagger$ is a projection to the eigenvector of the massless mode $\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}^{\text{NH}}$ or \mathbf{u}^{IH} . In order for this symmetry to hold for any θ , the following three equations must hold independently;

$$(1 - P)m_\nu(1 - P)^T = m_\nu, \quad (8)$$

$$e^{i\theta}(1 - P)m_\nu P^T + e^{i\theta}Pm_\nu(1 - P)^T = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$e^{2i\theta}Pm_\nu P^T = 0. \quad (10)$$

Since m_ν is a symmetric matrix, the condition $e^{i\theta}(1 - P)m_\nu P^T = 0$ is sufficient for Eq. (9). Adding and subtracting these three conditions lead to

$$(1 - P)m_\nu = m_\nu(1 - P)^T = m_\nu, \quad Pm_\nu = m_\nu P^T = 0. \quad (11)$$

In other words, a massless mode associated with \mathbf{u} appears if m_ν does not have a projective component of this direction. In particular, since \mathbf{u} is not the zero vector $\mathbf{0}$,

$$m_\nu P^T = m_\nu \mathbf{u}^* \otimes \mathbf{u}^T = 0 \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad m_\nu \mathbf{u}^* = \mathbf{0}. \quad (12)$$

In the type-I seesaw mechanism, this condition becomes

$$Pm_D M_R^{-1} m_D^T = m_D M_R^{-1} m_D^T P^T = 0. \quad (13)$$

The existence of M_R^{-1} with $\det M_R \neq 0$ implies $Pm_D = 0$ and $m_D^T \mathbf{u}^* = \mathbf{0}$. That is, m_D also respects the chiral $U(1)$ symmetry due to the left-handed lepton number¹,

$$(1 - P + e^{i\theta}P)m_D = m_D, \quad (14)$$

and m_D has no projection in the eigenvector of zero mode. We will show later that the same condition holds for $\det M_R = 0$.

¹ The anti-symmetry $(1 - P + e^{i\theta}P)m_D = -m_D$ has only the trivial solution $m_D = 0$.

The necessary condition ($Pm_\nu = 0 \Rightarrow Pm_D = 0$) also holds when $\det M_R \neq 0$ is satisfied. By assuming $m_1 = 0$ for simplicity, SVDs of two matrices (with rank two) $m_\nu = Um_\nu^{\text{diag}}U^T$ and $m_D = U_D m_D^{\text{diag}} V_D^\dagger$ lead to

$$U \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} U^T = U_D \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_{D2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_{D3} \end{pmatrix} V_D^\dagger M_R^{-1} V_D^* \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_{D2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_{D3} \end{pmatrix} U_D^T, \quad (15)$$

where $m_{D(2,3)}$ are singular values of m_D . Performing production of matrices between two m_D^{diag} , we obtain

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} = U^\dagger U_D \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * \end{pmatrix} U_D^T U^*, \quad (16)$$

where $*$ denotes any matrix element. Since this is also a SVD of m_ν , $U^\dagger U_D$ must be a unitary transformation of the 2-3 submatrix;

$$U^\dagger U_D = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & * & * \\ 0 & * & * \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

Therefore the eigenvectors of zero modes must be identical, and $Pm_\nu = 0 \Rightarrow Pm_D = 0$ holds. From this, the existence of this chiral symmetry is a necessary and sufficient condition for m_ν and m_D .

This is due to the nature that the left-handed chiral symmetry gives constraints only for m_D and does not depend on M_R [26]. It is easy to show as follows. Since $R_1 = \text{diag}(e^{i\theta}, 1, 1)$ is the generator of the chiral symmetry in the diagonal basis of m_ν , the matrices satisfying $R_1 m_{\nu,D} = m_{\nu,D}$ can be written as

$$m_\nu^{\text{diag}} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ a & b & c \\ d & e & f \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M_{11} & M_{12} & M_{13} \\ M_{12} & M_{22} & M_{23} \\ M_{13} & M_{23} & M_{33} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & d \\ 0 & b & e \\ 0 & c & f \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

with arbitrary parameters $a \sim f$. Although a unitary transformation of M_R changes magnitudes of $a \sim f$, the chiral symmetry is preserved.

The minimal seesaw model [7, 27–29] with $\det M_R = 0$ always has this chiral symmetry, because the limit of $M_{33} \rightarrow \infty$ removes M_{i3} and c, f from the low energy. Specifically, by substituting $M_3 \rightarrow \infty$ or $C_i = 0$ in the natural representation (23), a cross product $\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$ represents the eigenvector of the massless mode and generates the chiral symmetry.

For m_D to satisfy the chiral symmetry (14), it is sufficient to have this subgroup of a chiral Z_2 symmetry with $\theta = \pi$ [30]. If vectors \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are linearly independent,

$$Sm_D = +m_D, \quad S = 1 - 2\mathbf{u} \otimes \mathbf{u}^\dagger, \quad \mathbf{u} \equiv \frac{(\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^*}{|\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}|}. \quad (19)$$

The anti-symmetric condition $Sm_D = -m_D$ is unsuitable because the rank of m_D becomes unity. Such relations between eigenvectors of m_ν and the residual Z_2 symmetry have been well discussed [31–34]. Since it is obvious that this chiral Z_2 symmetry reduces the rank of m_D by one, this symmetry is a necessary and sufficient condition for the massless lightest neutrino².

For example, for approximate eigenvectors of massless modes $\mathbf{u}^{\text{NH}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(2, -1, -1)^T$ and $\mathbf{u}^{\text{IH}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0, 1, -1)^T$, generators of the symmetry S_i are

$$S_1 \equiv 1 - 2\mathbf{u}^{\text{NH}} \otimes (\mathbf{u}^{\text{NH}})^\dagger = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & -1 \\ 2 & -1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad S_3 \equiv 1 - 2\mathbf{u}^{\text{IH}} \otimes (\mathbf{u}^{\text{IH}})^\dagger = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Note that S_3 generates a chiral $\mu - \tau$ symmetry [35–38]. For each of these, matrices m_D with chiral Z_2 symmetry are

$$m_D^{(\text{NH})} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{A_2+A_3}{2} & \frac{B_2+B_3}{2} & \frac{C_2+C_3}{2} \\ A_2 & B_2 & C_2 \\ A_3 & B_3 & C_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad m_D^{(\text{IH})} = \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & C_1 \\ A_2 & B_2 & C_2 \\ A_2 & B_2 & C_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

and the symmetry fix a row of m_D .

Since $m_D^{(\text{NH}, \text{IH})}$ has no $\mathbf{u}^{(\text{NH}, \text{IH})}$ component, these textures can be realized by a linear combination of vacuum expectation values of the following flavons;

$$\langle \phi_1 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle \phi_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \langle \phi_3 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

From this fact, a massless neutrino and a simple unification with an up-type Yukawa matrices $Y_u \sim Y_\nu$ seem incompatible because because m_D with exact chiral Z_2 symmetry have similar sizes of two elements in a certain column.

² One might suspect there exists another solution $Sm_D S_R^\dagger = m_D$ with a symmetry of M_R , $S_R^T M_R S_R = M_R$. However, it does not satisfy the chiral symmetry because $Sm_\nu = Sm_D M_R^{-1} m_D^T = m_D M_R^{-1} S_R^* m_D^T \neq m_\nu$.

III. CHIRAL PERTURBATION THEORY FOR THE LIGHTEST MASS $m_{1 \text{ or } 3}$

The finite lightest mass $m_{1 \text{ or } 3}$ makes Eq. (14) an approximate chiral lepton number symmetry. Then, let us survey how the condition for m_D such as (21) is relaxed by a perturbatively light $m_{1 \text{ or } 3}$, i.e., “chiral perturbation theory” [39] for m_ν .

In the diagonal basis of M_R , the natural representation [40] of the matrix m_ν is

$$m_\nu = m_D M_R^{-1} m_D^T = \frac{1}{M_1} \mathbf{A} \otimes \mathbf{A}^T + \frac{1}{M_2} \mathbf{B} \otimes \mathbf{B}^T + \frac{1}{M_3} \mathbf{C} \otimes \mathbf{C}^T, \quad (23)$$

where M_i are mass singular values of M_R . In well-considered models, there are two possibilities for the massless mode;

1. The limit of $M_3 \rightarrow \infty$.
2. \mathbf{C} is linearly dependent on \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} .

To treat the linear independence of \mathbf{C} from \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} as perturbative parameters, m_D and m_ν are devided as follows;

$$m_D = m_{D0} + \delta m_D \equiv (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}_0) + (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \delta \mathbf{C}), \quad (24)$$

$$(\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^T \mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{A}^\dagger \delta \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{B}^\dagger \delta \mathbf{C} = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_\nu &= (m_{D0} + \delta m_D) M_R^{-1} (m_{D0} + \delta m_D)^T \equiv m_{\nu 0} + \delta m_\nu + \delta^2 m_\nu \\ &\equiv m_{D0} M_R^{-1} m_{D0}^T + \frac{1}{M_3} (\mathbf{C}_0 \otimes \delta \mathbf{C}^T + \delta \mathbf{C} \otimes \mathbf{C}_0^T) + \frac{1}{M_3} \delta \mathbf{C} \otimes \delta \mathbf{C}^T. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

In Eq. (25), note that \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} and $(\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^*$ form a basis under the Hermitian inner product. Although other parameterizations of the breaking are possible, the expression is significant because the inverse of the heaviest mass M_3^{-1} is associated with the parameters and we can use the fact that \mathbf{C} is hierarchical ($|C_3| \gg |C_{1,2}|$) in many models.

The unitary matrix U that diagonalizes m_ν is divided as

$$U = U_0 + \delta U \equiv (\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{w}_0) + (\delta \mathbf{u}, \delta \mathbf{v}, \delta \mathbf{w}), \quad (27)$$

where $\mathbf{u}_0 \propto (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^*$ and $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{w}_0$ are linear combinations of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} . The second-order perturbation $\delta^2 U$ is not considered because it does not contribute to the lowest-order calculation.

By considering NH for simplicity, m_ν in the basis of diagonalizing $m_{\nu 0}$ is

$$U_0^\dagger m_\nu U_0^* = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{M_3} \begin{pmatrix} C_u^2 & C_u C_v & C_u C_w \\ C_u C_v & 0 & 0 \\ C_u C_w & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

where $C_u \equiv \mathbf{u}_0^\dagger \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{u}_0^\dagger \delta \mathbf{C}$ and $C_v \equiv \mathbf{v}_0^\dagger \mathbf{C} = \mathbf{v}_0^\dagger \mathbf{C}_0$ by Eq. (25). A similar notation is used for \mathbf{w}_0 . The parameter C_u represents a magnitude of chiral perturbation because $C_u \propto (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^T \mathbf{C} = \det m_D$. Thus, the change of eigenvector $\delta \mathbf{u}$ is a first-order perturbation, and the lightest mass value m_1 arises from a second-order perturbation. The detailed calculation is found in the appendix.

What needs to be investigated is how the constraints such as (21) are shifted by the chiral symmetry breaking. For example, the deviation $\delta \mathbf{u}$ for the massless eigenvector $\mathbf{u}_0^* \propto \mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B}$ is evaluated as follows. Performing a further diagonalization for Eq. (28), we obtain the deviation from the non-perturbed unitary matrix U_0 as

$$1 + U_0 \delta U^\dagger \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\frac{C_u C_v}{m_2 M_3} & -\frac{C_u C_w}{m_3 M_3} \\ \frac{C_u C_v}{m_2 M_3} & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{C_u C_w}{m_3 M_3} & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} = 1 + \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{u}_0 & \mathbf{v}_0 & \mathbf{w}_0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \delta \mathbf{u}^\dagger \\ \delta \mathbf{v}^\dagger \\ \delta \mathbf{w}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

$$\mathbf{v}_0^\dagger \delta \mathbf{u} = -\frac{C_u^* C_v^*}{m_2 M_3}, \quad \mathbf{w}_0^\dagger \delta \mathbf{u} = -\frac{C_u^* C_w^*}{m_3 M_3}. \quad (30)$$

This evaluation is also obtained by substituting $j = 1$ and the unperturbed lightest mass $m_{01} = 0$ into the expression (A11) of the SVD.

We estimate approximate magnitudes of these parameters. Since the elements $(m_{\nu 0})_{22}$ and $(m_{\nu 0})_{33}$ have terms C_v^2/M_3 and C_w^2/M_3 , C_v and C_w have upper bound about $\sqrt{m_2 M_3}$ and $\sqrt{m_3 M_3}$ if there is no fine-tuning between the sums in $m_{\nu 0}$. Since we will see later $C_u \sim \sqrt{m_1 M_3}$, the perturbations in Eq. (29) are suppressed by at least $\sqrt{m_1/m_2}$ and $\sqrt{m_1/m_3}$ respectively.

The constraint for m_D (21) is changed by the perturbed eigenvector of the lightest mode. For simplicity, let U_0 be the tri-bi-maximal mixing [41] and ignore the contribution of $\mathbf{w}_0^\dagger \delta \mathbf{u}$ in Eq. (30) by $m_3 \sim 6 m_2$. The eigenvector \mathbf{u} actually observed is

$$\mathbf{u} = \mathbf{u}_0 + \delta \mathbf{u} \simeq \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix} 2 \\ -1 \\ -1 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{C_u^* C_v^*}{m_2 M_3} \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (31)$$

Conversely this means that \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} have \mathbf{u} components that are suppressed by at least $O(\sqrt{m_1/m_2})$;

$$\mathbf{u}^\dagger \mathbf{A} \simeq -\frac{C_u C_v}{m_2 M_3} \mathbf{v}^\dagger \mathbf{A}, \quad \mathbf{u}^\dagger \mathbf{B} \simeq -\frac{C_u C_v}{m_2 M_3} \mathbf{v}^\dagger \mathbf{B}. \quad (32)$$

Next, the lightest mass m_1 is found to be Eq. (A17) from the detailed calculation of the second-order perturbation;

$$m_1 = \left| \frac{C_u^2}{M_3} \left(1 - \frac{C_v^2}{m_2} - \frac{C_w^2}{m_3} \right) \right|. \quad (33)$$

Intuitively, Eq. (33) agrees with an approximate evaluation of the perturbative contribution like the seesaw mechanism in Eq (28). A relation $C_u \sim \sqrt{m_1 M_3}$ holds because C_v and C_w has an upper bound around $\sqrt{m_2 M_3}$ and $\sqrt{m_3 M_3}$. In particular, m_1 is proportional to $\det m_D^2/M_3$ because of $C_u = \mathbf{u}_0^\dagger \mathbf{C} \propto \det m_D$.

Moreover, $|C_{1,2}| \ll |C_3|$ is expected in many unified theories. If mixings in U_0 are as large as the MNS matrix in this hierarchical basis, a rough expression $\mathbf{C} \sim (0, 0, 1)^T$ leads to $|C_u| \sim |C_v| \sim |C_w| \sim \sqrt{m_1 M_3}$. Therefore, m_1 in Eq. (33) is approximately equal to the first term $|C_u^2/M_3|$ and the order of $\delta \mathbf{u}$ in Eq. (30) is reduced to $m_1/m_{2,3}$ instead of $\sqrt{m_1/m_{2,3}}$. Conditions that perturbations are sufficiently small in such a model is

$$m_1^{\text{NH}} \lesssim 1 \text{ meV}, \quad m_3^{\text{IH}} \lesssim 5 \text{ meV}. \quad (34)$$

In this case, corrections (32) to the constraints for the Dirac mass matrix (21) is about 10% or less for the lighter (the first and second) generations.

In such models with large $C_3 = (m_D)_{33}$, although the lepton number symmetry (7) and chiral symmetry (14) are largely broken, there still remains a partial chiral (Z_2) symmetry [42] such that

$$S m_D P_3 = +m_D P_3, \quad P_3 \equiv \text{diag}(1, 1, 0). \quad (35)$$

Equivalently, for $\mathbf{u}^{\text{NH}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(2, -1, -1)^T$ and $\mathbf{u}^{\text{IH}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(0, 1, -1)^T$, the constraints are

$$m_D^{(\text{NH})} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \frac{A_2+A_3}{2} & \frac{B_2+B_3}{2} & C_1 \\ A_2 & B_2 & C_2 \\ A_3 & B_3 & C_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad m_D^{(\text{IH})} \simeq \begin{pmatrix} A_1 & B_1 & C_1 \\ A_2 & B_2 & C_2 \\ A_2 & B_2 & C_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

Since \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} must be approximately orthogonal to the eigenvectors of the massless mode, two complex parameters in the lighter generations are constrained.

Finally, such (partial) chiral symmetries are hardly renormalized and retained good symmetries [43]. This property holds as long as a renormalization group equation of a Yukawa matrix Y_ν is proportional to the Yukawa itself $dY_\nu/dt \propto Y_\nu \simeq S Y_\nu$.

IV. SUMMARY

In this paper, we perform chiral perturbative analysis of an approximate lepton number symmetry associated with a sufficiently light neutrino in the type-I seesaw mechanism. For the Dirac mass matrix $m_D = (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C})$, linearly independent components of \mathbf{C} from \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} are

treated as symmetry-breaking parameters. A deviation in the eigenvector of the massless mode $\delta\mathbf{u}$ occurs in the first-order perturbation and the lightest mass $m_{1\text{ or }3} \propto \det m_D^2/M_3$ emerges in the second-order. By solving the perturbation theory, we obtained specific expressions of $\delta\mathbf{u}$ and $m_{1\text{ or }3}$.

If m_D satisfies the hierarchy $|(m_D)_{13}|, |(m_D)_{23}| \ll |(m_D)_{33}|$ and the diagonalization of the mass matrix of light neutrinos m_ν has large mixing in this hierarchical basis, the order of $\delta\mathbf{u}$ is reduced to $m_{1\text{ or }3}/m_2$. Thus the perturbative description works well for $m_1^{\text{NH}} \lesssim 1\text{ meV}$, $m_3^{\text{IH}} \lesssim 5\text{ meV}$. As a result, in the type-I seesaw mechanism with a hierarchical Dirac mass matrix, flavor structures of the lighter generation are approximately orthogonal to the eigenvector of the lightest neutrino, and two complex parameters for m_D are constrained from the eigenvector.

Acknowledgment

This study is financially supported by JSPS Grants-in-Aid for Scientific Research No. JP18H01210 and MEXT KAKENHI Grant No. JP18H05543.

Appendix A: Detailed calculation of chiral perturbation theory

This section shows a detailed calculation of the chiral perturbation for the SVD of m_ν . If the three neutrino masses m_i are finite, \mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B} and \mathbf{C} are linearly independent. To treat this linear independence of m_D as perturbations, m_D and m_ν (23) can be divided as follows;

$$m_D = m_{D0} + \delta m_D \equiv (\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{B}, \mathbf{C}_0) + (\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{0}, \delta\mathbf{C}), \quad (\text{A1})$$

$$(\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^T \mathbf{C}_0 = \mathbf{A}^\dagger \delta\mathbf{C} = \mathbf{B}^\dagger \delta\mathbf{C} = 0, \quad (\text{A2})$$

$$\begin{aligned} m_\nu &= (m_{D0} + \delta m_D) M_R^{-1} (m_{D0} + \delta m_D)^T \equiv m_{\nu 0} + \delta m_\nu + \delta^2 m_\nu \\ &\equiv m_{D0} M_R^{-1} m_{D0}^T + \frac{1}{M_3} (\mathbf{C}_0 \otimes \delta\mathbf{C}^T + \delta\mathbf{C} \otimes \mathbf{C}_0^T) + \frac{1}{M_3} \delta\mathbf{C} \otimes \delta\mathbf{C}^T. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A3})$$

It is reasonable to treat $\delta\mathbf{C}$ as symmetry-breaking parameters because $\det m_D = (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^T \delta\mathbf{C}$ holds.

The unitary matrix U that diagonalizes m_ν is divided as

$$U = U_0 + \delta U \equiv (\mathbf{u}_0, \mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{w}_0) + (\delta\mathbf{u}, \delta\mathbf{v}, \delta\mathbf{w}), \quad (\text{A4})$$

where $\mathbf{u}_0 \propto (\mathbf{A} \times \mathbf{B})^*$ and $\mathbf{v}_0, \mathbf{w}_0$ are linear combinations of \mathbf{A} and \mathbf{B} . The second-order perturbation $\delta^2 U$ is not considered because it does not contribute to the lowest-order calculation³.

³ Even if we consider $\delta^2 U$, terms like $U_0 m_{\nu 0} \delta^2 U$ do not contribute to $(\delta^2 m_\nu^{\text{diag}})_{11}$.

The SVDs are given by

$$U_0^\dagger m_{\nu 0} U_0^* = m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}}, \quad U^\dagger m_\nu U^* = m_\nu^{\text{diag}} = m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} + \delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}} + \delta^2 m_\nu^{\text{diag}}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

The diagonalization of the first-order perturbation to $m_\nu m_\nu^\dagger$ is

$$(U_0 + \delta U)^\dagger (m_{\nu 0} + \delta m_\nu) (m_{\nu 0}^\dagger + \delta m_\nu^\dagger) (U_0 + \delta U) = (m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}})^2 + 2m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} \delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}} + (\delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}})^2. \quad (\text{A6})$$

By using the diagonalization (A5) and the orthogonality relation $\delta U^\dagger U_0 + U_0^\dagger \delta U = 0$,

$$U_0^\dagger m_{\nu 0} m_{\nu 0}^\dagger \delta U + \delta U^\dagger m_{\nu 0} m_{\nu 0}^\dagger U_0 + U_0^\dagger m_{\nu 0} \delta m_\nu^\dagger U_0 + U_0^\dagger \delta m_\nu m_{\nu 0}^\dagger U_0 = 2m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} \delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$= - (m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}})^2 \delta U^\dagger U_0 + \delta U^\dagger U_0 (m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}})^2 + m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} U_0^T \delta m_\nu^\dagger U_0 + U_0^\dagger \delta m_\nu U_0^* m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

For the diagonal element of Eq. (A8),

$$(U_0^T \delta m_\nu^\dagger U_0 + U_0^\dagger \delta m_\nu U_0^*)_{ii} = 2(\delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}})_{ii}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

In particular, $(\delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}})_{11} = 0$ holds, and the lightest mass occurs in the second-order perturbation. For the off-diagonal elements of Eq. (A8) with $i \neq j$,

$$-m_{0i}^2 (\delta U^\dagger U_0)_{ij} + (\delta U^\dagger U_0)_{ij} m_{0j}^2 + m_{0i} (U_0^T \delta m_\nu^\dagger U_0)_{ij} + (U_0^\dagger \delta m_\nu U_0^*)_{ij} m_{0j} = 0_{ij}, \quad (\text{A10})$$

where $m_{0i} = (m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}})_i$. Thus, we obtain

$$(U_0^\dagger \delta U)_{ij} = - \frac{m_{0i} (U_0^T \delta m_\nu^\dagger U_0)_{ij} + (U_0^\dagger \delta m_\nu U_0^*)_{ij} m_{0j}}{m_{0i}^2 - m_{0j}^2}. \quad (\text{A11})$$

From $U_0^\dagger (U_0 + \delta U) = 1 + U_0^\dagger \delta U$, it represents a perturbative transformation in the diagonalized basis of $m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}}$.

Next, to estimate the lightest mass $m_{1 \text{ or } 3}$, the perturbation theory proceeds to the second order. For simplicity, we directly consider a diagonalization of m_ν instead of $m_\nu m_\nu^\dagger$;

$$(U_0 + \delta U)^\dagger (m_{\nu 0} + \delta m_\nu + \delta^2 m_\nu) (U_0 + \delta U)^* = m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} + \delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}} + \delta^2 m_\nu^{\text{diag}}, \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$\delta U^\dagger m_{\nu 0} U_0^* + U_0^\dagger \delta m_\nu U_0^* + U_0^\dagger m_{\nu 0} \delta U^* = \delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}}, \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$U_0^\dagger \delta^2 m_\nu U_0^* + U_0^\dagger \delta m_\nu \delta U^* + \delta U^\dagger m_{\nu 0} \delta U^* + \delta U^\dagger \delta m_\nu U_0^* = \delta^2 m_\nu^{\text{diag}}. \quad (\text{A14})$$

The sum of Eq. (A13) and its complex conjugate is equivalent to Eqs. (A9). By substituting Eq. (A13) into Eq. (A14) and eliminating δm_ν ,

$$\begin{aligned} & U_0^\dagger \delta^2 m_\nu U_0^* + (\delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}} - m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} U_0^T \delta U^*) U_0^T \delta U^* \\ & - \delta U^\dagger U_0 m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} U_0^T \delta U^* + \delta U^\dagger U_0 (\delta m_\nu^{\text{diag}} - \delta U^\dagger U_0 m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}}) = \delta^2 m_\nu^{\text{diag}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A15})$$

Substituting $(m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}})_{11} = (\delta m_{\nu}^{\text{diag}})_{11} = 0$ to the 1-1 element, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &= (U_0^\dagger \delta^2 m_{\nu} U_0^* - \delta U^\dagger U_0 m_{\nu 0}^{\text{diag}} U_0^T \delta U^*)_{11} \\ &= (U_0^\dagger \delta^2 m_{\nu} U_0^*)_{11} - \sum_i \frac{(U_0^\dagger \delta m_{\nu} U_0^*)_{1i}}{m_{0i}} m_{0i} \frac{(U_0^\dagger \delta m_{\nu} U_0^*)_{1i}}{m_{0i}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A16})$$

Finally, δm_{ν} and $\delta^2 m_{\nu}$ in Eq. (A3) yields $(U_0^\dagger \delta m_{\nu} U_0^*)_{1i} = \frac{1}{M_3} (\mathbf{u}_0^\dagger \delta \mathbf{C}) \cdot (\mathbf{C}_0^T (\mathbf{u}_0^*, \mathbf{v}_0^*, \mathbf{w}_0^*))_i$ and the lightest mass is found to be

$$m_1 = \frac{C_u^2}{M_3} \left(1 - \frac{C_v^2}{m_{02}} - \frac{C_w^2}{m_{03}} \right). \quad (\text{A17})$$

The subscript 1 is due to the fact that \mathbf{u}_0 was specified as the first column, and it is also valid for IH by a rearrangement to the third column. The lightest singular value will be the absolute value of this expression because the phase can be eliminated by redefining the basis (Eq. (A9) is the form of conjugate addition because it is a correction to finite singular values. The absolute value should be taken for m_1 since this is the leading term).

-
- [1] P. Minkowski, Phys. Lett. **67B**, 421 (1977).
 - [2] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, Conf. Proc. **C790927**, 315 (1979).
 - [3] T. Yanagida, Conf. Proc. **C7902131**, 95 (1979).
 - [4] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
 - [5] H. Ishimori *et al.*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **183**, 1 (2010), arXiv:1003.3552.
 - [6] Z.-z. Xing and Z.-h. Zhao, Rept. Prog. Phys. **79**, 076201 (2016), arXiv:1512.04207.
 - [7] S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **439**, 350 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9806440.
 - [8] S. F. King, Nucl. Phys. B **562**, 57 (1999), arXiv:hep-ph/9904210.
 - [9] S. F. King, Nucl. Phys. B **576**, 85 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9912492.
 - [10] S. F. King, JHEP **09**, 011 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0204360.
 - [11] S. Antusch and S. F. King, New J. Phys. **6**, 110 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0405272.
 - [12] S. Antusch and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **591**, 104 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0403053.
 - [13] S. Antusch, S. F. King, and A. Riotto, JCAP **11**, 011 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0609038.
 - [14] S. Antusch, S. Boudjemaa, and S. F. King, JHEP **09**, 096 (2010), arXiv:1003.5498.
 - [15] S. F. King, JHEP **08**, 105 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0506297.
 - [16] S. Antusch and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **659**, 640 (2008), arXiv:0709.0666.
 - [17] S. Antusch, S. F. King, C. Luhn, and M. Spinrath, Nucl. Phys. B **856**, 328 (2012), arXiv:1108.4278.
 - [18] S. Antusch, S. F. King, and M. Spinrath, Phys. Rev. D **87**, 096018 (2013), arXiv:1301.6764.
 - [19] F. Björkeröth and S. F. King, J. Phys. G **42**, 125002 (2015), arXiv:1412.6996.
 - [20] D. Wyler and L. Wolfenstein, Nucl. Phys. B **218**, 205 (1983).

- [21] S. T. Petcov and S. T. Toshev, Phys. Lett. B **143**, 175 (1984).
- [22] G. C. Branco, W. Grimus, and L. Lavoura, Nucl. Phys. B **312**, 492 (1989).
- [23] A. S. Joshipura and K. M. Patel, Phys. Lett. B **727**, 480 (2013), arXiv:1306.1890.
- [24] A. S. Joshipura and K. M. Patel, JHEP **04**, 009 (2014), arXiv:1401.6397.
- [25] S. F. King and P. O. Ludl, JHEP **06**, 147 (2016), arXiv:1605.01683.
- [26] R. Adhikari and A. Raychaudhuri, Phys. Rev. D **84**, 033002 (2011), arXiv:1004.5111.
- [27] E. Ma, D. P. Roy, and U. Sarkar, Phys. Lett. B **444**, 391 (1998), arXiv:hep-ph/9810309.
- [28] P. H. Frampton, S. L. Glashow, and T. Yanagida, Phys. Lett. B **548**, 119 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0208157.
- [29] Z.-z. Xing and Z.-h. Zhao, Rept. Prog. Phys. **84**, 066201 (2021), arXiv:2008.12090.
- [30] M. J. S. Yang, Nucl. Phys. B **982**, 115893 (2022), arXiv:2204.08607.
- [31] C. S. Lam, Phys. Lett. **B640**, 260 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0606220.
- [32] C. S. Lam, Phys. Rev. D **74**, 113004 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0611017.
- [33] C. S. Lam, Phys. Lett. B **656**, 193 (2007), arXiv:0708.3665.
- [34] C. S. Lam, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 121602 (2008), arXiv:0804.2622.
- [35] T. Fukuyama and H. Nishiura, (1997), arXiv:hep-ph/9702253.
- [36] C. S. Lam, Phys. Lett. **B507**, 214 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0104116.
- [37] E. Ma and M. Raidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 011802 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0102255, [Erratum: Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 159901 (2001)].
- [38] K. R. S. Balaji, W. Grimus, and T. Schwetz, Phys. Lett. **B508**, 301 (2001), arXiv:hep-ph/0104035.
- [39] J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, Nucl. Phys. B **250**, 465 (1985).
- [40] V. Barger, D. A. Dicus, H.-J. He, and T.-j. Li, Phys. Lett. B **583**, 173 (2004), arXiv:hep-ph/0310278.
- [41] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins, and W. G. Scott, Phys. Lett. **B530**, 167 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0202074.
- [42] M. J. S. Yang, (2022), arXiv:2208.10000.
- [43] G. 't Hooft, NATO Adv. Study Inst. Ser. B Phys. **59**, 135 (1980).