

New parameterization and analysis for E6 inspired 331 model

Rena Çiftçi^a

*Department of Physics, Faculty of Science,
Ege University, 35040 Bornova, Izmir, Türkiye*

Abbas Kenan Çiftçi^b

*Department of Physics, Faculty of Arts and Sciences,
Izmir University of Economics, 35330 Balçova, Izmir, Türkiye*

Oleg Popov^c

*Department of Biology, Shenzhen MSU-BIT University,
1, International University Park Road, Shenzhen 518172, China and
Department of Physics, Korea Advanced Institute of Science and Technology,
291 Daehak-ro, Yuseong-gu, Daejeon 34141, Republic of Korea*

(Dated: December 1, 2022)

Abstract

We present a new parameterization for $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times U(1)_X$ extension of the Standard Model, which is inspired by E_6 symmetry. New setup predicts all Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa mixing angles and quark masses, total of nine observable variables, within 1-3 standard deviations of the experimental values with a minimum number of input parameters. A detailed numerical analysis and correlations between input parameters and predicted quantities are presented. The best global fit benchmark point corresponds to $\chi^2 \approx 0.7$ with $\forall \sigma < 0.6$. Advantages of the new parameterization and future prospects are discussed as well.

Keywords: 331 model, quark mass, CKM, mixing, parameterization, E6

^a rena.ciftci@ege.edu.tr

^b kenan.ciftci@ieu.edu.tr

^c opopo001@ucr.edu, Corresponding author.

CONTENTS		
I. Introduction	2	IV. Numerical analysis 12
II. 331 Model	5	V. Results 15
A. Quark content of Variant-A	5	VI. Discussion 19
B. Higgs and New Gauge Bosons	6	VII. Conclusion 20
C. Democratic Approach to the Quark Sector of 331 Model	8	Acknowledgments 20
III. Model Parameterization	10	References 21

I. INTRODUCTION

In spite of its effectiveness in accurately explaining electromagnetic, strong and weak interactions, the Standard Model (SM) has significant unresolved issues, such as the large mass spectrum and hierarchy of fermions, the small quark mixing angles, the existence of three fermion families, CP violation, the origin of neutrino masses, dark matter etc. Many extensions of SM, have been investigated to address some of these issues. The so-called 331 models are one of the simplest extensions, which modify electroweak gauge group of SM from $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$ to a $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ symmetry (331, hereafter). At the beginning, these models were presented as a natural explanation for the observed number of fermion families in nature. Various variants of the 331 model have been studied in detail to date. This model can be made anomaly-free in various ways. The 331 model can be made anomaly-free within the family as in the SM, or in other variants, it can be made anomaly-free by using all 3 families. The second approach is very attractive as it may be a natural explanation for the number of families being 3 in the SM.

331 based model has been focus of many studies and motivated by solving problems in various phenomenological applications. For instance, works on 331 model have been applied in the flavour physics [1–4], neutrino mass generation [5, 6], and other phenomenological issues [7–16]. Furthermore, in view of the well known W boson mass anomaly, which was reported recently by the Collider Detector at Fermilab (CDF) Collaboration taken at Tevatron particle accelerator [17], possible connection between W mass anomaly and the super-symmetric variation of the 331 model was examined [18]. For recent works on 331 models please refer to [19–22]. On the other hand, 331 based models can be viewed as a precursor to grand unification models at high energy scales [23–25]. Finally, 3311 model,

which is an extended variation of the 331 model, has been investigated in conjunction with dark matter candidates and neutrino mass generation mechanism [26–29].

The mass spectrum and the mixing of quarks are one of important unsolved problems of the particle physics. Experimental values of quark masses at the scale of mass of Z boson are listed as $m_d = 2.67 \pm 0.19$ MeV, $m_s = 53.16 \pm 4.61$ MeV, $m_b = 2.839 \pm 0.026$ GeV, $m_u = 1.23 \pm 0.21$ MeV, $m_c = 620 \pm 17$ MeV, $m_t = 168.26 \pm 0.75$ GeV [30], whereas masses in ref. [31] are given at different scales. Experimental limits [30] at $M_Z = 91.1876$ GeV scale of Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mixing matrix is

$$V_{\text{CKM}}^W = \begin{pmatrix} |V_{ud}| & |V_{us}| & |V_{ub}| \\ |V_{cd}| & |V_{cs}| & |V_{cb}| \\ |V_{td}| & |V_{ts}| & |V_{tb}| \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.97401 \pm 0.00011 & 0.22650 \pm 0.00048 & 0.00361^{+0.00011}_{-0.00009} \\ 0.22636 \pm 0.00048 & 0.97320 \pm 0.00011 & 0.04053^{+0.00083}_{-0.00061} \\ 0.00854^{+0.00023}_{-0.00016} & 0.03978^{+0.00082}_{-0.00060} & 0.999172^{+0.000024}_{-0.000035} \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

There are number of attempts to explain masses and relation of CKM matrix elements to them. Somehow parameterization of CKM quark and Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) neutrino mixing matrices have always been very intriguing problems of the particle physics. For example, Wolfenstein parameterization and its various extensions [32, 33] have gotten some attention. Triminimal and tribimaximal approaches have been also very popular parameterization methods [32–36]. Number of particle physicists used exponential [32, 33], recursive [37], re-phasing invariants [38] parameterizations and unified parameterization of quarks and lepton matrices [36, 39] also parameterization involving eigenvalues [40] can be listed for the mixing matrix parameterization. However, this incomplete list of parameterizations does not try to solve mixing in conjunction with mass hierarchy. Recent work on CKM and PMNS parametrization is given in Ref. [41].

The Democratic Mass Matrix (DMM) approach has been proposed mainly by H. Fritzsch [42–46] for the SM. In this approach, all quarks with the same quantum number behave equally under weak interaction in the up and down sectors and they are indistinguishable before the symmetry breaking:

$$\mathcal{M}_u^0 = h_u \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

and

$$\mathcal{M}_d^0 = h_d \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

Since there is only one Higgs field in the SM, $h_u = h_d$ is expected. In this case, it is naturally expected that $m_b \cong m_t$. The reason why the masses of these quarks are not close to each other, and therefore the wrong answer of the above mass matrix approach, which is so natural, may be due to the fact that the SM is not the last and most basic theory. To circumvent this, it was proposed to extend the SM to 4 families [47–51]. As can be easily seen in this model, the mass difference between the t and b quarks can be explained inherently. However, ATLAS and CMS data excluded the 4th family [52, 53]. Although the 4th family vector quark is not excluded by the experimental data, this deviates from the V-A theory, the natural approach of the SM.

In this paper, we will apply the DMM scheme to the anomaly-free 331 model for a single family because it is closer to the SM approach. 331 model being among the subgroups of E_6 [54–56] grand unification theory is another advantage of this model. One of the most important features of the E_6 inspired 331 model is the prediction of 3 different Higgs fields. This means that the up quark and the down quark interact with different Higgs fields. The last Higgs contributes to the mass of the heavy isosinglet quarks. With the DMM scheme it will shown that the quark masses and the CKM mixing angles of the SM can be obtained naturally in agreement with the most recent experimental data.

The extension of the $SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ flavor group with possible fermion and Higgs-boson representations has been investigated [57]. Some have studied these extensions as indistinguishable duplicates of a family as in SM [54, 58–70], while others have looked at them as a multi-family construct [8, 71–79] and implying a natural solution to the problem of SM fermion family number [7, 11, 80–82]. Many models lead to gauge anomalies [70, 83, 84], flavor-changing neutral currents [54, 59, 60, 62, 63, 65, 66, 69], right-handed currents at low scales [69], violation of quark-lepton universality [58, 65, 66, 85, 86], and flavour anomalies [2]. For instance, some models studied in Ref. [8, 71, 73–79] lead to physical inconsistencies which rule them out. Meanwhile, these is in agreement with the SM phenomenology, with the 3 quark and 3 lepton families, and the anomaly of the model is eliminated by the addition of quarks carrying exotic electric charges. The model in Ref. [7, 11, 80–82] is also three-

family and is in agreement with low energy phenomenology, but does not contain exotic electrically charged fermions. In this study, the quark sector of well known E_6 inspired $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ model is considered. It can be renamed in short as Variant-A of 331 model. Details of this variant are given in Ref. [87].

In this work, the Variant-A of 331 model is investigated in the light of DMM. The structure of the paper is as follows: Section II introduces 331 model and its variations. The quark content of the Variant-A is presented. Then, definition of the Higgs fields and new gauge bosons of the model, charged and neutral currents are given. DMM approach is applied to the Variant-A of 331 model. In section III, new parameterization of the Variant-A is defined. Numerical analysis, obtained correlation plots, are presented in Section IV. Section V contains the results of the analysis, more specifically the input parameters and obtained observable variables for the three most relevant and important benchmark points. Section VI discusses the features and prospects of the obtained results. Finally, Section VII concludes the work.

II. 331 MODEL

As mentioned earlier, $SU(3)_C \otimes SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ model is one of the minimal extensions of SM. Various sub-models of this model studied earlier [87] contain no exotic electrically charged particles. Two types of these models are variants (A and B) [88, 89] that have no triangle anomalies in one family, and the other two are variants (C and D) [7, 72, 73, 81] that have no triangle anomalies in three families. In three-family models, one has different quantum numbers from the other twos. Here the electroweak gauge group is supposed to be $SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X \supset SU(2)_L \otimes U(1)_Y$. It is also assumed that left-handed quarks (color triplets) and left-handed leptons (color singlets) transform under the two basic representations of $SU(3)_L$ (3 and 3^*). The gauge boson sector is identical in all models, but they may diverge in their quark and lepton contents and scalar sector. In this paper, quark sector of Variant-A of one family model is considered.

A. Quark content of Variant-A

The quark structure for this model [87] is as following

$$Q_L^\alpha = \begin{pmatrix} u_\alpha \\ d_\alpha \\ D_\alpha \end{pmatrix}_L \quad u_{\alpha L}^c \quad d_{\alpha L}^c \quad D_{\alpha L}^c, \quad (4)$$

$$\{3, 3, 0\} \quad \{3^*, 1, -\frac{2}{3}\} \quad \{3^*, 1, \frac{1}{3}\} \quad \{3^*, 1, \frac{1}{3}\}$$

where $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ correspond to the three families. Numbers in parenthesis refer to $(SU(3)_C, SU(3)_L, U(1)_X)$ quantum numbers, where X arising in the electric charge generators of the gauge group is defined as

$$Q = \frac{1}{2}\lambda_{3L} + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{3}}\lambda_{8L} + XI_3, \quad (5)$$

where λ_{iL} ($i = 1, \dots, 8$) are Gell-Mann matrices for $SU(3)_L$ and I_3 is 3-dimensional identity matrix.

B. Higgs and New Gauge Bosons

Model contains three Higgs fields, which are $(\phi_1^-, \phi_1^0, \phi_1'^0)$, $(\phi_2^-, \phi_2^0, \phi_2'^0)$ and $(\phi_3^0, \phi_3^+, \phi_3'^+)$. Vacuum Expectation Values (VEV) of Higgs fields are the following:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \phi_1 \rangle &= (0, 0, M)^T, \\ \langle \phi_2 \rangle &= (0, \frac{\eta}{\sqrt{2}}, 0)^T, \\ \langle \phi_3 \rangle &= (\frac{\eta'}{\sqrt{2}}, 0, 0)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\eta \sim 250$ GeV ($\eta' = \eta$ can be taken for simplicity).

In addition, this model has a total of 17 gauge bosons. One of the gauge fields is the gauge boson associated with $U(1)_X$. 8 of them are $SU(3)_C$ associated gauge bosons. The gauge fields of the electroweak sector can be listed as W^\pm , K^\pm , K^0 and \bar{K}^0 with mass for charged currents, and Z and Z' for the neutral currents, which are also massive and uncharged. The masses of the new bosons are proportionate to the symmetry breaking scale of the model, in the order of a few TeV. The masses of the gauge bosons of the electroweak sector can be

found using the following expressions:

$$m_{W^\pm}^2 = \frac{g^2}{4}(\eta^2 + \eta'^2), \quad (7a)$$

$$m_Z^2 = \frac{m_{W^\pm}^2}{C_W^2}, \quad (7b)$$

$$m_{K^\pm}^2 = \frac{g^2}{4}(2M^2 + \eta'^2), \quad (7c)$$

$$m_{K^0(\bar{K}^0)}^2 = \frac{g^2}{4}(2M^2 + \eta^2), \quad (7d)$$

$$m_{Z'}^2 = \frac{g^2}{4(3 - 4S_W^2)} \left[8C_W^2 M^2 + \frac{\eta^2}{C_W^2} + \frac{\eta^2(1 - 2S_W^2)^2}{C_W^2} \right]. \quad (7e)$$

where C_W and S_W are the cosine and sine of the electroweak mixing angle respectively with experimental value of $S_W^2 = 0.23122$. It should be emphasized that in addition to the SM, there are five new gauge bosons, which may lie within the detection limits of the Large Hadron Collider (LHC), as we assume their masses to be in the order of a few TeV. Limitations on the masses of these particles have been identified by the absence of certain types of expected events [31]. By using last ATLAS [90] and CMS data [91], a new and restrictive constraint on the mass of the Z' boson was found to be $M_{Z'} > 5.1$ TeV and $M_{Z'} > 4.6$ TeV at 95% CL, respectively.

In fact, the common feature of many models obtained by extending the SM is the participation of extra heavy gauge bosons [31], the charged ones usually denoted by W' . In the LHC, W' bosons would be observed through production of fermion or electroweak boson pairs resonantly. The most extensively considered signature contains a high-energy electron or muon and large lost transverse energy. Assuming that these new bosons couple with fermions in the SM, restrictive constraints on the mass of W' are obtained as $M_{W'} > 6$ TeV at 95% CL [92]. Although this limitation does not directly apply to our model, it gives a sense of the masses of the K^\pm and K^0 bosons.

Charged currents in this model are as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{CC} = & -\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \left[\bar{\nu}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu e_L^\alpha W_\mu^+ + \bar{N}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu e_L^\alpha K_\mu^+ + \bar{\nu}_L^\alpha \gamma^\mu N_L^\alpha K_\mu^0 + \bar{u}_{\alpha L} \gamma^\mu d_{\alpha L} W_\mu^+ \right. \\ & \left. + \bar{u}_{\alpha L} \gamma^\mu D_{\alpha L} K_\mu^+ - \bar{D}_{\alpha L} \gamma^\mu d_{\alpha L} K_\mu^0 + \text{h.c.} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

and neutral currents are given by

$$\mathcal{L}^{NC} = -\frac{g}{2CW} \sum_f [\bar{f} \gamma^\mu (g'_V + g'_A \gamma^5) f Z'_\mu], \quad (9)$$

where f represents leptons and quarks; g , g'_V , and g'_A are the coupling constants of $SU(3)_L$.

As can be seen from the above expressions, K^+ and K^- gauge bosons provide transitions between up sector quarks and new isosinglet D quarks, while K^0 and \bar{K}^0 gauge bosons mediate the interactions of SM down sector quarks and new isosinglet quarks.

C. Democratic Approach to the Quark Sector of 331 Model

The democratic mass matrix (DMM) approach was developed by H. Harari and H. Fritzsch [42–46] to solve the mass hierarchy and mixings’ problems, but was unsuccessful in predicting top quark’s mass. To remedy this, a number of papers were published, in which DMM was applied to four family SM [47, 48]. Later, the SM type fourth family fermions were excluded by ATLAS and CMS data [52, 53]. As a consequence, if DMM approach is correct, it will be inevitably applied to an extension of the SM. DMM assumes that Yukawa coupling constants should be approximately the same in the weak interaction Lagrangian. When the mass eigenstates are turned on, fermions gain different masses [49–51].

When applying DMM approach to the Variant-A of 331 model, two different basis are defined: $SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ symmetry basis, labeled with superscript “(0)” as in $f^{(0)}$ and the mass basis labeled without superscript as in f , where f stands for any fermion particle. Before the electroweak spontaneous symmetry breaking, quarks are grouped as following:

$$\begin{pmatrix} u^{(0)} \\ d^{(0)} \\ D^{(0)} \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad u_L^{c(0)}, d_L^{c(0)}, D_L^{c(0)}, \quad (10a)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} c^{(0)} \\ s^{(0)} \\ S^{(0)} \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad c_L^{c(0)}, s_L^{c(0)}, S_L^{c(0)}, \quad (10b)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} t^{(0)} \\ b^{(0)} \\ B^{(0)} \end{pmatrix}_L, \quad t_L^{c(0)}, b_L^{c(0)}, B_L^{c(0)}. \quad (10c)$$

In one-family case, all bases are equal. The Lagrangian with the quark Yukawa terms for only one-family case can be written as following:

$$\mathcal{L}_y^Q = Q_L^T C (a_u \phi_3 u_L^c + a_d \phi_2 d_L^c + a_D \phi_1 D_L^c + a_{dD} \phi_2 D_L^c + a_{Dd} \phi_1 d_L^c) + h.c., \quad (11)$$

where a_u , a_d , a_D , a_{dD} and a_{Dd} are Yukawa couplings in the $SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ basis and C is the charge conjugate operator.

In this case, we obtain a mass term for the up-quark sector:

$$m_u^0 = a_u \frac{\eta^u}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (\eta^u = \eta^d = \eta \text{ is taken for simplicity}), \quad (12)$$

and a mass term for the down-quark sector is given as:

$$m_{dD}^0 = \begin{pmatrix} a_d \eta^d / \sqrt{2} & \varepsilon a_d \eta^d / \sqrt{2} \\ \varepsilon a_D \eta^D / \sqrt{2} & a_D \eta^D / \sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

where ε is chosen very close to one, and εa_d corresponds to the a_{dD} and εa_D corresponds to the a_{Dd} .

In order to obtain mass eigenvalues, we need to diagonalize the above mass matrix. This is done in ref. [93] to demonstrate that this approach gives correct t and b quark masses in one-family case.

Now, we can write three-family quark Yukawa Lagrangian in the $SU(3)_L \otimes U(1)_X$ basis:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_y^Q = & \sum_{i=1}^3 Q_L^{iT} C(a_u \phi_3 u_L^c + a_d \phi_2 d_L^c + a_D \phi_1 D_L^c + \varepsilon a_d \phi_2 D_L^c + \varepsilon a_D \phi_1 d_L^c) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^3 Q_L^{iT} C(a_c \phi_3 c_L^c + a_s \phi_2 s_L^c + a_S \phi_1 S_L^c + \varepsilon a_s \phi_2 S_L^c + \varepsilon a_S \phi_1 s_L^c) \\
& + \sum_{i=1}^3 Q_L^{iT} C(a_t \phi_3 t_L^c + a_b \phi_2 b_L^c + a_B \phi_1 B_L^c + \varepsilon a_b \phi_2 B_L^c + \varepsilon a_B \phi_1 b_L^c) + \text{h.c.}
\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

III. MODEL PARAMETERIZATION

Democratic form of all quark mass matrices is broken via a small deviation, represented by β and γ parameters. Furthermore, the form of deviation is the identical for up, down, and heavy down quarks. In spite of this, deviations are parameterized by independent parameters. Mass matrices for up, down, and heavy down type isosinglet quarks are as follows

$$\mathcal{M}_u^0 = \frac{a^u \eta^u}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \gamma_u & 1 & 1 - \frac{9}{2} \gamma_u + \beta_u \\ 1 & 1 - 2\gamma_u & 1 + 3\gamma_u + \beta_u \\ 1 - \frac{9}{2} \gamma_u + \beta_u & 1 + 3\gamma_u + \beta_u & 1 + 4\beta_u \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15a}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_d^0 = \frac{a^d \eta^d}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \gamma_d & 1 & 1 - \frac{9}{2} \gamma_d + \beta_d \\ 1 & 1 - 2\gamma_d & 1 + 3\gamma_d + \beta_d \\ 1 - \frac{9}{2} \gamma_d + \beta_d & 1 + 3\gamma_d + \beta_d & 1 + 4\beta_d \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15b}$$

$$\mathcal{M}_D^0 = \frac{a^D \eta^D}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + \gamma_D & 1 & 1 - \frac{9}{2} \gamma_D + \beta_D \\ 1 & 1 - 2\gamma_D & 1 + 3\gamma_D + \beta_D \\ 1 - \frac{9}{2} \gamma_D + \beta_D & 1 + 3\gamma_D + \beta_D & 1 + 4\beta_D \end{pmatrix}. \tag{15c}$$

However, down sector quarks and isosinglet down type quarks are further mixed according to Eq. (14):

$$\mathcal{M}_{dD}^0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_d^0 & \varepsilon_d \mathcal{M}_d^0 \\ \varepsilon_d \mathcal{M}_D^0 & \mathcal{M}_D^0 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

Masses of down SM and Beyond Standard Model (BSM) isosinglet quarks are obtained

by diagonalizing \mathcal{M}_{dD}^0 6 by 6 mass matrix. This mass matrix can be diagonalized via a 6 by 6 unitary matrix U_{dD} . Whereas masses of up sector quarks are obtained by diagonalizing \mathcal{M}_u^0 mass matrix with a 3 by 3 unitary matrix U_u . Analogous 3 by 3 mixing matrices, U_d and U_D , for down type SM and heavy BSM quarks are defined as unitary matrices that diagonalize d and D blocks of the \mathcal{M}_{dD}^0 given in Eq. (16), respectively. For the sake of simplicity, the phases are considered as zero hereafter. Therefore, diagonalizing matrices will be real orthogonal matrices.

V_{CKM}^W , V^{K^\pm} and V^{K^0} mixing matrices correspond to the W SM electroweak gauge boson, while K^\pm and K^0 are BSM heavy gauge bosons, respectively. These mixing matrices are defined via a combinations of 3 by 3 diagonalizing matrices U_u , U_d , and U_D , mentioned earlier, and are given as

$$V_{CKM}^W = U_u U_d^T = \begin{pmatrix} V_{ud} & V_{us} & V_{ub} \\ V_{cd} & V_{cs} & V_{cb} \\ V_{td} & V_{ts} & V_{tb} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17a)$$

$$V^{K^\pm} = U_D U_u^T = \begin{pmatrix} V_{Du} & V_{Dc} & V_{Dt} \\ V_{Su} & V_{Sc} & V_{St} \\ V_{Bu} & V_{Bc} & V_{Bt} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17b)$$

$$V^{K^0} = U_D U_d^T = \begin{pmatrix} V_{Dd} & V_{Ds} & V_{Db} \\ V_{Sd} & V_{Ss} & V_{Sb} \\ V_{Bd} & V_{Bs} & V_{Bb} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17c)$$

These matrices can be parameterized with three mixing angles and one phase angle:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

where $c_{ij} \equiv \cos\theta_{ij}$, $s_{ij} \equiv \sin\theta_{ij}$; the angles θ_{ij} are mixing angles and δ is CP violating phase angle (its contribution has not been considered in this study).

IV. NUMERICAL ANALYSIS

We perform a numerical scan over all parameter region (7 input parameters, for details see Tab. I), first by randomly scanning over large parameter regions, and then by performing a close neighborhood scan over specific regions in order to find a global minimum with higher precision. After making numerical scans, we analyze the correlation between different input parameters, distinctive input parameters and predicted observable variables, as well as between various output observable variables. The correlations presented below will increase the predictive power of the model and assist in probing the model in the current and future phenomenological experiments. Given further are the most striking correlations between these and attempt to explain the origin of correlations for some cases.

In order to obtain the results given below we used this following values for a and η (defined in Sec. II C) parameters

$$\frac{a^{u,d}\eta^{u,d}}{\sqrt{2}} = 56.5 \text{ GeV}, \quad (19a)$$

$$\frac{a^D\eta^D}{\sqrt{2}} = 3 \times 10^4 \text{ GeV}. \quad (19b)$$

The most apparent connected patterns between diverse input parameters are shown in Fig. 1. As one may have noticed from Fig. 1a, there is the inverse correlation between β_u and β_d input parameters. Since β_u for up sector behaves identically as does β_d for down sector, these inverse correlation is originated from the CKM mixing angles. Fig. 1b demonstrates the correlation between γ_u and γ_d , which exhibits an inverse correlation as well, analogously with the β 's case. As a final example for the input parameters Fig. 1c depicts the direct correlation between input parameters that affect the down sector mass eigenvalues. Other plots for different input parameters show weak or no correlated patters, unlike the ones mentioned earlier.

The plots in the Fig. 2 demonstrate important dependence of some observable variables on model input parameters. For instance, plot in Fig. 2a shows the direct dependence of m_u , lightest eigenvalue of the up quark sector, on its most sensitive input parameter, β_u . On the other hand, from Fig. 2b one can see that there is a inverse non-linear dependence of m_u on γ_u . Strong correlations are observed between β_u and m_c , as well as between β_u and m_t , direct linear and inverse linear, respectively for m_c and m_t up sector quark mass




FIG. 1: Selected input correlation plots. Colors represent maximum standard deviation from experimental values. Green, yellow, and red colors stand for $\sigma_{\max} < 1$, 2, and 3, respectively. Whereas, squares, crosses, and discs correspond to $\langle \sigma \rangle / \sigma_{\max}$: 0 – 0.4, 0.4 – 0.6, 0.6 – 1.0, respectively.

eigenvalues. As a consequence, there is strong correlation between m_c and m_t 3c and all up sector eigenvalues show strong dependence on β_u input parameter for the model at hand. Regarding the down quark sector, analogous correlation can be seen between β_d - m_s and β_d - $\sin(\theta_{23}^{\text{CKM}})$ Fig. 2e and Fig. 2f, which exhibit proportional almost linear and direct-linear behaviour, respectively. γ_d , similar to the situation in the up sector Fig. 2b, has a strongest influence on the m_d , lightest eigenvalue of the down quark sector, Fig. 2g, with a direct behaviour. Furthermore, the direct proportionality between m_d and γ_d can be seen from Eq. (15b), for which the lightest eigenvalue(m_d) approaches to zero as γ_d goes to zero.

From the above analysis it can be concluded that $\gamma_{u,d}$ has noticeable influence on the lightest eigenvalue of its respective sector, whereas β_u effects all up sector quark masses and β_d effects m_s and $\sin(\theta_{23}^{\text{CKM}})$. This dependence of m_b on β_d is absent due to the mixing of SM down quark sector with BSM heavy quarks.

The most striking correlations of the CKM mixing angles are observed for $\sin(\theta_{23}^{\text{CKM}})$


mixing angle, which is directly proportional and completely determined by the two input parameters β_d and γ_d Fig. 2f and Fig. 2h. The other mixing angles exhibit more complex correlations with the input parameters.

Plots in the Figs. 3a, 3b, and 3c demonstrate a direct, inverse, and inversely linear correlation between all three up sector quark masses, respectively. This is an immediate consequence of the fact that all three strongly depend on the β_u input parameter, Figs. 2a, 2c, and 2d.

Taking the $\gamma_u \ll \beta_u \ll 1$ limit in Eq. (15a), we obtain $m_u \propto 2\gamma_u \ll m_c, m_t$ and $m_t/m_c \approx 5.125 + 7.11806\beta_u + 2.25\beta_u^{-1}$, which corresponds to the behaviour $m_t \propto -m_c + \text{const.}$ (Fig. 3c).

Fig. 3d shows a correlation between down quark sector mass, m_s , and CKM mixing angle, $\sin(\theta_{23}^{\text{CKM}})$. This can be seen from the direct linear dependence of $\sin(\theta_{23}^{\text{CKM}})$ on β_d and γ_d , Fig. 2f and Fig. 2h, respectively. Similarly, m_s has medium directly proportional dependence on β_d (Fig. 2e), as well as, weaker dependence on γ_d .

During the numerical analysis, in some cases the obtained output observable variables may have been negative. In which case, the negative sign has been dropped, in the view of the phases related argument made in the paragraph after the Eq. (16).






FIG. 2: Selected correlation plots between input parameters and observable variables. Grid lines indicate a one standard deviation regions of the experimental data. Green, yellow, and red colors stand for $\sigma_{\text{max}} < 1, 2, \text{ and } 3$, respectively. Whereas, squares, crosses, and discs correspond to $\langle \sigma \rangle / \sigma_{\text{max}}$: $0 - 0.4, 0.4 - 0.6, 0.6 - 1.0$, respectively.

V. RESULTS

In this section the results of the model predictions are presented and elaborated on. This, E_6 motivated, variation of 331 model predicts up and down quark masses, as well as, CKM mixing angles for total of seven input parameters. Up, down, and down type isosinglet quarks are controlled by two parameters each, and one mixing parameter, ε , between light




FIG. 3: Selected observable correlation plots. Grid lines indicate a one standard deviation regions of the experimental data. Green, yellow, and red colors stand for $\sigma_{\max} < 1$, 2, and 3, respectively. Whereas, squares, crosses, and discs correspond to $\langle \sigma \rangle / \sigma_{\max}$: 0 – 0.4, 0.4 – 0.6, 0.6 – 1.0, respectively.

and heavy down quarks. The input parameters for the three most relevant and important benchmark points are collected in Tab. I. The first benchmark point (BP1) was obtained as a point with the smallest χ^2 of approximately 0.777, which has maximum deviation from experimental results of 0.586σ , refer to Eq. (20) for details. On the other hand, the second benchmark point (BP2) is defined as the point of a parameter scan with the smallest set of deviations for all nine observable variables at hand with a maximum deviation of $\sim 0.501 \sigma$. As last, we give an average point for all data points obtained with $\forall \sigma_{\max} \leq 1$ as a third benchmark point (BP3), labeled as BP3₀ in Tab. II, whereas the spread (error) of all points with $\forall \sigma_{\max} \leq 1$ is indicated as *Spread*. The σ is defined as follows

$$\sigma = \left| \frac{x_{\text{exp}} - x_{\text{th}}}{x_{\text{err}}} \right|, \quad (20)$$

where x represents any of the observable variables from Tab. II, *exp.* stands for the experimentally obtained value, *th* corresponds to the simulated value from scan run, and lastly, *err.* means the error for the experimentally obtained value.

par.	BP1	BP2	BP3 _{⟨⟩}	BP3 _{spread}
β_u	-0.008127116503406678	-0.008074064951393775	-0.0081294	0.0000816256
γ_u	0.00012023151170229749	0.00012095573963901077	0.000120017	0.0000018874
β_d	0.044756546016957506	0.04508573236580676	0.0447492	0.000416564
γ_d	0.002037220066695815	0.0020439360347433004	0.00203794	0.0000212662
β_D	0.04796738067655066	0.04787190321609066	-0.0474458	0.000806016
γ_D	-0.05988836055185294	-0.06057801433337951	0.0605905	0.00131765
ε	1.0080400994427337	1.0080578648812581	1.00563	0.00575238

TABLE I: Model input parameters for the several benchmark points given in Tab. II

The parameter scan is very sensitive to the input parameters' value, therefore we keep up to twenty decimal places. For a total of seven input parameters the best result for χ^2 that was obtained is given in the 4'th and 5'th columns of Tab. II with $\chi^2 \approx 0.777$. As can be seen, the largest contribution to the χ^2 comes from m_u and m_d , whereas the second and third generation quark masses of up and down sectors contribute a much smaller error to the χ^2 . Next, as a result of the search for the smallest combination of the deviations from the experimental values (2'nd and 3'rd columns of Tab. II), the best point achieved is given in the 6'th and 7'th columns of Tab. II with $\chi^2 \approx 1.491$ and $\sigma_{\text{max}} \approx 0.501$. Lastly, we collect all points with maximum deviations ($\sigma_{\text{max}} \leq 1$) to generate mean and spread values, given in the 8'th and 9'th columns of Tab. II with $\chi^2 \approx 1.895$. These values show the location and the size of the area with the deviations from experimental values less than one (green area in Fig. 4).

The masses and mixing angles in Tab. II were defined as eigenvalues of mass matrices in Eqs. (15a), (16), and in Eq. (18) for V_{CKM}^W , V^{K^\pm} , V^{K^0} mixing matrices, respectively.

Figure 4 summarizes all the data points collected according to two criteria: horizontal axis corresponds to σ_{max} which represents the maximum deviation of each point with respect to the experimental value, vertical axis shows the χ^2 values for each point obtained. The




FIG. 4: Model global fit vs maximum deviation (up to 3σ) distribution graph. The solid curves stand for upper and lower theoretical limits and $\langle \rangle$ stand for the mean value.

Observable	Experimental		BP1		BP2		BP3	
	Value	Err.	Value	σ	Value	σ	$\langle \rangle$	Spread
m_u (MeV)	1.23	0.21	1.35	0.59	1.33	0.50	1.35	0.02
m_c (MeV)	620	17	616	0.26	611	0.50	616	6
m_t (GeV)	168.26	0.75	168.27	0.018	168.28	0.028	168.27	0.01
m_d (MeV)	2.67	0.19	2.58	0.48	2.59	0.44	2.58	0.03
m_s (MeV)	53.16	4.61	54.33	0.25	54.81	0.36	54.29	0.53
m_b (GeV)	2.839	0.026	2.841	0.075	2.848	0.350	2.839	0.015
M_{D_1} (GeV)	—		8677	-	8790	-	8801	219
M_{D_2} (GeV)	—		9724	-	9824	-	9820	189
M_{D_3} (GeV)	—		96687	-	96710	-	96673	71
$\sin(\theta_{12})$	0.22650	0.000431	0.22653	0.071278	0.22671	0.48643	0.22649	0.000235
$\sin(\theta_{23})$	0.04053	$^{+0.000821}_{-0.000601}$	0.04066	0.18581	0.04086	0.47030	0.04066	0.000292
$\sin(\theta_{13})$	0.00361	$^{+0.000110}_{-0.000090}$	0.00359	0.15861	0.00364	0.30446	0.00359	0.000036
$\sin(\theta_{12}^{K^\pm})$	—		0.67511	-	0.67502	-	0.67497	-
$\sin(\theta_{23}^{K^\pm})$	—		0.06082	-	0.06112	-	0.04728	-
$\sin(\theta_{13}^{K^\pm})$	—		0.00721	-	0.00693	-	0.00152	-
$\sin(\theta_{12}^{K^0})$	—		0.82460	-	0.82462	-	0.82438	-
$\sin(\theta_{23}^{K^0})$	—		0.03327	-	0.03345	-	0.07482	-
$\sin(\theta_{13}^{K^0})$	—		0.02290	-	0.02335	-	0.02857	-
χ^2	—		0.777		1.491		1.895	

TABLE II: Model various benchmark points with smallest χ^2 , smallest σ_{\max} , and mean value for $\forall \sigma_{\max} \leq 1$. Here σ stands for standard deviation and has no units. Obtained values shown above were rounded to have the same significant figures as experiment results.

plot is divided into three horizontal regions according to the value of σ_{\max} : $0 - 1$, $1 - 2$,

2 – 3; vertical region is separated into three categories as well, according to the values of $\langle\sigma\rangle/\sigma_{\max}$: 0 – 0.4, 0.4 – 0.6, 0.6 – 1.0. This last category represents the spread of all errors that contribute the total χ^2 . The solid curves on the plot stand for upper and lower theoretical limits for this plot given by $\chi^2 = 9\sigma_{\max}^2$ and $\chi^2 = \sigma_{\max}^2$, respectively.

VI. DISCUSSION

One can isolate and determine the causes of different levels of correlation between parameters and observable variables in the plots given in the earlier section, Figs. 2 and 3. Obviously, γ and β parameters affect mass values of quarks at up and down sector. Another factor in determining masses of the SM down sector quarks is the existence of BSM heavy isosinglet quarks, hereafter *BSM effect*. For example, one would expect that γ_u correlates with m_u strongly, and m_c and m_t weakly. However, since β_u is about 80 times greater than γ_u , strong correlation of γ_u - m_u is smeared into medium level through interference of β_u . As expected, β_u correlates strongly with m_c and m_t . Due to the relative size of β_u with respect to γ_u , it affects m_u weakly.

However, the situation is different in down sector. Similar to the up sector, γ_d correlates with m_d on the medium level. Correlation between γ_d and other down quark mass eigenvalues (m_s and m_b) disappears due to BSM effect. Correlation of β_d with m_d , m_s , and m_b is degraded proportional with the closeness to BSM quarks. Therefore, similarly to the up quark sector, weak correlation of β_d - m_d have disappeared due to small BSM effect. Whereas, expected strong correlation between β_d and m_s weakens down to the medium level due to the existence of the same BSM effect. Finally, strong correlation of β_d - m_b have disappeared due to very strong mixing with BSM quarks.

As mentioned earlier, CP violating phases are not considered in the present paper. Therefore, elements of mass matrices are chosen as real numbers. Consequently, some of the resulting eigenvalues of mass matrices and some elements of the CKM matrix are negative. It is possible to remove these negative signs and get correct CP violating phases by including phase multipliers to democratic mass matrix elements. These multipliers may even help to pinpoint χ^2 and σ_{\max} . The affect of the phases on the quark masses and CKM mixing angles is left for the future works.

VII. CONCLUSION

In the present paper, DMM approach is applied to the quark sector of the 331 model, which is inspired by E_6 symmetry. Model becomes prominent by being one of the simplest extensions of SM. Quark masses and mixing angles within one standard deviation of the experimental values with ten parameters are successfully derived. More specifically, each of the quark sectors (up, down, and isosinglet down) is controlled dominantly by set of three parameters (a, β, γ) , additionally one parameter corresponds to the mixing between SM and isosinglet down type quarks. In return, all SM and isosinglet quark masses and mixing angles are predicted, total of eighteen observable variables nine out of which are SM variables.

Detailed analysis is performed in order to find the best fit benchmark point. The best fit point obtained has a $\chi^2 = 0.777$ with the largest standard deviation from the experimental values of 0.586 for m_u . Another important benchmark point is the point with the smallest achieved standard deviation error from the experimental data has $\chi^2 = 1.491$ and the largest deviation of 0.501. Furthermore, a summary data plot of σ_{\max} vs χ^2 is produced, as well as, the average point for all generated data with $\sigma_{\max} \leq 1$ condition.

The model at hand demonstrates that a democratic approach can successfully lead to the SM quark masses and hierarchy between them. Furthermore, CKM mixing angles are also obtained within corresponding experimental limits. This result motivates for further exploration on parameter schemes based on fundamental democratic pattern. UV models of flavour symmetry leading naturally to democratic based quark sector mass scheme should be studied in the future works. From all of the above, it is concluded that this can be a possible explanation of hierarchy problem.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

RC was supported by Ege University Scientific Research Projects Coordination under Grant Number FGA-2021-22954. OP was supported by the Samsung Science and Technology Foundation under Grant No. SSTF-BA1602-04 and National Research Foundation of Korea

under Grant Number 2018R1A2B6007000.

- [1] N. T. Duy, P. N. Thu, and D. T. Huong, (2022), [arXiv:2205.02995 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [2] A. Addazi, G. Ricciardi, S. Scarlatella, R. Srivastava, and J. W. F. Valle, (2022), [arXiv:2201.12595 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [3] A. J. Buras, F. De Fazio, and J. Girrbach, *JHEP* **02**, 112 (2014), [arXiv:1311.6729 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [4] A. J. Buras, F. De Fazio, J. Girrbach, and M. V. Carlucci, *JHEP* **02**, 023 (2013), [arXiv:1211.1237 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [5] S. M. Boucenna, S. Morisi, and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 013005 (2014), [arXiv:1405.2332 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [6] M. B. Tully and G. C. Joshi, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 011301 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ph/0011172](#).
- [7] M. Singer, J. W. F. Valle, and J. Schechter, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 738 (1980).
- [8] F. Pisano and V. Pleitez, *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 410 (1992), [arXiv:hep-ph/9206242](#).
- [9] P. H. Frampton, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **69**, 2889 (1992).
- [10] M. Reig, J. W. F. Valle, and C. A. Vaquera-Araujo, *Phys. Lett. B* **766**, 35 (2017), [arXiv:1611.02066 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [11] H. N. Long, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 437 (1996), [arXiv:hep-ph/9504274](#).
- [12] A. E. Carcamo Hernandez, R. Martinez, and F. Ochoa, *Phys. Rev. D* **73**, 035007 (2006), [arXiv:hep-ph/0510421](#).
- [13] J. T. Liu and D. Ng, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 548 (1994), [arXiv:hep-ph/9401228](#).
- [14] S. Profumo and F. S. Queiroz, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74**, 2960 (2014), [arXiv:1307.7802 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, R. Martinez, and F. Ochoa, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, 634 (2016), [arXiv:1309.6567 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [16] R. M. Fonseca and M. Hirsch, *JHEP* **08**, 003 (2016), [arXiv:1606.01109 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [17] T. Aaltonen *et al.* (CDF), *Science* **376**, 170 (2022).
- [18] M. C. Rodriguez, (2022), [arXiv:2205.09109 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] A. E. Carcamo Hernandez, R. Martinez, and F. Ochoa, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 075009 (2013), [arXiv:1302.1757 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, E. Cataño Mur, and R. Martinez, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, 073001 (2014), [arXiv:1407.5217 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [21] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. Kovalenko, H. N. Long, and I. Schmidt, **JHEP** **07**, 144 (2018), [arXiv:1705.09169 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] E. R. Barreto, A. G. Dias, J. Leite, C. C. Nishi, R. L. N. Oliveira, and W. C. Vieira, **Phys. Rev. D** **97**, 055047 (2018), [arXiv:1709.09946 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] F. F. Deppisch, C. Hati, S. Patra, U. Sarkar, and J. W. F. Valle, **Phys. Lett. B** **762**, 432 (2016), [arXiv:1608.05334 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [24] C. Kownacki, E. Ma, N. Pollard, O. Popov, and M. Zakeri, **Phys. Lett. B** **777**, 121 (2018), [arXiv:1710.00762 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] C. Kownacki, E. Ma, N. Pollard, O. Popov, and M. Zakeri, **Nucl. Phys. B** **928**, 520 (2018), [arXiv:1801.01379 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] A. Alves, G. Arcadi, P. V. Dong, L. Duarte, F. S. Queiroz, and J. W. F. Valle, **Phys. Lett. B** **772**, 825 (2017), [arXiv:1612.04383 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] P. V. Dong, D. T. Huong, F. S. Queiroz, J. W. F. Valle, and C. A. Vaquera-Araujo, **JHEP** **04**, 143 (2018), [arXiv:1710.06951 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] S. K. Kang, O. Popov, R. Srivastava, J. W. F. Valle, and C. A. Vaquera-Araujo, **Phys. Lett. B** **798**, 135013 (2019), [arXiv:1902.05966 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] J. Leite, O. Popov, R. Srivastava, and J. W. F. Valle, **Phys. Lett. B** **802**, 135254 (2020), [arXiv:1909.06386 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [30] H. Fritzsch, Z.-z. Xing, and D. Zhang, **Nucl. Phys. B** **974**, 115634 (2022), [arXiv:2111.06727 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [31] P. Zyla *et al.* (Particle Data Group), **PTEP** **2020**, 083C01 (2020), and 2021 update.
- [32] G. Dattoli and E. Di Palma, (2013), [arXiv:1301.5111 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [33] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura, **Phys. Rev. D** **38**, 2295 (1988).
- [34] W. Rodejohann, **Phys. Lett. B** **671**, 267 (2009), [arXiv:0810.5239 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [35] X.-G. He, S.-W. Li, and B.-Q. Ma, **Phys. Rev. D** **78**, 111301 (2008), [arXiv:0809.1223 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [36] S.-W. Li and B.-Q. Ma, **Phys. Rev. D** **77**, 093005 (2008), [arXiv:0806.0670 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [37] S. Chaturvedi, V. Gupta, G. Sanchez-Colon, and N. Mukunda, **Rev. Mex. Fis.** **57**, 146 (2011), [arXiv:1006.4863 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [38] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura, **Phys. Lett. B** **208**, 123 (1988).
- [39] N. Li and B.-Q. Ma, **Phys. Rev. D** **71**, 097301 (2005), [arXiv:hep-ph/0501226](#).
- [40] S. Chaturvedi and V. Gupta, **AIP Conf. Proc.** **670**, 73 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ph/0209350](#).

- [41] J. Ganguly, (2022), [arXiv:2205.03084 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] H. Harari, H. Haut, and J. Weyers, *Physics Letters B* **78**, 459 (1978).
- [43] H. Fritzsch, *Nuclear Physics B* **155**, 189 (1979).
- [44] H. Fritzsch, *Physics Letters B* **184**, 391 (1987).
- [45] H. Fritzsch and J. Plankl, *Physics Letters B* **237**, 451 (1990).
- [46] H. Fritzsch and D. Holtmannspötter, *Physics Letters B* **338**, 290 (1994).
- [47] A. Datta and S. Raychaudhuri, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 4762 (1994).
- [48] A. Çelikel, A. K. Çiftçi, and S. Sultansoy, *Physics Letters B* **342**, 257 (1995).
- [49] S. Atağ, A. Çelikel, A. K. Çiftçi, S. Sultansoy, and U. O. Yilmaz, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 5745 (1996).
- [50] A. K. Çiftçi, R. Çiftçi, and S. Sultansoy, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 055001 (2002).
- [51] A. K. Çiftçi, R. Çiftçi, and S. Sultansoy, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 053006 (2005).
- [52] A. Djouadi and A. Lenz, *Physics Letters B* **715**, 310 (2012).
- [53] C. Collaboration, S. Basegmez, G. Bruno, R. Castello, L. Ceard, C. Delaere, T. Du Pree, D. Favart, L. Forthomme, A. Giammanco, *et al.*, *Phys. Lett* **725**, 36 (2013).
- [54] K. T. Mahanthappa and P. K. Mohapatra, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 2400 (1990).
- [55] F. Gursey, P. Ramond, and P. Sikivie, *Phys. Lett. B* **60**, 177 (1976).
- [56] P. Ramond, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **72**, 467 (1981).
- [57] C. H. Albright, C. Jarlskog, and M. O. Tjia, *Nucl. Phys. B* **86**, 535 (1975).
- [58] K. T. Mahanthappa and P. K. Mohapatra, *Phys. Rev. D* **43**, 3093 (1991), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 44, 1616 (1991)].
- [59] K. T. Mahanthappa and P. K. Mohapatra, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 1732 (1990).
- [60] M. Singer, *Phys. Rev. D* **19**, 296 (1979).
- [61] R. M. Barnett and L. N. Chang, *Phys. Lett. B* **72**, 233 (1977).
- [62] D. Horn and G. G. Ross, *Phys. Lett. B* **69**, 364 (1977).
- [63] P. Langacker and G. Segre, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39**, 259 (1977).
- [64] B. W. Lee and S. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1237 (1977).
- [65] M. Yoshimura, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **57**, 237 (1977).
- [66] G. Segre and J. Weyers, *Phys. Lett. B* **65**, 243 (1976).
- [67] P. Ramond, *Nucl. Phys. B* **110**, 214 (1976).
- [68] F. Gursey and P. Sikivie, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **36**, 775 (1976).

- [69] H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **63**, 99 (1976).
- [70] P. Fayet, *Nucl. Phys. B* **78**, 14 (1974).
- [71] D. Gomez Dumm, *Phys. Lett. B* **411**, 313 (1997), [arXiv:hep-ph/9709245](#).
- [72] M. Ozer, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 1143 (1996).
- [73] M. Ozer, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 4561 (1996).
- [74] L. Epele, H. Fanchiotti, C. Garcia Canal, and D. Gomez Dumm, *Phys. Lett. B* **343**, 291 (1995).
- [75] D. Ng, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 4805 (1994), [arXiv:hep-ph/9212284](#).
- [76] V. Pleitez and M. D. Tonasse, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 5274 (1993), [arXiv:hep-ph/9302201](#).
- [77] J. C. Montero, F. Pisano, and V. Pleitez, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 2918 (1993), [arXiv:hep-ph/9212271](#).
- [78] V. Pleitez and M. D. Tonasse, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 2353 (1993), [arXiv:hep-ph/9301232](#).
- [79] R. Foot, O. F. Hernandez, F. Pisano, and V. Pleitez, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 4158 (1993), [arXiv:hep-ph/9207264](#).
- [80] H. N. Long, *Phys. Rev. D* **54**, 4691 (1996), [arXiv:hep-ph/9607439](#).
- [81] V. Pleitez, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 514 (1996), [arXiv:hep-ph/9412304](#).
- [82] H. N. Long, L. T. Hue, and D. V. Loi, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, 015007 (2016), [arXiv:1605.07835 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [83] T. Kiyan, T. Maekawa, and S. Yokoi, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **17**, 1813 (2002), [arXiv:hep-ph/0206019](#).
- [84] T. Kiyan, T. Maekawa, M. Masuda, and H. Taira, (2002), [arXiv:hep-ph/0206180](#).
- [85] S. Lebbal, J. Mimouni, and N. Mebarki, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **37**, 2250005 (2022), [arXiv:2112.07345 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [86] S. Descotes-Genon, M. Moscati, and G. Ricciardi, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 115030 (2018), [arXiv:1711.03101 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [87] W. A. Ponce, J. B. Florez, and L. A. Sanchez, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **17**, 643 (2002), [arXiv:hep-ph/0103100](#).
- [88] L. A. Sanchez, W. A. Ponce, and R. Martinez, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 075013 (2001), [arXiv:hep-ph/0103244](#).
- [89] R. Martinez, W. A. Ponce, and L. A. Sanchez, *Phys. Rev. D* **65**, 055013 (2002), [arXiv:hep-ph/0110246](#).

- [90] G. Aad, B. Abbott, D. Abbott, O. Abdinov, A. Abed Abud, K. Abeling, D. Abhayasinghe, S. Abidi, O. AbouZeid, N. Abraham, H. Abramowicz, H. Abreu, and Y. Abulaiti, *Physics Letters B* **796**, 68 (2019).
- [91] C. Collaboration (CMS), *Search for a narrow resonance in high-mass dilepton final states in proton-proton collisions using 140 fb⁻¹ of data at $\sqrt{s} = 13$ TeV*, Tech. Rep. (CERN, Geneva, 2019).
- [92] G. Aad, B. Abbott, D. C. Abbott, O. Abdinov, A. Abed Abud, K. Abeling, and D. K. Abhayasinghe (ATLAS), *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 052013 (2019).
- [93] R. Çiftçi and A. K. Çiftçi, *AIP Conf. Proc.* **1722**, 070004 (2016).