

# Theoretical Aspect of Nonunitarity in Neutrino Oscillation

Chee Sheng Fong<sup>1,\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Centro de Ciências Naturais e Humanas*

*Universidade Federal do ABC, 09.210-170, Santo André, SP, Brazil*

## Abstract

Nonunitarity can arise in neutrino oscillation when the matrix with elements  $\mathbf{U}_{\alpha i}$  which relate the neutrino flavor  $\alpha$  and mass  $i$  eigenstates is not unitary when sum over the kinematically accessible mass eigenstates or over the three Standard Model flavors. We review how high scale nonunitarity arises after integrating out new physics which is not accessible in neutrino oscillation experiments. We contrast this to the low scale nonunitary scenario in which there are new states accessible in neutrino oscillation experiments but the oscillations involving these states are fast enough such that they are averaged out. Then we derive analytical formula for the neutrino oscillation probability amplitude for an arbitrary flavor of neutrinos without assuming unitarity. This result allows us to prove a theorem that if  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , then the neutrino oscillation probability in an *arbitrary matter potential* is *indistinguishable* from the *unitary* scenario. The main implication is that nonunitary effects are proportional  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta}$  with  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and disappearance experiments  $\nu_\beta \rightarrow \nu_\alpha$  are necessary for their discovery. Independently of matter potential, while nonunitary effects for high scale nonunitary scenario disappear as  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta} \rightarrow 0$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , low scale nonunitary effects remain.

---

\* sheng.fong@ufabc.edu.br

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the Standard Model (SM), there are three neutrinos which participate in the weak interactions and we have detected all of them. Despite they should be massless in the SM, experimentally, we have determined two nonzero mass-squared differences among them, showing that at least two of them are massive. Great experimental progress has been made in pinning down the neutrino parameters in the three-flavor paradigm with the current global best fit values given by [1, 2]: two mass splitting  $\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2 \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2 = 7.4 \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$ ,  $\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2 \equiv |m_3^2 - m_1^2| = 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$ , and three mixing angles  $\theta_{12} = 33^\circ$ ,  $\theta_{23} = 49^\circ$ , and  $\theta_{13} = 8.5^\circ$  determined to precision of a few percents with a preference of Normal mass Ordering (NO)  $m_3^2 - m_1^2 > 0$ . The absolute mass scale and the Dirac CP phase have not been determined while  $\theta_{23}$  can still be in the first quadrant. From the theoretical side, the mechanism behind neutrino mass together with the nature of the mass, Dirac or Majorana (including quasi-Dirac), remains an open question.

Treating the SM as an effective field theory, Majorana mass for neutrinos arise from the unique dimension-5 Weinberg operator [3, 4]. This is the minimal scenario without additional light degrees of freedom. In order to have Dirac mass, additional light degrees of freedom are needed to be the Dirac partners of the SM neutrinos. In either cases, it is not necessary that there is *unitary violation* or *nonunitarity* in the sense that the matrix  $U_{\alpha i}$  which relates the flavor (with index  $\alpha$ ) and mass (with index  $i$ ) eigenstates of neutrinos when sum over the kinematically accessible mass eigenstates or over the three SM flavors are not unitary

$$\sum_i^{\text{accessible}} U_{\alpha i} U_{\beta i}^* \neq \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad \sum_{\alpha=e,\mu,\tau} U_{\alpha i} U_{\alpha j}^* \neq \delta_{ij}. \quad (1)$$

In this work, we will focus on nonunitary scenario when the relations above hold true and contrast it to the three-flavor paradigm when unitarity is preserved.

We aim to give a more complete theoretical discussion of nonunitarity in neutrino oscillation [5–22]. We start by discussing how nonunitary can arise in Section II, highlighting two distinct scenarios: *high scale nonunitary* scenario where new physics resides beyond the energy scale of neutrino oscillation experiments and *low scale nonunitary* scenario where new fermionic states (sterile neutrinos) mix with the SM neutrinos and are accessible in neutrino oscillation experiments. In Section III, we derive analytical solution for neutrino




FIG. 1. The probability of  $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$  for neutrino crossing the entire Earth as a function of neutrino energy  $E_\nu$ . As the modulus of  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu}$  decreases, the probability approaches that of the standard three-flavor unitary scenario shown as the black solid line.

oscillation without assuming unitarity and in Section IV, we discuss how the high scale and low scale nonunitary effects can show up and be distinguished in experiments. Finally we present some concluding remarks in Section V. While many excellent discussions are there in previous work for e.g. [5], we will present some new results. In particular, we will prove a theorem in Section III that if nonunitary is only diagonal

$$\sum_i^{\text{accessible}} \mathbf{U}_{\alpha i} \mathbf{U}_{\beta i}^* = c_\alpha \delta_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (2)$$

with  $c_\alpha > 0$ , then neutrino oscillation probability in an arbitrary matter potential is *indistinguishable* from the *unitary* scenario. An important implication is that high scale nonunitary effects are proportional to the off-diagonal elements of  $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger$  and can only be confirmed in appearance experiments, in contrast to low scale nonunitary scenario where the effects can remain. To illustrate this point, in Figure 1, we show the probability of  $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$

as a function of neutrino energy  $E_\nu$  in high scale nonunitary scenario for neutrino passing through the Earth using the public code NuProbe [23, 24] with a simplified (Preliminary Reference Earth Model) PREM model [25]. Denoting  $U$  as a  $3 \times 3$  mixing matrix, we have fixed  $(UU^\dagger)_{ee} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = 0.96$ ,  $(UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = 1$ ,  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\tau} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\tau} = 0$  while varying  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu}$  from 0.001 to 0.04 (dashed lines) and the rest of the standard parameters have been fixed to the NO global best fit values from [1, 2]. As the modulus of  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu}$  decreases, the probability approaches that of the standard three-flavor unitary scenario (solid black line). For reader interested in experimental probe of nonunitary scenarios, he or she can jump straight to Section IV.

## II. MODELS

Here we will focus on models for neutrino oscillation assuming that the center-of-mass energy involved is below the electroweak symmetry breaking  $E < v_{\text{EW}} \equiv 174$  GeV. We will consider only Majorana mass term for neutrinos though the discussions below are independent of whether we have a Majorana or Dirac mass term. While neutrino oscillation cannot distinguish between strictly Majorana and Dirac mass, it is possible to distinguish them from quasi-Dirac scenario in which both types of mass terms exist while the Majorana mass term is much smaller than the Dirac one [26–30]. We will consider this interesting scenario in a future publication.

### A. High scale nonunitary

Assuming that for  $E < v_{\text{EW}}$ , we only have three SM neutrinos ( $\nu_e$ ,  $\nu_\mu$  and  $\nu_\tau$  are the SM left-handed neutrino flavor states), the general neutrino Lagrangian allowed by the SM electromagnetic gauge symmetry  $U(1)_{\text{EM}}$  in the charged lepton flavor basis is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu = & \frac{1}{2} (i\bar{\nu}_\alpha \not{\partial} D_{\alpha\beta} \nu_\beta - \bar{\nu}_\alpha^c m_{\alpha\beta} \nu_\beta + \text{h.c.}) \\ & - \left( \frac{g}{2} W_\mu^- \bar{\ell}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\alpha + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2} \cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \bar{\nu}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\alpha + \text{h.c.} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the flavor indices are  $\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$ ,  $D$  is a dimensionless Hermitian matrix while  $m$  is a symmetric matrix with mass dimension. In the second line,  $g$  is the  $SU(2)_L$  gauge coupling,  $\theta_W$  is the Weinberg or weak angle,  $P_L = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma^5)$  is the left-handed projector,

$\{\ell_e, \ell_\mu, \ell_\tau\} \equiv \{e^-, \mu^-, \tau^-\}$  are the charged leptons and  $W^\mp$  and  $Z$  are the charged and neutral weak bosons, respectively. Without additional light degrees of freedom, only Majorana mass term is possible.<sup>1</sup> Treating the Standard Model as an effective field theory, the neutrino mass and the modified kinetic terms come respectively from dimension-5 [3, 4] and dimension-6 operators [31, 42, 43]

$$\mathcal{O}_5 = \frac{\lambda_{\alpha\beta}}{\Lambda_5} (\overline{L}_\alpha^c \epsilon H) (L_\beta \epsilon H), \quad (4)$$

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{\eta_{\alpha\beta}}{\Lambda_6^2} (\overline{L}_\alpha \epsilon H^*) \not{\partial} (L_\beta \epsilon H), \quad (5)$$

where  $L$  and  $H$  are the  $SU(2)_L$  lepton and Higgs doublets, respectively,  $\lambda$  and  $\eta$  are dimensionless symmetric and Hermitian matrices, respectively, and  $\Lambda_5$  and  $\Lambda_6$  are effective scales below which the operators  $\mathcal{O}_5$  and  $\mathcal{O}_6$  are valid. Implicitly, we have assumed  $E \ll \Lambda_5, \Lambda_6$ . Not all ultraviolet models which generate  $\mathcal{O}_5$  also generate  $\mathcal{O}_6$ . For instance, type-I and type-III seesaw models generate both  $\mathcal{O}_5$  and  $\mathcal{O}_6$  while type-II seesaw model only generates  $\mathcal{O}_5$ .

In order to obtain canonical normalized kinetic term, we can first diagonalize the kinetic term as  $D = Y^\dagger \hat{D} Y$  where  $Y$  is unitary and  $\hat{D}$  is real and diagonal. Defining the normalized neutrino field as  $\tilde{\nu} \equiv \sqrt{\hat{D}} Y \nu$ , eq. (3) becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu = & \frac{1}{2} \left( i \overline{\tilde{\nu}}_\alpha \not{\partial} \tilde{\nu}_\alpha - \overline{\tilde{\nu}}_\alpha^c \tilde{m}_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\nu}_\beta + \text{h.c.} \right) \\ & - \left[ \frac{g}{2} W_\mu^- \overline{\ell}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \left( Y^\dagger \sqrt{\hat{D}}^{-1} \right)_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{\nu}_\beta + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2} \cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \left( \hat{D}^{-1} \right)_{\alpha\alpha} \overline{\tilde{\nu}}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \tilde{\nu}_\alpha + \text{h.c.} \right], \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

where we have defined

$$\tilde{m} \equiv \sqrt{\hat{D}}^{-1} Y^* m Y^\dagger \sqrt{\hat{D}}^{-1}. \quad (7)$$

The symmetric mass matrix above can be diagonalized by a unitary matrix  $V$  as  $\tilde{m} = V^* \hat{m} V^\dagger$  where  $\hat{m}$  is real and diagonal. Defining the neutrino field in the mass basis as  $\hat{\nu} = V^\dagger \tilde{\nu}$ , we have [5]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu = & \frac{1}{2} \left( i \overline{\hat{\nu}}_i \not{\partial} \hat{\nu}_i - \overline{\hat{\nu}}_i^c \hat{m}_{ii} \hat{\nu}_i + \text{h.c.} \right) \\ & - \left[ \frac{g}{2} W_\mu^- \overline{\ell}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L U_{\alpha i} \hat{\nu}_i + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2} \cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \overline{\hat{\nu}}_i (U^\dagger U)_{ij} \gamma^\mu P_L \hat{\nu}_j + \text{h.c.} \right], \quad (8) \end{aligned}$$

<sup>1</sup> In order to write down a Dirac mass term, new light degrees of freedom are required such that we can write  $\overline{\nu}'_f m'_{f\beta} \nu_\beta$  where  $\nu'_f$  are some new fermion fields which do not participate in weak interactions. In this case,  $m'_{f\beta}$  is a general complex matrix with mass dimension. Besides the fact that the mass term should be diagonalized by two unitary matrices, the discussion will remain the same since the effect of unitary rotation of  $\nu'$  which do not feel the weak force, is not observable.

where we denote  $i, j = 1, 2, 3$  to be the indices in mass basis and we have defined

$$U_{\alpha i} \equiv \left( Y^\dagger \sqrt{\hat{D}}^{-1} V \right)_{\alpha i}. \quad (9)$$

Notice that

$$UU^\dagger = Y^\dagger \hat{D}^{-1} Y, \quad U^\dagger U = V^\dagger \hat{D}^{-1} V. \quad (10)$$

Only if  $\hat{D} = I$  is the  $3 \times 3$  identity matrix, unitarity is restored in which  $U^\dagger U = UU^\dagger = I$ . We denote the general case with  $UU^\dagger \neq I$  and  $U^\dagger U \neq I$ , *high scale* nonunitary scenario.

## B. Low scale nonunitarity

Assuming that for  $E < v_{EW}$ , besides the three SM neutrinos ( $\nu_e, \nu_\mu$  and  $\nu_\tau$ ), we also have additional neutral fermions fields ( $\nu_{s_1}, \nu_{s_2}, \dots, \nu_{s_N}$ ) which do not participate in weak interactions but mix with the SM neutrinos through the mass term. The mixing between the SM and the additional fermions are the Dirac mass term. Here we will focus on mostly Majorana scenario where the Majorana mass term for new fermions is somewhat larger than the Majorana mass for the SM neutrinos as well as the Dirac mass term.<sup>2</sup> In order to highlight the distinction from the high scale unitary violation scenario, we further assume that the kinetic terms for all the fermions are canonical. In this case, the  $U(1)_{EM}$ -invariant neutrino Lagrangian in the charged lepton flavor basis is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu = & \frac{1}{2} (i\bar{\nu}_\alpha \not{\partial} \nu_\alpha - \bar{\nu}_\alpha^c m_{\alpha\beta} \nu_\beta + \text{h.c.}) \\ & - \left( \frac{g}{2} W_\mu^- \bar{\ell}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\alpha + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2} \cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \bar{\nu}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\alpha + \text{h.c.} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta, \dots = e, \mu, \tau, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N$ . The symmetric mass matrix  $m$  can be diagonalized by a unitary matrix  $\mathbf{U}$  as  $m = \mathbf{U}^* \hat{m} \mathbf{U}^\dagger$  where  $\hat{m}$  is real and diagonal. Here and in the following, we use a boldface  $\mathbf{U}$  to denote a  $(3 + N) \times (3 + N)$  matrix while  $U$  is reserved for a  $3 \times 3$  matrix. Defining the neutrino field in the mass basis as  $\hat{\nu} = \mathbf{U}^\dagger \tilde{\nu}$ , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu = & \frac{1}{2} (i\bar{\hat{\nu}}_i \not{\partial} \hat{\nu}_i - \bar{\hat{\nu}}_i^c \hat{m}_{ii} \hat{\nu}_i + \text{h.c.}) \\ & - \left[ \frac{g}{2} W_\mu^- \bar{\ell}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \mathbf{U}_{\alpha i} \hat{\nu}_i + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2} \cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \bar{\hat{\nu}}_i \gamma^\mu P_L \hat{\nu}_j + \text{h.c.} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

<sup>2</sup> Depending on the relative size of the corresponding mass terms, one can obtain the mostly Majorana, strictly Majorana, strictly Dirac or quasi-Dirac scenario. Strictly Dirac scenario cannot be distinguished from strictly Majorana scenario and will not also not result in apparent unitary violation. Mostly Majorana scenario will result in apparent unitary violation allowed by current measurements. Finally, though there is no apparent unitary violation, quasi-Dirac scenario will result in distinguished signatures [26–30] and will be considered in a future work.

where  $i, j, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, 3 + N$ . What distinguishes this from the high scale nonunitary scenario is that  $\mathbf{U}^\dagger \mathbf{U} = \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^\dagger = \mathbf{I}$  where  $\mathbf{I}$  is the  $(3 + N) \times (3 + N)$  identity matrix.

Strictly speaking, there is no unitary violation in this case. However, since only the mixing involving the SM neutrinos can be measured, one has

$$\sum_{\alpha=e,\mu,\tau} \mathbf{U}_{\alpha i} \mathbf{U}_{\alpha j}^* \neq \delta_{ij}. \quad (13)$$

Furthermore, if  $m_{i>3} \gg \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$  such that oscillations involving  $\nu_{i>3}$  can be averaged out, at leading order in small unitary violating parameter, the mixing elements involved are those of  $i = 1, 2, 3$  which sum to [14, 17]

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 \mathbf{U}_{\alpha i} \mathbf{U}_{\beta j}^* \neq \delta_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (14)$$

We denote this as *low scale* nonunitary scenario. If some additional states are not kinematically allowed in the process, one should describe it as in the high scale nonunitary scenario discussed previously, with possible enlargement of flavor beyond 3 to accommodate additional kinematically accessible states.

### III. GENERIC $3 + N$ NEUTRINO OSCILLATIONS

Here we will develop a generic  $3 + N$  neutrino oscillation framework which can be applied to both unitary and nonunitary neutrino oscillation. In general, the neutrino flavor states  $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$  are related to the mass eigenstates  $|\nu_i\rangle$  through a matrix  $\mathbf{U}$

$$|\nu_\alpha\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha}}} \sum_i \mathbf{U}_{\alpha i}^* |\nu_i\rangle, \quad (15)$$

where  $\alpha, \beta, \dots = e, \mu, \tau, s_1, s_2, \dots, s_N$  ( $\nu_e, \nu_\mu$  and  $\nu_\tau$  are the SM left-handed neutrino flavor states) and  $i, j, \dots = 1, 2, \dots, 3 + N$ . In general,  $\mathbf{U}$  does not have to be unitary  $\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger \neq \mathbf{I}$  and  $\mathbf{U}^\dagger \mathbf{U} \neq \mathbf{I}$ . Since the mass eigenstates are orthogonal  $\langle \nu_j | \nu_i \rangle = \delta_{ji}$ , the flavor states are properly normalized  $\langle \nu_\alpha | \nu_\alpha \rangle = 1$  though they are not necessarily orthogonal but equal to

$$\langle \nu_\beta | \nu_\alpha \rangle = \frac{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\alpha}}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\beta}}}. \quad (16)$$

In other words, there is nonzero overlap between different flavor states and there is a probability of flavor changing even at zero distance. The set of all  $\{|\nu_i\rangle\}$  is complete and

from the orthogonality condition, it further satisfies the completeness relation

$$\sum_i |\nu_i\rangle \langle \nu_i| = \mathbf{I}. \quad (17)$$

From eq. (15), we can write the inverse relation<sup>3</sup>

$$|\nu_i\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} (\mathbf{U}^{*, -1})_{i\alpha} \sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^{\dagger})_{\alpha\alpha}} |\nu_{\alpha}\rangle. \quad (18)$$

One can verify the orthogonality condition

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \nu_j | \nu_i \rangle &= \sum_{\alpha, \beta} (\mathbf{U}^{-1})_{j\beta} (\mathbf{U}^{*, -1})_{i\alpha} \langle \nu_{\beta} | \nu_{\alpha} \rangle \\ &= (\mathbf{U}^{-1} \mathbf{U} \mathbf{U}^{\dagger} \mathbf{U}^{\dagger, -1})_{ji} = \delta_{ji}, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

where in the second equality, we have used eq. (16). In the rest of the article, to avoid expressions crowded with normalization factors, we will define

$$\bar{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha i} \equiv \frac{\mathbf{U}_{\alpha i}}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^{\dagger})_{\alpha\alpha}}}. \quad (20)$$

Starting from an initial state  $|\nu_{\alpha}(0)\rangle = |\nu_{\alpha}\rangle$ , the time-evolved state  $|\nu_{\alpha}(t)\rangle$  is described by the Schrödinger equation

$$i \frac{d}{dt} |\nu_{\alpha}(t)\rangle = \mathcal{H} |\nu_{\alpha}(t)\rangle, \quad (21)$$

where the Hamiltonian is  $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_I$  with  $\mathcal{H}_0$  the free Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_0 |\nu_i\rangle = E_i |\nu_i\rangle, \quad E_i = \sqrt{\vec{p}_i^2 + m_i^2}, \quad (22)$$

and  $\mathcal{H}_I$  the interaction Hamiltonian with matrix elements

$$\langle \nu_{\beta} | \mathcal{H}_I | \nu_{\alpha} \rangle = V_{\beta\alpha}, \quad (23)$$

where  $V_{\beta\alpha}^* = V_{\alpha\beta}$  since  $\mathcal{H}_I^{\dagger} = \mathcal{H}_I$ .

Assuming relativistic neutrinos, we trade  $t = x$  and the amplitude of the transition  $\nu_{\alpha} \rightarrow \nu_{\beta}$  at distance  $x$  is then given by  $S_{\beta\alpha}(x) \equiv \langle \nu_{\beta} | \nu_{\alpha}(x) \rangle$  and the probability of an initial state  $|\nu_{\alpha}\rangle$  being detected as  $|\nu_{\beta}\rangle$  at distance  $x$  is

$$P_{\beta\alpha}(x) = |S_{\beta\alpha}(x)|^2. \quad (24)$$

---

<sup>3</sup> We can prove that inverse exists. Supposing that

$$|\nu_i\rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \mathbf{V}_{i\alpha} |\nu_{\alpha}\rangle,$$

and using orthogonality condition  $\langle \nu_j | \nu_i \rangle = \delta_{ji}$ , we have

$$\delta_{ij} = \sum_{\alpha} \mathbf{V}_{i\alpha} \langle \nu_j | \nu_{\alpha} \rangle = \sum_{\alpha} \mathbf{V}_{i\alpha} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^{\dagger})_{\alpha\alpha}}} \mathbf{U}_{\alpha j}^*,$$

and hence  $\mathbf{V}_{i\alpha} = \sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^{\dagger})_{\alpha\alpha}} (\mathbf{U}^{*, -1})_{i\alpha}$ .



From (21), we can write the evolution equation of  $S_{\beta\alpha}(x)$  as

$$\begin{aligned}
i \frac{d}{dx} S_{\beta\alpha}(x) &= \langle \nu_\beta | \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_I | \nu_\alpha(t) \rangle \\
&= \sum_i \langle \nu_\beta | \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_I | \nu_i \rangle \langle \nu_i | \nu_\alpha(t) \rangle \\
&= \sum_\eta \left[ \sum_i \bar{U}_{\beta i} E_i \left( \bar{U}^{-1} \right)_{i\eta} + \sum_\gamma V_{\beta\gamma} \left( \overline{U U^\dagger} \right)_{\gamma\eta}^{-1} \right] S_{\eta\alpha}(x), \tag{25}
\end{aligned}$$

where in the second equality, we have inserted the completeness relation eq. (17) and in the last equality, we have used eqs. (22), (23), (18) and (16). Considering relativistic neutrinos  $E \gg m_i$  and expanding  $E_i \simeq E + \frac{m_i^2}{2E}$ , we obtain, in matrix notation

$$i \frac{dS(x)}{dx} = \left[ \bar{U} \Delta \bar{U}^{-1} + V \left( \overline{U U^\dagger} \right)^{-1} \right] S(x), \tag{26}$$

where

$$\Delta \equiv \frac{1}{2E} \text{diag} (m_1^2, m_2^2, \dots, m_{3+N}^2) = \text{diag} (\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_{3+N}). \tag{27}$$

We have dropped the constant  $E$  which is an overall phase in  $S(x)$  and hence does not affect the probability in eq. (24).

### A. Vacuum mass basis

From eq. (26), the Hamiltonian in the flavor basis given by

$$H \equiv \bar{U} \Delta \bar{U}^{-1} + V \left( \overline{U U^\dagger} \right)^{-1}, \tag{28}$$

is not Hermitian  $H^\dagger \neq H$  nor *normal*  $H^\dagger H \neq H H^\dagger$ . In the following, we will prove that they can be diagonalized with real eigenvalues.

Let us change the Hamiltonian to the *vacuum mass basis* in which the free Hamiltonian is diagonal

$$\tilde{H} \equiv \bar{U}^{-1} H \bar{U} = \Delta + \bar{U}^{-1} V \bar{U}^{\dagger,-1}. \tag{29}$$

Notice that eq. (29) is Hermitian  $\tilde{H}^\dagger = \tilde{H}$ . Assuming  $V = V^\dagger$  is constant in the interval of interest  $0 \leq x < x_1$ , we can diagonalize the  $\tilde{H}$  with a unitary matrix  $X$

$$\tilde{H} = X \hat{H} X^\dagger, \tag{30}$$

where  $X$  is unitary and  $\hat{H} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_{3+N})$  is diagonal and real. Since eqs. (28) and (29) are related by similar transformation, they have the same eigenvalues  $\tilde{H}X = X\hat{H} \implies H\bar{U}X = \bar{U}X\hat{H}$  and hence we can also write

$$H = \bar{U}X\hat{H}(\bar{U}X)^{-1}, \quad (31)$$

where the nonnormal  $H$  is diagonalized by a nonunitary  $\bar{U}X$ . We see explicitly that despite the Hamiltonian in flavor basis  $H$  appears to be non-Hermitian, the eigenvalues remain real while the source of nonunitarity comes nonunitary  $\mathbf{U}$  resulting in nonorthogonal flavor basis. Although  $\bar{U}X$  is nonunitary, one can formally solve for  $(\bar{U}X)_{\alpha i}(\bar{U}X)_{i\beta}^{-1}$  in terms of eigenvalues and Hamiltonian elements using the same method as in refs. [23, 32]. Nevertheless, as we will see in the next subsection, the combination which appears in neutrino oscillation probability is not  $(\bar{U}X)_{\alpha i}(\bar{U}X)_{i\beta}^{-1}$  and we will solve for  $X_{ik}X_{jk}^*$  instead.

As shown in refs. [23, 32], by raising eq. (30) to the power of  $1, 2, \dots, 2 + N$  and taking into account the unitary relation  $XX^\dagger = \mathbf{I}$ , one can form a set of  $3 + N$  linearly independent equations for  $X_{ik}X_{jk}^*$  where the coefficients form a Vandermonde matrix<sup>4</sup> which can be inverted to give [23] (see also the pioneering work of Kimura, Takamura and Yokomakura who applied similar method for 3-flavor scenario [33, 34])

$$X_{ik}X_{jk}^* = \frac{\sum_{p=0}^{2+N} (-1)^p (\tilde{H}^p)_{ij} c_{2+N-p,k}}{Z_k}, \quad (32)$$

where we have defined

$$Z_k \equiv \prod_{p \neq k} (\lambda_p - \lambda_k), \quad (33)$$

$$c_{p,k} \equiv \sum_{\{q \neq r \neq \dots\} \neq k} \underbrace{\lambda_q \lambda_r \dots}_p, \quad (34)$$

with  $[\tilde{H}^0]_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$  and  $c_{0,k} = 1$ . The sum in  $c_{p,k}$  is over all possible unordered combinations of  $p$  distinct eigenvalues  $\lambda_q \lambda_r \dots$  where none of them is equal to  $\lambda_k$  and hence with  $3 + N$  neutrino flavors,  $c_{p,k}$  has  $\binom{2+N}{p} = \frac{(2+N)!}{p!(2+N-p)!}$  terms in the sum. As shown in ref. [35], the

<sup>4</sup> The equations obtained with power in  $\lambda_i$  greater than  $2 + N$  are not linearly independent since they can be rewritten in term of lower power using the characteristic equation of  $\tilde{H}$ . Suppose we have  $d + 1$  degenerate eigenvalues  $\lambda_l = \lambda_k$  for  $l = k, \dots, k + d$ , we only need to solve for the combination  $\sum_l X_{il}X_{jl}^*$  corresponding to  $\lambda_k$ , i.e.  $3 + N - d$  linear equations can be obtained from raising eq. (30) to the power of  $1, 2, \dots, 2 + N - d$ , including  $XX^\dagger = \mathbf{I}$ .

numerator of eq. (32) can be written in mathematically equivalent form in terms of elements of the adjugate of  $\lambda_k I - \tilde{H}$  i.e.  $[\text{Adj}(\lambda_k I - \tilde{H})]_{ij}$  though we have found that that numerically evaluating the analytical expression eq. (32) is about three times faster than evaluating the expression with adjugate.

## B. Oscillation probability

There is one subtle but *crucial* point regarding  $\tilde{S}$  in the vacuum mass basis which satisfies

$$i \frac{d\tilde{S}(x)}{dx} = \tilde{H} \tilde{S}(x), \quad (35)$$

and the solution is given by

$$\tilde{S}(x) = X e^{-i\tilde{H}x} X^\dagger. \quad (36)$$

How do we relate  $\tilde{S}(x)$  of the vacuum mass basis and  $S(x)$  in the flavor basis? Fixing the initial conditions  $\tilde{S}(0) = \mathbf{I}$  and  $S(0) = \overline{\mathbf{U}}\mathbf{U}^\dagger$  which follow from the orthogonality of mass eigenstates and the nonorthogonality of flavor eigenstates eq. (16), respectively, we have

$$\tilde{S}(x) \equiv \overline{\mathbf{U}}^{-1} S(x) \overline{\mathbf{U}}^{\dagger,-1}. \quad (37)$$

Hence we can write

$$S(x) = \overline{\mathbf{U}} X e^{-i\tilde{H}x} (\overline{\mathbf{U}} X)^\dagger. \quad (38)$$

It follows from eq. (24) that the neutrino oscillation probability for  $\nu_\alpha \rightarrow \nu_\beta$  at a distance  $0 \leq x < x_1$  is<sup>5</sup>

$$P_{\beta\alpha}(x) = \left| \sum_{i,j,k} \overline{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta i} \overline{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha j}^* X_{ik} X_{jk}^* e^{-i\lambda_k x} \right|^2. \quad (39)$$

which has exactly the same form as the unitary case despite that  $\overline{\mathbf{U}}$  does not have to be unitary.

One can generalize the solution in eq. (38) to the case when  $V$  is  $x$ -dependent by splitting  $x$  into intervals small enough that  $V(x)$  is approximately constant. Considering  $0 = x_0 < x_1 < x_2 < \dots$  where  $V(x)$  is equal to constant  $V_a$  for each interval  $x_{a-1} < x < x_a$ , we obtain

$$S(x) = T \prod_{a=1} S^{(a)}(x), \quad (40)$$

---

<sup>5</sup> The oscillation probability  $\overline{P}_{\beta\alpha}(x)$  for antineutrino  $\bar{\nu}_\alpha \rightarrow \bar{\nu}_\beta$  is obtained by taking  $\overline{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha i} \rightarrow \overline{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha i}^*$  and since our Universe consists only of matter, we should also take  $V \rightarrow -V$  in eq. (35).

where we have defined

$$S^{(a)}(x) \equiv (\bar{\mathbf{U}}X^{(a)}) e^{-i\hat{H}^{(a)}x^{(a)}} (\bar{\mathbf{U}}X^{(a)})^\dagger, \quad (41)$$

$$x^{(a)} \equiv [(x - x_{a-1})\theta(x_a - x) + (x_a - x_{a-1})\theta(x - x_a)]\theta(x - x_{a-1}), \quad (42)$$

with  $\theta(x \geq 0) = 1$ ,  $\theta(x < 0) = 0$  and  $T$  denotes the space ordering of the matrix multiplication such that the  $a$  term is always to the left of  $a - 1$  term. Furthermore,  $\hat{H}^{(a)} = \text{diag}(\lambda_1^{(a)}, \lambda_2^{(a)}, \dots, \lambda_{3+N}^{(a)})$  and  $X^{(a)}$  denote respectively the matrix of eigenvalues and unitary matrix which diagonalizes  $\tilde{H}$  as  $\tilde{H}^{(a)} = X^{(a)\dagger}\hat{H}^{(a)}X^{(a)}$  in the interval  $x_{a-1} < x < x_a$ . The neutrino oscillation probability can be calculated by substituting eq. (40) into eq. (24).

We will end this section by proving the following theorem.

**Theorem.** *If  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} \neq 1$  and  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , then the neutrino oscillation probability in an arbitrary matter potential is indistinguishable from the unitary scenario.*

The proof is as follows

$$\sum_i \bar{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta i} \bar{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha i}^* = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\beta}}} \sum_i \mathbf{U}_{\beta i} \mathbf{U}_{\alpha i}^* = \frac{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} \delta_{\alpha\beta}}{\sqrt{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\beta}}} = \delta_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (43)$$

From the above, it follows that  $(\bar{\mathbf{U}}\bar{\mathbf{U}}^\dagger)^{-1} = \mathbf{I} \implies \bar{\mathbf{U}}^{\dagger,-1}\bar{\mathbf{U}}^{-1} = \mathbf{I} \implies \bar{\mathbf{U}}^\dagger\bar{\mathbf{U}} = \mathbf{I}$  and hence  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$  is unitary. With unitary  $\bar{\mathbf{U}}$ , the Hamiltonians in the vacuum mass basis in eq. (29) reduces and coincides with the unitary one and hence the solution in eq. (41) will coincide with the unitary scenario as well. This result holds for an arbitrary matter potential  $V(x)$  since one can always construct the full solution as in (40). Let us denote this scenario as the *hidden nonunitary* scenario.

### C. Identities

The combination that appears in the oscillation amplitude in the flavor basis (38) is

$$\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta k} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha k}^* \equiv \sum_{i,j} \bar{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta i} \bar{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha j}^* X_{ik} X_{jk}^*. \quad (44)$$

Substituting eq. (32) into the equation above, we obtain

$$\tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta k} \tilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha k}^* = \frac{\sum_{p=0}^{2+N} (-1)^p (\bar{H}^p)_{\beta\alpha} c_{2+N-p,k}}{Z_k}, \quad (45)$$

where we have defined

$$\overline{H} \equiv \overline{\mathbf{U}} \widetilde{H} \overline{\mathbf{U}}^\dagger = H \overline{\mathbf{U}} \overline{\mathbf{U}}^\dagger = \overline{\mathbf{U}} \Delta \overline{\mathbf{U}}^\dagger + V, \quad (46)$$

and we have used eq. (29) and eq. (28) to arrive at the last equality. It is important to note that  $\overline{H}$  is not equal to the Hamiltonian in the flavor basis  $H$  but they only coincide with each other if  $\overline{\mathbf{U}}$  is unitary. Furthermore,  $\overline{H}$ , not being related to  $\widetilde{H}$  and  $H$  by similarity transformation, does not have to have the same eigenvalues as  $\widetilde{H}$  and  $H$ .

Under trace transformation  $H \rightarrow H + c \mathbf{I}$  with  $c$  any real constant or phase transformation  $H \rightarrow \Phi H \Phi^\dagger$  with  $\Phi = \text{diag}(e^{i\phi_1}, e^{i\phi_2}, \dots)$ , the probabilities (observables) (24) remain invariant. By observing that the following trace and phase transformation invariant combinations [36]

$$I_{\alpha\beta} = \text{Im} \left[ (H^2)_{\alpha\beta} H_{\alpha\beta}^* \right], \quad (47)$$

$$R_{\alpha\beta} = |H_{\alpha\beta}|^2, \quad \alpha \neq \beta, \quad (48)$$

should be independent of matter potential if the matter potential is *diagonal* in the flavor basis, several matter invariant identities are derived. The first one results in the Naumov-Harrison-Scott (NHS) identity [36, 37] or their generalized versions [35] while the second one results in further matter-invariant identities [35, 36]. In the nonunitary scenario, this is no longer true since the matter potential in the flavor basis (28) is no longer diagonal but given by  $V \left( \overline{\mathbf{U}} \overline{\mathbf{U}}^\dagger \right)^{-1}$ . Incidentally, this also shows that once we have nondiagonal NonStandard neutrino Interaction (NSI), eqs. (47) and (48) are no longer invariant under matter potential [23, 35]. As shown in ref. [23], NSI is still distinct from nonunitary scenario since the latter further breaks the unitary relations that we will discuss next.

Let us define the Jarlskog combinations by taking the imaginary part of the combination above [38]

$$J_{\beta\alpha}^{jk} \equiv \text{Im} \left( \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta j} \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha j}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta k}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha k} \right). \quad (49)$$

If  $\widetilde{\mathbf{U}}$  is unitary, one must have

$$\sum_k J_{\beta\alpha}^{jk} = \sum_k \text{Im} \left( \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta j} \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha j}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta k}^* \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\alpha k} \right) = \text{Im} \left( \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta j} \widetilde{\mathbf{U}}_{\beta j}^* \right) = 0. \quad (50)$$

Let us look at the modification due to nonunitarity. Since all the terms with  $p = q$  are real and we are only left with terms of  $p \neq q$

$$J_{\beta\alpha}^{jk} = \sum_{p \neq q; 0 \leq p < q}^{2+N} (-1)^{p+q} \frac{C_{2+N-p,j} C_{2+N-q,k} - C_{2+N-q,j} C_{2+N-p,k}}{Z_j Z_k} \text{Im} \left[ (\overline{H}^p)_{\beta\alpha} (\overline{H}^q)_{\beta\alpha}^* \right], \quad (51)$$

where there is no sum over  $j$  and  $k$  on the right and we have used  $\text{Im}z = -\text{Im}z^*$ . Summing over  $k$  and making use of

$$\sum_{k=1}^{3+N} \frac{c_{2+N-p,k}}{Z_k} = \begin{cases} 0 & p > 0 \\ 1 & p = 0 \end{cases}, \quad (52)$$

we arrive at

$$\sum_k J_{\beta\alpha}^{jk} = \sum_{q=1}^{2+N} (-1)^{q+1} \frac{c_{2+N-q,j}}{Z_j} \text{Im} \left[ \left( \overline{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger} \right)_{\beta\alpha} \left( \overline{H^q} \right)_{\beta\alpha}^* \right], \quad (53)$$

where we have used  $\overline{H^0} = \overline{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger}$ . For unitary  $\overline{\mathbf{U}} \implies \left( \overline{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger} \right)_{\beta\alpha} = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$  and since  $\overline{H^q}$  is Hermitian, the diagonal elements are real and we recover eq. (50). This is consistent with the theorem we have proven and indeed, if  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , the right hand side of eq. (53) vanishes. In the vacuum,  $\overline{H^q} = \left( \overline{\mathbf{U}\Delta\mathbf{U}^\dagger} \right)^q$  and one recover

$$\sum_k J_{\beta\alpha}^{jk} = -\text{Im} \left[ \left( \overline{\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger} \right)_{\beta\alpha} \overline{U}_{\alpha j} \overline{U}_{\beta j}^* \right], \quad (54)$$

as can also be derived directly from eq. (49). So by measuring these relations above, we can uncover unitarity violation in the matter (53) or in the vacuum (54).

## IV. HIGH VERSUS LOW SCALE NONUNITARITY

### A. In vacuum

In the absence of matter  $X_{ij} = \delta_{ij}$ , eq. (39) becomes

$$P_{\beta\alpha}(x) = \left| \sum_i \overline{U}_{\beta i} \overline{U}_{\alpha i}^* e^{-\frac{im_i^2 x}{2E}} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} (\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\beta}} \left| \sum_i U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha i}^* e^{-\frac{im_i^2 x}{2E}} \right|^2. \quad (55)$$

For the high scale nonunitary scenario,  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} = (UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} \neq 1$  and we obtain

$$P_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{high}}(x) = \frac{1}{(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} (UU^\dagger)_{\beta\beta}} \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha i}^* e^{-\frac{im_i^2 x}{2E}} \right|^2, \quad (56)$$

where  $U$  spans over three flavors. According to the theorem proved in the previous section, in the hidden unitary scenario  $(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , one cannot distinguish it from unitary scenario since  $\overline{U}$  will be unitary. This implies that nonunitary effect is proportional to  $(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta}$  for  $\alpha \neq \beta$  as encapsulated in eq. (54), making it more challenging to distinguish

it from the unitary scenario if the modulus of  $(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta}$  is small (this conclusion also holds in an arbitrary matter potential as we will discuss next).

Next, let us contrast the high scale nonunitary scenario to the low scale nonunitary scenario.

- (i) For the low scale nonunitary scenario,  $\mathbf{U}$  is unitary with  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} = 1$  and we have

$$P_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{low}}(x) = \left| \sum_{i=1}^{3+N} \mathbf{U}_{\beta i} \mathbf{U}_{\alpha i}^* e^{-\frac{im_i^2 x}{2E}} \right|^2. \quad (57)$$

The most direct way to discover low scale nonunitary scenario is to have an experiment with  $m_{i>3}^2 \sim E/x$  such that oscillations involving new fermions can be measured.<sup>6</sup> The main challenge is, a priori, we do not know  $m_{i>3}$  or even if  $\nu_{i>3}$  exist but one can design an experiment with identical detectors at various baselines to cover as large range of  $E/x$  as possible. In the scenario, unitary relations (50) is satisfied in contrast to high scale nonunitary scenario which satisfies (54).

- (ii) If  $m_{i>3} \gg \sqrt{\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2}$  such that the oscillations involving them are averaged out, we obtain [14, 17]

$$P_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{low,ave}}(x) = \mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta} + \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{U}_{\beta i} \hat{U}_{\alpha i}^* e^{-\frac{im_i^2 x}{2E}} \right|^2, \quad (58)$$

where we use  $\hat{U}$  to denote  $3 \times 3$  submatrix from  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta}$  is an additional constant term, also known as the *probability leaking term*

$$\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta} = \sum_{i=4}^{3+N} |\mathbf{U}_{\alpha i}|^2 |\mathbf{U}_{\beta i}|^2. \quad (59)$$

It is bounded from above and below [14]

$$\frac{1}{N} d_{\alpha\beta} \leq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta} \leq d_{\alpha\beta}, \quad (60)$$

where  $d_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \left(1 - \sum_{i=1}^3 |\hat{U}_{\alpha i}|^2\right) \left(1 - \sum_{j=1}^3 |\hat{U}_{\beta j}|^2\right)$ . In principle, a measurement of  $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta}$  will allow us to obtain information about the number  $N$  of additional fermions.

---

<sup>6</sup> For example, a recent short baseline reactor experiment STEREO [39] rules out the existence of a sterile neutrino with mass in the eV range and mixing element of the order of 0.4 and larger.

Notice that for  $N = 1$ ,  $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta}$  is completely fixed by  $\hat{U}$ . In practice, it is a challenging task since this term is expected to be small, being fourth order in unitarity violation parameter

$$\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \sqrt{\left| \delta_{\alpha\beta} - \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{U}_{\beta i} \hat{U}_{\alpha i}^* \right|}. \quad (61)$$

It is easier to distinguish eq. (58) and eq. (56) from the normalization term  $(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha} (UU^\dagger)_{\beta\beta}$  since this is an effect of  $\epsilon^2$ . We can also measure this deviation by looking at the deviation from unitary relations (50). With oscillations involving  $\nu_{i>3}$  averaged out, one cannot have direct access to the  $J_{\beta\alpha}^{jk}$  with  $j, k > 3$  in eq. (49) and hence we have

$$\sum_k J_{\beta\alpha}^{jk} = -\text{Im} \left[ \left( \hat{U} \hat{U}^\dagger \right)_{\beta\alpha} \hat{U}_{\alpha j} \hat{U}_{\beta j}^* \right], \quad (62)$$

in contrast to eq. (54) for the high scale nonunitary scenario.

In Figure 2, we plot the oscillation probability for  $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$  as a function of neutrino energy  $E_\nu$  fixing the baseline  $x = 1300$  km, for the standard three-flavor unitary scenario (solid black line), high scale (dotted lines) and low scale (dashed lines) nonunitary scenarios. Here and in the following, the standard parameters are always set to the global best fit values for NO from [1, 2]. For the high scale nonunitary scenario, we set  $(UU^\dagger)_{ee} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = 0.96$ ,  $(UU^\dagger)_{\tau\tau} = 1$ ,  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\tau} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\tau} = 0$  and  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu} = \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 0.03\}$ . To compare with the low scale nonunitary scenario where oscillations involving  $\nu_{i>3}$  are averaged out, we also set  $(\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{ee} = (\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = 0.96$ ,  $(\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{\tau\tau} = 1$ ,  $(\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{e\tau} = (\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{\mu\tau} = 0$  and  $(\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{e\mu} = \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 0.03\}$ . With this choice, the leaking term is bounded as  $0.0016/N < \mathcal{C}_{e\mu} \leq 0.0016$  and we have set  $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta} = 0.0016$  for illustration. As we can see explicitly, as  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu}$  decreases, the high scale nonunitary scenario approaches the unitary scenario while for the low scale nonunitary scenario, this does not happens. To illustrate the effect of  $\mathcal{C}_{e\mu}$ , we plot in Figure 3 by setting  $\mathcal{C}_{e\mu} = 0$  (dotted lines) in comparison with the case with  $\mathcal{C}_{e\mu} = 0.0016$  (dashed lines).

In the neutrino experiments, the number of observed of neutrinos at the detector can be






FIG. 2. Comparison of the probability of  $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$  at  $x = 1300 \text{ km}$  in the vacuum as a function of neutrino energy  $E_\nu$  between the high scale nonunitary scenario (dotted lines) and low scale nonunitary scenario (dashed lines) with  $(UU^\dagger)_{ee} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = (\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{ee} = (\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = 0.96$ . The solid black line is the standard three-flavor unitary scenario.

written as<sup>7</sup>

$$N_{\beta\alpha} = \sigma_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}(x) \phi_\alpha, \quad (63)$$

where  $\phi_\alpha$  is the  $\nu_\alpha$  neutrino flux at production and  $\sigma_\beta$  is the detection cross section of  $\nu_\beta$  and the energy dependence of all the terms are left implicit. In order to determine  $P_{\beta\alpha}(x)$  from  $N_{\beta\alpha}$ , it is crucial to have precise determination of  $\sigma_\beta \times \phi_\alpha$ . To mitigate the uncertainty in flux determination, one can take the ratio of measurement in a far detector placed at  $x_1$  and a near detector placed at  $x_0$

$$\frac{N_{\beta\alpha}(x_1)}{N_{\alpha\alpha}(x_0)} = \frac{\sigma_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}(x_1) \phi_\alpha}{\sigma_\alpha P_{\alpha\alpha}(x_0) \phi_\alpha} = \frac{\sigma_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}(x_1)}{\sigma_\alpha P_{\alpha\alpha}(x_0)}. \quad (64)$$

<sup>7</sup> This is a theorist's expression that we have not included experimental effects like detection efficiency and energy reconstruction.




FIG. 3. The probability of  $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$  at  $x = 1300 \text{ km}$  in the vacuum as a function of neutrino energy  $E_\nu$  for low scale nonunitary scenario with  $(\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{ee} = (\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = 0.96$  by setting the leaking term to be the maximum  $\mathcal{C}_{e\mu} = 0.0016$  (dashed lines) and the minimum  $\mathcal{C}_{e\mu} = 0$  (dotted lines). The solid black line is the standard three-flavor unitary scenario.

For the high and low scale unitary scenarios with  $x_0 \ll E/m_i^2$  for all  $i$ , eqs. (56) and (57) are

$$P_{\alpha\alpha}^{\text{high}}(x_0) \simeq P_{\alpha\alpha}^{\text{low}}(x_0) \simeq 1 - \mathcal{O}(x_0^2 m_i^4 / E^2), \quad (65)$$

which give

$$\frac{N_{\beta\alpha}(x_1)}{N_{\alpha\alpha}(x_0)} \simeq \frac{\sigma_\beta}{\sigma_\alpha} P_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{high,low}}(x_1). \quad (66)$$

With dedicated measurements of  $\sigma_\beta$  and  $\sigma_\alpha$ , the two scenarios can be distinguished from eqs. (56) and (57).<sup>8</sup>In the low scale unitary scenario with  $x_0 \gg E/m_i^2$  for  $i > 3$  such that

<sup>8</sup> In the high scale unitary scenario, the additional factor which appears in the cross section in comparison with the SM expectation  $\sigma_\alpha = \sigma_\alpha^{\text{SM}}(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha}$ . This factor should already be included in dedicated measurement.

the fast oscillations can be averaged out, eq. (58) gives

$$P_{\alpha\alpha}^{\text{low,ave}}(x_0) \simeq \mathcal{C}_{\alpha\alpha} + \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{U}_{\alpha i} \hat{U}_{\alpha i}^* \right|^2 - \mathcal{O}(x_0^2 m_i^4 / E^2). \quad (67)$$

In this case, one has

$$\frac{N_{\beta\alpha}(x_1)}{N_{\alpha\alpha}(x_0)} \simeq \frac{\sigma_\beta}{\sigma_\alpha} \frac{P_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{low,ave}}(x_1)}{\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\alpha} + \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{U}_{\alpha i} \hat{U}_{\alpha i}^* \right|^2}. \quad (68)$$

which can be differentiated from eq. (66). This type of arrangement has been planned in the upcoming neutrino experiments DUNE [40] and T2HK [41].

Besides through neutrino oscillation experiments, the synergy with constraints from the electroweak precision measurements is needed to discover high scale nonunitarity [42, 43] or low scale nonunitarity [44]. If  $(\mathbf{UU}^\dagger)_{ee} = (\mathbf{UU}^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = (\mathbf{UU}^\dagger)_{\tau\tau} \neq 1$ , one can measure this deviation by comparing the leptonic weak processes with the hadronic weak processes. For instance, while absolute lifetimes of  $\mu^\pm$ ,  $\pi^\pm$ ,  $K^\pm$  and  $K^0$  will be affected, the leptonic branching ratios will be the same. For  $K^\pm$  and  $K^0$ , the branching ratios to hadronic and leptonic channels will be modified. If  $(\mathbf{UU}^\dagger)_{ee} \neq (\mathbf{UU}^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} \neq (\mathbf{UU}^\dagger)_{\tau\tau} \neq 1$ , lepton universality is broken and one can measure this by studying different leptonic weak processes. The reader can refer to refs. [42–44] for more details.

## B. In matter

Now let us consider the scenario with matter effect. For high scale nonunitary scenario, eq. (29) is just

$$\tilde{H}^{\text{high}} = \Delta + \bar{U}^{-1} V \bar{U}^{\dagger,-1}, \quad (69)$$

where  $\bar{U}$  spans over 3 flavor. According to theorem proved earlier, in the hidden unitary scenario  $(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta} = 0$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ ,  $\bar{U}$  is unitary and hence  $\tilde{H}^{\text{high}}$  is indistinguishable from the unitary scenario. Moreover, this result holds for an arbitrary potential  $V(x)$  since one can always split  $x$  into intervals small enough that  $V(x)$  is constant and then construct the full solution as in eq. (40). So even in matter, nonunitary effect is proportional to  $(UU^\dagger)_{\alpha\beta}$  for  $\alpha \neq \beta$  in the high scale nonunitary scenario as encapsulated in eq. (53).

In low scale nonunitary scenario,  $\bar{U}^{-1} = \mathbf{U}^\dagger$ , eq. (29) becomes

$$\tilde{H}^{\text{low}} = \Delta + \mathbf{U}^\dagger V \mathbf{U}. \quad (70)$$

First of all, notice that eqs. (47) and (48) remain matter invariant as long as  $V$  is diagonal and hence the resulting matter invariant identities hold. Next, besides the two possibilities discussed in the vacuum case, now we have a new handle: with the matter effect, the difference appear at leading order in small unitary violating parameter  $\epsilon$  in which the leading Hamiltonian  $\tilde{H}^{\text{low}}$  is given by [17]

$$\tilde{H}^{\text{low},0} = \Delta + \hat{U}^\dagger V \hat{U}. \quad (71)$$

Comparing the  $\tilde{H}^{\text{high}}$  and  $\tilde{H}^{\text{low},0}$ , the difference is proportional to

$$\tilde{H}^{\text{low},0} - \tilde{H}^{\text{high}} = \hat{U}^\dagger V \hat{U} - U^{-1} \kappa V \kappa U^{\dagger,-1}, \quad (72)$$

where we have written  $\bar{U} = \kappa^{-1} U$  with  $\kappa \equiv \text{diag} \left( \sqrt{(UU^\dagger)_{ee}}, \sqrt{(UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu}}, \sqrt{(UU^\dagger)_{\tau\tau}} \right)$ .

Let us suppose that  $\hat{U} = U$ , i.e., the nonunitary effect results in an identical  $3 \times 3$  submatrix. Then  $\tilde{H}^{\text{low},0} - \tilde{H}^{\text{high}} \neq 0$  and matter effects will result in different eigenvalues and eigenvectors. For  $0 \leq x < x_1$  where  $V$  is constant, we can solve for the oscillation amplitude  $S$  in the flavor basis (38) as follows

$$S_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{high}} = \kappa_\beta^{-1} \kappa_\alpha^{-1} \sum_{i,j,k} U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha j}^* X_{ik}^{\text{high}} X_{jk}^{\text{high},*} e^{-i\lambda_k^{\text{high}} x}, \quad (73)$$

$$S_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{low},0} = \sum_{i,j,k} U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha j}^* X_{ik}^{\text{low}} X_{jk}^{\text{low},*} e^{-i\lambda_k^{\text{low}} x}. \quad (74)$$

Hence, besides the amplitudes, the frequencies are different due to different eigenvalues  $\lambda_k$ .

To minimize the difference in matter potential, let us make a different choice  $\hat{U} = \kappa U^{\dagger,-1}$  such that  $\tilde{H}^{\text{low},0} = \tilde{H}^{\text{high}}$ . In this case,  $\tilde{H}^{\text{high}}$  and  $\tilde{H}^{\text{low},0}$  will have exactly the same eigenvalues  $\lambda_k$  and are diagonalized by the same unitary matrix  $X$ . So, we have

$$S_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{high}} = \kappa_\beta^{-1} \kappa_\alpha^{-1} \sum_{i,j,k} U_{\beta i} U_{\alpha j}^* X_{ik} X_{jk}^* e^{-i\lambda_k x}, \quad (75)$$

$$S_{\beta\alpha}^{\text{low},0} = \kappa_\beta \kappa_\alpha \sum_{i,j,k} (U^{\dagger,-1})_{\beta i} (U^{\dagger,-1})_{\alpha j}^* X_{ik} X_{jk}^* e^{-i\lambda_k x}, \quad (76)$$

where the differences are only in the amplitudes.

In Figure 4, we show identical situation with Figure 2 except with a constant matter density of  $3 \text{ g/cm}^3$ . Overall, the matter effect enhances the differences between the high scale and low scale nonunitary scenarios as expected. We also observe that with decreasing modulus of  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu}$ , the high scale nonunitary scenario approaches the unitary scenario (the black line) while this does not happen for the low scale nonunitary scenario. In Figure




FIG. 4. Same as Figure 2 but in a constant matter density of  $3 \text{ g/cm}^3$ .

5, we consider earth core-crossing neutrinos in a simplified PREM model (see appendix A of [23]) with high scale nonunitary parameters  $(UU^\dagger)_{ee} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = 0.96$ ,  $(UU^\dagger)_{\tau\tau} = 1$ ,  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\tau} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\tau} = 0$  and  $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu} = \{10^{-3}, 10^{-2}, 0.03\}$ . For low scale nonunitary parameters, on the left plot, we set  $\hat{U} = U$  while on the right plot, we set  $\hat{U} = \kappa U^{\dagger,-1}$ . These represent the two extreme cases where for  $\hat{U} = U$ , the difference in matter between the two scenarios is maximal while for  $\hat{U} = \kappa U^{\dagger,-1}$ , the matter effect is identical.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

In this article, we have derived analytical oscillation probability amplitude for arbitrary flavors of neutrinos without assuming a unitary  $\mathbf{U}$ . With this result, we have proven a theorem that as long as  $(\mathbf{U}\mathbf{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\alpha} = 0$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , the scenario is indistinguishable from a unitary scenario in an arbitrary matter potential. We further derive a general identity (53) which reduces to (54) in the vacuum and vanishes in the unitary scenario.




FIG. 5. Comparison of the probability of  $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$  as a function of neutrino energy  $E_\nu$  using the simplified PREM model for neutrino crossing through the Earth core between high scale nonunitary scenario (dotted lines) and low scale nonunitary scenario (dashed lines). We have shown the two extreme choices  $\hat{U} = U$  (left plot) and  $\hat{U} = \kappa U^\dagger, -1$  (right plot). See text for further explanation. The solid black line is the standard three-flavor unitary scenario.

We have highlighted the differences between high scale and low scale nonunitary scenarios in neutrino oscillations, which are to be expected since in the former case, all new physics are integrated out while in the latter, new states are accessible though not necessarily remain coherent to result in oscillations. On the one hand, although high scale nonunitary scenario is model-independent (all the effects are fully captured by a nonunitary  $U$ ), nonunitary effects are proportional to  $(UU^\dagger)_{\beta\alpha}$  for  $\alpha \neq \beta$  and hence they can be discovered only through appearance experiments  $\nu_\beta \rightarrow \nu_\alpha$ . On the other hand, while low scale nonunitary scenario is model-dependent (depending on the properties of the new states), an almost model-independent scenario can be obtained if oscillations involving the new states can be averaged out and nonunitary effects can be captured by a nonunitary  $\hat{U}$  and a leaking term  $\mathcal{C}_{\alpha\beta}$ . Furthermore, we have shown that low scale nonunitary effects remain even in the limit of vanishing  $(\hat{U}\hat{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\alpha}$  for all  $\alpha \neq \beta$ . High scale and low scale nonunitary scenarios are distinct, one should test them both in the neutrino oscillation experiments.

## VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

C.S.F. acknowledges the support by grant 2019/11197-6 and 2022/00404-3 from São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), and grant 301271/2019-4 and 407149/2021-0 from National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq).

- 
- [1] Ivan Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, Michele Maltoni, Thomas Schwetz, and Albert Zhou, “The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations,” *JHEP* **09**, 178 (2020), arXiv:2007.14792 [hep-ph].
  - [2] “NuFIT 5.2: Three-neutrino fit based on data available in November 2022,” .
  - [3] Steven Weinberg, “Baryon and Lepton Nonconserving Processes,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 1566–1570 (1979).
  - [4] Steven Weinberg, “Varieties of Baryon and Lepton Nonconservation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1694 (1980).
  - [5] S. Antusch, C. Biggio, E. Fernandez-Martinez, M. B. Gavela, and J. Lopez-Pavon, “Unitarity of the Leptonic Mixing Matrix,” *JHEP* **10**, 084 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0607020.
  - [6] E. Fernandez-Martinez, M. B. Gavela, J. Lopez-Pavon, and O. Yasuda, “CP-violation from non-unitary leptonic mixing,” *Phys. Lett. B* **649**, 427–435 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0703098.
  - [7] Zhi-zhong Xing, “Correlation between the Charged Current Interactions of Light and Heavy Majorana Neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **660**, 515–521 (2008), arXiv:0709.2220 [hep-ph].
  - [8] Srubabati Goswami and Toshihiko Ota, “Testing non-unitarity of neutrino mixing matrices at neutrino factories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 033012 (2008), arXiv:0802.1434 [hep-ph].
  - [9] Stefan Antusch, Mattias Blennow, Enrique Fernandez-Martinez, and Jacobo Lopez-Pavon, “Probing non-unitary mixing and CP-violation at a Neutrino Factory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 033002 (2009), arXiv:0903.3986 [hep-ph].
  - [10] Zhi-zhong Xing, “A full parametrization of the 6 X 6 flavor mixing matrix in the presence of three light or heavy sterile neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 013008 (2012), arXiv:1110.0083 [hep-ph].
  - [11] F. J. Escrihuela, D. V. Forero, O. G. Miranda, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, “On the description of nonunitary neutrino mixing,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 053009 (2015), [Erratum:

- Phys.Rev.D 93, 119905 (2016)], arXiv:1503.08879 [hep-ph].
- [12] Stephen Parke and Mark Ross-Lonergan, “Unitarity and the three flavor neutrino mixing matrix,” Phys. Rev. D **93**, 113009 (2016), arXiv:1508.05095 [hep-ph].
- [13] Debajyoti Dutta and Pomita Ghoshal, “Probing CP violation with T2K, NO $\nu$ A and DUNE in the presence of non-unitarity,” JHEP **09**, 110 (2016), arXiv:1607.02500 [hep-ph].
- [14] Chee Sheng Fong, Hisakazu Minakata, and Hiroshi Nunokawa, “A framework for testing leptonic unitarity by neutrino oscillation experiments,” JHEP **02**, 114 (2017), arXiv:1609.08623 [hep-ph].
- [15] Shao-Feng Ge, Pedro Pasquini, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Measuring the leptonic CP phase in neutrino oscillations with nonunitary mixing,” Phys. Rev. D **95**, 033005 (2017), arXiv:1605.01670 [hep-ph].
- [16] Mattias Blennow, Pilar Coloma, Enrique Fernandez-Martinez, Josu Hernandez-Garcia, and Jacobo Lopez-Pavon, “Non-Unitarity, sterile neutrinos, and Non-Standard neutrino Interactions,” JHEP **04**, 153 (2017), arXiv:1609.08637 [hep-ph].
- [17] Chee Sheng Fong, Hisakazu Minakata, and Hiroshi Nunokawa, “Non-unitary evolution of neutrinos in matter and the leptonic unitarity test,” JHEP **02**, 015 (2019), arXiv:1712.02798 [hep-ph].
- [18] Ivan Martinez-Soler and Hisakazu Minakata, “Standard versus Non-Standard CP Phases in Neutrino Oscillation in Matter with Non-Unitarity,” PTEP **2020**, 063B01 (2020), arXiv:1806.10152 [hep-ph].
- [19] Ivan Martinez-Soler and Hisakazu Minakata, “Physics of parameter correlations around the solar-scale enhancement in neutrino theory with unitarity violation,” PTEP **2020**, 113B01 (2020), arXiv:1908.04855 [hep-ph].
- [20] Sebastian A. R. Ellis, Kevin J. Kelly, and Shirley Weishi Li, “Current and Future Neutrino Oscillation Constraints on Leptonic Unitarity,” JHEP **12**, 068 (2020), arXiv:2008.01088 [hep-ph].
- [21] Yilin Wang and Shun Zhou, “Non-unitary leptonic flavor mixing and CP violation in neutrino-antineutrino oscillations,” Phys. Lett. B **824**, 136797 (2022), arXiv:2109.13622 [hep-ph].
- [22] Peter B. Denton and Julia Gehrlein, “New oscillation and scattering constraints on the tau row matrix elements without assuming unitarity,” JHEP **06**, 135 (2022), arXiv:2109.14575 [hep-ph].



- [23] Chee Sheng Fong, “Analytic Neutrino Oscillation Probabilities,” (2022), arXiv:2210.09436 [hep-ph].
- [24] “NuProbe: Neutrino oscillation as a Probe of New Physics,” .
- [25] A. M. Dziewonski and D. L. Anderson, “Preliminary reference earth model,” *Phys. Earth Planet. Interiors* **25**, 297–356 (1981).
- [26] Marco Cirelli, Guido Marandella, Alessandro Strumia, and Francesco Vissani, “Probing oscillations into sterile neutrinos with cosmology, astrophysics and experiments,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **708**, 215–267 (2005), arXiv:hep-ph/0403158.
- [27] Andre de Gouvea, Wei-Chih Huang, and James Jenkins, “Pseudo-Dirac Neutrinos in the New Standard Model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 073007 (2009), arXiv:0906.1611 [hep-ph].
- [28] G. Anamiati, R. M. Fonseca, and M. Hirsch, “Quasi Dirac neutrino oscillations,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 095008 (2018), arXiv:1710.06249 [hep-ph].
- [29] G. Anamiati, V. De Romeri, M. Hirsch, C. A. Ternes, and M. Tórtola, “Quasi-Dirac neutrino oscillations at DUNE and JUNO,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100**, 035032 (2019), arXiv:1907.00980 [hep-ph].
- [30] C. S. Fong, T. Gregoire, and A. Tonero, “Testing quasi-Dirac leptogenesis through neutrino oscillations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **816**, 136175 (2021), arXiv:2007.09158 [hep-ph].
- [31] A. Broncano, M. B. Gavela, and Elizabeth Ellen Jenkins, “The Effective Lagrangian for the seesaw model of neutrino mass and leptogenesis,” *Phys. Lett. B* **552**, 177–184 (2003), [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 636, 332 (2006)], arXiv:hep-ph/0210271.
- [32] Osamu Yasuda, “On the exact formula for neutrino oscillation probability by Kimura, Takamura and Yokomakura,” (2007), arXiv:0704.1531 [hep-ph].
- [33] K. Kimura, A. Takamura, and H. Yokomakura, “Exact formula of probability and CP violation for neutrino oscillations in matter,” *Phys. Lett. B* **537**, 86–94 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0203099.
- [34] Keiichi Kimura, Akira Takamura, and Hidekazu Yokomakura, “Exact formulas and simple CP dependence of neutrino oscillation probabilities in matter with constant density,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 073005 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0205295.
- [35] Asli Mohamed Abdullahi and Stephen J. Parke, “Neutrino Oscillations in Matter using the Adjugate of the Hamiltonian,” (2022), arXiv:2212.12565 [hep-ph].
- [36] P. F. Harrison and W. G. Scott, “Neutrino matter effect invariants and the observables of neutrino oscillations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **535**, 229–235 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0203021.

- [37] Vadim A. Naumov, “Three neutrino oscillations in matter, CP violation and topological phases,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. D* **1**, 379–399 (1992).
- [38] C. Jarlskog, “Commutator of the Quark Mass Matrices in the Standard Electroweak Model and a Measure of Maximal  $CP$  Nonconservation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 1039 (1985).
- [39] H. Almazán *et al.* (STEREO), “STEREO neutrino spectrum of  $^{235}\text{U}$  fission rejects sterile neutrino hypothesis,” *Nature* **613**, 257–261 (2023), arXiv:2210.07664 [hep-ex].
- [40] “Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment,” .
- [41] “Hyper-Kamiokande Collaboration,” .
- [42] Stefan Antusch and Oliver Fischer, “Non-unitarity of the leptonic mixing matrix: Present bounds and future sensitivities,” *JHEP* **10**, 094 (2014), arXiv:1407.6607 [hep-ph].
- [43] Enrique Fernandez-Martinez, Josu Hernandez-Garcia, and Jacobo Lopez-Pavon, “Global constraints on heavy neutrino mixing,” *JHEP* **08**, 033 (2016), arXiv:1605.08774 [hep-ph].
- [44] André de Gouvêa and Andrew Kobach, “Global Constraints on a Heavy Neutrino,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 033005 (2016), arXiv:1511.00683 [hep-ph].