

# Universal Texture of Quark and Lepton Mass Matrices

Yoshio KOIDE

Department of Physics, University of Shizuoka, 52-1 Yada, Shizuoka, 422-8526 Japan

E-mail: koide@u-shizuoka-ken.ac.jp

Hiroyuki NISHIURA

Department of General Education, Junior College of Osaka Institute of Technology, Asahi-ku,

Osaka, 535-8585 Japan

E-mail: nishiura@jc.oit.ac.jp

Koichi MATSUDA, Tatsuru KIKUCHI, and Takeshi FUKUYAMA

Department of Physics, Ritsumeikan University, Kusatsu, Shiga, 525-8577 Japan

E-mail: sph30101@se.ritsumei.ac.jp, rp009979@se.ritsumei.ac.jp, and

fukuyama@se.ritsumei.ac.jp

## Abstract

Against the conventional picture that the mass matrix forms in the quark sectors will take somewhat different structures from those in the lepton sectors, a possibility that all the mass matrices of quarks and leptons have the same form as in the neutrinos is investigated. For the lepton sectors, the model leads to a nearly bi-maximal mixing with the prediction  $|J_{e3}| = m_e/2m_\tau = 0.0024$  and  $\tan^2 \theta_{sol} = m_1/m_2$ , and so on. For the quark sectors, it can lead to reasonable values of the CKM mixing matrix and masses:  $|V_{us}| \approx \sqrt{m_d/m_s}$ ,  $|V_{ub}| \approx \sqrt{m_c/m_u}$ ,  $|V_{td}| \approx |V_{cb}| |V_{us}|$  and so on.

Typeset using REVTeX

I. M O D E L

Recent neutrino oscillation experiments [1-4] have highly suggested a nearly binaxial mixing ( $\sin^2 2_{12} \approx 1, \sin^2 2_{23} \approx 1$ ) together with a small ratio  $R = \frac{m_{12}^2}{m_{23}^2} \approx 10^{-2}$ . On the other hand, we know that the observed quark mixing matrix  $V_{CKM}$  is characterized by small mixing angles. Thus, the mixing matrices of quarks and leptons are very different from each other. Therefore, usually, the following picture is accepted: the mass matrix forms in the quark sectors will take somewhat different structures from those in the lepton sectors.

Against such a conventional picture, we investigate a possibility that all the mass matrices of quarks and leptons have the same forms as in the neutrino sector:

$$M_f = P_{L_f}^Y M_f P_{R_f} ; \tag{1.1}$$

$$M_f = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & 1 \\ a_f & a_f & c_f \\ a_f & b_f & c_f \\ a_f & c_f & b_f \end{pmatrix} \quad (f = u; d; e); \tag{1.2}$$

where  $P_f = \text{diag}(e^{i\phi_1}; e^{i\phi_2}; e^{i\phi_3})$ , and the mass matrix  $M_f$  is invariant under a permutation symmetry between second and third generations. The mass matrix parameters  $a_f, b_f$ , and  $c_f$  can be expressed in terms of the mass eigenvalues as  $a_f = \sqrt{m_{f2}m_{f1}}$ ,  $b_f = (m_{f3}=2) [1 + (m_{f2} - m_{f1})/m_{f3}]$ , and  $c_f = (m_{f3}=2) [1 - (m_{f2} - m_{f1})/m_{f3}]$ .

The mass matrix form (2) was suggested from the neutrino mass matrix form [5] which leads to a nearly binaxial mixing

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & 1 \\ c & s & 0 \\ \frac{s}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{s}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix} ; \tag{1.3}$$

where  $U^T M U = \text{diag}(m_1; m_2; m_3)$  and

$$c = \cos \theta = \frac{\sqrt{m_2}}{m_2 + m_1} ; \quad s = \sin \theta = \frac{\sqrt{m_1}}{m_2 + m_1} ; \tag{1.4}$$



$$= \frac{1}{2}(e^{i_3} + e^{i_2}) ; \quad = \frac{1}{2}(e^{i_3} - e^{i_2}) : \quad (2.3)$$

Here we have put  $P = P_u P_d^Y = \text{diag}(e^{i_1}; e^{i_2}; e^{i_3})$ , and we have taken  $\phi_1 = 0$  without loss of generality.

From the expression (6), we obtain the phase-parameter independent predictions (the 3rd generation quark-mass independent predictions [7])

$$\frac{J_{ubj}}{J_{cbj}} = \frac{s_u}{c_u} = \frac{s}{m_u} ; \quad \frac{J_{tdj}}{J_{tsj}} = \frac{s_d}{c_d} = \frac{s}{m_s} ; \quad (2.4)$$

which are almost independent of the RGE effects.

Next let us fix the parameters  $\phi_3$  and  $\phi_2$ . From the relation

$$J_{cbj} = \frac{1}{1 + m_u = m_c} \sin \frac{\phi_3 - \phi_2}{2} ; \quad (2.5)$$

and the observed value [8]  $J_{cbj} = 0.0412 - 0.0020$ , we obtain  $\phi_3 - \phi_2 = 4.59 - 0.21$ . Also, from the expression of  $J_{usj}$ , we can obtain the value  $\phi_3 + \phi_2 = 93 - 22$ . Because of the small value  $\sin(\phi_3 - \phi_2) = 2 \times 0.04$ , we obtain the following approximate relations

$$J_{usj}' = \frac{s}{m_s} ; \quad J_{cdj}' = \frac{s}{m_s} ; \quad J_{tdj}' = J_{cbj} = J_{tsj} ; \quad (2.6)$$

which are consistent with the present experimental data [8].

In the present model, the rephasing invariant Jarlskog parameter  $J$  is given by

$$J = J_{ubj} J_{cbj} J_{usj} \sin \frac{\phi_3 + \phi_2}{2} ; \quad (2.7)$$

Therefore, the phase factor in the standard expression of  $V$  corresponds to  $\phi_3 + \phi_2 = 2$  in the present model. We predict  $J = (1.91 - 0.38) \times 10^5$ .

### III. LEPTON MIXING MATRIX

We assume that the neutrino masses are generated via the seesaw mechanism  $M = M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T$ . Here  $M_D$  and  $M_R$  are the Dirac neutrino and the right-handed Majorana neutrino mass matrices. Note that when we assume the same matrix forms (1) for  $M_D$  and

$M_R$ , the effective neutrino mass matrix  $M = M_D M_R^{-1} M_D$  is again given by the same texture (1):

$$M = P^Y M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T P^Y = P^Y M P^Y : \quad (3.1)$$

Therefore, we obtain the lepton mixing matrix  $U$

$$U = O_e^T P O = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & & & & 1 \\ c_e c + s_e s & c_e s & s_e c & & s_e c \\ s_e c & c_e s & s_e s + c_e c & & c_e c \\ & s & & & c \\ & & & & A \end{pmatrix} ; \quad (3.2)$$

where  $P = P_e P^Y = \text{diag}(e^{i\phi_1}; e^{i\phi_2}; e^{i\phi_3})$ . Hereafter we will again take  $\phi_1 = 0$  without loss of generality. Note that  $V = O_u^T P O_d$ , while  $U = O_e^T P O$ , so that all the mixing formulae in the lepton sectors are given by the replacement  $(m_u; m_c; m_t) \rightarrow (m_e; m_\mu; m_\tau)$  and  $(m_d; m_s; m_b) \rightarrow (m_1; m_2; m_3)$  in those in the quark sectors. However, this does not mean that the physics in the up-quark (down-quark) sector corresponds to the physics in the charged lepton (neutrino) sector. In fact, as we see in Table 1, the parameter values in each sector are different from the other.

We obtain the phase-parameter independent predictions

$$\frac{|J_{13}|}{|J_{23}|} = \frac{s_e}{c_e} = \frac{s}{m} \frac{m_e}{m_1} ; \quad \frac{|J_{31}|}{|J_{32}|} = \frac{s}{c} = \frac{s}{m_2} : \quad (3.3)$$

The neutrino mixing angle  $\theta_{atm}$  under the constraint  $|J_{23}| = |J_{12}|$  is given by

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{atm} = 4 |J_{23}|^2 |J_{33}|^2 = 4 |J_{12}|^2 |J_{33}|^2 c_e^2 = \frac{m}{m + m_e} \sin^2(\theta_3 - \theta_2) : \quad (3.4)$$

We assume the maximal mixing between  $\nu_1$  and  $\nu_2$ , so that we take  $\theta_3 - \theta_2 = \pi/2$ . Then, the model predicts

$$|J_{13}|^2 = \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_e}{m + m_e} = 0.00236 ; \quad (3.5)$$

which is consistent with the constraint  $|J_{13}|_{exp}^2 < 0.03$  from the CHOOZ data [3]. The mixing angle  $\theta_{solar}$  is given by

$$\sin^2 2_{\text{solar}} = 4 |U_{11}|^2 |U_{12}|^2 \frac{4m_{12}}{(m_1 + m_2)^2}; \quad (3.6)$$

which leads to the relation  $m_{12} = \tan^2 \theta_{\text{solar}} m_{11}$ . Therefore, the best fit value [2]  $\tan^2 \theta_{\text{solar}} = 0.34$  predicts the neutrino mass ratio  $m_{12} = 0.34 m_{11}$ , so that we can obtain the neutrino masses

$$m_1 = 0.0030 \text{ eV}; \quad m_2 = 0.0088 \text{ eV}; \quad m_3 = 0.050 \text{ eV}; \quad (3.7)$$

where we have used the best fit values [4,1] of  $m_{\text{solar}}^2 = 6.9 \times 10^5 \text{ eV}^2$  and  $m_{\text{atm}}^2 = 2.5 \times 10^3 \text{ eV}^2$ .

We also obtain the averaged neutrino mass  $m_{\text{avg}} = (10^3 - 10^4) \text{ eV}$ , but the explicit value is highly dependent on the value of  $(\theta_3 + \theta_2) = 2$ . At present, we cannot fix the value of  $\theta_3$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, stimulated by recent neutrino data, which suggest a nearly bi-maximal mixing, we have investigated a possibility that all the mass matrices of quarks and leptons have the same texture as the neutrino mass matrix. In spite of the assumption of the universal texture for all the fermion mass matrices, we can obtain the differences between  $V_{\text{quark}}$  and  $V_{\text{lepton}}$  as follows: (i) the mixing between 1st and 2nd generations is given by  $\tan^2 \theta_{12} = \frac{q}{m_1 + m_2}$ , so that the well-known empirical relation  $|V_{us}| = \frac{q}{m_d + m_s}$  is due to the observed mass ratios  $m_u = m_c = m_d = m_s = 1$ , and the nearly maximal mixing  $|V_{e2}| = \frac{p}{2}$  is due to the approximate degeneracy  $m_1 = m_2$  and the observed mass ratio  $m_e = m_{\mu} = m_{\tau} = 1$ ; (ii) the mixing between 2nd and 3rd generations is given by the relation (9) (and the corresponding relation in the lepton sector), so that the small value  $|V_{cb}| = 0.04$  means  $(\theta_3 - \theta_2) = 2 = 0.04$  and  $m_u = m_c = m_d = m_s = 1$ , and the maximal mixing  $V_{31} = \frac{p}{2}$  means  $\theta_3 - \theta_2 = 2$  together with  $m_e = m_{\mu} = m_{\tau} = 1$ .

The present data in the quark sectors have already fixed the CP violating phase parameters  $\theta_3$  and  $\theta_2$ , while the present neutrino data have yet not fixed the parameter  $(\theta_3 + \theta_2) = 2$ ,

although they have fixed the value of  $(\delta_{32})=2$ . We hope that future experiments on the CP violation will fix our remaining parameter  $\delta_{12}$ . Then, we will be able to obtain a clue to the origin of our phase parameters  $\delta_{ij}$  ( $i, j$ ).

Since, in the present model, each mass matrix  $M_f$  (i.e. the Yukawa coupling  $Y_f$ ) takes different values of the parameters  $a_f, b_f$ , and so on, the present model cannot be embedded into a GUT scenario. In spite of such a demerit, however, it is worthwhile noting that the present model can give a unified description of quark and lepton mass matrices with the same texture.

## REFERENCES

- [1] M .Shiozawa, talk at Neutrino 2002 (<http://neutrino.t30.physik.tu-muenchen.de/>).
- [2] SNO collaboration, Q .R .Ahmad et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 011302 (2002).
- [3] CHOOZ collaboration, M .Apollonio et al., Phys. Lett. B 466, 415 (1999).
- [4] KamLAND collaboration, K .Eguchi, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 021802 (2003).
- [5] T .Fukuyama and H .Nishiura, hep-ph/9702253; in Proceedings of the International Workshop on Masses and Mixings of Quarks and Leptons, Shizuoka, Japan, 1997, edited by Y .Koide (World Scientific, Singapore, 1998), p. 252; E .Ma and M .Raidal, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 011802 (2001); C .S .Lam , Phys. Lett. B 507, 214 (2001); K .R .S .Balaji, W .Grimus and T .Schwetz, Phys. Lett. B 508, 301 (2001); W .Grimus and L .Lavoura, Acta Phys. Pol. B 32, 3719 (2001).
- [6] Y .Koide, H .Nishiura, K .Matsuda, T .Kikuchi and T .Fukuyama, Phys. Rev. D 66, 093006 (2002).
- [7] G .C .Branco and L .Lavoura, Phys. Rev. D 44, R582 (1991).
- [8] Particle Data Group, K .Hagiwara et al., Phys. Rev. D 66, 010001 (2002).
- [9] H .Fusaoka and Y .Koide, Phys. Rev. D 57, 3986 (1998).

TABLES

Table 1. Input values  $m_i$  and output values  $a_f, b_f$  and  $c_f$ . The numerical values are given in unit of GeV except for the neutrino sector (in unit of eV). The input values are those [9] at  $\mu = m_Z$  except for the neutrino sector (for the neutrino sector, see the text).

f	Inputs			Outputs		
	$m_{f1}$	$m_{f2}$	$m_{f3}$	$a_f$	$b_f$	$c_f$
u	0.00233	0.677	181	0.0280	90.8	90.2
d	0.00469	0.0934	3.00	0.0148	1.54	1.46
e	0.000487	0.103	1.75	0.00500	0.924	0.822
	0.0030	0.0088	0.050	0.0036	0.028	0.022