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We exhibit the geometric structure of the convex cone in the linear space of the Wilson coefficients for the dimension-8 operators involving the left-handed lepton doublet $L$ and the Higgs doublet $H$ in the Standard Model effective field theory (SMEFT). The boundary of the convex cone gives rise to the positivity bounds on the Wilson coefficients, while the extremal ray corresponds to the unique particle state in the theory of ultra-violet completion. Among three types of canonical seesaw models for neutrino masses, we discover that only right-handed neutrinos in the type-I seesaw model show up as one of extremal rays, whereas the heavy particles in the type-II and type-III seesaw models live inside the cone. The experimental determination of the relevant Wilson coefficients close to the extremal ray of type-I seesaw model will unambiguously pin down or rule out the latter as the origin of neutrino masses. This discovery offers a novel way to distinguish the most popular seesaw model from others, and also strengthens the SMEFT as an especially powerful tool to probe new physics beyond the Standard Model.

**Introduction.**— The Standard Model effective field theory (SMEFT) serves as a general model-independent framework to search for new physics beyond the Standard Model (SM), which manifests itself at low energies in a series of non-renormalizable operators of mass dimension higher than four $[1][3]$. The associated Wilson coefficients (WCs) encode useful information about the masses and couplings of the heavy particles in the ultra-violet (UV) theory. Then the basic strategy is to extract the WCs from the precision data by a global-fit analysis $[4][13]$, and thus any deviations of the WCs from the SM values must signify new physics.

Now that nonzero neutrino masses have been firmly established $[14]$, the dimension-five Weinberg operator $O^{(5)} \equiv \bar{L}H H^\top L^\tau$ may naturally exist, leading to tiny Majorana neutrino masses after the spontaneous gauge symmetry breaking $[15]$. This observation indicates that new physics accounting for neutrino masses is very likely connected to the left-handed lepton doublet $L$ and the Higgs doublet $H$. However, it is difficult to uniquely determine the UV theory for neutrino masses, since the Weinberg operator $O^{(5)} \equiv \bar{L}H H^\top L^\tau$ can be realized at the tree level by extending the SM with different heavy particles, e.g., right-handed neutrino singlets, one Higgs triplet and fermion triplets as in the type-I $[16][20]$, type-II $[21][26]$ and type-III $[27]$ seesaw model. There exist many possibilities to combine those new heavy particles with some others to build UV models, for which the effective field theories (EFTs) contain the Weinberg operator.

This is an intrinsic difficulty for the “inverse problem” $[7][23][29]$, namely, reconstructing the UV complete theory from low-energy observables. In addition to the unique Weinberg operator, one may go one step further to consider the dimension-six (dim-6) operators in the SMEFT and explore potential signals of new physics. However, as it has been demonstrated in Refs. $[30][34]$, even if no deviations of the WCs of dim-6 operators are detected, one cannot exclude explicit UV models due to possible cancellation among the contributions from different UV states. On the other hand, if nonzero deviations are really found at the dim-6 level, it is still hard to infer valuable information about the UV theory due to the infinite degeneracy in mapping the UV models to the low-energy observables.

Though the difficulties exist in general, more and more data will be accumulated at the CERN Large Hadron Collider and future lepton or hadron colliders, offering the possibility to probe dimension-eight (dim-8) operators $[35][45]$. Recently, it has been found in Refs. $[30][31][33][37]$ that the linear space of dim-8 WCs exhibits a convex-cone structure, where the edge of the convex cone corresponds to a unique UV state and the so-called positivity bounds (see Refs. $[45][48][58]$ for more detailed discussions), derived from the analyticity and unitarity of scattering amplitudes, appear as the boundaries of the cone. In particular, if the UV state in the tree-level completion turns out to be on the edge of the convex cone, there will be no degeneracy at all in the determination of the UV theory. Bearing the origin of neutrino masses in mind, we show for the first time how three types of seesaw models appear in the space of the WCs associated with the dim-8 operators involving both the lepton doublet $L$ and the Higgs doublet $H$. The positivity bounds on the WCs are also derived.

**Framework.**— The gauge-invariant Lagrangian of the SMEFT $[1][2]$ (see, e.g., Ref. $[3]$, for a recent review) can be written as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{SMEFT}} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_d \mathcal{L}^{(d)} = \mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}} + \sum_{i=1}^{n_d} \frac{C^{(d)}_i}{\Lambda^{d-4}} O^{(d)}_i, \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{L}_{\text{SM}}$ stands for the SM Lagrangian, $d > 4$ the mass dimension of the operator $O^{(d)}_i$, $n_d$ the total number of $d$-dimensional operators, $C^{(d)}_i$ the corresponding
WCs, and Λ the cutoff scale. In this letter, we focus on the WCs \( C_i^{(8)} \) of dim-8 operators \( O_i^{(8)} \), which contribute to the second derivative of the forward 2-to-2 amplitudes \( \mathcal{M}_{ij \to kl}(s, t \to 0) \) with respect to \( s \) (where \( s, t \) are the ordinary Mandelstam variables, the indices \( i, j, k, l \) refer to the low-energy particles, including particle species, polarizations and quantum numbers). To extract \( C_i^{(8)} \)'s, we introduce a rank-4 tensor \( M_{ijkl} \) as follows

\[
M_{ijkl} \equiv \frac{d^2 \mathcal{M}_{ij \to kl}(s)}{ds^2} - \int_{-(\varepsilon \Lambda)^2}^{(\varepsilon \Lambda)^2} d\mu \frac{\text{Disc} \mathcal{M}_{ij \to kl}(\mu)}{2\pi\varepsilon \Lambda^3}.
\]

(2)

with the poles subtracted up to the scale \( \varepsilon \Lambda \) lower than the cutoff scale (with \( 0 < \varepsilon < 1 \)). In the consideration of analyticity and unitarity, as well as the generalized optical theorem at the tree level, the dispersion relation in Eq. (2) can be recast into \[50, 52\]

\[
M_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{(\varepsilon \Lambda)^2}^{\infty} d\mu \frac{\text{Disc} \mathcal{M}_{ij \to kl}(\mu)}{\mu^3} \sum_X \langle X| \mathcal{M}(r)|^2 \rangle \}
\]

(3)

where the summation is over all the intermediate UV states \( X \) and the crossing channel is taken into account. Defining \( m^{ij} \equiv \mathcal{M}_{ij \to X} \), one can regard the result on the right-hand side of Eq. (3) as a positive linear combination of \( m^{ij} m^{kl} + (j \leftrightarrow l) \), since the integration can be understood as a limit of summation. Consequently, \( M_{ijkl} \) belongs to the convex cone formed by \( m^{ij} m^{kl} + (j \leftrightarrow l) \), i.e.,

\[
M_{ijkl} = \text{cone} \left\{ m^{ij} m^{kl} + m^{ij} m^{kl} \right\}
\]

(4)

where \( j \) and \( l \) denote the antiparticle states. For an EFT with \( n \) low-energy states \( i, j = 1, \ldots, n \), \( m^{ij} \) by construction must be an \( n \)-dimensional matrix.

The convex cone is a subset of vectors in a linear space closed under addition and positive scalar multiplications. The extremal ray (ER) of the convex cone is defined as the vector that cannot be decomposed into any nontrivial positive sum of other vectors in the cone. Given a complete set of the ERs, any vector in the cone can be positively generated by the ERs. In this sense, the convex cone is uniquely determined by its ERs.

An important implication of the convex nature for the dim-8 WCs is the positivity bounds, which are a set of inequalities that must be satisfied by the WCs. As indicated in Eq. (4), \( M_{ijkl} \) is constrained by the boundaries of the cone in the space of WCs, so positivity bounds naturally arise as the inner product between \( M_{ijkl} \) and the boundaries.

Furthermore, as seen from Eq. (4), the UV state that resides in the irreducible representation (irrep) of the symmetry group corresponds to the ER of the cone. Following Ref. [34], we choose \( X \) to be the irrep (denoted as \( r \)) of the SU(3) × SU(2)_L × U(1)_Y gauge group. As for the amplitudes \( m^{ij} \), the particles \( i, j \) belong to the irrep \( r_i \) and \( r_j \), respectively. By the decomposition rule \( r_i \otimes r_j = \sum_{\alpha} C_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} \), where \( C_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} \) are the Clebsch-Gordan (CG) coefficients and the summation over all the states \( \alpha \)'s in \( r \) is implied, we can rewrite Eq. (4) as below

\[
M_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{(\varepsilon \Lambda)^2}^{\infty} d\mu \sum_{X} \langle X| \mathcal{M}(r)|^2 \rangle \}
\]

(5)

with \( G_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} \equiv \sum_{\alpha} C_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} (C_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j})^* + (j \leftrightarrow l) \) being defined as the “generator”.

Notice that an ER cannot be decomposed into other vectors in the convex cone. Therefore, if \( M_{ijkl} \) corresponds to the ER of the cone, \( X_{\text{ER}} \) on the right-hand side of Eq. (3) cannot live in two or more different \( r \)'s at the same time. Otherwise it is possible to rewrite \( M_{ijkl} \) as a positive sum of different projectors \( G_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} \)'s, contradicting with the definition of an ER. Hence \( M_{ijkl} \) plays the role of an ER, and \( M_{ijkl} \) can be generated by positive combinations of \( G_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} \)'s from different irrep's.

The amplitude \( m^{ij} \) is generated by the interaction between \( X \) and the particles \( i, j \). We can extend the amplitudes to include the CP-conjugate process, which is determined by \( X \) coupling to \( i, j \). More explicitly, if the crossing symmetry \( (i \leftrightarrow k) \) is added into Eq. (4), the generator of the cone is constructed as \[44\]

\[
G_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} = m^{ij} m^{kl} + m^{il} m^{kj} + m^{lj} m^{ki} + m^{jl} m^{ki} + m^{kl} m^{ij} + (i \leftrightarrow j, k \leftrightarrow l)
\]

(6)

where \( m \in \mathbb{C}^{2n \times 2n} \) and the cone is defined by \( C = \text{cone} \left\{ G_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} \right\} \). One can verify that such a construction incorporates both contributions from \( X \) and \( X \). Moreover, the crossing symmetry \( (i \leftrightarrow j, k \leftrightarrow l) \) is also taken into account, which is equivalent to the symmetry of the \( \pi \) angle of the forward scattering process rotating around the \( y \)-axis (if the forward direction is supposed to be along the \( z \)-axis).

Starting with Eq. (4), one can construct the convex cone as follows

1. Calculate the the amplitudes on the left-hand side of Eq. (4) in the SMEFT, such that \( M_{ijkl} \) turns out to be a linear function of the WCs, simply denoted as \( C_i \), where the subscript “\( (8) \)” refers to the relevant dim-8 operators and the superscript “\( (8) \)” will be omitted hereafter. The linear space formed by \( M_{ijkl} \) is labeled by the WCs.

2. Given the particles \( i, j \) and their representations, the matrix \( m^{ij} \) can be constructed by finding the CG coefficients from the decomposition rule. Then it is straightforward to fix the generator of the cone \( G_{ij,\alpha}^{r_i, r_j} \), corresponding to the irrep \( r \).
3. Match the results obtained in the previous two steps, namely, $\mathcal{G}^{ijkl} = M^{ijkl}(C_1, C_2, \ldots)$. After doing so, we can express each generator as a linear function of the WCs, which can be regarded as a vector $\vec{c} = (C_1, C_2, \ldots)$ in the linear space of WCs, outlining the shape of the convex cone.

Once the ERs of the cone are known, the boundaries determined by the ERs give rise to the positivity bounds. Furthermore, one can explore the UV information behind the ERs. We start by the tree-level UV completion and enumerate all possible UV states $X$ in each irrep of the SU(3) $\otimes$ SU(2)$_L$ $\otimes$ U(1)$_Y$ gauge group. Assuming that for each UV model only a single heavy state $X$ is added to the SM, we can calculate the forward scattering amplitude $ij \to kl$ mediated by the heavy state. After integrating the heavy state out at the tree level, the amplitude obtained after the matching procedure should be mapped to the generators constructed from the CG coefficients.

The UV States.--- As mentioned before, nonzero neutrino masses may hint at the existence of the Weinberg operator $O^{(5)} = \bar{T}H H^\dagger L^\dagger$ and thus new physics associated with lepton and Higgs doublets. To gain more information about possible UV states, we examine the minimal space of WCs, including all four-particle operators. To gain more information about possible UV states, we examine the minimal space of WCs, including all four-particle operators $O_{ijkl}$ with $i, j, k, l = H$ or $L$. For simplicity, only one lepton flavor is considered, but the extension to three flavors is straightforward. The dim-8 operators that contribute to the forward scattering amplitudes with the $s^2$-dependence can be classified into three types of subspaces [51]:

- **LLHH:**
  
  \begin{align}
  O_1 &= (\bar{L}\gamma_\mu \vec{D}_\mu^\gamma L) (D^\mu H^\dagger D^\nu H), \\
  O_2 &= (\bar{L}\gamma_\mu \sigma^I \vec{D}_\mu^\gamma L) (D^\mu H^\dagger \sigma^I D^\nu H); \\
  \end{align}

- **LLLL:**
  
  \begin{align}
  O_3 &= \partial_\nu (\bar{L}\gamma_\mu \sigma^I L) \partial^\nu (\bar{L}\gamma_\mu L), \\
  O_4 &= \partial_\nu (\bar{L}\gamma_\mu \sigma^I L) \partial^\nu (\bar{L}\gamma_\mu \sigma^I L); \\
  \end{align}

- **HHHH:**
  
  \begin{align}
  O_5 &= (\bar{D}_\mu H^\dagger D_\nu H) (D^\mu H^\dagger D^\nu H), \\
  O_6 &= (\bar{D}_\mu H^\dagger D_\nu H) (D^\mu H H^\dagger D^\nu H), \\
  O_7 &= (\bar{D}_\mu H^\dagger D_\mu^\gamma H) (D_\nu H^\dagger D^\nu H), \\
  \end{align}

where $\sigma^I$ (for $I = 1, 2, 3$) stand for the Pauli matrices and $\vec{D}_\mu \equiv D_\mu - \bar{D}_\mu$ with $D_\mu$ being the covariant derivative in the SM has been defined. Note that there are another two dim-8 operators in the subspace of LLHH, but they don’t contribute to the amplitudes of our interest.

The positivity bounds in two subspaces of HHHH and LLLL have been studied in the literature [30] [31] [34]. In the present letter, we enlarge the space of WCs by further combining those two operators $O_1$ and $O_2$ in Eq. (7). As we shall show later, the results obtained in the previous works can be reproduced when restricted to the subspace HHHH or LLLL.

Since both $L$ and $H$ are assigned as the irrep 2 of the SU(2)$_L$ group in the complex-field basis, the CG coefficients of direct product decomposition $2 \times 2 = 1 + 3$ and $2 \times 2 = 1 + 3$, labeled by $C_{ab}^{1/3, c}$ and $C_{ab}^{1/3, c}$, read

\begin{align}
  C_{1,c}^{1} &= \epsilon^{ab}, \quad C_{3,c}^{ab} = (c\sigma^I)^{ab}; \\
  C_{1,c}^{3} &= \delta^a_b, \quad C_{3,c}^{ab} = (\sigma^I)^a_b,
\end{align}

where $\epsilon \equiv i\sigma^2$ and the subscript “c” is trivial for 1 but $c = I$ for 3. With those CG coefficients, the $m^{ij}$ matrix can be found immediately, i.e.

\begin{align}
  H_3 = & \begin{pmatrix}
  C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} \\
  C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & xC_{1/3, c}^{ab} & xC_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} \\
  \pm C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} \\
  C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & ixC_{1/3, c}^{ab} & C_{1/3, c}^{ab} & xC_{1/3, c}^{ab}
  \end{pmatrix}, \\
  \end{align}

where $x$ is an arbitrary real parameter, representing the relative size of the coupling constant between $X$ and $H$ (or $H^\dagger H$) to that between $X$ and $L L$ (or $L L$). The generator $G_\tau^{ijkl}$ can be derived from Eq. (6) for each irrep $r$, and will be matched into the WC space by identifying $G_\tau^{ijkl} = M^{ijkl}(C_1, C_2, \ldots, C_6, C_7)$. In fact, it can be effectively viewed as a vector $\vec{c}_r$ in the WC space. On the other hand, all the generators can be interpreted as the tree-level exchange of a single heavy state $X$ in the irrep $r$. Therefore, one can evaluate $M^{ijkl}$ in the UV theory and integrate $X$ out to match $M^{ijkl}$ into the WC space. In this way, another vector will be obtained, but it must be identical to $\vec{c}_r$ up to an overall positive factor.

In Table I we list all possible scenarios of tree-level UV completion. In each scenario, the single heavy state is specified with the spin, the quantum number $r_\gamma$ under the SU(2)$_L$ $\otimes$ U(1)$_Y$ group, the interactions with light SM particles, and the corresponding vector $\vec{c}$ in the WC space. Once all those vectors in the WC space are obtained, the ERs will be identified the subset of $\vec{c}$'s so that other vectors can be positively decomposed into the ERs. We also explicitly indicate which vector is ER in one column. In particular, three types of seesaw models for neutrino masses are also marked.

Some comments on Table I are in order. First, the subspace of LLHH formed by the WCs $C_1$ and $C_2$ is orthogonal to two other types of subspaces, i.e., LLLL and HHHH. In the LLHH subspace, there are four scenarios of UV completion, for which all the UV states are fermions. In other scenarios, the UV states are bosons.
This is reasonable since one fermion cannot mediate interactions between two $L$’s or two $H$’s in the $s$-channel. Meanwhile, for the forward scattering, one boson cannot be tree-level UV completion of the effective vertices in $O_1$ and $O_2$. Otherwise, the resultant amplitude takes the form of $p_2^2 \bar{v}(p_1) p_1^\mu u(p_2)$ with $v(p_1)$ and $u(p_2)$ being the wave functions of external leptons (with four-momenta $p_1$ and $p_2$), which would vanish after applying equations of motion. This observation allows us to discuss the $LLHH$ subspace without worrying about the other WCs in the next section.

Second, if we restrict ourselves into the $HHHH$ subspace, corresponding to the last three components of $\vec{c}$, the results in Refs. [30, 51] can be reproduced with the positivity bounds $C_0 \geq 0$, $C_3 + C_6 \geq 0$, $C_5 + C_6 + C_7 \geq 0$. Similarly, when reduced to the $LLLL$ subspace, the same conclusions of the positivity bounds $C_3 + C_4 \leq 0$, $C_4 \leq 0$ in Refs. [31, 34] are reached.

Finally, it is worthwhile to notice that the $c$’s in the subspaces $LLLL$ and $HHHH$ don’t contain the components linear in $x$. Since the generator $G$ is the product of two $m$’s, while $m^3$ is the linear function of $x$, it is expected that $c$’s have the components both linearly and quadratically dependent on $x$, and independent of $x$. The reason is simply that the components linear in $x$ can only appear in the $LLHH$ subspace, but the one-boson realization of the operators $O_1$ and $O_2$ is impossible. This feature guarantees that the ERs in the subspace $LLLL$ and $HHHH$, respectively, remain to be so in the enlarged space, keeping the previously derived positivity bounds intact.

**The LLHH Subspace.** In the two-dimensional $LLHH$ subspace, the $x$- and $y$-axis actually refer to $C_1$ and $C_2$, respectively. This subspace is orthogonal to the rest and thus we simply set $C_3, \ldots, C_7 = 0$ for the moment. The first four rows in Table I correspond to the UV completion with fermions, and the corresponding vectors $\vec{c}$ are showed in Fig. 1. The polyhedron region in green is allowed by positivity bounds. The ERs are the two edges of polyhedron, namely, $\vec{c} = (-1/2, -1/2)$ and $(-1/2, 1/2)$. The positivity bounds are just the normal measurement with the dashed circle being the associated uncertainties.

![FIG. 1. The geometric structure of the convex cone in the LLHH subspace, where four different scenarios of UV completion are represented by the vectors with four colored dots. Only the green region is allowed by positivity bounds, and the vector $\vec{C} = (-3/2, 0)$ is a benchmark point of experimental measurement with the dashed circle being the associated uncertainties.](image)

\[ C_1 + C_2 \leq 0, \quad C_1 - C_2 \leq 0. \]  

Interestingly, we find that the type-I and type-III seesaw models belong to this subspace, but only the type-I...
seesaw lives on one of two edges. On the other hand, the type-II seesaw lives in the five-dimensional subspace of $LLLL$ and $HHHH$ and appears in the convex cone, as shown in its three-dimensional projection in Fig. 2.

To better visualize the convex cone and the UV models, we have chosen a particular two-dimensional direction as explained in the caption of Fig. 2.

![Image](54x399 to 299x643)

**FIG. 2.** The 3D cross section of the 5D $LLLL + HHHH$ subspace. To best visualize the $B_1$ state represented by the red line, we have chosen a particular direction to project the UV states with $(x, y, z) = (-0.7 C_5 + 0.69 C_4 + 0.11 C_5 + 0.13 C_5 + 0.057 C_7, 0.031 C_4 + 0.85 C_5 - 0.5 C_6 - 0.16 C_7, -0.019 C_3 + 0.31 C_6 - 0.95 C_7)/(C_3 + 2 C_4 - 2 C_5 - 3 C_6 - C_7)$, and the UV states ($\Xi_i, B, W^i$) are projected as points by specifying $x^2 = (1/4, 1, 1/4)$.

Another practical application of the convex geometry is to solve the inverse problem [31, 34]. as any UV completion must have net dim-8 effects that cannot be completely lifted by the contributions from other possible UV completions. Then we proceed to explain how to infer the information about the UV physics. Once the collider experiments observe the benchmark point that fixes the vector $\vec{C} = (-3/2, 0)$, it should be a positive combination of the generator vectors, i.e., $\vec{C} = \sum_i \omega_i \vec{c}_i$ with $i = E, N, \Sigma, \Sigma_1$ and $c_i$ being the vector corresponding to each UV state in the $C_1$-$C_2$ plane. The coefficients $\omega_i = g_i^2/M_i^2$ are positive, and they carry the very important information about the UV theory, namely, the relevant couplings and masses.

For instance, if the measured data point is located exactly on the edge represented by $\vec{e} = (-1/2, 1/2)$, then one can pin down the existence of $N$, i.e., the UV state in the type-I seesaw. At the same time, the existence of other UV states $E, \Sigma, \Sigma_1$ can be excluded. These conclusions are guaranteed by the salient feature of the ER of the convex cone. If the data point lies on the edge, the associated vector cannot be decomposed into any other vectors. Therefore, the only possible UV state $X$ should be the one in the irrep $r$ corresponding to that edge.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$C_0$</th>
<th>$E$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_1$</th>
<th>$N$</th>
<th>$\Sigma_1$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$(−1/2, 1/2)$</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.0$</td>
<td>$\infty$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(−3/2, 0)$</td>
<td>$\geq 0.9$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.07$</td>
<td>$\geq 0.9$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.07$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(−3/2, 0)$ with $\Delta = 0.1$</td>
<td>$\geq 0.85$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.0$</td>
<td>$\geq 0.85$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.0$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$(0, 0)$ with $\Delta = 0.1$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.22$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.5$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.22$</td>
<td>$\geq 1.5$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. The derived lower bounds on $M_i/\sqrt{g_i}$ in units of TeV for each UV state with $i = E, N, \Sigma, \Sigma_1$. The measured data are represented by two points in the first two rows, whereas by the allowed ranges in Eq. (14) with $\Delta = 0.1$ in the last two rows.

Generally, the measured data point may be not on the edge but inside the cone. In reality, the experimental results of the WCs are usually reported as a region bounded by the multidimensional ellipsoid, which is determined by the $\Delta \chi^2$-value. Then the question is how to extract the constraints on $\omega_i$ from experimental data. The solution has been provided in Refs. [31, 34]. If the experimental result is represented by a point $\bar{C}_0$ in the $C_1$-$C_2$ plane, then the upper bound on $\omega_i$ can be derived by finding the maximal value of $\lambda$ such that the following vector breaks the positivity condition

$$\bar{C}(\lambda) \equiv \bar{C}_0 - \lambda \bar{C}_i = \sum_{j \neq i} \omega_j \bar{c}_j + (\omega_i - \lambda) \bar{c}_i . \quad (13)$$

The value of $\lambda$ can be stated as the maximum possibility for the UV state $i$ to exist and explain the experimental data. Unlike the numerical solution in Refs. [31, 34], we find that this can be identified as a conic optimization problem, thanks to the convex nature of the WC space. Given the uncertainty as a multidimensional ellipsoid, the upper bound on $\omega_i$ can be determined since the conic optimization reduces to the second-order cone program

$$\text{maximize } \lambda$$

subject to $\bar{C} - \lambda \bar{c}_i \in C$

$$\langle \bar{C} - \bar{C}_0 \rangle \cdot A \cdot (\bar{C} - \bar{C}_0) \leq \Delta$$

where $A$ is the covariant matrix from the $\chi^2$-analysis, $\bar{C}_0$ is the best-fit point, and $\Delta$ is determined by the desired confidence level and by the number of free parameters. If the $\Delta$ constraints are absent, the problem automatically reduces to the linear optimization program. Both these two optimization problems can be solved by the well-established computer algorithms.

For illustration, we take the best-fit point $\bar{C}_0 = (-3/2, 0)$ and the constraint as the disc $(C_1 + 3/2)^2 + C_2^2 \leq 0.1$, whose boundary has been plotted as the dashed circle in Fig. 1. In Table II we summarize the results by solving Eq. (14) in such a simple setup. The bounds on $\omega_i$ for the benchmark point $\bar{C}_0 = (-3/2, 0)$ and that for the point on the edge $\bar{C}_0 = (-1/2, 1/2)$ have been derived and then converted into the bounds on $M_i/\sqrt{g_i}$ in
units of TeV for each UV state. In the former case, it is difficult to solve the inverse problem, i.e., all the UV models fit the measurement equally well. But, in the latter case, the type-I seesaw model is singled out even if the experimental uncertainty is taken into account. In contrast, if the experimental results point to $C_0 = (0, 0)$, all the UV models will unambiguously be ruled out up to a certain mass scale.

**Summary.**—Motivated by nonzero neutrino masses observed in neutrino oscillation experiments, we stress that the Weinberg operator $O^{(5)} = \tilde{T}HH^T \tilde{L}$ for tiny Majorana neutrino masses may naturally exist in the SMEFT and new physics beyond the SM is very likely once the experimental measurements of the WCs of dim-8 operators, this channel may be an ideal place to test the effects of dim-8 operators. Further studies in this direction are interesting and desirable. In the subspace of the WCs for two $LLHH$ operators, we discover that the type-I seesaw model resides on the edge of the convex cone, indicating that the measurement of the WCs close to the edge will unambiguously confirm or rule out the type-I seesaw model as the true theory of neutrino masses. However, type-II and type-III seesaw models live inside the convex cone. This discovery provides a new and highly nontrivial way to distinguish between the type-I seesaw model and its analogues. We also explain how to extract the constraints on the UV theories once the experimental measurements of the WCs of dim-8 operators are available.

Obviously the key point is to experimentally measure the relevant WCs of dim-8 operators in the $LLHH$ class. This can be achieved by probing the pair production of the Higgs bosons via $e^+e^- \to hh$ in future electron-positron colliders [59]. As tree-level SM contributions will be highly suppressed by the electron Yukawa coupling and the Higgs self-coupling, this channel may be an ideal place to test the effects of dim-8 operators. Further studies in this direction are interesting and desirable.
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