Frascati, 7 April '04

# Neutrino Masses as a Probe of Grand Unification

G. Altarelli
CERN

Some recent work by our group
G.A., F. Feruglio, I. Masina, hep-ph/0210342
(Addendum: v2 in Nov. '03), hep-ph/0402121.
Reviews:
G.A., F. Feruglio, hep-ph/0206077/0306265

# $\nu$ Oscillations Imply Different $\nu$ Masses

flavour mass

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{pmatrix} = U \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_2 \\ \nu_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

U: mixing matrix

$\nu_e$: same weak isospin doublet as $e^-$




$U = U_{P\text{-}MNS}$

Pontecorvo
Maki, Nakagawa, Sakata

$\nu_e = \cos\theta\ \nu_1 + \sin\theta\ \nu_2$
$\nu_\mu = -\sin\theta\ \nu_1 + \cos\theta\ \nu_2$

e.g 2 flav.

Stationary source:

Stodolsky

$\nu_{1,2}$: different mass, different x-dep:

$\nu_a(x) = e^{ip_a x}\,\nu_a \qquad p_a^2 = E^2 - m_a^2$

$P(\nu_e <\!\!-\!\!> \nu_\mu) = |\langle \nu_\mu(L)|\,\nu_e\rangle|^2 = \sin^2(2\theta)\cdot\sin^2(\Delta m^2 L/4E)$

**At a distance L, $\nu_\mu$ from $\mu^-$ decay can produce $e^-$ via charged weak interact's**

G. Altarelli

# Solid evidence for $\nu$ oscillations (+LSND unclear)

$\Delta m^2_{atm} \sim 2.5\ 10^{-3}\ eV^2$,
$\Delta m^2_{sol} \sim 7\ 10^{-5}\ eV^2$
($\Delta m^2_{LSND} \sim 1\ eV^2$)




G. Altarelli

## Solar ν's


$\nu_e \to \nu_{\mu,\tau}$

For the LA solution the oscill's
occur inside the sun thru the MSW effect

Mikhaev and Smirnov; Wolfenstein

## Atmospheric ν's




$\nu_\mu \to \nu_\tau$

atmospheric ν's traverse
different L depending on
azimuth θ
(up-down asymm.)

## Evolution in vacuum and in matter

$\nu_e = \cos\theta\, \nu_1 + \sin\theta\, \nu_2$
$\nu_\mu = -\sin\theta\, \nu_1 + \cos\theta\, \nu_2$

$\Delta m^2 = m_2^2 - m_1^2 > 0$

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\begin{bmatrix}\nu_e \\ \nu_\mu\end{bmatrix} = H_{eff}\begin{bmatrix}\nu_e \\ \nu_\mu\end{bmatrix}$$

$$H_{eff} = \frac{\Delta m^2}{4E}\begin{bmatrix}-\cos 2\theta & \sin 2\theta \\ \sin 2\theta & \cos 2\theta\end{bmatrix}$$

In vacuum, 2 flavours, apart from multiples of the identity

In matter CC int's on electrons introduce a flavour dep.
(coherent forward scattering on electrons)

$$H_{eff} = \frac{\Delta m^2}{4E}\begin{bmatrix}-\cos 2\theta & \sin 2\theta \\ \sin 2\theta & \cos 2\theta\end{bmatrix} + \begin{bmatrix}\sqrt{2}G_F N_e & 0 \\ 0 & 0\end{bmatrix}$$

$N_e$: n. of e per unit V

The mixing angle is changed
A resonance can appear (MSW)

$$\tan 2\theta_m = \frac{\tan 2\theta}{1 - \dfrac{2\sqrt{2}EG_F N_e}{\Delta m^2 \cos 2\theta}}$$

G. Altarelli

Mikhaev and Smirnov; Wolfenstein

# Atmospheric Neutrinos

Smirnov, Aachen'03

SuperKamiokande:




$\Delta m_{32}^2 = (1.3 - 3.0)\ 10^{-3}\ eV^2$
$\sin^2 2\theta_{23} > 0.9$

(90 % C.L.)

Confirmed by
MACRO,
SOUDAN
K2K

Combined analysis of CHOOZ, atmospheric (SK) and solar data:

$$\sin^2 2\theta_{13} < 0.067\ \ (3\sigma)$$

G.L. Fogli et al, hep-ph/p0308055

Best fit point: $\sin^2 2\theta_{23} = 1.0$
$\Delta m_{32}^2 = 2.0\ \ 10^{-3}\ eV^2$

# $\nu$ Reactions in SNO

April '02

**CC** $\nu_e + d \Rightarrow p + p + e^-$

- Good measurement of $\nu_e$ energy spectrum
- Weak directional sensitivity $\propto 1-1/3\cos(\theta)$
- $\nu_e$ only.




**NC** $\nu_x + d \Rightarrow p + n + \nu_x$

- Equal cross section for all $\nu$ types
- Measure total $^8B$ $\nu$ flux from the sun.




**ES** $\nu_x + e^- \Rightarrow \nu_x + e^-$

- Low Statistics
- Mainly sensitive to $\nu_e$, some sensitivity to $\nu_\mu$ and $\nu_\tau$
- Strong directional sensitivity

$$\frac{\Phi_{cc}}{\Phi_{es}} = \frac{\nu_e}{\nu_e + 0.154(\nu_\mu + \nu_\tau)} = 1\ ?$$

$$\frac{\Phi_{cc}}{\Phi_{nc}} = \frac{\nu_e}{\nu_e + \nu_\mu + \nu_\tau} = 1\ ?$$

# Results of April '02

Signal Extraction in $\Phi_{CC}$, $\Phi_{NC}$, $\Phi_{ES}$. $E_{Theshold} > 5$ MeV

$$\Phi_{cc}(\nu_e) = 1.76^{+0.06}_{-0.05}\,(\text{stat.})\,^{+0.09}_{-0.09}\,(\text{syst.})\times 10^6\ \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$$

$$\Phi_{es}(\nu_x) = 2.39^{+0.24}_{-0.23}\,(\text{stat.})\,^{+0.12}_{-0.12}\,(\text{syst.})\times 10^6\ \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$$

$$\Phi_{nc}(\nu_x) = 5.09^{+0.44}_{-0.43}\,(\text{stat.})\,^{+0.46}_{-0.43}\,(\text{syst.})\times 10^6\ \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$$

Signal Extraction in $\Phi_e$, $\Phi_{\mu\tau}$.

$$\Phi_e = 1.76^{+0.05}_{-0.05}\,(\text{stat.})\,^{+0.09}_{-0.09}\,(\text{syst.})\times 10^6\ \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$$

$$\Phi_{\mu\tau} = 3.41^{+0.45}_{-0.45}\,(\text{stat.})\,^{+0.48}_{-0.45}\,(\text{syst.})\times 10^6\ \text{cm}^{-2}\text{s}^{-1}$$

Note: $\Phi_{\mu,\tau} \sim 2\,\Phi_e$

(We receive an equal amount of $\nu_e$, $\nu_\mu$, $\nu_\tau$)

G. Altarelli

The measured total ν flux is in perfect agreement with the Solar Standard Model!!

But: $\Phi_e \sim 1/3\ (\Phi_e + \Phi_\mu + \Phi_\tau)$

$$\Phi_{ssm} = 5.05^{+1.01}_{-0.81} \quad \Phi_{sno} = 5.09^{+0.44\,+0.46}_{-0.43\,-0.43}$$




G. Altarelli

Direct evidence for $\nu_e \to \nu_{\mu,\tau}$ oscill's as solution of the solar $\nu_e$ deficit!

# Recent important results from KamLAND

Dec'02

Kamioka
Liquid
scintillator
AntiNeutrino
Detector



1 kton

13 m

Reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$ (E>2.6 MeV) detected 180 Km away at Kamiokande site

G. Altarelli

# First results from KamLAND

- Solar oscill.'s confirmed on earth
- Large angle sol. established

Best fit: $\Delta m^2 \sim 7.10^{-5}$ eV², $\sin^2 2\theta = 1$

- $\overline{\nu}_e$ from reactors behave as $\nu_e$ from sun:

Constraint on C~~PT~~ models










Best fit

# In summary for solar ν's:

Before Kamland




G. Altarelli

After Kamland

Δm² (eV²)




J. Bahcall et al

Note the change of scale

New!

# Sept.'03: SNO new results

All data now

Salt added to $D_2O$:
Better NC sensitivity

- Previous results confirmed
- More precision
- The upper $\Delta m^2$ part of the LA sol. now disfavoured
- $\theta_{12}$ is now $5.4\sigma$ from maximal



# $\nu$ Oscillations: Summary of Exp. Facts

Homestake, Gallex, Sage, (Super)Kamiokande, Macro... GNO,K2K,..

after KAMLAND, SNO-salt

## Atmospheric:

$\Delta m^2_{atm} \sim 2.5 \cdot 10^{-3}\ eV^2$
$\sin^2\theta_{23} \sim 1/2$

$\nu_\mu \to \nu_\tau$ dominant
$\nu_\mu \to \nu_e$ small
(Chooz $|U_{13}| <\sim 0.2$)
$\nu_\mu \to \nu_{sterile}$ small

## Solar:

The MSW-LA solution selected
$\Delta m^2 \sim 7\ 10^{-5}\ eV^2$, $\sin^2\theta_{12} \sim 0.3$

$\nu_e \to \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau$ dominant
$\nu_e \to \nu_{sterile}$ small

## LSND:

true or false?
MINIBOONE (in progress)

$\Delta m^2 \sim 1\ eV^2$, $\sin^2\theta \sim$ small

$\nu_\mu \to \nu_e, \nu_{sterile}$
CPT violation?

G. Altarelli

Maltoni et al

| parameter | best fit | $2\sigma$ | $3\sigma$ | $5\sigma$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| $\Delta m^2_{21}$ [$10^{-5}$eV$^2$] | 6.9 | 6.0–8.4 | 5.4–9.5 | 2.1–28 |
| $\Delta m^2_{31}$ [$10^{-3}$eV$^2$] | 2.6 | 1.8–3.3 | 1.4–3.7 | 0.77–4.8 |
| $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ | 0.30 | 0.25–0.36 | 0.23–0.39 | 0.17–0.48 |
| $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ | 0.52 | 0.36–0.67 | 0.31–0.72 | 0.22–0.81 |
| $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ | 0.006 | $\lesssim 0.035$ | $\lesssim 0.054$ | $\lesssim 0.11$ |




G. Altarelli

# $\nu$ oscillations measure $\Delta m^2$. What is $\overline{m}$?

$\Delta m^2_{atm} \sim 2.5\ 10^{-3}\ eV^2$; $\Delta m^2_{sun} \sim 7\ 10^{-5}\ eV^2$

- Direct limits (PDG '02)

End-point tritium $\beta$ decay (Mainz)

$m_{"\nu e"} < 2.8$ eV
$m_{"\nu\mu"} < 170$ KeV
$m_{"\nu\tau"} < 18.2$ MeV

- $0\nu\beta\beta$

- Cosmology $\Omega_\nu h^2 \sim \Sigma_i m_i /94eV$ $(h^2 \sim 1/2)$

$\Sigma_i m_i \sim 0.69$ eV (95%) $[\Omega_\nu \sim 0.014]$ WMAP

→ Any $\nu$ mass 0.23-1eV →

Why $\nu$'s so much lighter than quarks and leptons?

New powerful cosmological limit

Assumes some priors!
Could be somewhat relaxed




All info on the absolute scale of ν mass is very important!

Finding $0\nu\beta\beta$ would also prove Majorana ν's

G. Altarelli




G. Altarelli

# Neutrino masses are really special!

$m_t/(\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2} \sim 10^{12}$

## Massless ν's?

- no $\nu_R$
- L conserved

## Small ν masses?

- $\nu_R$ very heavy
- L not conserved

# How to guarantee a massless neutrino?

1) $\nu_R$ does not exist

→ No Dirac mass

$$\bar{\nu}_L \nu_R + \nu_R \bar{\nu}_L$$

and

2) Lepton Number is conserved

→ No Majorana mass

$$\bar{\nu}^c \nu \rightarrow \nu^T{}_R C \nu_R \text{ or } \nu^T{}_L C \nu_L$$

G. Altarelli

$C = i\gamma^0\gamma^2$

**Neutrinos:** Dirac mass: $\overline{\nu}_L \nu_R + \overline{\nu}_R \nu_L$

(needs $\nu_R$)

$\nu$'s have no electric charge. Their only charge is lepton number L

IF L is not conserved (not a good quantum number) $\nu$ and $\overline{\nu}$ are not really different

TCP, "Lorentz"

$|\nu, h = -1/2\rangle \longrightarrow |\overline{\nu}, h = +1/2\rangle$

Majorana mass: $\nu^T_R \nu_R$ or $\nu^T_L \nu_L$

(we omit the charge conj. matrix C)

**Violates L, B-L by $|\Delta L| = 2$**

G. Altarelli

## Weak isospin I

$\nu_L \Rightarrow I = 1/2,\ I_3 = 1/2$

$\nu_R \Rightarrow I = 0,\ I_3 = 0$

Dirac Mass:

$\bar{\nu}_L \nu_R + \bar{\nu}_R \nu_L$ $\quad |\Delta I| = 1/2$

Can be obtained from Higgs doublets: $\nu_L \bar{\nu}_R H$

Majorana Mass ($\Delta L = 2$):

- $\nu^T_L \nu_L$ $\quad |\Delta I| = 1$

Non ren., dim. 5 operator: $\nu^T_L\ \nu_L HH$

- $\nu^T_R \nu_R$ $\quad |\Delta I| = 0$

Directly compatible with SU(2)xU(1)!

G. Altarelli

# See-Saw Mechanism

Yanagida; Glashow;
Gell-Mann, Ramond , Slansky;
Mohapatra, Senjanovic

$M\nu^T{}_R\nu_R$ allowed by SU(2)xU(1)

Large Majorana mass M (as large as the cut-off)

$m_D\bar{\nu}_L\nu_R$

Dirac mass m from
Higgs doublet(s)

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ \nu_L \\ \nu_R \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{cc} \nu_L & \nu_R \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_D \\ m_D & M \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

$M \gg m_D$

Eigenvalues

$$\nu_{light} = \frac{-m_D^2}{M}, \quad \nu_{heavy} = M$$

sign conventional
for fermions

G. Altarelli

In general $\nu$ mass terms are:

$$\mathcal{L}_\nu = \bar{L} h \nu_R H + \text{h.c.} + \nu_R^T M_R \nu_R + \nu_L^T \frac{\lambda}{M_L} \nu_L H H$$

Dirac

$m_D = hv$

$v = \langle 0|H|0\rangle$

Maiorana

$$m = \frac{\lambda v^2}{M_L}$$

More general see-saw mechanism:

| | $\nu_L$ | $\nu_R$ |
|---|---|---|
| $\nu_L$ | $\lambda v^2/M_L$ | $m_D$ |
| $\nu_R$ | $m_D$ | $M_R$ |

$m_{light} \sim \frac{m_D^2}{M_R}$ and/or $\frac{\lambda v^2}{M_L}$

$m_{heavy} \sim M_R$

$m_{eff} = \nu^T_L m_{light} \nu_L$

G. Altarelli

Neutrinos are (probably) Majorana particles: $\nu_L^T m_\nu \nu_L$

See-saw




$m_\nu = m_D^T M^{-1} m_D$

connection with $m_D$

More in general: non ren. $O_5$ operator $\lambda/M\ \nu_L^T H H^T \nu_L$

e.g from




N: new particle $I_w$=0,1

## A very natural and appealing explanation:

ν's are nearly massless because they are Majorana particles and get masses through L non conserving interactions suppressed by a large scale $M \sim M_{GUT}$

$$m_\nu \sim \frac{m^2}{M}$$

$m \quad m_t \sim v \sim 200$ GeV

M: scale of L non cons.

Note:

$m_\nu \sim (\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2} \sim 0.05$ eV

$m \sim v \sim 200$ GeV

$M \sim 10^{15}$ GeV

**Neutrino masses are a probe of physics at $M_{GUT}$ !**

# B and L conservation in SM:

"Accidental" symmetries: in SM there is no dim.4 gauge invariant operator that violates B and/or L (if no $\nu_R$, otherwise $M \nu^T_R \nu_R$ is dim-3 $|\Delta L|=2$)

The same is true in SUSY with R-parity cons.

e. g. for the $\Delta B = \Delta L = -1$ transition $u + u \to e^+ + \bar{d}$

all good quantum numbers are conserved:
e.g. colour $u \sim 3$, $\bar{d} \sim \bar{3}$ and $3 \times 3 = 6 + \bar{3}$ but

$$\frac{\lambda}{M^2} \overline{d^c} \Gamma u \; \overline{e^c} \Gamma u \longrightarrow \text{dim-6}$$

SU(5): $p \to e^+ \pi^0$

Once $\nu_R$ is introduced (Dirac mass) large Majorana mass is naturally induced → see-saw

G. Altarelli

## Dark Matter

WMAP

Most of the Universe is not made up of atoms: $\Omega_{tot} \sim 1$, $\Omega_b \sim 0.044$, $\Omega_m \sim 0.27$
Most is Dark Matter and Dark Energy

Most Dark Matter is Cold (non relativistic at freeze out)
Significant Hot Dark matter is disfavoured
Neutrinos are not much cosmo-relevant: $\Omega_\nu < 0.015$ (WMAP)

SUSY has excellent DM candidates: Neutralinos
Also Axions are still viable

For 3 neutrinos: $\Omega_\nu < 0.015$ -> $m_\nu < 0.23$ eV ~ $5(\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2}$

the exact value depends on the cosmological model: can be somewhat relaxed

$m_\nu < \sim 1$ eV

G. Altarelli

## Baryogenesis

A most attractive possibility:

**BG via Leptogenesis near the GUT scale**

$T \sim 10^{12\pm3}$ GeV (after inflation)

Buchmuller,Yanagida, Plumacher, Ellis, Lola, Giudice et al, Fujii et al

Only survives if $\Delta$(B-L) is not 0
(otherwise is washed out at $T_{ew}$ by instantons)

Main candidate: decay of lightest $\nu_R$ ($M \sim 10^{12}$ GeV)

L non conserv. in $\nu_R$ out-of-equilibrium decay:
B-L excess survives at $T_{ew}$ and gives the obs. B asymm.

Quantitative studies confirm that the range of $m_i$ from $\nu$ oscill's is compatible with BG via (thermal) LG

In particular the bound was derived

$m_i < 10^{-1}$ eV

Close to WMAP

Buchmuller, Di Bari, Plumacher
Giudice et al

G. Altarelli

# The scale of the cosmological constant is a big mystery.

$\Omega_\Lambda \sim 0.65$ → $\rho_\Lambda \sim (2\ 10^{-3}\ \text{eV})^4 \sim (0.1\text{mm})^{-4}$ → Similar to $m_\nu$!?

In Quantum Field Theory: $\rho_\Lambda \sim (\Lambda_{cutoff})^4$

If $\Lambda_{cutoff} \sim M_{Pl}$ → $\rho_\Lambda \sim 10^{123}\ \rho_{obs}$

Exact SUSY would solve the problem: $\rho_\Lambda = 0$

But SUSY is broken: $\rho_\Lambda \sim (\Lambda_{SUSY})^4 \sim 10^{59}\ \rho_{obs}$

It is interesting that the correct order is $(\rho_\Lambda)^{1/4} \sim (\Lambda_{EW})^2/M_{Pl}$

So far no solution:

- A modification of gravity at 0.1mm?(large extra dim.)
- Leak of vac. energy to other universes (wormholes)?

•••

Other problem:
Why now?




G. Altarelli

The current experimental situation is still unclear

- LSND: true or false?
- what is the absolute scale of ν masses?
- ...

Different classes of models are possible:

If LSND true

sterile ν(s)??

CPT violat'n??

- "3-1"

$\nu_{sterile}$


If LSND false → 3 light ν's are OK

We assume this case here

- Degenerate ($m^2 >> \Delta m^2$)
- Inverse hierarchy
- Normal hierarchy




G. Altarelli

# 3-ν Models

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{pmatrix} = U \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_2 \\ \nu_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

flavour — mass




$U = U_{P\text{-}MNS}$

Pontecorvo
Maki, Nakagawa, Sakata

In basis where $e^-$, $\mu^-$, $\tau^-$ are diagonal:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13}e^{i\delta} & 0 & c_{13} \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \sim$$

s = solar: large

CHOOZ: $|s_{13}| <\sim 0.2$

$$\sim \begin{bmatrix} c_{13}c_{12} & c_{13}s_{12} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ \dots & \dots & c_{13}s_{23} \\ \dots & \dots & c_{13}c_{23} \end{bmatrix}$$

atm.: ~ max

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} c & -s & 0 \\ \frac{s}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{-1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{s}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{c}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{bmatrix}$$

(some signs are conventional)

G. Altarelli

$$m_\nu \sim U \begin{bmatrix} e^{i\phi_1} m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_2} m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{bmatrix} U^T$$

In general 9 parameters:
3 masses, 3 angles,
3 phases

$L^T m_\nu L$

For $s_{13} \sim 0$:

$0\nu\beta\beta$

$$m_\nu \sim \begin{bmatrix} m_1c^2+m_2s^2 & (m_1-m_2)cs/\sqrt{2} & (m_1-m_2)cs/\sqrt{2} \\ \ldots & (m_1s^2+m_2c^2+m_3)/2 & (m_1s^2+m_2c^2-m_3)/2 \\ \ldots & \ldots & (m_1s^2+m_2c^2+m_3)/2 \end{bmatrix}$$

Note:
- $m_\nu$ is symmetric
- phases included in $m_i$

Relation between masses and frequencies:

$P(\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_\mu) = P(\nu_e \leftrightarrow \nu_\tau) = 1/2 \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \cdot \sin^2\Delta_{sun}$

$P(\nu_\mu \leftrightarrow \nu_\tau) = \sin^2\Delta_{atm} - 1/4 \sin^2 2\theta_{12} \cdot \sin^2\Delta_{sun}$

$$\Delta_{sun} = \frac{m_2^2 - m_1^2}{4E} L \quad ; \quad \Delta_{atm} = \frac{m_3^2 - m_{1,2}^2}{4E} L$$

G. Altarelli

In our def.: $\Delta_{sun} > 0$, $\Delta_{atm} >$ or $< 0$

# $0\nu\beta\beta$ can tell degenerate, inverted or normal hierarchy

$|m_{ee}|=c_{13}^2\,[m_1 c_{12}^2+e^{i\alpha}m_2 s_{12}^2]+m_3 e^{i\beta}s_{13}^2$

LA:~0.3-1

Degenerate: $\sim|m|\,|c_{12}^2+e^{i\alpha}s_{12}^2|$

$|m_{ee}|\sim|m|\,(0.3-1)< 0.23\text{-}1$ eV

IH: $\sim(\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2}|c_{12}^2+e^{i\alpha}s_{12}^2|$

$|m_{ee}|\sim(1.6\text{-}5)\ 10^{-2}$ eV

NH: $\sim(\Delta m^2_{sol})^{1/2}s_{12}^2+(\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2}e^{i\beta}s_{13}^2$

$|m_{ee}|\sim$ (few) $10^{-3}$ eV




lightest $m_\nu$ (eV)

G. Altarelli

Present exp. limit: $m_{ee}< 0.3\text{-}0.5$ eV
(and a hint of signal?????)

# Evidence for 0νββ?

Heidelberg-Moscow
Klapdor-Kleingrothaus et al

Not at all compelling!!!!

New recent ('04) paper

Iff true: (WMAP ??)

$m_{ee}/z = 0.39 \pm 0.11\,\text{eV} >> (\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2}$

(z~0.6-2.8
uncert. matrix element)

would clearly point
to degenerate models

G. Altarelli




Feruglio, Strumia, Vissani



# Degenerate ν's

$m^2 >> \Delta m^2$

- Apriori compatible with hot dark matter ($m \sim 1$-2 eV)
  → was considered by many
- Limits on $m_{ee}$ from $0\nu\beta\beta$ then imply large mixing also for solar oscillations: (Vissani; Georgi,Glashow)

$m_{ee} < 0.3$-$0.5$ eV (Exp)

$$m_{ee} = c^2_{13}\,(m_1 c^2_{12} + m_2 s^2_{12}) + s^2_{13} m_3 \sim m_1 c^2_{12} + m_2 s^2_{12}$$

If $|m_1| \sim |m_2| \sim |m_2| \sim 1$-2 eV → $m_1 = -m_2$ and $c^2_{12} \sim s^2_{12}$

LA solution: $\sin^2\theta \sim 0.3$ → $\cos^2\theta - \sin^2\theta \sim 0.4$

a moderate suppression factor!

Trusting WMAP: $|m| < 0.23$ eV, only a moderate degeneracy is allowed: for LA, $m/(\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2} < 5$, $m/(\Delta m^2_{sol})^{1/2} < 30$.

Less constraints from $0\nu\beta\beta$ (both $m_1 = \pm m_2$ allowed)

G. Altarelli

Recall: leptogenesis prefers $|m| < 0.1$ eV

After KamLAND, SNO and WMAP not too much hierarchy is needed for $\nu$ masses:

$r \sim \Delta m^2_{sol}/\Delta m^2_{atm} \sim 1/40$




Precisely at $3\sigma$: $0.018 < r < 0.053$

or

$m_{heaviest} < 1$ - $0.23$ eV
$m_{next} > \sim 7\ 10^{-3}$ eV

⟹ Anarchical or semi-anarchical models

G. Altarelli

# Anarchy (or accidental hierarchy): No structure in the leptonic sector

Hall, Murayama, Weiner

See-Saw:
$m_\nu \sim m^2/M$
produces hierarchy
from random m,M

could fit LA




But: all mixing angles should be large

marginal for LA → predicts $\theta_{13}$ near bound




G. Altarelli

# Semianarchy: no structure in 23

Consider a matrix like $m_\nu \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 & \lambda & \lambda \\ \lambda & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

Note: $\theta_{13} \sim \lambda$
$\theta_{23} \sim 1$

with coeff.s of o(1) and det23~o(1)
[λ~1 corresponds to anarchy]

After 23 and 13 rotations $m_\nu \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^2 & \lambda & 0 \\ \lambda & \eta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$

Normally two masses are of o(1) and $\theta_{12} \sim \lambda$
But if, accidentally, $\eta \sim \lambda$, then the solar angle is also large.

The advantage over anarchy is that $\theta_{13}$ is small, but
the hierarchy $m^2_3 >> m^2_2$ is accidental

G. Altarelli Ramond et al, Buchmuller et al

# Inverted Hierarchy

Zee, Joshipura et al;
Mohapatra et al; Jarlskog et al;
Frampton,Glashow; Barbieri et al
Xing; Giunti, Tanimoto




An interesting model for double maximal mixing (bimixing):

$$U \sim \begin{bmatrix} 1/\sqrt{2} & -1/\sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 1/2 & 1/2 & -1/\sqrt{2} \\ 1/2 & 1/2 & 1/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}$$

1st approximation

$$m_{\nu diag} = \begin{bmatrix} m & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -m & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad ; \quad U m_{\nu diag} U^T = 1/\sqrt{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m & m \\ m & 0 & 0 \\ m & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

Can arise from see-saw or dim-5 $L^T H H^T L$

e.g. by approximate $L_e$-$L_\mu$-$L_\tau$ symmetry

- 1-2 degeneracy stable under rad. corr.'s

1st approximation

$$m_{\nu diag} = \begin{bmatrix} m & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -m & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad ; \quad U m_{\nu diag} U^T = 1/\sqrt{2} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m & m \\ m & 0 & 0 \\ m & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

- LA? This texture prefers $\theta_{sol}$ closer to maximal than $\theta_{atm}$
  i.e $\theta_{sol} - \pi/4$ small for $(\Delta m^2_{sol}/\Delta m^2_{atm})_{LA} \sim 1/40$

In fact: 12-> $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & m \\ m & 0 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow$ Pseudodirac $\theta_{12}$ maximal  23-> $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow \theta_{23} \sim o(1)$

With perturbations: $\begin{bmatrix} 0 & m & m \\ m & 0 & 0 \\ m & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \longrightarrow m \begin{bmatrix} \delta & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \eta & \eta \\ 1 & \eta & \eta \end{bmatrix}$

$tg^2\,\theta_{12} \sim 1 + o(\delta + \eta)$  $(\Delta m^2_{sol}/\Delta m^2_{atm})_{LA} \sim o(\delta + \eta)$

- In principle one can use the charged lepton mixing
  to go away from $\theta_{12}$ maximal.
  In practice constraints from $\theta_{13}$ small $(\delta\theta_{12} \sim \theta_{13})$

Frampton et al; GA, Feruglio, Masina '04

For the corrections to bimixing from the charged lepton sector, typically $|\sin\theta_{13}| \sim (1-\tan^2\theta_{12})/4$

GA, Feruglio, Masina '04




Figure 1: Taking an upper bound on $|U_{e3}|$ respectively equal to $0.23, 0.1, 0.05, 0.01$, we show (from yellow to red) the allowed regions of the plane $[s^e_{12}, s^e_{13}]$. Each plot is obtained by setting $\alpha_1$ to a particular value, while leaving $\alpha_2 + \delta_e$ free. We keep the present 3 $\sigma$ window for $\delta_{sol}$ [10].

- In general more $\theta_{12}$ is close to maximal, more is IH likely

G. Altarelli

# Normal Hierarchy




- Assume 3 widely split light neutrinos.
- For u, d and $l^-$ Dirac matrices the 3rd generation eigenvalue is dominant.
- May be this is also true for $m_{\nu D}$: diag $m_{\nu D} \sim (0,0,m_{D3})$.
- Assume see-saw is dominant: $m_\nu \sim m^T{}_D M^{-1} m_D$
  See-saw quadratic in $m_D$: tends to enhance hierarchy
- Maximally constraining: GUT's relate q, $l^-$, $\nu$ masses!

- A crucial point: in the 2-3 sector we need both large $m_3$-$m_2$ splitting and large mixing.

$m_3 \sim (\Delta m^2_{atm})^{1/2} \sim 5\ 10^{-2}$ eV
$m_2 \sim (\Delta m^2_{sol})^{1/2} \sim 8\ 10^{-3}$ eV for LA

- The "theorem" that large $\Delta m_{32}$ implies small mixing (pert. th.: $\theta_{ij} \sim 1/|E_i-E_j|$) is not true in general: all we need is (sub)det[23]~0

- Example: $m_{23} \sim \begin{bmatrix} x^2 & x \\ x & 1 \end{bmatrix}$

Det = 0; Eigenvl's: 0, $1+x^2$
Mixing: $\sin^2 2\theta = 4x^2/(1+x^2)^2$

So all we need are natural mechanisms for det[23]=0

For x~1
large splitting
and large mixing!

G. Altarelli

# Examples of mechanisms for Det[23]~0

see-saw $m_\nu \sim m^T_D M^{-1} m_D$

1) A $\nu_R$ is lightest and coupled to $\mu$ and $\tau$

King; Allanach; Barbieri et al......

$$M \sim \begin{bmatrix} \varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \rightarrow M^{-1} \sim \begin{bmatrix} 1/\varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \approx \begin{bmatrix} 1/\varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

$$m_\nu \sim \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1/\varepsilon & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a & c \\ b & d \end{bmatrix} \approx 1/\varepsilon \begin{bmatrix} a^2 & ac \\ ac & c^2 \end{bmatrix}$$

2) M generic but $m_D$ "lopsided" $\quad m_D \sim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x & 1 \end{bmatrix}$

Albright, Barr; GA, Feruglio, .....

$$m_\nu \sim \begin{bmatrix} 0 & x \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} a & b \\ b & c \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ x & 1 \end{bmatrix} = c \begin{bmatrix} x^2 & x \\ x & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Caution: if 0 -> 0($\varepsilon$), det23=0 could be spoiled by suitable $1/\varepsilon$ terms in $M^{-1}$

# An important property of SU(5)

Left-handed quarks have small mixings ($V_{CKM}$),
but right-handed quarks can have large mixings (unknown).

In SU(5):
LH for d quarks ⟷ RH for $l^-$ leptons

$\bar{5}$ → $m_d \sim \bar{d}_R d_L$ ← 10

10 → $m_e \sim \bar{e}_R e_L$ ← $\bar{5}$

$\bar{5}$ : $(\bar{d},\bar{d},\bar{d}, \nu, e^-)$ — $(\bar{d},\bar{d},\bar{d})$: R, $(\nu, e^-)$: L

$$m_d = m_e^T$$

cannot be exact, but approx.

Most "lopsided" models are based on this fact. In these models large atmospheric mixing arises (at least in part) from the charged lepton sector.

G. Altarelli

- Hierarchical ν's and see-saw dominance

$L^T m_\nu L \to m_\nu \sim m_D^2/M$

allow to relate q, l, ν masses and mixings in GUT models.
For dominance of dim-5 operators -> less constraints

$\lambda^2/M\ L^T LHH \to m_\nu \sim \lambda^2 v^2/M$

- The correct pattern of masses and mixings, also including ν's, is obtained in simple models based on

$SU(5)xU(1)_{flavour}$

Ramond et al; GA, Feruglio+Masina; Buchmuller et al; King et al; Yanagida et al, Berezhiani et al; Lola et al.......

- SO(10) models could be more predictive, as are non abelian flavour symmetries, eg O(3)

Albright, Barr; Babu et al; Buccella et al; Barbieri et al; Raby et al; King, Ross

- The non trivial pattern of fermion masses and mixing demands a flavour structure (symmetry)

- (SUSY) $SU(5)XU(1)_F$ models offer a minimal description of flavour symmetry

- A flexible enough framework used to realize and compare models with anarchy or hierarchy (direct or inverse) in $\nu$ sector, with see-saw dominance or not.

- On this basis we found that for LA there is still a significant preference for hierarchy vs anarchy

G.A., F. Feruglio, I. Masina, hep-ph/0210342 (v2 Nov '03)

Previous related work: Haba,Murayama; Hirsch,King; Vissani; Rosenfeld,Rosner; Antonelli et al….

# Hierarchy for masses and mixings via horizontal U(1) charges.

Froggatt, Nielsen '79

**Principle:**

A generic mass term

$$\bar{R}_1 m_{12} L_2 H$$

is forbidden by U(1) if $q_1+q_2+q_H$ not 0

$q_1$, $q_2$, $q_H$: U(1) charges of $\bar{R}_1$, $L_2$, H

U(1) broken by vev of "flavon" field $\theta$ with U(1) charge $q_\theta = -1$.
The coupling is allowed: if vev $\theta = w$, and $w/M = \lambda$ we get:

$\Delta_{charge}$

$$\bar{R}_1 m_{12} L_2 H \, (\theta/M)^{q1+q2+qH} \qquad m_{12} \to m_{12} \lambda^{q1+q2+qH}$$

Hierarchy: More $\Delta_{charge}$ -> more suppression ($\lambda$ small)

One can have more flavons ($\lambda$, $\lambda'$, ...)
with different charges (>0 or <0)etc -> many versions

With suitable charge assignments all relevant patterns can be obtained

1st fam. 2nd 3rd

$\Psi_{10}$: (5, 3, 0)
$\Psi_5$: (2, 0, 0) ← Equal 2,3 ch. for lopsided
$\Psi_1$: (1,-1, 0)

Recall: u~ 10 10
d=e$^T$~ $\bar{5}$ 10
$\nu_D$~$\bar{5}$ 1;$M_{RR}$~ 1 1

| Model | $\Psi_{10}$ | $\Psi_{\bar{5}}$ | $\Psi_1$ | $(H_u, H_d)$ |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Anarchical $(A)$ | (3,2,0) | (0,0,0) | (0,0,0) | (0,0) |
| Semi-Anarchical $(SA)$ | (2,1,0) | (1,0,0) | (2,1,0) | (0,0) |
| Hierarchical $(H_I)$ | (6,4,0) | (2,0,0) | (1,-1,0) | (0,0) |
| Hierarchical $(H_{II})$ | (5,3,0) | (2,0,0) | (1,-1,0) | (0,0) |
| Inversely Hierarchical $(IH_I)$ | (3,2,0) | (1,-1,-1) | (-1,+1,0) | (0,+1) |
| Inversely Hierarchical $(IH_{II})$ | (6,4,0) | (1,-1,-1) | (-1,+1,0) | (0,+1) |

No structure for leptons → Anarchical

No automatic det23 = 0 → Semi-Anarchical

all charges positive

Automatic det23 = 0 → Hierarchical

not all charges positive

G. Altarelli

All entries are a given power of $\lambda$ times a free o(1) coefficient

$$m_u \sim v_u \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^{10} & \lambda^8 & \lambda^5 \\ \lambda^8 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

In a statistical approach we generate these coeff.s as random complex numbers $\rho e^{i\phi}$ with $\phi = [0,2\pi]$ and $\rho = [0.5,2]$ (default) or [0.8,1.2], or [0.95,1.05] or [0,1] (real numbers also considered for comparison)

For each model we evaluate the success rate (over many trials) for falling in the exp. allowed window:

(boundaries ~$3\sigma$ limits)

Maltoni et al, hep-ph/0309130

$r \sim \Delta m^2_{sol}/\Delta m^2_{atm}$

$0.018 < r < 0.053$

$|U_{e3}| < 0.23$

$0.30 < \tan^2\theta_{12} < 0.64$

$0.45 < \tan^2\theta_{23} < 2.57$

for each model the $\lambda, \lambda'$ values are optimised

G. Altarelli

The optimised values of $\lambda$ are of the order of $\lambda_C$ or a bit larger (moderate hierarchy)

| model | $\lambda(=\lambda')$ |
|---|---|
| $A_{SS}$ | 0.2 |
| $SA_{SS}$ | 0.25 |
| $H_{(SS,II)}$ | 0.35 |
| $H_{(SS,I)}$ | 0.45 |
| $IH_{(SS,II)}$ | 0.45 |
| $IH_{(SS,I)}$ | 0.25 |

# Results with see-saw dominance (updated in Nov. '03):

Scale: Σrates=100

1 or 2 refer to models with 1 or 2 flavons of opposite ch.

With charges of both signs and 1 flavon some entries are zero




A: Anarchy
SA: Semi-anarchy
H: Normal Hierarchy
IH: Inv. Hierarchy

Errors are linear comb. of stat. and syst. errors (varying the extraction procedure: interval of $\rho$, real or complex)

H2 is better than SA, better than A, better than IH

G. Altarelli

# Example: Normal Hierarchy

G.A., Feruglio, Masina

Note: not all charges positive
--> det23 suppression

1st fam. → 2nd → 3rd

$q(10)$: $(5, 3, 0)$
$q(\bar{5})$: $(2, 0, 0)$
$q(1)$: $(1, -1, 0)$

$q(H) = 0$, $q(\bar{H}) = 0$
$q(\theta) = -1$, $q(\theta') = +1$

In first approx., with $<\theta>/M \sim \lambda \sim \lambda' \sim 0.35 \sim o(\lambda_C)$

$10_i 10_j$:

$$m_u \sim v_u \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^{10} & \lambda^8 & \lambda^5 \\ \lambda^8 & \lambda^6 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$10_i \bar{5}_j$:

$$m_d = m_e^T \sim v_d \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^7 & \lambda^5 & \lambda^5 \\ \lambda^5 & \lambda^3 & \lambda^3 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

"lopsided"

$\bar{5}_i 1_j$:

$$m_{\nu D} \sim v_u \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^3 & \lambda & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda & \lambda' & 1 \\ \lambda & \lambda' & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

$1_i 1_j$:

$$M_{RR} \sim M \begin{bmatrix} \lambda^2 & 1 & \lambda \\ 1 & \lambda'^2 & \lambda' \\ \lambda & \lambda' & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$



Note: coeffs. 0(1) omitted, only orders of magnitude predicted

With no see-saw ($m_\nu$ generated directly from $L^T m_\nu L \sim \bar{5}\,\bar{5}\,H$) is better than A

[With no-see-saw H coincide with SA]




Note: we always include the effect of diagonalising charged leptons

## Some distributions

IH2 NO-SS $\lambda = \lambda' = 0.3$

We see that IH tends to predict maximal solar mixing angle $\theta_{12}$

Only compatible because of ch. lepton diagonalisation




With data dritfing away from maximal $\theta_{12}$, IH is rapidly disfavoured (in U(1) models)

G. Altarelli

ch. lepton mixing small because $m_e$ small

The main problem of Anarchy is $U_{e3}$ (as expected)

$\lambda=\lambda'=0.2$




In all models the distr. for $\tan^2\theta_{23}$ is flat




r




H2 SS, $\lambda=0.35$

$\lambda=\lambda'=0.35$

$U_{e3}$




$\tan^2\theta_{12}$




$\tan^2\theta_{13}$

G.

# The main advantage of SA vs A is for $U_{e3}$

$$\Psi_5 \sim (2,0,0) \rightarrow m_\nu \sim \begin{pmatrix} \lambda^4 & \lambda^2 & \lambda^2 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \\ \lambda^2 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$Det_{23} \sim 0(1)$

$$r \equiv \frac{\Delta m^2_{sun}}{\Delta m^2_{atm}}$$

works when r is small enough by chance




G. Altarelli

# Summing up:

- $\nu$ masses very small -> Majorana $\nu$'s and see-saw mechanism
- $\nu$ masses are consistent with the standard way beyond the SM: SUSY and GUT's
- Recent exp progress:
  - $\Delta m^2_{sol}$ went closer to $\Delta m^2_{atm}$ → less hierarchy → $|m_3/m_2| \sim 6$
  - smaller upper limit on absolute mass: WMAP: $\Sigma m_\nu < 0.69$ eV
- Crucial issues:
  - LSND??
  - $s_{13}$ small (how small?) disfavours anarchy
  - $s_{23} \sim$ maximal (too maximal?), $s_{12} \sim$ large not maximal disfavours inv. hierarchy
  - $0\nu\beta\beta$: near bound ? → degenerate $\nu$'s
    intermediate? → inverted hierarchy
    small ? → normal hierarchy → Looks simplest and fine
  - CP violation: still in the future

G. Altarelli