

Dynamical Mass Generations and Collective Excitations in the (Supersymmetric-)Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model and a Gauge Theory with Left-Right-Asymmetric Majorana Mass Terms

Tadafumi Ohsaku

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität zu Köln, Köln, Bundesrepublik Deutschland, and
Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas, the United States of America**

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

The structure of effective potential surface of the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model with right-left asymmetric Majorana mass terms (corresponds to the single-flavor type-II seesaw situation of neutrino) is investigated. After the dynamical generation of Dirac mass, two collective modes appear similar to the case of ordinary NJL model, and the phase mode (phason), which corresponds to majoron or pion at vanishing Majorana mass parameter(s), has an excitation mass. The mechanism of generation of phason as a pseudo Nambu-Goldstone boson is examined by a mathematical manner, summarized into a theorem. The mass of phason is also evaluated in a supersymmetric version of the NJL-type model, and phason mass takes the order of that of axion commonly accepted today. An $SU(2_c)$ -gauge model is constructed for the context of neutrino seesaw mechanism, and the Schwinger-Dyson equation of dynamical mass functions is examined. Several physical implications such as decay modes of phason, a non-linear sigma model for phason are given. It is proposed that the method/result of this paper can be applied to an understanding on the origin of the Kobayashi-Maskawa matrix.

PACS numbers: 12.60.-i,12.60.Rc,14.60.Pq,14.60.St,14.80.Mz

Lange lieb ich dich schon, möchte dich, mir zu Lust, ... (Friedrich Hölderlin, "Heidelberg")

Zwei Dinge erfüllen das Gemüt mit immer neuer und zunehmender Bewunderung und Ehrfurcht, je öfter und anhaltender sich das Nachdenken damit beschäftigt: Der bestirnte Himmel über mir, und das moralische Gesetz in mir. (I. Kant, Kritik der praktischen Vernunft (1788))

I. INTRODUCTION

In spite of non-renormalizability, four-fermion interaction models [1,3,8,9,15,17,20,26,30,34,53,62,63,64,70,77,78,92,] [96,100,101,109,110,114,115,116,117,118,119,141,146,148,153,161,164,169] are quite useful in condensed matter, nuclei and hadrons, and particle physics: They seem to have infinite-number of applications. For example, quantitative evaluations of physical quantities in asymptotic-free gauge theory such as quantum chromodynamics (QCD) are usually difficult, not only by its strong-coupling nature of the infrared region, but also the impossibility to use the Slavnov-Taylor identity in a nonperturbative calculation: We have to employ approximations to obtain an integration kernel and the running gauge coupling which has an infrared (IR) divergence, cannot avoid gauge dependence, reduce the theory to an Abelianized version (so-called "QCD-like" model), even in a calculation of a self-consistent mass function in a Schwinger-Dyson (SD) equation [2,6,10,41,45,46,62,64,85,93,94,97,101,113,120,133,146,161,169]. (Though various numerical results of SD equation show that it gives good agreement with experimental measurements.) On the contrary, in a four-fermion interaction model, we have to introduce a cutoff, and cannot evaluate a physical quantity under a renormalization-group invariant manner. Thus, a prediction of a four-fermion model is less confidential compared with that of an asymptotic-free gauge theory. However, it is much easier to examine, for example, collective modes associated with a spontaneous symmetry breaking, than by a gauge theory: In a gauge theory, one should employ a Bethe-Salpeter formalism for examinations of collective modes, and it is usually difficult and complicated to solve [62,85,93,101,133]. In fact, applying method of global analysis to a four-fermion model is relatively much easier than a gauge theory: We can say a four-fermion model is mathematically more "well-defined" than a gauge theory, and a gauge theory has too many freedoms which should be fixed before doing a global analysis of it. Therefore, it is a natural attitude to examine dynamical symmetry breaking by a four-fermion model first, and for the next step, one should investigate a gauge model.

The Standard Model (SM) accurately describes physical phenomena of energy scales accessible by accelerators until now, and it is still our starting point of scientific investigations on particle phenomenology, hadrons/nuclei, atomic physics, astrophysics, and cosmology [39,156]. The main problems of the SM, their importances *established by experimental facts*, we have not yet found ultimate solutions/understandings are, (1) origins of masses in quarks and charged leptons, (2) origins of flavor mixings, (3) CP-violations, (4) neutrino masses, (5) candidates of dark sector

in the SM [4,7,18,29,39,54,56,66,68,72,75,76,79,88,90,104,112,129,142,143,160]. The subject which we consider in this paper will relate *all* of these problems, with an emphasis on *neutrino seesaw mechanism*. For example, a CP-violation may cause, a difference of life times of particle and anti-particle, a particle-number non-conservation, breakdown of time-reversal invariance if a system/theory keeps CPT and Lorentz invariances. If CPT is conserved, the flavor fraction in mass eigenstates in neutrino oscillation must be the same for neutrinos and anti-neutrinos, at least in the framework of the usual neutrino oscillation theory [121]. We might obtain another picture/interpretation if we get a radical/essential modification for modern neutrino oscillation paradigm for explaining various experimental facts. In experimental examinations, neutrinos seem to have no magnetic moment [39] and they are electrically neutral, while the discussion on the type of mass of neutrino (Dirac mass or Majorana mass) has not yet meet a unique conclusion until now [76,104]. If neutrino is Dirac particle, they can have magnetic moments, $\mu_\nu^D = 3eG_F m_\nu / (8\sqrt{2}\pi^2)$, induced by corrections of weak interaction [44], while it has no diagonal electric/magnetic moments when it is Majorana. Hence an examination on neutrino magnetic moment can provide us to distinguish neutrinos as Dirac or Majorana [140]. If neutrinos have magnetic moment, some astrophysical processes inside stars, especially neutron star cooling, might be affected [59]. In fact, a supernova will release 90 percent of its energy by neutrino emission [144]. Neutrinoless double β decay can say something about whether neutrinos are Dirac or Majorana [7,154]. Neutrinos can be regarded as relic particles of dynamics/evolution of early Universe [136]. By these various interesting issues and recent remarkable advances in experiments, surely neutrino physics is now "the key" to understand physics from "beyond the SM" to astro-particle physics and cosmology [5,7,11,12,23,42,54,56,104,112,121].

The top-quark condensation model of the SM is one of candidates toward "beyond the SM", and it stands a quite close place to the SM [9,30,64,77,92,100,169]. In the top-condensation model, Bardeen, Hill and Lindner employed the method of renormalization-group with a compositeness condition (set from/below a GUT (grand unified theory) scale) as a boundary condition of the RG equation [9], while Miransky, Tanabashi and Yamawaki used the Schwinger-Dyson approach supplemented with the Pagels-Stokar formula [100]. (It was proved that these two methods are equivalent at the large- N limit [30,169]. Hence, both of these approaches examined the first derivative of the SM effective potential with respect to Higgs VEV (vacuum expectation value), and thus these methods cannot be applied to the case of first-order phase transition. For a full examination, we need a total/global profile of the effective potential, and it is an interesting issue for us, especially in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model (MSSM) [20,21,22,26].)

Observations of neutrino oscillation give us the evidence that neutrinos have masses, at least two of three generations [142,143]. A very economical explanation for neutrino tiny mass is the seesaw mechanism [52,99,103,170]: In the mechanism, neutrinos have both Dirac and right-handed Majorana mass terms and a Nambu-Goldstone (NG) boson (majoron [25]) will arise from the Higgs sector associated with giving a VEV for a lepton-number-violating Majorana mass term of neutrino. Hence it is an interesting question that what will happen if a fermion-field acquires a Dirac mass dynamically under having both left- and right- handed Majorana mass terms [119]. Recently, Antusch et al. gave a theory of dynamical seesaw mechanism of neutrinos which should relate to the top-condensation model [3]. In such a dynamical model, the theory will be reduced to a Ginzburg-Landau (a low-energy effective) bosonic model, and an examination of collective fields of a Ginzburg-Landau model are usually done by their energy-momentum relations, global structure of energy profile, and mode-mode couplings [105]. Sometimes, a mode-mode coupling reduces a Higgs VEV. An investigation on possible relations between majoron and leptogenesis, dark energy, was given by Ref. [65]. In Ref. [86], decay processes of right-handed neutrinos caused by interactions with majorons are examined, and it is argued that they would contribute to lepton asymmetry. In Ref. [12], majoron-mediated neutrino decay processes and its implication to astrophysical, supernova neutrino emission are considered. Majoron and axion are related to (coming from) a phase degree of freedom of a mass parameter of a field theory. If majoron is very light, it could be found through the Raffelt-Stodolsky mechanism [131] which is usually discussed in axion-photon mixing [123]. The dark energy seems to dominate dynamics of the accelerated Universe, and there are several models of mass-varying (depends on environment) neutrinos for explanations of dark energy [16,73].

Recently, a paper on seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass in the SUSY Nambu-Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model supplemented by Majorana mass terms are given by the author [119]. In the model, dynamical generation of a Dirac mass term, and a relation between phase degrees of freedom of Dirac, left- and right-handed Majorana mass parameters were discussed. Kobayashi and Maskawa found a phase of the quark mixing matrix which cannot be absorbed by any field redefinition in a six-flavor theory [79]. It is a well-known fact that the Kobayashi-Maskawa phase is too weak to keep lepton/baryon asymmetries. The purpose of this paper is to give an investigation on dynamical mass functions, and the mass phases, they cannot be absorbed by a field redefinition, as collective modes, with the emphasis on the neutrino seesaw mechanism.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we introduce an NJL type four-fermion model with left-right asymmetric Majorana mass terms, evaluate the one-loop effective potential of it, and examine the first and second derivatives with respect to collective fields. A supersymmetric extension of the result of Sec. II is given in Sec. III.

Sec. IV, we construct a gauge model for neutrino seesaw mechanism, and examine an SD equation for Dirac and Majorana masses. Several physical implications of our theory is given in Sec. V. Finally, we give our conclusion of this works with futher investigations in Sec. VI.

Throughout this paper, we use the conventions $g_{\mu\nu} = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$ and $\gamma_5 = i\gamma^0\gamma^1\gamma^2\gamma^3$. The chiral projectors are defined as follows:

$$P_+ \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 + \gamma_5), \quad P_- \equiv \frac{1}{2}(1 - \gamma_5). \quad (1)$$

II. THE NAMBU–JONA-LASINIO MODEL WITH LEFT-RIGHT ASYMMETRIC MAJORANA MASS TERMS

A. Preliminary

We start our investigation by a re-expression of a well-known result in the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio (NJL) model. The Lagrangian is

$$\mathcal{L}^{NJL} = \bar{\psi}(i\cancel{\partial} - |m^{(0)}|)\psi + G[(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 + (\bar{\psi}i\gamma_5\psi)^2] = -\frac{1}{2G}|M_{dyn}|^2 + \bar{\psi}(i\cancel{\partial} - |m^{(0)}| - M_{dyn}P_+ - M_{dyn}^\dagger P_-)\psi, \quad (2)$$

$$M_{dyn} = |M_{dyn}|e^{i\theta_\chi} \quad \theta_\chi \in \mathbf{R}^1. \quad (3)$$

Note that the way of entering the auxiliary field M_{dyn} is slightly different from the orthodox definition given in literature [62]. We have written the pion degree of freedom by a linear combination of phase θ_χ . The $U(1)$ phase θ_χ cannot be absorbed by any field redefinition, since \mathcal{L} has bare mass $|m^{(0)}|$. This Lagrangian gives the following mass eigenvalue:

$$M = \sqrt{|m^{(0)}|^2 + |M_{dyn}|^2 + 2|m^{(0)}||M_{dyn}|\cos\theta_\chi}. \quad (4)$$

Note that M is a periodic function of θ_χ . Hence, the one-loop effective potential, its first derivatives with respect to $|M_{dyn}|$ and θ_χ also become periodic:

$$V_{eff} = \frac{|M_{dyn}|^2}{2G} - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left[\Lambda^2 M^2 + \Lambda^4 \ln\left(1 + \frac{M^2}{\Lambda^2}\right) - M^4 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{M^2}\right) \right], \quad (5)$$

$$\frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial |M_{dyn}|} = \frac{|M_{dyn}|}{G} - \frac{|M_{dyn}| + |m^{(0)}|\cos\theta_\chi}{4\pi^2} \left[\Lambda^2 - M^2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{M^2}\right) \right], \quad (6)$$

$$\frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial \theta_\chi} = \frac{|M_{dyn}||m^{(0)}|\sin\theta_\chi}{4\pi^2} \left[\Lambda^2 - M^2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{M^2}\right) \right]. \quad (7)$$

Thus, one finds $\theta_\chi = 2n\pi$ ($n \in \mathbf{Z}$) are minima and stable. From the definition of the fluctuation of θ_χ around $2n\pi$ by $\tilde{\theta}_\chi \equiv \delta_{\theta_\chi}(M_{dyn}) = |M_{dyn}|\delta\theta_\chi$, the product of a wavefunction renormalization constant and a square of mass of fluctuation $\tilde{\theta}_\chi$ becomes the formula of pion mass known in literature [70]:

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\theta_\chi}^{-1}(m_{\theta_\chi})^2 &= \frac{1}{2!} \frac{1}{|M_{dyn}|^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}}{\partial \theta_\chi^2} \Big|_{\theta_\chi=2n\pi, \frac{\partial V_{eff}}{\partial |M_{dyn}|}=0} \\ &= \frac{1}{2G} \frac{|m^{(0)}|}{|m^{(0)}| + |M_{dyn}|} \sim \frac{\Lambda^2}{8\pi^2} \frac{|m^{(0)}|}{|m^{(0)}| + |M_{dyn}|}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Next, we consider a more generic case. Let \hat{g} be an element of a compact Lie group, and let $\psi \rightarrow \hat{g}\psi$ be a global gauge transformation. Let $i\hat{\mathcal{D}}$ be a Dirac operator properly defined for a problem. In a non-Abelian case, $\hat{g} = \exp(i\theta^\alpha T_\alpha)$, $[T_\alpha, T_\beta] = if_{\alpha\beta\gamma}T_\gamma$. Then, if $[\hat{M}^{(0)}, T_i] \neq 0$, ($i = 1, \dots, n \leq N$, N : dimension of the Lie group), \hat{g} of the following Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L}^{g-NJL} = -\frac{1}{2G}(\hat{M}_{dyn})^2 + \bar{\psi}(i\hat{\mathcal{D}} - \hat{M}^{(0)} - \hat{g}\hat{M}_{dyn}\hat{g}^{-1})\psi \quad (9)$$

cannot be absorbed by any field redefinition. In that case,

$$0 = \frac{\partial \Gamma[\widetilde{M}]}{\partial \theta_i} = -(2G)^{-1} \widehat{M}_{dyn} \frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{dyn}}{\partial \theta_i} - (2G)^{-1} \frac{\partial \widehat{M}_{dyn}}{\partial \theta_i} \widehat{M}_{dyn} - i \text{Tr} \frac{1}{i \widehat{\mathcal{D}} - \widetilde{M}} \frac{\partial \widetilde{M}}{\partial \theta_i}, \quad (10)$$

$$\widetilde{M} = \widehat{M}^{(0)} + \widehat{g} \widehat{M}_{dyn} \widehat{g}^{-1}, \quad (11)$$

give the stationary condition of the action in the parameter space $\{\theta_i\}$. (Note that the action $\Gamma[\widetilde{M}]$ given from \mathcal{L}^{g-NJL} is a real-analytic function of the variable defined by the matrix \widetilde{M} .) The product of squares of mass eigenvalues λ_j ($j = 1, \dots, l$) are obtained by

$$\lambda_1^2(\theta_i) \times \dots \times \lambda_l^2(\theta_i) = \det \widetilde{M}. \quad (12)$$

The mass eigenvalue M of the chiral $U(1)$ case (4) can be obtained by the same way, with applying chiral projectors.

Before closing this subsection, we will make a comment on a complex structure of the dynamical mass M_{dyn} . In fact, $|m^{(0)}| \rightarrow |m^{(0)}| + M_{dyn} P_+ + M_{dyn}^\dagger P_-$ can be interpreted as a "chiral" affine mapping. The generation of the phase degree of freedom θ_χ is included by the following (quasi)conformal mapping [67] $|M_{dyn}| \rightarrow |M_{dyn}| e^{i(\alpha z + \beta \bar{z})}$ and its complex conjugate ($z, \alpha, \beta \in \mathbf{C}$). A Lagrangian with the following mass and its mapping

$$\begin{aligned} |m^{(0)}| + z P_+ + \bar{z} P_- &\rightarrow |m^{(0)}| + w P_+ + \bar{w} P_-, \\ w = f(z, \bar{z}), \quad \bar{w} &= \bar{f}(\bar{z}, z) \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

still keeps its Hermiticity. By a (quasi)conformal mapping of a complex mass parameter $z(\bar{z}) \rightarrow w$, we can handle variations $f(z, \bar{z}) \rightarrow f(z + \delta z, \bar{z} + \delta \bar{z})$ with respect to the amplitude $|M_{dyn}|$ and the phase θ_χ of the $U(1)$ case in a unified manner, and can construct first and second variations of the theory more mathematically. Hence, there are Riemann surfaces and their Teichmüller/moduli [67] spaces as the background of complex mass functions, though the Riemann sphere $\widehat{\mathbf{C}}$ may physically appropriate domain for a complex mass parameter. On the other hand, there is a discussion on a convergence property and invariance of measure of the path integration of auxiliary fields, which may give a restriction to a form of integration domain [48].

B. The Lagrangian and the Propagator

We introduce the following NJL-type four-fermion contact interaction Lagrangian with left- and right- handed Majorana mass terms:

$$\mathcal{L}^{NJL+M} = \xi^\dagger i \bar{\sigma}^\mu \partial_\mu \xi + \eta^\dagger i \sigma^\mu \partial_\mu \eta - \frac{1}{2} (m_R \xi^\dagger i \sigma_2 \xi^* - m_R^\dagger \xi^T i \sigma_2 \xi) - \frac{1}{2} (m_L \eta^T i \sigma_2 \eta - m_L^\dagger \eta^\dagger i \sigma_2 \eta^*) + G \eta^\dagger \xi \xi^\dagger \eta. \quad (14)$$

The Majorana mass terms break the following global $U(1)$ symmetries:

$$\xi \rightarrow \xi' = e^{i\theta_1} \xi, \quad \eta \rightarrow \eta' = e^{i\theta_2} \eta. \quad (15)$$

Namely, both the gauge $U(1)_V$ and chiral $U(1)_A$ symmetries are explicitly broken by introducing non-vanishing mass parameters m_R and m_L . The coupling constant G has its mass dimension as $[\text{mass}]^{-2}$. As usual, the four-fermion interaction is prepared to generate a dynamical Dirac mass term in our model. Hence, it will be converted such as

$$G \eta^\dagger \xi \xi^\dagger \eta \rightarrow -m_D \xi^\dagger \eta - m_D^\dagger \eta^\dagger \xi. \quad (16)$$

Here, we do not intend to introduce Majorana mass terms dynamically: Usually, it is energetically unfavorable to generate a left-right asymmetric Majorana mass terms dynamically, and we will obtain a scalar Cooper-pair-type mass given by a linear combination of a right and a left handed Majorana mass terms. Through the method of auxiliary fields of composites, the generating functional of the theory becomes

$$\mathcal{Z} = \int \mathcal{D} m_D \mathcal{D} m_D^\dagger \mathcal{D} \Psi_{MN} \mathcal{D} \overline{\Psi}_{MN} \exp \left[i \int d^4 x \left(-\frac{|m_D|^2}{G} + \frac{1}{2} \overline{\Psi}_{MN} \Omega_M^F \Psi_{MN} \right) + (\text{sources}) \right]. \quad (17)$$

Here, the matrix and fields in \mathcal{Z} are defined as follows:

$$\Omega_M^F \equiv \begin{pmatrix} i\bar{\vartheta} - m_R^\dagger P_+ - m_R P_- & -m_D^\dagger P_+ - m_D P_- \\ -m_D^\dagger P_+ - m_D P_- & i\bar{\vartheta} - m_L^\dagger P_+ - m_L P_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

and

$$\Psi_{MN} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \psi_{MR} \\ \psi_{ML} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \overline{\Psi}_{MN} = (\overline{\psi_{MR}}, \overline{\psi_{ML}}), \quad \psi_{MR} = \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ i\sigma_2 \xi^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_{ML} = \begin{pmatrix} -i\sigma_2 \eta^* \\ \eta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

ψ_{MR} and ψ_{ML} are right- and left- handed Majorana fields, respectively. Ψ_{MN} can be called as a Majorana-Nambu-notation field [119]. For our convenience, we write the global $U(1)$ transformation laws:

$$U(1)_V: \quad \psi'_{MR} = e^{i\gamma_5\theta} \psi_{MR}, \quad \psi'_{ML} = e^{-i\gamma_5\theta} \psi_{ML}, \quad \Psi'_{MN} = e^{i(\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_3)\theta} \Psi_{MN}, \quad \overline{\Psi}'_{MN} = \overline{\Psi}_{MN} e^{i(\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_3)\theta}, \quad (20)$$

$$U(1)_A: \quad \psi'_{MR} = e^{i\gamma_5\theta} \psi_{MR}, \quad \psi'_{ML} = e^{i\gamma_5\theta} \psi_{ML}, \quad \Psi'_{MN} = e^{i(\gamma_5 \otimes 1)\theta} \Psi_{MN}, \quad \overline{\Psi}'_{MN} = \overline{\Psi}_{MN} e^{i(\gamma_5 \otimes 1)\theta}. \quad (21)$$

In momentum space, Ω_M^F will be inverted into (the method, see Ref. [114]):

$$(\Omega_M^F)^{-1} \equiv \frac{1}{D(k)} \begin{pmatrix} G_{11}(k) & G_{12}(k) \\ G_{21}(k) & G_{22}(k) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

where,

$$G_{11}(k) \equiv (k^2 - |m_L|^2)(\not{k} + m_R P_+ + m_R^\dagger P_-) - (m_D P_+ + m_D^\dagger P_-)(\not{k} - m_L^\dagger P_+ - m_L P_-)(m_D P_+ + m_D^\dagger P_-), \quad (23)$$

$$G_{12}(k) \equiv (\not{k} + m_R P_+ + m_R^\dagger P_-)(m_D^\dagger P_+ + m_D P_-)(\not{k} + m_L P_+ + m_L^\dagger P_-) - |m_D|^2 (m_D P_+ + m_D^\dagger P_-), \quad (24)$$

$$G_{21}(k) \equiv (\not{k} + m_L P_+ + m_L^\dagger P_-)(m_D^\dagger P_+ + m_D P_-)(\not{k} + m_R P_+ + m_R^\dagger P_-) - |m_D|^2 (m_D P_+ + m_D^\dagger P_-), \quad (25)$$

$$G_{22}(k) \equiv (k^2 - |m_R|^2)(\not{k} + m_L P_+ + m_L^\dagger P_-) - (m_D P_+ + m_D^\dagger P_-)(\not{k} - m_R^\dagger P_+ - m_R P_-)(m_D P_+ + m_D^\dagger P_-), \quad (26)$$

and the denominator is

$$D(k) = [k^2 - (M_+^F)^2]^2 [k^2 - (M_-^F)^2]^2 = (k_0 - E_+^F(\mathbf{k}))^2 (k_0 + E_+^F(\mathbf{k}))^2 (k_0 - E_-^F(\mathbf{k}))^2 (k_0 + E_-^F(\mathbf{k}))^2. \quad (27)$$

Here, the energy spectra will be obtained into the following forms [119]:

$$E_\pm^F(\mathbf{k}) = \sqrt{\mathbf{k}^2 + (M_\pm^F)^2}, \quad (28)$$

$$M_\pm^F = \sqrt{|m_D|^2 + \frac{|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2}{2} \mp \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 + 4|m_D|^2(|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L|\cos\Theta)}}, \quad (29)$$

$$\Theta \equiv \theta_R + \theta_L - 2\theta_D, \quad (30)$$

where, the definitions of phases of the mass parameters are given by

$$m_R = |m_R| e^{i\theta_R}, \quad m_L = |m_L| e^{i\theta_L}, \quad m_D = |m_D| e^{i\theta_D}. \quad (31)$$

Θ in M_\pm^F is a dimensionless quantity: Its mass dimension is [mass]⁰. At first glance, the spectra $E_\pm^F(\mathbf{k})$ seem to have the complicated structures, though the spectra do not break the proper Lorentz symmetry $O(3,1)$. Note that Ω_M^F is an 8×8 matrix, each of the energy spectra has two-fold degeneracy. From the method to obtain the propagator $(\Omega_M^F)^{-1}$, we find the reasons of the degeneracy: (1) the theory keeps the Lorentz symmetry, (2) we do not consider vector and axial-vector type dynamical masses in here. (Especially, an axial vector mean field causes an anomaly [34].) For example, the mass eigenvalues under the type-I seesaw condition $|m_L| = 0$ and $|m_R| \gg |m_D|$ of neutrino [104] will be obtained from M_\pm^F given above as

$$M_+^F = \frac{|m_D|^2}{|m_R|}, \quad M_-^F = |m_R|. \quad (32)$$

The situation with non-vanishing m_L gives a type-II-like seesaw mechanism while $m_L = 0$ will be called as a type-I seesaw of the single-flavor model. The Pauli-Gürsey symmetry defined as a rotation of particle and anti-particle space, $\psi' = a\psi + b\gamma_5\psi^c$, $\overline{\psi}' = a^*\overline{\psi} - b^*\overline{\psi^c}\gamma_5$, $|a|^2 + |b|^2 = 1$, is broken due to the Dirac and Majorana mass terms while the kinetic term keeps it [122]. This symmetry restricts the type of interaction in the "classical" theory of left-handed neutrino.

By imposing the self-consistency condition of the propagator, one finds two gap equations of m_D in the following forms (in the Euclidean region):

$$m_D \pm m_D^\dagger = G \int_k \frac{(m_D \pm m_D^\dagger)(k^2 + |m_D|^2) - m_D^\dagger m_R m_L \mp m_D m_R^\dagger m_L^\dagger}{[k^2 + (M_+^F)^2][k^2 + (M_-^F)^2]}. \quad (33)$$

It seems impossible to determine both $|m_D|$ and θ_D by these equations. Later, we will find that $\theta_D = 0$ while $\theta_R + \theta_L = \Theta = (2n + 1)\pi$ from the one-loop effective potential of the theory.

If we use the formalism of Dirac bispinors, the fermion matrix in \mathcal{Z} will be replaced by

$$\Omega_D^F \equiv \begin{pmatrix} i\cancel{\partial} - m_D^\dagger P_+ - m_D P_- & -m_L^\dagger C P_+ - m_R C P_- \\ -m_R^\dagger C P_+ - m_L C P_- & -C^{-1}(i\cancel{\partial})C + m_D^\dagger P_+ + m_D P_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad (34)$$

with the following definitions of fields,

$$\Psi_{DN} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \psi_D \\ \psi_D^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad \overline{\Psi}_{DN} = (\overline{\psi}_D, \psi_D^T), \quad \psi_D = \begin{pmatrix} \xi \\ \eta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (35)$$

Here, Ψ_{DN} is a Dirac-Nambu notation [114]. Needless to say, the formalism of the Dirac fields is physically equivalent to that of the Majorana fields.

C. The One-Loop Effective Potential

We will employ the steepest descent approximation for the integrations of collective fields. We get the following effective action:

$$\Gamma_{eff}^{NJL+M} = - \int d^4x \frac{|m_D|^2}{G} - \frac{i}{2} \ln \text{Det} \Omega_M^F. \quad (36)$$

To examine the structure and the stationary condition of the effective potential $V_{eff}^{NJL+M} \equiv -\Gamma_{eff}^{NJL+M} / \int d^4x$, first we neglect the contribution of quantum fluctuation δm_D of the collective field m_D . Due to the existence of the phase Θ in our theory, collective excitations will obtain some effects coming from a nontrivial Θ -dependent structure of the potential of our model. Our model has its characteristic feature at this point. By the four-dimensional covariant cutoff regularization for the momentum integration, the effective potential of the theory is found to be

$$V_{eff}^{NJL+M} = \frac{|m_D|^2}{G} - \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left[\Lambda^2 (M_+^F)^2 + \Lambda^2 (M_-^F)^2 + \Lambda^4 \ln \left(1 + \frac{(M_+^F)^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) \left(1 + \frac{(M_-^F)^2}{\Lambda^2} \right) - (M_+^F)^4 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^F)^2} \right) - (M_-^F)^4 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_-^F)^2} \right) \right]. \quad (37)$$

We should mention that this potential is not normalized as $V_{eff}^{NJL+M}(|m_D| = 0) = 0$. The first-derivative of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} with respect to the collective field $|m_D|$ becomes

$$\frac{\partial V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial |m_D|} = \frac{2|m_D|}{G} - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial (M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} F_+^F + \frac{\partial (M_-^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} F_-^F \right], \quad (38)$$

while, we also have to take into account the following derivative,

$$\frac{\partial V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial \Theta} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial (M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} F_+^F + \frac{\partial (M_-^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} F_-^F \right], \quad (39)$$

where,

$$F_\pm^F \equiv \Lambda^2 - (M_\pm^F)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_\pm^F)^2} \right). \quad (40)$$

The global minimum of our model has to satisfy the vanishing conditions of both of these derivatives. The derivatives become

$$\frac{\partial (M_\pm^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} = 2|m_D| \left[1 \mp \frac{|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta}{\sqrt{(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 + 4|m_D|^2(|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)}} \right], \quad (41)$$

$$\frac{\partial (M_\pm^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} = \pm \frac{2|m_D|^2 |m_R||m_L| \sin \Theta}{\sqrt{(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 + 4|m_D|^2(|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)}}. \quad (42)$$

Especially,

$$\frac{\partial(M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial|m_D|}\Big|_{\Theta=\pi} = 2|m_D|\left(1 \mp \frac{|m_R| - |m_L|}{\sqrt{(|m_R| + |m_L|)^2 + 4|m_D|^2}}\right), \quad (43)$$

$$\frac{\partial(M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial\Theta}\Big|_{\Theta=\pi} = 0, \quad (44)$$

(assume $|m_R| > |m_L|$). Here, mass dimensions of these derivatives $\frac{\partial(M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial|m_D|}$ and $\frac{\partial(M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial\Theta}$ are $[\text{mass}]^1$ and $[\text{mass}]^2$, respectively. The first derivative $\frac{\partial V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial\Theta}$ has zero-points at $\Theta = 0, \pi$, and it is almost proportional to $-\sin \Theta$, always negative at $0 < \Theta < \pi$. Therefore, a global minimum locates at a point on the line $\Theta = \pi$ of the two-dimensional effective potential surface $V_{eff}^{NJL+M}(|m_D|, \Theta)$: We find $\Theta = 0$ is always unstable, and the potential gives the lowest energy at $\Theta = \pi$ with fixed $|m_D|$. This feature is always the case under various values of $|m_R|$ and $|m_L|$, both of the cases $|m_R| > |m_L|$ and $|m_R| < |m_L|$, and this Θ -dependence of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} disappears when $|m_R| = 0$ and/or $|m_L| = 0$. $V_{eff}^{NJL+M}(|m_D|, \Theta)$ is real and analytic except $|m_D| = \infty$.

If we derive the gap equation from the derivative $\frac{\partial V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial|m_D|}$ of the form before momentum integration of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} is done, we obtain it in the following form (in the Euclidean region):

$$|m_D| = G \int_k \frac{|m_D|(k^2 + |m_D|^2 - |m_R||m_L|\cos\Theta)}{[k^2 + (M_+^F)^2][k^2 + (M_-^F)^2]}. \quad (45)$$

Compared with (33), this is the "correct" gap equation and we should solve it with the condition $\Theta = (2n + 1)\pi$ ($n \in \mathbf{Z}$). Equation (33) with $\theta_D = 0$, $\theta_R + \theta_L = \Theta$ coincides with (45). Hence, we conclude that the theory at one-loop level chooses $\theta_D = 0$ while $\theta_R + \theta_L = \Theta = (2n + 1)\pi$. Due to the CPT theorem of a Lorentz invariant theory, we can use the time-reversed Lagrangian of (14) for examining whether the system dynamically breaks CP symmetry or not. Since phase of mass parameters cannot be absorbed at $m_R \neq m_L$, $m_D \neq 0$ in our model (and, the gauge symmetry is explicitly broken), it might be possible that the invariance under the CP transformation $\psi_D \rightarrow \gamma^0 C \bar{\psi}_D^T = \gamma^0 \psi_D^c$, $\bar{\psi}_D \rightarrow -\psi_D^T C^{-1} \gamma^0 = \bar{\psi}_D^c \gamma^0$, (we use $C \equiv i\gamma^2 \gamma^0$) is dynamically broken. However, each of the energy spectra obtained by (29) has two-fold degeneracy, and thus the theory should conserve CP (namely, time-reversal) symmetry. We have found that $\theta_D = 0$ and $\theta_R + \theta_L = \Theta = (2n + 1)\pi$ will be chosen as the vacuum. We find when

$$\theta_R = \left(2j + \frac{1}{2}\right)\pi, \quad \theta_L = \left(2l + \frac{1}{2}\right)\pi, \quad \text{or} \quad \theta_R = \left(2j + \frac{3}{2}\right)\pi, \quad \theta_L = \left(2l + \frac{3}{2}\right)\pi, \quad (46)$$

($j, l \in \mathbf{Z}$) both of the Majorana mass terms are invariant under a T-transformation (we use the definition and the phase convention of time-reversal transformation as $\psi_D(x_0) \rightarrow i\gamma^1 \gamma^3 \psi_D(-x_0)$ with taking complex conjugations to c -numbers/matrices): In this phase choice,

$$m_R = -m_R^\dagger, \quad m_L = -m_L^\dagger, \quad (47)$$

and CP is conserved. In summary, the theory chooses the vacuum as $\theta_D = 0$, $\theta_R = \theta_L = \pi/2$ and CP is conserved at the vacuum state. A similar situation will happen in theory of relativistic superconductivity [114,115]. In relativistic theory of superconductivity, the Lagrangian with spin-singlet scalar Cooper pairing is given by

$$\mathcal{L}_{sc} \equiv \bar{\psi}_D(i\cancel{\partial} - m_D^\dagger P_+ - m_D P_- + \gamma^0 \mu)\psi_D + \Delta_S^* \psi_D^T C \gamma_5 \psi_D - \Delta_S \bar{\psi}_D \gamma_5 C \bar{\psi}_D^T. \quad (48)$$

Here, μ is chemical potential. The Majorana mass terms of (48) coincide with the Cooper-pair mass terms at

$$\Delta_S = -\frac{m_R}{2} = \frac{m_L^\dagger}{2}. \quad (49)$$

The Cooper-pair mass term is formally not symmetric under a CP-transformation in general, and it becomes CP-even at $\Delta_S = -\Delta_S^*$. Because ξ and η have common mass in this case, we cannot consider θ_R and θ_L independent with each other. Thus, the condition $\Delta_S = -\Delta_S^*$ with $m_D = m_D^\dagger$ cannot be achieved simultaneously, in general. The phase degree of freedom of Cooper pair gives a vortex inside superconductor/superfluid, and gives various interesting phenomena they have been observed by experiments. We wish to emphasize that our theory chooses the CP (time-reversal) invariant vacua variationally, and $U(1)$ symmetries are broken from the beginning of the theory, while a

$Z(N)$ symmetry arises in the one-loop effective potential. Therefore, we can say our theory does not have uncountable infinitely degenerate vacua usually appear in a spontaneous symmetry breakdown of a theory, while it has countable infinite number of vacua (the cardinal number \aleph_0 [19]). It is interesting for us to find such a phenomenon in other physical system/situation, and this phenomenon may be summarized into a generic conjecture/theorem:

Conjecture.1:

When a continuous and global symmetry of a compact Lie group in a Hermitian/unitary quantum field theory is broken explicitly by a parameter, and if an order parameter which breaks the same symmetry develops, infinitely countable degenerate vacua will arise from the effective potential of the theory.

Proof:

The Nambu-Goldstone theorem states that infinitely degenerate uncountable (continuous) vacua will arise associated with a zero-mode (a Nambu-Goldstone mode) if a continuous symmetry (automorphism) is broken spontaneously in a quantum field theory. While if the continuous symmetry is broken from the beginning of the theory, the NG theorem cannot be applied. The Lagrangian (or, at least its effective potential) of the theory must be single-valued under a variation with respect to the parameter θ (the direction of the continuous symmetry) if the potential is real and has no singular point in coordinate θ , thus this criterion requests the theory to make its potential as a periodic form in a domain D ($U(1)$ -case, $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi$). Inside this domain, the potential always has at least a maximum and a minimum, since the continuous infinite degeneracy is lifted. Thus, after the domain of the effective potential is appropriately extended ($U(1)$ -case: $0 \leq \theta \leq 2\pi \rightarrow -\infty < \theta < \infty$, by making a correspondence between a function F on a torus \mathbf{T} and the real number field \mathbf{R} , i.e. $F(t \bmod 2\pi) = F(t)$ ($t \in \mathbf{R}$)), a countable infinitely degenerate vacua must arise in the theory. We should mention that this proof is rigorous for the $U(1)$ case, while we need more rigorous discussion for cases of non-Abelian compact Lie groups.

Here, we wish to emphasize that this conjecture/theorem gives a notion which will generalize the Nambu-Goldstone theorem in particle physics. (A breaking of rotational invariance gives a periodic potential. For example, the potential of rotation of the earth is surely periodic. A magnon excitation may have a mass when an external magnetic field is applied to a magnet, and a rotational potential is periodic.) Physically, this phenomenon coming from the explicit symmetry breaking can be interpreted as a "localization" in a field-configuration space.

The origin of the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) mixing matrix [18,79] (and the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) matrix [90,129]) may also be understood/found from the viewpoint of this theorem. The CKM matrix is in fact, a periodic matrix function with four coordinates $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ and ϕ . A family (or, a flavor) symmetry in it can be taken from a compact Lie group, like an $SU(3)$ family symmetry [23]. A problem is that the determination of the CKM matrix in our nature is under the variation principle or not. The NG theorem deeply depends on the variation principle (for example, established via a Ward-Takahashi identity), while the CKM matrix seems to show an inconsistency/uncertainty between mass eigenstates/bases/fields (obeys the variation principle) and flavor/horizontal symmetries. Namely, the question is that the CKM/PMNS matrices are fields or fundamental constants. It may be the case that a pseudo-NG manifold parametrized by a set of compact Lie group generators is bounded and thus it could be studied by a Morse-theory approach [98]. (Morse theory assumes a function of a domain, given as a subset of a manifold, as bounded. Note that a compact group is a bounded and closed set, thus the parameter space of the group is also a bounded and closed domain, and a volume of the group manifold defined by a Haar measure becomes finite.) For example, the Vafa-Witten theorem [152] or an axion potential [124,125,137,138] may fall into a class of this theorem (conjecture). Some exceptional cases are, (1) a global gauge symmetry of BRS generator [84], (2) supersymmetry [165], and both of them are defined by fermionic generators. Beside BRS, we need the notion of supermanifold [33,135], namely a pseudo-NG supermanifold for addressing this issue.

The $U(1)$ p-NG (pseudo Nambu-Goldstone) mode [50,157] determines a curve by the following mapping $c : (e_1, e_2) \rightarrow M$, where (e_1, e_2) denotes the end points of the curve, and M is a differentiable manifold. Moreover, this curve is always closed due to its $U(1)$ -nature and define

$$c : S^1 \rightarrow M. \quad (50)$$

In our $U(1)$ p-NG case, we find an imbedding of S^1 to a three dimensional manifold \mathbf{R}^3 , namely $g : S^1 \rightarrow g(S^1) \in \mathbf{R}^3$.

For example, if we consider a 2×2 matrix case,

$$\mathcal{A} \propto \begin{pmatrix} a + a^\dagger & i(a - a^\dagger) \\ -i(a - a^\dagger) & a + a^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = 2|a| \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_1 & \sin \theta_1 \\ -\sin \theta_1 & \cos \theta_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (51)$$

This matrix defines a closed curve $S^1 \in \mathbf{R}^2$. In our context, we regard θ_1 as a p-NG mode associated with a $U(1)$ symmetry breaking. It is known fact that a compactification of string usually gives several $U(1)$ degrees of

freedom [55,130]. This kind of matrix can be generated by an NJL-type four-fermion model which has off-diagonal interactions in flavor space without much difficulties. Our approach has a similarity with the flavon mechanism (Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism [13,36,43,126]), though the flavon mechanism intends to obtain a mass matrix with mass hierarchy simultaneously by particle interactions, while our approach considers only mixing angles at the moment. Our method is not enough to obtain a prediction of a mixing angle, though it is suggestive fact that the diagonal part is dominant in the CKM mixing matrix of quark sector, while maximal mixing is observed in the PMNS matrix of neutrino sector. For example, the PMNS matrix U_{PMNS} is given by

$$U_{PMNS} \equiv V_{PMNS} P_{PMNS}, \quad (52)$$

$$V_{PMNS} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (53)$$

$$P_{PMNS} \equiv \text{diag}(1, e^{i\alpha}, e^{i(\beta+\delta)}), \quad (54)$$

$$c_{12} \equiv \cos \theta_{12}, \quad s_{23} \equiv \sin \theta_{23}, \dots \quad (55)$$

V_{PMNS} can be factorized into three rotational matrices (three S^1 -curves, show a rotational asymmetry) of $SO(3)$, while P_{PMNS} is in fact, a maximal torus of $U(3)$. (In case of type-II seesaw, the mixing matrix becomes $U_f = e^{i\phi} P_f \tilde{U}_f Q_f$, where $P_f = \text{diag}(1, e^{i\alpha}, e^{i\beta})$ and $Q_f = \text{diag}(1, e^{i\rho}, e^{i\sigma})$ [134].) Since $SO(3) \subset SU(3)$, the PMNS matrix is given by a product of four representations of $U(3)$. In more generic case of N_f -flavors, a mixing matrix may take the form of a product of N_f curves with a maximal torus of $U(N_f)$: $\mathbf{T}_{N_f} \equiv \text{diag}(e^{i\lambda_1}, \dots, e^{i\lambda_{N_f}})$. These speculations are useful to find a symmetry and its breaking scheme for constructing a dynamical model of CKM/PMNS matrices.

If a potential is an analytic function of $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ and ϕ , and it is periodic into these directions, we can always take 1st and 2nd derivatives of them, and there is a stable point (a non-degenerate critical point as a notion of Morse theory), and the potential has low-energy excitations (quantum fluctuations) around the point. To emphasize the particle nature of those excitations, we will call fluctuations of $\theta_1, \theta_2, \theta_3$ as mixon (and their possible superpartners as mixino, similar to the relation between axion and axino) and that of ϕ as cpon (and its superpartner as cpino). Here, we emphasize that a mixing matrix is considered as physical degrees of freedom (a particle picture), and this is independent from the question whether these degrees of freedom are p-NG or not, in principle. Then it becomes remarkable when we consider a supersymmetric counterpart of a mixing matrix. Therefore, there might be a reaction processes of squarks mediated by a mixino, and such a reaction might be suppressed under a certain mechanism. Our framework will radically modify the physical mechanism of neutrino oscillation. A kaon reaction might also be described by this framework. We have arrived at the notion in which "fundamental constants" of the SM are VEVs, their fluctuations and (p-)NG modes of an underlying theory. We can utilize VEVs of dilaton/moduli of strings sometimes used in string phenomenology [55,130].

At a critical point,

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial x_1}(p) = \dots = \frac{\partial f}{\partial x_n}(p) = 0, \quad (56)$$

is satisfied, and if the Hessian

$$\mathcal{H} \equiv \left(\frac{\partial^2 f}{\partial x_i \partial x_j}(p) \right)_{1 \leq i, j \leq n} \quad (57)$$

is regular $\det \mathcal{H} \neq 0$, the point is non-degenerate. If a critical point is non-degenerate, it is isolated and it has no other critical point in its neighborhood [98]. Our $U(1)$ periodic potential is just this case. Here, $f : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}$ is a C^∞ class function, x_i ($i = 1, \dots, n$) denotes a local coordinates at $p \in M$. It is well-known that, when all of eigenvalues of Hessian are positive, the critical point is stable, and this corresponds to the case where a theory has a p-NG mode, while eigenvalues of NG modes are zero and the critical point is degenerate. Negative eigenvalues indicate tachyonic modes. In Morse theory, it is known fact that a manifold is homeomorphic to S^n if the manifold has only two non-degenerate critical points. The $U(1)$ case we have discussed above is an example of this fact. A function of a bounded domain which will have a minimum must satisfy the following Palais-Smale condition [98]:

$$\inf_S \|df\| = 0, \quad (S \subset M, \quad f : M \rightarrow \mathbf{R}). \quad (58)$$

Here, df is an appropriately defined differential of f . Then, f has a critical point inside the closure \bar{S} . Especially, a continuous function on a compact set always have at least a maximum and a minimum. Note the fact that

several homogeneous spaces gives S^m , such as $SO(n+1)/SO(n) = O(n+1)/O(n) = S^n$, $SU(n+1)/SU(n) = U(n+1)/U(n) = S^{2n+1}$, $O(n+1)/(O(1) \times O(n)) = S^n/\mathbf{Z}_2$. For more generic case, Grassmann manifolds $G_{k,n}(\mathbf{R}) = O(n)/(O(k) \times O(n-k))$ and Stiefel manifolds $V(m,r) = SO(m)/SO(m-r)$ are interesting from our context. If a matrix \mathcal{M} is regular, $\det \mathcal{M} \neq 0$, it will be diagonalized as $\mathcal{M} = (V^{(1)}(\theta_i))^\dagger \lambda_{\mathcal{M}} V^{(2)}(\theta_i)$ ($i = 1, \dots, n$), like the case of CKM/PMNS theory ($\lambda_{\mathcal{M}}$: a diagonal matrix). Thus, the regular condition of \mathcal{M} excludes an NG-mode, an effective action Γ_{eff} given by a polynomial or a convergent series of \mathcal{M} is a periodic function of θ_i , and defines a mapping $\Gamma_{eff} : \mathbf{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbf{R}^1$. Non-degenerate critical points of \mathbf{R}^n for Γ_{eff} , and their physical meaning will be obtained by the prescription discussed above.

The phase of dynamical mass of the $U(1)$ -case discussed previously is, in fact, a Fourier component/basis $\exp[i(\xi t)]$ defined on a torus \mathbf{T} or the real number field \mathbf{R} (both of them are commutative) namely a one-dimensional irreducible unitary representation:

$$f_k : \mathbf{T} \rightarrow \mathbf{C}^\times, \quad t \bmod 2\pi \rightarrow e^{ikt}. \quad (59)$$

An irreducible unitary representation of a possibly non-commutative compact Lie group G is obtained by the following relation of non-commutative harmonic analysis via the Peter-Weyl theorem (Fourier analysis is sometimes called as commutative analysis) [80]:

$$\pi(f) = \int_G f(g) \pi(g) dg, \quad (60)$$

where dg is the Haar measure of G . If our approach to the CKM/PMNS matrices is correct, their matrix elements can be given by some matrix elements of $\pi(g)$. Then, if the parameters θ_i ($i = 1, 2, 3$) of the CKM/PMNS matrices are physical, then one should examine a variation of an effective action $\Gamma[\pi(f)]$ with respect to matrix elements of $\pi(f)$. Hence,

Proposition. 2:

The CKM/PMNS matrices can be examined by methods of non-commutative harmonic analysis.

An interesting problem is to know how infinitely countable degenerate vacua will arise from infinitely uncountable degenerate vacua, by (non)commutative harmonic analysis. Moreover, one would need method of (non)commutative harmonic superanalysis with theory of super-Lie group to investigate p-NG supermanifold (here, we do not restrict ourselves on phenomena of "spontaneous/dynamical SUSY breaking") and supersymmetric CKM/PMNS matrices [18,38,40,69,79,90,102,129,135,165,167]. For this purpose, we also need to invent theory of super-Banach/Hilbert space for a construction of Finsler superspace.

Before closing this subsection, we wish to comment on topological (global) aspect of the periodic effective potential [106]. In fact, our $U(1)$ periodic effective potential has tangent bundle TM_{pNG} and its dual (cotangent) bundle. Here, M_{pNG} is the base manifold, i.e. S^1 . In our case, only a trivial bundle is physically acceptable. Following theorem is obvious from our discussion:

Theorem. 3:

The $U(1)$ potential acquires a topological (winding) number n by the definition $V(\Theta \bmod 2n\pi) = V(\Theta)$.

D. The Critical Coupling Constant

The critical coupling with fixed Θ is obtained from the stationary condition $\frac{\partial V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial |m_D|} = 0$:

$$\begin{aligned} (G^{cr})^{-1} = & \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\left(1 - \frac{|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L|\cos\Theta}{|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2} \right) \left(\Lambda^2 - |m_L|^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{|m_L|^2} \right) \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \left(1 + \frac{|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L|\cos\Theta}{|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2} \right) \left(\Lambda^2 - |m_R|^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{|m_R|^2} \right) \right) \right]. \quad (61) \end{aligned}$$

However, we know only G^{cr} at $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$ is the correct critical coupling from the structure of the two-dimensional effective potential surface $V_{eff}^{NJL+M}(|m_D|, \Theta)$. Namely, only G^{cr} at $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$,

$$(G^{cr})^{-1} = \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\left(1 - \frac{|m_R| - |m_L|}{|m_R| + |m_L|}\right) \left(\Lambda^2 - |m_L|^2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{|m_L|^2}\right)\right) + \left(1 + \frac{|m_R| - |m_L|}{|m_R| + |m_L|}\right) \left(\Lambda^2 - |m_R|^2 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{|m_R|^2}\right)\right) \right], \quad (62)$$

is physically meaningful. Moreover, due to the factors coming from $|m_D|^{-1} \frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial|m_D|} \Big|_{|m_D|=0}$ in the gap equation, we can take the right-left symmetric condition $|m_R| = |m_L|$ in G^{cr} of Eq.(61) only at $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$. In that case, one finds

$$(G^{cr})^{-1} = \frac{\Lambda^2}{4\pi^2} \left[1 - \frac{|m_L|^2}{\Lambda^2} \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{|m_L|^2}\right) \right]. \quad (63)$$

Hence, from this expression, we find G^{cr} of finite $|m_L|$ ($= |m_R|$) is always larger than the case $|m_L| = 0$ at a fixed Λ , and we obtain the well-known formula $G^{cr} = 4\pi^2/\Lambda^2$ at $|m_L| = |m_R| = 0$ [109].

E. The Collective Modes

Now, we consider fluctuations of the collective fields. The effective action with taking into account the fluctuations becomes the following form as a Taylor expansion around a point:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{eff}^{NJL+M} &= - \int d^4x \frac{|m_D|^2}{G} - \frac{i}{2} \ln \text{Det} \Omega_M^F \\ &\rightarrow - \int d^4x \frac{|m_D + \delta m_D|^2}{G} - \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \ln \Omega_M^F + \frac{i}{2} \text{Tr} \sum_{n=2}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n} \left((\Omega_M^F)^{-1} \Sigma^F \right)^n. \end{aligned} \quad (64)$$

Here, we consider the fluctuations δm_D as a small displacement of m_D :

$$m_D \rightarrow m_D + \delta m_D, \quad (65)$$

and the "self-energy" matrix Σ^F is defined by

$$\Sigma^F \equiv \delta m_D^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P_+ \\ P_+ & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \delta m_D \begin{pmatrix} 0 & P_- \\ P_- & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (66)$$

We wish to expand V_{eff}^{NJL+M} around the minimum ($|m_D|, \Theta = \pi$) of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} . Due to the phase factor at the global minimum, the collective field m_D with its fluctuations $\delta|m_D|$ and $\delta\Theta$ are expressed at the global minimum ($|m_D|, \Theta = \pi$) of the two-dimensional effective potential surface as follows:

$$\Theta = \theta_R + \theta_L - 2\theta_D = \theta_R + \theta_L = \pi, \quad (67)$$

$$\delta\Theta = -2\delta\theta_D, \quad (68)$$

$$m_D \rightarrow (|m_D| + \delta|m_D|) e^{i\delta\theta_D} = |m_D| + \delta|m_D| - \frac{i}{2} |m_D| \delta\Theta. \quad (69)$$

Hence,

$$\Sigma^F = \Sigma_D^F + \Sigma_\Theta^F, \quad \Sigma_\Theta^F \equiv \frac{|m_D|}{2} \delta\Theta \begin{pmatrix} 0 & i\gamma_5 \\ i\gamma_5 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_D^F \equiv \delta|m_D| \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (70)$$

The sum of phases $\theta_R + \theta_L$ is fixed. In this paper, we call the collective mode associated with the Θ -degree of freedom as "phason", and denote it as $\tilde{\Theta}$:

$$\tilde{\Theta} \equiv \frac{|m_D|}{2} \delta\Theta. \quad (71)$$

Note that $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a bare quantity. The phason corresponds to majoron at $|m_L| = 0, |m_R| \neq 0$ [25], and it becomes pion at $|m_R| = |m_L| = 0$ [109]. As discussed above, since both of the global $U(1)$ symmetries $U(1)_V$ and $U(1)_A$ are broken explicitly at $|m_L| \neq 0, |m_R| \neq 0$, the phason is a p-NG boson, and it has a finite mass.

F. The Decay Constant and Mass of Phason

Before doing our estimation of the excitation mass and decay constant of phason, we will proceed with our examination to the second-derivative, Hessian, of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} with respect to $|m_D|$ and Θ . The entries of the Hessian matrix become

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial |m_D|^2} = \frac{2}{G} - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2 (M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|^2} F_+^F + \left(\frac{\partial (M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} \right)^2 J_+^F + \frac{\partial^2 (M_-^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|^2} F_-^F + \left(\frac{\partial (M_-^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} \right)^2 J_-^F \right], \quad (72)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2 (M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} F_+^F + \frac{\partial (M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} \frac{\partial (M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} J_+^F + \frac{\partial^2 (M_-^F)^2}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} F_-^F + \frac{\partial (M_-^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} \frac{\partial (M_-^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} J_-^F \right], \quad (73)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial \Theta^2} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2 (M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta^2} F_+^F + \left(\frac{\partial (M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} \right)^2 J_+^F + \frac{\partial^2 (M_-^F)^2}{\partial \Theta^2} F_-^F + \left(\frac{\partial (M_-^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} \right)^2 J_-^F \right], \quad (74)$$

where,

$$J_{\pm}^F \equiv \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Lambda^2 + (M_{\pm}^F)^2} - \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_{\pm}^F)^2} \right). \quad (75)$$

The derivatives appear in the Hessian become

$$\frac{\partial^2 (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|^2} = \frac{1}{|m_D|} \frac{\partial (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} \pm \frac{8|m_D|^2 (|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)^2}{[(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 + 4|m_D|^2 (|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)]^{3/2}} \quad (76)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} = \frac{2}{|m_D|} \frac{\partial (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} \mp \frac{8|m_D|^3 |m_R||m_L| \sin \Theta (|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)}{[(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 + 4|m_D|^2 (|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)]^{3/2}}, \quad (77)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial \Theta^2} = \cot \Theta \frac{\partial (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} \pm \frac{8|m_D|^4 |m_R|^2 |m_L|^2 \sin^2 \Theta}{[(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 + 4|m_D|^2 (|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)]^{3/2}}, \quad (78)$$

and their mass dimensions are $[\text{mass}]^0$, $[\text{mass}]^1$ and $[\text{mass}]^2$, respectively. $-\frac{\delta^2 \Gamma_{eff}^{NJL+M} / \int d^4x}{\delta(|m_D|) \delta(\Theta/2)^2} = \frac{1}{2!} \frac{4}{|m_D|^2} \frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial \Theta^2}$ corresponds to the square of mass of phason. The Hessian of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} gives a description on the collective excitations of our model, and a unitary rotation in the two-dimensional space of $|m_D|$ and Θ corresponds to a canonical transformation of collective coordinates. Especially, at $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$,

$$\frac{\partial^2 (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|^2} \Big|_{\Theta=(2n+1)\pi} = 2 \left(1 \mp \frac{|m_R| - |m_L|}{\sqrt{(|m_R| + |m_L|)^2 + 4|m_D|^2}} \right) \pm \frac{8|m_D|^2}{(|m_R| - |m_L|) [(|m_R| + |m_L|)^2 + 4|m_D|^2]^{3/2}}, \quad (79)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} \Big|_{\Theta=(2n+1)\pi} = 0, \quad (80)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial \Theta^2} \Big|_{\Theta=(2n+1)\pi} = \mp \frac{2|m_D|^2 |m_R||m_L|}{(|m_R| - |m_L|) \sqrt{(|m_R| + |m_L|)^2 + 4|m_D|^2}}, \quad (81)$$

(assume $|m_R| > |m_L|$). Hence,

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} \Big|_{\Theta=(2n+1)\pi} = 0. \quad (82)$$

Because the off-diagonal element $\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta}$ vanishes at $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$ and the Hessian is diagonal, there is no mode-mode coupling (decouple) on the line $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$ of the two-dimensional surface $(|m_D|, \Theta)$ of the potential V_{eff}^{NJL+M} , at least at the description up to the second-order derivatives, corresponds to an RPA (random phase approximation), while it does not vanish at $\Theta \neq (2n+1)\pi$, gives a mode-mode coupling. The eigenvalue of the Hessian will be given simply by its diagonal entries at $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$. Note that $\frac{\partial^2 (M_{\pm}^F)^2}{\partial \Theta^2}$ are singular at $|m_R| = |m_L|$, $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$. From the expression of second-derivative, the product of the inverse of the renormalization constant

of phason field Z_Θ^{-1} and the square of phason mass m_Θ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} Z_\Theta^{-1}(m_\Theta)^2 &= \frac{1}{2!} \left(\frac{2}{|m_D|} \right)^2 \frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{NJL+M}}{\partial \Theta^2} \Big|_{\Theta=(2n+1)\pi} \\ &= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left[\frac{|m_R||m_L|}{|m_R| - |m_L|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(|m_R| + |m_L|)^2 + 4|m_D|^2}} \right] \left\{ (M_+^F)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^F)^2} \right) - (M_-^F)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_-^F)^2} \right) \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (83)$$

where, M_\pm^F in this case (namely at $\Theta = (2n + 1)\pi$) become

$$M_\pm^F = \sqrt{|m_D|^2 + \frac{|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2}{2} \mp \frac{1}{2} (|m_R| - |m_L|) \sqrt{(|m_R| + |m_L|)^2 + 4|m_D|^2}}, \quad (84)$$

(assume $|m_R| > |m_L|$). Here, we should mention that $Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2$ of (83) does not vanish at $|m_D| = 0$ with $|m_R| \neq 0$, $|m_L| \neq 0$, $|m_R| \neq |m_L|$, while it will vanishes at $|m_R| = 0$, $|m_L| \neq 0$ or $|m_R| \neq 0$, $|m_L| = 0$ (majoron), $|m_R| = |m_L| = 0$ (pion). The limit $|m_R| = |m_L|$ of $Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2$ of this expression does not give a singularity because the bracket of squares of M_\pm^F will vanish more rapidly.

Phason is not a "light" particle, since it is a bound (or, resonance) state of a heavy and a light particles. When $\Lambda \gg |m_R| \gg |m_D|, |m_L| > 0$ (this is not the same with the (type-I) seesaw condition $|m_R| \gg |m_D| > |m_L| = 0$),

$$Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2 \approx \frac{|m_R||m_L|}{2\pi^2} \frac{\Lambda^4}{(\Lambda^2 + (M_+^F)^2)(\Lambda^2 + (M_-^F)^2)} \approx \frac{|m_R||m_L|}{2\pi^2}. \quad (85)$$

Since the condition $|m_R| \gg |m_D|$, a contribution of $|m_D|$ which gives cutoff dependence will come to the next-order of our evaluation of $Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2$ given above. To achieve the type-I or type-II seesaw situations $\Lambda \gg |m_R| \gg |m_D| > |m_L| \geq 0$, we need a fine-tuning of G because $|m_D|$ sharply rises to obtain $\mathcal{O}(\Lambda)$ when G moves from G_{cr} . The corresponding quantity of pion in the ordinary NJL model will vanish by a self-consistent gap equation. It is interesting for us to compare (85) with the following mass relation:

$$m_\Theta^2 \approx 2m_D(m_R + m_L) + 2m_R m_L. \quad (86)$$

This formula is obtained from the mass relation $m_{pseudo}^2 = 2m_{dyn}(m_{current}^a + m_{current}^b) + 2m_{current}^a m_{current}^b$, called as a PCAC (partial conservation of axial-vector current) relation valid both in NJL and QED (m_{pseudo}^2 ; mass of a pseudo-scalar meson, m_{dyn} ; dynamical Dirac mass, $m_{current}^{a,b}$; current mass parameters), shows the amount of energy of stabilization of the effective potential [101]. Here, we have assumed that the mass relation is also valid for the Majorana mass parameters m_R and m_L . The sign of m_Θ^2 reflects the (in)stability of the effective potential. Since Z_Θ^{-1} (must be a logarithmically divergent quantity) will give a numerical factor, our result in (85) is almost the same with the mass relation (86).

We obtain $m_\Theta \sim 20$ GeV (assuming $Z_\Theta^{-1} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$) when we use $|m_R| = 10^{11}$ GeV and $|m_L| = 10^2$ eV, and it is a little lighter than weak bosons while heavier than mesons/baryons. The compton wave length of phason becomes $\lambda_{compton} \sim 10^{-2}$ fm. A cross section between a neutrino and a nucleon is absolutely small, thus there is no place for a high-density neutrino matter inside a star. Phason would obtain a reaction process of the intermediate energy scale between electroweak to GUT breakings. It seems not unnatural because the radius of so-called "primeval fire ball" at GUT phase transition is 10^{-28} times smaller than those of our Universe [136].

To obtain Z_Θ^{-1} , we evaluate vacuum polarization (VP) functions of our theory. Since we have interest on the VP functions in the vicinity of a vacuum (ground state) of the theory at the one-loop level, we should set mass parameters/phases suitably for this purpose: $m_D = m_D^\dagger$, $m_R = -m_R^\dagger$ and $m_L = -m_L^\dagger$. The definitions of VP functions are obtained from Eqs. (64) and (70) as

$$\Pi_{DD}^F(q) \equiv \text{tr} \int_k (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k+q) \tau_1 (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k) \tau_1, \quad (87)$$

$$\Pi_{D\Theta}^F(q) \equiv \text{tr} \int_k (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k+q) \tau_1 (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k) i\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_1, \quad (88)$$

$$\Pi_{\Theta D}^F(q) \equiv \text{tr} \int_k (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k+q) i\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_1 (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k) \tau_1, \quad (89)$$

$$\Pi_{\Theta\Theta}^F(q) \equiv \text{tr} \int_k (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k+q) i\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_1 (\Omega_M^F)^{-1}(k) i\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_1, \quad (90)$$

where, τ_1 acts on the right-left space of the Majorana-Nambu field Ψ_{MN} . After taking traces, we obtain

$$\Pi_{IJ}^F(q) = \int_k \frac{A_{IJ}^F(k+q, k)}{D(k+q)D(k)}, \quad (I, J = D, \Theta). \quad (91)$$

We have an interest on $\Pi_{D\Theta}^F$, because they would give a coupling between the amplitude and phase modes, and also might give an imaginary part to the effective potential. The result becomes

$$\begin{aligned} A_{D\Theta}^F &= 2(2i)^2 |m_R| |m_L| \sin \Theta \\ &\times \left\{ (k+q)^2 k^2 + (|m_D|^2 - |m_L|^2)(k+q)^2 + (|m_D|^2 - |m_R|^2)k^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2|m_D|^2 |m_R| |m_L| \cos \Theta - 3|m_D|^4 + |m_R|^2 |m_L|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (92)$$

Note that this $A_{D\Theta}^F$ is real. Hence, both $\Pi_{D\Theta}^F$ and $\Pi_{\Theta D}^F$ will vanish at $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$, and again, we find there is no mode-mode coupling, there is no imaginary part of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} at this second-order level (and parity is also conserved). If we set another choice of the phases of mass parameters, different from CP conserving condition (46), $A_{D\Theta}^F$ does not vanish, and gives a pure-imaginary matrix element of Lagrangian of the collective fields derived from V_{eff}^{NJL+M} . We cannot deny a possibility that the theory generates an imaginary part of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} , in triangle, box, ..., diagrams of our definition of the expansion of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} before estimating them since we should be careful to apply the Furry theorem-like consideration in our calculations, though the V_{eff}^{NJL+M} of the one-loop level (37) is real (this is guaranteed by Hermiticity of the theory). Vertex corrections of our four-fermion theory has a class of diagrams they cannot be factorized into summations of Π_{IJ}^F . They also give couplings between the amplitude and phase modes. If V_{eff}^{NJL+M} gets an imaginary part, it would cause an instability of the theory similar to the sense of Weinberg-Wu [155]. Because our theory is relativistic, a derivative of time takes the form of second-order inside a secular equation of the bosonic collective fields, we should examine energy spectra of the bosonic sector of our model before concluding whether an imaginary part gives a remarkable effect or not.

The result of $A_{\Theta\Theta}^F$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} A_{\Theta\Theta}^F(k+q, k) &= 4 \left[(k+q)^2 - |m_L|^2 - |m_D|^2 \right] \left[k^2 - |m_R|^2 - |m_D|^2 \right] (k+q) \cdot k \\ &\quad - 4 \left[|m_R| |m_L| \cos \Theta \{ [(k+q)^2 - |m_L|^2] (k^2 - |m_R|^2) + |m_D|^4 \} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |m_D|^2 \{ [(k+q)^2 - |m_L|^2] |m_R|^2 + (k^2 - |m_R|^2) |m_L|^2 \} \right] \\ &\quad - 4 |m_D|^2 \left[|m_R|^2 |m_L|^2 \cos 2\Theta + |m_R| |m_L| \cos \Theta [(k+q)^2 + k^2 - 2|m_D|^2] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + [(k+q)^2 - |m_D|^2] (k^2 - |m_D|^2) \right] \\ &\quad + (R \leftrightarrow L). \end{aligned} \quad (93)$$

The propagator of the phason is defined as follows:

$$G_{\Theta}^{-1}(q) \equiv -\frac{2}{G} + \frac{i}{4} \Pi_{\Theta\Theta}^F(q) = Z_{\Theta}^{-1}(q^2 - m_{\Theta}^2), \quad Z_{\Theta}^{-1} = \frac{i}{4} \frac{\partial \Pi_{\Theta\Theta}^F(q)}{\partial q^2} \Big|_{q=0}, \quad -Z_{\Theta}^{-1} m_{\Theta}^2 = -\frac{2}{G} + \frac{i}{4} \Pi_{\Theta\Theta}^F(0). \quad (94)$$

We have neglected the relative angle contribution of k and q in the definition for Z_{Θ}^{-1} . By a rough estimation (picking up several terms of the leading order for both the numerator and denominator of the integrand of Eq.(91)) with the condition $\Lambda \gg M_{\pm}$, we get

$$Z_{\Theta}^{-1} \approx \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{2((M_+^F)^2 + (M_-^F)^2)}, \quad (95)$$

$$\frac{i}{4} \Pi_{\Theta\Theta}^F(0) \approx \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\Lambda^2 - 2((M_+^F)^2 + (M_-^F)^2) \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{2((M_+^F)^2 + (M_-^F)^2)} \right], \quad (96)$$

in the vicinity of $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$. The coefficient factor 2 for mass squared $(M_+^F)^2 + (M_-^F)^2$ seems strange, and it might have come from the case that the leading-order integration of the VP function which could not take into account the

orders of poles/singularities due to its roughness of the approximation, though our calculation in the approximation is correct. $Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2$ in (94) will vanish at $|m_R| = |m_L| = 0$, becomes the gap equation for $|m_D|$ of the ordinary NJL model. The vertex of fermion and phason is found as follows:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Psi\Theta} \equiv -g_{\Psi\bar{\Psi}\Theta} \overline{\Psi_{MN}} \tilde{\Theta}^{(ren)} i\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_1 \Psi_{MN}, \quad g_{\Psi\bar{\Psi}\Theta} = \sqrt{Z_\Theta}, \quad \tilde{\Theta}^{(ren)} \equiv Z_\Theta^{-1/2} \tilde{\Theta}. \quad (97)$$

While, the phason decay constant is given by

$$F_\Theta^2 \approx 4|m_D|^2 Z_\Theta^{-1} = \frac{|m_D|^2}{2\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{2((M_+^F)^2 + (M_-^F)^2)}. \quad (98)$$

This result should be compared with $f_\pi^2 \sim \frac{|m_D|^2}{4\pi^2} \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{|m_D|^2}$ of the chiral limit of the ordinary NJL model obtained by the Nambu-Goldstone theorem [78,101,109]. Since we cannot use the Nambu-Goldstone theorem in the problem we consider here, this is an approximate expression for F_Θ^2 , though it is important because it bridges between the UV scale (defined by the condensation scale Λ) and the IR scale (defined by dynamical mass $|m_D|$). In principle, our model is independent from electroweak symmetry breaking, though if we apply our theory to it, the decay constant of phason obtains the constraint from masses of charged and neutral bosons, $m_W^2, m_Z^2 \sim (g_{SU(2)_L} F_\Theta/2)^2$ (relations coming from the dynamical Higgs mechanism of electroweak symmetry breaking), and becomes $F_\Theta \sim 250$ GeV [169]. Therefore, from (98),

$$|m_R| \approx \frac{\Lambda}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{\pi^2 F_\Theta^2}{|m_D|^2}\right), \quad (99)$$

and then we obtain $|m_R| \sim 10^{10} - 10^{11}$ GeV when $\Lambda \sim 10^{16}$ GeV and $F_\Theta/|m_D| \sim 2$. In this case, seesaw mass becomes $|m_D|^2/|m_R| \sim 10^2$ eV.

III. PHASON MASS IN THE SUPERSYMMETRIC NAMBU–JONA-LASINIO MODEL WITH LEFT-RIGHT ASYMMETRIC MAJORANA MASS TERMS

In this section, we evaluate phason mass in the framework of the supersymmetric Nambu–Jona-Lasinio (SNJL) model with the left-right-asymmetric Majorana mass terms [119]. A generalization of our analysis of the NJL-type model to the SNJL-type model is interesting, since the quadratic divergence of V_{eff}^{NJL+M} in the NJL-type model (which causes an inherent problem in the NJL case) will be removed due to $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY, the superpartners of phason/majoron would appear (phasino/majorino) if we set the theory appropriately for them, similar to the case of axion and axino [68], and some cosmological results also be modified especially in an evaluation of reaction/decay rates of phason/phasino. The Lagrangian of the SNJL model we consider here is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{SNJL} \equiv & \left[(1 - \Delta^2 \theta^2 \bar{\theta}^2) [\Phi_+^\dagger \Phi_+ + \Phi_-^\dagger \Phi_-] + G \Phi_+^\dagger \Phi_-^\dagger \Phi_+ \Phi_- \right]_{\theta\theta\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}} \\ & + \left[\frac{m_R^\dagger}{2} \Phi_+ \Phi_+ + \frac{m_L}{2} \Phi_- \Phi_- \right]_{\theta\theta} + \left[\frac{m_R}{2} \Phi_+^\dagger \Phi_+^\dagger + \frac{m_L^\dagger}{2} \Phi_-^\dagger \Phi_-^\dagger \right]_{\bar{\theta}\bar{\theta}}. \end{aligned} \quad (100)$$

Φ_\pm are chiral superfields [165]. The SUSY breaking mass Δ is introduced to avoid the non-renormalization theorem in generating a dynamical mass: If SNJL model keeps $\mathcal{N} = 1$ SUSY, it cannot generate a dynamical Dirac mass [17]. Through the method of SUSY auxiliary fields of composites [17,20,26,117,118,119], we get

$$V_{eff}^{SNJL} = V_{eff}^{NJL+M} + V_{eff}^B, \quad V_{eff}^{NJL+M} = \frac{|m_D|^2}{G} + i \ln \text{Det} \Omega_M^F, \quad V_{eff}^B = -2i \ln \text{Det} \Omega_M^B. \quad (101)$$

The matrix Ω_M^B for the sector of elementary bosons is

$$\Omega_M^B \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \square - |m_R|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2 & m_R m_D^\dagger + m_L^\dagger m_D \\ m_R^\dagger m_D + m_L m_D^\dagger & \square - |m_L|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (102)$$

Here, we take the SUSY breaking mass Δ as real. Then we get

$$\begin{aligned} V_{eff}^{SNJL} = & \frac{|m_D|^2}{G} + \frac{1}{16\pi^2} \left[2\Lambda^2 \Delta^2 + \Lambda^4 \ln \frac{[\Lambda^2 + (M_+^B)^2][\Lambda^2 + (M_-^B)^2]}{[\Lambda^2 + (M_+^F)^2][\Lambda^2 + (M_-^F)^2]} \right. \\ & \left. - (M_+^B)^4 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^B)^2}\right) - (M_-^B)^4 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_-^B)^2}\right) + (M_+^F)^4 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^F)^2}\right) + (M_-^F)^4 \ln\left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_-^F)^2}\right) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (103)$$

The mass eigenvalues of bosons become

$$M_{\pm}^B = \sqrt{|m_D|^2 + \frac{|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2}{2} + \Delta^2 \mp \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 + 4|m_D|^2(|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + 2|m_R||m_L| \cos \Theta)}} \quad (104)$$

We summarize the results of the following derivatives: The first derivatives,

$$\frac{\partial V_{eff}^{SNJL}}{\partial |m_D|} = \frac{2|m_D|}{G} + \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial(M_+^B)^2}{\partial |m_D|} F_+^B + \frac{\partial(M_-^B)^2}{\partial |m_D|} F_-^B - \frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} F_+^F - \frac{\partial(M_-^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} F_-^F \right], \quad (105)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial V_{eff}^{SNJL}}{\partial \Theta} &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} F_+^F + \frac{\partial(M_-^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} F_-^F - \frac{\partial(M_+^B)^2}{\partial \Theta} F_+^B - \frac{\partial(M_-^B)^2}{\partial \Theta} F_-^B \right] \\ &= -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} [F_+^F - F_-^F - F_+^B + F_-^B], \end{aligned} \quad (106)$$

where, we have used

$$F_{\pm}^B \equiv \Lambda^2 - (M_{\pm}^B)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_{\pm}^B)^2} \right), \quad (107)$$

$$J_{\pm}^B \equiv \frac{\Lambda^2}{\Lambda^2 + (M_{\pm}^B)^2} - \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_{\pm}^B)^2} \right), \quad (108)$$

and

$$\frac{\partial(M_+^B)^2}{\partial \Theta} = \frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} = -\frac{\partial(M_-^B)^2}{\partial \Theta} = -\frac{\partial(M_-^F)^2}{\partial \Theta}, \quad (109)$$

is satisfied. $F_+^F = F_+^B$, $F_-^F = F_-^B$, $J_+^F = J_+^B$ and $J_-^F = J_-^B$ hold at $\Delta = 0$. While, the second derivatives are

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{SNJL}}{\partial |m_D|^2} = \frac{2}{G} - \frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2(M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|^2} (F_+^F - F_+^B) + \left(\frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} \right)^2 (J_+^F - J_+^B) + (+ \rightarrow -) \right], \quad (110)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{SNJL}}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2(M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D| \partial \Theta} (F_+^F - F_+^B) + \frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial |m_D|} \frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} (J_+^F - J_+^B) + (+ \rightarrow -) \right], \quad (111)$$

$$\frac{\partial^2 V_{eff}^{SNJL}}{\partial \Theta^2} = -\frac{1}{8\pi^2} \left[\frac{\partial^2(M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta^2} [F_+^F - F_-^F - F_+^B + F_-^B] + \left(\frac{\partial(M_+^F)^2}{\partial \Theta} \right)^2 [J_+^F + J_-^F - J_+^B - J_-^B] \right]. \quad (112)$$

From these results, we find $\Theta = 0$ is now stable, $\frac{\partial V_{eff}^{SNJL}}{\partial \Theta}$ monotonically increases from $\Theta = 0$ to $\Theta = \pi$, while $\Theta = \pi$ is unstable and tachyonic to the Θ -direction, by both the first and second derivatives given above. Thus, the CP-conserving condition for this case becomes

$$\begin{aligned} m_D &= m_D^\dagger, \quad m_R = -m_R^\dagger, \quad m_L = -m_L^\dagger, \\ \theta_D &= 0, \\ \theta_R &= \left(2j + \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi, \quad \theta_L = \left(2l + \frac{3}{2} \right) \pi, \quad \text{or} \quad \theta_R = \left(2j + \frac{3}{2} \right) \pi, \quad \theta_L = \left(2l + \frac{1}{2} \right) \pi, \quad j, l \in \mathbf{Z}. \end{aligned} \quad (113)$$

Therefore, we get the following expression at $\Lambda \gg |m_R|, \Delta \gg |m_D|, |m_L|$,

$$\begin{aligned} Z_{\Theta}^{-1} m_{\Theta}^2 &= -\frac{1}{2\pi^2} \left[\frac{|m_R||m_L|}{|m_R| + |m_L|} \frac{1}{\sqrt{(|m_R| - |m_L|)^2 + 4|m_D|^2}} \right] \\ &\quad \times \left\{ (M_+^F)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^F)^2} \right) - (M_+^B)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^B)^2} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (M_-^F)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_-^F)^2} \right) + (M_-^B)^2 \ln \left(1 + \frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_-^B)^2} \right) \right\} \\ &\approx \frac{|m_R||m_L|}{2\pi^2} \cdot \frac{\Lambda^4 [2\Lambda^2 \Delta^2 + \Delta^2 (2|m_D|^2 + |m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + \Delta^2)]}{(\Lambda^2 + (M_+^F)^2)(\Lambda^2 + (M_-^F)^2)(\Lambda^2 + (M_+^B)^2)(\Lambda^2 + (M_-^B)^2)} \approx \frac{|m_R||m_L|}{2\pi^2} \cdot \frac{2\Delta^2}{\Lambda^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

This expression gives $Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2 = 0$ at $\Delta = 0$ (This limit is physically meaningless since $\Delta \neq 0$ must be satisfied to obtain a finite $|m_D|$ in the SNJL model). $Z_\Theta^{-1}(m_\Theta)^2$ is $2\Delta^2/\Lambda^2$ times smaller than that of NJL. The limit $|m_R| = |m_L|$ in the first expression gives $Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2 = 0$, the same with the NJL case. If we use $|m_R| = 10^{11}$ GeV, $|m_L| = 10^2$ eV, $\Delta = 1$ TeV and $\Lambda = 10^{16}$ GeV with assuming $Z_\Theta^{-1} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, $m_\Theta \sim 2 \times 10^{-3}$ eV, and phason becomes very light particle, somewhat similar to axion (though it strongly depends on the ratio of the SUSY breaking scale Δ and the condensation scale Λ) [57]. In this case, the compton length becomes 10^{11} fm.

To evaluate VP functions of bosonic sector, again we should choose mass parameters as $m_D = m_D^\dagger$, $m_R = -m_R^\dagger$ and $m_L = -m_L^\dagger$ in the propagator $(\Omega^B(k))^{-1}$ used for an expansion of V_{eff}^{SNJL} . We use the following partition

$$\Omega^B \rightarrow \Omega^B - \Sigma_{(1)}^B - \Sigma_{(2)}^B. \quad (115)$$

The definitions of $\Omega^B(k)$ and the fluctuation matrices of scalar sector become

$$\begin{aligned} (\Omega^B(k))^{-1} &= \frac{1}{D_B(k)} \begin{pmatrix} k^2 - |m_L|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2 & -i|m_D|(|m_R| - |m_L|) \\ i|m_D|(|m_R| - |m_L|) & k^2 - |m_R|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ D_B(k) &\equiv (s + (M_+^B)^2)(s + (M_-^B)^2), \end{aligned} \quad (116)$$

and

$$\Sigma_{(1)}^B \equiv \frac{|m_D|^2}{4}(\delta\Theta)^2 \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Sigma_{(2)}^B \equiv -\frac{|m_D|}{2}(|m_R| + |m_L|)(\delta\Theta) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (117)$$

We show the results:

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}(\Omega^B(k))^{-1}\Sigma_{(1)}^B &= -\frac{i}{2}\frac{|m_D|^2}{4}(\delta\Theta)^2\frac{2}{D_B(k)}\left[k^2 - |m_D|^2 - \frac{|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2}{2} - \Delta^2\right], \\ -\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}\frac{1}{2}(\Omega^B(k))^{-1}\Sigma_{(2)}^B(\Omega^B(k+q))^{-1}\Sigma_{(2)}^B & \\ &= \frac{1}{D_B(k)D_B(k+q)}\frac{|m_D|^2}{4}(\delta\Theta)^2 \\ &\times \left\{ (|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2)[(k^2 - |m_L|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2)((k+q)^2 - |m_R|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2) \right. \\ &\left. + (k^2 - |m_R|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2)((k+q)^2 - |m_L|^2 - |m_D|^2 - \Delta^2)] - 2|m_D|^2(|m_R|^2 - |m_L|^2)^2 \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (118)$$

The momentum integration of the first VP function given above diverges quadratically, while the second one logarithmically diverges. Then we get

$$-\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}\int_k(\Omega^B(k))^{-1}\Sigma_{(1)}^B \approx \frac{1}{8\pi^2}(\tilde{\Theta})^2\left(\Lambda^2 - ((M_+^B)^2 + (M_-^B)^2)\ln\frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^B)^2 + (M_-^B)^2}\right), \quad (120)$$

$$-\frac{i}{2}\text{tr}\int_k\frac{1}{2}(\Omega^B(k))^{-1}\Sigma_{(2)}^B(\Omega^B(k))^{-1}\Sigma_{(2)}^B \approx \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\tilde{\Theta}^2(|m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2)\ln\frac{\Lambda^2}{2((M_+^B)^2 + (M_-^B)^2)}. \quad (121)$$

Note that $(M_+^B)^2 + (M_-^B)^2 = 2|m_D|^2 + |m_R|^2 + |m_L|^2 + \Delta^2$. Then, one finds the gap equation from the following definition of phason propagator:

$$G_\Theta^{-1}(q) \equiv -\frac{2}{G} + \frac{i}{4}(\Pi_{\Theta\Theta}^F(q) - \Pi_{\Theta\Theta}^B(q)) = Z_\Theta^{-1}(q^2 - m_\Theta^2), \quad (122)$$

$$-Z_\Theta^{-1}m_\Theta^2 = -\frac{2}{G} + \frac{1}{8\pi^2}\left[((M_+^B)^2 + (M_-^B)^2)\ln\frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^B)^2 + (M_-^B)^2} - ((M_+^F)^2 + (M_-^F)^2)\ln\frac{\Lambda^2}{(M_+^F)^2 + (M_-^F)^2} \right]. \quad (123)$$

Here, we have omitted minor difference between the results of the boson and fermion sectors, and dropped the factor 2, from the reason of a physical consideration to construct the gap equation, and which coincides with the previous result in literature [119].

Before closing this section, let us comment of the superpartner of phason, namely "phasino." If we consider a Coleman-Weinberg type effective potential [28,155],

$$V_{eff(CW)}^{SNJL} = \frac{m_{\Theta}^2}{2}\tilde{\Theta}_c^2 + \frac{\lambda_{\Theta}}{4!}\tilde{\Theta}_c^4 + \frac{1}{16\pi^2}\left[m_{\Theta}^4 \ln \frac{m_{\Theta}^2}{\Lambda^2} - m_{phasino}^4 \ln \frac{m_{phasino}^2}{\Lambda^2}\right], \quad (124)$$

$m_{\Theta}^2 \geq m_{phasino}^2$ should be satisfied ($m_{phasino}$; mass of superpartner of phason) for stability of the effective potential.

IV. THE SCHWINGER-DYSON EQUATIONS IN THE GAUGE THEORY WITH THE MAJORANA MASS TERMS

In this section, we will examine dynamical mass functions of a gauge model supplemented by "current" Majorana mass terms, by the Schwinger-Dyson (SD) formalism. In this model for neutrino seesaw mass, we will meet notions of bare, running and physical neutrino masses [4]. We use the terminology of explicit, spontaneous, dynamical symmetry breakings as "symmetry broken by a (renormalized) parameter without spontaneous mechanism", "symmetry breaking at the tree-level, such as a Goldstone-Higgs model", "symmetry breaking by the BCS-NJL mechanism".

A. Model Building for the Type-II-like Neutrino Seesaw Mechanism

We will consider three choices of gauge symmetries, $U(1)$, $SU(2)$ and $SU(N_c)$ ($N_c \geq 3$). It will be explained that our choice of gauge symmetries is restricted from the physical situations we consider here.

In this paper, we consider the case where two $U(1)$ (vector and chiral) symmetries are broken by both right- and left- Majorana mass terms. If fermions couple with a $U(1)$ -gauge field, an explicit $U(1)$ symmetry breaking causes a serious trouble, the gauge field acquires mass through quantum radiative corrections: In that case, in the vacuum polarization

$$\Pi_{\mu\nu}(q) = -i(g_{\mu\nu}q^2 - q_{\mu}q_{\nu})\Pi(q^2) + ig_{\mu\nu}\Pi_2(q^2), \quad (125)$$

we cannot deny the possibility of non-vanishing $\Pi_2(q^2)$, and it can give a photon mass. Due to the non-conservation of vector current $\partial_{\mu}j_V^{\mu} \neq 0$, the transversal condition of a VP function $k_{\mu}\Pi_{\mu\nu} = 0$ can also be violated. In Ref. [108], it was proven that a proper vertex correction of $\Pi_{\mu\nu}$ recovers the $U(1)$ -gauge invariance $k_{\mu}\Pi_{\mu\nu} = 0$ in the case of superconductivity, a spontaneous symmetry breakdown, with a dynamical Higgs mechanism; it does not work in an explicit symmetry breaking due to the number of physical degrees of freedom. We should maintain gauge-invariance, at least BRS-invariance, for keeping unitarity of the theory [84]. A gauge theory which will permit us to make physical interpretation must be constructed on a physical Hilbert space (positive metric), $|phys\rangle \in \mathcal{V}_{phys}$, $Q_{BRS}|phys\rangle = 0$ (Q_{BRS} : BRS charge) [84]. We should also take care about the unitarity of S-matrix, while at least we consider here a Lagrangian which is Hermitian. If we wish to consider a local $U(1)_V$ gauge symmetry from the beginning of a theory for neutrino Majorana masses, we have to employ a Higgs potential and Higgs mechanism or a dynamical breaking of $U(1)_V$ for a possible mechanism of the origin of Majorana mass terms. If we can consider the case where mass functions B_R , B_L and B_D are all $SU(N_c)$ -singlet, $SU(N_c)$ gauge symmetry is not broken in an SD equation, while $U(1)_V$ is spontaneously broken by a "possible mechanism". We need a flavor degree of freedom to satisfy the Pauli principle in $SU(N_c)$ gauge-singlet B_R and B_L . It seems quite difficult to achieve the hierarchy of the seesaw situation $|B_R| \gg |B_D| \gg |B_L| \geq 0$ by a vector-like interaction of gauge fields. This special situation of the seesaw mechanism of neutrino mass restricts our model building.

The irreducible representation of a direct product of fundamental representation of $SU(N_c)$ is given by $\mathbf{N}_c \otimes \overline{\mathbf{N}}_c = 1 \oplus (\mathbf{N}_c^2 - 1)$, $\mathbf{N}_c \otimes \mathbf{N}_c = \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{N}_c(\mathbf{N}_c - 1) \oplus \frac{1}{2}\mathbf{N}_c(\mathbf{N}_c + 1)$. In the case of $SU(3_c)$, $\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \overline{\mathbf{3}}_a \oplus \mathbf{6}_s$, and thus the color symmetry will be broken by a diquark-type fermion pair. For sake of simplicity of our formulation, we wish to choose $SU(2_c)$ gauge symmetry. In this case, a diquark-type pair formation for generating Majorana-type mass functions can belong to $SU(2_c)$ -singlet ($\mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{3}$), and then the $SU(2_c)$ -gauge symmetry is not broken by Majorana masses. For Pauli principle of Majorana-type fermion bilinears, we also introduce $SU(2)_R \times SU(2)_L$ chiral group, and take the flavor singlet. Since we keep the $SU(2_c)$ symmetry manifestly, several relations of renormalization constants and Ward-Takahashi identities also become simple. The situation of our model has an essential difference with a diquark system or a color superconductor of $SU(3_c)$.

If our theory has a vector-like gauge coupling, it does not suffer from a non-Abelian quantum anomaly, and it is identically guaranteed in the case of $SU(2_c)$, though we cannot choose different gauge coupling to the right- and left-

handed fermions to keep the gauge symmetry. While, the theory will suffer from axial anomaly. In cases of $SU(N_c)$ with $N_c \geq 3$, Majorana mass terms will break gauge symmetries. A Yukawa coupling also be colored, and then an $SU(N_c)$ gauge symmetry is broken at the tree level, the gauge fields become Proca, and then it is difficult (though, not impossible in principle) to use the Proca fields in a dynamics described by the SD formalism: It is desirable to avoid a breaking of a gauge symmetry which is relevant for a dynamical mass generation inside an SD-equation, at least at the tree-level (for constructiong a tractable model). By several examinations, we recognize the fact that it seems difficult to make the $U(1)$ -gauge symmetry as a local one by the Higgs mechanism prescription for providing left-right asymmetric Majorana mass terms which will break the global $U(1)$ -symmetry explicitly (note that, here we are mentioning on a Majorana mass generation from a zero-mass model to a finite-mass case), except a GUT approach. Since we do not need a local $U(1)$ -gauge symmetry for our discussion of neutrino seesaw mechanism, in conclusion, we will examine an $SU(2_c)$ -gauge model with left-right asymmetric Majorana masses, only $SU(2_c)$ is gauged. The bare Majorana mass parameters are introduced from outside of the theory as external parameters. Several four-fermion interactions of an $SU(2_c)$ -gauged NJL-type model can be used for generating Majorana mass parameters with a large-hierarchy for seesaw machanism by the model itself, though it means that we have to depart from the gauge principle [151,171].

The symmetry of the Lagrangian becomes

$$SU(2_c) \times SU(2_f)_R \times SU(2_f). \quad (126)$$

Both $U(1)_V$ and $U(1)_A$ are broken by Majorana masses and an axial anomaly. The symmetry of the Lagrangian with zero-Majorana masses becomes $SU(2N_f)$ (we will discuss later) [81]. We consider the generic case of broken left-right symmetry by mass terms. We summarize the $SU(2_c)$ gauge transformation:

$$\xi' = e^{i\omega_A t_A} \xi, \quad \eta' = e^{i\omega_A t_A} \eta, \quad (127)$$

$$\psi'_{MR} = e^{i\omega \gamma_5 T_A} \psi_{MR}, \quad \psi'_{ML} = e^{i\omega_A C^{-1} \gamma_5 T_A C} \psi_{ML}, \quad (128)$$

$$\overline{\psi}'_{MR} = \overline{\psi}_{MR} e^{-i\omega_A \gamma_5 C^{-1} T_A C}, \quad \overline{\psi}'_{ML} = \overline{\psi}_{ML} e^{-i\omega_A \gamma_5 T_A}, \quad (129)$$

$$\Psi'_{MN} = e^{i\omega_A (\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_3) T_A} \Psi_{MN}, \quad \overline{\Psi}'_{MN} = \overline{\Psi}_{MN} e^{i\omega_A (\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_3) T_A^*}, \quad (130)$$

where, the definitions of several matrices are

$$\begin{aligned} t_A &= \frac{\rho_A}{2}, \quad [t_A, t_B] = i f_{ABC} t_C, \quad T_A \equiv \begin{pmatrix} t_A & 0 \\ 0 & t_A^T \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{T}_A \equiv \begin{pmatrix} T_A & 0 \\ 0 & T_A^T \end{pmatrix}, \\ T_A^\dagger &= T_A, \quad T_A^T = T_A^* = -\gamma^0 T_A^\dagger \gamma^0, \quad t_A^T = -\rho_2 t_A \rho_2, \quad C \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \rho_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_2 \end{pmatrix} = C^{-1} = C^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (131)$$

Here, t_A are $SU(2_c)$ Hermitian generators. The $SU(N_f)$ flavor rotation is also defined in the same manner:

$$\xi' = e^{i\omega_i^R \Upsilon_i} \xi, \quad \eta' = e^{i\omega_i^L \Upsilon_i} \eta. \quad (132)$$

Here, Υ_i are generators of an $SU(N_f)$ flavor rotation.

Now, we introduce the following manifestly $SU(2_c)$ -gauge invariant Lagrangian:

$$\mathcal{L}_{SU(2)} \equiv \mathcal{L}_{gauge} + \mathcal{L}_{matter}, \quad (133)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{gauge} \equiv -\frac{1}{4} G_{\mu\nu}^A G^{A\mu\nu} + B^A \partial^\mu G_\mu^A + \frac{\xi}{2} (B^A)^2 - i \bar{c}^A \partial^\mu D_\mu c^A, \quad (134)$$

$$G_{\mu\nu}^A \equiv \partial_\mu G_\nu^A - \partial_\nu G_\mu^A + g^{(0)} f_{ABC} G_\mu^B G_\nu^C, \quad (135)$$

$$D_\mu c^A \equiv \partial_\mu c^A + g^{(0)} f_{ABC} G_\mu^B c^C, \quad (136)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{matter} \equiv \frac{1}{2} \overline{\Psi}_{MN} (i \not{\partial} \otimes \hat{1} + g^{(0)} A^A (\gamma_5 \otimes \tau_3) \mathcal{T}_A - \mathcal{M}_M^{(0)}) \Psi_{MN}. \quad (137)$$

Here, B^A are the Nakanishi-Lautrup B -fields [87,107]. The matter fermion fields are taken as the fundamental

representation of $SU(2_c)$. The mass matrix $\mathcal{M}_M^{(0)}$ is defined by

$$\mathcal{M}_M^{(0)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{M}_R^{(0)} & \mathcal{M}_D^{(0)} \\ \mathcal{M}_D^{(0)} & \mathcal{M}_L^{(0)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (138)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_R^{(0)} \equiv [(m_R^{(0)})^\dagger P_+ + m_R^{(0)} P_-] \rho_2 \Upsilon_2, \quad (139)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_L^{(0)} \equiv [(m_L^{(0)})^\dagger P_+ + m_L^{(0)} P_-] \rho_2 \Upsilon_2, \quad (140)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_D^{(0)} \equiv (m_D^{(0)})^\dagger P_+ + m_D^{(0)} P_-. \quad (141)$$

($N_c = 2$) The Majorana masses are taken to be as $SU(2_c)$, $SU(2_f)_R$ and $SU(2_f)_L$ singlet by multiplying anti-symmetric matrices of color and flavor spaces ρ_2 and Υ_2 . The $U(1)_V$ current is not conserved by the Majorana mass terms, the $U(1)_A$ current is suffered from an axial anomaly, while the currents of $SU(2_f)_V$ and $SU(2_f)_A$ are conserved. In the context of neutrino physics, the $SU(2_c)$ fields are hypothetical gauge fields they might relevant for dynamics of the system we consider here. Let us discuss about symmetry breaking schema of our model. Due to pseudo-real nature of $SU(2_c)$, the Lagrangian has a large chiral symmetry, i.e. $SU(2N_f)$ at the zero-mass case (see below) [81]. We summarize the following breaking schema:

- (1) $m_D^{(0)} = m_R^{(0)} = m_L^{(0)} = 0$ and $m_{dyn}^D \neq 0$ (dynamical Dirac mass); $SU(4_f) \rightarrow Sp(4_f)$.
- (2) $m_D^{(0)} = m_R^{(0)} = m_L^{(0)} = 0$, $m_{dyn}^D = 0$, $m_{dyn}^R \neq 0$, $m_{dyn}^L \neq 0$ with $m_{dyn}^R = m_{dyn}^L$ (both of the right and left Majorana masses are taken to be $SU(2_f)_{R,L}$ singlet); no symmetry breaking.
- (3) $m_D^{(0)} = m_R^{(0)} = m_L^{(0)} = 0$, $m_{dyn}^D = 0$, $m_{dyn}^R \neq 0$, $m_{dyn}^L \neq 0$ with $m_{dyn}^R \neq m_{dyn}^L$; $SU(4_f) \rightarrow SU(2_f)_R \times SU(2_f)_L$.
- (4) $m_D^{(0)} = m_R^{(0)} = m_L^{(0)} = 0$, $m_{dyn}^D \neq 0$, $m_{dyn}^R \neq 0$, $m_{dyn}^L \neq 0$ with $m_{dyn}^R \neq m_{dyn}^L$; $SU(4_f) \rightarrow SU(2_f)_{R+L}$.
- (5) $m_D^{(0)} = 0$, $m_R^{(0)} \neq 0$, $m_L^{(0)} \neq 0$, $m_{dyn}^D \neq 0$, $m_{dyn}^R \neq 0$, $m_{dyn}^L \neq 0$ with $m_{dyn}^R \neq m_{dyn}^L$; $SU(2_f)_R \times SU(2_f)_L \rightarrow SU(2_f)_{R+L}$.
- (6) $m_D^{(0)} \neq 0$, $m_R^{(0)} \neq 0$, $m_L^{(0)} \neq 0$; no dynamical symmetry breaking, no NG boson.

Here, subscript dyn indicates dynamical masses, while superscript (0) implies bare quantities. For neutrino seesaw phenomenology, the case (6) may be the most preferable because it does not generate an NG boson. Usually, in the energy region of SD equation in QCD, we should prepare three flavors u , d and s and $SU(3_f)_R \times SU(3_f)_L$ chiral group, though our main interest is on neutrino mass, and we have no insight on this (a desirable criterion is asymptotic freedom, $N_f < 11N_c/2$) and thus we have determined the number of flavor from the Pauli principle, the smallest number for it. In generic case of flavor number $N_f \geq 3$, one can introduce more complicated Majorana-type condensations. Since we should choose $SU(2_c)$ -singlet (antisymmetric), a representation of a bilinear in the flavor space must be chosen from $\mathbf{N}_f(\mathbf{N}_f - 1)/2$, namely we have $N_f(N_f - 1)/2$ -directions (alignment of vacuum) of condensates. The generic case of a trial function of a Majorana-type condensation is therefore given in terms of a linear combination of these $N_f(N_f - 1)/2$ bases. Moreover, we can choose different directions of condensations in flavor space for a left and a right Majorana condensates.

The matter part of our Lagrangian in the Dirac-Nambu notation becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{matter} &= \frac{1}{2} \overline{\Psi}_{DN} \begin{pmatrix} i\cancel{\partial} + g^{(0)} \cancel{A}^A t_A - (m_D^{(0)})^\dagger P_+ - m_D^{(0)} P_- & -(m_L^{(0)})^\dagger P_+ C - m_R^{(0)} P_- C \\ -(m_R^{(0)})^\dagger P_+ C - m_L^{(0)} P_- C & -C^{-1} (i\cancel{\partial} + g^{(0)} \cancel{A}^A \rho_2 t_A \rho_2) C + (m_D^{(0)})^\dagger P_+ + m_D^{(0)} P_- \end{pmatrix} \Psi_{DN}. \end{aligned} \quad (142)$$

As we have mentioned above, a fermion model of $SU(2_c)$ -color gauge has a larger flavor symmetry $SU(2N_f)$ due to the pseudo-real nature of fundamental representation of $SU(2_c)$. To show it, we will rewrite the Lagrangian in the following form from a Majorana-like definition of Ψ_{PR} :

$$\mathcal{L}_{matter} = \Psi_{PR}^\dagger i\sigma^\mu D_\mu \Psi_{PR} + \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{PR}^T \sigma_2 \rho_2 \mathcal{M}_{PR}^{(0)} \Psi_{PR} - \frac{1}{2} \Psi_{PR}^\dagger \sigma_2 \rho_2 (\mathcal{M}_{PR}^{(0)})^\dagger \Psi_{PR}^*, \quad (143)$$

$$D_\mu \equiv \partial_\mu - ig^{(0)} A_\mu^A t_A, \quad \Psi_{PR} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \eta \\ (i\sigma_2)(i\rho_2)\xi^* \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathcal{M}_{PR}^{(0)} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} m_L^{(0)} & -m_D^{(0)} \\ m_D^{(0)} & m_R^{(0)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (144)$$

From this form, the breaking scheme $SU(2N_f) \rightarrow Sp(2N_f)$ is obvious when the Lagrangian has/acquires only Dirac mass and/or a chiral condensate and does not have Majoranas. Note that, in a generic case, a fermion field will be given by a linear combination (mixing) of particle and antiparticle bases due to the pseudo-real nature of $SU(2_c)$.

B. Renormalization

In this subsection, we summarize the renormalization property of a non-Abelian gauge theory. We work with the mass-independent renormalization scheme of 't Hooft and Weinberg (or, so-called zero-mass renormalization scheme) [149,158], combined with the method of mass-independent homogeneous renormalization equations. In this renormalization scheme, the renormalization constants (and RG equations) do not depend on mass parameters. Several definitions of renormalization constants in perturbative gauge theories are given as follows:

$$\psi^{(0)} = \sqrt{Z_2(\mu, \Lambda)}\psi^{(\mu)}, \quad (145)$$

$$A(p^2) = (Z_2(\mu, \Lambda))^{-1}A^{(\mu)}(p^2), \quad (146)$$

$$\mathbf{B}(p^2) = (Z_2(\mu, \Lambda))^{-1}\mathbf{B}^{(\mu)}(p^2), \quad (147)$$

$$A_\mu^{(0)} = \sqrt{Z_3(\mu, \Lambda)}A_\mu^{(\mu)}, \quad (148)$$

$$g^{(0)} = (Z_3(\mu, \Lambda))^{-3/2}Z_1(\mu, \Lambda)g, \quad (149)$$

$$\mathbf{m}^{(0)}(\Lambda) = (m_D^{(0)}(\Lambda), m_R^{(0)}(\Lambda), m_L^{(0)}(\Lambda))^T = Z_m(\mu, \Lambda)\mathbf{m}^{(\mu)}, \quad (150)$$

$$\mathbf{m}^{(\mu)} = (m_D^{(\mu)}, m_R^{(\mu)}, m_L^{(\mu)})^T = \mathbf{B}_{current}^{(\mu)}(p^2)/A^{(\mu)}(p^2), \quad (151)$$

$$\mathbf{B}(p^2) = \mathbf{B}_{current}(p^2) + \mathbf{B}_{dyn}(p^2). \quad (152)$$

Here, $\mathbf{m}^{(\mu)}$ is renormalized mass, and $\mathbf{m}^{(0)}(\Lambda)$ is bare mass defined at the UV (ultraviolet) cutoff scale. $A(p^2)$ and $\mathbf{B}(p^2)$ are defined by a dressed propagator such like

$$\mathcal{G}_M^{-1}(p) \equiv A(p^2)\not{p} - \mathbf{B}(p^2). \quad (153)$$

The explicit form of $\mathcal{G}_M^{-1}(p)$ will be given in the next subsection. These renormalization constants are flavor-independent. Here, $Z_m = Z_m^R = Z_m^L = Z_m^D$ due to the zero-mass renormalization scheme, namely the Majorana and Dirac mass parameters share a common renormalization constant. The solutions of RG equations of Landau gauge QCD (corresponds to the case $\xi = 0$) at one-loop level give [62,101]

$$A = Z_2 = 1, \quad Z_m = (\bar{g}^2(\Lambda^2)/\bar{g}^2(\mu^2))^{\gamma_m}, \quad \gamma_m = \frac{c}{a}. \quad (154)$$

Some group-theoretical factors are summarized as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{C,D} f_{ACD}f_{BCD} &= C_2(G)\delta_{AB}, \quad \text{tr}(t_A t_B) = T(R)\delta_{AB}, \quad \sum_A t_A t_A = C_2(R), \\ c &\equiv \frac{3}{8\pi^2}C_2(R), \quad a \equiv \frac{1}{24\pi^2}(11C_2(G) - 4N_f T(R)), \\ C_2(G = SU(N_c)) &= N_c, \quad T(N_c) = \frac{1}{2}, \quad C_2(R = N_c) = \frac{N_c^2 - 1}{2N_c}, \end{aligned} \quad (155)$$

and the RG-invariant coupling constant is given by

$$\bar{g}^2(p^2) = \frac{2}{a \ln(p^2/\Lambda_{QCD}^2)}, \quad \Lambda_{QCD} = \mu e^{-\frac{1}{ag^2}}. \quad (156)$$

Here, a is the first coefficient of the QCD β -function, Λ_{QCD} in $SU(3_c)$ case (the definition of it shows so-called "dimensional transmutation") is determined experimentally, $\Lambda_{QCD} \sim 300$ GeV [101] (in fact, there are several choices). Both the ladder (non-running gauge coupling) and improved ladder (running case) approximations which we will use in our analysis of SD equation of our model is in fact not gauge invariant, though the convergence property prefers the choice of Landau gauge in ordinary QED/QCD (without dynamical Majorana masses) [62,101]. We consider it is also the case in our models. While $\mathbf{B}^{(\mu)}$ and \mathbf{B} are complex, the renormalization constants Z_2 , Z_3 and Z_m are real. $Z_3 = 1$ is satisfied in the quenched QED, and the ladder approximation with Landau gauge gives

$Z_2 = 1$ in QCD and $Z_1 = Z_2 = 1$ in QED. It is known fact that $Z_2 = 1$ can be taken also in the improved ladder approximation [62,93,94,101,133]. Hence, we should concentrate on divergences and renormalizations in fermion mass functions, Z_m .

The renormalization-group invariant condensation $\tilde{\phi}$ and its complex conjugate $\tilde{\phi}^\dagger$ in our model will be defined by

$$\tilde{\phi} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \phi_D \\ \phi_R \\ \phi_L \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\left(\ln(\mu^2/\Lambda_{QCD}^2)\right)^{\gamma_m}} \begin{pmatrix} \langle 0 | \frac{1}{2} (\overline{\psi_{MR} P_+ \psi_{ML}} + \overline{\psi_{ML} P_+ \psi_{MR}})^{(\mu)} | 0 \rangle \\ \langle 0 | (\overline{\psi_{MR} P_+ \rho_2 \Upsilon_2 \psi_{MR}})^{(\mu)} | 0 \rangle \\ \langle 0 | (\overline{\psi_{ML} P_+ \rho_2 \Upsilon_2 \psi_{ML}})^{(\mu)} | 0 \rangle \end{pmatrix}, \quad (157)$$

$$\tilde{\phi}^\dagger \equiv \begin{pmatrix} \phi_D^\dagger \\ \phi_R^\dagger \\ \phi_L^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{\left(\ln(\mu^2/\Lambda_{QCD}^2)\right)^{\gamma_m}} \begin{pmatrix} \langle 0 | \frac{1}{2} (\overline{\psi_{MR} P_- \psi_{ML}} + \overline{\psi_{ML} P_- \psi_{MR}})^{(\mu)} | 0 \rangle \\ \langle 0 | (\overline{\psi_{MR} P_- \rho_2 \Upsilon_2 \psi_{MR}})^{(\mu)} | 0 \rangle \\ \langle 0 | (\overline{\psi_{ML} P_- \rho_2 \Upsilon_2 \psi_{ML}})^{(\mu)} | 0 \rangle \end{pmatrix}. \quad (158)$$

$(\overline{\psi_{MR} P_+ \psi_{ML}} + \dots)^{(\mu)}, \dots$ denote renormalized composite operators. Here, condensations are given as complex numbers in order to take into account phase factors of them. ρ_2 and Υ_2 are inserted for the Pauli principle.

The asymptotic behavior of the mass function is known by examinations of both RG equations and an operator product expansion of a fermion bilinear [10,128]:

$$A^{(\mu)}(p^2) \rightarrow 1, \quad (159)$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{B}_{current}^{(\mu)}(p^2)}{A^{(\mu)}(p^2)} \rightarrow \tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)} \left(\ln \frac{p^2}{\Lambda_{QCD}^2} \right)^{-\gamma_m}, \quad (160)$$

$$\frac{\mathbf{B}_{dyn}^{(\mu)}(p^2)}{A^{(\mu)}(p^2)} \rightarrow -\tilde{\phi} \frac{3C_2(R) \bar{g}^2(p^2)}{4N_c p^2} \left(\ln \frac{p^2}{\Lambda_{QCD}^2} \right)^{\gamma_m}, \quad (p^2 \gg \Lambda_{QCD}^2) \quad (161)$$

$$\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)} = (\tilde{m}_D^{(ren)}, \tilde{m}_R^{(ren)}, \tilde{m}_L^{(ren)})^T. \quad (162)$$

(in Euclidean region). Here, the asymptotics of $\mathbf{B}_{current}^{(\mu)}$ and $\mathbf{B}_{dyn}^{(\mu)}$ are called as hard and soft mass terms, respectively. These forms of hard and soft mass terms are essentially determined by mass (wavefunction) renormalization constant, thus they will take the same form for Dirac and Majorana masses. The determination of UV asymptotic behavior of $\mathbf{B}_{current}$ have had some discussions in the past, and the above form is obtained by the axial current conservation at $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$, i.e. $\lim_{\Lambda \rightarrow \infty} m_D^{(0)} (Z_m(\mu, \Lambda))^{-1} = 0$ [101]. This condition must be satisfied also in our gauge model with including Majorana masses. The asymptotic form of Dirac mass function given above can be used for a trial function for minimizing the effective potential of QCD, can describe a chiral phase transition (an IR (infrared) phenomenon), even though the asymptotic form valids at $p^2 \gg \Lambda_{QCD}^2$ [62]. The RG-invariant (physical) current mass $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)}$ is defined by

$$\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)} = \mathbf{m}^{(\mu)} \left(\ln \frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda_{QCD}^2} \right)^{\gamma_m}. \quad (163)$$

Note that the RG-invariant (physical) current mass $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)}$ are independent from the constituent part. This fact indicates that these two parts consist a linearly independent basis set of a Hilbert space with an appropriate definition of inner product for expanding a solution of SD equation, i.e. an integral equation. (The integration kernel of our SD equation which will be discussed later is not the Hilbert-Schmidt type, since the kernel has singular points on real axis, not bounded in L^2 -norm of an integration domain of the SD equation.) The soft mass term decreases rapidly at the UV region, and the divergence property of the theory is determined by the behavior of the hard mass term. Hence, it is established that both "symmetric" and "broken" phases are described by a theory. The explicit symmetry breaking is defined by $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)} \neq \mathbf{0}$. On the other hand, the bare mass will vanish at $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$ by the definition $\mathbf{m}^{(0)}(\Lambda) = Z_m(\mu, \Lambda) \mathbf{m}^{(\mu)}$. In the asymptotic free gauge theory, the dynamical dimension of the fermion-antifermion composite operator becomes three at the one-loop level of the Landau gauge $\xi = 0$ (resembles to a free theory). The "chiral limit" is defined by $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)} = \mathbf{0}$. The fermion mass function depends sensitively on current mass $\mathbf{m}^{(\mu)}$. In our neutrino model, the Θ -degree of freedom of $Z(N)$ dynamically arises at the case $m_D^{(0)} = 0$. It is known from several numerical studies on Dirac-type mass function of $SU(3_c)$ -QCD that it will take almost constant at $p^2/\Lambda_{QCD}^2 \leq 1$, while it will decrease rapidly at $p^2/\Lambda_{QCD}^2 \geq 1$ in the case of zero Dirac current mass. The global behavior of our mass functions $\mathbf{B}(s)$ should qualitatively the same with this well-known result in literature. If a theory has an asymptotic freedom, the UV behavior of Z_m is qualitatively the same (the scaling exponent depends on N_c, N_f). Our theory will obtain a critical coupling for dynamical mass generation at $\mathbf{m}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ as an analytic formula (in the non-running

coupling case) and it describes a chiral phase transition at $\mathbf{m}^{(0)} = \mathbf{0}$ (precisely, $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)} = \mathbf{0}$), while dynamical mass generation at $\mathbf{m}^{(0)} \neq \mathbf{0}$ does not give a phase transition since any symmetry will not be broken dynamically in that case while chiral $U(1)$ symmetry is broken from the beginning. Since the QCD running coupling has an IR divergence, one should employ the Higashijima-type modified running coupling [62]:

$$\bar{g}^2(p^2) = \frac{2}{a \ln((p^2 + p_c^2)/\Lambda_{QCD}^2)}. \quad (164)$$

Here, the IR cutoff p_c is a free parameter.

C. The Schwinger-Dyson Equation

In this subsection, we derive the SD-equation and examine it. The SD equation of the improved ladder approximation in our case becomes

$$\mathcal{G}_M(p) = \mathcal{G}_M^{(0)}(p) + C_2(R) \int_k \bar{g}^2((p-k)^2) \Gamma_A^\mu \mathcal{G}_M(k) \Gamma_A^\nu D_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(p-k). \quad (165)$$

The SD equation can also be derived from an appropriately defined effective action Γ , by taking the first derivative $\frac{\delta\Gamma}{\delta\mathcal{G}_M} = 0$ in an infinite-dimensional manifold. The manifold becomes Banach, by an appropriate definition of norm of tangent and cotangent vectors of it, and the manifold is considered as a complete metric space. Note that this variation will be done in an infinite-dimensional linear space of propagator \mathcal{G}_M , not a direct variation of the space of mass functions. This difference has come from the fact that we consider a variation in a mass *matrix* space. The generic form of an SD equation is written by

$$\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(p) = \widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{(0)} + \lambda \int_b^a dk \widehat{K}[p, k; \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(k)] \widehat{\mathcal{M}}(k), \quad (166)$$

and an operation of a Lie group to it gives

$$g\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(p)g^{-1} = g\widehat{\mathcal{M}}^{(0)}g^{-1} + \lambda \int_b^a dk \widehat{K}[p, k; g\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(k)g^{-1}] g\widehat{\mathcal{M}}(k)g^{-1}, \quad (167)$$

i.e., under a quite non-linear manner. Since \mathcal{G}_M depends on gauge, one should choose it before constructing an explicit form of an SD equation: We choose the Landau gauge. After a gauge is chosen, a norm of mass function space is appropriately determined, it will become a Finsler space [24], and an isometry given by a Lie group of a symmetry of a theory should keep a norm. The bare vertex Γ_A^μ of (165) is

$$\Gamma_A^\mu \equiv (\gamma^\mu \gamma_5 \otimes \tau_3) \mathcal{T}_A. \quad (168)$$

The free gauge-boson propagator is given as follows:

$$D_{\mu\nu}^{(0)}(k) = \delta_{AB} \frac{1}{k^2} \left(g_{\mu\nu} - (1 - \xi) \frac{k_\mu k_\nu}{k^2} \right). \quad (169)$$

We consider the SD equation of the Abelianized form in the neutrino model. The propagator $\mathcal{G}_M^{(0)}(p)$ is obtained by substituting $m_j \rightarrow m_j^{(0)}$ ($j = R, L, D$) in Eq. (22) of the definition of Ω_M^{-1} ((0) indicates a bare quantity). The inverse of dressed propagator is found from Eq. (18):

$$(\mathcal{G}_M(p))^{-1} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} A(p^2)\not{p} - B_R^\dagger(p^2)P_+ - B_R(p^2)P_- & -B_D^\dagger(p^2)P_+ - B_D(p^2)P_- \\ -B_D^\dagger(p^2)P_+ - B_D(p^2)P_- & A(p^2)\not{p} - B_L^\dagger(p^2)P_+ - B_L(p^2)P_- \end{pmatrix}. \quad (170)$$

Here, all quantities of $\mathcal{G}_M(p)$ are bare, and we keep mass functions of Majorana-type B_L , B_R and Dirac-type B_D as complex functions. In the neutrino model, we consider the case of all of B_R , B_L and B_D are color and flavor singlet, and thus $SU(2_c)$ gauge symmetry is conserved, in principle. The Landau gauge is taken by setting $\xi = 0$, and thus we can set $A(p^2) = 1$ in our ladder approximation. This is guaranteed by the fermion wavefunction renormalization constant Z_2 given in the previous subsection. After some manipulations, we obtain the following six coupled equations

as our SD equation (in Euclidean region):

$$B_R(p^2) \pm B_R^\dagger(p^2) = m_R^{(0)} \pm (m_R^{(0)})^\dagger + C_2(R) \int_k \bar{g}^2((p-k)^2) \frac{3+\xi}{(p-k)^2} \times \frac{[B_R(k^2) \pm B_R^\dagger(k^2)][k^2 + |B_L(k^2)|^2] - (B_D(k^2))^2 B_L^\dagger(k^2) \mp (B_D^\dagger(k^2))^2 B_L(k^2)}{D_{SD}(k^2)}, \quad (171)$$

$$B_L(p^2) \pm B_L^\dagger(p^2) = m_L^{(0)} \pm (m_L^{(0)})^\dagger + C_2(R) \int_k \bar{g}^2((p-k)^2) \frac{3+\xi}{(p-k)^2} \times \frac{[B_L(k^2) \pm B_L^\dagger(k^2)][k^2 + |B_R(k^2)|^2] - (B_D(k^2))^2 B_R^\dagger(k^2) \mp (B_D^\dagger(k^2))^2 B_R(k^2)}{D_{SD}(k^2)}, \quad (172)$$

$$B_D(p^2) \pm B_D^\dagger(p^2) = m_D^{(0)} \pm (m_D^{(0)})^\dagger + C_2(R) \int_k \bar{g}^2((p-k)^2) \frac{3+\xi}{(p-k)^2} \times \frac{[B_D(k^2) \pm B_D^\dagger(k^2)][k^2 + |B_D(k^2)|^2] - B_R(k^2) B_L(k^2) B_D^\dagger(k^2) \mp B_R^\dagger(k^2) B_L^\dagger(k^2) B_D(k^2)}{D_{SD}(k^2)} \quad (173)$$

$$D_{SD}(s) = (s + M_+^2(s))(s + M_-^2(s)). \quad (174)$$

Here, M_\pm are obtained from the result of Sec. II as follows:

$$M_\pm(s) = \left(|B_D(s)|^2 + \frac{|B_R(s)|^2 + |B_L(s)|^2}{2} \mp \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(|B_R(s)|^2 - |B_L(s)|^2)^2 + 4|B_D(s)|^2(|B_R(s)|^2 + |B_L(s)|^2 + 2|B_R(s)||B_L(s)| \cos \Theta)} \right)^{1/2}. \quad (175)$$

The $U(1)$ phases of mass functions are defined as follows:

$$B_D(s) = |B_D(s)|e^{i\theta_D}, \quad B_R(s) = \rho_2 \Upsilon_2 |B_R(s)|e^{i\theta_R}, \quad B_L(s) = \rho_2 \Upsilon_2 |B_L(s)|e^{i\theta_L}, \quad \Theta = \theta_R + \theta_L - 2\theta_D. \quad (176)$$

Here, we assume these phases have no momentum dependence, and coincide with that of bare mass parameters. If we take different phases between a mass function and corresponding bare mass parameter, the SD formalism will obtain a problem, an inconsistency between the real and imaginary parts of a mass function. We will write the SD equation into a vector form as

$$\mathbf{B}(s) = \mathbf{m}^{(0)} + \frac{3C_2(R)}{16\pi^2} \int_s^{\Lambda^2} ds' \bar{g}^2(s') \frac{\mathbf{F}(s')}{D_{SD}(s')} + \frac{3C_2(R)\bar{g}^2(s)}{16\pi^2 s} \int_0^s ds' \frac{s' \mathbf{F}(s')}{D_{SD}(s')}, \quad (177)$$

$$F_D(s) \equiv |B_D(s)| \left\{ s - |B_R(s)||B_L(s)| \cos \Theta + |B_D(s)|^2 \right\}, \quad (178)$$

$$F_R(s) \equiv |B_R(s)|(s + |B_L(s)|^2) - |B_D(s)|^2 |B_L(s)| \cos \Theta, \quad (179)$$

$$F_L(s) \equiv |B_L(s)|(s + |B_R(s)|^2) - |B_D(s)|^2 |B_R(s)| \cos \Theta, \quad (180)$$

$$\mathbf{B}(s) \equiv (|B_D(s)|, |B_R(s)|, |B_L(s)|)^T, \quad (181)$$

$$\mathbf{F}(s) \equiv (F_D(s), F_R(s), F_L(s))^T, \quad (182)$$

$$\mathbf{m}^{(0)} \equiv (|m_D^{(0)}|, |m_R^{(0)}|, |m_L^{(0)}|)^T. \quad (183)$$

The first integral which takes into account relatively high-energy region will give the hard mass (current mass) term (160), while the second integral corresponds to the soft mass (constituent mass) term (161). As we have mentioned previously, the bare mass $\mathbf{m}^{(0)}$ vanishes at $\Lambda \rightarrow \infty$. To remove angular dependences inside the integrals of the above SD equation, we have employed the following approximation [62,101]:

$$\int \sin \theta d\theta d\phi (p-k)^{-2} \rightarrow \theta(p-k)p^{-2} + \theta(k-p)k^{-2}, \quad (184)$$

$$g^2 \rightarrow \bar{g}^2((p-k)^2) \rightarrow \bar{g}^2(\max(p^2, k^2)) = \theta(p-k)\bar{g}^2(p^2) + \theta(k-p)\bar{g}^2(k^2). \quad (185)$$

From (177), one finds

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow 0} \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{3C_2(R)\bar{g}^2(s)}{16\pi^2 s} \right) \right]^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} \mathbf{B}(s) = 0, \quad (186)$$

$$\lim_{s \rightarrow \Lambda^2} \left\{ \mathbf{B}(s) - \mathbf{m}^{(0)} - \frac{3C_2(R)\bar{g}^2(s)}{16\pi^2 s} \int_0^s \frac{s' \mathbf{F}(s')}{D_{SD}(s')} \right\} = 0 \quad (187)$$

as the IR and the UV boundary conditions of the differential equation, respectively. Both the IR and UV boundary conditions take the same forms with those of the SD equation of Dirac mass in QCD without Majorana mass terms. Since the mass functions $|B_D(s)|, \dots$ are much smaller than cutoff Λ or s in the UV region, the UV asymptotic behavior of the SD equation and its solution will take the same form with that of QED₄ (non-running case in our model) or QCD₄ without Majorana mass terms. Our SD equation as a coupled integral equation will be converted into the following differential equation:

$$\frac{d}{ds} \left\{ \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{3C_2(R)\bar{g}^2(s)}{16\pi^2 s} \right) \right]^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} \mathbf{B}(s) \right\} = \frac{s \mathbf{F}(s)}{D_{SD}(s)} = \frac{s}{D_{SD}(s)} \Xi(s) \mathbf{B}(s). \quad (188)$$

The definition of Ξ is

$$\Xi(s) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s + |B_D(s)|^2 - |B_R(s)||B_L(s)| \cos \Theta & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & s + |B_L(s)|^2 & -|B_D(s)|^2 \cos \Theta \\ 0 & -|B_D(s)|^2 \cos \Theta & s + |B_R(s)|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (189)$$

The global behavior of $\mathbf{B}(s)$ is determined by the first derivative $\frac{d}{ds} \mathbf{B}(s)$ and it will decrease monotonically at $s \rightarrow \infty$ in ordinary QCD. In our SD equation, it is non-trivial due to the existence of Θ .

First, let us consider the SD equation with an appropriate linearization. The SD equation is Fuchsian, has four regular singular points $s = 0, M_+, M_-, \infty$, and after a linearization, it becomes a Heun equation (see Appendix), can be solved analytically [60,61]. To obtain our SD equation as a matrix Heun equation, we will linearize it by substituting all of mass functions of Ξ by their value at the origin: $\mathbf{m}_{dyn} = (m_{dyn}^D, m_{dyn}^R, m_{dyn}^L)^T \equiv \mathbf{B}(s=0)$. This kind of linearization is also frequently used in ordinary QED/QCD, and it is justified at a "critical" region $0 < |B|^2/\Lambda^2 \ll \infty$ and $s \rightarrow \Lambda$. Moreover, $\lim_{s \rightarrow \infty} \mathbf{B}(s) \rightarrow \text{const.}$ (in fact, vanish) if $s = \infty$ is a regular singular point. (The Heun equation is important for theory of integrable nonlinear wave equations, and appears in the scalar-vector sector of a spinor-spinor Bethe-Salpeter equation [61]. Both the Heun equation and the Gauss hypergeometric differential equation are defined on the Riemann sphere, and the Heun equation has 192 solutions (local), similar to the case that the Gauss equation has Kummer's 24 local solutions [49,89,147].) SD equations of QED or QCD with non-running couplings, and without Majorana mass terms, are converted into the Gauss hypergeometric differential equation of three singular points, and our Heun-type SD equation (in the non-running coupling case) also becomes the Gauss hypergeometric differential equation when we consider some limiting cases of mass functions/parameters (for example, $|B_R(s)| = |B_L(s)|$). From the usual procedure, we get all of the scaling behaviors of $|B_D(s)|$, $|B_R(s)|$ and $|B_L(s)|$ in (188) are the same, and the exponents are found to be (in the non-running coupling case)

$$l = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{3C_2(R)g^2}{4\pi^2}} \right), \quad (190)$$

if we neglect the off-diagonal elements of Ξ in our matrix Heun-type equation. We can obtain analytic expressions of exponents for the case of non-vanishing off-diagonal elements of Ξ by solving a 2×2 matrix eigenvalue problem as the indicial equation of the problem, when we assume the UV behaviors $|B_R(s)| \sim |B_L(s)| \sim s^{l, l \pm 1, l \pm 2, \dots}$ at $s \rightarrow \infty$, but the correction will become small. Hence the contribution of the off-diagonal element $|B_D|^2 \cos \Theta$ inside the SD equation will vanish at $s \rightarrow \infty$. Moreover, from the discussion of renormalized mass function given previously, $|B_R|$ and $|B_L|$ should take the same exponent at the UV asymptotic region. This off-diagonal elements clearly shows the coupling between $|B_R|$ and $|B_L|$. Thus the coupling tends to zero at $s \rightarrow \infty$. The parameter q in Appendix A has no role for the character of singularity in the generic Heun equation, and thus the mass functions of the matrix elements of Ξ do not contribute to the SD equation of the UV asymptotic region.

From the well-known asymptotic behavior of mass functions in QCD, we can discuss the characteristic aspect of our matrix SD equation. In our treatment, current and constituent parts of a mass function share the same phase, and it seems the only choice for us in the SD formalism. Moreover, as mentioned above, only the choice to take the

same phase for bare mass parameters and mass functions (self-energies) can keep consistency between the real and imaginary parts of a mass function inside the SD equation. We have taken the convention of negative sign of $\tilde{\phi}$. The current mass part becomes dominant than the constituent part inside the mass function at large s . Hence, when we consider our SD equation without the linearization, there are several cases of the behavior of $\mathbf{B}(s)$: Its first derivative is

$$\frac{d\mathbf{B}(s)}{ds} = \frac{3C_2(R)}{16\pi^2} \left(\frac{1}{s} \frac{d\bar{g}^2(s)}{ds} - \frac{\bar{g}^2(s)}{s^2} \right) \int_0^s s' ds' \frac{\mathbf{F}(s')}{D_{SD}(s)}. \quad (191)$$

$\mathbf{B}(s)$ decreases monotonically at $s \rightarrow \infty$ when the matrix elements of Ξ is always positive, while if, for example, $s + |B_D|^2 - |B_R||B_L| \cos \Theta$ has the region where it becomes negative (especially in the IR region), the mass function $|B_D(s)|$ can have regions of s where it decreases/increases, implies an instability of vacuum of the theory similar to the NJL-type model case we have discussed previously, and can have a node, can cross the s -axis before it will vanish at $s \rightarrow \infty$. The character of matrix elements of Ξ for the SD equation are determined by relative sizes between $|B_D|$, $|B_R|$, $|B_L|$ and the phase factor Θ . To find the value of Θ for vacua of the theory, we should examine its effective potential: In our speculation, a stationary point in Θ -coordinates is non-degenerate critical from the result of our NJL-type model, namely we should find a specific VEV of Θ . The behavior of mass function at the IR region, namely a mass function at "relatively" long distance, has strong connection with the stability of the effective potential of the theory (and also confinement [2,41,62]), though the asymptotic behavior of mass functions given in the previous subsection can be used for discussion of the structure of the effective potential due to confinement of fermions [62]. An interesting fact of our case is that the Θ -degree of freedom can qualitatively affect the global behavior of the solution of our matrix SD equation.

Since $\mathbf{B}(s)$ is a three-dimensional real vector, we can represent it as

$$\mathbf{B}(s)^T = (|B_D(s)|, |B_R(s)|, |B_L(s)|) = r(s)(\cos \theta, \sin \theta \cos \phi, \sin \theta \sin \phi), \quad (192)$$

$$r(s) \equiv \sqrt{|B_D(s)|^2 + |B_R(s)|^2 + |B_L(s)|^2}. \quad (193)$$

Then, our SD equation becomes

$$\frac{d}{ds} \left\{ \left[\frac{d}{ds} \left(\frac{3C_2(R)\bar{g}^2(s)}{16\pi^2 s} \right) \right]^{-1} \frac{d}{ds} r(s) \right\} = \frac{r(s)s}{D_{SD}(s)} [s + r^2(s)\Phi(\theta, \phi)], \quad (194)$$

$$\Phi(\theta, \phi) = \cos^4 \theta + 2 \sin^4 \theta \sin^2 \phi \cos^2 \phi - 3 \cos^2 \theta \sin^2 \theta \sin \phi \cos \phi \cos \Theta. \quad (195)$$

Here, we have taken the approximation of the complete neglect on momentum s dependence of θ and ϕ . This is a rough approximation because it fixes a relative ratio of $|B_D|$, $|B_R|$, and $|B_L|$ for whole region of $0 \leq s < \infty$, though we mainly have our interest on the UV asymptotic behavior of the mass functions (which determines critical couplings of mass generations), it should work well at the asymptotic region. The seesaw condition $|B_R|^2 \gg |B_D|^2 \gg |B_L|^2$ is obtained at $\phi \sim 0$, $\theta \sim \pi/2$. By this prescription with the linearization by $r(s) \rightarrow r(0)$ for the right-hand side of bracket of (194), again our SD equation, as a Heun equation, will give the same exponents (190) for $r(s)$. $\phi = \pi/4$ of the left-right symmetric case gives a Gauss hypergeometric equation. In the vicinity of critical region, we obtain the following well-known asymptotic behaviors from the UV boundary condition at $\mathbf{m}^{(0)} = 0$ limit with using the non-running coupling:

$$r(x) \propto x^{-\frac{1}{2}} \left(1 \pm \sqrt{1 - \frac{3C_2(R)g^2}{4\pi^2}} \right), \quad \text{for } 1 \geq \frac{3C_2(R)g^2}{4\pi^2}, \quad (196)$$

$$\propto x^{-1/2} \cos \left(\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{3C_2(R)g^2}{4\pi^2} - 1} \ln x \right), \quad \text{for } 1 \leq \frac{3C_2(R)g^2}{4\pi^2}. \quad (197)$$

Hence, the critical coupling satisfies the well-known result $3C_2(R)g^2/4\pi^2 = 1$ [62,101]. Here, we consider the case where the coupling constant is close to the critical value. By the UV boundary condition with this situation, and with the zero bare-mass limit $|m_D^{(0)}| = |m_R^{(0)}| = |m_L^{(0)}| = 0$, gives (non-running coupling case)

$$M_{dyn} = \Lambda \exp \left[- \frac{(2n+1)\pi}{2\sqrt{\frac{3}{4\pi^2}C_2(R)g^2 - 1}} \right], \quad (n = 0, 1, 2 \dots), \quad (198)$$

$$M_{dyn} = \sqrt{(m_{dyn}^D)^2 + (m_{dyn}^R)^2 + (m_{dyn}^L)^2}, \quad (m_{dyn}^D, m_{dyn}^R, m_{dyn}^L) = (|B_D(0)|, |B_R(0)|, |B_L(0)|). \quad (199)$$

By utilizing the vector notation of mass function \mathbf{B} , one finds

$$\Phi(\theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{r^4(s)} \left(|B_D(s)|^4 + 2|B_R(s)|^2|B_L(s)|^2 - 3|B_D(s)|^2|B_R(s)||B_L(s)| \cos \Theta \right). \quad (200)$$

For example, when we consider $|B_R| \sim 10^{11}$ GeV, $|B_D| \sim 10^2$ GeV and $|B_L| \sim 10^2$ eV, then we find $|B_D|^4 \sim |B_R|^2|B_L|^2 \sim |B_D|^2|B_R||B_L| \sim 10^8$ (GeV)⁴. In this case, they will take the same magnitude in $\Phi(\theta, \phi)$. Thus, under the seesaw condition with the three-dimensional vector approximation for mass function, the effect of Θ in the SD equation is not negligible.

Our SD equation of several limiting cases can be solved more explicitly. Let us examine the SD equation of the Dirac mass part. We list the following cases:

$$\frac{sF_D(s)}{D_{SD}(s)} \rightarrow \frac{s|B_D(s)|}{s + |B_D(s)|^2}, \quad (\text{case}(a); |B_R| = |B_L| = 0), \quad (201)$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{s|B_D(s)|}{s + |B_D(s)|^2 + |B_R(s)|^2}, \quad (\text{case}(b); |B_R| = |B_L|, \Theta = (2n+1)\pi), \quad (202)$$

$$\rightarrow \frac{s|B_D(s)|(s + |B_D(s)|^2)}{\left(s + \left(\frac{|B_R(s)|}{2} - \sqrt{\frac{|B_R(s)|^2}{4} + |B_D(s)|^2} \right)^2 \right) \left(s + \left(\frac{|B_R(s)|}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{|B_R(s)|^2}{4} + |B_D(s)|^2} \right)^2 \right)}, \quad (\text{case}(c); |B_R| \neq 0, |B_L| = 0). \quad (203)$$

The case (c) with $|B_R(s)|^2 \gg |B_D(s)|^2$ gives the type-I seesaw condition [104]. We will set $|B_R(s)| = m_R = \text{const.}$ for solving the SD equation (becomes a hypergeometric differential equation by this linearization) of case (b). It is impossible to obtain a single function of analytical solution for the linearized SD equation in the whole region of momentum space $0 \leq s < \infty$ (no global solution, though we can use analytic continuations) [147]. Since the hypergeometric differential equation has $s = 0, 1, \infty$ as regular singular points from its definition, we obtain the following convergent serieses (expansions of solutions inside several convergent radii defined around $s = 0, 1, \infty$) from the 24 Kummer local solutions of hypergeometric functions ${}_2F_1 = F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, x)$ as special solutions (up to a multiplicative constant) of the linearized SD equation [49,147]:

$$F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, x), \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{x^{1-\gamma} F(\alpha - \gamma + 1, \beta - \gamma + 1, 2 - \gamma, x)}{\Gamma(2 - \gamma)} \quad \text{for} \quad |x| < 1, \quad (204)$$

$$x^{-\alpha} F(\alpha, 1 + \alpha - \gamma, 1 + \alpha - \beta, 1/x) \quad \text{and} \quad x^{-\beta} F(\beta, 1 + \beta - \gamma, 1 + \beta - \alpha, 1/x) \quad \text{for} \quad |x| > 1, \quad (205)$$

$$\frac{F(\alpha, \beta, \alpha + \beta - \gamma + 1, 1 - x)}{\Gamma(\alpha + \beta - \gamma + 1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{(1 - x)^{\gamma - \alpha - \beta} F(\gamma - \beta, \gamma - \alpha, \gamma - \alpha - \beta + 1, 1 - x)}{\Gamma(\gamma - \alpha - \beta + 1)} \quad \text{for} \quad |1 - x| < 1 \quad (206)$$

$$x \equiv -\frac{s}{|m_R|^2 + (m_{dyn}^D)^2}, \quad \alpha \equiv \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - \frac{3C_2(R)g^2}{4\pi^2}}}{2}, \quad \beta \equiv \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - \frac{3C_2(R)g^2}{4\pi^2}}}{2}, \quad \gamma \equiv 2.$$

Here, we use gamma functions to remove singularities at several points of arguments in the hypergeometric functions. The IR boundary condition is satisfied by $F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, x)$, while $|B_D(s)|$ of the UV region is given by a linear combination of $x^{-\alpha} F(\alpha, 1 + \alpha - \gamma, 1 + \alpha - \beta, 1/x)$ and $x^{-\beta} F(\beta, 1 + \beta - \gamma, 1 + \beta - \alpha, 1/x)$. Obviously, under the approximations mentioned above, the critical coupling becomes the same with (196-197).

In summary, a numerical value of Θ can affect the structure and solution of our SD equation, and then it reflects "global" structure of the effective potential of the theory, the effect is not negligible even in the case of seesaw situation of a huge mass hierarchy. While, various parts of our SD equation show same characters/behaviors with those of QED/QCD even though our model includes Majorana masses. At least in non-running coupling case, Θ does not affect the critical coupling of dynamical mass generation. In the case of NJL-type model, Θ affects essentially on structure of effective potential, gap equation and critical coupling. An evaluation of phason mass and decay constant demands us a hard and complicated calculation in our gauge model, while a numerical calculation is not meaningful due to the huge hierarchy of the explicit symmetry breaking mass parameters $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}^{(ren)}$. If a mass prediction is the purpose, one should employ the renormalization group analysis of the SM/MSSM [9,20,21,22,26]. We should mention that, here we do not prove that the seesaw situation takes place in our SD equation with taking a large hierarchy of bare mass parameter, and discuss several characteristic features of the equation. Our SD equation has a non-linear vector radial Schrödinger operator at the non-running coupling case. It is an interesting subject to examine the operator by differential Galois group to understand our SD equation more deeply [95].

V. INTERACTIONS, REACTIONS AND THERMODYNAMICS OF PHASON: PHYSICAL IMPLICATIONS

A. Two-body Phason Decay

The two-body pion decay $\pi^- \rightarrow l^- + \bar{\nu}_\mu$ is the best laboratory to examine the μe -universality of weak interaction [39]. This reaction is used to determine $f_\pi = 93$ MeV. Since phason $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a "pseudo-scalar meson"ic boson field, we can evaluate the two-body phason decay $\tilde{\Theta} \rightarrow \varphi_1 + \bar{\varphi}_2$ by a similar way of pion weak decay, with assuming a hypothetical V-A type interaction. Since $\tilde{\Theta}$ is a neutral boson, it does not have a decay like $\tilde{\Theta}^\dagger \rightarrow \bar{\varphi}_1 + \varphi_2$ which could have a role in lepton/baryon-number non-conservation. By assuming $m_1 \neq 0$, $m_2 = 0$, and temperature-dependence as $|m_D(T)| = |m_D(T=0)|\sqrt{1-T^2/T_c^2}$ (T_c ; critical temperature), one finds the decay width

$$\Gamma(\tilde{\Theta} \rightarrow \varphi_1 + \bar{\varphi}_2) = \frac{G_p^2 F_\Theta^2 (m_\Theta^2 - m_1^2)^2 m_1^2}{4\pi m_\Theta^3} \quad (207)$$

will vanish at $T \rightarrow T_c$ and $|m_D(T=0)| = 0$ in our NJL-type model. Here, G_p is the Fermi constant of this hypothetical interaction. We wish to mention that, quite recently, an implication of a rare pion decay (a two-body type) to dark matter was given in literature [71]. The two-body phason decay could also obtain such an implication in universe.

B. Tunneling, Instanton, and Topological Nature of the Theory

We have found that $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$ ($n \in \mathbf{Z}$) give infinitely degenerate vacua of the NJL-type model, and V_{eff}^{NJL+M} is almost proportional to $\cos\Theta$. Hence, there is a tunneling probability $P_t = \exp(-S_E)$ between two vacua. Here, the effective action S_E for describing dynamics in the direction Θ in a field-theoretical framework can be written as follows:

$$Z(\beta) = \int \mathcal{D}\tilde{\Theta} e^{-S_E}, \quad (208)$$

$$S_E = \mathcal{V}_{3D} \int_0^\beta d\tau \left(\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{|m_D|}{2} \right)^2 \left(\frac{d\Theta}{d\tau} \right)^2 + \frac{\Delta V_{eff}}{2} \cos\Theta \right), \quad (209)$$

$$\Delta V_{eff} \equiv V_{eff}(\Theta=0) - V_{eff}(\Theta=\pi) \sim \mathcal{O}(|m_D|^2 |m_R| |m_L|), \quad (210)$$

$$|m_D|^2 \sim F_\Theta^2, \quad \Delta_{eff} \sim F_\Theta^2 m_\Theta^2. \quad (211)$$

Here, \mathcal{V}_{3D} is the three dimensional volume of the system. For example, we obtain

$$\Delta V_{eff} \sim 10^4 (\text{GeV})^4 \quad (212)$$

by using $|m_D| \sim 1\text{GeV}$, $|m_L| \sim 1\text{eV}$ and $|m_R| \sim 10^{13}\text{GeV}$. We will consider quantum mechanics to describe the system. The system has kink (instanton, namely a classical solution which makes action functional as a finite quantity) solution [27]. We can evaluate a tunneling effect of instanton/anti-instanton to the system, and it will give a perturbation to eigenvalues. For an estimation of it, we can use the virial theorem, with assuming the harmonic potential in the vicinity of the bottom of a valley by specifying the order of Θ . The system is translation invariant in time direction, and thus it has a zero-mode which will be removed by a Faddeev-Popov determinat in the path-integration of a partition function. Moreover, the system is perfectly periodic, and thus a wavefunction of the potential can take a Bloch form obtained (for example) by solving a canonically quantized Schrödinger equation of the Hamiltonian in S_E . Hence, the potential of Θ resembles to the θ -vacua of QCD₄. We find the canonical commutation relation $[\Theta, P_\Theta] = i$ for quantization, and the uncertainty relation $\Delta P_\Theta \Delta \Theta \geq 1/2$ also be satisfied. We wish to emphasize that this is an uncertainty relation of fluctuation of phase of mass parameters and its canonical momentum. We can consider a squeezed state for Θ via a harmonic approximation for describing the vicinity of the bottom of a valley. If an external field like $-C_{ext} \frac{\Theta}{2\pi}$ is added to the system (209) and becomes stronger than a threshold, a representation point of the system (a wave packet) will move toward Θ -direction, passes through places where CP is broken, and the dynamics seems like that of a density wave in (1+1)-dimensions. (Note that CP is obviously broken at $\Theta \neq \pi$ at the classical Lagrangian level.)

To examine thermodynamics of the one-dimensional system defined above, we assume the temperature-dependence of the dynamical Dirac mass as $|m_D(T)| \sim |m_D(T=0)|\sqrt{1-T^2/T_c^2}$. When temperature goes down from $T \sim T_c$ to $T \ll T_c$, the amplitude of modulation of V_{eff} is developed, and a decoherence between quantum states of valleys

can take place. For example, in the case $\mathcal{O}(|m_D(T=0)|) \sim T_c \sim \mathcal{O}(1\text{MeV})$, a vanishment of Dirac mass by thermal effect exists inside a neutron star (T_c of superfluidity in a neutron star becomes $\sim \mathcal{O}(1\text{MeV})$) [115]. A thermal energy of our model will be obtained by Θ -direction, a thermodynamic system like a neutron star would have a statistical density matrix which includes CP-violating states (a CP-violation by thermalization). This effect cannot be observed in the one-loop calculation of our model under the Matsubara formalism because each of the mass spectra of our model at this approximation level has two-fold degeneracy. On the contrary, the Lagrangian obviously breaks CP-invariance at $\Theta \neq 0$, and this fact indicates that the effect of the CP-violation cannot be described by a mean-field approximation. To clarify this issue, we need a further examination. A thermal spectrum will also be obtained in a curved spacetime or a uniform acceleration [32,47,58,150]. Hence, a uniformly accelerated observer would detect a CP-violation effect by the Hawking-Unruh effect [32,47,58,116,145,150]. Hence, if the evolution of Universe had an era of a huge accelerated expansion, a CP violation by the acceleration might occur. Namely, a large-scale dynamics of the Universe itself causes a CP-violating effects. In that case, different observer of different Rindler coordinates will detect different result of CP violation from observations of a single system. If our theory obtains a Lorentz-symmetry violating perturbation, such as gravitational effect, then CPT theorem cannot be utilized by us, and the perturbation would lift the degeneracies of mass spectra and CP and T violation might occur. CP and T are conserved at the vacua (ground state) of our Lorentz symmetric NJL-type model even though which has Majorana mass terms in the left-right asymmetric manner. While, if Lorentz symmetry is explicitly broken in a Dirac equation with having only Dirac-type mass, the model can give a CPT violation [53,82,83]. In this paper, we mainly consider neutrino seesaw mass, though a similar situation might take place in mixon/cpon of a CKM/PMNS-type matrices. If the CKM/PMNS matrices are physical, they give p-NG modes and if they have their origins in dynamical symmetry breakings, then they may have decay constants, they would contribute to cosmological processes such as leptogenesis. Hence, it may be possible that entries of the CKM/PMNS matrices vary by environment or a uniform acceleration in our Universe. Moreover, the entries of the CKM/PMNS matrices may have kink solutions.

By concerning the fact that a scalar field is dimensionless in (1+1)-dimensions, we introduce the following action for describing dynamics of phason beyond a single-valley (i.e., a harmonic potential) approximation:

$$S_p = \int dx_0 dx_1 \left[\frac{F_\Theta^2}{2} (\partial_\mu \Theta)^2 - \frac{m_\Theta^2}{2} \cos \Theta \right]. \quad (213)$$

We have redefined m_Θ^2 from mass dimension. This action is a relativistic version of a commensurate charge density wave, and it will have a soliton solution as an excited state of phason [31,91,111,132,173]. By using a soliton solution, we obtain the energy of a soliton as

$$E_{soliton} \sim \sqrt{F_\Theta m_\Theta}, \quad (214)$$

namely, energy of a soliton can have the same order of magnitude of phason mass. By putting m_Θ and F_Θ of (85), (98) and $|m_D(T)| = |m_D(0)|\sqrt{1 - T^2/T_c^2}$, one finds,

$$E_{soliton} \sim \left(\frac{2}{\pi^2} |m_R| |m_L| |m_D(0)| \right)^{1/4} \left[1 - \frac{T^2}{T_c^2} \right]^{1/4}. \quad (215)$$

Since T_c and $|m_D(T=0)|$ take the same order of magnitude, the Dirac mass term will vanish before a soliton is thermally excited when $\Lambda \gg T_c$. Therefore, tunneling and thermal effects are more important for a transport of energy between two nearest valleys than a solitonic excitation.

C. Effective Action of the Phason-Photon System

In case of pion, two-photon pion decay has deep relation with the axial anomaly. In Ref. [127], an effect of temperature to $\pi^0 \rightarrow 2\gamma$ was examined. If phason $\hat{\Theta}$ couples with electromagnetic field under the similar way with

the case of axion, the Lagrangian of the phason-photon system can be given as follows [14,37,38,51,74,163]:

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Theta-em} \equiv \mathcal{L}_{\Theta(K)} + \mathcal{L}_{\Theta M} + \mathcal{L}_{em} + \mathcal{L}_{\Theta-em}, \quad (216)$$

$$\mathcal{U} \equiv \exp[i\tilde{\Theta}/F_{\Theta}], \quad (217)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Theta(K)} \equiv F_{\Theta}^2 \partial_{\mu} \mathcal{U}^{-1} \partial^{\mu} \mathcal{U}, \quad (218)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Theta(M)} \equiv -F_{\Theta}^2 \frac{m_{\Theta}^2}{2} \cos \frac{\tilde{\Theta}}{F_{\Theta}} = -F_{\Theta}^2 \frac{m_{\Theta}^2}{4} (\mathcal{U} + \mathcal{U}^{-1}), \quad (219)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{\Theta-em} \equiv \kappa \tilde{\Theta} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}^{\mu\nu}, \quad (220)$$

$$\mathcal{L}_{em} \equiv -\frac{1}{4}(F_{\mu\nu})^2 - \frac{1}{2\xi}(\partial_{\mu} A^{\mu})^2. \quad (221)$$

We will obtain the Raffelt-Stodolsky-type Lagrangian if we expand the potential of (219) up to the fourth-order of $\tilde{\Theta}$. In our case, phason is massive boson. Integrating out fluctuation of phason field by employing a harmonic potential approximation gives a four-body photon coupling $\kappa^2 \int d^4y F_{\mu\nu}(x) \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}(x) G_{\Theta}(x-y) F_{\mu\nu}(y) \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}(y)$. The interaction $\tilde{\Theta} F_{\mu\nu} \tilde{F}_{\mu\nu}$ ($\tilde{\Theta}$ is a pseudoscalar) of the Lagrangian (220) causes a two-photon phason decay $\tilde{\Theta} \rightarrow 2\gamma$. Note that this interaction gives gauge-invariant results in invariant scattering amplitudes. The coupling κ becomes

$$\kappa \equiv \frac{e^2}{16\pi^2} F_{\Theta}^{-1}. \quad (222)$$

If we assume the temperature dependence of Dirac mass as $|m_D(T)| = |m_D(T=0)|\sqrt{1-T^2/T_c^2}$, we have

$$F_{\Theta}^2 \approx \frac{|m_D(T=0)|^2}{2\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{T^2}{T_c^2}\right) \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{2|m_R|^2}. \quad (223)$$

The result of Pisarsky et al. for pion is $f_{\pi}(T) \sim (1 - T^2/(12f_{\pi}^2))f_{\pi}$ [127], and it could be interpreted as the expansion of our formula at $T \ll T_c$. Since we have obtained F_{Θ} by utilizing the Nambu-Goldstone theorem, our F_{Θ} is estimated quite roughly, though this formula tells us that a finite-temperature effect suppresses F_{Θ} . Similar effect to temperature can arise from a uniform acceleration or a curved spacetime, by the Hawking-Unruh effect [32,47,58,150]. Hence the decay width of $\tilde{\Theta} \rightarrow 2\gamma$ becomes

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(\tilde{\Theta} \rightarrow 2\gamma) &\propto \left(\frac{e^2}{4\pi}\right)^2 \frac{m_{\Theta}^3}{F_{\Theta}^2} \\ &\propto \left(\frac{e^2}{4\pi}\right)^2 m_{\Theta}^3 \left\{ \frac{|m_D(T=0)|^2}{2\pi^2} \left(1 - \frac{T^2}{T_c^2}\right) \ln \frac{\Lambda^2}{2|m_R|^2} \right\}^{-1}. \end{aligned} \quad (224)$$

Since we know that m_{Θ} does not vanish at $|m_D| = 0$ with $|m_R| \neq |m_L|$, $|m_R| \neq 0$, $|m_L| \neq 0$, we find that $\Gamma(\tilde{\Theta} \rightarrow 2\gamma)$ diverges at $T \rightarrow T_c$ or at $|m_D(T=0)| \rightarrow 0$.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

We will summarize our results:

- In our NJL-type model, a pseudo Nambu-Goldstone boson arises after the dynamical generation of the Dirac mass, and the phase (we call its quantum fluctuation as "phason" in this paper) is self-consistently chosen as $\Theta = (2n+1)\pi$ as infinitely countable degenerate vacua of V_{eff} . We have examined the mechanism of (dynamical) generation of infinitely countable degenerate vacua, summarized into a theorem by mathematical language.
- The p-NG boson has a non-vanishing mass in its excitation spectrum which corresponds to the observable quantity, the mass-gap of collective excitation. The phason mode becomes a majoron at $|m_L| = 0$ (for example, in the case of type-I seesaw condition of neutrino), and gives a pion at $|m_R| = |m_L| = 0$ in our model. Evaluations of phason mass in NJL and SNJL have been presented, and the NJL gives the mass as little lighter than weak bosons, while that of SNJL becomes very light, almost the same order of axion mass today accepted by people widely.

- The $SU(2_c) \times SU(N_f)_R \times SU(N_f)_L$ model for neutrino seesaw mass has been constructed, and the SD equation for current and dynamical masses has been examined. The linearized version of the SD equation will take a matrix Heun equation under the non-running coupling case. The effect of mass phase Θ appears in the SD equation and can become crucial under the seesaw mechanism situation.
- We have considered the two-body/two-photon phason decay rates, which might have some contributions to astrophysical/cosmological processes. Possible physical implications coming from the phase degree Θ have been discussed.

In this paper, we have assumed the order parameter m_D of the NJL/SNJL-type model as spacetime-independent. If we investigate the relation between spacetime-dependent $m_D(x)$ and the seesaw mass spectra, we should employ a "Bogoliubov-de Gennes"-type equation often used in theory of superconductivity. This is also the case in a curved spacetime. We only consider the (3+1)-dimensional case, though our method and also the dispersion relations we have obtained in this paper can be applied/used to study similar situations in other spacetime dimensions.

For a three-flavor model, we can introduce mass matrices as $\text{diag}(m_R^e, m_R^\mu, m_R^\tau)$, $\text{diag}(m_L^e, m_L^\mu, m_L^\tau)$. If we wish to consider an $U(3)$ -flavor symmetry in dynamical Dirac mass terms, we can utilize $g_1(\bar{\psi}\psi)^2 + g_2(\bar{\psi}\frac{\lambda_3}{2}\psi)^2 + g_3(\bar{\psi}\frac{\lambda_8}{2}\psi)^2$. We denote $\lambda_3/2$ and $\lambda_8/2$ as the Cartan subalgebra. This interaction can generate the Gell-Mann–Okubo type mass relation usually used in the classical three-flavor quark model. An implementation of the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism of mass hierarchy of a flavon field [23,43] is also an interesting direction of an extension of our models. This could reduce model parameters to get a mass hierarchy or a mass matrix of a theory. For example, we can consider the following Lagrangian for a dynamical Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism of neutrino sector:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} = & \bar{\psi}i\partial\psi + G \left[\left(\bar{\psi}\frac{1+\tau_3}{2}\psi \right)^2 + \left(\bar{\psi}i\gamma_5\frac{1+\tau_3}{2}\psi \right)^2 \right] + \epsilon\bar{\psi}\frac{\tau_1+i\tau_2}{2}\psi + \epsilon^\dagger\bar{\psi}\frac{\tau_1-i\tau_2}{2}\psi \\ & - \frac{1}{2}\psi^T(m_R^\dagger CP_+ + m_L CP_-)\psi - \frac{1}{2}\bar{\psi}(m_L^\dagger CP_+ + m_R CP_-)\bar{\psi}^T, \end{aligned} \quad (225)$$

where, $\psi \equiv (\psi_1, \psi_2)$ is a two-flavor Dirac field. By using τ_3 Pauli matrix (here τ_j ($j = 1, 2, 3$) act on the two-dimensional flavor space), we give an NJL interaction only to the first flavor ψ_1 , while ϵ gives a cross term between two flavors. We can replace the NJL interaction to an $SU(2)$ gauge interaction similar to our model discussed in Sec. IV. The Majorana mass parameters m_R, m_L are universal for the two flavors. After a dynamical generation of Dirac mass takes place in the first flavor, we integrate out it, and then we will get a Dirac mass term of the second flavor. This model has no massless majoron, could obtain a mass hierarchy between the first and second flavors.

Next, we present an approach to CKM/PMNS matrices based on a $NL\sigma M$ (non-linear sigma model) [14,37,38,51,74,163]. When CKM/PMNS matrices are regarded as physical degrees of freedom, it is possible to describe them by an $NL\sigma M$ Lagrangian, due to a similarity of the mathematical structures of $NL\sigma M$ Lagrangians with flavon or little Higgs models. We concentrate on the PMNS matrix. The diagonalization of PMNS matrix is achieved by

$$\widehat{M}_{neu} = U_{PMNS}^* \lambda_{neu} U_{PMNS}^\dagger. \quad (226)$$

Here, λ_{neu} is the matrix of mass eigenvalue. While, the p-NG field Σ of non-linear realization parametrized by broken generators (an exponential mapping of a Lie group) will be transformed according to the transformation law of \widehat{M}_{neu} as follows:

$$\Sigma \equiv e^{i\Pi_a/F}, \quad \Sigma \rightarrow \Sigma' = U_{PMNS}\Sigma U_{PMNS}^T. \quad (227)$$

Note that Π_a are matrices of a flavor space. Therefore, the $NL\sigma M$ Lagrangian will be determined as

$$\mathcal{L}_{neu} \equiv \frac{F^2}{2} \left[\partial_\mu \Sigma \partial^\mu \Sigma^\dagger - \kappa_{neu} \text{tr}(\widehat{M}_{neu} \Sigma + \Sigma^\dagger \widehat{M}_{neu}^\dagger) \right]. \quad (228)$$

(κ_{neu} ; a constant.) From a minimization of a potential given by the mass term, ultimately, we can obtain VEVs of mixons (mixing angles). For obtaining a realistic mixing matrix, one should choose \widehat{M}_{neu} suitably for the purpose.

Let us consider a possible experiment which can prove fluctuations of mixing angles are physical. If it is the case, then there should exist thermal excitations. Oscillation of a very strong and thermal beam of neutrinos would show an effect of such kind of thermal/collective excitations. (We wish to emphasize that our viewpoint argues that

neutrino oscillation experiments can find a key for understanding interactions in a flavor space of the neutrino/lepton sector.) Similarly, a very strong gravitational field (curvature of spacetime) can give a similar effect. Recently, a paper on a possible modification of neutrino oscillation by gravity from a context of CPT violation was published in literature [139].

Another interesting subject for the next step of our investigation is to construct theory of noncommutative harmonic superanalysis and its application to a (p)NG supermanifold, supersymmetry and Morse theory [98], generalizations/extensions of the MSSM and the SNJL (namely, a geometrical understanding of the MSSM/SNJL), so forth. The Kobayashi-Maskawa sector may take a (SUSY) NL σ M, and gauge symmetry for a flavor space may take $SU(N_F)$, it is global, cannot be given by a complete description of local gauge interactions because the symmetry should be broken explicitly. Thus, if we try to generate such a mass matrix, we need an NJL-type four fermion interaction like the top-condensation model. Explicit symmetry breaking parameters/matrices may determine the total structure and mixing character of a mass matrix as "boundary conditions" of it. In this approach, dynamics of the Kobayashi-Maskawa sector is similar to that of phason which has been studied in this paper. A mathematical definition of path integral should be done on a Finsler manifold [24]. Thus, measure of path-integration, symmetry of a system, and a definition for a (supersymmetric) NL σ M could be examined by Finsler geometry. This issue is related not only pseudo-NG (super)manifold, but also random matrix theory [172].

The dynamics of our model has some similarities with axion of the strong-CP problem of QCD [162,166]. In our model, the Majorana mass terms plays the role of an axion potential, and in fact the dynamics of our model is simpler than those of QCD (while, our model may have the domain wall problem [137]). We can add the following terms to a Lagrangian,

$$\delta\theta_\chi \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}, \quad \text{or} \quad \delta\Theta \frac{g^2}{16\pi^2} G_{\mu\nu} \tilde{G}_{\mu\nu}. \quad (229)$$

$\delta\theta_\chi = 0$ or $\delta\Theta = 0$ are chosen under the variation principle in our models, as discussed in Sec. II. The interaction given above will not modify equations of motion of the theory, while they may contribute to masses of fluctuating phases similar to the case of η' meson [159]. In the massless QCD, θ is not a physical degree of freedom, and the Peccei-Quinn type axion theory makes it as physical by combining the phase of the Dirac mass term of QCD [124,125]. We wish to emphasize that the model we have considered here spontaneously choose a CP-conserving vacuum. Our results they have been shown in this paper are an attempt for understanding majoron, phason, pion, axion and mixon under a simple/unified point of view.

The mass relations of neutrino sector may implies us toward both beyond the SM and beyond the BCS-NJL. In fact, both of them are based on the gauge principle and spontaneous/dynamical symmetry breakdown, namely an inconsistency between a local Ward-Takahashi-type relation and a global symmetry, and some parts of issues of the SM might not be explained by the gauge principle, while the (generalized) Nambu-Goldstone theorem is quite universal, seems to work well in a large part of model buildings in various energy scales, as shown in this paper. From our context, our speculation on "beyond the SM" is, a top-condensation-type gauged-(S)NJL with a set of explicit symmetry breaking (in very generic sense) parameters. (An example of "beyond the MSSM", see Ref. [35].) To find a physical solution for the issue "beyond the SM vs beyond the BCS-NJL", we wish to hope new experimental results, especially on lepton sector of the SM. The author also speculate that a deep mathematical understanding on electroweak symmetry breaking and flavor physics [168] gives the way toward a new physics (for example, a mathematical investigation of a top-condensation-type gauged-(S)NJL with explicit symmetry breaking parameters as an effective theory or its effective theory). Our results are generic, some parts of them are not restricted to neutrino seesaw phenomenology: For example, (S)GUT physics may also have similar phenomena coming from pseudo NG bosons, and it is an interesting subject for us for the next stage of our investigation: A cosmological criterion would restrict masses of pNG bosons/fermions of (S)GUT (breakings of gauge, flavor, SUSY, so on), and it may work to give us a key for constructing a (S)GUT. We cannot make a universe inside a laboratory, while only cosmology can answer the reason why our Universe chooses the SM from infinite number of possible theories. Hence, each universe might have its proper "SM". Therefore, ultimately, there is two ways toward "beyond the SM": beyond the SM inside, or outside our Universe. It is interesting for us which is correct way to study a physical law, and this is also related to a question "what is physics...".

APPENDIX A: THE HEUN EQUATION

Any Fuchsian type differential equation with four singular points can be converted into the Heun equation. The Heun equation with singular points $z = 0, 1, a, \infty$ is defined as follows:

$$\left\{ \frac{d^2}{dz^2} + \left(\frac{\gamma}{z} + \frac{\delta}{z-1} + \frac{\epsilon}{z-a} \right) \frac{d}{dz} + \frac{\alpha\beta z - q}{z(z-1)(z-a)} \right\} U(z) = 0. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The Fuchs relation

$$\epsilon = \alpha + \beta - \gamma - \delta + 1 \quad (\text{A2})$$

must be satisfied if the singular point $z = \infty$ is regular. q is called as accessory parameter. The exponents at $z = 0, 1, a, \infty$ are obtained as

$$(0, 1 - \gamma), \quad (0, 1 - \delta), \quad (0, 1 - \epsilon), \quad (\alpha, \beta), \quad (\text{A3})$$

respectively.

* Present address: Department of Physics, University of Texas at Austin, tadafumi@physics.utexas.edu

- ¹ A. Abada, A. Le Yaouanc, L. Oliver, O. Péne and J.-C. Raynel, *Dynamical Generation of Majorana Masses*, Phys. Rev. **D42**, 1699 (1990).
- ² R. Alkofer and L. von Smekal, *The Infrared Behaviour of QCD Green's Functions, Confinement, Dynamical Symmetry Breaking, and Hadrons as Relativistic Bound States*, Phys. Rep. **353**, 281 (2001), R. Alkofer, *QCD Green Functions and Their Application to Hadron Physics*, Braz. J. Phys. **37**, 144 (2007).
- ³ S. Antusch, J. Kersten, M. Lindner and M. Ratz, *Dynamical Electroweak Symmetry Breaking by a Neutrino Condensate*, Nucl. Phys. **B658**, 203 (2003).
- ⁴ S. Antusch, J. Kersten, M. Lindner and M. Ratz, *Running Neutrino Masses, Mixings and CP Phases: Analytical Results and Phenomenological Consequences*, Nucl. Phys. **B674**, 401 (2003).
- ⁵ S. Antusch and E. Fernandez-Martinez, *Signals of CPT Violation and Non-locality in Future Neutrino Oscillation Experiments*, Phys. Lett. **665**, 190 (2008).
- ⁶ T. Appelquist, K. Lane and U. Mahanta, *Ladder Approximation for Spontaneous Chiral-Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 1553 (1988).
- ⁷ F. T. Avignone III, S. R. Elliott and J. Engel, *Double Beta Decay, Majorana Neutrinos, and Neutrino Mass*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 481 (2008).
- ⁸ J. Bardeen, L. N. Cooper and J. R. Schrieffer, *Theory of Superconductivity*, Phys. Rev. **108**, 1175 (1957).
- ⁹ W. A. Bardeen, C. T. Hill and M. Lindner, *Minimal Dynamical Symmetry Breaking of the Standard Model*, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 1647 (1990).
- ¹⁰ A. Barducci, R. Casalbuoni, S. De Curtis, D. Dominici and R. Gatto, *Dynamical Chiral-Symmetry Breaking and Determination of the Quark Masses*, Phys. Rev. **D38**, 238 (1988).
- ¹¹ V. Barger, D. A. Dicus, H.-J. He and T. Li, *Structure of Cosmological CP-Violation via Neutrino Seesaw*, Phys. Lett. **B583**, 173 (2004).
- ¹² A neutrino decay model: V. Barger, J. G. Learned, S. Pakvasa and T. J. Weiler, *Neutrino Decay as an Explanation of Atmospheric Neutrino Observations*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 2640 (1999).
- ¹³ F. Bazzocchi, S. Bertolini, M. Fabbrichesi and M. Piai, *Fermion Masses and Mixings in the Little Flavon Model*, Phys. Rev. **D69**, 036002 (2004).
- ¹⁴ J. Bijnens, A. Bramon and F. Cornet, *Chiral Perturbation Theory for Anomalous Processes*, Z. Phys. **C46**, 599 (1990).
- ¹⁵ A. H. Blin, B. Hiller and M. Schaden, *Electromagnetic Form-Factors in the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model*, Z. Phys. **A331**, 75 (1988).
- ¹⁶ A. W. Brookfield, C. van der Bruck, D. F. Mota and D. Tocchini-Valentini, *Cosmology with Massive Neutrinos Coupled to Dark Energy*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 061301 (2006).
- ¹⁷ W. Buchmüller and S. T. Love, *Chiral Symmetry and Supersymmetry in the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model*, Nucl. Phys. **B204**, 213 (1982), W. Buchmüller and U. Ellwanger, *On the Structure of Composite Goldstone Supermultiplets*, Nucl. Phys. **B245**, 237 (1984).
- ¹⁸ N. Cabibbo, *Unitary Symmetry and Leptonic Decays*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 531 (1963).
- ¹⁹ G. Cantor, *Beiträge zur Begründung der transfiniten Mengenlehre*, (Erster und Zweiter), Mathematische Annalen **46**, 481 (1895), **49**, 207 (1897).
- ²⁰ M. Carena, T. E. Clark, C. E. M. Wagner, W. A. Bardeen and K. Sasaki, *Dynamical Symmetry Breaking and the top Quark Mass in the Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model*, Nucl. Phys. **B369**, 33 (1992).

- ²¹ M. S. Carena, J. R. Espinosa, M. Quirós and C. E. M. Wagner, *Analytic Expressions for Radiatively Corrected Higgs Masses and Couplings in the MSSM*, Phys. Lett. **B355**, 209 (1995).
- ²² M. S. Carena, M. Quirós and C. E. M. Wagner, *Effective Potential Methods and the Higgs Mass Spectrum in the MSSM*, Nucl. Phys. **B461**, 407 (1996).
- ²³ M.-C. Chen and K. T. Mahanthappa, *Fermion Masses and Mixing and CP-Violation in SO(10) Models with Family Symmetries*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A18**, 5819 (2003).
- ²⁴ S. S. Chern and Z. Shen, *Riemann-Finsler Geometry*, (World Scientific, 2005).
- ²⁵ Y. Chikashige, R. N. Mohapatra and R. D. Peccei, *Are There Real Goldstone Bosons Associated with Broken Lepton Number?*, Phys. Lett. **98B**, 265 (1981).
- ²⁶ T. E. Clark, S. T. Love and W. A. Bardeen, *The top Quark Mass in a Supersymmetric Standard Model with Dynamical Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Lett. **B237**, 235 (1990).
- ²⁷ S. Coleman, *Aspects of Symmetry*, (Cambridge University Press, 1985).
- ²⁸ S. Coleman and E. Weinberg, *Radiative Corrections as the Origin of Spontaneous Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 1888 (1973).
- ²⁹ J. M. Conrad, *Neutrino Experiments*, arXiv:0708.2446.
- ³⁰ G. Cvetič, *Top-quark Condensation*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **71**, 513 (1999).
- ³¹ R. F. Dashen, S.-k. Ma and R. Rajaraman, *Finite-Temperature Behavior of a Relativistic Field Theory with Dynamical Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 1499 (1975).
- ³² P. C. W. Davies, *Scalar Particle Production in Schwarzschild and Rindler Metrics*, J. Phys. **A8**, 609 (1975).
- ³³ B. De Witt, *Supermanifolds* (Cambridge University Press, 1992).
- ³⁴ A. Dhar and S. R. Wadia, *Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model, An Effective Lagrangian for Quantum Chromodynamics at Intermediate Length Scale*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 959 (1984), A. Dhar, R. Shankar and S. R. Wadia, *Nambu–Jona-Lasinio–type Effective Lagrangian: Anomalies and Nonlinear Lagrangian of Low-Energy, Large- N QCD*, Phys. Rev. **D31**, 3256 (1985).
- ³⁵ M. Dine, N. Seiberg and S. Thomas, *Higgs Physics as a Window beyond the MSSM*, Phys. Rev. **D76**, 095004 (2007).
- ³⁶ A. Dobado, L. Tabares-Cheluci and S. Penaranda, *Higgs Effective Potential in the Littlest Higgs Model at the One-Loop Level*, Phys. Rev. **D75**, 083527 (2007).
- ³⁷ D. Ebert, A. A. Belkov, A. V. Lanyov and A. Schaale, *Effective Chiral Lagrangians for Strong, Weak and Electromagnetic-Weak Interactions of Mesons from Quark Flavor Dynamics*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A8**, 1313 (1993).
- ³⁸ G. Ecker, *Chiral Perturbation Theory*, arXiv:hep-ph/9501357.
- ³⁹ S. Eidelman et al. (Particle Data Group), *Review of Particle Physics*, Phys. Lett. **B592**, 1 (2004).
- ⁴⁰ A. M. El Gradechi and L. M. Nieto, *Supercoherent States, SuperKähler Geometry and Geometric Quantization*, Commun. Math. Phys. **175**, 521 (1996).
- ⁴¹ C. S. Fischer, *Infrared Properties of QCD from Dyson-Schwinger Equations*, J. Phys. **G32**, R253 (2006).
- ⁴² D. H. Frampton, S. L. Glashow and T. Yanagida, *Cosmological Sign of Neutrino CP Violation*, Phys. Lett. **B548**, 119 (2002).
- ⁴³ C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, *Hierarchy of Quark Masses, Cabibbo Angles and CP Violation*, Nucl. Phys. **B147**, 277 (1979).
- ⁴⁴ K. Fujikawa and R. Shrock, *The Magnetic Moment of a Massive Neutrino and Neutrino Spin Rotation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 963 (1980).
- ⁴⁵ R. Fukuda and T. Kugo, *Schwinger-Dyson Equation for Massless Vector Theory and Absence of Fermion Pole*, Nucl. Phys. **B117**, 250 (1976).
- ⁴⁶ R. Fukuda and T. Kugo, *Dynamical Theory of the Yang-Mills Field.I*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **60**, 565 (1978). This work contains an analytic solution of a matrix Schwinger-Dyson equation, and all of the essential part of the framework of SD formalism are explained.
- ⁴⁷ S. A. Fulling, *Nonuniqueness of Canonical Field Quantization in Riemannian Space-Time*, Phys. Rev. **D7**, 2850 (1973).
- ⁴⁸ Y. V. Fyodorov, Y. Wei and M. R. Zirnbauer, *Hyperbolic Hubbard-Stratonovich Transformation made Rigorous*, J. Math. Phys. **49**, 053507 (2008).
- ⁴⁹ C. F. Gauss, *Gauss Werke*, dritter Band, Herausgegeben von der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (1866), B. Riemann, *Beiträge zur Theorie der durch die Gauss'sche Reihe $F(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, x)$ darstellbaren Functionen*, Abhandlungen der Königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen (1857).
- ⁵⁰ H. Georgi and A. Pais, *Vacuum Symmetry and the Pseudo-Goldstone Phenomenon*, Phys. Rev. **D12**, 508 (1975).
- ⁵¹ J. Gasser and H. Leutwyler, *Chiral Perturbation Theory to One Loop*, Ann. Phys. **158**, 142 (1984).
- ⁵² M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, *Complex Spinors and Unified Theories*, in *Supergravity* (P. Niuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman. eds.), (North-Holland, Amsterdam (1979)), p.315.
- ⁵³ M. Gomes, T. Mariz, J. R. Nascimento and A. J. da Silva, *Dynamical Lorentz and CPT Symmetry Breaking in a 4D Four-fermion Model*, Phys. Rev. **D77**, 105002 (2008).
- ⁵⁴ M. C. Gonzalez-Garciz and M. Maltoni, *Phenomenology with Massive Neutrinos*, Phys. Rep. **460**, 1 (2008).
- ⁵⁵ M. B. Green, J. H. Schwarz and E. Witten, *Superstring Theory: 1 and 2*, (Cambridge University Press, 1987).
- ⁵⁶ W. Grimus, *Neutrino Physics – Theory*, arXiv:hep-ph/0307149.
- ⁵⁷ C. Hagmann, H. Murayama, G. G. Raffelt, L. J. Rosenberg and K. van Bibber, *Axions*, Phys. Lett. **B667**, 1 (2008). (available at Particle Data Group website.)
- ⁵⁸ S. W. Hawking, *Particle Creation by Black Holes*, Commun. Math. Phys. **43**, 199 (1975).
- ⁵⁹ A. Heger, A. Friedland, M. Giannotti and V. Cirigliano, *The Impact of Neutrino Magnetic Moments on the Evolution of Massive Stars*, arXiv:0809.4703.

- ⁶⁰ K. Heun, *Zur Theorie der Riemann'schen Functionen zweiter Ordnung mit vier Verzweigungspunkten*, Mathematische Annalen, **33**, 161 (1899).
- ⁶¹ K. Higashijima, *Solutions of the Spinor-Spinor Bethe-Salpeter Equation in the Scalar-Vector Sector*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **55**, 1591 (1976).
- ⁶² K. Higashijima, *Theory of Dynamical Symmetry Breaking*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **104**, 1 (1991).
- ⁶³ C. T. Hill, M. A. Luty and E. A. Paschos, *Electroweak Symmetry Breaking by Fourth-Generation Condensates and the Neutrino Spectrum*, Phys. Rev. **D43**, 3011 (1991).
- ⁶⁴ C. T. Hill and E. H. Simmons, *Strong Dynamics and Electroweak Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Rep. **381**, 235 (2003).
- ⁶⁵ C. T. Hill, I. Mocioiu, E. A. Paschos and U. Sarkar, *Neutrino Phenomenology, Dark Energy and Leptogenesis from Pseudo-Nambu-Goldstone Bosons*, Phys. Lett. **B651**, 188 (2007).
- ⁶⁶ A review mainly on (s)quarks of SUSY models: T. Ibrahim and P. Nath, *CP Violation from the Standard Model to Strings*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **80**, 577 (2008).
- ⁶⁷ Y. Imayoshi and M. Taniguchi, *An Introduction to Teichmüller Spaces* (Springer Verlag, Berlin und Heidelberg (1992)).
- ⁶⁸ G. Jungman, M. Kamionkowski and K. Griest, *Supersymmetric Dark Matter*, Phys. Rep. **267**, 195 (1996).
- ⁶⁹ V. G. Kac, *Lie Superalgebras*, Adv. Math. **26**, 8 (1977), *A Sketch of Lie Superalgebra Theory*, Commun. Math. Phys. **53**, 31 (1977).
- ⁷⁰ D. Kahana and U. Vogl, *Diquark Bosonization of the Nambu Model*, Phys. Lett. **B244**, 10 (1990).
- ⁷¹ Y. Kahn, M. Schmitt and T. M. P. Tait, *Enhanced Rare Pion Decays from a Model of MeV Dark Matter*, arXiv:0712.0007.
- ⁷² KamLAND Collaboration, K. Eguchi et al., *First Results from KamLAND: Evidence for Reactor Antineutrino Disappearance*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 021802 (2003), KamLAND Collaboration, I. Shimizu et al., *KamLAND (Anti-Neutrino Status)*, J. Phys. Conference Series **120**, 052022 (2008).
- ⁷³ D. B. Kaplan, A. E. Nelson and N. Weiner, *Neutrino Oscillations as a Probe of Dark Energy*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 091801 (2004).
- ⁷⁴ O. Kaymakcalan and J. Schechter, *Chiral Lagrangian of Pseudoscalars and Vectors*, Phys. Rev. **D31**, 1109 (1985).
- ⁷⁵ J. E. Kim and G. Carosi, *Axions and the Strong CP Problem*, arXiv:0807.3125.
- ⁷⁶ S. F. King, *Neutrino Mass Models: a road map*, arXiv:0810.0492.
- ⁷⁷ S. F. King and S. H. Mannan, *The Top Quark Condensate*, Phys. Lett. **B241**, 249 (1990).
- ⁷⁸ S. P. Klevansky, *The Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model of Quantum Chromodynamics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **64**, 649 (1992).
- ⁷⁹ M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, *CP-Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **49**, 652 (1973).
- ⁸⁰ T. Kobayashi and T. Oshima, *Lie Groups and Representations*, (Iwanami, Tokyo, 2005).
- ⁸¹ J. B. Kogut, M. A. Stephanov, D. Toublan, J. J. M. Verbaarschot and A. Zhitnitsky, *QCD-like Theories at Finite Baryon Density*, Nucl. Phys. **B582**, 477 (2000).
- ⁸² The recent overviews of CPT violation, *CPT and Lorentz Symmetry II*, edited by V. A. Kostelecky (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).
- ⁸³ V. A. Kostelecky and R. Potting, *CPT and Strings*, Nucl. Phys. **B359**, 545 (1991), V. A. Kostelecky and R. Potting, *CPT, Strings, and Meson Factories*, Phys. Rev. **D51**, 3923 (1995), D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecky, *CPT Violation and the Standard Model*, Phys. Rev. **D55**, 6760 (1997), V. A. Kostelecky and M. Mewes, *Lorentz and CPT Violation in Neutrino Sector*, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 031902 (2004).
- ⁸⁴ T. Kugo and I. Ojima, *Local Covariant Operator Formalism of Nonabelian Gauge Theories and Quark Confinement Problem*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **66**, 1 (1979).
- ⁸⁵ T. Kugo, *Basic Concepts in Dynamical Symmetry Breaking and Bound State Problems*, Preprint KUNS-1086, Jul 1991, (available at Slac Spires).
- ⁸⁶ M. Lattanzi, *Decaying Majoron Dark Matter and Neutrino Masses*, arXiv:0802.3155.
- ⁸⁷ B. Lautrup, Kgl. Danske Videnskab. Selskab. Mat.-fys. Medd. **35**, No.11, 1 (1967).
- ⁸⁸ B. W. Lee, S. Pakvasa, R. E. Shrock and H. Sugawara, *Muon and Electron Number Nonconservation in a V – A Gauge Model*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **38**, 937 (1977), B. W. Lee and R. E. Shrock, *Natural Suppression of Symmetry Violation in Gauge Theories: Muon- and Electron-Lepton-Number Nonconservation*, Phys. Rev. **D16**, 1444 (1977).
- ⁸⁹ R. S. Maier, *The 192 Solutions of the Heun Equation*, Math. Comp. **76**, 811 (2007).
- ⁹⁰ Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, *Remarks on the Unified Model of Elementary Particles*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **28**, 870 (1962).
- ⁹¹ S. Mandelstam, *Soliton Operators for the Quantized Sine-Gordon Equation*, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 3026 (1975).
- ⁹² W. J. Marciano, *Heavy Top-Quark Mass Predictions*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 2793 (1989), *Dynamical Symmetry Breaking and the Top Quark Mass*, Phys. Rev. **D41**, 219 (1990).
- ⁹³ P. Maris and C. D. Roberts, *π - and K -Meson Bethe-Salpeter Amplitudes*, Phys. Rev. **C56**, 3369 (1997).
- ⁹⁴ P. Maris and C. D. Roberts, *Dyson-Schwinger Equations: A Tool for Hadron Physics*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **E12**, 297 (2003).
- ⁹⁵ I. Marshall and M. Semenov-Tian-Shansky, *Poisson Groups and Differential Galois Theory of Schrödinger Equation on the Circle*, arXiv: math:0710.5456.
- ⁹⁶ S. P. Martin, *Dynamical Electroweak Symmetry Breaking with top-Quark and Neutrino Condensates*, Phys. Rev. **D44**, 2892 (1991).
- ⁹⁷ T. Maskawa and H. Nakajima, *Spontaneous Breaking of Chiral Symmetry in a Vector-Gluon Model*, Prog. Theor. Phys. **52**, 1326 (1974).
- ⁹⁸ J. Milnor, *Morse Theory* (Ann. of Math. Studies, no.51. Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1963).
- ⁹⁹ The first paper of the neutrino seesaw mechanism: P. Minkowski, *$\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$ at a Rate of One Out of 1-Billion Muon*

- Decays?*, Phys. Lett. **B67**, 421 (1977).
- ¹⁰⁰ V. A. Miransky, M. Tanabashi and K. Yamawaki, *Dynamical Electroweak Symmetry Breaking with Large Anomalous Dimension and t Quark Condensate*, Phys. Lett. **B221**, 177 (1989).
- ¹⁰¹ V. A. Miransky, *Dynamical Symmetry Breaking in Quantum Field Theories*, (World Scientific, Singapore, 1993).
- ¹⁰² The first attempt toward supersymmetry (super-algebra): H. Miyazawa, *Spinor Currents and Symmetries of Baryons and Mesons*, Phys. Rev. **170**, 1586 (1968).
- ¹⁰³ R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanović, *Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Violation*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 912 (1980).
- ¹⁰⁴ R. N. Mohapatra et al., *Theory of Neutrinos: A White Paper*, hep-ph/0510213.
- ¹⁰⁵ T. Moriya, *Spin Fluctuations in Itinerant Electron Magnetism* (Springer, Berlin-Heidelberg-New York, 1985).
- ¹⁰⁶ M. Nakahara, *Geometry, Topology and Physics* (IOP Publishing, 1990).
- ¹⁰⁷ N. Nakanishi, Prog. Theor. Phys. **35**, 1111 (1966), **49**, 640 (1973), **52**, 1929 (1974).
- ¹⁰⁸ Y. Nambu, *Quasi-particles and Gauge Invariance in the Theory of Superconductivity*, Phys. Rev. **117**, 648 (1960).
- ¹⁰⁹ Y. Nambu and G. Jona-Lasinio, *Dynamical Model of Elementary Particles Based on an Analogy with Superconductivity. I*, Phys. Rev. **122**, 345 (1961), *Dynamical Model of Elementary Particles Based on an Analogy with Superconductivity. II*, Phys. Rev. **124**, 246 (1961).
- ¹¹⁰ Y. Nambu, in *New Theories in Physics*, proceedings of the XI International Symposium on Elementary Particle Physics, Kazimierz, Poland, 1988, edited by Z. Ajduk, S. Pokorski, and A. Trautman (World Scientific, Singapore, 1989).
- ¹¹¹ S. P. Novikov, S. V. Manakov, L. B. Pitaevskii and V. E. Zakharov, *Theory of Solitons. The Inverse Scattering Method*, (Plenum Press, New York, 1984).
- ¹¹² H. Nunokawa, S. Parke and José W. F. Valle, *CP Violation and Neutrino Oscillations*, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **60**, 338 (2008).
- ¹¹³ S. Nussinov and R. Shrock, *On the π and K as $q\bar{q}$ Bound States and Approximate Nambu-Goldstone Bosons*, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 016005 (2009).
- ¹¹⁴ T. Ohsaku, *BCS and Generalized BCS Superconductivity in Relativistic Quantum Field Theory: Formulation*, Phys. Rev. **B65**, 024512 (2002).
- ¹¹⁵ T. Ohsaku, *BCS and Generalized BCS Superconductivity in Relativistic Quantum Field Theory. II. Numerical Calculations*, Phys. Rev. **B66**, 054518 (2002).
- ¹¹⁶ T. Ohsaku, *Dynamical Chiral Symmetry Breaking and its Restoration for an Accelerated Observer*, Phys. Lett. **B599**, 102 (2004).
- ¹¹⁷ T. Ohsaku, *Dynamical Chiral Symmetry Breaking and Superconductivity in the Supersymmetric Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model at finite Temperature and Density*, Phys. Lett. **B634**, 285 (2006).
- ¹¹⁸ T. Ohsaku, *Dynamical Chiral Symmetry Breaking, Color Superconductivity, and Bose-Einstein Condensation in an $SU(N_c) \times U(N_f)_L \times U(N_f)_R$ -invariant Supersymmetric Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model at finite Temperature and Density*, Nucl. Phys. **B803**, 299 (2008).
- ¹¹⁹ T. Ohsaku, *Dynamical Dirac Mass Generation in the Supersymmetric Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model with the Seesaw Mechanism of Neutrinos*, arXiv:0801:1256, submitted for publication.
- ¹²⁰ H. Pagels, *Dynamical Chiral Symmetry Breaking in Quantum Chromodynamics*, Phys. Rev. **D19**, 3080 (1979), *Models of Dynamically Broken Gauge Theories*, Phys. Rev. **D21**, 2336 (1980).
- ¹²¹ S. Parke, *CP Violation in the Neutrino Sector*, arXiv:0807.3311.
- ¹²² W. Pauli, Nuovo Cim. **6**, 204 (1957), G. Gürsey, Nuovo Cim. **7**, 411 (1958).
- ¹²³ A. Payez, J. R. Cudell and D. Hutsemékers, *Axions and Polarisation of Quasars*, CP1038, Hadronic Physics, Joint Meeting Heidelberg-Liège-Paris-Wroclaw (HLPW 2008).
- ¹²⁴ R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, *Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Pseudoparticles*, Phys. Rev. **D16**, 1791 (1977).
- ¹²⁵ R. D. Peccei, *The Strong CP Problem and Axions*, Lect. Notes Phys. **741**, 3 (2008).
- ¹²⁶ M. Perelstein, *Little Higgs Models and Their Phenomenology*, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **58**, 247 (2007).
- ¹²⁷ R. D. Pisarsky, T. L. Trueman and M. H. G. Tytgat, *How $\pi^0 \rightarrow \gamma\gamma$ Changes with Temperature*, Phys. Rev. **D56**, 7077 (1997).
- ¹²⁸ H. D. Politzer, *Effective Quark Masses in the Chiral Limit*, Nucl. Phys. **B117**, 397 (1976).
- ¹²⁹ B. Pontecorvo, *Mesonium and Anti-Mesonium*, Sov. Phys. JETP **6**, 429 (1957), B. Pontecorvo, *Neutrino Experiments and the Problem of Conservation of Leptonic Charge*, Sov. Phys. JETP **26**, 984 (1968), S. M. Bilensky and B. Pontecorvo, *Lepton Mixing and Neutrino Oscillations*, Phys. Rep. **41**, 225 (1978).
- ¹³⁰ J. Polchinski, *String Theory, I and II*, (Cambridge University Press, 1998).
- ¹³¹ G. Raffelt and L. Stodolsky, *Mixing of the Photon with Low-mass Particles*, Phys. Rev. **D37**, 1237 (1988).
- ¹³² R. Rajaraman, *Solitons and Instantons*, (North-Holland, 1982).
- ¹³³ C. D. Roberts and A. G. Williams, *Dyson-Schwinger Equations and Their Applications to Hadron Physics*, hep-ph/9403224, C. D. Roberts and S. M. Schmidt, *Dyson-Schwinger Equations: Density, Temperature and Continuum Strong QCD*, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, S1 (2000).
- ¹³⁴ W. Rodejohann, *Type II Seesaw Mechanism, Deviations from Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing, and Leptogenesis*, Phys. Rev. **D70**, 073010 (2004).
- ¹³⁵ A. Rogers, *Super Lie Groups: Global Topology and Local Structure*, J. Math. Phys. **22**, 939 (1981).
- ¹³⁶ H. Sato, *Cosmology* (Iwanami, Tokyo, 1997).
- ¹³⁷ P. Sikivie, *Axion Cosmology*, arXiv:astro-ph/0610440.
- ¹³⁸ P. Sikivie and Q. Yang, *Bose-Einstein Condensation of Dark Matter Axions*, arXiv:0901.1106.

- ¹³⁹ M. Sinha and B. Mukhopadhyay, *CPT and Lepton Number Violation in the Neutrino Sector: Modified Mass Matrix and Oscillation due to Gravity*, Phys. Rev. **77**, 025003 (2008).
- ¹⁴⁰ A. Studenikin, *Neutrino Magnetic Moment: A Window to New Physics*, arXiv:0812.4716.
- ¹⁴¹ H. Sugawara, *Dynamical Calculation of Quark, Lepton, and Gauge-Boson Masses*, Phys. Rev. **D30**, 2396 (1984).
- ¹⁴² SuperKamiokande Collaboration, Y. Fukuda et al., *Evidence for Oscillation of Atmospheric Neutrinos*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 1562 (1998).
- ¹⁴³ SuperKamiokande Collaboration, D. W. Liu et al., *Limits on the Neutrino Magnetic Moment using Super-Kamiokande Solar Neutrino Data*, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A20**, 3110 (2005).
- ¹⁴⁴ Supernova Search Team, *Observational Evidence from Supernovae for an Accelerating Universe and a Cosmological Constant*, Astron. J. **116**, 1009 (1998).
- ¹⁴⁵ S. Takagi, *Vacuum Noise and Stress Induced by Uniform Acceleration*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **88**, 1 (1986).
- ¹⁴⁶ T. Takeuchi, *Analytical and Numerical Study of the Schwinger-Dyson Equation with Four-fermion Coupling*, Phys. Rev. **D40**, 2697 (1989).
- ¹⁴⁷ K. Terasawa, *Mathematics for Natural Scientists (Revised and Expanded Version)*, (Iwanami, Tokyo, 1983).
- ¹⁴⁸ H. Terazawa, Y. Chikashige and K. Akama, *Unified Model of the Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Type for all Elementary-Particle Forces*, Phys. Rev. **D15**, 480 (1977), H. Terazawa, *t-Quark Mass Predicted from a Sum Rule for Lepton and Quark Masses*, Phys. Rev. **D22**, 2921 (1980).
- ¹⁴⁹ G. 't Hooft, *Dimensional Regularization and the Renormalization Group*, Nucl. Phys. **B61**, 455 (1973).
- ¹⁵⁰ W. G. Unruh, *Notes on Black Hole Evaporation*, Phys. Rev. **D14**, 870 (1976).
- ¹⁵¹ R. Utiyama, *Invariant Theoretical Interpretation of Interaction*, Phys. Rev. **101**, 1597 (1956).
- ¹⁵² C. Vafa and E. Witten, *Parity Conservation in Quantum Chromodynamics*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 535 (1984).
- ¹⁵³ C. Valenzuela, *Spontaneous CP Symmetry Breaking at the Electroweak Scale*, Phys. Rev. **D71**, 095014 (2005).
- ¹⁵⁴ P. Vogel and A. Piepke, *Neutrinoless Double- β Decay*, Particle Data Group, 2008.
- ¹⁵⁵ E. J. Weinberg and A.-q. Wu, *Understanding Complex Perturbative Effective Potentials*, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 2474 (1987).
- ¹⁵⁶ S. Weinberg, *A Model of Leptons*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **19**, 1264 (1967).
- ¹⁵⁷ S. Weinberg, *Approximate Symmetries and Pseudo-Goldstone Bosons*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **29**, 1698 (1972).
- ¹⁵⁸ S. Weinberg, *New Approach to the Renormalization Group*, Phys. Rev. **D8**, 3497 (1973).
- ¹⁵⁹ S. Weinberg, *The U(1) Problem*, Phys. Rev. **D11**, 3583 (1975).
- ¹⁶⁰ S. Weinberg, *Gauge Theory of CP Nonconservation* Phys. Rev. Lett. **37**, 657 (1976).
- ¹⁶¹ S. Weinberg, *Implications of Dynamical Symmetry Breaking*, Phys. Rev. **D13**, 974 (1976), *Implications of Dynamical Symmetry Breaking: An Addendum*, Phys. Rev. **D19**, 1277 (1979).
- ¹⁶² S. Weinberg, *A New Light Boson?*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 223 (1978).
- ¹⁶³ S. Weinberg, *Phenomenological Lagrangians*, Physica **96**, 327 (1979).
- ¹⁶⁴ C. Weiss, A. Buck, R. Alkofer and H. Reinhardt, *Diquark Electromagnetic Form-Factors in a Nambu–Jona-Lasinio Model*, Phys. Lett. **B312**, 6 (1993).
- ¹⁶⁵ J. Wess and J. Bagger, *Supersymmetry and Supergravity*, (Princeton Univ. Press, 1992).
- ¹⁶⁶ F. Wilczek, *Problem of Strong P and T Invariance in the Presence of Instantons* Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 279 (1978).
- ¹⁶⁷ E. Witten, *Supersymmetry and Morse Theory*, J. Diff. Geom. **17**, 661 (1982).
- ¹⁶⁸ E. Witten, *From Superconductors and Four-Manifolds to Weak Interactions*, Bul. Am. Math. Soc. **44**, 361 (2007).
- ¹⁶⁹ K. Yamawaki, *Top Quark Condensate Revisited*, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **123**, 19 (1996).
- ¹⁷⁰ T. Yanagida, in Proceedings of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe (O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto, eds.) (KEK, Tsukuba, Japan (1979)), p.95.
- ¹⁷¹ C.-N. Yang and R. L. Mills, *Conservation of Isotopic Spin and Isotopic Gauge Invariance*, Phys. Rev. **96**, 191 (1954).
- ¹⁷² M. R. Zirnbauer, *Symmetry Classes in Random Matrix Theory*, arXiv:math-ph/0404058.
- ¹⁷³ V. E. Zakharov, L. A. Takhtajan and L. D. Faddeev, *Complete Description of Solutions of the "Sine-Gordon" Equation*, Doklady AN SSSR, **219**, 1334 (1973).