

$\Delta(27)$ flavor singlet-triplet Higgs model for fermion masses and mixings.A. E. Cárcamo Hernández^{a,*}, Juan Carlos Gómez-Izquierdo^{b,c,d,†}, Sergey Kovalenko^{a,‡} and Myriam Mondragón^{c,§}^a*Universidad Técnica Federico Santa María
and Centro Científico-Tecnológico de Valparaíso
Casilla 110-V, Valparaíso, Chile,*^b*Departamento de Física,
Centro de Investigación y de Estudios Avanzados del I. P. N.,
Apdo. Post. 14-740, 07000,
Ciudad de México, México,*^c*Departamento de Física Teórica, Instituto de Física,
Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México
A.P. 20-364 01000, México D.F,*^d*Centro de Estudios Científicos y Tecnológicos No 16,
Instituto Politécnico Nacional,
Pachuca: Ciudad del Conocimiento y la Cultura,
Carretera Pachuca Actopan km 1+500,
San Agustín Tlaxiaca, Hidalgo, México.*

(Dated: November 10, 2021)

We propose a multiscalar singlet extension of the singlet-triplet Higgs model capable of explaining the SM fermion mass spectrum and mixing parameters. Our model is based on the $\Delta(27)$ family symmetry, supplemented by cyclic symmetries, which are spontaneously broken thus yielding the observed hierarchy of the SM charged fermion masses and quark mixing angles. The masses of the light active neutrinos are produced by type-II seesaw mechanism mediated by the neutral component of the $SU(2)_L$ scalar triplet. The model symmetries lead to the extended Gatto-Sartori-Tonin relations between the quark masses and mixing angles.

I. INTRODUCTION

Despite its great experimental success, the Standard Model (SM) does not answer several fundamental questions such as, for instance, the number of fermion families and the observed pattern of fermion masses and mixing angles. While the quark mixing angles are very small, thus implying a quark mixing matrix close to the identity matrix, two of the leptonic mixing angles are large, and one is small, i.e., of the order of the Cabibbo angle, indicating that the leptonic mixing matrix is significantly different from the identity matrix. This aforementioned experimental fact suggests a different kind of New Physics in the neutrino sector in comparison with the quark sector. The Daya Bay [3], T2K [4], MINOS [5], Double CHOOZ [6] and RENO [7] neutrino oscillation experiments, have brought clear evidence that at least two of the light active neutrinos have non-vanishing masses. These experiments have provided important constraints on the neutrino mass squared splittings and leptonic mixing parameters [8]. On the other hand, the SM does is unable to explain the large hierarchy of fermion masses, which is extended over a range of about thirteen orders of magnitude, from the neutrino mass scale up to the top quark mass. This, the so-called “flavor puzzle” which is left without an explanation by the SM, motivates the introduction of various SM extensions with larger scalar and/or fermion sectors with extended gauge group and discrete flavour symmetries in order to get viable and predictive fermion mass matrix textures that explain the SM fermion mass spectrum and fermionic mixing parameters. Using discrete family symmetries in several theories corresponding to extensions of the Standard Model allow to successfully explain the observed pattern of charged fermion masses and mixing angles (recent reviews on discrete flavor groups are provided in Refs. [9–14]). In this line of thought, several discrete groups have been employed in those extensions of the SM, such as S_3 [15–47], A_4 [48–80], S_4 [81–95], D_4 [96–104], Q_6 [105–115], T_7 [116–125], T_{13} [126–129], T' [130–145], $\Delta(27)$ [147–166, 169–173], $\Delta(54)$ [174], $\Delta(96)$ [175–177], $\Delta(6N^2)$ [178–180], $\Sigma(26 \times 3)$ [181], $\Sigma(72 \times 3)$ [182] and A_5 [183–193].

*Electronic address: antonio.carcamo@usm.cl

†Electronic address: jcgizquierdo1979@gmail.com

‡Electronic address: sergey.kovalenko@usm.cl

§Electronic address: myriam@fisica.unam.mx

An extra motivation to use discrete flavor symmetries is that these can arise from the underlying theory, e. g., string theory or compactification via orbifolding. In particular, from the heterotic orbifold models one can generate the D_4 and $\Delta(54)$ flavor symmetries [194–198]. Furthermore, magnetized/intersecting D-brane models can generate the $\Delta(27)$ flavor symmetry [194–198].

In this paper we propose a predictive multiscalar singlet extension of the singlet-triplet Higgs model, capable of explaining the current SM fermion mass spectrum and fermionic mixing parameters. In our model we use $\Delta(27)$ family symmetry supplemented by other auxiliary cyclic symmetries, whose spontaneous breaking at very large energy scale, produces predictive and viable textures for the fermion sector, which in a natural benchmark scenario with just two free quark sector parameters, allows to reasonably reproduce the experimental values of the ten physical observables of the quark sector. The model symmetries yield extended Gatto-Sartori-Tonin relations between the quark masses and mixing angles consistent with the low energy quark flavor data. In our model the masses of the light active neutrinos are generated from a type-II seesaw mechanism mediated by the neutral component of the $SU(2)_L$ scalar triplet. The experimental values for the physical observables of the lepton sector are also successfully reproduced for both normal and inverted neutrino mass hierarchy. We use the $\Delta(27)$ discrete group, since it is the smallest non trivial group of the type $\Delta(3n^2)$ and is isomorphic to the semi-direct product group $(Z'_3 \times Z''_3) \rtimes Z_3$.

The layout of the remainder of the paper is as follows. In section II we describe the model-setup. In section III we present the implications of our model for the quark sector observables. Section IV discusses the masses and mixings in the lepton sector. Our conclusions are provided in section V. A concise description of the $\Delta(27)$ discrete group is presented in Appendix A.

II. THE MODEL

We propose an extension of the singlet-triplet Higgs model where the full symmetry \mathcal{G} features the following spontaneous symmetry breaking chain:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{G} &= SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times \Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24} \\
 &\quad \Downarrow \Lambda_{int} \\
 &SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \\
 &\quad \Downarrow v \\
 &SU(3)_C \times U(1)_Q
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where the scale of spontaneous breaking of the $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$ discrete group, namely Λ_{int} is assumed to be much larger than the Fermi scale, thus implying the hierarchy $\Lambda_{int} \gg v$, where $v = 246$ GeV.

The fermion assignments under the group $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$ are:

$$\begin{aligned}
 q_{1L} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_2, e^{-\frac{3i\pi}{8}}, 1), & q_{2L} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_2, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{4}}, 1), & q_{3L} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, 1, 1), \\
 u_{1R} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, e^{\frac{5i\pi}{8}}, 1), & u_{2R} &\sim (\mathbf{11}_1, e^{\frac{i\pi}{4}}, 1), & u_{3R} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, 1, 1), \\
 d_{1R} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_1, e^{\frac{5i\pi}{8}}, 1), & d_{2R} &\sim (\mathbf{12}_0, e^{\frac{3i\pi}{8}}, e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}}), & d_{3R} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, e^{\frac{3i\pi}{8}}, -1), \\
 l_L &\sim (\mathbf{3}, 1, 1), & l_{1R} &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, e^{\frac{7i\pi}{8}}, ie^{-\frac{7i\pi}{3}}), & l_{2R} &\sim (\mathbf{11}_0, e^{\frac{4i\pi}{8}}, e^{-\frac{4i\pi}{3}}) \\
 l_{3R} &\sim (\mathbf{12}_0, e^{\frac{i\pi}{8}}, -ie^{-\frac{i\pi}{3}}).
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

The scalar sector of the model is composed of an SM Higgs doublet ϕ , an $SU(2)$ scalar triplet Δ with lepton number equal to -2 and hypercharge equal to 1 and eighteen scalar SM singlets, i.e, $S, \sigma, \rho, \eta, \tau, \chi_1, \chi_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2, \xi_i, \zeta_i, \Phi_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). Of these fifteen only S has a non-vanishing lepton number, which is set to 2 , to allow the quartic scalar interaction $S\phi^\dagger\Delta\phi$. Then the S is required to have vanishing hypercharge. The $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$ assignments for

	q_{1L}	q_{2L}	q_{3L}	u_{1R}	u_{2R}	u_{3R}	d_{1R}	d_{2R}	d_{3R}	l_L	l_{1R}	l_{2R}	l_{3R}
$\Delta(27)$	$\mathbf{10}_2$	$\mathbf{10}_2$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{12}_2$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{10}_1$	$\mathbf{12}_0$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{3}$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{11}_0$	$\mathbf{12}_0$
Z_{16}	$e^{-\frac{3i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{4}}$	1	$e^{\frac{5i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{4}}$	1	$e^{\frac{5i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{\frac{3i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{\frac{3i\pi}{8}}$	1	$e^{\frac{7i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{\frac{4i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{\frac{i\pi}{8}}$
Z_{24}	1	1	1	1	-1	1	1	$e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}}$	-1	1	$ie^{-\frac{7i\pi}{3}}$	$e^{-\frac{4i\pi}{3}}$	$-ie^{-\frac{i\pi}{3}}$

Table I: Fermion assignments under $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$.

	ϕ	Δ	σ	ρ	η	τ	χ_1	χ_2	ξ	ζ	Φ	φ_1	φ_2
$\Delta(27)$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{10}_1$	$\mathbf{12}_1$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{11}_0$	$\mathbf{11}_0$	$\mathbf{11}_1$	$\mathbf{3}$	$\mathbf{3}$	$\mathbf{3}$	$\mathbf{10}_0$	$\mathbf{12}_0$
Z_{16}	1	1	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}$	1	-1	-1	1	-1
Z_{24}	1	1	1	1	$e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}}$	$i^{\frac{1}{2}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{12}}$	$e^{-\frac{i\pi}{12}}$	1	$e^{-\frac{2i\pi}{3}}$	$e^{-\frac{2i\pi}{3}}$	-i	$i^{\frac{1}{2}}$

Table II: Scalar assignments under $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$.

the scalar sector are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\phi &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, 1, 1), & S &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, 1, 1), & \sigma &\sim (\mathbf{10}_1, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}, 1), & \rho &\sim (\mathbf{12}_1, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}, 1), \\
\eta &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}, e^{\frac{i\pi}{3}}), & \tau &\sim (\mathbf{11}_0, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}, i^{\frac{1}{2}}), & \chi_1 &\sim (\mathbf{11}_0, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{12}}) \\
\chi_2 &\sim (\mathbf{11}_1, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{8}}, e^{-\frac{i\pi}{12}}), & \xi &\sim (\mathbf{3}, 1, 1), & \zeta &\sim (\mathbf{3}, -1, e^{-\frac{2i\pi}{3}}), & \Delta &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, 1, 1), \\
\varphi_1 &\sim (\mathbf{10}_0, 1, -i), & \varphi_2 &\sim (\mathbf{12}_0, -1, i^{\frac{1}{2}})
\end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

We decompose the scalar fields around their VEVs as

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \pi^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(v + \phi^0 + i\pi^0) \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Delta = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\Delta^+}{\sqrt{2}} & \Delta^{++} \\ v_\Delta + \Delta_1^0 + i\Delta_2^0 & -\frac{\Delta^+}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad S = v_S + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(S_R + iS_I). \tag{4}$$

Since all singlet scalars acquire vacuum expectation values (VEVs) at a scale much larger than the electroweak symmetry breaking scale, they are very heavy and thus the mixing angles of these scalar singlets with the scalar fields ϕ , Δ and S are very suppressed by ratio of their VEVs, which is a consequence of the method of recursive expansion proposed in Ref. [202]. Consequently, we can neglect the mixing angles between these scalar fields, and at energies scales $\lesssim \mathcal{O}(1)$ TeV, it is enough to consider the low energy scalar potential of the model, studied in detail in Ref. [203], where it was demonstrated that the Majoron η_I resulting from the spontaneous breaking of the lepton number symmetry is given by the following linear combination

$$\eta_I = \frac{v_S (v^2 + 4v_\Delta^2) S_I + 2v_\Delta^2 v\pi^0 - v^2 v_\Delta \Delta_2^0}{\sqrt{v_S^2 (v^2 + 4v_\Delta^2)^2 + 4v^2 v_\Delta^4 + v^4 v_\Delta^2}} \tag{5}$$

In order to be consistent with the invisible Z -decay and the precision electroweak measurements one requires $v_\Delta \ll v_S$ and $v_\Delta \ll v = 246$ GeV, respectively. We note that without S our model at low energies would reduce to the triplet Majoron model [204], ruled out by the invisible Z -decay data.

We assume the following VEV pattern for the $\Delta(27)$ triplet SM singlet scalars ξ , ζ and Φ :

$$\langle \xi \rangle = \frac{v_\xi}{\sqrt{3}}(1, 1, 1), \quad \langle \zeta \rangle = \frac{v_\zeta}{\sqrt{2}}(1, 0, 1), \quad \langle \Phi \rangle = v_\Phi(0, 1, 0), \tag{6}$$

which is a natural solution of the scalar potential minimization equations for the whole region of parameter space, as shown in detail in Refs. [167, 168]

With the above particle content, the following Yukawa terms arise:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L}_Y = & y_{33}^{(U)} \bar{q}_{3L} \tilde{\phi} u_{3R} + y_{23}^{(U)} \bar{q}_{2L} \tilde{\phi} u_{3R} \frac{\sigma^2}{\Lambda^2} + y_{22}^{(U)} \bar{q}_{2L} \tilde{\phi} u_{2R} \frac{\tau^4}{\Lambda^4} + y_{11}^{(U)} \bar{q}_{1L} \tilde{\phi} u_{1R} \frac{\sigma^8}{\Lambda^8} \\
& + y_{33}^{(D)} \bar{q}_{3L} \phi d_{3R} \frac{\eta^3}{\Lambda^3} + y_{13}^{(D)} \bar{q}_{1L} \phi d_{3R} \frac{\sigma \rho \tau^4}{\Lambda^6} + y_{22}^{(D)} \bar{q}_{2L} \phi d_{2R} \frac{\chi_2^4 \sigma}{\Lambda^5} + y_{12}^{(D)} \bar{q}_{1L} \phi d_{2R} \frac{\chi_1^4 \sigma^2}{\Lambda^6} + y_{11}^{(D)} \bar{q}_{1L} \phi d_{1R} \frac{\sigma^8}{\Lambda^8} \\
& + y_1^{(l)} (\bar{l}_L \phi \xi)_{\mathbf{1}_{0,0}} l_{1R} \frac{\eta^7 \varphi_1}{\Lambda^9} + y_2^{(l)} (\bar{l}_L \phi \xi)_{\mathbf{1}_{2,0}} l_{2R} \frac{\eta^4}{\Lambda^5} + y_3^{(l)} (\bar{l}_L \phi \xi)_{\mathbf{1}_{1,0}} l_{3R} \frac{\eta \varphi_1^*}{\Lambda^3} + y_4^{(l)} (\bar{l}_L \phi \xi)_{\mathbf{1}_{1,0}} l_{1R} \frac{\eta^7 \varphi_2^{*2}}{\Lambda^{10}} \\
& + y_5^{(l)} (\bar{l}_L \phi \xi)_{\mathbf{1}_{0,0}} l_{3R} \frac{\eta \varphi_2^2}{\Lambda^4} + y_1^{(\nu)} (\bar{l}_L^C i \sigma_2 \Delta l_L)_{\mathbf{3}_{S_1}} \frac{\zeta \eta^8}{\Lambda^9} + y_2^{(\nu)} (\bar{l}_L^C i \sigma_2 \Delta l_L)_{\mathbf{3}_{S_2}} \frac{\zeta \eta^8}{\Lambda^9} \\
& + y_3^{(\nu)} (\bar{l}_L^C i \sigma_2 \Delta l_L)_{\mathbf{3}_{S_1}} \frac{\Phi \eta^8}{\Lambda^9} + y_4^{(\nu)} (\bar{l}_L^C i \sigma_2 \Delta l_L)_{\mathbf{3}_{S_2}} \frac{\Phi \eta^8}{\Lambda^9} + h.c., \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

where the dimensionless couplings are presumably $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameters. Furthermore, as it will be shown in Sect. III, the quark assignments under the different group factors of our model will give rise to SM quark mass textures where the Cabbibo mixing as well as the mixing in the 1-3 plane emerges from the down type quark sector, whereas the up type quark sector generates the quark mixing angle in the 2-3 plane.

In a generic scenario the Yukawa couplings are complex. However, not all of them are physical. Some phases can be rotated away by the phase rotation of the quark and lepton fields. The conditions for the rotation away of the Yukawa phases by the redefinition of the phases α_f of the fermion fields are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\arg(y_{33}^{(U)}) - \alpha_{q_{3L}} + \alpha_{u_{3R}} = 0, & \quad \arg(y_{23}^{(U)}) - \alpha_{q_{2L}} + \alpha_{u_{3R}} = 0, & (8) \\
\arg(y_{22}^{(U)}) - \alpha_{q_{2L}} + \alpha_{u_{2R}} = 0, & \quad \arg(y_{11}^{(U)}) - \alpha_{q_{1L}} + \alpha_{u_{1R}} = 0, \\
\arg(y_{33}^{(D)}) - \alpha_{q_{3L}} + \alpha_{d_{3R}} = 0, & \quad \arg(y_{13}^{(D)}) - \alpha_{q_{1L}} + \alpha_{d_{3R}} = 0, \\
\arg(y_{22}^{(D)}) - \alpha_{q_{2L}} + \alpha_{d_{2R}} = 0, & \quad \arg(y_{12}^{(D)}) - \alpha_{q_{1L}} + \alpha_{d_{2R}} = 0, \\
\arg(y_{11}^{(D)}) - \alpha_{q_{1L}} + \alpha_{d_{1R}} = 0, & \\
\arg(y_1^{(l)}) - \alpha_{l_L} + \alpha_{l_{1R}} = 0, & \quad \arg(y_2^{(l)}) - \alpha_{l_L} + \alpha_{l_{2R}} = 0, \\
\arg(y_3^{(l)}) - \alpha_{l_L} + \alpha_{l_{3R}} = 0, & \quad \arg(y_4^{(l)}) - \alpha_{l_L} + \alpha_{l_{1R}} = 0, \\
\arg(y_5^{(l)}) - \alpha_{l_L} + \alpha_{l_{3R}} = 0, & \\
\arg(y_{1,2,3,4}^{(\nu)}) + 2\alpha_{l_L} = 0. & \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

As seen, in the quark sector all the Yukawa phases can be rotated away. Thus, all the Yukawa coupling of the quark sector can be set real. In the sector of the charged leptons there is one physical phase. This can be the phase of one of the Yukawa couplings: $y_{1,3,4,5}^{(l)}$, while $y_2^{(l)}$ is always real. In the neutrino sector all the Yukawa phases are physical. Consequently, the observed CP violation in the quark sector will arise from complex vacuum expectation values of the gauge singlet scalars charged under the discrete symmetries of the model. Thus, the spontaneous breaking of the discrete symmetries of our model, gives rise to the observed CP violation in the quark sector. This mechanism of generating CP violation in the fermion sector from the spontaneous breaking of the discrete groups is called Geometrical CP violation and has been implemented in other models, such as, for example, in Refs. [95, 142, 145, 149, 151, 155, 199, 200]. A concise review of group theoretical origin of CP violation is provided in Ref. [201]. The geometrical CP violation can have implications for leptogenesis, see, for example, Ref. [142].

Let us comment on the role of each discrete group factor of our model. We were searching for such discrete groups, which would allow us at minimal cost to reach viable textures for the fermion sector, consistent with the observed pattern of fermion masses and mixings. We found that $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$ is a good candidate, since the Z_{16} and Z_{24} symmetries give rise to the hierarchical structure of the charged fermion mass matrices that yields the observed charged fermion mass and mixing pattern. At the same time, it is worth mentioning the properties of the Z_N groups; in particular, the Z_{16} symmetry is the smallest cyclic symmetry that allows us to build the Yukawa terms, $\bar{q}_{1L} \tilde{\phi} u_{1R} \frac{\sigma^8}{\Lambda^8}$ and $\bar{q}_{1L} \phi d_{1R} \frac{\sigma^8}{\Lambda^8}$, of dimension twelve from an $\frac{\sigma^8}{\Lambda^8}$ insertion on the $\bar{q}_{1L} \tilde{\phi} u_{1R}$ and $\bar{q}_{1L} \phi d_{1R}$ operators. These are crucial

to get the required λ^8 suppression (where $\lambda = 0.225$ is one of the Wolfenstein parameters) in the 11 entry of the quark mass matrices to naturally explain the smallness of the up and down quark masses. In addition, it is noteworthy that the small value of the up and down quark masses naturally arises from the aforementioned quark Yukawa terms of dimension 12. Along with this, we use the Z_{24} discrete symmetry since it is the smallest cyclic symmetry that contains both the Z_6 and Z_8 symmetries that glue η^3 and τ^4 with d_{3R} , respectively, which is crucial for generating the right value for the bottom quark mass and for the quark mixing angle in the 1-3 plane, without tuning the corresponding Yukawa couplings.

Besides that, as the hierarchy among charged fermion masses and CKM parameters emerges from the spontaneous breaking of the $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$ discrete group, we set the magnitudes of the VEVs of the SM singlet scalar fields $\sigma, \rho, \eta, \tau, \chi_1, \chi_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2, \xi_i, \zeta_i$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) with respect to the Wolfenstein parameter $\lambda = 0.225$ and the model cutoff Λ , as follows:

$$|v_\Phi| \sim |v_\zeta| \sim |v_\xi| \sim |v_\sigma| \sim |v_\rho| \sim |v_\eta| \sim |v_\tau| \sim |v_{\chi_1}| \sim |v_{\chi_2}| \sim |v_{\varphi_1}| \sim |v_{\varphi_2}| \sim |v_\xi| \sim \lambda\Lambda. \quad (11)$$

It is straightforward to show that the aforementioned assumption is consistent with the minimization conditions of the scalar potential (see, for instance, Refs. [164, 166]). To show that, it is sufficient to consider the quartic scalar couplings of order unity and the mass coefficients of the bilinear mass terms of the same order of magnitude.

In the standard basis, the mass terms are given by

$$\mathcal{L}_Y = \bar{d}_L \mathbf{M}_d d_R + \bar{u}_L \mathbf{M}_u u_R + \bar{l}_L \mathbf{M}_l l_R + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\nu}_L \mathbf{M}_\nu (\nu_L)^C + h.c., \quad (12)$$

where the mass matrices $\mathbf{M}_{d,u,l,\nu}$ are determined by the Yukawa couplings (7) and will be studied in what follows.

III. QUARK MASSES AND MIXINGS

The quark Yukawa interactions of Eq. (7) and the relation given by Eq. (11), give rise to the following SM quark mass matrices are:

$$\mathbf{M}_u = \begin{pmatrix} a_1^{(U)} \lambda^8 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & a_2^{(U)} \lambda^4 & a_4^{(U)} \lambda^2 \\ 0 & 0 & a_3^{(U)} \end{pmatrix} \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \mathbf{M}_d = \begin{pmatrix} a_1^{(D)} \lambda^8 & a_4^{(D)} \lambda^6 & a_5^{(D)} \lambda^6 \\ 0 & a_2^{(D)} \lambda^5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_3^{(D)} \lambda^3 \end{pmatrix} \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (13)$$

where $\lambda = 0.225$ is one of the Wolfenstein parameters, $v = 246$ GeV the scale of electroweak symmetry breaking and $a_i^{(U)}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and $a_j^{(D)}$ ($j = 1, 2, 3, 4$) are $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameters. From the SM quark mass textures given above, it follows that the Cabibbo mixing as well as the mixing in the 1-3 plane emerges from the down type quark sector, whereas the up type quark sector generates the quark mixing angle in the 2-3 plane.

The hierarchical structure of the quark mass matrices (13) in the form of different powers of λ -parameter is a consequence of the symmetries of our model. If this hierarchical structure correctly reproduces the experimentally observed quark mass hierarchy we expect that all the dimensionless parameters are $a_i^{(U,D)} \sim 1$. As we will see, the values of these parameters, obtained from a fit to the quark masses and mixing angles, are compatible with this expectation. This observation, in particular, justifies the simplifying assumption $a_4^{(D)} = a_1^{(D)}$ allowing analytical diagonalization of the quark mass matrices. We do not use this simplification in our numerical analysis, but adopt it in order to derive certain analytical formulas, which help revealing some properties of our model. With the simplified assumption $a_4^{(D)} = a_1^{(D)}$ we can write the quark mass matrices (13) in the form

$$\mathbf{M}_u = \begin{pmatrix} A_U & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & B_U & C_U \\ 0 & 0 & F_U \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{M}_d = \begin{pmatrix} A_D \lambda^2 & A_D & F_D \\ 0 & B_D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & C_D \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} A_D &= a_1^{(D)} \lambda^6 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, & B_D &= a_2^{(D)} \lambda^5 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, & C_D &= a_3^{(D)} \lambda^3 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, & F_D &= a_5^{(D)} \lambda^6 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}; \\ A_U &= a_1^{(U)} \lambda^8 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, & B_U &= a_2^{(U)} \lambda^4 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, & C_U &= a_4^{(U)} \lambda^2 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, & F_U &= a_3^{(U)} \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

In general, these mass matrices are complex and these can be diagonalized by the unitary matrices $\mathbf{U}_{u(L,R)}$ and $\mathbf{U}_{d(L,R)}$ such that

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}}_d = \text{diag}(m_d, m_s, m_b) = \mathbf{U}_{dL}^\dagger \mathbf{M}_d \mathbf{U}_{dR}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{M}}_u = \text{diag}(m_u, m_c, m_t) = \mathbf{U}_{uL}^\dagger \mathbf{M}_u \mathbf{U}_{uR}. \quad (16)$$

In order to find the CKM matrix defined as

$$\mathbf{V}^{CKM} = \mathbf{U}_{uL}^\dagger \mathbf{U}_{dL} \quad (17)$$

we proceed in the standard way and consider the matrices $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_d \hat{\mathbf{M}}_d^\dagger = \mathbf{U}_{dL}^\dagger \mathbf{M}_d \mathbf{M}_d^\dagger \mathbf{U}_{dL}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{M}}_u \hat{\mathbf{M}}_u^\dagger = \mathbf{U}_{uL}^\dagger \mathbf{M}_u \mathbf{M}_u^\dagger \mathbf{U}_{uL}$, which are useful for derivation of \mathbf{U}_{uL} and \mathbf{U}_{dL} . As one can be verified, the associated CP phases to the hermitian matrix $\mathbf{M}_d \mathbf{M}_d^\dagger$ can be factorized as $\mathbf{M}_d \mathbf{M}_d^\dagger = \mathbf{P}_d \mathbf{m}_d \mathbf{m}_d^\dagger \mathbf{P}_d^\dagger$ where $\mathbf{m}_d \mathbf{m}_d^\dagger$ is a real symmetric matrix and $\mathbf{P}_d = \text{Diag}(1, e^{-i\alpha_{D1}}, e^{-i\alpha_{D2}})$ where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{D1} &= \alpha_{AD} - \alpha_{BD} \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_{AD} = \arg(A_D) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{BD} = \arg(B_D) \\ \alpha_{D2} &= \alpha_{FD} - \alpha_{CD} \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_{FD} = \arg(F_D) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{CD} = \arg(C_D). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

As usual we can write $\mathbf{U}_{dL} = \mathbf{P}_d \mathbf{O}^d$. Explicitly, the real orthogonal matrix \mathbf{O}^d is given by

$$\mathbf{O}^d = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - |B_D|^2)(|C_D|^2 - m_d^2)(|B_D|^2 - m_d^2)}{\mathcal{D}_1}} & \sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - |B_D|^2)(|C_D|^2 - m_s^2)(m_s^2 - |B_D|^2)}{\mathcal{D}_2}} & \sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - |B_D|^2)(m_b^2 - |C_D|^2)(m_b^2 - |B_D|^2)}{\mathcal{D}_3}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - m_d^2)(m_b^2 - |B_D|^2)(m_s^2 - |B_D|^2)}{\mathcal{D}_1}} & \sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - m_s^2)(m_b^2 - |B_D|^2)(|B_D|^2 - m_d^2)}{\mathcal{D}_2}} & \sqrt{\frac{(m_b^2 - |C_D|^2)(m_s^2 - |B_D|^2)(|B_D|^2 - m_d^2)}{\mathcal{D}_3}} \\ \sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - m_s^2)(m_b^2 - |C_D|^2)(|B_D|^2 - m_d^2)}{\mathcal{D}_1}} & -\sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - m_d^2)(m_b^2 - |C_D|^2)(m_s^2 - |B_D|^2)}{\mathcal{D}_2}} & \sqrt{\frac{(|C_D|^2 - m_s^2)(|C_D|^2 - m_d^2)(m_b^2 - |B_D|^2)}{\mathcal{D}_3}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_1 &= (|C_D|^2 - |B_D|^2) (m_b^2 - m_d^2) (m_s^2 - m_d^2), \\ \mathcal{D}_2 &= (|C_D|^2 - |B_D|^2) (m_b^2 - m_s^2) (m_s^2 - m_d^2), \\ \mathcal{D}_3 &= (|C_D|^2 - |B_D|^2) (m_b^2 - m_s^2) (m_b^2 - m_d^2). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

As seen from (19), there is a condition on the parameters $m_b > |C_D| > m_s > |B_D| > m_d$.

In the up quark sector, analogously to the down quark sector, we obtain that $\mathbf{M}_u \mathbf{M}_u^\dagger = \mathbf{P}_u \mathbf{m}_u \mathbf{m}_u^\dagger \mathbf{P}_u^\dagger$ where $\mathbf{m}_u \mathbf{m}_u^\dagger$ is a real symmetric matrix and $\mathbf{P}_u = \text{Diag}(1, 1, e^{-i\alpha_U})$ where

$$\alpha_U = \alpha_{CU} - \alpha_{FU} \quad \text{with} \quad \alpha_{CU} = \arg(C_U) \quad \text{and} \quad \alpha_{FU} = \arg(F_U). \quad (21)$$

Then, we choose appropriately $\mathbf{U}_{uL} = \mathbf{P}_u \mathbf{O}_u$ where

$$\mathbf{O}_u = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \theta_u & \sin \theta_u \\ 0 & -\sin \theta_u & \cos \theta_u \end{pmatrix}, \quad \cos \theta_u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\frac{m_t^2 - m_c^2 - |C_U|^2 + R_u}{m_t^2 - m_c^2}}, \quad \sin \theta_u = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sqrt{\frac{m_t^2 - m_c^2 + |C_U|^2 - R_u}{m_t^2 - m_c^2}} \quad (22)$$

with $R_u = \sqrt{(m_t^2 + m_c^2 - |C_U|^2)^2 - 4m_t^2 m_c^2}$, and the condition $m_t > |C_U| > m_c$ to be satisfied.

Then, we obtain the CKM mixing matrix (17) in the form

$$\mathbf{V}^{CKM} = \begin{pmatrix} O_{11}^d & O_{12}^d & O_{13}^d \\ O_{21}^d \cos \theta_u e^{-i\alpha_{D1}} - O_{31}^d \sin \theta_u e^{-i\bar{\alpha}_{D2}} & O_{22}^d \cos \theta_u e^{-i\alpha_{D1}} - O_{32}^d \sin \theta_u e^{-i\bar{\alpha}_{D2}} & O_{23}^d \cos \theta_u e^{-i\alpha_{D1}} - O_{33}^d \sin \theta_u e^{-i\bar{\alpha}_{D2}} \\ O_{21}^d \sin \theta_u e^{-i\alpha_{D1}} + O_{31}^d \cos \theta_u e^{-i\bar{\alpha}_{D2}} & O_{22}^d \sin \theta_u e^{-i\alpha_{D1}} + O_{32}^d \cos \theta_u e^{-i\bar{\alpha}_{D2}} & O_{23}^d \sin \theta_u e^{-i\alpha_{D1}} + O_{33}^d \cos \theta_u e^{-i\bar{\alpha}_{D2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where $\bar{\alpha}_{D_2} = \alpha_{D_2} - \alpha_U$. Note that this mixing matrix depends on four free parameters $|C_U|$, $|C_D|$, $|B_D|$ and one effective CP violating phase to be adjusted in order to reproduce the CKM matrix elements. However, as one can verify, the correct value of the Cabbibo angle is obtained with the following values of the model parameters $|C_U|^2 = m_c^2 + m_t m_c$, $|C_D|^2 = m_b^2$ and $|B_D|^2 = m_s^2 - m_s m_d$. Then, we have

$$V_{us}^{CKM} \approx \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2} \frac{m_d^2}{m_s^2}\right), \quad V_{cb}^{CKM} \approx -\sqrt{\frac{m_c}{m_t}}, \quad V_{td}^{CKM} \approx \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}} \sqrt{\frac{m_c}{m_t}}. \quad (24)$$

These approximate relations, valid in our model, are in agreement with the well known extended Gatto-Sartori-Tonin relations [206–217].

After these notes on some properties of our model derived from the explicit analytical expression for the quark spectrum and CKM mixing matrix we carry out a numerical analysis without imposing $a_4^{(D)} = a_1^{(D)}$. We find that the experimental values for the physical quark mass spectrum [218, 219], mixing angles and CP violating phase [205] can be reproduced for the following benchmark point:

$$\begin{aligned} a_1^{(U)} &\simeq 1.252, & a_2^{(U)} &\simeq 1.415, & a_3^{(U)} &\simeq 0.989, & a_4^{(U)} &\simeq 0.802, & a_1^{(D)} &\simeq 0.579, \\ a_2^{(D)} &\simeq 0.570, & a_3^{(D)} &\simeq 1.416, & a_4^{(D)} &\simeq 0.583, & a_5^{(D)} &\simeq 0.163 + 0.403i. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Naturally, ten free parameters fit perfectly ten observables, but what is important is that the absolute values of all the parameters are $|a_i^{(A)}| \sim 1$. This means that the hierarchies existing in the quark spectrum and mixing is reproduced by the symmetries of the model resulting in the particular texture of the quark mass matrices (13) without the need of manual introduction of a hierarchy in the free parameters $a_i^{(A)}$. We only mildly tune these parameters to perfectly reproduce the quark masses and mixing.

The result of the fit in Eq. (25) suggests several simplified benchmark scenarios:

$$\text{S-5 (5 parameters): } a_4^{(D)} = a_1^{(D)}, \quad a_1^{(U)} = a_3^{(U)} = 1, \quad a_3^{(D)} = a_2^{(U)}. \quad (26)$$

$$\text{Best-fit values: } a_2^{(U)} \simeq 1.43, \quad a_4^{(U)} \simeq 0.80, \quad a_1^{(D)} \simeq 0.58, \quad a_2^{(D)} \simeq 0.57, \quad |a_5^{(D)}| \simeq 0.44.$$

$$\text{S-4 (4 parameters): } a_4^{(D)} = a_1^{(D)} = a_2^{(D)}, \quad a_1^{(U)} = a_3^{(U)} = 1, \quad a_3^{(D)} = a_2^{(U)}. \quad (27)$$

$$\text{Best-fit values: } a_2^{(U)} \simeq 1.42, \quad a_4^{(U)} \simeq 0.81, \quad a_1^{(D)} \simeq 0.58, \quad |a_5^{(D)}| \simeq 0.43.$$

$$\text{S-3 (3 parameters): } a_4^{(D)} = a_1^{(D)} = a_2^{(D)}, \quad a_1^{(U)} = a_3^{(U)} = a_4^{(U)} = 1, \quad a_3^{(D)} = a_2^{(U)}. \quad (28)$$

$$\text{Best-fit values: } a_2^{(U)} \simeq 1.42, \quad a_1^{(D)} \simeq 0.58, \quad |a_5^{(D)}| \simeq 0.43.$$

$$\text{S-2 (2 parameters): } a_4^{(D)} = a_1^{(D)} = a_2^{(D)}, \quad a_1^{(U)} = a_3^{(U)} = a_4^{(U)} = a_3^{(D)} = a_2^{(U)} = 1. \quad (29)$$

$$\text{Best-fit values: } a_1^{(D)} \simeq 0.58, \quad |a_5^{(D)}| \simeq 0.31.$$

Observable	S-5	S-4	S-3	S-2	Experimental value
$m_u (MeV)$	1.16	1.16	1.16	1.16	$1.45_{-0.45}^{+0.56}$
$m_c (MeV)$	641	635	634	448	635 ± 86
$m_t (GeV)$	174	174	174	174	$172.1 \pm 0.6 \pm 0.9$
$m_d (MeV)$	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.9	$2.9_{-0.4}^{+0.5}$
$m_s (MeV)$	59.2	60.1	60.1	60.1	$57.7_{-15.7}^{+16.8}$
$m_b (GeV)$	2.85	2.82	2.82	1.99	$2.82_{-0.04}^{+0.09}$
$\sin \theta_{12}$	0.225	0.220	0.220	0.220	0.225
$\sin \theta_{23}$	0.0407	0.0411	0.0507	0.0507	0.0412
$\sin \theta_{13}$	0.00352	0.00351	0.00351	0.00351	0.00351

Table III: Values of the CKM parameters and quark masses in our model compared with the experimental ones. The columns label S-P correspond to the different benchmark scenarios, where P stands for the number of free parameters. The quark masses are given at the M_Z scale.

As seen from Tab. III the 5- and 4-parameter scenarios S-5 and S-4 fit perfectly the experimental data. Even the 2-parameter scenario S-2 does not contradict the data. In view of this fact it becomes tempting to think that the conditions (26), (27), (28), (29), imposed as additional constraints, actually originate from some symmetry compatible with our model, but missed in the present study. We will address this possibility elsewhere.

IV. LEPTON MASSES AND MIXINGS

Analyzing the lepton sector of the model we adopt a simplifying benchmark scenario with particular assumption about the model parameters

$$y_4^{(l)} = y_1^{(l)}, \quad y_5^{(l)} = -y_3^{(l)}, \quad v_{\varphi_1} = \lambda \cos \theta_l \Lambda, \quad v_{\varphi_2} = \sqrt{\lambda \sin \theta_l} \Lambda, \quad v_\eta = \lambda \Lambda, \quad (30)$$

where $\sin \theta_l \sim \mathcal{O}(\lambda)$. This scenario is compatible with the VEV hierarchy (11) and, as we will show, features a nice simple relation between the reactor mixing angle and the Wolfenstein parameter.

In what follows we limit ourselves to this scenario considering the relations (30) as additional constraints on our model parameter space. On the other hand it is possible that the relations (30) arise in our model framework as a consequence of some unrecognized symmetry or can be attributed to a particular ultraviolet completion of the model. From the lepton Yukawa terms in Eq. (7) we find the charged lepton mass matrix M_l defined in (12). It can be written in the form

$$\mathbf{M}_l = R_{lL} S_{lL} \text{Diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau), \quad R_{lL} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\ 1 & \omega^2 & \omega \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{3}}, \quad S_l = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_l & 0 & -\sin \theta_l \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \sin \theta_l & 0 & \cos \theta_l \end{pmatrix}, \quad (31)$$

where the charged lepton masses are given by:

$$m_e = a_1^{(l)} \lambda^9 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad m_\mu = a_2^{(l)} \lambda^5 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad m_\tau = a_3^{(l)} \lambda^3 \frac{v}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (32)$$

Here $a_i^{(l)}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$) are $\mathcal{O}(1)$ dimensionless parameters.

In the standard basis (12) the charged lepton mass matrix is diagonalized with $\mathbf{U}_{lL} = R_{lL} S_l$ so that $\mathbf{U}_{lL}^\dagger \mathbf{M}_l \mathbf{U}_{lL} = S_l^T R_{lL}^\dagger R_{lL} S_l \cdot \text{Diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau) = \text{Diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau)$.

The neutrino mass matrix, derived from the Yukawa terms in Eq. (7), is given by:

$$\mathbf{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} a_\nu & b_\nu & c_\nu \\ b_\nu & d_\nu & b_\nu \\ c_\nu & b_\nu & a_\nu \end{pmatrix} \quad (33)$$

where

$$a_\nu = y_1^{(\nu)} \frac{v_\zeta v_\eta^8}{\sqrt{2} \Lambda^9} v_\Delta, \quad b_\nu = y_2^{(\nu)} \frac{v_\zeta v_\eta^8}{\sqrt{2} \Lambda^9} v_\Delta, \quad c_\nu = y_4^{(\nu)} \frac{v_\Phi v_\eta^8}{\Lambda^9} v_\Delta, \quad d_\nu = y_3^{(\nu)} \frac{v_\Phi v_\eta^8}{\Lambda^9} v_\Delta. \quad (34)$$

Diagonalization of neutrino mass matrix $\mathbf{U}_\nu^\dagger \mathbf{M}_\nu \mathbf{U}_\nu^* = \hat{\mathbf{M}} = \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3)$ is realized by $\mathbf{U}_\nu = \mathbf{U}_{\pi/4} \mathbf{u}_\nu$ so that

$$\hat{\mathbf{M}} = \mathbf{u}_\nu^\dagger \mathbf{m}_\nu \mathbf{u}_\nu^*, \quad \mathbf{m}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} a_\nu + c_\nu & \sqrt{2} b_\nu & 0 \\ \sqrt{2} b_\nu & d_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & a_\nu - c_\nu \end{pmatrix}, \quad \mathbf{U}_{\pi/4} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

where

$$\mathbf{u}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta_\nu & \sin \theta_\nu & 0 \\ -\sin \theta_\nu & \cos \theta_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (36)$$

with

$$\tan 2\theta_\nu = \frac{\sqrt{8}b_\nu}{d_\nu - a_\nu - c_\nu} \quad (37)$$

and the neutrino masses given by

$$\begin{aligned} m_1 &= (a_\nu + c_\nu) \cos^2 \theta_\nu + d_\nu \sin^2 \theta_\nu - \sqrt{2}b_\nu \sin 2\theta_\nu, \\ m_2 &= (a_\nu + c_\nu) \sin^2 \theta_\nu + d_\nu \cos^2 \theta_\nu + \sqrt{2}b_\nu \sin 2\theta_\nu, \\ m_3 &= a_\nu - c_\nu, \end{aligned} \quad (38)$$

Considering the PMNS mixing matrix, defined as $\mathbf{V} = \mathbf{U}_{lL}^\dagger \mathbf{U}_\nu$, we find its matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned} V_{11} &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \cos \theta_l \cos \theta_\nu \left[1 - \frac{\omega}{2} \tan \theta_l - \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \tan \theta_\nu (1 + \omega \tan \theta_l) \right], \\ V_{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \cos \theta_l \cos \theta_\nu \left[1 + \omega \tan \theta_l + \sqrt{2} \tan \theta_\nu \left(1 - \frac{\omega}{2} \tan \theta_l \right) \right], \\ V_{13} &= -\frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \theta_l, \\ V_{21} &= -\frac{\omega^2}{\sqrt{6}} \cos \theta_\nu \left[1 + \sqrt{2} \tan \theta_\nu \right], \\ V_{22} &= \frac{\omega^2}{\sqrt{3}} \cos \theta_\nu \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tan \theta_\nu \right], \\ V_{23} &= \frac{i\omega^2}{\sqrt{2}}, \\ V_{31} &= -\frac{\omega}{\sqrt{6}} \cos \theta_l \cos \theta_\nu \left[1 + \sqrt{2} \tan \theta_\nu + \sqrt{2}\omega^2 \tan \theta_l \left(\sqrt{2} - \tan \theta_\nu \right) \right], \\ V_{32} &= \frac{\omega}{\sqrt{3}} \cos \theta_l \cos \theta_\nu \left[1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \tan \theta_\nu - \omega^2 \tan \theta_l \left(1 + \sqrt{2} \tan \theta_\nu \right) \right], \\ V_{33} &= -\frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{2}} \cos \theta_l. \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

In the standard parametrization of the PMNS matrix we have the generic relations

$$\sin^2 \theta_{13} = |V_{13}|^2, \quad \sin^2 \theta_{23} = \frac{|V_{23}|^2}{1 - |V_{13}|^2}, \quad \sin^2 \theta_{12} = \frac{|V_{12}|^2}{1 - |V_{13}|^2}. \quad (40)$$

Examining Eqs. (39) and (40) we get a nice relation between the reactor and atmospheric angles:

$$\sin^2 \theta_{23} = \frac{1/2}{1 - \sin^2 \theta_{13}}, \quad (41)$$

which satisfies the experimental data in Tables IV,V within $\sim 1\sigma$ both for normal hierarchy (NH) and inverted hierarchy (IH). As seen from Eqs. (39) and (40) the model has only two free parameters θ_l and θ_ν to fit four neutrino sector observables: three angles $\theta_{12}, \theta_{23}, \theta_{13}$ and the CP-violating phase δ_{CP} .

On the other hand, according to Eqs. (38), (37), there are three parameters a_ν, b_ν, c_ν to fit two observables Δm_{21}^2 and $\Delta m_{31/13}^2$, which means the model has no limitations on the neutrino mass squared differences. Any of their experimental values can be reproduced exactly. That is why in Tables IV,V we do not show model values for these two observables.

Then we fit only the neutrino mixing angles θ_{ij} and the CP-violating phase δ_{CP} . The latter can be conveniently extracted from the neutrino mixing matrix (39) using the Jarlskog invariant

$$J_{CP} = \text{Im} [V_{23} V_{13}^* V_{12} V_{22}^*] \quad (42)$$

and its equivalent definition [233] in the standard parametrization

$$J_{CP} = \frac{1}{8} \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{23} \sin 2\theta_{13} \cos \theta_{13} \sin \delta_{CP}. \quad (43)$$

Comparing Eqs. (42) and (43) as well as taking into account (39), (40) we find an expression for $\sin \delta_{CP}$ in terms of the model parameters θ_l and θ_ν .

Observable	Model value	Experimental value		
		1 σ range	2 σ range	3 σ range
Δm_{21}^2 [10^{-5}eV^2] (NH)	–	$7.55^{+0.20}_{-0.16}$	7.20 – 7.94	7.05 – 8.14
Δm_{31}^2 [10^{-3}eV^2] (NH)	–	2.50 ± 0.03	2.44 – 2.57	2.41 – 2.60
δ_{CP} [$^\circ$] (NH)	233	218^{+38}_{-27}	182 – 315	157 – 349
$\sin^2 \theta_{12}/10^{-1}$ (NH)	3.2	$3.20^{+0.20}_{-0.16}$	2.89 – 3.59	2.73 – 3.79
$\sin^2 \theta_{23}/10^{-1}$ (NH)	5.11	$5.47^{+0.20}_{-0.30}$	4.67 – 5.83	4.45 – 5.99
$\sin^2 \theta_{13}/10^{-2}$ (NH)	2.170	$2.160^{+0.083}_{-0.069}$	2.03 – 2.34	1.96 – 2.41

Table IV: The model values shown in the table correspond to the results of the best fit for the mixing angles and CP violating phase for normal hierarchy. The 1 – 3 σ experimental ranges [8] are also shown for comparison.

Observable	Model value	Experimental value		
		1 σ range	2 σ range	3 σ range
Δm_{21}^2 [10^{-5}eV^2] (IH)	–	$7.55^{+0.20}_{-0.16}$	7.20 – 7.94	7.05 – 8.14
Δm_{13}^2 [10^{-3}eV^2] (IH)	–	$2.42^{+0.03}_{-0.04}$	2.34 – 2.47	2.31 – 2.51
δ_{CP} [$^\circ$] (IH)	233	281^{+23}_{-27}	229 – 328	202 – 349
$\sin^2 \theta_{12}/10^{-1}$ (IH)	3.20	$3.20^{+0.20}_{-0.16}$	2.89 – 3.59	2.73 – 3.79
$\sin^2 \theta_{23}/10^{-1}$ (IH)	5.11	$5.51^{+0.18}_{-0.30}$	4.91 – 5.84	4.53 – 5.98
$\sin^2 \theta_{13}/10^{-2}$ (IH)	2.223	$2.220^{+0.074}_{-0.076}$	2.07 – 2.36	1.99 – 2.44

Table V: The model values shown in the table correspond to the results of the best fit for the mixing angles and CP violating phase for inverted hierarchy. The 1 – 3 σ experimental ranges [8] are also shown for comparison.

In Tables IV,V we show the best-fit values of the mixing angles $\sin^2 \theta_{ij}$ and the CP-violating phase δ_{CP} corresponding to the model parameters

$$\begin{aligned} \text{NH} : \theta_l &\approx 12^\circ, \quad \theta_\nu \approx -65^\circ, \\ \text{IH} : \theta_l &\approx 12.2^\circ, \quad \theta_\nu \approx -65^\circ. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

Varying the angles θ_ν , θ_l within $\sim 1\sigma$ range of the experimental values of $\sin^2 \theta_{ij}$ we find that in the benchmark scenario (30) our model predicts

$$-3.0 \times 10^{-2} \lesssim J_{CP} \lesssim -2.40 \times 10^{-2}, \quad 230^\circ \lesssim \delta_{CP} \lesssim 236^\circ \quad (45)$$

for both the normal and inverted neutrino mass spectrum.

The two Majorana phases, α and β , can be calculated through the invariants [229–232]

$$I_1 = \text{Im} [V_{11}^* V_{12}], \quad I_2 = \text{Im} [V_{11}^* V_{13}], \quad (46)$$

which in the standard parametrization of the PMNS matrix can be written in equivalent forms as follows:

$$I_1 = \cos \theta_{12} \sin \theta_{12} \cos^2 \theta_{13} \sin(\alpha/2), \quad I_2 = \cos \theta_{12} \sin \theta_{13} \cos \theta_{13} \sin(\beta/2 - \delta_{CP}). \quad (47)$$

Comparing these two equivalent definitions and taking into account Eqs. (39), (40) and (44) we find for the Majorana phases

$$\alpha \simeq 32^\circ, \quad \beta \simeq 55^\circ \quad (48)$$

for both the normal and inverted neutrino mass hierarchies.

Another important observable, to be considered, is the effective Majorana neutrino mass parameter of neutrinoless double beta decay ($0\nu\beta\beta$) defined as:

$$m_{ee} = \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 m_i V_{1i}^2 \right|. \quad (49)$$

In our model the mass parameter, m_{ee} , depends on the two model parameters θ_ν , θ_l and lightest neutrino mass m_1 for the normal and m_3 for inverted hierarchy by virtue of

$$\begin{aligned} m_2 &= \sqrt{\Delta m_{21}^2 + m_1^2}, & m_3 &= \sqrt{\Delta m_{31}^2 + m_1^2} & \text{normal hierarchy,} \\ m_2 &= \sqrt{\Delta m_{13}^2 + \Delta m_{21}^2 + m_3^2}, & m_1 &= \sqrt{\Delta m_{13}^2 + m_3^2}, & \text{inverted hierarchy.} \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

In Figs. 1 we show the conventional plots for correlations between the effective Majorana neutrino mass parameter m_{ee} and the lightest active neutrino mass for the normal (left plot) and inverted (right plot) neutrino mass hierarchies. The arrays of black points in these Figures were generated in our model by randomly varying the model parameters θ_ν and θ_l around their best-fit values (44) inside the 3σ experimental range of the mixing angles θ_{ij} (see Tables IV,V). The lightest active neutrino mass was randomly varied in the range $0 < m_1 < 0.2$ eV for the normal and $0 < m_3 < 0.1$ eV for the inverted neutrino mass hierarchy. As seen from Figs. 1 the effective Majorana neutrino mass parameter m_{ee} lies within the limited ranges. Numerically they are

$$0.001 \text{ eV} \leq m_{ee} \leq 0.05 \text{ eV} \quad \text{NH} \quad (51)$$

$$0.02 \text{ eV} \leq m_{ee} \leq 0.05 \text{ eV} \quad \text{IH.} \quad (52)$$

Note that in our model the parameter m_{ee} is bounded from below even in the case of normal hierarchy. These values




Figure 1: Effective Majorana neutrino mass parameter m_{ee} as a function of the lightest active neutrino mass m_1 for the normal (left pannel) and inverted (right pannel) neutrino mass hierarchies. The green and brown horizontal lines are the upper bounds 0.1 eV and 0.16 eV from the KamLAND-Zen [222] and GERDA “phase-II” [223, 224] experiments, respectively. The vertical blue, magenta, orange and gray lines are the upper bounds on the lightest neutrino mass from the combination of Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) radiation and Baryon acoustic oscillations (BAO) data [225], Cosmic Microwave Background (CMB) radiation as well as lensing observations [226], Wilkinson Microwave Anisotropy Probe (WMAP) Observations [227] and Katrin experiment [228], respectively. The black curve corresponds to the predictions of our model.

are within the declared reach of the next-generation bolometric CUORE experiment [220] or, more realistically, of the next-to-next-generation ton-scale $0\nu\beta\beta$ -decay experiments (for a recent review see for instance Ref. [221]). The currently most stringent experimental upper bound $m_{ee} \leq 160$ meV is set by $T_{1/2}^{0\nu\beta\beta}({}^{136}\text{Xe}) \geq 1.1 \times 10^{26}$ yr at 90% C.L. from the KamLAND-Zen experiment [222].

Finally, let us briefly comment on the lepton flavor violating process, $\mu \rightarrow e \gamma$, which may be phenomenologically dangerous for the models with the SM triplet scalars [235–238]. Our model is this very case: it has the triplet Δ with the decomposition shown in Eq. (4). The contribution of the singly Δ^+ and doubly Δ^{++} charged scalars to the

branching ratio (BR) of this process was found in Ref. [234]. In our model this contribution can be written in the form

$$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e \gamma) \approx 4.5 \times 10^{-3} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}v_\Delta \lambda^9} \right)^4 \left| \left(\mathbf{V}^* \hat{\mathbf{M}}_\nu^\dagger \hat{\mathbf{M}}_\nu \mathbf{V}^T \right)_{e\mu} \right|^2 \left(\frac{200 \text{ GeV}}{m_{\Delta^{++}}} \right)^4 \quad (53)$$

where \mathbf{V} is the PMNS mixing matrix. We assumed for simplicity $m_{\Delta^+} = m_{\Delta^{++}}$ for the masses of the singly and doubly charged scalars. Note that the PMNS matrix elements, depending in our model only on the θ_ν and θ_l parameters, have already been fixed numerically (44) from the fit to the experimental data on the neutrino mixing angles. The neutrino masses are related by Eq. (50) to the lightest neutrino mass m_1 or m_3 for NH or IH, respectively. From Eq. (53) we find the model prediction

$$\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e \gamma) < 1.1 \times 10^{-23} \text{ Model} \quad (54)$$

for the range of the parameters: $0 \lesssim m_1 \lesssim 0.2 \text{ eV}$ for NH and $0 \lesssim m_3 \lesssim 0.1 \text{ eV}$ for IH as well as $80 \text{ GeV} < m_{\Delta^{++}} \text{ GeV}$ and $v_\Delta < 5 \text{ GeV}$. The latter upper bound comes from the precision measurements of the SM ρ -parameter. The lower limit for the mass of the singly and doubly charged Higgs $m_{\Delta^{++}}$ derives from various low and high energy data [205]. The current experimental bound $\text{BR}(\mu \rightarrow e \gamma) < 4.2 \times 10^{-13}$ [205] is significantly weaker than the model prediction (54). Therefore, the model easily passes this phenomenological test.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We constructed a multiscalar singlet extension of the singlet-triplet Higgs model, which explains the observed pattern of the quark and lepton masses and mixing by imposed symmetries and the field content. The model incorporates the $\Delta(27)$ family symmetry, which is supplemented by the $Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$ discrete group. The observed hierarchy of SM charged fermion masses and mixing angles is produced by the spontaneous breaking of the $\Delta(27) \times Z_{16} \times Z_{24}$ discrete group at a very high energy-scale. The light active neutrino masses arise from a type-II seesaw mechanism mediated by the neutral component of the $SU(2)_L$ scalar triplet. The obtained physical observables for both quark and lepton sectors are compatible with their experimental values. In the quark sector, there is a particular scenario inspired by naturalness arguments, which allowed us to reduce the number of the model parameters from ten to four. Even in this restricted scenario the model was able to accurately fit the ten observables of the SM quark sector. Moreover we found in the model a natural benchmark scenario with just two free parameters allowing to reasonably reproduce the experimental values of these ten observables.

The model is also successful in the neutrino sector, reproducing the mixing angles within 2 and 3σ of their most recent experimental values. The inverted hierarchy is slightly favored by the model. The model predicts the effective Majorana neutrino mass parameter of neutrinoless double beta decay in the range $0.001(0.02) \text{ eV} \lesssim m_{ee} \lesssim 0.05 \text{ eV}$ for the normal (inverted) neutrino spectrum. We found the Jarlskog invariant and leptonic Dirac CP violating phase in the ranges $-3.0 \times 10^{-2} \lesssim J_{CP} \lesssim -2.40 \times 10^{-2}$ and $230^\circ \lesssim \delta_{CP} \lesssim 236^\circ$ both for normal and inverted neutrino mass spectrum. In principle, we can also accommodate dark matter, adding to our model two complex scalar singlets, Φ_1 and Φ_2 with lepton number $L = 1$, as was done in Ref. [203]. In this work, we do not pretend to address the dark matter problem, which is beyond the scope of this paper and will be addressed elsewhere.

Acknowledgments

This research has received funding from Chilean grants Fondecyt No. 1170803, No. 1150792 and CONICYT PIA/Basal FB0821 and ACT1406; and Mexican grant 237004, PAPIIT IN111518. JCGI thanks CINVESTAV for the warm hospitality and Red de Altas Energías-CONACYT for the financial support.

Appendix A: The product rules of the $\Delta(27)$ discrete group

The $\Delta(27)$ discrete group is a subgroup of $SU(3)$ having 27 elements divided into 11 conjugacy classes. It has the following 11 irreducible representations: one triplet $\mathbf{3}$, one antitriplet $\bar{\mathbf{3}}$ and nine singlets $\mathbf{1}_{k,l}$ ($k, l = 0, 1, 2$), where k

and l correspond to the Z_3 and Z'_3 charges, respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \bar{\mathbf{3}}_{S_1} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{3}}_{S_2} \oplus \bar{\mathbf{3}}_A \\
\bar{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} &= \mathbf{3}_{S_1} \otimes \mathbf{3}_{S_2} \oplus \mathbf{3}_A \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}} &= \sum_{r=0}^2 \mathbf{1}_{r,0} \oplus \sum_{r=0}^2 \mathbf{1}_{r,1} \oplus \sum_{r=0}^2 \mathbf{1}_{r,2} \\
\mathbf{1}_{k,\ell} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{k',\ell'} &= \mathbf{1}_{k+k' \bmod 3, \ell+\ell' \bmod 3}
\end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

$$\tag{A2}$$

Denoting (x_1, y_1, z_1) and (x_2, y_2, z_2) as the basis vectors for two $\Delta(27)$ -triplets $\mathbf{3}$, one finds:

$$\begin{aligned}
(\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3})_{\bar{\mathbf{3}}_{S_1}} &= (x_1 y_1, x_2 y_2, x_3 y_3), \\
(\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3})_{\bar{\mathbf{3}}_{S_2}} &= \frac{1}{2} (x_2 y_3 + x_3 y_2, x_3 y_1 + x_1 y_3, x_1 y_2 + x_2 y_1), \\
(\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3})_{\bar{\mathbf{3}}_A} &= \frac{1}{2} (x_2 y_3 - x_3 y_2, x_3 y_1 - x_1 y_3, x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1), \\
(\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}})_{\mathbf{1}_{r,0}} &= x_1 y_1 + \omega^{2r} x_2 y_2 + \omega^r x_3 y_3, \\
(\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}})_{\mathbf{1}_{r,1}} &= x_1 y_2 + \omega^{2r} x_2 y_3 + \omega^r x_3 y_1, \\
(\mathbf{3} \otimes \bar{\mathbf{3}})_{\mathbf{1}_{r,2}} &= x_1 y_3 + \omega^{2r} x_2 y_1 + \omega^r x_3 y_2,
\end{aligned} \tag{A3}$$

where $r = 0, 1, 2$ and $\omega = e^{i\frac{2\pi}{3}}$. More details on the $\Delta(27)$ discrete group are provided in Refs. [9, 164, 165]

-
- [1] G. Aad *et al.* [ATLAS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 1 (2012) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.020 [arXiv:1207.7214 [hep-ex]].
- [2] S. Chatrchyan *et al.* [CMS Collaboration], Phys. Lett. B **716**, 30 (2012) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.021 [arXiv:1207.7235 [hep-ex]].
- [3] F. P. An *et al.* [Daya Bay Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 171803 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.171803 [arXiv:1203.1669 [hep-ex]].
- [4] K. Abe *et al.* [T2K Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 041801 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.041801 [arXiv:1106.2822 [hep-ex]].
- [5] P. Adamson *et al.* [MINOS Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **107**, 181802 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.107.181802 [arXiv:1108.0015 [hep-ex]].
- [6] Y. Abe *et al.* [Double Chooz Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 131801 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.131801 [arXiv:1112.6353 [hep-ex]].
- [7] J. K. Ahn *et al.* [RENO Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 191802 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.108.191802 [arXiv:1204.0626 [hep-ex]].
- [8] P. F. de Salas, D. V. Forero, C. A. Ternes, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, arXiv:1708.01186 [hep-ph].
- [9] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, Y. Shimizu, H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl. **183**, 1 (2010) doi:10.1143/PTPS.183.1 [arXiv:1003.3552 [hep-th]].
- [10] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **82**, 2701 (2010) doi:10.1103/RevModPhys.82.2701 [arXiv:1002.0211 [hep-ph]].
- [11] S. F. King and C. Luhn, Rept. Prog. Phys. **76**, 056201 (2013) doi:10.1088/0034-4885/76/5/056201 [arXiv:1301.1340 [hep-ph]].
- [12] S. F. King, A. Merle, S. Morisi, Y. Shimizu and M. Tanimoto, New J. Phys. **16**, 045018 (2014) doi:10.1088/1367-2630/16/4/045018 [arXiv:1402.4271 [hep-ph]].
- [13] S. F. King, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **94**, 217 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.ppnp.2017.01.003 [arXiv:1701.04413 [hep-ph]].
- [14] S. T. Petcov, arXiv:1711.10806 [hep-ph].
- [15] J. M. Gerard, Z. Phys. C **18**, 145 (1983). doi:10.1007/BF01572477
- [16] J. Kubo, A. Mondragon, M. Mondragon and E. Rodriguez-Jauregui, Prog. Theor. Phys. **109**, 795 (2003) Erratum: [Prog. Theor. Phys. **114**, 287 (2005)] doi:10.1143/PTP.109.795 [hep-ph/0302196].
- [17] J. Kubo, Phys. Lett. B **578**, 156 (2004) Erratum: [Phys. Lett. B **619**, 387 (2005)] doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2005.06.013, 10.1016/j.physletb.2003.10.048 [hep-ph/0309167].
- [18] T. Kobayashi, J. Kubo and H. Terao, Phys. Lett. B **568**, 83 (2003) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2003.03.002 [hep-ph/0303084].
- [19] S. L. Chen, M. Frigerio and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. D **70**, 073008 (2004) Erratum: [Phys. Rev. D **70**, 079905 (2004)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.70.079905, 10.1103/PhysRevD.70.073008 [hep-ph/0404084].

- [20] A. Mondragon, M. Mondragon and E. Peinado, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 076003 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.076003 [arXiv:0706.0354 [hep-ph]].
- [21] A. Mondragon, M. Mondragon and E. Peinado, *Rev. Mex. Fis.* **54**, no. 3, 81 (2008) [Rev. Mex. Fis. Suppl. **54**, 0181 (2008)] [arXiv:0805.3507 [hep-ph]].
- [22] G. Bhattacharyya, P. Leser and H. Päs, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 011701 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.011701 [arXiv:1006.5597 [hep-ph]].
- [23] P. V. Dong, H. N. Long, C. H. Nam and V. V. Vien, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 053001 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.053001 [arXiv:1111.6360 [hep-ph]].
- [24] A. G. Dias, A. C. B. Machado and C. C. Nishi, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 093005 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.093005 [arXiv:1206.6362 [hep-ph]].
- [25] D. Meloni, *JHEP* **1205**, 124 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2012)124 [arXiv:1203.3126 [hep-ph]].
- [26] F. Gonzalez Canales, A. Mondragon and M. Mondragon, *Fortsch. Phys.* **61**, 546 (2013) doi:10.1002/prop.201200121 [arXiv:1205.4755 [hep-ph]].
- [27] F. González Canales, A. Mondragón, M. Mondragón, U. J. Saldaña Salazar and L. Velasco-Sevilla, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 096004 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.096004 [arXiv:1304.6644 [hep-ph]].
- [28] E. Ma and B. Melic, *Phys. Lett. B* **725**, 402 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.07.015 [arXiv:1303.6928 [hep-ph]].
- [29] Y. Kajiyama, H. Okada and K. Yagyu, *Nucl. Phys. B* **887**, 358 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2014.08.009 [arXiv:1309.6234 [hep-ph]].
- [30] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, R. Martínez and F. Ochoa, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, no. 11, 634 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4480-3 [arXiv:1309.6567 [hep-ph]].
- [31] E. Ma and R. Srivastava, *Phys. Lett. B* **741**, 217 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.12.049 [arXiv:1411.5042 [hep-ph]].
- [32] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, R. Martínez and J. Nisperuza, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, no. 2, 72 (2015) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3278-z [arXiv:1401.0937 [hep-ph]].
- [33] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, E. Cataño Mur and R. Martínez, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no. 7, 073001 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.073001 [arXiv:1407.5217 [hep-ph]].
- [34] S. Gupta, C. S. Kim and P. Sharma, *Phys. Lett. B* **740**, 353 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.12.005 [arXiv:1408.0172 [hep-ph]].
- [35] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and E. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no. 1, 016003 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.016003 [arXiv:1509.02083 [hep-ph]].
- [36] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and N. A. Neill, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 3, 033011 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.033011 [arXiv:1511.07420 [hep-ph]].
- [37] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, no. 9, 503 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4351-y [arXiv:1512.09092 [hep-ph]].
- [38] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and E. Schumacher, arXiv:1601.00661 [hep-ph].
- [39] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. Kovalenko and I. Schmidt, *JHEP* **1702**, 125 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2017)125 [arXiv:1611.09797 [hep-ph]].
- [40] C. Arbeláez, A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. Kovalenko and I. Schmidt, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, no. 6, 422 (2017) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-4948-9 [arXiv:1602.03607 [hep-ph]].
- [41] J. C. Gómez-Izquierdo, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77**, no. 8, 551 (2017) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-017-5094-0 [arXiv:1701.01747 [hep-ph]].
- [42] E. Ma, *Phys. Lett. B* **777**, 332 (2018) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.12.049 [arXiv:1707.03352 [hep-ph]].
- [43] A. A. Cruz and M. Mondragón, arXiv:1701.07929 [hep-ph].
- [44] C. Espinoza, E. A. Garcés, M. Mondragón and H. Reyes-González, arXiv:1804.01879 [hep-ph].
- [45] E. A. Garcés, J. Carlos Gómez-Izquierdo and F. Gonzalez-Canales, arXiv:1807.02727 [hep-ph].
- [46] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, J. Vignatti and A. Zerwekh, arXiv:1807.05321 [hep-ph].
- [47] J. C. Gómez-Izquierdo and M. Mondragón, arXiv:1804.08746 [hep-ph].
- [48] E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, *Phys. Rev. D* **64**, 113012 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.113012 [hep-ph/0106291].
- [49] X. G. He, Y. Y. Keum and R. R. Volkas, *JHEP* **0604**, 039 (2006) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2006/04/039 [hep-ph/0601001].
- [50] M. C. Chen and S. F. King, *JHEP* **0906**, 072 (2009) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/06/072 [arXiv:0903.0125 [hep-ph]].
- [51] Y. H. Ahn and S. K. Kang, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 093003 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.093003 [arXiv:1203.4185 [hep-ph]].
- [52] N. Memenga, W. Rodejohann and H. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, no. 5, 053021 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.87.053021 [arXiv:1301.2963 [hep-ph]].
- [53] R. Gonzalez Felipe, H. Serodio and J. P. Silva, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, no. 1, 015015 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.015015 [arXiv:1304.3468 [hep-ph]].
- [54] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and D. Pidt, *JHEP* **1303**, 065 (2013) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2013)065 [arXiv:1211.5370 [hep-ph]].
- [55] H. Ishimori and E. Ma, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 045030 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.045030 [arXiv:1205.0075 [hep-ph]].
- [56] S. F. King, S. Morisi, E. Peinado and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Lett. B* **724**, 68 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.05.067 [arXiv:1301.7065 [hep-ph]].
- [57] A. E. Carcamo Hernandez, I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. G. Kovalenko, H. Päs and I. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, no. 7, 076014 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.076014 [arXiv:1307.6499 [hep-ph]].
- [58] K. S. Babu, E. Ma and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Lett. B* **552**, 207 (2003) doi:10.1016/S0370-2693(02)03153-2 [hep-ph/0206292].
- [59] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, *Nucl. Phys. B* **741**, 215 (2006) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2006.02.015 [hep-ph/0512103].
- [60] S. Gupta, A. S. Joshipura and K. M. Patel, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 031903 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.031903 [arXiv:1112.6113 [hep-ph]].

- [61] S. Morisi, M. Nebot, K. M. Patel, E. Peinado and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 036001 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.036001 [arXiv:1303.4394 [hep-ph]].
- [62] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, *Nucl. Phys. B* **720**, 64 (2005) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2005.05.005 [hep-ph/0504165].
- [63] A. Kadosh and E. Pallante, *JHEP* **1008**, 115 (2010) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2010)115 [arXiv:1004.0321 [hep-ph]].
- [64] A. Kadosh, *JHEP* **1306**, 114 (2013) doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2013)114 [arXiv:1303.2645 [hep-ph]].
- [65] F. del Aguila, A. Carmona and J. Santiago, *JHEP* **1008**, 127 (2010) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2010)127 [arXiv:1001.5151 [hep-ph]].
- [66] M. D. Campos, A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. Kovalenko, I. Schmidt and E. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. D* **90**, no. 1, 016006 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.90.016006 [arXiv:1403.2525 [hep-ph]].
- [67] V. V. Vien and H. N. Long, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **30**, no. 21, 1550117 (2015) doi:10.1142/S0217751X15501171 [arXiv:1405.4665 [hep-ph]].
- [68] A. S. Joshipura and K. M. Patel, *Phys. Lett. B* **749**, 159 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.07.062 [arXiv:1507.01235 [hep-ph]].
- [69] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández and R. Martinez, *Nucl. Phys. B* **905**, 337 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2016.02.025 [arXiv:1501.05937 [hep-ph]].
- [70] P. Chattopadhyay and K. M. Patel, *Nucl. Phys. B* **921**, 487 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2017.06.008 [arXiv:1703.09541 [hep-ph]].
- [71] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández and H. N. Long, *J. Phys. G* **45**, no. 4, 045001 (2018) doi:10.1088/1361-6471/aaace7 [arXiv:1705.05246 [hep-ph]].
- [72] E. Ma and G. Rajasekaran, *EPL* **119**, no. 3, 31001 (2017) doi:10.1209/0295-5075/119/31001 [arXiv:1708.02208 [hep-ph]].
- [73] S. Centelles Chuliá, R. Srivastava and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Lett. B* **773**, 26 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.07.065 [arXiv:1706.00210 [hep-ph]].
- [74] F. Björkeröth, E. J. Chun and S. F. King, arXiv:1711.05741 [hep-ph].
- [75] R. Srivastava, C. A. Ternes, M. Tórtola and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Lett. B* **778**, 459 (2018) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2018.01.014 [arXiv:1711.10318 [hep-ph]].
- [76] A. S. Belyaev, S. F. King and P. B. Schaefers, arXiv:1801.00514 [hep-ph].
- [77] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández and S. F. King, arXiv:1803.07367 [hep-ph].
- [78] R. Srivastava, C. A. Ternes, M. Tórtola and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, no. 9, 095025 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.97.095025 [arXiv:1803.10247 [hep-ph]].
- [79] L. M. G. De La Vega, R. Ferro-Hernandez and E. Peinado, arXiv:1811.10619 [hep-ph].
- [80] S. Pramanick, arXiv:1903.04208 [hep-ph].
- [81] K. M. Patel, *Phys. Lett. B* **695**, 225 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2010.11.024 [arXiv:1008.5061 [hep-ph]].
- [82] S. Morisi, K. M. Patel and E. Peinado, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 053002 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.053002 [arXiv:1107.0696 [hep-ph]].
- [83] R. N. Mohapatra and C. C. Nishi, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 073007 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.073007 [arXiv:1208.2875 [hep-ph]].
- [84] P. S. Bhupal Dev, B. Dutta, R. N. Mohapatra and M. Severson, *Phys. Rev. D* **86**, 035002 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.86.035002 [arXiv:1202.4012 [hep-ph]].
- [85] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and L. Lavoura, *J. Phys. G* **40**, 085002 (2013) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/40/8/085002 [arXiv:1212.3247 [hep-ph]].
- [86] G. J. Ding, S. F. King, C. Luhn and A. J. Stuart, *JHEP* **1305**, 084 (2013) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2013)084 [arXiv:1303.6180 [hep-ph]].
- [87] H. Ishimori, Y. Shimizu, M. Tanimoto and A. Watanabe, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 033004 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.033004 [arXiv:1010.3805 [hep-ph]].
- [88] G. J. Ding and Y. L. Zhou, *Nucl. Phys. B* **876**, 418 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2013.08.011 [arXiv:1304.2645 [hep-ph]].
- [89] C. Hagedorn and M. Serone, *JHEP* **1110**, 083 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2011)083 [arXiv:1106.4021 [hep-ph]].
- [90] M. D. Campos, A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, H. Päs and E. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, no. 11, 116011 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.116011 [arXiv:1408.1652 [hep-ph]].
- [91] P. V. Dong, H. N. Long, D. V. Soa and V. V. Vien, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **71**, 1544 (2011) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-011-1544-2 [arXiv:1009.2328 [hep-ph]].
- [92] V. V. Vien, H. N. Long and D. P. Khoi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **30**, no. 17, 1550102 (2015) doi:10.1142/S0217751X1550102X [arXiv:1506.06063 [hep-ph]].
- [93] F. J. de Anda, S. F. King and E. Perdomo, *JHEP* **1712**, 075 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2017)075 [arXiv:1710.03229 [hep-ph]].
- [94] F. J. de Anda and S. F. King, arXiv:1803.04978 [hep-ph].
- [95] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández and S. F. King, arXiv:1903.02565 [hep-ph].
- [96] P. H. Frampton and T. W. Kephart, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **10**, 4689 (1995) doi:10.1142/S0217751X95002187 [hep-ph/9409330].
- [97] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, *Phys. Lett. B* **572**, 189 (2003) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2003.08.032 [hep-ph/0305046].
- [98] W. Grimus, A. S. Joshipura, S. Kaneko, L. Lavoura and M. Tanimoto, *JHEP* **0407**, 078 (2004) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2004/07/078 [hep-ph/0407112].
- [99] M. Frigerio, S. Kaneko, E. Ma and M. Tanimoto, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 011901 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.011901 [hep-ph/0409187].
- [100] A. Adulpravitchai, A. Blum and C. Hagedorn, *JHEP* **0903**, 046 (2009) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/03/046

- [arXiv:0812.3799 [hep-ph]].
- [101] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, Y. Omura, R. Takahashi and M. Tanimoto, *Phys. Lett. B* **662**, 178 (2008) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.03.007 [arXiv:0802.2310 [hep-ph]].
- [102] C. Hagedorn and R. Ziegler, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 053011 (2010) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.82.053011 [arXiv:1007.1888 [hep-ph]].
- [103] D. Meloni, S. Morisi and E. Peinado, *Phys. Lett. B* **703**, 281 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2011.07.084 [arXiv:1104.0178 [hep-ph]].
- [104] V. V. Vien and H. N. Long, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **28**, 1350159 (2013) doi:10.1142/S0217751X13501595 [arXiv:1312.5034 [hep-ph]].
- [105] K. Kawashima, J. Kubo and A. Lenz, *Phys. Lett. B* **681**, 60 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2009.09.064 [arXiv:0907.2302 [hep-ph]].
- [106] Y. Kaburaki, K. Konya, J. Kubo and A. Lenz, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 016007 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.016007 [arXiv:1012.2435 [hep-ph]].
- [107] K. S. Babu, K. Kawashima and J. Kubo, *Phys. Rev. D* **83**, 095008 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.83.095008 [arXiv:1103.1664 [hep-ph]].
- [108] Babu, Kaladi S. and Kubo, Jisuke, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 056006 (2005) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.71.056006 [arXiv:0411226 [hep-ph]].
- [109] Kajiyama, Yuji and Itou, Etsuko and Kubo, Jisuke, *Nucl. Phys. B* **743**, 74 (2006) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2006.02.042 [arXiv:0511268 [hep-ph]].
- [110] Kajiyama, Yuji, *JHEP*, **04**, 007 (2007) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2007/04/007 [arXiv:0702056 [hep-ph]].
- [111] Kifune, Naoko and Kubo, Jisuke and Lenz, Alexander, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 076010 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.076010 [arXiv:0712.0503 [hep-ph]].
- [112] Babu, K.S. and Meng, Yanzhi, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 075003 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.075003 [arXiv:0907.4231 [hep-ph]].
- [113] Araki, Takeshi and Li, Y.F., *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 065016 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.065016 [arXiv:1112.5819 [hep-ph]].
- [114] J. C. Gómez-Izquierdo, F. González-Canales and M. Mondragon, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **75**, no. 5, 221 (2015) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-015-3440-7 [arXiv:1312.7385 [hep-ph]].
- [115] J. C. Gómez-Izquierdo, F. Gonzalez-Canales and M. Mondragón, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **32**, no. 28-29, 1750171 (2017) doi:10.1142/S0217751X17501718 [arXiv:1705.06324 [hep-ph]].
- [116] C. Luhn, S. Nasri and P. Ramond, *Phys. Lett. B* **652**, 27 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.06.059 [arXiv:0706.2341 [hep-ph]].
- [117] C. Hagedorn, M. A. Schmidt and A. Y. Smirnov, *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 036002 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.036002 [arXiv:0811.2955 [hep-ph]].
- [118] Q. H. Cao, S. Khalil, E. Ma and H. Okada, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 131801 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.131801 [arXiv:1009.5415 [hep-ph]].
- [119] C. Luhn, K. M. Parattu and A. Wingarter, *JHEP* **1212**, 096 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2012)096 [arXiv:1210.1197 [hep-ph]].
- [120] Y. Kajiyama, H. Okada and K. Yagyu, *JHEP* **1310**, 196 (2013) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2013)196 [arXiv:1307.0480 [hep-ph]].
- [121] C. Bonilla, S. Morisi, E. Peinado and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Lett. B* **742**, 99 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.01.017 [arXiv:1411.4883 [hep-ph]].
- [122] V. V. Vien and H. N. Long, *JHEP* **1404**, 133 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2014)133 [arXiv:1402.1256 [hep-ph]].
- [123] V. V. Vien, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **29**, 28 (2014) doi:10.1142/S0217732314501399 [arXiv:1508.02585 [hep-ph]].
- [124] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández and R. Martínez, *J. Phys. G* **43**, no. 4, 045003 (2016) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/43/4/045003 [arXiv:1501.07261 [hep-ph]].
- [125] C. Arbeláez, A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. Kovalenko and I. Schmidt, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, no. 11, 115015 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.115015 [arXiv:1507.03852 [hep-ph]].
- [126] G. J. Ding, *Nucl. Phys. B* **853**, 635 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2011.08.012 [arXiv:1105.5879 [hep-ph]].
- [127] C. Hartmann, *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 013012 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.85.013012 [arXiv:1109.5143 [hep-ph]].
- [128] C. Hartmann and A. Zee, *Nucl. Phys. B* **853**, 105 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2011.07.023 [arXiv:1106.0333 [hep-ph]].
- [129] Y. Kajiyama and H. Okada, *Nucl. Phys. B* **848**, 303 (2011) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2011.02.020 [arXiv:1011.5753 [hep-ph]].
- [130] A. Aranda, C. D. Carone and R. F. Lebed, *Phys. Rev. D* **62**, 016009 (2000) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.62.016009 [hep-ph/0002044].
- [131] F. Feruglio, C. Hagedorn, Y. Lin and L. Merlo, *Nucl. Phys. B* **775**, 120 (2007) Erratum: [*Nucl. Phys. B* **836**, 127 (2010)] doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2007.04.002, 10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2010.04.018 [hep-ph/0702194].
- [132] S. Sen, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 115020 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.115020 [arXiv:0710.2734 [hep-ph]].
- [133] A. Aranda, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 111301 (2007) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.76.111301 [arXiv:0707.3661 [hep-ph]].
- [134] M. C. Chen and K. T. Mahanthappa, *Phys. Lett. B* **652**, 34 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.06.064 [arXiv:0705.0714 [hep-ph]].
- [135] D. A. Eby, P. H. Frampton and S. Matsuzaki, *Phys. Lett. B* **671**, 386 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2008.11.074 [arXiv:0810.4899 [hep-ph]].
- [136] P. H. Frampton, T. W. Kephart and S. Matsuzaki, *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 073004 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.073004 [arXiv:0807.4713 [hep-ph]].
- [137] P. H. Frampton and S. Matsuzaki, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **24**, 429 (2009) doi:10.1142/S0217732309030229 [arXiv:0807.4785 [hep-ph]].

- [138] D. A. Eby, P. H. Frampton and S. Matsuzaki, *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 053007 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.80.053007 [arXiv:0907.3425 [hep-ph]].
- [139] P. H. Frampton and S. Matsuzaki, *Phys. Lett. B* **679**, 347 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2009.08.001 [arXiv:0902.1140 [hep-ph]].
- [140] D. A. Eby and P. H. Frampton, *Phys. Lett. B* **713**, 249 (2012) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.06.004 [arXiv:1111.4938 [hep-ph]].
- [141] D. A. Eby, P. H. Frampton, X. G. He and T. W. Kephart, *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 037302 (2011) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.84.037302 [arXiv:1103.5737 [hep-ph]].
- [142] M. C. Chen and K. T. Mahanthappa, arXiv:1107.3856 [hep-ph].
- [143] P. H. Frampton, C. M. Ho and T. W. Kephart, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, no. 2, 027701 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.027701 [arXiv:1305.4402 [hep-ph]].
- [144] M. C. Chen, J. Huang, K. T. Mahanthappa and A. M. Wijangco, *JHEP* **1310**, 112 (2013) doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2013)112 [arXiv:1307.7711 [hep-ph]].
- [145] I. Girardi, A. Meroni, S. T. Petcov and M. Spinrath, *JHEP* **1402**, 050 (2014) doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2014)050 [arXiv:1312.1966 [hep-ph]].
- [146] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. F. King and G. G. Ross, *Phys. Lett. B* **648**, 201 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.03.009 [hep-ph/0607045].
- [147] E. Ma, *Phys. Lett. B* **660**, 505 (2008) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.12.060 [arXiv:0709.0507 [hep-ph]].
- [148] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, D. Emmanuel-Costa and P. Leser, *Phys. Lett. B* **716**, 193 (2012) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2012.08.008 [arXiv:1204.3633 [hep-ph]].
- [149] G. Bhattacharyya, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and P. Leser, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 241603 (2012) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.109.241603 [arXiv:1210.0545 [hep-ph]].
- [150] P. M. Ferreira, W. Grimus, L. Lavoura and P. O. Ludl, *JHEP* **1209**, 128 (2012) doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2012)128 [arXiv:1206.7072 [hep-ph]].
- [151] G. C. Branco, J. M. Gerard and W. Grimus, *Phys. Lett.* **136B**, 383 (1984). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(84)92024-0
- [152] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. F. King and G. G. Ross, *Phys. Lett. B* **648**, 201 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2007.03.009 [hep-ph/0607045].
- [153] E. Ma, *Phys. Lett. B* **723**, 161 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.05.011 [arXiv:1304.1603 [hep-ph]].
- [154] C. C. Nishi, *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, no. 3, 033010 (2013) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.88.033010 [arXiv:1306.0877 [hep-ph]].
- [155] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and D. Pidt, *J. Phys. G* **41**, 025004 (2014) doi:10.1088/0954-3899/41/2/025004 [arXiv:1307.0711 [hep-ph]].
- [156] A. Aranda, C. Bonilla, S. Morisi, E. Peinado and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, no. 3, 033001 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.033001 [arXiv:1307.3553 [hep-ph]].
- [157] P. F. Harrison, R. Krishnan and W. G. Scott, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **29**, no. 18, 1450095 (2014) doi:10.1142/S0217751X1450095X [arXiv:1406.2025 [hep-ph]].
- [158] E. Ma and A. Natale, *Phys. Lett. B* **734**, 403 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.05.070 [arXiv:1403.6772 [hep-ph]].
- [159] M. Abbas and S. Khalil, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, no. 5, 053003 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.91.053003 [arXiv:1406.6716 [hep-ph]].
- [160] M. Abbas, S. Khalil, A. Rashed and A. Sil, *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, no. 1, 013018 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.013018 [arXiv:1508.03727 [hep-ph]].
- [161] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, *JHEP* **1508**, 157 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2015)157 [arXiv:1507.00338 [hep-ph]].
- [162] F. Björkeröth, F. J. de Anda, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and S. F. King, *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 1, 016006 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.94.016006 [arXiv:1512.00850 [hep-ph]].
- [163] P. Chen, G. J. Ding, A. D. Rojas, C. A. Vaquera-Araujo and J. W. F. Valle, *JHEP* **1601**, 007 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2016)007 [arXiv:1509.06683 [hep-ph]].
- [164] V. V. Vien, A. E. Cárcamo Hernández and H. N. Long, *Nucl. Phys. B* **913**, 792 (2016) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2016.10.010 [arXiv:1601.03300 [hep-ph]].
- [165] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, H. N. Long and V. V. Vien, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **76**, no. 5, 242 (2016) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-016-4074-0 [arXiv:1601.05062 [hep-ph]].
- [166] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. Kovalenko, J. W. F. Valle and C. A. Vaquera-Araujo, *JHEP* **1707**, 118 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2017)118 [arXiv:1705.06320 [hep-ph]].
- [167] I. P. Ivanov and C. C. Nishi, *JHEP* **1501**, 021 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2015)021 [arXiv:1410.6139 [hep-ph]].
- [168] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. F. King, C. Luhn and T. Neder, *Phys. Lett. B* **775**, 303 (2017) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2017.11.005 [arXiv:1704.06322 [hep-ph]].
- [169] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, G. G. Ross and J. Talbert, arXiv:1710.01741 [hep-ph].
- [170] N. Bernal, A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and S. Kovalenko, arXiv:1712.02792 [hep-ph].
- [171] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, H. N. Long and V. V. Vien, arXiv:1803.01636 [hep-ph].
- [172] I. De Medeiros Varzielas, M. L. López-Ibáñez, A. Melis and O. Vives, arXiv:1807.00860 [hep-ph].
- [173] A. E. Cárcamo Hernández, S. Kovalenko, J. W. F. Valle and C. A. Vaquera-Araujo, arXiv:1811.03018 [hep-ph].
- [174] B. Carballo-Perez, E. Peinado and S. Ramos-Sanchez, *JHEP* **1612**, 131 (2016) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2016)131 [arXiv:1607.06812 [hep-ph]].
- [175] S. F. King, C. Luhn and A. J. Stuart, *Nucl. Phys. B* **867**, 203 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2012.09.021 [arXiv:1207.5741 [hep-ph]].
- [176] S. F. King, T. Neder and A. J. Stuart, *Phys. Lett. B* **726**, 312 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2013.08.052 [arXiv:1305.3200

- [hep-ph].
- [177] G. J. Ding and S. F. King, Phys. Rev. D **89**, no. 9, 093020 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.89.093020 [arXiv:1403.5846 [hep-ph]].
- [178] H. Ishimori and S. F. King, Phys. Lett. B **735**, 33 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.06.003 [arXiv:1403.4395 [hep-ph]].
- [179] S. F. King and T. Neder, Phys. Lett. B **736**, 308 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.07.043 [arXiv:1403.1758 [hep-ph]].
- [180] H. Ishimori, S. F. King, H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Lett. B **743**, 172 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2015.02.027 [arXiv:1411.5845 [hep-ph]].
- [181] S. j. Rong, Phys. Rev. D **95**, no. 7, 076014 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.95.076014 [arXiv:1604.08482 [hep-ph]].
- [182] R. Krishnan, P. F. Harrison and W. G. Scott, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, no. 1, 74 (2018) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-018-5516-7 [arXiv:1801.10197 [hep-ph]].
- [183] L. L. Everett and A. J. Stuart, Phys. Rev. D **79**, 085005 (2009) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.79.085005 [arXiv:0812.1057 [hep-ph]].
- [184] F. Feruglio and A. Paris, JHEP **1103**, 101 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP03(2011)101 [arXiv:1101.0393 [hep-ph]].
- [185] I. K. Cooper, S. F. King and A. J. Stuart, Nucl. Phys. B **875**, 650 (2013) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2013.07.027 [arXiv:1212.1066 [hep-ph]].
- [186] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and L. Lavoura, J. Phys. G **41**, 055005 (2014) doi:10.1088/0954-3889/41/5/055005 [arXiv:1312.0215 [hep-ph]].
- [187] J. Gehrlein, J. P. Oppermann, D. Schäfer and M. Spinrath, Nucl. Phys. B **890**, 539 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2014.11.023 [arXiv:1410.2057 [hep-ph]].
- [188] J. Gehrlein, S. T. Petcov, M. Spinrath and X. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. B **896**, 311 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2015.04.019 [arXiv:1502.00110 [hep-ph]].
- [189] A. Di Iura, C. Hagedorn and D. Meloni, JHEP **1508**, 037 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2015)037 [arXiv:1503.04140 [hep-ph]].
- [190] P. Ballett, S. Pascoli and J. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 9, 093008 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.093008 [arXiv:1503.07543 [hep-ph]].
- [191] J. Gehrlein, S. T. Petcov, M. Spinrath and X. Zhang, Nucl. Phys. B **899**, 617 (2015) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2015.08.019 [arXiv:1508.07930 [hep-ph]].
- [192] J. Turner, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 11, 116007 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.116007 [arXiv:1507.06224 [hep-ph]].
- [193] C. C. Li and G. J. Ding, JHEP **1505**, 100 (2015) doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2015)100 [arXiv:1503.03711 [hep-ph]].
- [194] T. Kobayashi, H. P. Nilles, F. Ploger, S. Raby and M. Ratz, Nucl. Phys. B **768**, 135 (2007) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2007.01.018 [hep-ph/0611020].
- [195] T. Kobayashi, Y. Omura and K. Yoshioka, Phys. Rev. D **78**, 115006 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.78.115006 [arXiv:0809.3064 [hep-ph]].
- [196] H. Abe, K. S. Choi, T. Kobayashi and H. Ohki, Nucl. Phys. B **820**, 317 (2009) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2009.05.024 [arXiv:0904.2631 [hep-ph]].
- [197] M. Berasaluce-Gonzalez, L. E. Ibanez, P. Soler and A. M. Uranga, JHEP **1112**, 113 (2011) doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2011)113 [arXiv:1106.4169 [hep-th]].
- [198] F. Beye, T. Kobayashi and S. Kuwakino, Phys. Lett. B **736**, 433 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.physletb.2014.07.058 [arXiv:1406.4660 [hep-th]].
- [199] M. C. Chen, M. Fallbacher, K. T. Mahanthappa, M. Ratz and A. Trautner, Nucl. Phys. B **883**, 267 (2014) doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2014.03.023 [arXiv:1402.0507 [hep-ph]].
- [200] G. C. Branco, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and S. F. King, Phys. Rev. D **92**, no. 3, 036007 (2015) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.92.036007 [arXiv:1502.03105 [hep-ph]].
- [201] M. C. Chen and M. Ratz, arXiv:1903.00792 [hep-ph].
- [202] W. Grimus and L. Lavoura, JHEP **0011**, 042 (2000) doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2000/11/042 [hep-ph/0008179].
- [203] E. Ma and M. Maniatis, JHEP **1707**, 140 (2017) doi:10.1007/JHEP07(2017)140 [arXiv:1704.06675 [hep-ph]].
- [204] G. B. Gelmini and M. Roncadelli, Phys. Lett. **99B**, 411 (1981). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(81)90559-1
- [205] C. Patrignani *et al.* [Particle Data Group], Chin. Phys. C **40**, no. 10, 100001 (2016). doi:10.1088/1674-1137/40/10/100001
- [206] R. Gatto, G. Sartori and M. Tonin, Phys. Lett. **28B**, 128 (1968). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(68)90150-0
- [207] N. Cabibbo and L. Maiani, Phys. Lett. **28B**, 131 (1968). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(68)90151-2
- [208] R. J. Oakes, Phys. Lett. **29B**, 683 (1969). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(69)90110-5
- [209] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. **70B**, 436 (1977). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(77)90408-7
- [210] H. Fritzsch, Phys. Lett. **73B**, 317 (1978). doi:10.1016/0370-2693(78)90524-5
- [211] H. Fritzsch, Nucl. Phys. B **155**, 189 (1979). doi:10.1016/0550-3213(79)90362-6
- [212] H. Fritzsch and Z. z. Xing, Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **45**, 1 (2000) doi:10.1016/S0146-6410(00)00102-2 [hep-ph/9912358].
- [213] H. Fritzsch and Z. z. Xing, Nucl. Phys. B **556**, 49 (1999) doi:10.1016/S0550-3213(99)00337-5 [hep-ph/9904286].
- [214] M. Gupta and G. Ahuja, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **27**, 1230033 (2012) doi:10.1142/S0217751X12300335 [arXiv:1302.4823 [hep-ph]].
- [215] U. J. Saldaña-Salazar, Phys. Rev. D **93**, no. 1, 013002 (2016) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.013002 [arXiv:1509.08877 [hep-ph]].
- [216] U. J. Saldaña-Salazar and K. M. Tame-Narvaez, arXiv:1804.04578 [hep-ph].
- [217] M. H. Rahat, P. Ramond and B. Xu, Phys. Rev. D **98**, no. 5, 055030 (2018) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.055030 [arXiv:1805.10684 [hep-ph]].
- [218] K. Bora, Horizon **2** (2013) [arXiv:1206.5909 [hep-ph]].

- [219] Z. z. Xing, H. Zhang and S. Zhou, Phys. Rev. D **77**, 113016 (2008) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.77.113016 [arXiv:0712.1419 [hep-ph]].
- [220] F. Alessandria *et al.* [CUORE Collaboration], arXiv:1109.0494 [nucl-ex].
- [221] M. Agostini, G. Benato and J. Detwiler, Phys. Rev. D **96**, no. 5, 053001 (2017) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.96.053001 [arXiv:1705.02996 [hep-ex]].
- [222] A. Gando *et al.* [KamLAND-Zen Collaboration], Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, no. 8, 082503 (2016) Addendum: [Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, no. 10, 109903 (2016)] doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.109903, 10.1103/PhysRevLett.117.082503 [arXiv:1605.02889 [hep-ex]].
- [223] I. Abt *et al.*, hep-ex/0404039.
- [224] K. H. Ackermann *et al.* [GERDA Collaboration], Eur. Phys. J. C **73**, no. 3, 2330 (2013) doi:10.1140/epjc/s10052-013-2330-0 [arXiv:1212.4067 [physics.ins-det]].
- [225] P. A. R. Ade *et al.* [Planck Collaboration], Astron. Astrophys. **594**, A13 (2016) doi:10.1051/0004-6361/201525830 [arXiv:1502.01589 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [226] R. A. Battye and A. Moss, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, no. 5, 051303 (2014) doi:10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.051303 [arXiv:1308.5870 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [227] E. Komatsu and K. M. Smith and J. Dunkley and C. L. Bennett and B. Gold and G. Hinshaw and N. Jarosik and D. Larson and M. R.olta and L. Page and D. N. Spergel and M. Halpern and R. S. Hill and A. Kogut and M. Limon and S. S. Meyer and N. Odegard and G. S. Tucker and J. L. Weiland and E. Wollack and E. L. Wright, Astrophys.J.Suppl.192:18,2011 [arXiv:1001.4538].
- [228] J. Wolf [KATRIN Collaboration], Nucl. Instrum. Meth. A **623**, 442 (2010) doi:10.1016/j.nima.2010.03.030 [arXiv:0810.3281 [physics.ins-det]].
- [229] Bilenky, Samoil M. and Pascoli, S. and Petcov, S. T., Phys. Rev. D **64**, 113003 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.113003 [arXiv:0104218 [hep-ph]].
- [230] Nieves, Jose F. and Pal, Palash B., Phys. Rev. D **36**, 315 (1987) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.36.315
- [231] Nieves, Jose F. and Pal, Palash B., Phys. Rev. D **64**, 076005 (2001) doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.64.076005 [arXiv:0105305 [hep-ph]].
- [232] Aguilar-Saavedra, J. A. and Branco, G. C., Phys. Rev. D **62** 096009 (2000) doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.62.096009 [arXiv:0007025 [hep-ph]].
- [233] Krastev, P. I. and Petcov, S. T. Phys. Lett. B **205** 84 (1988) doi:10.1016/0370-2693(88)90404-2
- [234] Lindner, Manfred and Platscher, Moritz and Queiroz, Farinaldo S. Phys. Rept. **731** (2018) doi:10.1016/j.physrep.2017.12.001 [arXiv:1610.06587 [hep-ph]].
- [235] Fileviez Perez, Pavel and Han, Tao and Huang, Gui-Yu and Li, Tong and Wang, Kai. Phys. Rev. D **78** 071301 (2008) doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.78.071301 [arXiv:0803.3450 [hep-ph]].
- [236] Akeroyd, A. G. and Aoki, Mayumi and Sugiyama, Hiroaki. Phys. Rev. D **79** 113010 (2009) doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.79.113010 [arXiv:0904.3640 [hep-ph]].
- [237] Fukuyama, Takeshi and Sugiyama, Hiroaki and Tsumura, Koji", JHEP **1003**, 044 (2010) doi: 10.1007/JHEP03(2010)044 [arXiv:0909.4943 [hep-ph]].
- [238] Melfo, Alejandra and Nemevsek, Miha and Nesti, Fabrizio and Senjanovic, Goran and Zhang, Yue". Phys. Rev. D **85** 055018 (2012) doi: 10.1103/PhysRevD.85.055018 [arXiv:1108.4416 [hep-ph]].