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#### Abstract

We develop for the CKM and PMNS matrices a new representation with special properties. It is obtained by splitting each of these matrices into two rotations by the angle $\sim 2 \pi / 3$ and a universal diagonal matrix with elements, which are cubic roots of 1 . Such a representation of the CKM and PMNS matrices may indicate the $Z_{3}$ symmetry to be present in the Yukawa sector of the SM. Identical mathematical structure of the CKM and PMNS matrices is also an extension of the quark-lepton universality. In this 'approach the CP violation is a natural consequence of the structure of the Yukawa couplings. The CP violating phase is not a fitted parameter and its value is governed by the parameters of two rotations. The parameters of the diagonalizing matrices of the bi-unitary transformation do not exhibit a hierarchy, which means that the origins of the hierarchy of quark masses and of the CKM matrix elements are not the same.
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## 1. Introduction

In classical physics the invariance of all phenomena under the discrete symmetries $P, T$ and $C$ was beyond doubt, so it was considered certain that it should also be extended to quantum physics at any level. This belief was unexpectedly broken by experimental confirmation [1] of the prediction of space parity violation [2] in weak interactions. Almost simultaneously the violation of the charge conjugation invariance $C$ was observed in the experiment measuring the polarization of muons in the decays of charged pions [3]. Next the hypothesis of the combined CP invariance was experimentally proven to be broken in neutral $K$ meson decays [4]. The violation of the time rever'sal invariance $T$ was observed for the first time in the neutral K system [5].

The discussion of the violation of discrete symmetries invariance was gradually evolving in the theory of weak interaction as new experimental results were emerging. The first the--oretical attempt of the description of $\beta$-decay was formulated by Fermi [6, 7] with only vector charged currents interactions and it did not contain the breaking of discrete symmetries. The parity violation through $V-A$ weak current was introduced into the Fermi's theoretical description of weak interactions by Sudarshan and Marshak in Refs. [8, 9] and Feynman and GellMann in Ref. [10]. The next step in the theoretical development was the reconciliation of universality of weak interactions of weak decays of strange particles with $\beta$ decays of muons by expressing the weak hadronic current as a mixture described by

[^0]one angle $\theta$ of strangeness conserving current and strangeness changing current [11]. CP violation can only be consistently described in the theory with three generations of quarks and it was done in the framework of the Standard Model (SM) by Kobayashi and Maskawa by introducing the $3 \times 3$ unitary mixing matrix for quark interactions with charged vector bosons [12]. We thus see that description of charged current weak interactions by the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa (CKM) matrix is the result of the 40 years study of the properties of elementary particles, with emphasis on the lepton-hadron universality.

For massive neutrinos in the lepton sector the mixing matrix, called the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) matrix [13-17], plays an identical role and has similar mathematical properties as the CKM matrix for quarks. The only difference is the number of parameters that appear for the Majorana neutrinos.

The least understood part of the SM is the Yukawa sector. In the classical SM (with masless neutrinos) it contains 13 phenomenological parameters: 9 quark and lepton masses and 4 parameters of the CKM matrix. Better understanding of the Yukawa sector may lead to a significant reduction of the number of parameters of the SM.

## 2. General remarks about the CKM and PMNS matrices

The three most important results of our analysis are: 1. The CP violation appears naturally and the CP violating phase is not a free parameter. 2. The CKM and PMNS matrices have a common algebraic structure and this extends the quark lepton universality. 3. The experimental data for the CKM and PMNS matrices suggest the $Z_{3}$ symmetry to be present in the Yukawa sector of the Standard Model.

The CKM matrix $V$, when derived from the Yukawa couplings of quarks with the Higgs field is equal to

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=V_{L}^{u} V_{L}^{d^{\dagger}}, \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $V_{L}^{u}$ and $V_{L}^{d}$ are the unitary matrices that are determined by the biunitary diagonalization of the Yukawa interactions matrices of the up and down quarks.

It is not simple to obtain properties of the Yukawa couplings from the experimental values of the CKM matrix [18], because there is an excessive arbitrariness in the splitting of the matrix $V$ in Eq. (1) into two unitary matrices. The conventional way to derive those properties is to assume a discrete flavor symmetry or some other properties, like textures for the Yukawa couplings and then compare the predictions with experimental values for the CKM or PMNS matrix elements. For a recent illustration of the first method see Ref. [19] and for the recent paper on textures see [20].

In phenomenological applications there are two mostly used parameterizations of the CKM matrix: the standard one [21], which is a superposition of three rotations around the $x, y$ and $z$ axes with a complex rotation around the $y$ axis and a second one is the Wolfenstein parameterization [22], which highlights the hierarchy between the CKM matrix elements.

## 3. New representation of the CKM and PMNS matrices

In this paper we will use a special representation of a general unitary matrix as a product of three matrices

$$
\begin{equation*}
U=O_{1} D O_{2}^{T} . \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $O_{1}$ and $O_{2}$ are orthogonal (rotation) matrices ${ }^{1}$ and $D$ is the diagonal matrix whose elements are imaginary exponents. A sketch of a proof that a general unitary matrix can be expressed in a form (2) is given in Ref. [23].

Now using the representation in Eq. (2) we will analyze the CKM and PMNS (Dirac case) matrices ${ }^{2}$. Our aim is not to find a new parameterization of those matrices, but to show that the matrices $O_{1}, O_{2}$ and $D$ have a special form, which can be identified with the symmetry present in the Yukawa interactions of quarks and leptons. For this purpose we will determine the matrices $O_{1}, O_{2}$ and $D$ from the experimental input for the CKM and PMNS matrices using the method described below.

The CKM and PMNS matrices have dimension $3 \times 3$ and are unitary. The rephasing freedom of the quark and lepton fields results in the reduction to 4 of the number of significant parameters of each matrix. A general $3 \times 3$ unitary matrix has 9 free parameters. This means that we have some freedom in the choice of the values of the parameters in representation (2) for the reproduction of the experimental values of the CKM and PMNS matrices. In order to uncover the $Z_{3}$ symmetry of the Yukawa sector we will make the following assumptions about the structure of the matrices $O_{1}, O_{2}$ and $D$ in Eq. (2)

[^1]1. The diagonal matrix $D$ for both CKM and PMNS matrices comprises of the third order roots of 1 ( $Z_{3}$ symmetry) and is equal

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{Z_{3}}=\operatorname{diag}\left(e^{\frac{4 \pi i}{3}}, e^{\frac{2 \pi i}{3}}, 1\right) \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

matrix The choice of such a form is also motivated by the successful two-angle parameterization of the CKM matrix [24], which uses a similar form of this matrix. This ansatz for the matrix $D$ reduces the number of free parameters for each matrix by 3 .
2. We choose the angles $\alpha$ of the rotation of the real orthogonal matrices $O_{1}$ and $O_{2}$ to be fixed and equal to each other, so these matrices differ only by the axis of rotation and thus we remain with 4 free parameters for each matrix CKM and PMNS.

These assumptions lead the following representation of the CKM and PMNS matrices

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=\mathcal{R}\left(\alpha ; \theta_{u}, \phi_{u}\right) D_{Z_{3}} \mathcal{R}\left(\alpha ; \theta_{d}, \phi_{d}\right)^{T} . \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $\mathcal{R}(\alpha ; \theta, \phi)$ is the matrix of rotation, $\alpha$ is the angle of rotation and $\theta$ and $\phi$ are the spherical angles of the axis of rotation.

## 4. Parameters of the CKM and PMNS matrices from experiment

Our goal is to investigate the compatibility of the representation (4) with the measured values of the elements of the CKM and PMNS matrices, by determination of the parameters of the CKM matrix in representation (4) from the absolute values of the matrix elements of the CKM and PMNS matrices generated by the fit of these matrices to the experimental values. In such a way the parameters of the unitary matrix in Eq. (4) will be determined exactly. As our input we use the central values of the parameters of each matrix given by PDG [18], which are

## for the CKM matrix

$$
\lambda=0.22500, A=0.826, \bar{\rho}=0.159, \bar{\eta}=0.348
$$

for the PMNS matrix (normal order)

$$
\begin{align*}
& \sin ^{2}\left(\theta_{12}\right)=0.307, \sin ^{2}\left(\theta_{23}\right)=0.547 \\
& \sin ^{2}\left(\theta_{13}\right)=0.0220, \delta_{\mathrm{CP}}=1.23 \pi \text { radians } \tag{5}
\end{align*}
$$

for the PMNS matrix (inverted order)

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \sin ^{2}\left(\theta_{12}\right)=0.307, \sin ^{2}\left(\theta_{23}\right)=0.534 \\
& \sin ^{2}\left(\theta_{13}\right)=0.0220, \delta_{\mathrm{CP}}=1.23 \pi \text { radians }
\end{aligned}
$$

and calculate the absolute values of the elements of the CKM and PMNS matrices. Next we determine exactly the spherical angles $\theta$ and $\phi$ for both matrices by solving the set of corresponding equations for these absolute values.

As the next step in the search of the $Z_{3}$ symmetry we test the assumption that the angle of rotation $\alpha$ is equal exactly to $2 * \pi / 3$. Such an assumption is not compatible with the experimental information for the CKM and PMNS matrices. Subsequently we tested a small deviation of angle $\alpha$ from $2 \pi / 3$ for both matrices. The positive result of our search is shown in Table 1 where
we give the values of the angle $\alpha$ and spherical angles $\theta$ and $\phi$ which exactly reproduce the CKM and PMNS matrices generated from the data given in Eq. (5) and we see that the deviation

| Matrix | $\alpha$ | $\theta_{u}$ | $\phi_{u}$ | $\theta_{d}$ | $\phi_{d}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CKM | $\frac{2 \pi}{3} * 1.04$ | $52.92^{\circ}$ | $46.35^{\circ}$ | $52.70^{\circ}$ | $50.25^{\circ}$ |
| PMNS (A) | $\frac{2 \pi}{3} * 1.01$ | $64.24^{\circ}$ | $138.66^{\circ}$ | $156.96^{\circ}$ | $33.02^{\circ}$ |
| PMNS (B) | $\frac{2 \pi}{3} * 1.01$ | $64.18^{\circ}$ | $138.98^{\circ}$ | $156.55^{\circ}$ | $32.52^{\circ}$ |

Table 1: The angles $\alpha, \theta$ and $\phi$ of the CKM and PMNS matrices. PMNS (A) stands for normal order and PMNS (B) stands for the inverted order. Angle $\alpha$ is in radians and the remaining angles are in degrees.
from the value $2 \pi / 3$ is small: for the CKM matrix it is $4 \%$ and for the PMNS matrix it is only $1 \%$. The striking fact is that none of the angles in Table 1 are small, which suggests a non perturbative nature of the CKM and PMNS matrices.

## 5. Discussion of the results

The data in Table 1 show that the spherical angles of the axes of rotation in the CKM matrix for the $u p$ and down quarks are almost equal and this is a consequence of the fact that the matrix of the absolute values CKM matrix is almost symmetric. The spherical angles of the axes of rotation of the CKM and PMNS matrices are different, but this was to be expected, because these matrices are not equal.

The structure of the matrix $D_{Z_{3}}$ and the values of the angle $\alpha$ for the CKM and PMNS matrices give a strong support for the idea of the presence of the $Z_{3}$ symmetry for the matrices CKM and PMNS and thus also for the Yukawa couplings of quarks and leptons. A deviation of the angle $\alpha$ from the value $2 * \pi / 3$ may be caused by a small $Z_{3}$ symmetry breaking.

Our representation of the CKM and PMNS matrices allows the determination of the left bi-unitary diagonalizing matrices $V_{L}^{u}$ and $V_{L}^{d}$

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{L}^{f}=\mathcal{R}\left(\alpha, \theta_{f}, \phi_{f}\right) D_{f}, \quad f=u, d, \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $D_{u}$ and $D_{d}$ are the diagonal matrices

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{u}=\operatorname{diag}\left(1, e^{2 \pi i / 3}, e^{4 \pi i / 3}\right), \quad D_{d}=\operatorname{diag}\left(e^{2 \pi i / 3}, 1, e^{4 \pi i / 3}\right) \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{Z_{3}}=D_{u} D_{d}^{\dagger} . \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

It follows from the biunitary diagonalization that the quark Yukawa couplings matrices $Y^{u}$ and $Y^{d}$ are equal

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} Y^{f}=V_{L}^{f^{\dagger}} M^{f} V_{R}^{f} & \\
& =D_{f}^{\dagger} \mathcal{R}\left(\alpha, \theta_{f}, \phi_{f}\right)^{T} M^{f} V_{R}^{f}, \quad f=u, d . \tag{9}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $M^{f}$ is the diagonal quark or lepton mass matrix and $v$ is the vacuum expectation value of the Higgs field. The right biunitary diagonalizing matrices do not enter into any observables and we will consider two cases: $V_{R}^{f}=I$ or $V_{R}^{f}=V_{L}^{f}$. These
choices lead to different results for the matrices of the quark and lepton Yukawa couplings:

$$
\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} Y^{f}= \begin{cases}\text { case A } & D_{f}^{\dagger} \mathcal{R}\left(\alpha, \theta_{f}, \phi_{f}\right)^{T} M^{f} \text { for } V_{R}^{u}=I  \tag{10}\\ \text { case B } & D_{f}^{\dagger} \mathcal{R}\left(\alpha, \theta_{f}, \phi_{f}\right)^{T} M^{f} V_{L}^{f} D_{f} \text { for } V_{R}^{f}=V_{L}^{f}\end{cases}
$$

Below we give the explicit numerical values of the $V_{l}^{f}$ and $Y^{f}$ matrices for quarks obtained from the values of the angles in Table 1 For clarity we did not substitute the phases $e^{2 \pi i / 3}$ and $e^{4 \pi i / 3}$ by its numerical values, because in such a way the mathematical structure of these matrices becomes clear.

$$
\begin{align*}
& V_{L}^{u}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.094 & 0.0043 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 1.00 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} \\
0.99 & -0.047 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.094 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} \\
0.048 & 1.00 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.00021 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3}
\end{array}\right)  \tag{11}\\
& V_{L}^{d}=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.16 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & -0.0088 & 0.99 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} \\
0.99 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.017 & 0.16 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} \\
-0.018 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 1.00 & 0.0069 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3}
\end{array}\right) \tag{12}
\end{align*}
$$

These matrices have the following properties

- The numerical structure of the matrices $V_{L}^{u}$ and $V_{L}^{d}$ is similar.
- The phases of the matrix elements in each column are equal.
- There is a hierarchy between the matrix elements of the matrices: the matrix elements: in each row (or column) one matrix element is of the order $\sim 1$ and the remaining matrix elements are small.
- The hierarchy of the matrix elements is independent of the masses of quarks.
- There are no exact textures.

Next, we calculate from Eq. (9) the matrices of the Yukawa couplings $Y^{f}$ for two cases explained in Eq. (10). In the equations below we provide the numerical values of the matrices $v Y^{u, d} /\left(m_{t, b} \sqrt{2}\right)$ for the $u p$ and down quarks. For $Y^{u}$ and $Y^{d}$ we normalize the values of these matrices by the masses $m_{t}$ and $m_{b}$, respectively.

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { case A: } \frac{v}{m_{t} \sqrt{2}} Y^{u} \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-1.18 \cdot 10^{-6} & 0.0073 & 0.048 \\
5.35 \cdot 10^{-8} \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & -0.00035 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & 1.00 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} \\
0.000012 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.00069 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.00021 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3}
\end{array}\right) \tag{13a}
\end{align*}
$$

case $\mathrm{B}: \frac{v}{m_{t} \sqrt{2}} Y^{u}$

$$
=\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0.0095 & 0.047 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.00070 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3}  \tag{13b}\\
0.047 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & 1.00 & 0.00018 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} \\
0.00070 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.00018 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & 0.000078
\end{array}\right)
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { case A: } \frac{v}{m_{b} \sqrt{2}} Y^{d} \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
-0.00018 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & 0.022 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & -0.018 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} \\
-9.87 \cdot 10^{-6} & 0.00038 & 1.00 \\
0.0011 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.0037 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.0060 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3}
\end{array}\right) \tag{14a}
\end{align*}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { case B: } \quad \frac{v}{m_{b} \sqrt{2}} Y^{d} \\
& =\left(\begin{array}{ccc}
0.022 & -0.018 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & 0.0033 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} \\
-0.018 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 1.00 & 0.0060 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} \\
0.0033 \cdot e^{4 \pi i / 3} & 0.0060 \cdot e^{2 \pi i / 3} & 0.0017
\end{array}\right) \tag{14b}
\end{align*}
$$

We observe that the Yukawa couplings $Y^{f}$ have the following properties

- For case A the phases of the matrix elements in each row are equal and for case B the matrices are hermitian.
- There are no exact textures, because all matrix elements of $\mathcal{R}\left(\alpha, \theta_{f}, \phi_{f}\right)$ are non-vanishing.
- The absolute value of only one matrix element of each matrix is close to 1 , the remaining ones are several order of magnitude smaller. For case A, the matrix element $(2,3)$ dominates, and for case $B$, the element $(2,2)$ dominates.
- The hierarchy in the $Y^{f}$ matrices is stronger than in case of the $V_{L}^{f}$ matrices which is caused by the strong hierarchy of the quark masses.


## 6. Conclusions

Let us summarize the obtained results by stating that we formulated a new representation of the CKM and PMNS matrices with the following properties

1. Both matrices CKM and PMNS have the following identical mathematical structure

$$
V_{\mathrm{CKM}, \mathrm{PMNS}}=\mathcal{R}\left(\alpha, \theta_{u}, \phi_{u}\right) D_{Z_{3}} \mathcal{R}\left(\alpha, \theta_{d}, \phi_{d}\right)^{T}
$$

with $D_{Z_{3}}$ fixed, given in Eq. (3) and the angle $\alpha$ is close to $2 \pi / 3$.
2. The structure of the diagonal matrix $D_{Z_{3}}$, whose elements are cubic roots of 1 and the value of the angle $\alpha$ close to $2 \pi / 3$ support the idea of the presence of the $Z_{3}$ symmetry in the Yukawa sector of the Standard Model.
3. The CP violation phase in the CKM matrix is not a fitted parameter, but is the consequence of the structure of the phases of the Yukawa couplings matrices (see Eq. (9). This may be a starting point of a future theory of CP violation.
4. The angles describing the diagonalizing matrices $V_{L}^{u}$ and $V_{L}^{d}$ are not small (see Table 1). This means that the hierarchy present in the CKM matrix seems to be accidental and has a different origin than the hierarchy of the quark and lepton masses. This point of view is supported by the lack of the hierarchy in the PMNS matrix.
5. The Yukawa couplings do not have exact textures.

Points 1., 2. and 3. provide a description of CP violation without free parameters in the SM and reestablish the quark-lepton universality, which seemed missing in the Yukawa sector. Points 4. and 5. may be a good testing ground in search of the quark flavor symmetry.
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