Neutrino Anarchy from Flavor Deconstruction

Admir Greljo^{1,*} and Gino Isidori^{2,†}

¹Department of Physics, University of Basel, Klingelbergstrasse 82, CH-4056 Basel, Switzerland

²Physik-Institut, Universität Zürich, CH-8057 Zürich, Switzerland

Flavor deconstruction refers to non-universal gauge extensions where the original gauge symmetry is deconstructed into separate copies, one for each family. A hierarchical chain of symmetry breaking provides an attractive low-scale solution to the flavor puzzle, consistent with flavor-changing neutral currents and finite naturalness. Although successful in explaining the origin of flavor hierarchies in the quark and charged lepton sectors, existing models have struggled with the large and seemingly anarchic mixing observed in neutrino oscillations. This letter identifies conditions under which neutrino anarchy may arise from flavor deconstruction in generic models with right-handed neutrinos. When deconstruction is applied to carefully chosen subgroups of the extended gauge symmetry, hierarchies in the seesaw formula cancel out.

1. Introduction

Flavor deconstruction refers to a framework wherein a gauge group G is extended in the ultraviolet to G^3 , incorporating one G factor for each family. Such nonuniversal gauge extensions of the Standard Model (SM) have gained significant attention recently [1–18]. The chain of spontaneous symmetry breaking initially proceeds through $G_1 \times G_2 \rightarrow G_{12}$, facilitated by a scalar link field ϕ_{21} acquiring a non-zero vacuum expectation value (VEV) $\langle \phi_{21} \rangle$. This is followed by $G_{12} \times G_3 \rightarrow G$, mediated by another scalar link field ϕ_{32} , which connects $G_2 \times G_3$. Fermions f_i are individually charged under the respective G_i factor associated with each flavor i = 1, 2, 3.¹

Spontaneous symmetry breaking to a diagonal subgroup for simple groups is robustly predicted for a nontrivial scalar representation under both factors. However, it is economical to choose link fields such that $\phi_{21}f_1$ and f_2 belong to the same gauge representation, likewise for $\phi_{32}f_2$ and f_3 . In addition, the Higgs field H is only charged under G_3 . This sets the basis for explaining the flavor hierarchies: the inter-family mass rations are controlled by the suppression factors $\epsilon_1 = \langle \phi_{21} \rangle / \Lambda_{21}$ and $\epsilon_2 = \langle \phi_{32} \rangle / \Lambda_{32}$, of $O(10^{-2})$, where Λ_{ij} generically denote the scales of the effective operators yielding at low energies the SM Yukawa couplings. In addition, separating the light family dynamics from the third family by $\langle \phi_{21} \rangle \gg \langle \phi_{32} \rangle \gg \langle H \rangle$ allows for a low-scale flavor model consistent with the flavor-changing neutral currents and finite naturalness [10].²

While hierarchical singular values are observed in the quark and charged-lepton mass matrices, the neutrino mass matrix appears to be anarchic. In contrast to the small and hierarchical mixing between quark generations, neutrino oscillation experiments reveal large $\mathcal{O}(1)$ mixing angles, see e.g. [20, 21]. Even the ratio of mass differences $|\Delta m_{\rm atm}^{\nu}|/|\Delta m_{\rm sol}^{\nu}| \approx 5$ is not particularly large compared to the mass hierarchies in the charged fermion sector between consecutive generations, which are on average $\mathcal{O}(100)$. The question addressed in this letter is whether and under which conditions flavor deconstruction can lead to flavor anarchy in the neutrino sector together with the observed hierarchical Yukawa couplings for quarks and charged leptons.

This question cannot be addressed without making hypotheses about the origin of neutrino masses. We analyze the problem under the general assumption that the set of chiral fermions is extended by at least three right-handed neutrinos. Under this assumption, we first analyze in detail the representative case of the type-I seesaw mechanism (Section 2). We then show how the conclusions derived in that case can easily be generalized in the presence of an inverse seesaw mechanism (Section 3).

2. Deconstructing the type-I seesaw

In this section, we will limit ourselves to the type-I seesaw mechanism [22–26], where neutrino masses are described by the following Lagrangian

$$-\mathcal{L} \supset Y_{\nu}^{ij} \bar{\ell}_i \tilde{H} \nu_j + \frac{1}{2} M_{\mathrm{M}}^{ij} \nu_i \nu_j + \mathrm{h.c.}$$
(1)

Here, ℓ_i and ν_i are the left-handed lepton doublets and right-handed neutrinos, while $\tilde{H} = i\sigma_2 H^*$. After integrating out heavy ν_i , the mass matrix for active neutrinos becomes

$$m_{\nu} \approx -\langle H \rangle^2 Y_{\nu} M_{\rm M}^{-1} (Y_{\nu})^T . \qquad (2)$$

To understand how flavor deconstruction acts on m_{ν} , we need to specify which gauge group is deconstructed. It is easy to realize that deconstructing any of the three simple subgroups of the SM gauge symmetry prevents anarchic neutrino mixing and hierarchical quark and chargedlepton masses simultaneously. More precisely, producing the desired $Y_{u,d,e}$ singular value hierarchies requires

^{*} admir.greljo@unibas.ch

 $^{^{\}dagger}$ isidori@physik.uzh.ch

¹ Since the anomaly cancelation takes place within a family, such gauge extensions are automatically anomaly-free.

² Flavor deconstruction could originate from a warped extra dimension, see e.g. [19].

deconstructing either $SU(2)_L$ or $U(1)_Y$ or both.³ This inevitably imprints hierarchies in Y_{ν} while keeping M_M intact since ν_i are SM gauge singlets. In particular,

$$Y_{\nu} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon^2 & \epsilon^2 & \epsilon^2 \\ \epsilon & \epsilon & \epsilon \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} , \qquad (3)$$

for both SU(2)_L and U(1)_Y deconstruction, where we assumed $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon$ for simplicity. In this case, diagonalising the complex matrix m_{ν} in Eq. (2) via $U_{\nu}^T m_{\nu} U_{\nu} = \hat{m}_{\nu}$, leads to $U_{\nu} \approx \mathbf{1}$. The left-handed charged lepton mixing has a similar form, implying a neutrino mixing matrix [27] close to the identity: $V_{\text{PMNS}} = U_{\nu}^{\dagger} U_{e_L} \approx \mathbf{1}$.⁴

A necessary ingredient to achieve our goal is an extended gauge group where the ν_i are not singlets, allowing $M_{\rm M}$ to acquire a non-trivial flavor pattern that can compensate for the (unavoidably) hierarchical structure of Y_{ν} . Without loss of generality, given the fermion content under consideration, we enlarge the gauge group to

$$SU(3)_{C} \times SU(2)_{L} \times U(1)_{R} \times U(1)_{B-L}, \qquad (4)$$

where hypercharge is a subgroup of the two U(1) factors:⁵ Y = R + (B - L)/2. In particular, the right-handed neutrinos carry R = +1/2 and L = 1 such that Y = 0. The full deconstruction of either U(1)_R or U(1)_{B-L}, with the other remaining universal, leads to the following texture for the Majorana mass matrix:

$$M_{\rm M} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon^4 & \epsilon^3 & \epsilon^2 \\ \epsilon^3 & \epsilon^2 & \epsilon \\ \epsilon^2 & \epsilon & 1 \end{bmatrix} .$$
 (5)

In order to get an anarchic m_{ν} , the following form of the Dirac mass matrix is required (Appendix A):

$$Y_{\nu} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon^2 & \leq \epsilon & \leq 1 \\ \leq \epsilon^2 & \epsilon & \leq 1 \\ \leq \epsilon^2 & \leq \epsilon & 1 \end{bmatrix} .$$
 (6)

No entry in a given column should be parametrically larger than the diagonal one. Additionally, the diagonal entries must strictly adhere to the $(\epsilon^2, \epsilon, 1)$ power counting.

The key to a successful description of neutrino, charged-lepton, and quark mass matrices is deconstructing some of the simple groups in Eq. (4) in order to

Scalars	$\mathrm{U}(1)^{(1)}_{\mathrm{R}}$	$\mathrm{U}(1)^{(2)}_{\mathrm{R}}$	$\mathrm{U}(1)^{(3)}_{\mathrm{R}}$	$\rm U(1)_{B-L}$
ϕ_{21}	1/2	-1/2	0	0
ϕ_{32}	0	1/2	-1/2	0
X	0	0	-1	+2
H	0	0	1/2	0

TABLE I. Charges of the symmetry-breaking scalars under $U(1)_R^3 \times U(1)_{B-L}.$

achieve both Eqs. (5) and (6), together with hierarchical (and properly aligned) $Y_{u,d,e}$.

The Majorana mass matrix assumes the inverse hierarchical form under the following three hypotheses:

- A) $U(1)^{3}_{R} \times U(1)_{B-L}$,
- B) $U(1)_{R} \times U(1)_{B-L}^{3}$,
- C) $U(1)^3_R \times U(1)^3_{B-L}$.

In the following, we proceed to analyze these three options in detail. As we will show, all of them can lead to a phenomenologically viable pattern for all mass matrices if accompanied by suitable deconstructions of either $SU(3)_C$ (option A) or $SU(2)_L$ (options B and C).

2.1. Model A: $SU(3)^2_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)^3_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$

The scalar field content of this option is illustrated in Table I. Note its minimality, leaving no uneaten Goldstone bosons. The effective theory operators generating the leptonic Yukawa interactions are

$$\mathcal{L}_{Y} \supset \quad \bar{\ell}_{i}He_{3} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}}\bar{\ell}_{i}H\phi_{32}e_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda_{21}}\bar{\ell}_{i}H\phi_{32}\phi_{21}e_{1} \\ + \bar{\ell}_{i}\tilde{H}\nu_{3} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}}\bar{\ell}_{i}\tilde{H}\phi_{32}^{*}\nu_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda_{21}}\bar{\ell}_{i}\tilde{H}\phi_{32}^{*}\phi_{21}^{*}\nu_{1} ,$$

$$(7)$$

where we have omitted to show $\mathcal{O}(1)$ parameters in front of the operators. Similarly, the Majorana mass matrix gets generated from

$$-\mathcal{L}_{M} = \chi \nu_{3} \nu_{3} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}} \chi \phi_{32}^{*} \nu_{3} \nu_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32} \Lambda_{21}} \chi \phi_{32}^{*} \phi_{21}^{*} \nu_{3} \nu_{1} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}^{2}} \chi \phi_{32}^{*} \phi_{32}^{*} \nu_{2} \nu_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}^{2} \Lambda_{21}} \chi \phi_{32}^{*} \phi_{32}^{*} \phi_{21}^{*} \nu_{2} \nu_{1} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}^{2} \Lambda_{21}^{2}} \chi \phi_{32}^{*} \phi_{32}^{*} \phi_{21}^{*} \nu_{1} \nu_{1} .$$
(8)

The common effective scales Λ_{21} and Λ_{32} lead to the universal suppression factors $\epsilon_i = \langle \phi_{ij} \rangle / \Lambda_{ij}$.⁶ For simplicity, we assume universal $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon_2 = \epsilon$ as before.

³ The deconstruction of QCD, which is a vector-like group, does not predict mass hierarchies.

⁴ This is not specific to the type-I seesaw mechanism and can be formulated at the level of the Weinberg operator $\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{c_{ij}}{\Lambda} \ell_i \ell_j H H$. Since ℓ_i are charged under both SU(2)_L and U(1)_Y, c_{ij} is necessarily hierarchical under their deconstruction. Obviously, the same holds if neutrinos are Dirac, see Eq. (3), though this case is less motivated as it does not address the overall smallness of neutrino masses.

 $^{^5}$ Both U(1) groups can be embedded in motivated non-Abelian groups; however, this makes no difference for the present discussion.

 $^{^{6}}$ A straightforward UV completion which ensures the effective neutrino operators in Eqs. (7) and (8) are suppressed by the



FIG. 1. A representative UV completion of selected operators in Eqs. (7) and (8). A heavy vectorlike fermion $N = N_L \oplus N_R$ in the gauge representation of ν_3 , and mass $m_N \gg \langle \chi \rangle, \langle \phi_i \rangle$, when integrated out, ensures the same suppression factor $\epsilon_2 = \langle \phi_2 \rangle / m_N$ in Y_{ν} and M_M matrices. Similarly, adding another vectorlike fermion in the gauge representation of ν_2 allows the completion of the first-family structure.

The deconstruction of $U(1)_R$ leads to Yukawa couplings of the form

$$Y_{u,d,e,\nu}^{\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{R}}^{3}} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon^{2} & \epsilon & 1\\ \epsilon^{2} & \epsilon & 1\\ \epsilon^{2} & \epsilon & 1 \end{bmatrix} , \qquad (9)$$

while the Majorana mass matrix takes the form in Eq. (5). The singular values of Y_e are $(\epsilon^2, \epsilon, 1)$ producing the observed mass hierarchies. Furthermore, given the condition in Eq. (6) is satisfied, the resulting neutrino mass matrix m_{ν} is anarchic.

However, the left-handed mixing matrices obtained from the singular value decomposition have $\mathcal{O}(1)$ angles. While this works well for $V_{\rm PMNS}$, it is not a viable structure for $V_{\rm CKM}$ [28, 29] obtained from the left-handed mixing in the quark sector. This problem can be addressed through the flavor deconstruction of QCD without compromising the leptonic sector. Note that since QCD is a vector-like group, its deconstruction does not affect quark masses that remain similar to the charged-lepton ones.

Consider, for concreteness, a partial QCD deconstruction $SU(3)^{(12)}_C \times SU(3)^{(3)}_C$. A scalar field $\Omega \sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{\overline{3}})$ breaks the symmetry down to the QCD. The effective Lagrangian for the quark sector becomes

$$-\mathcal{L}_{Y} \supset \overline{q}_{3}Hd_{3} + \frac{1}{\Lambda'}\overline{q}_{p}H\Omega d_{3}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda'}\overline{q}_{3}H\phi_{32}\Omega^{\dagger}d_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda_{21}\Lambda'}\overline{q}_{3}H\phi_{32}\phi_{21}\Omega^{\dagger}d_{1}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}}\overline{q}_{p}H\phi_{32}d_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda_{21}}\overline{q}_{p}H\phi_{32}\phi_{21}d_{1}$$

$$+ \overline{q}_{3}\tilde{H}u_{3} + \frac{1}{\Lambda'}\overline{q}_{p}\tilde{H}\Omega u_{3}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda'}\overline{q}_{3}\tilde{H}\phi_{32}^{*}\Omega^{\dagger}u_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda_{21}\Lambda'}\overline{q}_{3}\tilde{H}\phi_{32}^{*}\phi_{21}^{*}\Omega^{\dagger}u_{1}$$

$$+ \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}}\overline{q}_{p}\tilde{H}\phi_{32}^{*}u_{2} + \frac{1}{\Lambda_{32}\Lambda_{21}}\overline{q}_{p}\tilde{H}\phi_{32}^{*}\phi_{21}^{*}u_{1} .$$

$$(10)$$

Here, p = 1, 2 and Λ' is the effective scale of operators containing insertions of Ω . The corresponding suppression factor $\epsilon' = \langle \Omega \rangle / \Lambda$ shows up only in the mixing. The quark Yukawa matrices, therefore, take the form

$$Y_{u,d}^{\mathrm{I}} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon^2 & \epsilon & \epsilon' \\ \epsilon^2 & \epsilon & \epsilon' \\ \epsilon' \epsilon^2 & \epsilon' \epsilon & 1 \end{bmatrix} .$$
 (11)

The singular values of $Y_{u,d}$ are $(\epsilon^2, \epsilon, 1)$ in agreement with the charged leptons. The predicted Cabbibo angle is large while V_{cb} and V_{ub} are of order ϵ' . A full deconstruction of QCD would predict $V_{us} \sim \epsilon'_1$, $V_{cb} \sim \epsilon'_2$ and $V_{ub} \sim V_{us}V_{cb}$.

A relevant question to address is the identification of the smallest scale at which deconstruction occurs. The EFT description in Eq. (8) is valid only when $\Lambda_{1,2} \gtrsim \langle \chi \rangle$. The absolute neutrino mass scale naturally points to $\langle \chi \rangle \approx \langle H \rangle^2 / (0.1 \,\mathrm{eV}) \sim 10^{14} \,\mathrm{GeV}$. On the other hand, the charged fermion hierarchies are best fitted for $\epsilon \sim 4 \times 10^{-3}$ (see the Supplemental Material of [30]). Assuming the same ϵ for neutrinos and charged leptons, this points to a high scale for the U(1)_R deconstruction, which makes it challenging for experiments. Moreover, this scenario

same scales Λ_{21} and Λ_{32} involves a tree-level mediation of heavy vector-like fermions that transform in the same gauge representations as ν_2 and ν_3 , respectively. See Fig. 1.

Scalars	$\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{B-L}}^{(1)}$	$\mathrm{U}(1)^{(2)}_{\mathrm{B-L}}$	$\mathrm{U}(1)^{(3)}_{\mathrm{B-L}}$	$\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{R}}$
ϕ^q_{21}	-1/3	1/3	0	0
ϕ^q_{32}	0	-1/3	+1/3	0
χ	0	0	+2	-1
H	0	0	0	1/2

TABLE II. Charges of the minimal set of symmetry-breaking scalars under $U(1)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}^3$.

would require a huge tuning of the Higgs mass term in the absence of a protection mechanism such as low-energy supersymmetry or compositeness.

One way to lower the scale would be to introduce a universal suppression factor in the Y_{ν} matrix. A possible option is a flavor-universal Z_2 symmetry under which only the ν_i are odd. Denoting μ_{ν} the corresponding symmetry-breaking spurion, $\langle \chi \rangle \sim (\mu_{\nu}/10^{-4})^2 \times$ 1000 TeV. A more motivated option is to implement flavor deconstruction in a symmetry-protected seesaw mechanism, such as the inverse seesaw. We discuss this option in Section 3.

2.2. Model B: $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L^3 \times U(1)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}^3$

A minimal option to deconstruct U(1)_{B-L} and generate the effective SM Yukawa couplings is via the scalar field content in Table II. This way, all Goldstone bosons are gauged away. However, one can consider less minimal options also introducing the link fields $\phi_{ij}^{\ell} \sim (\phi_{ij}^{q*})^3$. This is why, to keep the discussion more general, we define $\epsilon_i^{q,\ell} = \langle \phi_{ij}^{q,\ell} \rangle / \Lambda_{ij}^{q,\ell}$. With these assumptions, U(1)³_{B-L} implies

$$Y_{u,d}^{\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{B-L}}^{3}} \sim \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_{q} & \epsilon_{q}^{2} \\ \epsilon_{q} & 1 & \epsilon_{q} \\ \epsilon_{q}^{2} & \epsilon_{q} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_{e,\nu}^{\mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{B-L}}^{3}} \sim \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \epsilon_{\ell} & \epsilon_{\ell}^{2} \\ \epsilon_{\ell} & 1 & \epsilon_{\ell} \\ \epsilon_{\ell}^{2} & \epsilon_{\ell} & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$
(12)

where in the minimal model $\epsilon_{\ell} = \epsilon_q^3$. The Majorana mass matrix takes the form in Eq. (5) with the replacement $\epsilon \to \epsilon_{\ell}$. This texture does not generate neutrino anarchy nor charged fermion mass hierarchy, calling for an additional deconstruction of the SU(2)_L group. To this purpose, we introduce another pair of scalar link fields, bi-doublets under SU(2)_L⁽¹⁾ × SU(2)_L⁽²⁾ and SU(2)_L⁽²⁾ × SU(2)_L⁽³⁾, respectively. The Higgs is charged under SU(2)_L⁽³⁾. Denoting ϵ_L the suppression factor associated to the SU(2)_L deconstruction, one has

$$Y_{u,d,e,\nu}^{\mathrm{SU}(2)_{\mathrm{L}}^{3}} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} \\ \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix} .$$
(13)

Hence the combined effect of $SU(2)^3_L \times U(1)^3_{B-L}$ is

$$Y_{u,d}^{\mathrm{II}} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} \epsilon_{q} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} \epsilon_{q}^{2} \\ \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} \epsilon_{q} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} \epsilon_{q} \\ \epsilon_{q}^{2} & \epsilon_{q} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad Y_{e,\nu}^{\mathrm{II}} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} \epsilon_{\ell} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}}^{2} \epsilon_{\ell}^{2} \\ \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} \epsilon_{\ell} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} & \epsilon_{\mathrm{L}} \epsilon_{\ell} \\ \epsilon_{\ell}^{2} & \epsilon_{\ell} & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

without affecting the Majorana mass matrix. This scenario satisfies the neutrino criteria in Eq. (6) if

$$\epsilon_{\rm L} = \epsilon_{\ell} , \qquad (15)$$

and successfully generates hierarchical masses for quarks and charged leptons with singular values ($\epsilon_{\rm L}^2, \epsilon_{\rm L}, 1$). In addition, it predicts a perturbative $V_{\rm CKM}$ matrix which is close to the unit matrix with $V_{us} \sim V_{cb} \sim \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_q$ and $V_{ub} \sim V_{us} V_{cb}$. The predicted off-diagonal elements are arguably too small. However, in the minimal realization, where $\epsilon_q = \epsilon_{\rm L}^{1/3}$, this could be acceptable.

2.3. Model C: $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L^3 \times U(1)_R^3 \times U(1)_{B-L}^3$

While $U(1)_{R}^{3} \times U(1)_{B-L}^{3}$ yields a successful description of quark and charged-lepton Yukawa couplings, it does not satisfy the neutrino conditions in Eqs. (5) and (6). However, this can be achieved via the deconstruction of the full electroweak group: $SU(2)_{L}^{3} \times U(1)_{R}^{3} \times U(1)_{B-L}^{3}$. This deconstruction implies

$$Y_{u,d}^{\rm III} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{\rm L}^2 \epsilon_{\rm R}^2 & \epsilon_{\rm L}^2 \epsilon_{\rm R} \epsilon_q & \epsilon_{\rm L}^2 \epsilon_q^2 \\ \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_{\rm R}^2 \epsilon_q & \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_{\rm R} & \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_q \\ \epsilon_{\rm R}^2 \epsilon_q^2 & \epsilon_{\rm R} \epsilon_q & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$
(16)

and

$$Y_{e,\nu}^{\rm III} \sim \begin{bmatrix} \epsilon_{\rm L}^2 \epsilon_{\rm R}^2 & \epsilon_{\rm L}^2 \epsilon_{\rm R} \epsilon_{\ell} & \epsilon_{\rm L}^2 \epsilon_{\ell}^2 \\ \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_{\rm R}^2 \epsilon_{\ell} & \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_{\rm R} & \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_{\ell} \\ \epsilon_{\rm R}^2 \epsilon_{\ell}^2 & \epsilon_{\rm R} \epsilon_{\ell} & 1 \end{bmatrix} , \qquad (17)$$

while the Majorana mass matrix has the form in Eq. (5) with the replacement $\epsilon \to \epsilon_{\ell} \epsilon_R$. When

$$\epsilon_{\rm L} = \epsilon_{\rm R} = \epsilon_{\ell} \,\,, \tag{18}$$

this texture produces neutrino anarchy while predicting quark and charged-lepton mass hierarchy, with singular values ($\epsilon_{\rm L}^4, \epsilon_{\rm L}^2, 1$) and the $V_{\rm CKM}$ matrix close to the unit matrix with $V_{us} \sim V_{cb} \sim \epsilon_{\rm L} \epsilon_q$ and $V_{ub} \sim V_{us} V_{cb}$. This relation works better when relating quark masses to the $V_{\rm CKM}$ elements than in Section 2.2.

At this point, it is tempting to ask what happens if, in addition, we also deconstruct $SU(3)_C$ such that the full underlying gauge group is

$$PS^{(1)} \times PS^{(2)} \times PS^{(3)}$$
, (19)

as initially conjectured in [1]. Staying at the level of $SU(3)^3_C \times SU(2)^3_L \times U(1)^3_R \times U(1)^3_{B-L}$, we simply assume ϕ^q_{21} in Table II to be a $(\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{\overline{3}})$ under $SU(3)^{(1)}_C \times SU(3)^{(2)}_C$

and the same for ϕ_{32}^q under $\mathrm{SU}(3)_{\mathrm{C}}^{(2)} \times \mathrm{SU}(3)_{\mathrm{C}}^{(3)}$. Here, however, we need to have ϕ_{ij}^{ℓ} fields as well. In fact, ϕ_{ij}^q and ϕ_{ij}^{ℓ} unify into a pair of bifundamentals Σ_{ij} of $\mathrm{SU}(4)^3 \supset \mathrm{SU}(3)_{\mathrm{C}}^3 \times \mathrm{U}(1)_{\mathrm{B-L}}^3$. Remarkably, this model predicts exactly the flavor structure of Model C!

3. Deconstructing the inverse seesaw

The inverse seesaw [31, 32] belongs to a class of symmetry-protected seesaw mechanisms that predict lighter sterile neutrinos with larger couplings. This provides an interesting target for probing the origin of neutrino masses in ongoing and upcoming experiments. In addition to left-chiral ℓ_i and right-chiral ν_i , the model is extended by (left-chiral) gauge singlets S_i , where for concreteness, we consider three flavors (i = 1, 2, 3). Let us define $n_i = (\ell_i^1, \nu_i^c, S_i)$. Here, ℓ^1 stands for the neutral component of the lepton doublet and c is for the charge conjugation. The neutral lepton mass matrix (9 × 9) is

$$-\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{1}{2} \bar{n}_i M_{\nu}^{ij} n_j^c, \quad M_{\nu} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & M_D & 0 \\ M_D^T & 0 & M_R^T \\ 0 & M_R & \mu_S \end{bmatrix} , \quad (20)$$

The global lepton number is an approximate symmetry softly broken by μ_S^{ij} . For $\mu_S \ll M_D < M_R$ ⁷, the active neutrino mass matrix takes the form

$$m_{\nu} \approx M_D M_R^{-1} \mu_S (M_R^{-1})^T M_D^T$$
 . (21)

For the same arguments presented in Section 2, a deconstruction of the SM gauge symmetry cannot reconcile hierarchical charged leptons with anarchic neutrinos. Therefore, we are again led to consider the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ gauge symmetry. Introducing the scalar field $\chi \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, -1/2, +1)$ that breaks the two U(1)'s down to the SM hypercharge, allow us to write

$$-\mathcal{L} \supset Y_R^{ij} \bar{S}_i \chi \nu_j , \quad M_R^{ij} = Y_R^{ij} \langle \chi \rangle .$$
 (22)

Note that the Majorana mass term for ν_i is absent at the renormalizable level. As before, $M_D^{ij} = Y_{\nu}^{ij} \langle H \rangle$ stems from $\mathcal{L} \supset -Y_{\nu}^{ij} \bar{\ell}_i \tilde{H} \nu_j$. The remaining renormalizable operator $\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{2} \mu_S^{ij} \bar{S}_i^c S_i$ finally justifies Eq. (20).

Since the S_i are gauge singlets, the natural expectation for μ_S^{ij} is flavor anarchy. On the other hand, flavor deconstruction imprints hierarchical patterns in Y_{ν} and Y_R . When put together, Eq. (21) requires $Y_{\nu}Y_R^{-1}$ to be an anarchic matrix for m_{ν} also to be anarchic. Under $U(1)_R$ or $U(1)_{B-L}$ deconstruction, Y_R takes the form of Eq. (9). As a result, Y_{ν} should satisfy the same condition as in Eq. (6), see Appendix B. Since the condition in Eq. (6) is unchanged, the same gauge symmetries that worked for the high-scale seesaw discussed in Sections 2.1 and 2.2 are also applicable in the inverse seesaw case. This is not surprising given the additional fermions we have introduced (the S_i), being gauge singlets do not participate in the flavor deconstruction. The observed neutrino mass splittings suggest $\mu \sim 0.1 \text{ eV} \langle \chi \rangle^2 / \langle H \rangle^2$. Therefore, the major advantage of the inverse seesaw is that the deconstruction can easily take place at the TeV scale, which is consistent with finite naturalness (see also [34]). Detailed phenomenological investigations are left for future studies.

4. Conclusions

Seemingly anarchic neutrino flavor structure, when contrasted with the hierarchies observed in the charged fermion sector, poses a significant challenge for many flavor models, especially those involving flavor deconstruction. The SM gauge group's deconstruction fails to reconcile both phenomena simultaneously. However, as demonstrated in this letter, minimal extensions where right-handed neutrinos are not gauge singlets allow for reconciliation, enabling the correct generation of charged fermion mass and mixing hierarchies while predicting anarchy for the light-active neutrinos. Focusing on the type-I and inverse seesaw mechanisms, we have conducted a comprehensive survey of possible options and identified promising models for further study. While these models strictly lead to neutrino anarchy, other deconstruction models with moderate tuning should not be disregarded.

Acknowledgments

We thank Joe Davighi for his useful comments on the manuscript. This work has received funding from the Swiss National Science Foundation (SNF) through the Eccellenza Professorial Fellowship "Flavor Physics at the High Energy Frontier," project number 186866. In addition, this project has received funding from the European Research Council (ERC) under the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement 833280 (FLAY) and by the SNF under contract 200020_204428.

A. Type-I seesaw: Hierarchy cancellation

Consider the matrices

$$X_{\rm M} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11}\epsilon_1^2\epsilon_2^2 & x_{12}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2^2 & x_{13}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 \\ x_{12}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2^2 & x_{22}\epsilon_2^2 & x_{23}\epsilon_2 \\ x_{13}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 & x_{23}\epsilon_2 & x_{33} \end{pmatrix} , \quad Y_{\rm D} = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1\epsilon_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$
(A1)

⁷ The PMNS non-unitarity sets limit on M_D/M_R , see e.g. [33].

The following relation holds (with no approximations):

$$Y_{\rm D} X_{\rm M}^{-1} Y_{\rm D}^{T} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{11} & x_{12} & x_{13} \\ x_{12} & x_{22} & x_{23} \\ x_{13} & x_{23} & x_{33} \end{pmatrix}^{-1} .$$
(A2)

For $x_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\epsilon_i \ll 1$, this provides a mechanism to generate an anarchic mass matrix for active neutrinos starting from hierarchical Yukawa couplings in the type-I seesaw mechanism.

- M. Bordone, C. Cornella, J. Fuentes-Martin, and G. Isidori, A three-site gauge model for flavor hierarchies and flavor anomalies, Phys. Lett. B 779 (2018) 317-323, [arXiv:1712.01368].
- [2] A. Greljo and B. A. Stefanek, Third family quark-lepton unification at the TeV scale, Phys. Lett. B 782 (2018) 131-138, [arXiv:1802.04274].
- [3] B. C. Allanach and J. Davighi, Third family hypercharge model for $R_{K^{(*)}}$ and aspects of the fermion mass problem, JHEP **12** (2018) 075, [arXiv:1809.01158].
- [4] A. Greljo, T. Opferkuch, and B. A. Stefanek, Gravitational Imprints of Flavor Hierarchies, Phys. Rev. Lett. 124 (2020), no. 17 171802, [arXiv:1910.02014].
- [5] J. Fuentes-Martín and P. Stangl, Third-family quark-lepton unification with a fundamental composite Higgs, Phys. Lett. B 811 (2020) 135953, [arXiv:2004.11376].
- [6] L. Allwicher, G. Isidori, and A. E. Thomsen, Stability of the Higgs Sector in a Flavor-Inspired Multi-Scale Model, JHEP 01 (2021) 191, [arXiv:2011.01946].
- [7] J. Fuentes-Martin, G. Isidori, J. Pagès, and B. A. Stefanek, Flavor non-universal Pati-Salam unification and neutrino masses, Phys. Lett. B 820 (2021) 136484, [arXiv:2012.10492].
- [8] J. Davighi and J. Tooby-Smith, Electroweak flavour unification, JHEP 09 (2022) 193, [arXiv:2201.07245]
- [9] J. Davighi, G. Isidori, and M. Pesut, Electroweak-flavour and quark-lepton unification: a family non-universal path, JHEP 04 (2023) 030, [arXiv:2212.06163].
- [10] J. Davighi and G. Isidori, Non-universal gauge interactions addressing the inescapable link between Higgs and flavour, JHEP 07 (2023) 147, [arXiv:2303.01520].
- [11] J. Davighi and B. A. Stefanek, Deconstructed hypercharge: a natural model of flavour, JHEP 11 (2023) 100, [arXiv:2305.16280].
- [12] M. Fernández Navarro and S. F. King, Tri-hypercharge: a separate gauged weak hypercharge for each fermion family as the origin of flavour, JHEP 08 (2023) 020, [arXiv:2305.07690].

B. Inverse seesaw: Hierarchy cancellation

Consider the matrices

$$Y_{\rm D} = \begin{pmatrix} y_{11}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 & y_{12}\epsilon_2 & y_{13} \\ y_{21}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 & y_{22}\epsilon_2 & y_{23} \\ y_{31}\epsilon_1\epsilon_2 & y_{32}\epsilon_2 & y_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_R = \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1\epsilon_2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \epsilon_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$
(B1)

The following relation holds (with no approximations):

$$Y_{\rm D}Y_{\rm R}^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} y_{11} & y_{12} & y_{13} \\ y_{21} & y_{22} & y_{23} \\ y_{31} & y_{32} & y_{33} \end{pmatrix} .$$
(B2)

For $y_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\epsilon_i \ll 1$, this provides a mechanism to generate an anarchic mass matrix for active neutrinos in the inverse seesaw mechanism.

- [13] M. Fernández Navarro, S. F. King, and A. Vicente, *Tri-unification: a separate SU*(5) for each fermion family, arXiv:2311.05683.
- [14] J. Davighi, A. Gosnay, D. J. Miller, and S. Renner, *Phenomenology of a Deconstructed Electroweak Force*, arXiv:2312.13346.
- [15] R. Barbieri and G. Isidori, Minimal flavour deconstruction, arXiv:2312.14004.
- [16] B. Capdevila, A. Crivellin, J. M. Lizana, and S. Pokorski, SU(2)_L deconstruction and flavour (non)-universality, arXiv:2401.00848.
- [17] J. Fuentes-Martín and J. M. Lizana, Deconstructing flavor anomalously, arXiv:2402.09507.
- [18] M. Fernández Navarro, S. F. King, and A. Vicente, Minimal complete tri-hypercharge theories of flavour, arXiv:2404.12442.
- [19] J. Fuentes-Martin, G. Isidori, J. M. Lizana, N. Selimovic, and B. A. Stefanek, *Flavor hierarchies*, *flavor anomalies*, and *Higgs mass from a warped extra dimension*, *Phys. Lett. B* 834 (2022) 137382, [arXiv:2203.01952].
- [20] I. Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz, and A. Zhou, *The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations*, *JHEP* 09 (2020) 178, [arXiv:2007.14792].
- [21] F. Capozzi, E. Di Valentino, E. Lisi, A. Marrone,
 A. Melchiorri, and A. Palazzo, *Global constraints on absolute neutrino masses and their ordering*, *Phys. Rev.* D 95 (2017), no. 9 096014, [arXiv:2003.08511].
 [Addendum: Phys.Rev.D 101, 116013 (2020)].
- [22] P. Minkowski, $\mu \to e\gamma$ at a Rate of One Out of 10^9 Muon Decays?, Phys. Lett. B **67** (1977) 421–428.
- [23] T. Yanagida, Horizontal Symmetry and Masses of Neutrinos, Prog. Theor. Phys. 64 (1980) 1103.
- [24] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, Complex Spinors and Unified Theories, Conf. Proc. C 790927 (1979) 315–321, [arXiv:1306.4669].
- [25] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Nonconservation, Phys. Rev. Lett. 44 (1980) 912.

- [26] S. Centelles Chuliá, A. Herrero-Brocal, and A. Vicente, The Type-I Seesaw family, arXiv:2404.15415.
- [27] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa, and S. Sakata, Remarks on the unified model of elementary particles, Prog. Theor. Phys. 28 (1962) 870–880.
- [28] N. Cabibbo, Unitary Symmetry and Leptonic Decays, Phys. Rev. Lett. 10 (1963) 531–533.
- [29] M. Kobayashi and T. Maskawa, CP Violation in the Renormalizable Theory of Weak Interaction, Prog. Theor. Phys. 49 (1973) 652–657.
- [30] S. Antusch, A. Greljo, B. A. Stefanek, and A. E. Thomsen, U(2) Is Right for Leptons and Left for Quarks, Phys. Rev. Lett. 132 (2024), no. 15 151802, [arXiv:2311.09288].

- [31] D. Wyler and L. Wolfenstein, Massless Neutrinos in Left-Right Symmetric Models, Nucl. Phys. B 218 (1983) 205–214.
- [32] R. N. Mohapatra and J. W. F. Valle, Neutrino Mass and Baryon Number Nonconservation in Superstring Models, Phys. Rev. D 34 (1986) 1642.
- [33] S. Antusch, E. Cazzato, and O. Fischer, Sterile neutrino searches at future e⁻e⁺, pp, and e⁻p colliders, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **32** (2017), no. 14 1750078, [arXiv:1612.02728].
- [34] P. Fileviez Pérez, C. Murgui, S. Patrone, A. Testa, and M. B. Wise, *Finite naturalness and quark-lepton unification*, *Phys. Rev. D* 109 (2024), no. 1 015011, [arXiv:2308.07367].