

Curiously in the minimal left right symmetric model, chiral ( $\chi$ ) symmetry that protects the electron's mass ( $m_e$ ), due to parity (P) implies the vanishing of its neutrino mixing angles. We break the  $\chi$  symmetry to generate the observed neutrino mixing which causes the electron to acquire its mass on RGE running, and in turn determines the  $B - L$  gauge symmetry breaking scale ( $v_R$ ) to be  $10^{10} GeV \lesssim v_R \leq 10^{15} GeV$  (and with fine-tuning can be at  $10 TeV$  scale). If the muon's mass is also generated radiatively, the  $B - L$  breaking scale is  $\sim 10^{14-15}$  GeV. Regardless of how high the scale  $v_R$  is, this is a testable model for obtaining the mass of the electron (and muon), since on RGE running and P breaking, a large strong CP phase ( $\theta \gg 10^{-10}$ ) which depends logarithmically on  $v_R$  is generated if there is  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  CP violation in leptonic Yukawa couplings. Hence we expect that leptonic CP phases including the Dirac CP phase  $\delta_{CP}$  of the PMNS matrix must be consistent with  $0$  or  $180^\circ$  to within a degree, which can be verified or excluded by neutrino experiments such as DUNE and Hyper-Kamiokande. In lieu of P, if charge conjugation C is used, the same results follow. However with C and no P, axions would likely need to be added anyway, in which case there is no constraint on  $\delta_{CP}$ .

*Introduction.* It is well known that approximate chiral symmetries [1, 2] that act on left handed first and second generation quarks, can suppress the associated quark masses and simultaneously also their Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa or CKM mixing (which is their left handed mixing), leading to an understanding of the smallness of both.

However in the leptonic sector while the charged leptons exhibit mass hierarchy (notably,  $m_e/m_\tau \sim 3 \times 10^{-4}$ ), the neutrino mixing angles in the Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) matrix (which is their left-handed mixing) are large or  $\sim 0.1 - 1$  and are anarchical [3, 4] rather than hierarchical.

To accommodate neutrino masses and mixing, we can treat the Standard Model (SM) as an effective low energy theory and add a non renormalizable Weinberg term [5]  $L_{iL}^T H H^T L_{jL}$ , where  $L_{iL}$  are leptonic  $SU(2)_L$  doublets ( $i = 1, 2, 3$  for the three generations) and  $H$  is the SM Higgs doublet.

Now the charged lepton mass hierarchy can be understood as being due to approximate chiral symmetry acting on the right handed charged leptons (rather than left handed), so as not to suppress the observed neutrino mixing [6].

If we augment the SM with an  $SU(2)_L$  Higgs triplet  $\Delta_L$  [7], while  $e_R \rightarrow e^{i\chi} e_R$  can be broken approximately to keep the electron mass ( $m_e$ ) small, the observed large neutrino mixing can be generated by the Majorana type Yukawa terms  $f_{ij} L_{iL}^T \tau_2 \Delta_L L_{jL}$  when  $\Delta_L$  picks up a VEV (Type II seesaw mechanism), with  $f_{ij}$  being unaffected by the chiral symmetry.

There is however a vexing issue in the popular minimal Left-Right symmetric (LR) model [8, 9] that restores parity as a good symmetry of nature.

$e_R$  is now paired with  $\nu_{eR}$  in the  $SU(2)_R$  lepton doublet  $L_{1R}$ , and parity (P or charge conjugation C) implies that

if there is an approximate chiral symmetry acting on the right handed-leptons, there is a corresponding symmetry on the left-handed leptons.  $L_{1R} \rightarrow e^{i\chi} L_{1R}$  imposed to keep the electron massless, will due to parity, imply there is also a  $\chi$ -symmetry  $L_{1L} \rightarrow e^{i\chi} L_{1L}$  which renders the above Majorana Yukawa couplings of  $L_{1L}$  with  $\Delta_L$ , namely,  $f_{1j} = f_{j1} = 0$ . To generate unsuppressed  $f_{1j} = f_{j1}$  the chiral symmetry must be broken in a non-approximate way.

As far as we know, this crucial aspect of the minimal left right symmetric model hasn't been adequately discussed and addressed before. This work is the first to explore it within the framework of the Type II dominant seesaw mechanism.

That is, in the minimal left right symmetric model if we make the electron massless by imposing a chiral symmetry, its neutrino mixing also vanishes, and it is a challenge to understand the observed largeness of the leptonic mixing angles (see also [6]).

In this work we address this challenge by adding a second triplet  $\Delta'_L$  ( $\rightarrow e^{-i\chi} \Delta'_L$  under  $\chi$ -symmetry so that it can couple to  $L_{1L}$ ), whose mixing with  $\Delta_L$  breaks the  $\chi$ -symmetry and generates the observed neutrino mixing angles of the first generation, while the electron remains massless at the tree level. After integrating out the heavy  $\Delta'_L$  (by going to its mass basis at its mass scale  $M'$ ) and its parity partner  $\Delta'_R$ , we obtain the minimal left right symmetric model which on RGE running to the parity breaking scale  $v_R$ , generates the electron mass (corresponding Yukawa coupling) in two loops. Thus we not only gain an understanding of the smallness but also obtain the electron's mass.

The idea of generating the masses and mixing angles of the first and/or second generation leptons and/or quarks radiatively at different loop orders has been previously explored in different contexts over the years [10–16]. In some of the past work, the scalar content has been chosen so that there are no gauge invariant Yukawa terms that directly give masses to lighter fermions. Several heavy fields that interact with the light fermions are added to

\* raviparity@gmail.com

$SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$		
$\Delta_L = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_L^+/\sqrt{2} & \Delta_L^{++} \\ \Delta_L^o & -\Delta_L^+/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \Delta'_L$	$(3, 1, 2)$	
$\Delta_R = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_R^+/\sqrt{2} & \Delta_R^{++} \\ \Delta_R^o & -\Delta_R^+/\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}, \Delta'_R$	$(1, 3, 2)$	
$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^o & \phi_2^+ \\ \phi_1^- & \phi_2^o \end{pmatrix}$	$(2, 2, 0)$	
$L_{iL} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{iL} \\ e_{iL}^- \end{pmatrix}, L_{iR} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{iR} \\ e_{iR}^- \end{pmatrix}$	$(2, 1, -1), (1, 2, -1)$	

TABLE I. Scalars and leptons of the minimal left right symmetric model with additional scalar triplets  $\Delta'_{L,R}$  (whose  $2 \times 2$  matrix representation is similar to  $\Delta_{L,R}$ ). The neutral components of the scalars are denoted by the superscript “o” and can pick up VEVs.

enable their radiative mass generation. In our model, as is also the case with the SM, the scalar content is such that Yukawa terms that give charged fermion masses are allowed by gauge symmetry. Therefore we impose chiral symmetry to protect the electron mass, which gets generated on RGE running from neutrino mass and mixing parameters of the minimal left-right symmetric model itself, below the chiral symmetry breaking scale.

*Chiral symmetry breaking & neutrino mixing.* We begin with the Left-Right symmetric model [8, 9] based on  $SU(3)_c \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L} \times P$  with the Higgs sector consisting of the usual triplet  $\Delta_R$ , augmented by an additional  $\Delta'_R$  and their parity partners  $\Delta_L, \Delta'_L$ , along with an  $SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R$  bi-doublet  $\phi$ .

Scalars and leptons in our model are displayed in Table I and there are also the quarks. Note that the left handed electron  $e_L \equiv e_{1L}^-$  and its neutrino  $\nu_{eL} \equiv \nu_{1L}$  are in the first generation doublet  $L_{1L}$  and likewise the muon and tau (and their neutrinos) are in second and third generation respectively.

Under Parity ( $P$ ) the space-time  $(x, t) \rightarrow (-x, t)$ , the gauge bosons of  $SU(2)_L \leftrightarrow SU(2)_R$ , and  $\phi \rightarrow \phi^\dagger, Q_{iL} \leftrightarrow Q_{iR}$  for the quarks, and similarly subscripts  $L \leftrightarrow R$  for all the fields in table I. We impose  $P$  as a good symmetry broken spontaneously at a high scale  $v_R$ .

Additionally, we impose a chiral symmetry  $\chi$  under which

$$L_{1L} \rightarrow e^{i\chi} L_{1L}, \Delta'_L \rightarrow e^{-i\chi} \Delta'_L. \quad (1)$$

Alternatively the chiral  $\chi$  symmetry can also be the discrete

$$L_{1L} \rightarrow -L_{1L}, \Delta'_L \rightarrow -\Delta'_L. \quad (2)$$

The Yukawa couplings that give Dirac type mass terms to the leptons have the usual form

$$h_{ij}^\ell \bar{L}_{iL} \phi L_{jR} + \tilde{h}_{ij}^\ell \bar{L}_{iL} \tilde{\phi} L_{jR} + h.c. \quad (3)$$

where  $\tilde{\phi} = \tau_2 \phi^* \tau_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_2^{o*} & -\phi_1^+ \\ -\phi_2^- & \phi_1^{o*} \end{pmatrix}$ , and  $h_{ij}^\ell = h_{ji}^{\ell*}$ ,  $\tilde{h}_{ij}^\ell = \tilde{h}_{ji}^{\ell*}$ , where the Hermiticity of matrices  $h^\ell$  and  $\tilde{h}^\ell$  is due to  $P$ , and  $\tau_2$  is the Pauli matrix.

The chiral symmetry  $\chi$  implies for all  $j$  that

$$h_{1j}^\ell = h_{j1}^\ell = \tilde{h}_{1j}^\ell = \tilde{h}_{j1}^\ell = 0. \quad (4)$$

The Majorana type Yukawa terms are of the form (note that  $L \rightarrow R$  refers to the subscript  $L$ ),

$$i f_{ij} L_{iL}^T \tau_2 \Delta_L L_{jL} + i f'_{ij} L_{iL}^T \tau_2 \Delta'_L L_{jL} + L \rightarrow R + h.c. \quad (5)$$

where  $f, f'$  are symmetric matrices ( $f_{ij} = f_{ji}, f'_{ij} = f'_{ji}$ ), and due to  $\chi$  symmetry,

$$f_{12} = f_{13} = f'_{33} = f'_{22} = f'_{11} = f'_{23} = 0. \quad (6)$$

$f_{11} = 0$  (or  $f_{11} \neq 0$ ) depending on eq. (1) (or eq. (2)).

The mass terms of the Higgs potential that involve the scalar triplets can be compactly written as

$$V_{mass} = Tr \left[ (\Delta_L^\dagger \Delta_L' \Delta_L) \mathcal{M}^2 \begin{pmatrix} \Delta_L \\ \Delta_L' \end{pmatrix} \right] + L \rightarrow R \quad (7)$$

with  $\mathcal{M}^2 = \begin{pmatrix} M^2 & \mu'^{2*} \\ \mu'^2 & M'^2 \end{pmatrix}$  where  $\mu'^2$  breaks the  $\chi$  symmetry softly (since it is a mass dimension 2 term), and  $\mathcal{M}^2$  is Hermitian. Hereafter we let  $\mu'^2$  be real as its phase can be absorbed into a redefinition of the  $\Delta'_{L,R}$  fields.

We take  $\mu'^2 \sim (0.1 \text{ to } 0.8) M'^2$  and we choose  $\Delta'_L$  to have a mass  $\sim M'^2 \gg v_R^2$  so that it decouples and we just have the minimal left right symmetric model below the scale  $M'$ . That is,  $\mathcal{M}^2$  has two eigenvalues, the heavier being  $\sim Tr \mathcal{M}^2 \sim M'^2 + M^2 \sim M'^2$  (we take  $M^2 \leq M'^2$  without loss of generality) and the lighter being  $\sim -v_R^2$ . The lighter eigenvalue of  $\mathcal{M}^2$  is negative as it generates the VEV  $v_R$  which breaks  $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$  spontaneously.

Evaluating  $Det \mathcal{M}^2 \sim (-v_R^2)(M'^2)$  using the above form of  $\mathcal{M}^2$ , we obtain  $M^2 - |\mu'|^4/M'^2 \sim -v_R^2$ . This is the usual fine-tuning due to the hierarchy problem associated with keeping the  $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$  gauge symmetry breaking scale  $v_R$  much smaller than the higher mass scales or cut-off scale <sup>1</sup> There is no fine tuning we do other than what is anyway necessary for the hierarchy of the gauge symmetry breaking scales.

<sup>1</sup> If we supersymmetrize [17], then this fine-tuning issue disappears which also indicates that it is the usual gauge hierarchy problem. For example the superpotential  $W = (\mu' \Delta + M' \Delta') \bar{\Delta}'$  that is symmetric under  $\bar{\Delta} \rightarrow -\bar{\Delta}$  mixes the superfields  $\Delta$  and  $\Delta'$  at scale  $M'$  while the mass of  $\Delta, \bar{\Delta}$  (renaming the lighter mass eigenstates to be these) is zero due to this symmetry and is well separated from  $M'$ . Note that  $\mu'$  softly breaks the  $\chi$  symmetry  $L_1, \bar{\Delta}' \rightarrow e^{i\chi} \{L_1, \bar{\Delta}'\}, \Delta' \rightarrow e^{-i\chi} \Delta'$  at scale  $\sim M'$ .

We now obtain the  $2 \times 2$  orthogonal transformation  $\mathcal{O}$  that diagonalizes  $\mathcal{M}^2$  so that  $\mathcal{M}_{diag}^2 = \mathcal{O}^T \mathcal{M}^2 \mathcal{O}$ . Note that the  $\mathcal{O}_{21}$  term  $\sin\theta_\Delta$  depends on  $\mu'^2/M'^2 \sim 0.1-0.8$ . We now change variables in the original Lagrangian

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_L &\rightarrow \cos(\theta_\Delta)\Delta_L - \sin(\theta_\Delta)\Delta'_L \\ \Delta'_L &\rightarrow \sin(\theta_\Delta)\Delta_L + \cos(\theta_\Delta)\Delta'_L, \quad L \rightarrow R \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where the fields on the right hand side are in the physical mass basis.

That is after substituting (8) into (5) and then dropping terms containing  $\Delta'_{L,R}$  as they have decoupled (and doing the same for all the Higgs potential terms as well), we rename the resulting Majorana Yukawa couplings of  $\Delta_{L,R}$  as follows:

$$[f_{ij}\cos(\theta_\Delta) + f'_{ij}\sin(\theta_\Delta)] \rightarrow f_{ij}. \quad (9)$$

$f_{12}, f_{13}$  which were zero (see equation (6)) are now unsuppressed, and equation 5 becomes

$$if_{ij}L_{iL}^T \tau_2 \Delta_L L_{jL} + L \rightarrow R + h.c. \quad (10)$$

with all  $f_{ij}$  unsuppressed (except for  $f_{11} = 0$  in case of eq. (1)), and  $\Delta'_{L,R}$  have decoupled.

Importantly, equation (4) now only holds as a boundary condition at the scale  $M'$  and below that scale  $h_{1j}^\ell, \tilde{h}_{1j}^\ell$  are generated from  $h_{33}^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell$  by renormalization group running (between scales  $M'$  and  $v_R$ ) due to the now non-zero  $f_{12}$  and  $f_{13}$ .

Note that  $f_{11} = 0$  points to a normal mass hierarchy with the lightest neutrino getting its mass  $\sim m_{12}\sin^2\theta_{12} \approx 0.003eV$  via the PMNS mixing angle from its heavier counterpart.

Once  $\Delta_R^o, \phi_1^o$  and  $\phi_2^o$  pick up VEVs  $v_R, \kappa_1$  (can always be chose real), and  $\kappa_2$  (taken real for ease of calculation) respectively, the neutral component  $\Delta_L^o$  picks up an induced VEV

$$v_L = \langle \Delta_L^o \rangle \sim (\beta_1\kappa_1\kappa_2 + \beta_2\kappa_1^2 + \beta_3\kappa_2^2)/(\rho_3 - 2\rho_1)v_R \quad (11)$$

because of the following terms in the Higgs potential

$$\beta_1 Tr(\phi\Delta_R\phi^\dagger\Delta_L^\dagger) + \beta_2 Tr(\tilde{\phi}\Delta_R\phi^\dagger\Delta_L^\dagger) + \beta_3 Tr(\phi\Delta_R\tilde{\phi}^\dagger\Delta_L^\dagger) + h.c. \quad (12)$$

where the  $\beta_i$  are real due to Parity and  $(\rho_3 - 2\rho_1)v_R^2$  is the mass of  $\Delta_L$ , with  $\rho_3, \rho_1$  being the usual Higgs potential parameters of the minimal left-right symmetric model using the standard notation given for example in [18, 19].

The charged lepton mass matrix  $h^-$  and the light neutrino mass matrix  $m_\nu$  can be evaluated using the Yukawa couplings in equations (3),(10):

$$h^- v_{wk} = h^\ell \kappa_2 + \tilde{h}^\ell \kappa_1, \quad h^D v_{wk} = h^\ell \kappa_1 + \tilde{h}^\ell \kappa_2^* \quad (13)$$

$$m_\nu = f v_L - (v_{wk}^2/v_R) h^D \left( \frac{1}{f} \right) h^{D^T} \quad (14)$$

with equation (4) being the boundary condition at the scale  $M'$ , and where  $v_{wk}^2 = \kappa_1^2 + |\kappa_2|^2 \sim \kappa_1^2$  (since the top quark gets its mass from  $\kappa_1$ ),  $v_R > \kappa_1 > v_L$ , and  $v_L$  is from equation (11).

Note that the second term on the right hand side of the equation for  $m_\nu$  is the Type I seesaw contribution. Substituting from equation (4) in  $h^D$  of eqn (13), we can see that the second term in equation (14) does not contribute to the first generation's PMNS matrix elements at the scale  $M'$  and therefore we have Type II (first term) dominant seesaw mechanism. While it can contribute, for example to the third generation light neutrino mass (if  $h_{33}^D$  is competitively large), it doesn't change our results, and therefore for the ease of calculations, without any loss in generality, we ignore any Type I contribution from  $h^D$ .

*RGE, electron mass &  $v_R$  scale.* The charged lepton Yukawa matrix  $h^-$  (that determines the electron's mass) given in equation (13) can be evaluated at the scale  $v_R$  by using the RGEs of  $h^\ell$  and  $\tilde{h}^\ell$  which can be written in terms of their beta functions as

$$\frac{\partial h^\ell}{\partial t} = \beta_{h^\ell} = \beta_{h^\ell}^{(1)} + \beta_{h^\ell}^{(2)} + \dots \quad (15)$$

and similarly the beta function  $\beta_{\tilde{h}^\ell}$  with  $h^\ell \rightarrow \tilde{h}^\ell$  in the above, and where  $t = \ln\mu$  is the renormalization scale (and  $\mu$  runs from  $M'$  down to  $v_R$ ) and the superscripts (1) etc stand for the loop expansion.

The one loop beta functions of the minimal left right symmetric model [20] include the term  $\beta_{h^\ell}^{(1)} = (3/16\pi^2)(f^\dagger f h^\ell + h^\ell f^\dagger f)$ , and therefore  $h_{13}^\ell = h_{31}^{\ell*}, h_{12}^\ell = h_{21}^{\ell*}$  which were 0 at scale  $M'$ , get generated on RGE running from components such as  $f_{13}^* f_{33} h_{33}^\ell, h_{33}^\ell f_{33}^* f_{31}$ . This suggests that the Yukawa matrix  $h^-$  constrained at scale  $M'$  by equation (4) to have a zero eigenvalue (corresponding to massless electron) may pick up a small non-zero one loop contribution to its determinant on RGE running.

However on integrating the RGE equations numerically using the program *R*, we find this not to be the case. Note that this one loop term is due to the correction in the propagator of the fermions rather than being a true vertex correction.

The leptonic Yukawa coupling  $h^\ell$  receives two-loop contributions from the diagrams in Fig 1 corresponding to the beta function term

$$\beta_{h^\ell}^{(2)} \sim \frac{6\beta_2}{(16\pi^2)^2} (f^\dagger h^{\ell*} f) \quad (16)$$

and contributes to  $h^-$  in eqn (13) on RGE running, and generates the mass of the electron

$$m_e \approx \frac{6h_{33}^\ell \kappa_2}{(16\pi^2)^2} c_{\nu mix} (f_{33}^2 \beta_2) \ln(M'/v_R) \quad (17)$$

where we work in a basis where at scale  $M'$ ,  $h^-$  is diagonal with  $h_{j1}^- = h_{1j}^- = 0$  due to equation 4, we neglect  $h^D$




FIG. 1. Two loop contribution that generates  $m_e$  from  $\beta_2$  and  $h^\ell$  (via eqs. (16),(17)) when  $\phi_2^0$  picks the VEV  $\kappa_2$ . The contribution from  $\beta_1$  and  $h^\ell$  to  $\beta_{h^\ell}^{(2)}$  can be obtained from similar diagrams on relabelling  $\beta_2 \rightarrow \beta_1$  and flipping the external scalar line from  $\phi_2^0$  to  $\phi_1^0$  which picks the VEV  $\kappa_1$  (eq. (21)).

to simplify calculation, and the matrix  $f$  in equation (16) (and 10)) is almost fully determined (up to a scale factor which we have taken to be  $f_{33}$ ) by the known neutrino mass squared differences and PMNS mixing angles, and using  $f_{33} = 1$  (we have assumed normal ordering and the smallest neutrino mass is negligibly small and its exact value does not affect this calculation).

$c_{\nu mix} \approx c \sin \theta_{13} \approx 0.1$  is the factor obtained on solving the RGE equations numerically using R, and is due to the PMNS mixing. Keeping other things the same, if we half or double  $s_{13}$  the above contribution to  $m_e$  halves or doubles.

$c \sim 1$  is due to the observed values of the larger two mixing angles. Had these larger PMNS mixing angles been zero, so would  $c$  be, and  $c_{\nu mix}$  would have scaled as  $\sin^2 \theta_{13}$ .

Substituting  $h_{33}^\ell \kappa_2 \approx m_\tau \approx 1 \text{ GeV}$  and taking the  $\ln$  to be  $\sim 8$  we obtain

$$m_e = 0.4 \text{ MeV} (f_{33}^2 \beta_2) \quad (18)$$

Thus the observed electron mass of 0.5 MeV is generated if

$$f_{33}^2 \beta_2 \approx 1. \quad (19)$$

The above parameters are the only relevant unknowns in determining the P breaking or  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{B-L}$  breaking scale from equation (11) and the first term of equation (14), and the observed light neutrino mass scale  $\sim 0.05 \text{ eV}$ . Therefore the generation of electron mass through the  $\beta_2$  coupling implies that

$$\sqrt{\Delta m_{\nu 23}^2} \sim 0.05 \text{ eV} \sim f_{33} \beta_2 v_{wk}^2 / (\rho_3 - 2\rho_1) v_R \quad (20)$$

Substituting  $f_{33}, \beta_2 \sim 1$  (due to equation (19)) we get  $v_R \sim 10^{14-15} \text{ GeV}$ . We have set  $\rho_3, \rho_1 \sim 1$  in the denominator as they anyway get generated in one loop RGE.

The beta function of  $\tilde{h}^\ell, \beta_{\tilde{h}^\ell}^{(2)} \sim (6\beta_1/16\pi^2) f^\dagger \tilde{h}^\ell f$  contributes to  $h^-$  in eq. (13) (through  $\tilde{h}^\ell \kappa_1$  term whose diagonal entries at scale  $M'$  we take to be the mu and tau

	$\beta_1 \approx 1$	$\beta_2 \approx 1$	$\beta_3 \approx 1$
$v_R$	$10^{12-14} \text{ GeV}$	$10^{14-15} \text{ GeV}$	$10^{10-13} \text{ GeV}$

TABLE II. Range for  $U(1)_{B-L}$  breaking scale  $v_R$  obtained from (11) and first term in (14) using  $\kappa_1 \approx v_{wk}, \kappa_2/\kappa_1 \sim 0.1$  to  $10^{-2.5}, \rho_3 \sim 1$ . Moreover, to generate  $m_e, f_{33} \sim 1$  and one of the  $\beta_i \approx 1$ . If  $\kappa_2/\kappa_1 \sim 10^{-5.5}$  (needs fine-tuning) then  $v_R \sim 10 \text{ TeV}$  for  $\beta_3 \approx 1$ .

Yukawa couplings), and the  $m_e$  generated on RGE running can be estimated in analogy with equation (17) to be

$$m_e \approx \frac{6(h_{33}^\ell \kappa_1)}{(16\pi^2)^2} c'_{\nu mix} (f_{33}^2 \beta_1) \ln(M'/v_R) \quad (21)$$

If the above term is responsible for generating  $m_e$ , then  $v_R$  can be lowered – if we take  $f_{33}, \beta_1 \approx 1$  then  $h_{33}^\ell$  must be  $\sim 0.01$  (near the tau Yukawa) to get the correct value for  $m_e$ . Since the second term in equation (14) also contributes to the light neutrino mass, the lower bound on  $v_R$  is a factor  $h_{33}^{\ell 2}$  lower than what we obtained earlier, or  $v_R \gtrsim 10^{11} \text{ GeV}$ . If  $v_R$  is lowered more by further lowering  $h_{33}^\ell$ , then sufficient mass for the electron is not generated via  $\beta_1$  coupling.

To appreciate the physics it helps to consider the approximately broken  $\mu_Q$ -symmetry under which

$$\phi \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \phi (\Rightarrow \tilde{\phi} \rightarrow e^{-i\alpha} \tilde{\phi}), Q_{iL} \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} Q_{iL} \quad (22)$$

so that the resulting top quark's SM Yukawa is unsuppressed, while the bottom quark's Yukawa coupling (as also the VEV  $\kappa_2$ ) occurs from terms that break  $\mu_Q$  (such as  $\mu_2^2 \text{Tr}(\tilde{\phi}^\dagger \phi)$ ) and is therefore suppressed  $h_b \sim 1/40$ .

Since  $h^\ell$  as well as  $\tilde{h}^\ell$  terms in equation 3 break the above  $\mu_Q$ -symmetry, we would expect both  $h_{33}^\ell$  and  $\tilde{h}_{33}^\ell$  (and therefore also  $h_{33}^D$ ) be suppressed  $\sim h_b$  or  $h_\tau$ . Moreover from equation (12),  $\beta_1$  respects the  $\mu_Q$ -symmetry, while  $\beta_2$  and  $\beta_3$  don't and are suppressed. This provides the physical context for electron mass generation from equation (21) via the unsuppressed  $\beta_1 \approx 1$  coupling and the range of  $v_R$  scale shown in Table (II).

On the other hand, instead of  $\mu_Q$ , if we have an approximate  $\mu_{QL}$  symmetry under which,

$$\phi, Q_{iL}, L_{iL} \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} \{\phi, Q_{iL}, L_{iL}\}; \Delta_L, \Delta'_L \rightarrow e^{-2\alpha} \{\Delta_L, \Delta'_L\} \quad (23)$$

then  $\beta_2, f$  and  $h^\ell$  respect the symmetry, while  $\beta_1, \beta_3, \tilde{h}^\ell$  break the symmetry and are suppressed. This provides the context for  $m_e$  generation through  $\beta_2 \sim 1, h_{33}^\ell \kappa_2$  in equations (16),(17) and (18). In this case there can also be a similar contribution from a suppressed  $\beta_1 \sim 0.01$  and unsuppressed  $h_{33}^\ell \kappa_1$  through equation (21).

The electron mass can also be generated if  $\beta_3 f_{33}^2 \approx 1$ , using the beta function for  $\tilde{h}^\ell$  obtained by replacing  $\beta_2 \rightarrow \beta_3$  and  $h^\ell \rightarrow \tilde{h}^\ell$  on both sides of equation (16). This leads to equation (17) with  $\beta_2 \rightarrow \beta_3$ . In this case, if we set  $\beta_1 \approx \beta_2 \approx 0$ , then we can further lower the

scale of  $v_R$  calculated using equations (11) and (14) since  $|\kappa_2|/\kappa_1, h_{33}^\ell$  (and therefore also  $h_{33}^D$ ) can be chosen to be  $\sim 10^{-5.5}$  (so that  $v_R \sim 10TeV$ ). However since  $|\kappa_2| \gtrsim 10^{-2.5}\kappa_1$  due to tree-level or one loop RGE generation, it requires fine-tuning, for example of  $\mu_2^2 Tr(\phi^\dagger \phi)$  ( $\mu_2^2$  real due to P) to lower  $\kappa_2$  for obtaining  $v_R \sim 10TeV$ , whose natural scale is given in Table II.

In order to obtain  $v_R \sim 1-10TeV$  without ‘‘heavy fine-tuning’’ (quoting [21]) P can be broken softly so that  $\Delta_L$  gets a much heavier mass  $\gg v_R$ [21, 22]. Even now, we can generate  $m_e$  by RGE running above the  $\Delta_L$  mass. In this case Table II will not apply.

*Muon mass.* If we use  $\chi$ -symmetry (like eq. (2)) to set both the electron and muon Yukawa couplings to zero, and break it softly at scale  $M'$  by the mixing of  $\Delta'_{L,R}$  and  $\Delta_{L,R}$  fields as before, and take both  $\beta_1 f_{33}^2, h_{33}^\ell \sim 1$ , then the mass of the muon (rather than the electron) is generated by the right hand side of equation (21). Since originally the electron and the muon masses are both zero and degenerate, sufficient mass for the electron is not generated efficiently at the two loop level. However if we add additional triplets  $\Delta''_{L,R}$  at scale  $M'$  (whose mass is a factor of 2-3 more or less than  $M'$ ), then the threshold effects at this scale are sufficient to first lift the degeneracy and then generate both the muon and electron masses with  $\beta_1, f_{33}, h_{33}^\ell \sim 1$  (and therefore  $v_R \sim 10^{14-15}GeV$ ). The tau mass is  $\sim h_{33}\kappa_2$ , so that all lepton masses are generated via  $\mathcal{O}(1)$  Yukawa parameters.

*Testing the model.* P sets  $\theta_{QCD}$  to zero and the strong CP phase  $\theta$  generated on its spontaneous breaking depends on the imaginary part of a dimensionless quartic coupling ( $\alpha_2$ ) of the Higgs potential of the minimal left right symmetric model. As was shown in reference [23], leptons circulating in one internal loop contribute through the Yukawa couplings  $h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell$  and  $f$  to  $\alpha_2$  so that

$$\bar{\theta} \sim (1/16\pi^2) (m_t/m_b) \left| Tr \left( f^\dagger f [h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell] \right) \right| \ln(M'/v_R) \quad (24)$$

is generated along with the electron mass on RGE running between  $M'$  and  $v_R$  scales. The trace in the above is purely imaginary since the commutator  $[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell]$  is anti-Hermitian, and  $m_{t,b}$  are the top and bottom quark masses. Importantly, the dependence on  $v_R$  is logarithmic and so the contribution is significant even for  $v_R \sim 10^{10-15}GeV$ , which provides the way to test our model.

Since to generate the electron’s mass the scale of  $f_{ij} \sim f_{33} \sim 1$ , and to generate the tau mass one of the Dirac type Yukawa couplings, say  $\tilde{h}_{33} \gtrsim 0.01$ , we obtain from eq. (24),

$$|\bar{\theta}| \sim f_{33}^2 \tilde{h}_{33} h_{33}^\ell |\sin \delta_{CP}| \sim (10^{-2})(h_{33}^\ell) |\sin \delta_{CP}| \quad (25)$$

where we have taken  $\ln(M'/v_R) \sim 20$ , and  $[h^\ell, \tilde{h}^\ell] \sim (10^{-2})(h_{33}^\ell)/10$ , as its off diagonal terms can have a tree-level value and also get generated in RGE running from  $f_{ij} \sim 1$ .  $\delta_{CP}$  is the Dirac CP violating phase in the PMNS matrix obtained from CP phases present in  $f, h, \tilde{h}$ .

The bound from neutron EDM experiments [24]  $\bar{\theta} \leq 10^{-10}$  implies that for  $h_{33}^\ell \geq 10^{-6}$ ,  $\delta_{CP} \leq 0.01 \text{ mod } \pi$ . Therefore for  $10TeV \leq v_R \leq 10^{15}GeV$  (see Table II), we expect  $|\sin \delta_{CP}| \leq 0.01$ .

For  $h_{33}^\ell \gtrsim 10^{-2}$ , which is the likely value of suppression due to approximate  $\mu_Q$  and  $\mu_{QL}$  symmetries (eqs. (22) and (23)), we obtain  $\delta_{CP} \leq 10^{-6} \text{ mod } \pi$ .

Thus, with the exception of a highly tuned region where  $h_{33}^\ell < 10^{-6.5}$ , we expect that upcoming neutrino experiments Hyper-K [25] and DUNE [26] will make a discovery consistent with the absence of CP violation in the leptonic PMNS matrix, that would be otherwise surprising.

As of now, joint analysis [27] of NOvA and T2K experiments reveals  $\delta_{CP} = 203_{-37}^{+63}$ , while the global best fit of neutrino experiments by Nu-Fit 5.3 (2024) [28] is  $197_{-25}^{+41}$ , for normal ordering of neutrino masses.  $\delta_{CP} = 180^\circ$  is currently within one sigma. It is exciting to have a model for radiative generation of electron (and also muon) mass that is testable, despite its high energy scale.

*Charge Conjugation, Unification.* P beautifully controls the strong CP problem and the absence of leptonic CP phases is the way to test it (the minimal extension that solves the strong CP problem [29] also predicts an absence of leptonic CP phases [30]). But if there is grand unification we’d expect CP violation. However this does not cause a conflict because it is the left right symmetric model with C (rather than P) that unifies to  $SO(10)$ . If we use C to exchange the  $SU(2)_L$  and  $SU(2)_R$  groups, the same results for the electron mass and  $v_R$  scale follow. However with C (and no P), many other CP phases are present and they as well as the CKM phase can generate  $\theta$  at tree level and via RGE running. Hence we would likely need to introduce axions [31–33] anyway, in which case there is no prediction of the absence of leptonic  $\delta_{CP}$ .

*Conclusion.* We focused on an interesting puzzle in the left-right symmetric model – chiral symmetry that sets the electron’s mass to zero, due to P (or C), also sets its neutrino mixing angles to zero, making it difficult to reconcile the smallness of the electron mass with the largeness of its neutrino mixing. We solved the puzzle by imposing and softly breaking the chiral symmetry to obtain the observed large neutrino mixing, which in turn generated the electron’s mass radiatively in two loop RGE running, and determined the B-L breaking scale  $10^{10}GeV \lesssim v_R \leq 10^{15}GeV$  (and can be  $10TeV$  with fine-tuning). Our mechanism can also generate the muon mass radiatively. Along with the electron (or muon) mass, a large strong CP phase is generated in one loop RGE running from leptonic CP phases and therefore our model (with P) can be tested by the surprising non-discovery of CP violation in the PMNS matrix by the upcoming neutrino experiments DUNE and Hyper-K. If there are axions then there is no prediction of absence of leptonic  $\delta_{CP}$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Thanks to Kaustubh Agashe for insightful discussions and helpful suggestions.

- 
- [1] H. Fritzsch, Weak-interaction mixing in the six-quark theory, *Physics Letters B* **73**, 317 (1978).
- [2] G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio, and I. Masina, Large neutrino mixing from small quark and lepton mixings, *Physics Letters B* **472**, 382–391 (2000).
- [3] L. Hall, H. Murayama, and N. Weiner, Neutrino mass anarchy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2572 (2000).
- [4] N. Haba and H. Murayama, Anarchy and hierarchy: An approach to study models of fermion masses and mixings, *Phys. Rev. D* **63**, 053010 (2001).
- [5] S. Weinberg, Varieties of baryon and lepton nonconservation, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 1694 (1980).
- [6] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, Models of neutrino masses and mixings, *New Journal of Physics* **6**, 106 (2004).
- [7] C. Bonilla, R. M. Fonseca, and J. W. F. Valle, Consistency of the triplet seesaw model revisited, *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 075028 (2015), arXiv:1508.02323 [hep-ph].
- [8] J. C. Pati and A. Salam, Lepton number as the fourth "color", *Phys. Rev. D* **10**, 275 (1974); R. N. Mohapatra and J. C. Pati, Left-right gauge symmetry and an "iso-conjugate" model of  $cp$  violation, *Phys. Rev. D* **11**, 566 (1975).
- [9] G. Senjanovic and R. N. Mohapatra, Exact Left-Right Symmetry and Spontaneous Violation of Parity, *Phys. Rev. D* **12**, 1502 (1975).
- [10] B. S. Balakrishna, Fermion Mass Hierarchy From Radiative Corrections, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **60**, 1602 (1988).
- [11] B. S. Balakrishna, A. L. Kagan, and R. N. Mohapatra, Quark Mixings and Mass Hierarchy From Radiative Corrections, *Phys. Lett. B* **205**, 345 (1988).
- [12] B. S. Balakrishna, RADIATIVELY INDUCED LEPTON MASSES, *Phys. Lett. B* **214**, 267 (1988).
- [13] S. M. Barr, A Predictive hierarchical mode of quark and lepton masses, *Phys. Rev. D* **42**, 3150 (1990).
- [14] B. A. Dobrescu and P. J. Fox, Quark and lepton masses from top loops, *JHEP* **08**, 100, arXiv:0805.0822 [hep-ph].
- [15] K. S. Babu and A. Thapa, Left-Right Symmetric Model without Higgs Triplets, (2020), arXiv:2012.13420 [hep-ph].
- [16] G. Mohanta and K. M. Patel, Radiatively generated fermion mass hierarchy from flavor nonuniversal gauge symmetries, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 075020 (2022).
- [17] R. Kuchimanchi and R. N. Mohapatra, No parity violation without  $r$ -parity violation, *Phys. Rev. D* **48**, 4352 (1993).
- [18] P. Duka, J. Gluza, and M. Zralek, Quantization and renormalization of the manifest left-right symmetric model of electroweak interactions, *Annals Phys.* **280**, 336 (2000), arXiv:hep-ph/9910279.
- [19] E. Akhmedov, P. Bhupal Dev, S. Jana, and R. N. Mohapatra, Long-lived doubly charged scalars in the left-right symmetric model: Catalyzed nuclear fusion and collider implications, *Physics Letters B* **852**, 138616 (2024).
- [20] J. Chakraborty, J. Gluza, T. Jeliński, and T. Srivastava, Theoretical constraints on masses of heavy particles in left-right symmetric models, *Physics Letters B* **759**, 361 (2016).
- [21] P. S. B. Dev, R. N. Mohapatra, and Y. Zhang, Probing the higgs sector of the minimal left-right symmetric model at future hadron colliders, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2016**, 174 (2016).
- [22] D. Chang, R. N. Mohapatra, and M. K. Parida, Decoupling of parity- and  $SU(2)_R$ -breaking scales: A new approach to left-right symmetric models, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 1072 (1984).
- [23] R. Kuchimanchi, Leptonic CP problem in left-right symmetric model, *Phys. Rev. D* **91**, 071901(R) (2015), arXiv:1408.6382 [hep-ph].
- [24] C. Abel, S. Afach, N. J. Ayres, C. A. Baker, G. Ban, G. Bison, K. Bodek, V. Bondar, M. Burghoff, E. Chanel, Z. Chowdhuri, P.-J. Chiu, B. Clement, C. B. Crawford, M. Daum, S. Emmenegger, L. Ferraris-Bouchez, M. Fertl, P. Flaux, B. Franke, A. Fratangelo, P. Geltenbort, K. Green, W. C. Griffith, M. van der Grinten, Z. D. Grujić, P. G. Harris, L. Hayen, W. Heil, R. Henneck, V. Hélaine, N. Hild, Z. Hodge, M. Horras, P. Iaydjiev, S. N. Ivanov, M. Kasprzak, Y. Kermaidic, K. Kirch, A. Knecht, P. Knowles, H.-C. Koch, P. A. Koss, S. Komposch, A. Kozela, A. Kraft, J. Krempel, M. Kuźniak, B. Lauss, T. Lefort, Y. Lemièrre, A. Leredde, P. Mohanmurthy, A. Mtchedlishvili, M. Musgrave, O. Naviliat-Cuncic, D. Pais, F. M. Piegsa, E. Pierre, G. Pignol, C. Plonka-Spehr, P. N. Prashanth, G. Quémener, M. Rawlik, D. Rebreyend, I. Rienäcker, D. Ries, S. Rocca, G. Rogel, D. Rozpedzik, A. Schnabel, P. Schmidt-Wellenburg, N. Severijns, D. Shiers, R. Tavakoli Dinani, J. A. Thorne, R. Virost, J. Voigt, A. Weis, E. Wursten, G. Wyszynski, J. Zejma, J. Zenner, and G. Zsigmond, Measurement of the permanent electric dipole moment of the neutron, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 081803 (2020).
- [25] K. Abe and H.-K. Tanaka, Hyper-kamiokande construction status and prospects, *Frontiers in Physics* **12**, 10.3389/fphy.2024.1378254 (2024).
- [26] F. Terranova, Future long-baseline neutrino experiments, *Universe* **10**, 10.3390/universe10050221 (2024).
- [27] Z. Vallari, Results from a joint analysis of data from NOvA and T2K, (2024), Seminar: <https://indico.fnal.gov/event/62062/>.
- [28] I. Esteban, M. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz, and A. Zhou, The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations, *Journal of High Energy Physics* **2020**, 10.1007/jhep09(2020)178 (2020).
- [29] R. Kuchimanchi,  $P/CP$  Conserving  $CP/P$  Violation Solves Strong  $CP$  Problem, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 116008 (2010), arXiv:1009.5961 [hep-ph].
- [30] R. Kuchimanchi,  $p$  and  $cp$  solution of the strong  $cp$  puzzle, *Phys. Rev. D* **108**, 095023 (2023).
- [31] R. D. Peccei and H. R. Quinn, CP conservation in the presence of pseudoparticles, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440 (1977).

- [32] S. Weinberg, A new light boson?, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 223 (1978).
- [33] F. Wilczek, Problem of strong  $p$  and  $t$  invariance in the presence of instantons, Phys. Rev. Lett. **40**, 279 (1978).