

# Confronting the seesaw mechanism with neutrino oscillations: a general and explicit analytical bridge

Zhi-zhong Xing<sup>1,3,4</sup> \*, Jing-yu Zhu<sup>2</sup> †

<sup>1</sup>Institute of High Energy Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

<sup>2</sup>Institute of Modern Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Lanzhou 730000, China

<sup>3</sup>School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

<sup>4</sup>Center of High Energy Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China

## Abstract

With the help of a full Euler-like block parametrization of the flavor structure for the canonical seesaw mechanism, we present the *first* general and explicit analytical calculations of the two neutrino mass-squared differences, three flavor mixing angles and the effective Dirac CP-violating phase responsible for the primary behaviors of neutrino oscillations. Such model-independent results will pave the way for testing the seesaw mechanism at low energies.

arXiv:2412.17698v2 [hep-ph] 31 Dec 2024

---

\*xingzz@ihep.ac.cn

†zhujingyu@impcas.ac.cn (corresponding author)

# 1 Introduction

It is widely accepted that the canonical seesaw mechanism [1–5] has stood out as the most natural and most economical extension of the standard model (SM) of particle physics to explain both the origin of tiny neutrino masses and the cosmic baryon number asymmetry via leptogenesis [6]. But this elegant mechanism contains 18 unknown flavor parameters,

- 3 heavy Majorana neutrino masses  $M_j$  (for  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ),
- 9 active-sterile flavor mixing angles  $\theta_{ij}$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ),
- 6 independent CP-violating phases  $\delta_{ij}$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ),

in a complete Euler-like block parametrization of its flavor structure [7, 8], making the experimental tests of its validity extremely difficult. In this situation, to what extent can we *model-independently* probe or constrain the seesaw parameter space with the help of our accurate determination of the two neutrino mass-squared differences ( $\Delta m_{21}^2$  and  $\Delta m_{31}^2$  or  $\Delta m_{32}^2$ ), three active flavor mixing angles ( $\theta_{12}$ ,  $\theta_{13}$  and  $\theta_{23}$ ) and the Dirac CP-violating phase ( $\delta$ ) of the  $3 \times 3$  Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) lepton flavor mixing matrix [9–11] in the next-generation long-baseline reactor and accelerator neutrino oscillation experiments (e.g., JUNO [12, 13], DUNE [14] and Hyper-Kamiokande [15])?

To answer this absolutely meaningful question, one needs to calculate all the 6 aforementioned neutrino oscillation quantities in terms of the 18 *original* seesaw flavor parameters. Such a general analytical approach has not been developed, mainly because the calculation itself is formidably lengthy. The purpose of this work is to fill the gap, so as to pay the way for testing the seesaw mechanism at low energies. Our strategies for doing so are outlined below.

(1) We start from the seesaw-modified Lagrangian for leptonic weak charged-current interactions:

$$-\mathcal{L}_{\text{cc}} = \frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \overline{(e \ \mu \ \tau)}_{\text{L}} \gamma^\mu \left[ U \begin{pmatrix} \nu_1 \\ \nu_2 \\ \nu_3 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{L}} + R \begin{pmatrix} N_4 \\ N_5 \\ N_6 \end{pmatrix}_{\text{L}} \right] W_\mu^- + \text{h.c.} , \quad (1.1)$$

where  $U = AU_0$  is the general PMNS matrix in which  $U_0$  denotes a unitary matrix of the form

$$U_0 = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & \hat{s}_{12}^*c_{13} & \hat{s}_{13}^* \\ -\hat{s}_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}\hat{s}_{13}\hat{s}_{23}^* & c_{12}c_{23} - \hat{s}_{12}^*\hat{s}_{13}\hat{s}_{23}^* & c_{13}\hat{s}_{23}^* \\ \hat{s}_{12}\hat{s}_{23} - c_{12}\hat{s}_{13}c_{23} & -c_{12}\hat{s}_{23} - \hat{s}_{12}^*\hat{s}_{13}c_{23} & c_{13}c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.2)$$

with  $c_{12} \equiv \cos \theta_{12}$  and  $\hat{s}_{12} \equiv e^{i\delta_{12}} \sin \theta_{12}$  and so on,  $A$  is a  $3 \times 3$  lower-triangular matrix which deviates slightly from the identity matrix  $I$ , and  $R$  describes the strengths of Yukawa interactions of massive Majorana neutrinos and satisfies the unitarity condition  $UU^\dagger + RR^\dagger = AA^\dagger + RR^\dagger = I$ . Given the Euler-like block parametrization of the seesaw flavor structure proposed in Refs. [7, 8],  $A$  and  $R$  consist of the same set of active-sterile flavor mixing parameters (i.e.,  $\theta_{ij}$  and  $\delta_{ij}$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ) as can be seen in Eq. (2.1), and a proper redefinition of the phases associated with three charged lepton

fields in Eq. (1.1) allows us to remove three of the nine phase parameters  $\delta_{ij}$  or their combinations and thus arrive at six independent CP-violating phases.

(2) We make use of the exact seesaw relation [16]

$$U_0 D_\nu U_0^T = - (A^{-1} R) D_N (A^{-1} R)^T \quad (1.3)$$

to bridge the gap between the active and sterile neutrino sectors, where  $D_\nu \equiv \text{Diag}\{m_1, m_2, m_3\}$  and  $D_N \equiv \text{Diag}\{M_4, M_5, M_6\}$  with  $m_i$  and  $M_j$  standing respectively for the light and heavy Majorana neutrino masses (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ). So it becomes clear that the 9 flavor parameters of  $D_\nu$  and  $U_0$  (i.e.,  $m_1, m_2, m_3; \theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23}; \delta_{12}, \delta_{13}, \delta_{23}$ ) are all *derivational* in the sense they can be derived from the 18 *original* seesaw flavor parameters hidden in  $D_N$  and  $R$ . But these two sets of flavor parameters are correlated with each other via Eq. (1.3) in a very complicated way, so that the general analytical results for their explicit correlations have never been achieved before.

(3) We only adopt the leading term of Maclaurin's series

$$A^{-1} R = \begin{pmatrix} \hat{s}_{14}^* & \hat{s}_{15}^* & \hat{s}_{16}^* \\ \hat{s}_{24}^* & \hat{s}_{25}^* & \hat{s}_{26}^* \\ \hat{s}_{34}^* & \hat{s}_{35}^* & \hat{s}_{36}^* \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(s_{ij}^3), \quad (1.4)$$

where  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 4, 5, 6$ , so as to simplify our analytical calculations and show how the light degrees of freedom depend on the original seesaw flavor parameters in an instructive manner. This approximation is very reliable, because every active-sterile flavor mixing angle in  $A^{-1} R$  is expected to be smaller than  $\mathcal{O}(10^{-1.5}) \sim 3^\circ$ , as can be seen from Eqs. (2.3) and (2.4) in section 2. It is essentially equivalent to neglecting tiny non-unitarity of the PMNS matrix  $U$ , or to focusing on the unique Weinberg operator in the seesaw-extended SM effective field theory (SMEFT) [17].

(4) We determine the effective Dirac CP-violating phase of  $U_0$  (i.e.,  $\delta \equiv \delta_{13} - \delta_{12} - \delta_{23}$  when taking the standard phase convention of  $U_0$  as advocated by the Particle Data Group [18]) with the help of its simple relation to the Jarlskog invariant of leptonic CP violation [19, 20],

$$\mathcal{J}_\nu = \frac{1}{8} \sin 2\theta_{12} \sin 2\theta_{13} \cos \theta_{13} \sin 2\theta_{23} \sin \delta, \quad (1.5)$$

because the analytical expression of  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  has recently been derived by one of us in terms of the original seesaw flavor parameters and in the same analytical approximation [21].

(5) We leave aside the two effective Majorana CP-violating phases of  $U_0$  (i.e.,  $\rho \equiv \delta_{12} + \delta_{23}$  and  $\sigma \equiv \delta_{23}$  in the PDG-like phase convention of  $U$  [22]) in this work for two reasons. First, they are irrelevant to the present and future neutrino oscillation experiments. Second, they can be determined from comparing the elements of  $M_\nu \equiv U_0 D_\nu U_0^T$  expressed in terms of the light degrees of freedom with those obtained in terms of the original seesaw flavor parameters [16], after the analytical results of  $m_1, m_2, m_3, \theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23}$  and  $\delta$  are taken into account <sup>1</sup>.

---

<sup>1</sup>It is worth pointing out that the effective mass  $\langle m \rangle_{0\nu 2\beta}$  for a neutrinoless double-beta decay depends on both  $m_i U_{ei}^2$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) and  $R_{ej}^2/M_j$  (for  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ) in the canonical seesaw mechanism [22], as both light and heavy Majorana neutrinos contribute to the same lepton-number-violating process of this kind. As a result,  $\langle m \rangle_{0\nu 2\beta}$  is simply a function of the original seesaw flavor parameters  $M_j$  and  $R_{ej}$  thanks to the exact seesaw relation  $(m_1 U_{e1}^2 + m_2 U_{e2}^2 + m_3 U_{e3}^2) = -(M_4 R_{e4}^2 + M_5 R_{e5}^2 + M_6 R_{e6}^2)$  as indicated by Eq. (1.3).

The remaining parts of this paper are organized as follows. In section 2 we show our numerical constraints on the 9 active-sterile flavor mixing angles to assure the validity and reliability of our analytical approximations made in this work. Then we calculate the light neutrino masses, the active flavor mixing angles and the effective Dirac CP-violating phase in section 3. Section 4 is devoted to the simplified results in the *minimal* seesaw scenario with only two right-handed neutrino fields, and section 5 is devoted to our summary and some further discussions.

## 2 Bounds on active-sterile flavor mixing

Taking account of a full Euler-like block parametrization of the flavor structure for the canonical seesaw mechanism [7, 8], we write out the explicit expressions of  $A$  and  $R$  appearing in Eq. (1.1):

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \begin{pmatrix} c_{14}c_{15}c_{16} & 0 & 0 \\ -c_{14}c_{15}\hat{s}_{16}\hat{s}_{26}^* - c_{14}\hat{s}_{15}\hat{s}_{25}^*c_{26} & c_{24}c_{25}c_{26} & 0 \\ -\hat{s}_{14}\hat{s}_{24}^*c_{25}c_{26} & & \\ -c_{14}c_{15}\hat{s}_{16}c_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* + c_{14}\hat{s}_{15}\hat{s}_{25}^*\hat{s}_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* & -c_{24}c_{25}\hat{s}_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* - c_{24}\hat{s}_{25}\hat{s}_{35}^*c_{36} & c_{34}c_{35}c_{36} \\ -c_{14}\hat{s}_{15}c_{25}\hat{s}_{35}^*c_{36} + \hat{s}_{14}\hat{s}_{24}^*c_{25}\hat{s}_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* & -\hat{s}_{24}\hat{s}_{34}^*c_{35}c_{36} & \\ +\hat{s}_{14}\hat{s}_{24}^*\hat{s}_{25}\hat{s}_{35}^*c_{36} - \hat{s}_{14}c_{24}\hat{s}_{34}^*c_{35}c_{36} & & \end{pmatrix}, \\
R &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{s}_{14}^*c_{15}c_{16} & \hat{s}_{15}^*c_{16} & \hat{s}_{16}^* \\ -\hat{s}_{14}^*c_{15}\hat{s}_{16}\hat{s}_{26}^* - \hat{s}_{14}^*\hat{s}_{15}\hat{s}_{25}^*c_{26} & -\hat{s}_{15}^*\hat{s}_{16}\hat{s}_{26}^* + c_{15}\hat{s}_{25}^*c_{26} & c_{16}\hat{s}_{26}^* \\ +c_{14}\hat{s}_{24}^*c_{25}c_{26} & & \\ -\hat{s}_{14}^*c_{15}\hat{s}_{16}c_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* + \hat{s}_{14}^*\hat{s}_{15}\hat{s}_{25}^*\hat{s}_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* & -\hat{s}_{15}^*\hat{s}_{16}c_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* - c_{15}\hat{s}_{25}^*\hat{s}_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* & c_{16}c_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* \\ -\hat{s}_{14}^*\hat{s}_{15}c_{25}\hat{s}_{35}^*c_{36} - c_{14}\hat{s}_{24}^*c_{25}\hat{s}_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* & +c_{15}c_{25}\hat{s}_{35}^*c_{36} & \\ -c_{14}\hat{s}_{24}^*\hat{s}_{25}\hat{s}_{35}^*c_{36} + c_{14}c_{24}\hat{s}_{34}^*c_{35}c_{36} & & \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $c_{ij} \equiv \cos \theta_{ij}$  and  $\hat{s}_{ij} \equiv e^{i\delta_{ij}} \sin \theta_{ij}$  with  $\theta_{ij}$  and  $\delta_{ij}$  being the active-sterile flavor mixing angles and their associated CP-violating phases (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ). We require that all  $\theta_{ij}$  lie in the first quadrant, while  $\delta_{ij}$  may vary between zero and  $2\pi$ . Now that  $A$  characterizes a deviation of the PMNS matrix  $U = AU_0$  from the unitary matrix  $U_0$ , it must not be far away from the identity matrix  $I$ . A careful global analysis of current electroweak precision measurements and neutrino oscillation data has given the numerical bounds [23–26]

$$\epsilon \equiv |I - A| < \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 1.3 \times 10^{-3} & 0 & 0 \\ 2.4 \times 10^{-5} & 1.1 \times 10^{-5} & 0 \\ 1.8 \times 10^{-3} & 1.1 \times 10^{-4} & 1.0 \times 10^{-3} \end{pmatrix} & \text{(NMO)} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 1.4 \times 10^{-3} & 0 & 0 \\ 2.4 \times 10^{-5} & 1.0 \times 10^{-5} & 0 \\ 1.6 \times 10^{-3} & 3.6 \times 10^{-5} & 8.1 \times 10^{-4} \end{pmatrix} & \text{(IMO)} \end{cases} \quad (2.2)$$




Figure 1: Numerical constraints on the active-sterile flavor mixing angles  $\theta_{1j}$ ,  $\theta_{2j}$  and  $\theta_{3j}$  (for  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ) with the help of the upper bounds on  $\epsilon_{ii'}$  (for  $i, i' = 1, 2, 3$ ) in Eq. (2.2) in the NMO case, where different colors in the bar legend denote different values of  $\log_{10}(\epsilon_{ii'})$ .

in the normal mass ordering (NMO) or inverted mass ordering (IMO) case for the three light Majorana neutrinos, implying that all the 9 active-sterile flavor mixing angles are very small.

In Figs. 1 and 2, we illustrate how the six nonzero elements of  $\epsilon$  depend on  $\theta_{i4}$ ,  $\theta_{i5}$  and  $\theta_{i6}$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) by confronting Eq. (2.1) with Eq. (2.2) and taking  $\delta_{ij} \in [0, 2\pi]$  in the respective NMO and IMO cases. The upper bounds of  $\theta_{1j}$ ,  $\theta_{2j}$  and  $\theta_{3j}$  (for  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ) can therefore be extracted as follows:

$$\theta_{1j} < 2.92^\circ, \quad \theta_{2j} < 0.27^\circ, \quad \theta_{3j} < 2.56^\circ \quad (2.3)$$

in the NMO case (i.e.,  $m_1 < m_2 < m_3$ ); or

$$\theta_{1j} < 3.03^\circ, \quad \theta_{2j} < 0.26^\circ, \quad \theta_{3j} < 2.31^\circ \quad (2.4)$$

in the IMO case (i.e.,  $m_3 < m_1 < m_2$ ). These novel constraints allow us to expand the elements of  $A$




Figure 2: Numerical constraints on the active-sterile flavor mixing angles  $\theta_{1j}$ ,  $\theta_{2j}$  and  $\theta_{3j}$  (for  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ) with the help of the upper bounds on  $\epsilon_{ii'}$  (for  $i, i' = 1, 2, 3$ ) in Eq. (2.2) in the IMO case, where different colors in the bar legend denote different values of  $\log_{10}(\epsilon_{ii'})$ .

and  $R$  as Maclaurin's series of the form

$$\begin{aligned}
 A &= I - \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} s_{14}^2 + s_{15}^2 + s_{16}^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 2\hat{s}_{14}\hat{s}_{24}^* + 2\hat{s}_{15}\hat{s}_{25}^* + 2\hat{s}_{16}\hat{s}_{26}^* & s_{24}^2 + s_{25}^2 + s_{26}^2 & 0 \\ 2\hat{s}_{14}\hat{s}_{34}^* + 2\hat{s}_{15}\hat{s}_{35}^* + 2\hat{s}_{16}\hat{s}_{36}^* & 2\hat{s}_{24}\hat{s}_{34}^* + 2\hat{s}_{25}\hat{s}_{35}^* + 2\hat{s}_{26}\hat{s}_{36}^* & s_{34}^2 + s_{35}^2 + s_{36}^2 \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(s_{ij}^4), \\
 R &= \begin{pmatrix} \hat{s}_{14}^* & \hat{s}_{15}^* & \hat{s}_{16}^* \\ \hat{s}_{24}^* & \hat{s}_{25}^* & \hat{s}_{26}^* \\ \hat{s}_{34}^* & \hat{s}_{35}^* & \hat{s}_{36}^* \end{pmatrix} + \mathcal{O}(s_{ij}^3). \tag{2.5}
 \end{aligned}$$

So it is really reliable to use the leading term of  $A^{-1}R$  shown by Eq. (1.4) in our analytical calculations.

### 3 Results for the canonical seesaw mechanism

#### 3.1 The masses of three light neutrinos

To derive the expressions of  $m_i^2$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) in terms of the original seesaw flavor parameters, let us begin from Eq. (1.3) by defining

$$\begin{aligned} H &\equiv (U_0 D_\nu U_0^T) (U_0 D_\nu U_0^T)^\dagger = U_0 D_\nu^2 U_0^\dagger = R D_N R^T R^* D_N R^\dagger, \\ H^2 &\equiv H H^\dagger = U_0 D_\nu^4 U_0^\dagger = R D_N R^T R^* D_N R^\dagger R D_N R^T R^* D_N R^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

where the reliable approximations made in Eqs. (1.4) and (2.5) have been taken into consideration (i.e., only the leading terms of  $A$  and  $R$  are kept in our subsequent calculations). The elements of hermitian  $H$  and  $H^2$  can be more explicitly expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} H_{\alpha\beta} &= \sum_{j=4}^6 \sum_{k=4}^6 M_j M_k I_{jk} R_{\alpha j} R_{\beta k}^*, \\ (H^2)_{\alpha\beta} &= \sum_{j=4}^6 \sum_{k=4}^6 \sum_{m=4}^6 \sum_{n=4}^6 M_j M_k M_m M_n I_{jk} I_{mn} I_{mk} R_{\alpha j} R_{\beta n}^*, \end{aligned} \quad (3.2)$$

where the Greek subscripts run over  $e, \mu$  and  $\tau$ , and

$$I_{jk} \equiv R_{ej} R_{ek}^* + R_{\mu j} R_{\mu k}^* + R_{\tau j} R_{\tau k}^* = \sum_{i=1}^3 \hat{s}_{ij}^* \hat{s}_{ik} \quad (3.3)$$

for  $j, k = 4, 5, 6$ . As  $\text{tr}(H) = m_1^2 + m_2^2 + m_3^2$ ,  $\text{tr}(H^2) = m_1^4 + m_2^4 + m_3^4$  and  $\det(H) = m_1^2 m_2^2 m_3^2$  hold,  $m_i^2$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) must be the three roots of the cubic characteristic equation

$$m_i^6 - \text{tr}(H) m_i^4 + \frac{[\text{tr}(H)]^2 - \text{tr}(H^2)}{2} m_i^2 - \det(H) = 0. \quad (3.4)$$

Then we arrive at the solutions

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 &= \frac{1}{3}x - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ z + \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right], \\ m_2^2 &= \frac{1}{3}x - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ z - \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right], \\ m_3^2 &= \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{2}{3}z\sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \end{aligned} \quad (3.5)$$

in the NMO case; or

$$\begin{aligned} m_1^2 &= \frac{1}{3}x - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ z - \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right], \\ m_2^2 &= \frac{1}{3}x + \frac{2}{3}z\sqrt{x^2 - 3y}, \\ m_3^2 &= \frac{1}{3}x - \frac{1}{3}\sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ z + \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (3.6)$$

in the IMO case, where

$$\begin{aligned}
x &= \text{tr}(H) \ , \\
y &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ [\text{tr}(H)]^2 - \text{tr}(H^2) \right] \ , \\
z &= \cos \left[ \frac{1}{3} \arccos \frac{2x^3 - 9xy + 27d}{2(x^2 - 3y)^{3/2}} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

with  $d = \det(H)$ . The three neutrino mass-squared differences  $\Delta_{ii'} \equiv m_i^2 - m_{i'}^2$  (for  $i \neq i' = 1, 2, 3$ ) turn out to be

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{21} &= \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \ , \\
\Delta_{31} &= \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ 3z + \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right] \ , \\
\Delta_{32} &= \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ 3z - \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.8}$$

in the NMO case; or

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{21} &= \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ 3z - \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right] \ , \\
\Delta_{13} &= \frac{2}{3} \sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \ , \\
\Delta_{23} &= \frac{1}{3} \sqrt{x^2 - 3y} \left[ 3z + \sqrt{3(1 - z^2)} \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{3.9}$$

in the IMO case. Taking account of Eq. (3.2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
d &= M_4^2 M_5^2 M_6^2 (I_{56} I_{65} I_{44} + I_{46} I_{64} I_{55} + I_{45} I_{54} I_{66} - I_{45} I_{56} I_{64} - I_{54} I_{65} I_{46} - I_{44} I_{55} I_{66})^2 \ , \\
x &= M_4^2 I_{44}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55}^2 + M_6^2 I_{66}^2 + M_4 M_5 (I_{45}^2 + I_{54}^2) + M_4 M_6 (I_{46}^2 + I_{64}^2) + M_5 M_6 (I_{56}^2 + I_{65}^2) \ , \\
y &= M_4^2 M_5^2 (I_{45} I_{54} - I_{44} I_{55})^2 + M_4^2 M_6^2 (I_{46} I_{64} - I_{44} I_{66})^2 + M_5^2 M_6^2 (I_{56} I_{65} - I_{55} I_{66})^2 \\
&\quad + [(I_{54} I_{46} - I_{44} I_{56})^2 + (I_{45} I_{64} - I_{44} I_{65})^2] M_4^2 M_5 M_6 \\
&\quad + [(I_{45} I_{56} - I_{55} I_{46})^2 + (I_{54} I_{65} - I_{55} I_{64})^2] M_4 M_5^2 M_6 \\
&\quad + [(I_{56} I_{64} - I_{66} I_{54})^2 + (I_{65} I_{46} - I_{66} I_{45})^2] M_4 M_5 M_6^2 \ ,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.10}$$

where  $I_{jk} = I_{kj}^*$  (for  $j, k = 4, 5, 6$ ) have been defined in Eq. (3.3).

To see how  $x$ ,  $y$  and  $d$  depend on the active-sterile flavor mixing angles and CP-violating phases, we proceed to rewrite their expressions in a more explicit manner:

$$\begin{aligned}
d &= M_4^2 M_5^2 M_6^2 \left[ I_{44} I_{55} I_{66} - I_{44} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5} s_{i6} s_{i'5} s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i - \beta_{i'}) - I_{55} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i6} s_{i'4} s_{i'6} \cos(\gamma_i - \gamma_{i'}) \right. \\
&\quad \left. - I_{66} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) + 2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'5} s_{i'6} s_{i''4} s_{i''6} \cos(\alpha_i + \beta_{i'} + \gamma_{i''}) \right]^2 \ , \\
x &= M_4^2 I_{44}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55}^2 + M_6^2 I_{66}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2M_5M_6 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_{i'}) + 2M_4M_6 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_{i'}) , \\
y = & 2M_4^2M_5M_6 \left\{ 2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i + \gamma_{i'}) \right]^2 \right. \\
& - \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] \times \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\gamma_i - \gamma_{i'}) \right] \\
& - 2I_{44} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} + \gamma_{i''}) + I_{44}^2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_{i'}) \left. \right\} \\
& + 2M_4M_5^2M_6 \left\{ 2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i + \beta_{i'}) \right]^2 \right. \\
& - \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] \times \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i - \beta_{i'}) \right] \\
& - 2I_{55} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\alpha_i + \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''}) + I_{55}^2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_{i'}) \left. \right\} \\
& + 2M_4M_5M_6^2 \left\{ 2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i + \gamma_{i'}) \right]^2 \right. \\
& - \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i - \beta_{i'}) \right] \times \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\gamma_i - \gamma_{i'}) \right] \\
& - 2I_{66} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''}) + I_{66}^2 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \left. \right\} \\
& + M_4^2M_5^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) - I_{44}I_{55} \right]^2 \\
& + M_5^2M_6^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i - \beta_{i'}) - I_{55}I_{66} \right]^2 \\
& + M_4^2M_6^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\gamma_i - \gamma_{i'}) - I_{44}I_{66} \right]^2 , \tag{3.11}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $I_{jj} = s_{1j}^2 + s_{2j}^2 + s_{3j}^2$  (for  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ) can be directly read off from Eq. (3.3), and the three sets of CP-violating phase differences defined as

$$\alpha_i \equiv \delta_{i4} - \delta_{i5} , \quad \beta_i \equiv \delta_{i5} - \delta_{i6} , \quad \gamma_i \equiv \delta_{i6} - \delta_{i4} \tag{3.12}$$

satisfy the sum rule  $\alpha_i + \beta_i + \gamma_i = 0$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ). So six of the above nine phase parameters are independent and serve as the original source of CP violation in the seesaw mechanism. For instance, one may simply fix  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) as the six original CP-violating phases.

## 3.2 Flavor mixing angles and the effective Dirac phase

Now let us calculate the three flavor mixing angles ( $\theta_{12}, \theta_{13}, \theta_{23}$ ) and the effective Dirac CP-violating phase ( $\delta \equiv \delta_{13} - \delta_{12} - \delta_{23}$ ) of  $U_0$  which determine the strengths of flavor oscillations for the three active neutrinos. A combination of the unitarity of  $U_0$  and Eq. (3.1) leads us to

$$\begin{aligned} (U_0)_{\alpha 1} (U_0)_{\beta 1}^* + (U_0)_{\alpha 2} (U_0)_{\beta 2}^* + (U_0)_{\alpha 3} (U_0)_{\beta 3}^* &= \delta_{\alpha\beta} , \\ m_1^2 (U_0)_{\alpha 1} (U_0)_{\beta 1}^* + m_2^2 (U_0)_{\alpha 2} (U_0)_{\beta 2}^* + m_3^2 (U_0)_{\alpha 3} (U_0)_{\beta 3}^* &= H_{\alpha\beta} , \\ m_1^4 (U_0)_{\alpha 1} (U_0)_{\beta 1}^* + m_2^4 (U_0)_{\alpha 2} (U_0)_{\beta 2}^* + m_3^4 (U_0)_{\alpha 3} (U_0)_{\beta 3}^* &= (H^2)_{\alpha\beta} , \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

where  $\delta_{\alpha\beta}$  is the Kronecker symbol for  $\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$ . The three variables  $(U_0)_{\alpha i} (U_0)_{\beta i}^*$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) can then be derived from the above three linear equations. In the case of  $\alpha = \beta$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |(U_0)_{\alpha 1}|^2 &= \frac{(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha} - H_{\alpha\alpha} (m_2^2 + m_3^2) + m_2^2 m_3^2}{\Delta_{21} \Delta_{31}} , \\ |(U_0)_{\alpha 2}|^2 &= \frac{(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha} - H_{\alpha\alpha} (m_1^2 + m_3^2) + m_1^2 m_3^2}{\Delta_{21} \Delta_{23}} , \\ |(U_0)_{\alpha 3}|^2 &= \frac{(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha} - H_{\alpha\alpha} (m_1^2 + m_2^2) + m_1^2 m_2^2}{\Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}} ; \end{aligned} \quad (3.14)$$

and in the case of  $\alpha \neq \beta$ , we arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} (U_0)_{\alpha 1} (U_0)_{\beta 1}^* &= \frac{(H^2)_{\alpha\beta} - H_{\alpha\beta} (m_2^2 + m_3^2)}{\Delta_{21} \Delta_{31}} , \\ (U_0)_{\alpha 2} (U_0)_{\beta 2}^* &= \frac{(H^2)_{\alpha\beta} - H_{\alpha\beta} (m_1^2 + m_3^2)}{\Delta_{21} \Delta_{23}} , \\ (U_0)_{\alpha 3} (U_0)_{\beta 3}^* &= \frac{(H^2)_{\alpha\beta} - H_{\alpha\beta} (m_1^2 + m_2^2)}{\Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}} . \end{aligned} \quad (3.15)$$

In view of Eq. (1.2), one finds that the three flavor mixing angles are related to the moduli of  $U_0$  in its first row and third column as follows:

$$s_{12}^2 = \frac{|(U_0)_{e2}|^2}{1 - |(U_0)_{e3}|^2} , \quad s_{13}^2 = |(U_0)_{e3}|^2 , \quad s_{23}^2 = \frac{|(U_0)_{\mu 3}|^2}{1 - |(U_0)_{e3}|^2} . \quad (3.16)$$

Substituting Eq. (3.14) into Eq. (3.16), we get

$$\begin{aligned} s_{12}^2 &= \frac{[(H^2)_{ee} - H_{ee} (m_1^2 + m_3^2) + m_1^2 m_3^2] \Delta_{31}}{[(H^2)_{ee} - H_{ee} (m_1^2 + m_2^2) + m_1^2 m_2^2 - \Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}] \Delta_{21}} , \\ s_{13}^2 &= \frac{(H^2)_{ee} - H_{ee} (m_1^2 + m_2^2) + m_1^2 m_2^2}{\Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}} , \\ s_{23}^2 &= \frac{(H^2)_{\mu\mu} - H_{\mu\mu} (m_1^2 + m_2^2) + m_1^2 m_2^2}{-(H^2)_{ee} + H_{ee} (m_1^2 + m_2^2) - m_1^2 m_2^2 + \Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}} , \end{aligned} \quad (3.17)$$

where the explicit expressions of  $H_{\alpha\alpha}$  and  $(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha}$  can be found in Appendix A, and those of  $m_i^2$  and  $\Delta_{ii'}$  (for  $i, i' = 1, 2, 3$ ) can be achieved from Eqs. (3.5)—(3.11).

On the other hand, the effective Dirac CP-violating phase  $\delta$  can be extracted from the Jarlskog invariant  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  shown in Eq. (1.5). Namely <sup>2</sup>,

$$\sin \delta = \frac{\mathcal{J}_\nu}{\sqrt{s_{12}^2 s_{13}^2 s_{23}^2 (1 - s_{12}^2) (1 - s_{23}^2) (1 - s_{13}^2)}}, \quad (3.18)$$

where the expressions of  $s_{ii'}^2$  (for  $ii' = 12, 13, 23$ ) have been given in Eq. (3.17), and  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  has already been calculated in Ref. [21] with the help of

$$\mathcal{J}_\nu = \frac{\text{Im} \left[ \sum_{\gamma} \epsilon_{\alpha\beta\gamma} H_{\alpha\beta} (H^2)_{\beta\alpha} \right]}{\Delta_{21} \Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}} = \frac{\text{Im} (H_{e\mu} H_{\mu\tau} H_{\tau e})}{\Delta_{21} \Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}} \quad (3.19)$$

for  $(\alpha, \beta, \gamma)$  running cyclically over  $(e, \mu, \tau)$ . The explicit analytical result of  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  consists of the terms proportional to  $M_j^3 M_k^3$ ,  $M_j^4 M_k^2$ ,  $M_j^4 M_k M_l$ ,  $M_j^3 M_k^2 M_l$  and  $M_j^2 M_k^2 M_l^2$  (for  $j \neq k \neq l = 4, 5, 6$ ) [21], and the product  $\Delta_{21} \Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}$  can be directly deduced from Eq. (3.8) or Eq. (3.9).

Note that  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  depends on the six original and independent phase parameters of the seesaw mechanism (e.g.,  $\alpha_i$  and  $\beta_i$  for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ), as specifically shown in Ref. [21]. So  $\sin \delta$  must also be a function of  $\sin \alpha_i$  and  $\sin \beta_i$ , similar to  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$ . The point is that all the CP-violating phases in the seesaw mechanism are of the Majorana nature, in the sense that they may manifest themselves in those lepton-number-violating processes. That is why  $\delta$  is referred to as the ‘‘effective’’ Dirac CP-violating phase which is unique to CP violation in neutrino oscillations, given the fact that non-unitarity of the PMNS matrix  $U$  is strongly suppressed and realistically negligible in the foreseeable neutrino experiments.

It is the *first* time that the general and explicit analytical relations between the 6 *derivational* neutrino oscillation parameters and the 18 *original* seesaw flavor parameters have been established. The approximation made in our calculations is equivalent to concentrating on the unique Weinberg dimension-5 operator [17] in the seesaw-extended SMEFT, simply because small non-unitarity of  $U$  is associated with those dimension-6 operators of the SMEFT and its effects are almost experimentally untouchable in the near future. Our results are expected to be useful for testing the seesaw mechanism in a variety of existing and upcoming neutrino oscillation experiments.

Here let us make some brief comments on a few well-known non-oscillation quantities of massive neutrinos in the canonical seesaw framework.

- It is straightforward to calculate the sum of three light neutrino masses  $\Sigma_\nu \equiv m_1 + m_2 + m_3$  with the help of Eq. (3.5) or Eq. (3.6), and its upper bound extracted from a number of cosmological observations [27] can therefore be used to constrain the original seesaw parameter space.
- The effective mass of the beta decays, namely  $\langle m \rangle_e \equiv \sqrt{m_1^2 |U_{e1}|^2 + m_2^2 |U_{e2}|^2 + m_3^2 |U_{e3}|^2}$ , can also be used to constrain the parameter space of the seesaw mechanism, since its upper bound has recently been obtained from the KATRIN experiment [28]. Note that  $\langle m \rangle_e = \sqrt{H_{ee}}$  holds,

---

<sup>2</sup>Of course, one may also determine  $\cos \delta$  from  $|(U_0)_{\mu 1}|^2$ ,  $|(U_0)_{\mu 2}|^2$ ,  $|(U_0)_{\tau 1}|^2$  or  $|(U_0)_{\tau 2}|^2$  by use of the cosine theorem and with the help of Eqs. (3.14) and (3.17).

as can be seen from Eq. (3.13). The explicit expression of  $H_{ee}$  is given by Eq. (A.1) in Appendix A.

- The effective mass of the neutrinoless double-beta decays, denoted as  $\langle m \rangle_{0\nu 2\beta}$ , is composed of both the  $m_i U_{ei}^2$  terms (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) and the  $R_{ej}^2/M_j$  terms (for  $j = 4, 5, 6$ ) in the canonical seesaw framework [22], as such lepton-number-violating processes are mediated by both light and heavy Majorana neutrinos. Given  $(m_1 U_{e1}^2 + m_2 U_{e2}^2 + m_3 U_{e3}^2) = -(M_4 R_{e4}^2 + M_5 R_{e5}^2 + M_6 R_{e6}^2)$  as indicated by the exact seesaw relation in Eq. (1.3), we find that  $\langle m \rangle_{0\nu 2\beta}$  depends only on the original seesaw flavor parameters  $M_j$  and  $R_{ej}$ . So the upper bound of  $\langle m \rangle_{0\nu 2\beta}$  [29] is certainly useful to constrain the seesaw parameter space.

It is also helpful to consider those charged-lepton-flavor-violating processes to probe or constrain the parameter space of the seesaw mechanism (e.g., as done in Refs. [26, 30]).

## 4 Results for the minimal seesaw scenario

The minimal seesaw scenario is a simplified version of the canonical seesaw mechanism which contains only two right-handed neutrino fields [31–34] and thus involves only 11 original flavor parameters (i.e., 2 heavy neutrino masses, 6 active-sterile flavor mixing angles and 3 independent CP-violating phases [35]). The most salient feature of this interesting and instructive scenario is  $m_1 = 0$  in the NMO case or  $m_3 = 0$  in the IMO case, as a straightforward consequence of switching off the third heavy Majorana neutrino field  $N_6$  and its relevant flavor parameters. The relevant results obtained in section 3 can therefore be simplified to a great extent.

Note that the experimental constraints on the active-sterile flavor mixing angles in the minimal seesaw framework are much stronger than in the canonical case. Taking account of the latest global-fit results about non-unitarity of the PMNS matrix  $U$  obtained in Ref. [26], namely

$$\epsilon \equiv |I - A| < \begin{cases} \begin{pmatrix} 9.4 \times 10^{-6} & 0 & 0 \\ 2.4 \times 10^{-5} & 1.3 \times 10^{-4} & 0 \\ 4.4 \times 10^{-5} & 2.6 \times 10^{-4} & 2.1 \times 10^{-4} \end{pmatrix} & \text{(NMO)} \\ \begin{pmatrix} 5.5 \times 10^{-4} & 0 & 0 \\ 2.6 \times 10^{-5} & 3.2 \times 10^{-5} & 0 \\ 2.8 \times 10^{-4} & 7.0 \times 10^{-5} & 4.5 \times 10^{-5} \end{pmatrix} & \text{(IMO)} \end{cases} \quad (4.1)$$

in the minimal seesaw scenario, we switch off  $\theta_{i6}$  and  $\delta_{i6}$  in Eq. (2.1) and confront the resulting  $A$  with Eq. (4.1) for arbitrary values of  $\delta_{i4}$  and  $\delta_{i5}$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ )<sup>3</sup>. Figs. 3 and 4 illustrate how the six nonzero elements of  $\epsilon$  in Eq. (4.1) depend on  $\theta_{i4}$  and  $\theta_{i5}$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$ ) in the respective NMO and IMO cases, and the upper bounds of these six flavor mixing angles are extracted as follows:

$$\theta_{1j} < 0.25^\circ, \quad \theta_{2j} < 0.92^\circ, \quad \theta_{3j} < 1.17^\circ \quad \text{(NMO)};$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Note that  $R$  is actually a  $3 \times 2$  matrix in the minimal seesaw framework, and thus the rank of  $D_\nu$  in Eq. (1.3) must be two, implying that one of the three light Majorana neutrinos has to be massless at the tree level.




Figure 3: Numerical constraints on the active-sterile flavor mixing angles  $\theta_{1j}$ ,  $\theta_{2j}$  and  $\theta_{3j}$  (for  $j = 4, 5$ ) with the help of the upper bounds on  $\epsilon_{ii'}$  (for  $i, i' = 1, 2, 3$ ) in Eq. (4.1) in the NMO case of the minimal seesaw scenario, where different colors in the bar legend denote different values of  $\log_{10}(\epsilon_{ii'})$ .

$$\theta_{1j} < 1.90^\circ, \quad \theta_{2j} < 0.46^\circ, \quad \theta_{3j} < 0.54^\circ \quad (\text{IMO}), \quad (4.2)$$

where  $j = 4$  and  $5$ . These stringent constraints strongly support our analytical approximations made in this work — only keeping the leading terms of  $A$  and  $R$  in our calculations.

In the minimal seesaw scenario, the analytical expressions of neutrino masses can be simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} m_{2,3}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left( x' \mp \sqrt{y'} \right), \\ \Delta_{21} &= \frac{1}{2} \left( x' - \sqrt{y'} \right), \quad \Delta_{31} = \frac{1}{2} \left( x' + \sqrt{y'} \right), \quad \Delta_{32} = \sqrt{y'} \end{aligned} \quad (4.3)$$

in the NMO case; or

$$m_{1,2}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( x' \mp \sqrt{y'} \right),$$




Figure 4: Numerical constraints on the active-sterile flavor mixing angles  $\theta_{1j}$ ,  $\theta_{2j}$  and  $\theta_{3j}$  (for  $j = 4, 5$ ) with the help of the upper bounds on  $\epsilon_{ii'}$  (for  $i, i' = 1, 2, 3$ ) in Eq. (4.1) in the IMO case of the minimal seesaw scenario, where different colors in the bar legend denote different values of  $\log_{10}(\epsilon_{ii'})$ .

$$\Delta_{21} = \sqrt{y'} , \quad \Delta_{13} = \frac{1}{2} (x' - \sqrt{y'}) , \quad \Delta_{23} = \frac{1}{2} (x' + \sqrt{y'}) \quad (4.4)$$

in the IMO case, where  $x' \equiv \text{tr}(H)$  and  $y' \equiv 2\text{tr}(H^2) - [\text{tr}(H)]^2$ . The expressions of  $x'$  and  $y'$  are

$$x' = M_4^2 I_{44}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) ,$$

$$y' = M_4^4 I_{44}^4 + M_5^4 I_{55}^4 + 4M_4 M_5 (M_4^2 I_{44}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55}^2) \times \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right]$$

$$- 2M_4^2 M_5^2 \left\{ I_{44}^2 I_{55}^2 - 4I_{44} I_{55} \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right\}$$

$$+ 2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \sin(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right]^2 \Big\}, \quad (4.5)$$

in which  $I_{jj} = s_{1j}^2 + s_{2j}^2 + s_{3j}^2$  (for  $j = 4, 5$ ). So switching off the 6 active-sterile flavor mixing angles in the minimal seesaw framework, which is equivalent to switching off the Yukawa interactions between left- and right-handed neutrinos, will immediately lead us to  $x' = 0$ ,  $y' = 0$  and thus  $m_1 = m_2 = m_3 = 0$ .

The general results for the three active flavor mixing angles obtained in Eq. (3.17) can also be simplified by taking  $m_1 = 0$  in the NMO case or  $m_3 = 0$  in the IMO case. In either case the relevant expressions of  $H_{\alpha\alpha}$  and  $(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha}$  (for  $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ ) listed in Appendix A are simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} H_{ee} &= M_4^2 I_{44} s_{14}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55} s_{15}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 s_{14} s_{15} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_1) \right], \\ H_{\mu\mu} &= M_4^2 I_{44} s_{24}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55} s_{25}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 s_{24} s_{25} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_2) \right], \\ H_{\tau\tau} &= M_4^2 I_{44} s_{34}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55} s_{35}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 s_{34} s_{35} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_3) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} (H^2)_{ee} &= M_4^4 I_{44}^3 s_{14}^2 + M_5^4 I_{55}^3 s_{15}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 \left\{ s_{14} s_{15} (M_4^2 I_{44}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_1) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (M_4^2 I_{44} s_{14}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55} s_{15}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right] \right\} \\ &\quad + M_4^2 M_5^2 \left\{ 2s_{14} s_{15} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} s_{i''4} s_{i''5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} + \alpha_{i''} + \alpha_1) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (I_{44} s_{15}^2 + I_{55} s_{14}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2s_{14} s_{15} I_{44} I_{55} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_1) \right] \right\}, \\ (H^2)_{\mu\mu} &= M_4^4 I_{44}^3 s_{24}^2 + M_5^4 I_{55}^3 s_{25}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 \left\{ s_{24} s_{25} (M_4^2 I_{44}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_2) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (M_4^2 I_{44} s_{24}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55} s_{25}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right] \right\} \\ &\quad + M_4^2 M_5^2 \left\{ 2s_{24} s_{25} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} s_{i''4} s_{i''5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} + \alpha_{i''} + \alpha_2) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (I_{44} s_{25}^2 + I_{55} s_{24}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] \right\} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2s_{24}s_{25}I_{44}I_{55} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_2) \right] \Big\} , \\
(H^2)_{\tau\tau} = & M_4^4 I_{44}^3 s_{34}^2 + M_5^4 I_{55}^3 s_{35}^2 + 2M_4 M_5 \left\{ s_{34}s_{35} (M_4^2 I_{44}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_3) \right] \right. \\
& + (M_4^2 I_{44} s_{34}^2 + M_5^2 I_{55} s_{35}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right] \Big\} \\
& + M_4^2 M_5^2 \left\{ 2s_{34}s_{35} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5}s_{i''4}s_{i''5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} + \alpha_{i''} + \alpha_3) \right] \right. \\
& + (I_{44} s_{35}^2 + I_{55} s_{34}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] \\
& \left. + 2s_{34}s_{35}I_{44}I_{55} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_3) \right] \right\} . \tag{4.7}
\end{aligned}$$

It is obvious that  $H_{\mu\mu}$  and  $(H^2)_{\mu\mu}$  can respectively be read off from  $H_{ee}$  and  $(H^2)_{ee}$  by doing the replacements  $\theta_{14} \leftrightarrow \theta_{24}$ ,  $\theta_{15} \leftrightarrow \theta_{25}$  and  $\alpha_1 \leftrightarrow \alpha_2$ . Similarly, one may write out  $H_{\tau\tau}$  and  $(H^2)_{\tau\tau}$  from  $H_{ee}$  and  $(H^2)_{ee}$  with the replacements  $\theta_{14} \leftrightarrow \theta_{34}$ ,  $\theta_{15} \leftrightarrow \theta_{35}$  and  $\alpha_1 \leftrightarrow \alpha_3$ .

Furthermore, the effective Dirac CP-violating phase can be deduced from Eq. (3.18), where the Jarlskog invariant  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  in the minimal seesaw scenario is of a much simpler form

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{J}_\nu = & \frac{M_4^2 M_5^2 (I_{44} I_{55} - |I_{45}|^2)}{\Delta_{21} \Delta_{31} \Delta_{32}} \left\{ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} (M_4^2 I_{44} s_{i''4}^2 - M_5^2 I_{55} s_{i''5}^2) \sin(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right. \\
& + M_4 M_5 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} (s_{i4}^2 s_{i''5}^2 + s_{i''4}^2 s_{i'5}^2 - s_{i''4}^2 s_{i5}^2 - s_{i'4}^2 s_{i''5}^2) \sin(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right. \\
& \left. \left. - \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}^2 s_{i5}^2 (s_{i'4}^2 s_{i''5}^2 - s_{i''4}^2 s_{i'5}^2) \sin 2\alpha_i \right] \right\} , \tag{4.8}
\end{aligned}$$

where  $i, i'$  and  $i''$  run cyclically over 1, 2 and 3. As discussed in Ref. [21],  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  in Eq. (4.8) is composed of the sine functions of 9 different phase combinations. In comparison, the results of  $m_i^2$ ,  $H_{\alpha\alpha}$  and  $(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha}$  (for  $i = 1, 2, 3$  and  $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ ) consist of the following phase combinations:

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cos 2\alpha_1 , \cos 2\alpha_2 , \cos 2\alpha_3 ; \cos(\alpha_1 \pm \alpha_2) , \cos(\alpha_2 \pm \alpha_3) , \cos(\alpha_3 \pm \alpha_1) ; \\
& \cos 4\alpha_1 , \cos 4\alpha_2 , \cos 4\alpha_3 ; \cos(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3) , \cos(2\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 + \alpha_1) , \cos(2\alpha_3 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) ; \\
& \cos(3\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) , \cos(3\alpha_1 + \alpha_3) , \cos(3\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) , \cos(3\alpha_2 + \alpha_1) , \cos(3\alpha_3 + \alpha_1) , \cos(3\alpha_3 + \alpha_2) ; \\
& \cos 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) , \cos 2(\alpha_3 + \alpha_1) .
\end{aligned}$$

The above analytical results show that it should be much easier to test the minimal seesaw scenario with the help of neutrino oscillations.

The analytical expressions for some non-oscillation quantities of massive neutrinos, such as the sum of three light neutrino masses  $\Sigma_\nu$ , the effective mass of a beta decay  $\langle m \rangle_e$  and the effective mass

of a neutrinoless double-beta decay  $\langle m \rangle_{0\nu 2\beta}$ , can also be simplified in the minimal seesaw framework. Therefore, whether this benchmark mechanism of neutrino mass generation is able to survive the experimental tests will hopefully be seen in the near future.

## 5 Summary and remarks

So far hundreds of neutrino mass models have been proposed in the literature, but it remains to be seen which one may finally prove to be true. From the theoretical point of view, we expect that a most promising model of this kind should represent a most natural extension of the SM with high gains and low costs. The canonical seesaw mechanism, which is fully consistent with the spirit of Weinberg’s SMEFT and capable of simultaneously explaining two big puzzles — the origin of tiny neutrino masses and the origin of cosmic matter-antimatter asymmetry, turns out to be the most favorite candidate in this respect. Then we are left with an important question: how can the canonical seesaw mechanism be tested in the upcoming precision measurement era of neutrino physics?

To answer this question, one needs to establish a model-independent bridge between the original seesaw flavor parameters and all the possibly observable quantities in particle physics and cosmology. In the present work we have *for the first time* derived the general and explicit analytical expressions of the 6 neutrino oscillation parameters in terms of the 18 seesaw flavor parameters without any special assumptions. We hope that our results will pave the way for testing the seesaw mechanism at low energies, especially in a variety of neutrino oscillation experiments.

Of course, the naturalness of the canonical seesaw mechanism requires the mass scale of three heavy Majorana neutrinos to be far above the electroweak scale. This requirement implies that non-unitarity of the  $3 \times 3$  PMNS matrix  $U$  must be highly suppressed, as can be seen from the strongly suppressed active-sterile flavor mixing angles that we have illustrated. On the other hand, it implies a gap between the flavor parameters of three light Majorana neutrinos at the seesaw scale and their counterparts that are observable at the electroweak scale. It is well known that the renormalization-group equations (RGEs) can help fill the gap, and such quantum corrections are found to be small in most cases within the seesaw-extended SM framework [36]. That is why we have left aside the RGE effects in the present work, but they can easily be taken into account when necessary, in particular when the input neutrino oscillation data or non-oscillation data are accurate and precise enough.

Let us remark that the 9 active-sterile flavor mixing angles of  $R$  characterize the strengths of Yukawa interactions for massive neutrinos, and hence most of them are not allowed to vanish although some of them might be vanishingly small. The reason is simply that  $R = \mathbf{0}$  would lead to the collapse of the seesaw mechanism, as it would result in  $UD_\nu U^T = -RD_N R^T = \mathbf{0}$ . So the largeness of heavy Majorana neutrino masses help compensate the smallness of active-sterile flavor mixing, in order to generate tiny masses but significant flavor mixing effects for the three active neutrinos. This is just the keystone of “seesaw”. Further constraints on the texture of  $R$  via neutrino oscillations will allow us to explore the tiny Yukawa interactions between the Higgs and neutrino fields.

A global analysis of all the available experimental data to constrain the parameter space of the

canonical seesaw mechanism is highly nontrivial and beyond the scope of our paper. In other words, this work is mainly intended to present the general and explicit analytical results for all the neutrino oscillation parameters in terms of the original seesaw flavor parameters. We are going to carry out a comprehensive numerical analysis of this kind elsewhere.

## **Acknowledgements**

The work of Z.Z.X. is supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No. 12075254, and the work of J.Y.Z. is partly supported by the the National Key Research and Development Program of China under grant No. 2021YFA1601300, by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under grant No. 12222512, and by the CAS Pioneer Hundred Talent Program.

# Appendix

## A The expressions of $H_{\alpha\alpha}$ and $(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha}$

The more specific analytical expressions of  $H_{\alpha\alpha}$  (for  $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ ) defined in Eq. (3.2) are listed below:

$$\begin{aligned}
H_{ee} &= s_{14}^2 I_{44} M_4^2 + s_{15}^2 I_{55} M_5^2 + s_{16}^2 I_{66} M_6^2 + 2M_4 M_5 s_{14} s_{15} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_1) \right] \\
&\quad + 2M_5 M_6 s_{15} s_{16} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i5} s_{i6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_1) \right] + 2M_4 M_6 s_{14} s_{16} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_1) \right], \\
H_{\mu\mu} &= s_{24}^2 I_{44} M_4^2 + s_{25}^2 I_{55} M_5^2 + s_{26}^2 I_{66} M_6^2 + 2M_4 M_5 s_{24} s_{25} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_2) \right] \\
&\quad + 2M_5 M_6 s_{25} s_{26} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i5} s_{i6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_2) \right] + 2M_4 M_6 s_{24} s_{26} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_2) \right], \\
H_{\tau\tau} &= s_{34}^2 I_{44} M_4^2 + s_{35}^2 I_{55} M_5^2 + s_{36}^2 I_{66} M_6^2 + 2M_4 M_5 s_{34} s_{35} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_3) \right] \\
&\quad + 2M_5 M_6 s_{35} s_{36} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i5} s_{i6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_3) \right] + 2M_4 M_6 s_{34} s_{36} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_3) \right]. \quad (\text{A.1})
\end{aligned}$$

In comparison, the analytical expressions of  $(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha}$  (for  $\alpha = e, \mu, \tau$ ) defined in Eq. (3.2) can be decomposed into the following 15 terms:

$$\begin{aligned}
(H^2)_{\alpha\alpha} &= T_{400}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4^4 + T_{040}^{\alpha\alpha} M_5^4 + T_{004}^{\alpha\alpha} M_6^4 + T_{112}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4 M_5 M_6^2 + T_{121}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4 M_5^2 M_6 + T_{112}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4 M_5 M_6^2 \\
&\quad + T_{130}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4 M_5^3 + T_{103}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4 M_6^3 + T_{013}^{\alpha\alpha} M_5 M_6^3 + T_{310}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4^3 M_5 + T_{301}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4^3 M_6 \\
&\quad + T_{031}^{\alpha\alpha} M_5^3 M_6 + T_{220}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4^2 M_5^2 + T_{022}^{\alpha\alpha} M_5^2 M_6^2 + T_{202}^{\alpha\alpha} M_4^2 M_6^2, \quad (\text{A.2})
\end{aligned}$$

where each  $T_{pqt}^{\alpha\alpha}$  represents the coefficient of the term proportional to  $M_4^p M_5^q M_6^t$  with  $p, q$  and  $t$  being the simple integers. To be more explicit, we obtain the expressions

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{400}^{ee} &= I_{44}^3 s_{14}^2, \quad T_{040}^{ee} = I_{55}^3 s_{15}^2, \quad T_{004}^{ee} = I_{66}^3 s_{16}^2, \\
T_{112}^{ee} &= 2I_{66} \left\{ s_{14} s_{15} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5} s_{i6} s_{i'4} s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i + \gamma_{i'} - \alpha_1) \right] \right. \\
&\quad + s_{15} s_{16} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'4} s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i - \gamma_{i'} - \beta_1) \right] \\
&\quad \left. + s_{14} s_{16} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4} s_{i5} s_{i'5} s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} - \gamma_1) \right] \right\} \\
&\quad + 2s_{14} s_{16} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i5} s_{i6} s_{i'5} s_{i'6} s_{i''4} s_{i''6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''} - \gamma_1) \right]
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + 2s_{15}s_{16} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6}s_{i''5}s_{i''6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_{i'} - \beta_{i''} - \beta_1) \right] \\
& + 2s_{16}^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''}) \right], \\
T_{130}^{ee} & = 2I_{55}^2 s_{14}s_{15} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_1) \right] + 2I_{55}s_{15}^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right], \\
T_{220}^{ee} & = (I_{44}s_{15}^2 + I_{55}s_{14}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] + 2s_{14}s_{15}I_{44}I_{55} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_1) \right] \\
& + 2s_{14}s_{15} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5}s_{i''4}s_{i''5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} + \alpha_{i''} + \alpha_1) \right]; \tag{A.3}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{400}^{\mu\mu} & = I_{44}^3 s_{24}^2, \quad T_{040}^{\mu\mu} = I_{55}^3 s_{25}^2, \quad T_{004}^{\mu\mu} = I_{66}^3 s_{26}^2, \\
T_{112}^{\mu\mu} & = 2I_{66} \left\{ s_{24}s_{25} \left[ \sum_{i,i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i + \gamma_{i'} - \alpha_2) \right] \right. \\
& + s_{25}s_{26} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i - \gamma_{i'} - \beta_2) \right] \\
& + s_{24}s_{26} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} - \gamma_2) \right] \left. \right\} \\
& + 2s_{24}s_{26} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''} - \gamma_2) \right] \\
& + 2s_{25}s_{26} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6}s_{i''5}s_{i''6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_{i'} - \beta_{i''} - \beta_2) \right] \\
& + 2s_{26}^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''}) \right], \\
T_{130}^{\mu\mu} & = 2I_{55}^2 s_{24}s_{25} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_2) \right] + 2I_{55}s_{25}^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right], \\
T_{220}^{\mu\mu} & = (I_{44}s_{25}^2 + I_{55}s_{24}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] + 2s_{24}s_{25}I_{44}I_{55} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_2) \right] \\
& + 2s_{24}s_{25} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5}s_{i''4}s_{i''5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} + \alpha_{i''} + \alpha_2) \right]; \tag{A.4}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{400}^{\tau\tau} & = I_{44}^3 s_{34}^2, \quad T_{040}^{\tau\tau} = I_{55}^3 s_{35}^2, \quad T_{004}^{\tau\tau} = I_{66}^3 s_{36}^2, \\
T_{112}^{\tau\tau} & = 2I_{66} \left\{ s_{34}s_{35} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\beta_i + \gamma_{i'} - \alpha_3) \right] \right.
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + s_{35}s_{36} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i - \gamma_{i'} - \beta_3) \right] \\
& + s_{34}s_{36} \left[ \sum_{i,i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} - \gamma_3) \right] \Big\} \\
& + 2s_{34}s_{36} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i5}s_{i6}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\beta_i + \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''} - \gamma_3) \right] \\
& + 2s_{35}s_{36} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i6}s_{i'4}s_{i'6}s_{i''5}s_{i''6} \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_{i'} - \beta_{i''} - \beta_3) \right] \\
& + 2s_{36}^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'5}s_{i'6}s_{i''4}s_{i''6} \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''}) \right], \\
T_{130}^{\tau\tau} & = 2I_{55}^2 s_{34}s_{35} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_3) \right] + 2I_{55}s_{35}^2 \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'}) \right], \\
T_{220}^{\tau\tau} & = (I_{44}s_{35}^2 + I_{55}s_{34}^2) \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_{i'}) \right] + 2s_{34}s_{35}I_{44}I_{55} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5} \cos(\alpha_i - \alpha_3) \right] \\
& + 2s_{34}s_{35} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^3 \sum_{i'=1}^3 \sum_{i''=1}^3 s_{i4}s_{i5}s_{i'4}s_{i'5}s_{i''4}s_{i''5} \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} + \alpha_{i''} + \alpha_3) \right]; \tag{A.5}
\end{aligned}$$

and the other coefficients can simply be achieved from Eqs. (A.3), (A.4) and (A.5) by making the following subscript and phase replacements:

$$\begin{aligned}
T_{121}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{112}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (4, 6, 5) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow -(\gamma_i, \beta_i, \alpha_i) \}, \\
T_{211}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{112}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (6, 5, 4) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow -(\beta_i, \alpha_i, \gamma_i) \}, \\
T_{103}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{130}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (4, 6, 5) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow -(\gamma_i, \beta_i, \alpha_i) \}, \\
T_{013}^{ee} & = T_{130}^{ee} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (5, 6, 4) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow +(\beta_i, \gamma_i, \alpha_i) \}, \\
T_{310}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{130}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (5, 4, 6) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow -(\alpha_i, \gamma_i, \beta_i) \}, \\
T_{301}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{130}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (6, 4, 5) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow +(\gamma_i, \alpha_i, \beta_i) \}, \\
T_{031}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{130}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (6, 5, 4) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow -(\beta_i, \alpha_i, \gamma_i) \}, \\
T_{202}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{220}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (4, 6, 5) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow -(\gamma_i, \beta_i, \alpha_i) \}, \\
T_{022}^{\alpha\alpha} & = T_{220}^{\alpha\alpha} \{ (4, 5, 6) \rightarrow (5, 6, 4) ; (\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i) \rightarrow +(\beta_i, \gamma_i, \alpha_i) \}, \tag{A.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where the Greek superscript “ $\alpha\alpha$ ” runs over  $ee$ ,  $\mu\mu$  and  $\tau\tau$ . It is easy to see that  $H_{\mu\mu}$  can be read off from  $H_{ee}$  by doing the replacements  $s_{14} \leftrightarrow s_{24}$ ,  $s_{15} \leftrightarrow s_{25}$ ,  $s_{16} \leftrightarrow s_{26}$ ,  $\alpha_1 \leftrightarrow \alpha_2$ ,  $\beta_1 \leftrightarrow \beta_2$  and  $\gamma_1 \leftrightarrow \gamma_2$ . We find that  $(H^2)_{\mu\mu}$  can be obtained from  $(H^2)_{ee}$  with the same subscript replacements. Similarly,  $H_{\tau\tau}$  and  $(H^2)_{\tau\tau}$  can easily be read off from  $H_{ee}$  and  $(H^2)_{ee}$  by doing the replacements  $s_{14} \leftrightarrow s_{34}$ ,  $s_{15} \leftrightarrow s_{35}$ ,  $s_{16} \leftrightarrow s_{36}$ ,  $\alpha_1 \leftrightarrow \alpha_3$ ,  $\beta_1 \leftrightarrow \beta_3$  and  $\gamma_1 \leftrightarrow \gamma_3$ .

It is worth pointing out that the phase combinations that appear in the three active flavor mixing

angles and the effective Dirac CP-violating phase shown in Eqs. (3.17) and (3.18) include

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cos(\alpha_i \pm \alpha_{i'}) , \cos(\beta_i \pm \beta_{i'}) , \cos(\gamma_i \pm \gamma_{i'}) ; \cos(\alpha_i + \beta_{i'}) , \cos(\beta_i + \gamma_{i'}) , \cos(\gamma_i + \alpha_{i'}) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_i - \beta_{i'} + \gamma_{i''}) , \cos(\alpha_i + \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''}) , \cos(\beta_i + \gamma_{i'} - \alpha_{i''}) , \cos(\alpha_i + \beta_{i'} + \gamma_{i''}) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} + \alpha_{i''} + \alpha_{i'''}) , \cos(\beta_i + \beta_{i'} + \beta_{i''} + \beta_{i'''}) , \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_{i'} + \gamma_{i''} + \gamma_{i'''}) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_i + \alpha_{i'} - \beta_{i''} - \beta_{i'''}) , \cos(\beta_i + \beta_{i'} - \gamma_{i''} - \gamma_{i'''}) , \cos(\gamma_i + \gamma_{i'} - \alpha_{i''} - \alpha_{i'''}) ,
\end{aligned}$$

where  $i, i', i'', i''' = 1, 2, 3$ . In total, there are 267 different phase combinations as listed below.

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cos \alpha_1 , \cos \alpha_2 , \cos \alpha_3 ; \cos \beta_1 , \cos \beta_2 , \cos \beta_3 ; \cos \gamma_1 , \cos \gamma_2 , \cos \gamma_3 ; \\
& \cos 2\alpha_1 , \cos 2\alpha_2 , \cos 2\alpha_3 ; \cos 2\beta_1 , \cos 2\beta_2 , \cos 2\beta_3 ; \cos 2\gamma_1 , \cos 2\gamma_2 , \cos 2\gamma_3 ; \\
& \cos 4\alpha_1 , \cos 4\alpha_2 , \cos 4\alpha_3 ; \cos 4\beta_1 , \cos 4\beta_2 , \cos 4\beta_3 ; \cos 4\gamma_1 , \cos 4\gamma_2 , \cos 4\gamma_3 ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 \pm \alpha_2) , \cos(\alpha_2 \pm \alpha_3) , \cos(\alpha_3 \pm \alpha_1) ; \cos(\beta_1 \pm \beta_2) , \cos(\beta_2 \pm \beta_3) , \cos(\beta_3 \pm \beta_1) ; \\
& \cos(\gamma_1 \pm \gamma_2) , \cos(\gamma_2 \pm \gamma_3) , \cos(\gamma_3 \pm \gamma_1) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_3) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_1) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_3) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_1) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_2) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \gamma_2) ; \\
& \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\beta_3 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\beta_3 + \gamma_2) ; \\
& \cos 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) , \cos 2(\alpha_3 + \alpha_1) ; \cos 2(\beta_1 + \beta_2) , \cos 2(\beta_2 + \beta_3) , \cos 2(\beta_3 + \beta_1) ; \\
& \cos 2(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) , \cos 2(\gamma_2 + \gamma_3) , \cos 2(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1) ; \\
& \cos 2(\alpha_1 - \beta_1) , \cos 2(\alpha_1 - \beta_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_1 - \beta_3) , \cos 2(\alpha_2 - \beta_1) , \cos 2(\alpha_2 - \beta_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_2 - \beta_3) , \\
& \cos 2(\alpha_3 - \beta_1) , \cos 2(\alpha_3 - \beta_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_3 - \beta_3) ; \cos 2(\alpha_1 - \gamma_1) , \cos 2(\alpha_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_1 - \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos 2(\alpha_2 - \gamma_1) , \cos 2(\alpha_2 - \gamma_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos 2(\alpha_3 - \gamma_1) , \cos 2(\alpha_3 - \gamma_2) , \cos 2(\alpha_3 - \gamma_3) ; \\
& \cos 2(\beta_1 - \gamma_1) , \cos 2(\beta_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos 2(\beta_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos 2(\beta_2 - \gamma_1) , \cos 2(\beta_2 - \gamma_2) , \cos 2(\beta_2 - \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos 2(\beta_3 - \gamma_1) , \cos 2(\beta_3 - \gamma_2) , \cos 2(\beta_3 - \gamma_3) ; \\
& \cos(3\alpha_1 + \alpha_2) , \cos(3\alpha_1 + \alpha_3) , \cos(3\alpha_2 + \alpha_1) , \cos(3\alpha_2 + \alpha_3) , \cos(3\alpha_3 + \alpha_1) , \cos(3\alpha_3 + \alpha_2) ; \\
& \cos(3\beta_1 + \beta_2) , \cos(3\beta_1 + \beta_3) , \cos(3\beta_2 + \beta_1) , \cos(3\beta_2 + \beta_3) , \cos(3\beta_3 + \beta_1) , \cos(3\beta_3 + \beta_2) ; \\
& \cos(3\gamma_1 + \gamma_2) , \cos(3\gamma_1 + \gamma_3) , \cos(3\gamma_2 + \gamma_1) , \cos(3\gamma_2 + \gamma_3) , \cos(3\gamma_3 + \gamma_1) , \cos(3\gamma_3 + \gamma_2) ; \\
& \cos(2\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \cos(2\alpha_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\alpha_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\alpha_2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \\
& \cos(2\alpha_2 - \beta_1 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\alpha_2 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\alpha_3 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \cos(2\alpha_3 - \beta_1 - \beta_3) , \\
& \cos(2\alpha_3 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) ; \cos(2\alpha_1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(2\alpha_1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\alpha_1 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos(2\alpha_2 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(2\alpha_2 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\alpha_2 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\alpha_3 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \\
& \cos(2\alpha_3 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\alpha_3 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) ; \cos(2\beta_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(2\beta_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_3) , \\
& \cos(2\beta_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) , \cos(2\beta_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(2\beta_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_3) , \cos(2\beta_2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) , \\
& \cos(2\beta_3 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(2\beta_3 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_3) , \cos(2\beta_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) ; \cos(2\beta_1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \\
& \cos(2\beta_1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\beta_1 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\beta_2 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(2\beta_2 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos(2\beta_2 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\beta_3 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(2\beta_3 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos(2\beta_3 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) ; \\
& \cos(2\gamma_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \cos(2\gamma_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\gamma_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\gamma_2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \\
& \cos(2\gamma_2 - \beta_1 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\gamma_2 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) , \cos(2\gamma_3 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \cos(2\gamma_3 - \beta_1 - \beta_3) , \\
& \cos(2\gamma_3 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) ; \cos(2\gamma_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(2\gamma_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_3) , \cos(2\gamma_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) , \\
& \cos(2\gamma_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(2\gamma_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_3) , \cos(2\gamma_2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) , \cos(2\gamma_3 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \\
& \cos(2\gamma_3 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_3) , \cos(2\gamma_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) ;
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& \cos(2\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + \alpha_3) , \cos(2\alpha_2 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_3) , \cos(2\alpha_3 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_2) ; \\
& \cos(2\beta_1 + \beta_2 + \beta_3) , \cos(2\beta_2 + \beta_1 + \beta_3) , \cos(2\beta_3 + \beta_1 + \beta_2) ; \\
& \cos(2\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 + \gamma_3) , \cos(2\gamma_2 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_3) , \cos(2\gamma_3 + \gamma_1 + \gamma_2) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_2 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_3 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_1 + \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_3 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_1 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_2 + \gamma_1) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_1 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_1 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_2 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_2 + \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_3 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 - \beta_3 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_2 - \beta_1 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_2 - \beta_1 + \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_2 - \beta_2 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_2 - \beta_2 + \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_2 - \beta_3 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_2 - \beta_3 + \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_3 - \beta_1 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_3 - \beta_1 + \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_3 - \beta_2 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_3 - \beta_2 + \gamma_2) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_3 - \beta_3 + \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_3 - \beta_3 + \gamma_2) ; \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_2 - \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_3 - \gamma_1) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_2 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_3 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \beta_3 - \gamma_3) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_1 - \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_3 - \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_3 - \gamma_2) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \beta_3 - \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_1 - \gamma_1) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_2 - \gamma_1) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_2 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_1 - \gamma_3) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \beta_2 - \gamma_3) ; \\
& \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_1) , \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_1) , \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_2) , \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_2) , \\
& \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_3) , \cos(\beta_1 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_3) , \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_1) , \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_1) , \\
& \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_2) , \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_3) , \cos(\beta_2 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_3) , \\
& \cos(\beta_3 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_1) , \cos(\beta_3 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_1) , \cos(\beta_3 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(\beta_3 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_2) , \\
& \cos(\beta_3 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_3) , \cos(\beta_3 + \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) ; \\
& \cos(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) , \cos(\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 - \beta_3 - \beta_1) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) , \cos(\alpha_2 + \alpha_3 - \beta_3 - \beta_1) , \\
& \cos(\alpha_3 + \alpha_1 - \beta_1 - \beta_2) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \alpha_1 - \beta_2 - \beta_3) , \cos(\alpha_3 + \alpha_1 - \beta_3 - \beta_1) ; \\
& \cos(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos(\beta_1 + \beta_2 - \gamma_3 - \gamma_1) , \\
& \cos(\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos(\beta_2 + \beta_3 - \gamma_3 - \gamma_1) , \\
& \cos(\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \gamma_1 - \gamma_2) , \cos(\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \gamma_2 - \gamma_3) , \cos(\beta_3 + \beta_1 - \gamma_3 - \gamma_1) ; \\
& \cos(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) , \cos(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_1) , \\
& \cos(\gamma_2 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(\gamma_2 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) , \cos(\gamma_2 + \gamma_3 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_1) , \\
& \cos(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_1 - \alpha_2) , \cos(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_2 - \alpha_3) , \cos(\gamma_3 + \gamma_1 - \alpha_3 - \alpha_1) .
\end{aligned}$$

In comparison,  $\mathcal{J}_\nu$  depends on 240 different combinations of the original CP-violating phases in the canonical seesaw mechanism, as explicitly shown in Ref. [21].

## References

- [1] P. Minkowski, “ $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$  at a rate of one out of  $10^9$  muon decays?,” Phys. Lett. **67B** (1977) 421.
- [2] T. Yanagida, “Horizontal gauge symmetry and masses of neutrinos,” Conf. Proc. C **7902131** (1979) 95.
- [3] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, “Complex spinors and unified theories,” Conf. Proc. C **790927** (1979) 315 [arXiv:1306.4669 [hep-th]].

- [4] S. L. Glashow, “The future of elementary particle physics,” NATO Sci. Ser. B **61** (1980) 687.
- [5] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, “Neutrino mass and spontaneous parity nonconservation,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **44** (1980) 912.
- [6] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagida, “Baryogenesis Without Grand Unification,” Phys. Lett. B **174** (1986), 45-47.
- [7] Z. z. Xing, “Correlation between the Charged Current Interactions of Light and Heavy Majorana Neutrinos,” Phys. Lett. B **660** (2008), 515-521 [arXiv:0709.2220 [hep-ph]].
- [8] Z. z. Xing, “A full parametrization of the  $6\times 6$  flavor mixing matrix in the presence of three light or heavy sterile neutrinos,” Phys. Rev. D **85** (2012), 013008 [arXiv:1110.0083 [hep-ph]].
- [9] B. Pontecorvo, “Mesonium and anti-mesonium,” Sov. Phys. JETP **6** (1957) 429 [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **33** (1957) 549].
- [10] Z. Maki, M. Nakagawa and S. Sakata, “Remarks on the unified model of elementary particles,” Prog. Theor. Phys. **28** (1962) 870.
- [11] B. Pontecorvo, “Neutrino Experiments and the Problem of Conservation of Leptonic Charge,” Sov. Phys. JETP **26** (1968) 984 [Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **53** (1967) 1717].
- [12] F. An *et al.* [JUNO], “Neutrino Physics with JUNO,” J. Phys. G **43** (2016) no.3, 030401 [arXiv:1507.05613 [physics.ins-det]].
- [13] A. Abusleme *et al.* [JUNO], “JUNO physics and detector,” Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys. **123** (2022), 103927 [arXiv:2104.02565 [hep-ex]].
- [14] R. Acciarri *et al.* [DUNE], “Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility (LBNF) and Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE): Conceptual Design Report, Volume 2: The Physics Program for DUNE at LBNF,” [arXiv:1512.06148 [physics.ins-det]].
- [15] K. Abe *et al.* [Hyper-Kamiokande Proto-], “Physics potential of a long-baseline neutrino oscillation experiment using a J-PARC neutrino beam and Hyper-Kamiokande,” PTEP **2015** (2015), 053C02 [arXiv:1502.05199 [hep-ex]].
- [16] Z. z. Xing, “The formal seesaw mechanism of Majorana neutrinos with unbroken gauge symmetry,” Nucl. Phys. B **987** (2023), 116106 [arXiv:2301.10461 [hep-ph]].
- [17] S. Weinberg, “Baryon and Lepton Nonconserving Processes,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **43** (1979), 1566-1570
- [18] S. Navas *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of particle physics,” Phys. Rev. D **110** (2024) no.3, 030001

- [19] C. Jarlskog, “Commutator of the Quark Mass Matrices in the Standard Electroweak Model and a Measure of Maximal  $CP$  Nonconservation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55** (1985), 1039.
- [20] D. d. Wu, “The Rephasing Invariants and  $CP$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D* **33** (1986), 860.
- [21] Z. z. Xing, “Mapping the sources of  $CP$  violation in neutrino oscillations from the seesaw mechanism,” *Phys. Lett. B* **856** (2024), 138909 [arXiv:2406.01142 [hep-ph]].
- [22] Z. z. Xing, “Flavor structures of charged fermions and massive neutrinos,” *Phys. Rept.* **854** (2020), 1-147 [arXiv:1909.09610 [hep-ph]].
- [23] S. Antusch and O. Fischer, “Non-unitarity of the leptonic mixing matrix: Present bounds and future sensitivities,” *JHEP* **10** (2014), 094 [arXiv:1407.6607 [hep-ph]].
- [24] M. Blennow, P. Coloma, E. Fernandez-Martinez, J. Hernandez-Garcia and J. Lopez-Pavon, “Non-Unitarity, sterile neutrinos, and Non-Standard neutrino Interactions,” *JHEP* **04** (2017), 153 [arXiv:1609.08637 [hep-ph]].
- [25] Y. Wang and S. Zhou, “Non-unitary leptonic flavor mixing and  $CP$  violation in neutrino-antineutrino oscillations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **824** (2022), 136797 [arXiv:2109.13622 [hep-ph]].
- [26] M. Blennow, E. Fernández-Martínez, J. Hernández-García, J. López-Pavón, X. Marcano and D. Naredo-Tuero, “Bounds on lepton non-unitarity and heavy neutrino mixing,” *JHEP* **08** (2023), 030 [arXiv:2306.01040 [hep-ph]].
- [27] N. Aghanim *et al.* [Planck], “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020), A6 [erratum: *Astron. Astrophys.* **652** (2021), C4] [arXiv:1807.06209 [astro-ph.CO]].
- [28] C. Fengler [KATRIN], “A Look at General Neutrino Interactions with KATRIN,” *PoS EPS-HEP2023* (2024), 188
- [29] M. Agostini, G. Benato, J. A. Detwiler, J. Menéndez and F. Vissani, “Toward the discovery of matter creation with neutrinoless  $\beta\beta$  decay,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **95** (2023) no.2, 025002 [arXiv:2202.01787 [hep-ex]].
- [30] Z. z. Xing and D. Zhang, “Radiative decays of charged leptons as constraints of unitarity polygons for active-sterile neutrino mixing and  $CP$  violation,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **80** (2020) no.12, 1134 [arXiv:2009.09717 [hep-ph]].
- [31] A. Kleppe, “Extending the standard model with two right-handed neutrinos,” in *Neutrino physics* (Proceedings of the 3rd Tallinn Symposium, Lohusalu, Estonia, October 8-11, 1995), page 118-125.

- [32] E. Ma, D. P. Roy and U. Sarkar, “A Seesaw model for atmospheric and solar neutrino oscillations,” *Phys. Lett. B* **444** (1998), 391-396 [arXiv:hep-ph/9810309 [hep-ph]].
- [33] P. H. Frampton, S. L. Glashow and T. Yanagida, “Cosmological sign of neutrino CP violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **548** (2002), 119-121 [arXiv:hep-ph/0208157 [hep-ph]].
- [34] Z. z. Xing and Z. h. Zhao, “The minimal seesaw and leptogenesis models,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **84** (2021) no.6, 066201 [arXiv:2008.12090 [hep-ph]].
- [35] Z. z. Xing, “CP violation in light neutrino oscillations and heavy neutrino decays: A general and explicit seesaw-bridged correlation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **844** (2023), 138065 [arXiv:2306.02362 [hep-ph]].
- [36] T. Ohlsson and S. Zhou, “Renormalization group running of neutrino parameters,” *Nature Commun.* **5** (2014), 5153 [arXiv:1311.3846 [hep-ph]].