

Framework for Naturally Light Singlet Neutrinos

Ernest Ma

*Department of Physics
University of California
Riverside, California 92521, USA*

Abstract

The totality of present neutrino data seems to require four light neutrinos, but only three of them can be the neutral components of left-handed lepton doublets. To accommodate one or more naturally light singlet neutrino(s), an extra $U(1)$ gauge factor is proposed to implement an analogous seesaw mechanism which accounts for the light doublet neutrinos. Using the constraints of anomaly cancellation, the property of this $U(1)$ is determined. The most attractive theoretical framework is that of a supersymmetric $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_N$ model already proposed.

There are at present a number of neutrino experiments with data[1, 2, 3] which can be interpreted as being due to neutrino oscillations.[4] Solar data[1] indicate the oscillation of neutrinos differing in the square of their masses of the order $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-5}\text{eV}^2$ for the matter-enhanced solution[5] or $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-10}\text{eV}^2$ for the vacuum solution. Atmospheric data[2] indicate possible oscillation of $\Delta m^2 \sim 10^{-2}\text{eV}^2$. More recently, the LSND (Liquid Scintillator Neutrino Detector) experiment has obtained results[3] which indicate possible oscillation of $\Delta m^2 \sim 1\text{eV}^2$. To accommodate all the above data as being due to neutrino oscillations, it is clear that four neutrinos are needed to have three unequal mass differences. Since the invisible width of the Z boson is already saturated with the three known doublet neutrinos ν_e, ν_μ , and ν_τ , *i.e.* from $Z \rightarrow \nu\bar{\nu}$, one must then have a fourth neutrino which does not couple to the Z boson, *i.e.* a singlet. The question is why such a singlet neutrino should be light.

Let us review our current understanding of why the three known doublet neutrinos are light. It is called the seesaw mechanism[6]. First, we assume that for each left-handed doublet neutrino ν , there is a right-handed singlet neutral fermion N which couples to the former through the usual Higgs scalar doublet $\Phi = (\phi^+, \phi^0)$ of the standard model. The mass matrix spanning ν and N is then given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_D \\ m_D & m_N \end{bmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where m_D comes from the vacuum expectation value of ϕ^0 and m_N is a Majorana mass allowed by the fact that N is a singlet under the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ gauge symmetry of the standard model. The origin of m_N is presumably from new physics at a much higher energy scale, so it should be large. The zero in the (11) entry of \mathcal{M} is protected by the standard gauge group and the fact that there is no scalar triplet. As a result, the neutrino

mass is given by the well-known formula

$$m_\nu \sim \frac{m_D^2}{m_N}. \quad (2)$$

For a given value of m_D , say of the order of the corresponding charged-lepton mass, m_ν can be very small for a very large m_N .

To have a very light singlet neutrino S , let us make sure that its mass is zero by itself, just as m_ν would be without N . To give this zero the analogous level of protection as the (11) entry of Eq. (1), assume an extra U(1) gauge factor, under which N is trivial, but not S . Hence m_N is still allowed, but not m_S . We now let S couple to N through a singlet scalar boson χ which develops a nonzero vacuum expectation value, thereby breaking this extra U(1). The mass matrix spanning ν , N , and S is then given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 \\ m_D & m_N & m_X \\ 0 & m_X & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

In the limit of large m_N , this reduces to

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} m_D^2/m_N & m_D m_X/m_N \\ m_D m_X/m_N & m_X^2/m_N \end{bmatrix} \quad (4)$$

for the two light neutrinos, with mass eigenvalues 0 and $(m_D^2 + m_X^2)/m_N$, corresponding to the states $\nu \cos \theta - S \sin \theta$ and $\nu \sin \theta + S \cos \theta$ respectively, where $\tan \theta = m_D/m_X$.

So far, we have not specified how the usual quarks and leptons transform under this new $U(1)'$. However, since they must acquire masses by coupling to scalar doublets, the following Yukawa interaction terms must exist:

$$(\nu_e, e)e^c(\phi_1^0, \phi_1^-), \quad (\nu_e, e)N(\phi_2^+, \phi_2^0), \quad (5)$$

$$(u, d)d^c(\phi_3^0, \phi_3^-), \quad (u, d)u^c(\phi_4^+, \phi_4^0), \quad (6)$$

where we have adopted the notation that all fermions are left-handed and the superscript c denotes the charge-conjugated state. We have assumed four different scalar doublets with

$U(1)'$ assignments $N_{1,2,3,4}$ respectively. We also assign N_S to S (and thus $-N_S$ to χ) as well as N_q to (u, d) . We now require this extended gauge model to be free of triangle anomalies[7].

We find

$$Tr(T_3^2 N) = 0 \Rightarrow N_2 = 3N_q, \quad (7)$$

$$Tr(Y^2 N) = 0 \Rightarrow 3N_1 + N_3 + 4N_4 = 0, \quad (8)$$

$$Tr(YN^2) = 0 \Rightarrow (N_3 + N_4)(6N_2 + 5N_3 - N_4) = 0, \quad (9)$$

$$Tr(N^3) = 0 \Rightarrow \sum N_S^3 = 35n_f \left(\frac{N_3 + N_4}{6} \right)^3, \quad (10)$$

where n_f is the number of families and we have allowed more than just one S .

The simplest solution to Eq. (10) is to assume that for each family, there are two S fermions with

$$N_{S_1} = \frac{1}{2}(N_3 + N_4), \quad N_{S_2} = \frac{1}{3}(N_3 + N_4). \quad (11)$$

Furthermore, we can choose $N_3 + N_4 = 6$ without loss of generality because that can be absorbed into a redefinition of the $U(1)'$ coupling. We now consider Eqs. (8) and (9) to obtain a family of solutions:

$$N_1 = -2 - N_4, \quad N_2 = N_4 - 5, \quad N_3 = 6 - N_4, \quad N_{S_1} = 3, \quad N_{S_2} = 2. \quad (12)$$

Note that there is no solution for less than four different doublets, *i.e.* $N_1 = N_3$ or $N_1 = -N_2$, *etc.* are impossible because they always lead to $N_3 + N_4 = 0$. Note also that if N is a solution to Eqs. (7) to (10), then $aN + bY$ is also a solution; hence a single-parameter family of solutions is the best we can do without further assumptions.

If we allow $N_3 + N_4 = 0$, then Eqs. (8) and (9) can be satisfied with $N_1 = -N_2 = N_3 = -N_4$, *i.e.* we need only one scalar doublet. On the other hand, Eq. (10) must now be satisfied by either pairs of singlets with opposite N_S , which would then form Dirac masses with each other, contrary to the aim of this investigation, or by having a large number of

singlets with just the right N_S assignments. An example of the latter is to have one singlet with $N_S = 3$, three others with $N_S = -2$, and yet three more with $N_S = -1$.

Another way to implement the idea of a light singlet is to use a variation of the seesaw mechanism. Let S couple to two fermion doublets (ν_E, E) and (E^c, N_E^c) with electric charge assignments $(0, -1)$ and $(1, 0)$ respectively, and assume also that these two doublets can combine to have a large Dirac mass. The mass matrix spanning ν_E, N_E^c , and S is then given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_E & m_1 \\ m_E & 0 & m_2 \\ m_1 & m_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

As a result,

$$m_S \sim \frac{2m_1m_2}{m_E}, \quad (14)$$

and the mechanism is again seesaw, but instead of the usual version[6] where the large mass is that of a singlet, here it is that of a doublet.

In order to have $\nu - S$ mixing, we must now connect the two sectors. If we restrict ourselves to only scalar doublets, then only the νS , $\nu_E N$, and $N_E^c N$ terms have to be considered. If the νS term exists, then it has to be fine-tuned to be much smaller than m_D^2/m_N and $2m_1m_2/m_E$ to be phenomenologically viable. Hence it is much better to forbid it by the assumed $U(1)'$. Consequently, the combined mass matrix spanning ν , N , ν_E , N_E^c , and S is given by

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ m_D & m_N & m_3 & m_4 & 0 \\ 0 & m_3 & 0 & m_E & m_1 \\ 0 & m_4 & m_E & 0 & m_2 \\ 0 & 0 & m_1 & m_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (15)$$

In the limit of large m_N and m_E , the effective mass matrix for the light neutrinos is then

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} m_D^2/m_N & (m_1m_3 + m_2m_4)m_D/m_Nm_E \\ (m_1m_3 + m_2m_4)m_D/m_Nm_E & 2m_1m_2/m_E \end{bmatrix} \quad (16)$$

as desired. Note that in this scenario, the $\nu - S$ mixing is naturally small. Again the consideration of anomaly cancellation leads to Eqs. (7) to (10), but now $m_{1,2,3,4}$ require up to four more scalar doublets with $N_{6,5,8,7}$ respectively. However, as it turns out, the minimum solution needs only one more. For example, let $N_4 = 8$, then $N_1 = -10$, $N_2 = 3$, $N_3 = -2$, $N_5 = -N_4$, $N_6 = -N_3$, and the only new assignment is $N_7 = -N_8 = -5$. Of course, we still need to add one singlet to break the $U(1)'$. Note also that the νS term is indeed forbidden.

The above discussion shows that in order to have naturally light singlet neutrinos under the protection of an extra $U(1)$, many new particles are required which are otherwise unmotivated. The question is now whether there is another framework where such particles are not necessary. The fact that the fermion doublets introduced above, i.e. (ν_E, E) and (E^c, N_E^c) , have the same standard-model gauge transformations as the scalar doublets (ϕ_1^0, ϕ_1^-) and (ϕ_2^+, ϕ_2^0) is a strong hint that we should consider supersymmetry and identify them as partners.

Assume first the following supersymmetric extension of the standard model: in addition to the quark and lepton superfields, each family has two Higgs superfields as well as one N and one S . The anomaly-free conditions now have no solution. However, if we add two color-triplet superfields transforming under $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)'$ as follows:

$$h \sim (3, 1, -1/3; N_h), \quad h^c \sim (3^*, 1, 1/3; N_{h^c}), \quad (17)$$

then we obtain

$$N_1 + 3N_q = 0, \quad N_h + N_{h^c} = N_1 + N_2, \quad (18)$$

$$3(N_h - N_{h^c}) = N_1 - 3N_2, \quad N_S = -N_1 - N_2. \quad (19)$$

A solution is now possible, *i.e.*

$$N_q = -\frac{1}{3}N_1, \quad N_S = -N_1 - N_2, \quad N_h = \frac{2}{3}N_1, \quad N_{h^c} = \frac{1}{3}N_1 + N_2. \quad (20)$$

Furthermore, the above $U(1)'$ assignments fix all the possible Yukawa interactions among the superfields. For example, $(\nu_E, E)(E^c, N_E^c)S$ is allowed but not $(\nu_E, E)(E^c, N_E^c)$, and $(\nu_e, e)(E^c, N_E^c)$ is allowed but not any other term which links the singlet and doublet neutrino sectors. As a result, the analog of Eq. (15) is now

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & m_D & 0 & m_3 & 0 \\ m_D & m_N & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & m_E & m_1 \\ m_3 & 0 & m_E & 0 & m_2 \\ 0 & 0 & m_1 & m_2 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

which reduces to

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{bmatrix} m_D^2/m_N & m_1 m_3/m_E \\ m_1 m_3/m_E & 2m_1 m_2/m_E \end{bmatrix} \quad (22)$$

as desired.

Let us now consider

$$N' = \frac{-5N + 2(3N_2 - 2N_1)Y}{N_1 + N_2}, \quad (23)$$

which is a solution to Eqs. (18) and (19) because N is. We then have the following $U(1)'$ assignments:

$$(u, d), u^c, e^c \sim 1; \quad d^c, (\nu_e, e) \sim 2; \quad N \sim 0; \quad (24)$$

$$(\nu_E, E), h^c \sim -3; \quad (E^c, N_E^c), h \sim -2; \quad S \sim 5. \quad (25)$$

Hence $U(1)'$ can be embedded into E_6 and

$$N' = 6Y_L + T_{3R} - 9Y_R \quad (26)$$

under the $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_{Y_L} \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{Y_R}$ decomposition with the electric charge $Q = T_{3L} + Y_L + T_{3R} + Y_R$. The superfields of Eqs. (24) and (25) make up exactly the fundamental **27** representation of E_6 , and the $U(1)'$ of Eq. (26) is exactly what is called $U(1)_N$ in two previous papers[8].

In conclusion, if a light singlet neutrino is needed to explain data in terms of neutrino oscillations, the natural framework is an extra $U(1)$ gauge symmetry. If no other new fermions are added, then the requirement of anomaly cancellation requires two singlet neutrinos per family and four scalar doublets, as well as a scalar singlet which breaks $U(1)'$ spontaneously. On the other hand, if supersymmetry is included, then a model based on E_6 is the natural choice. Details of the latter have already been presented[8].

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837.

References

- [1] R. Davis, Jr. *et al.*, *Annu. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **39**, 467 (1989); K. S. Hirata *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **44**, 2241 (1991); A. I. Abazov *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 3332 (1991); P. Anselmann *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **327**, 377 (1994).
- [2] R. Becker-Szendy *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. D* **46**, 3720 (1992); K. S. Hirata *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. B* **280**, 146 (1992); Y. Fukuda *et al.*, *ibid.* **335**, 237 (1994).
- [3] C. Athanassopoulos *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 2650 (1995); Los Alamos Laboratory Report No. LA-UR-96-1582 (May, 1996).
- [4] For a brief review, see for example R. G. H. Robertson, in *Proc. of the 14th International Workshop on Weak Interactions and Neutrinos*, ed. by J. E. Kim and S. K. Kim (World Scientific, Singapore, 1994), p. 184.
- [5] S. P. Mikheyev and A. Yu. Smirnov, *Yad. Fiz.* **42**, 1441 (1985) [*Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **42**, 913 (1985)]; L. Wolfenstein, *Phys. Rev. D* **17**, 2369 (1978).
- [6] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity*, *Proc. of the Workshop, Stony Brook, New York, 1979*, ed. by P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Z. Freedman (North-Holland, Amsterdam, 1979), p. 315; T. Yanagida, in *Proc. of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979*, ed. by O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK Report No. 79-18, Tsukuba, Japan, 1979).
- [7] S. L. Adler, *Phys. Rev.* **177**, 2426 (1969); J. S. Bell and R. Jackiw, *Nuovo Cimento* **60A**, 47 (1969).
- [8] E. Ma, hep-ph/9507348, *Phys. Lett. B* (in press); E. Keith and E. Ma, hep-ph/9603353, *Phys. Rev. D* (in press).