

UCRHEP-T485

February 2010

LEFT-HANDED NEUTRINOS AND RIGHT-HANDED SCOTINOS
(Secret Identity of the Right-handed Neutrino Exposed:
It is Actually a Scotino [Dark-Matter Fermion])

Ernest Ma

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

Abstract

The Standard Model of particle interactions is extended to include fermion doublets $(n, e)_R$ transforming under the gauge group $SU(2)_R$ such that n is a scotino (dark-matter fermion), with odd R parity. This dark left-right model (DLRM) treats neutrinos and scotinos in parallel, and has interesting phenomenology at the Large Hadron Collider (LHC).

*Talk at BUE-CTP International Conference on Neutrino Physics in the LHC Era, Luxor, Egypt, November 2009.

1 Introduction

In this talk, I will discuss the concept of having a “right-handed” singlet neutrino. I will consider its role in the Standard Model of particle interactions, and in its left-right gauge extension. I will show how its true identity may be misread in the usual treatment of left-right models, and expose it as a “scotino”, i.e. a dark-matter fermion. Interesting phenomenological and theoretical consequences of this hypothesis are presented.

2 SM ν_R is not compulsory

The Standard Model (SM) does not need a singlet fermion ν_R because it transforms as $(1, 1, 0)$, i.e. trivially under the gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$. If ν_R is added anyway, then the Yukawa interaction $\bar{\nu}_R(\nu_L\phi^0 - l_L\phi^+)$ induces a Dirac mass term $m_D\bar{\nu}_R\nu_L$, as ϕ^0 acquires a nonzero vacuum expectation value. Thus ν_R is usually referred to as the “right-handed neutrino”. However, since ν_R is a gauge singlet, it can have an arbitrary Majorana mass m_R . The resulting 2×2 mass matrix is of the famous seesaw form

$$\mathcal{M}_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D \\ m_D & m_R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

which has the eigenvalues $m_R/2 \pm \sqrt{(m_R^2/4) + m_D^2}$. Assuming $m_R \gg m_D$ then implies ν_L is almost a mass eigenstate with mass eigenvalue $-m_D^2/m_R$. This idea (1979) has tyrannized the thinking of neutrino mass for some 20 years. On the other hand, it was certainly known already in the beginning that ν_R was not compulsory for neutrino mass in the SM, but it was not until about 10 years ago (1999) that other equally “natural” mechanisms were also widely discussed.

In particular, a Higgs triplet (ξ^{++}, ξ^+, ξ^0) with a very small vacuum expectation value $\langle \xi^0 \rangle$ works just as well for ν_L to acquire a Majorana mass without any ν_R . However, it

was incorrectly thought by the community at large for many years that this is somehow “unnatural”. To understand why this is also a seesaw mechanism (Type II) and just as natural as that (Type I) using ν_R with a large m_R , see for example the 1998 paper of Ma and Sarkar,[1] where it is shown simply and explicitly that

$$V = m_\xi^2 \xi^\dagger \xi + \mu \xi^\dagger \Phi \Phi + \dots \Rightarrow \langle \xi^0 \rangle \simeq \frac{-\mu \langle \phi^0 \rangle^2}{m_\xi^2}, \quad (2)$$

if m_ξ^2 is positive and large.

3 Left-right ν_R is compulsory

If the SM is extended to accommodate $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1)_X$, then the conventional assignment of

$$(\nu, l)_L \sim (1, 2, 1, -1/2), \quad (\nu, l)_R \sim (1, 1, 2, -1/2), \quad (3)$$

$$(u, d)_L \sim (3, 2, 1, 1/6), \quad (u, d)_R \sim (3, 1, 2, 1/6), \quad (4)$$

implies the well-known result that $X = (B - L)/2$ and $Y = T_{3R} + (B - L)/2$. There must then be Higgs bidoublets

$$\phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^0 & \phi_2^+ \\ \phi_1^- & \phi_2^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\Phi} = \begin{pmatrix} \bar{\phi}_2^0 & -\phi_1^+ \\ -\phi_2^- & \bar{\phi}_1^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (5)$$

both transforming as $(1, 2, 2, 0)$, yielding lepton Dirac mass terms

$$m_l = f_l \langle \phi_2^0 \rangle + f'_l \langle \bar{\phi}_1^0 \rangle, \quad m_\nu = f_l \langle \phi_1^0 \rangle + f'_l \langle \bar{\phi}_2^0 \rangle, \quad (6)$$

and similarly in the quark sector. This results in the appearance of phenomenologically undesirable tree-level flavor-changing neutral currents from Higgs exchange, as well as inevitable $W_L - W_R$ mixing. If supersymmetry is imposed, then $\tilde{\Phi}$ can be eliminated, but then $(\mathcal{M}_\nu)_{ij} \propto (\mathcal{M}_l)_{ij}$ as well as $(\mathcal{M}_u)_{ij} \propto (\mathcal{M}_d)_{ij}$, contrary to what is observed. Hence the

prevalent thinking is that $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ is actually broken down to $U(1)_Y$ at a very high scale from an $SU(2)_R$ Higgs triplet $(\Delta_R^{++}, \Delta_R^+, \Delta_R^0) \sim (1, 1, 3, 1)$ which provides ν_R at the same time with a large Majorana mass from $\langle \Delta_R^0 \rangle$.

The Type I seesaw mechanism is thus implemented and everyone should be happy. But wait, no remnant of the $SU(2)_R$ gauge symmetry is detectable at the TeV scale and we will not know if ν_R really exists. Is there a natural way to lower the $SU(2)_R \times U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking scale?

The answer was already provided 22 years ago[2] in the context of the superstring-inspired supersymmetric E_6 model. The fundamental $\underline{27}$ fermion representation here is decomposed under $[(SO(10), SU(5))]$ as

$$\underline{27} = (16, 10) + (16, 5^*) + (16, 1) + (10, 5) + (10, 5^*) + (1, 1). \quad (7)$$

Under its maximum subgroup $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$, the $\underline{27}$ is organized instead as $(3, 3^*, 1) + (1, 3, 3^*) + (3^*, 1, 3)$, i.e.

$$\begin{pmatrix} d & u & h \\ d & u & h \\ d & u & h \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} N & E^c & \nu \\ E & N^c & e \\ \nu^c & e^c & n^c \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} d^c & d^c & d^c \\ u^c & u^c & u^c \\ h^c & h^c & h^c \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

It was realized[2] in 1987 that there are actually two left-right options: (A) Let E_6 break down to the fermion content of the conventional $SO(10)$, given by $(16, 10) + (16, 5^*) + (16, 1)$, which is the usual left-right model which everybody knows. (B) Let E_6 break down to the fermion content given by $(16, 10) + (10, 5^*) + (1, 1)$ instead, thereby switching the first and third rows of $(3^*, 1, 3)$ and the first and third columns of $(1, 3, 3^*)$. Thus $(\nu, e)_R$ becomes $(n, e)_R$ and n_R is not the mass partner of ν_L . This is referred to by the Particle Data Group as the Alternative Left-Right Model (ALRM). Here the usual left-handed lepton doublet is part of a bidoublet:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu & E^c \\ e & N^c \end{pmatrix}_L \sim (1, 2, 2, 0). \quad (9)$$

In this supersymmetric model, ν_L is still the Dirac mass partner of ν_R and gets a seesaw mass, whereas[3] n_R (which couples to e_R through W_R) mixes with the usual neutralinos, the lightest of which is a dark-matter candidate.

4 Dark left-right model

Earlier in 2009, a simpler nonsupersymmetric variant of the ALRM was proposed[4] which has the same basic fermion structure as a model discussed already 31 years ago[5]. We call it the Dark Left-Right Model (DLRM). We impose a global $U(1)$ symmetry S , so that under $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times SU(2)_R \times U(1) \times S$, the “leptons” transform as

$$\psi_L = (\nu, e)_L \sim (1, 2, 1, -1/2; 1), \quad \psi_R = (n, e)_R \sim (1, 1, 2, -1/2; 1/2), \quad (10)$$

and the Higgs bidoublet as

$$\Phi = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_1^0 & \phi_2^+ \\ \phi_1^- & \phi_2^0 \end{pmatrix} \sim (1, 2, 2, 0; 1/2). \quad (11)$$

Hence $\tilde{\Phi}$ has $S = -1/2$ and the Yukawa term $\bar{\psi}_L \tilde{\Phi} \psi_R$ is forbidden, whereas $\bar{\psi}_L \Phi \psi_R$ is allowed. The breaking of $SU(2)_R \times U(1) \rightarrow U(1)_Y$ leaves $L = S - T_{3R}$ unbroken, so that $\langle \phi_2^0 \rangle \neq 0$, but $\langle \phi_1^0 \rangle = 0$. The former allows a Dirac mass term $m_e \bar{e}_L e_R$, whereas the latter means that ν_L and n_R are not Dirac mass partners and can be completely different particles with independent masses of their own. Since n_R has $L = 1/2 - 1/2 = 0$, it also has odd R parity, i.e. $R = (-)^{3B+L+2j} = -1$, even though the model is nonsupersymmetric. It may thus be a dark-matter fermion, i.e. a scotino.

Let n_R and ν_L become massive in parallel, the former *via* $(\Delta_R^{++}, \Delta_R^+, \Delta_R^0) \sim (1, 1, 3, 1; -1)$, and the latter *via* $(\Delta_L^{++}, \Delta_L^+, \Delta_L^0) \sim (1, 3, 1, 1; -2)$. Since Δ_L^0 has $L = -2$, the soft term $\tilde{\Phi}_L^\dagger \Delta_L \Phi_L$ is needed to break L to $(-)^L$. The Higgs doublet $\Phi_L \sim (1, 2, 1, 1/2; 0)$ is needed as well as $\Phi_R \sim (1, 1, 2, 1/2; -1/2)$ because the quark sector is now given by

$$Q_L = (u, d)_L \sim (3, 2, 1, 1/6; 0), \quad d_R \sim (3, 1, 1, -1/3; 0), \quad (12)$$

$$Q_R = (u, h)_R \sim (3, 1, 2, 1/6; 1/2), \quad h_L \sim (3, 1, 1, -1/3; 1). \quad (13)$$

The allowed Yukawa terms are then $\bar{Q}_L \tilde{\Phi} Q_R$, $\bar{Q}_L \Phi_L d_R$, and $\bar{Q}_R \Phi_R h_L$. Hence m_u comes from $v_2 = \langle \phi_2^0 \rangle$, m_d from $v_3 = \langle \phi_L^0 \rangle$, and m_h from $v_4 = \langle \phi_R^0 \rangle$. Tree-level flavor-changing neutral currents are thus guaranteed to be absent. Since the scotino n has $L = 0$ and e has $L = 1$, this implies that W_R^+ has $L = -1$ and h has $L = 1$. Thus W_R does not mix with W_L , and h does not mix with d .

The new neutral gauge boson Z' of this model couples to the current $J_{Z'} = xJ_{3L} + (1 - x)J_{3R} - xJ_{em}$ where $x \equiv \sin^2 \theta_W$, with coupling $e/\sqrt{x(1-x)(1-2x)}$. Neglecting $M_{W_L}^2$, we then have

$$\frac{(1-2x)}{2(1-x)} M_{Z'}^2 < M_{W_R}^2 < \frac{(1-2x)}{(1-x)} M_{Z'}^2. \quad (14)$$

The lower (upper) bound applies to $\langle \phi_R^0 \rangle \ll (>) \langle \Delta_R^0 \rangle$. Present Tevatron data imply that $M_{Z'} > 850$ GeV ($M_{W_R} > 500$ GeV). At the LHC (with $E_{cm} = 14$ TeV), the discovery reach[4] of this Z' by the observation of 10 dilepton events of one type is $M_{Z'} = 1.5$ (2.4) TeV for an integrated luminosity of 1 (10) fb^{-1} . Once Z' is observed, this model predicts W_R as shown, in contrast to all purely $U(1)'$ gauge models.

5 Scotino = n_R (ν_R)

The particles $n, h, W_R^\pm, \phi_R^\pm, \Delta_R^\pm, \phi_1^\pm, \text{Re}(\phi_1^0), \text{Im}(\phi_1^0)$ are odd under R parity. The lightest n can be stable and be a good candidate for the dark matter of the Universe. Assuming that $\Delta_R^\pm$ is much lighter than $W_R^\pm$ and Z' , the dominant annihilation of n is then $nn \rightarrow e^+e^-$ via $\Delta_R^\pm$ exchange. The measured Ωh^2 values for dark matter by WMAP are obtained[4] for a wide range of n and $\Delta_R^\pm$ masses in the neighborhood of 200 GeV. Since n always interacts with a lepton in this model, recent observations by the PAMELA and ATIC collaborations may also be relevant.[6]

6 Scotogenic neutrino masses

The mass of ν_L may also be derived from n_R as a radiative effect, i.e. scotogenic. To accomplish this, Δ_L is removed in favor of a scalar singlet $\chi \sim (1, 1, 1, 0; -1)$, then the trilinear scalar term $\text{Tr}(\Phi\tilde{\Phi}^\dagger)\chi$ is allowed. Using the soft term χ^2 to break L to $(-)^L$, a scotogenic neutrino mass is obtained in one loop, as pointed out first[7] in 2006.

7 Conclusion

The presence of ν_R is unavoidable in a left-right gauge extension of the Standard Model. However, it does not have to be the Dirac mass partner of ν_L . In that case, it should be renamed n_R and could function as a scotino, i.e. a dark-matter fermion. The $SU(2)_R$ gauge bosons of this dark left-right model (DLRM), i.e. $W_R^\pm$ and Z' , are observable at the LHC. The recent PAMELA and ATIC observations may also be relevant. Scotogenic neutrino masses are also possible.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported in part by the U. S. Department of Energy under Grant No. DE-FG03-94ER40837. I thank S. Khalil and the other organizers of the BUE-CTP International Conference on Neutrino Physics in the LHC Era (November 2009) for their great hospitality and a stimulating meeting in Luxor.

References

- [1] E. Ma and U. Sarkar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 5716 (1998).
- [2] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D36**, 274 (1987).
- [3] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D62**, 093022 (2000).
- [4] S. Khalil, H.-S. Lee, and E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D79**, 041701(R) (2009).
- [5] P. Ramond and D. B. Reiss, Phys. Lett. **80B**, 87 (1978).
- [6] Q.-H. Cao, E. Ma, and G. Shaughnessy, Phys. Lett. **B673**, 152 (2009).
- [7] E. Ma, Phys. Rev. **D73**, 077301 (2006).