

New Physics in Neutrino Oscillation: Nonunitarity or Nonorthogonality?

Chee Sheng Fong^{1,*}

¹*Centro de Ciências Naturais e Humanas*

Universidade Federal do ABC, 09.210-170, Santo André, SP, Brazil

Abstract

Neutrino oscillation phenomenon is a definite evidence of physics beyond the Standard Model (SM) and high precision measurement of neutrino properties will certainly give us clue about what lies beyond the SM. In particular, precise measurements of the mixing matrix elements $U_{\alpha i}$ which relate the neutrino flavor α and mass i eigenstates are crucial since new physics at scale beyond experimental reach can lead to a *nonunitary* U . This in turns results in *nonorthogonal* neutrino flavor states. How to calculate the oscillation probability in this scenario is an important theoretical issue that will be treated here. We show that probability constructed using theory of projection probability will ensure that the theory remains *unitary* in time evolution and the probabilities of neutrino of certain flavor being detected as all possible flavor states always sum up to unity. This result is crucial for discovery of new physics through neutrino oscillation phenomena.

* sheng.fong@ufabc.edu.br

I. INTRODUCTION

Neutrino mass is a definite evidence of physics beyond the Standard Model (SM). It cannot be overemphasized the importance of scrutinizing the neutrino sector to as high precision as our current and future technology would allow [1, 2], as this will most certainly lead us towards new physics that not only give rise to neutrino mass but address more fundamental questions like why only the left-handed fields feel the weak force, why is the weak scale so much smaller than the Planck scale, why is electric charge quantized and so on. From the Effective Field Theory (EFT) point of view, even if the new physics scale is beyond our experimental reach, with high enough precision, we will learn important clues about the new physics.

Treating the SM as an EFT, neutrino mass arises, after the electroweak symmetry breaking, from the unique dimension-5 Weinberg operator [3, 4]

$$\mathcal{O}_5 = \frac{\lambda_{\alpha\beta}}{\Lambda_5} (\overline{L}_\alpha^c \epsilon H) (L_\beta^T \epsilon H), \quad (1)$$

where $L_\alpha (\alpha = e, \mu, \tau)$ and H are the $SU(2)_L$ lepton and Higgs doublets, respectively, and ϵ is an $SU(2)_L$ antisymmetric tensor used to contract the two doublets to form a singlet. Here λ is a dimensionless symmetric matrix, and Λ_5 is the new physics scale below which the operator \mathcal{O}_5 is valid. The existence of this operator is in good agreement with experimental observations in neutrino oscillation phenomena [5] while the other key prediction is in neutrinoless double-beta decay which might be discovered in current or future experiments [6, 7]. Next, considering the following dimension-6 operator [8–11]

$$\mathcal{O}_6 = \frac{\eta_{\alpha\beta}}{\Lambda_6^2} (\overline{L}_\alpha \epsilon H^*) i \not{\partial} (L_\beta^T \epsilon H), \quad (2)$$

where η is a dimensionless Hermitian matrix and Λ_6 is the new physics scale (which might or might not be related to Λ_5) below which the operator is valid. The kinetic term of the SM neutrinos will be modified after the electroweak symmetry breaking. Once neutrino fields are redefined such that kinetic terms are again canonical, the matrix U which relates the neutrino mass and flavor eigenstates is no longer unitary. Implicitly, we are assuming that the center of mass energy in an experiment $E \ll \Lambda_5, \Lambda_6$ such that there is no new degrees of freedom beyond those of the SM. As a remark, not all ultraviolet models which generate \mathcal{O}_5 also generate \mathcal{O}_6 . For instance, type-I and type-III seesaw models generate both \mathcal{O}_5 and \mathcal{O}_6

while type-II seesaw model only generates \mathcal{O}_5 (see for example a review article [12]). Here we clearly see the importance of measuring U to a very high precision as it gives us a clue what UV models can give rise to modifications in neutrino sector and the scale in which they reside. Clearly, this cannot be achieved without a precise theoretical formalism of how to deal with possible nonunitary U .

Our main result is to show that the net effect of a nonunitary U is that the neutrino flavor states become *nonorthogonal* while the theory remain unitary, as opposed to what have been studied so far in both phenomenological and experimental work involving neutrino oscillation phenomena with nonunitary U [8, 13–32]. With hindsight, this surprising conclusion is perhaps to be expected from the outset since without new degrees of freedom accessible in experiments, i.e. the flavor states are complete, the theory should remain unitary.¹

It is interesting to note that nonorthogonal basis states are commonplace in quantum chemistry [37–43] since it is convenient to express molecular orbitals as linear combinations of atomic orbitals which are in general not orthogonal. In this study, nonorthogonal neutrino flavor states are imposed on us due to new physics which results in nonunitary U . While the theory is *unitary*, we will continue to use the term *high scale unitarity violation* (in reference to the mixing matrix U) to describe this scenario.

II. NEUTRINO EFFECTIVE FIELD THEORY

Here we will assume the center-of-mass energy E involved is below the electroweak symmetry breaking $E < v_{\text{EW}} \equiv 174 \text{ GeV}$ and also $E < \Lambda_5, \Lambda_6$. Due to the operators (1) and (2), the general neutrino Lagrangian allowed by the SM electromagnetic gauge symmetry $U(1)_{\text{EM}}$ in the charged lepton mass basis is given by²

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu = & \frac{1}{2} \left(i\bar{\nu}_\alpha \not{\partial} D_{\alpha\beta} \nu_\beta - \bar{\nu}_\alpha^c m_{\alpha\beta} \nu_\beta + \text{h.c.} \right) \\ & - \left(\frac{g}{2} W_\mu^- \bar{\ell}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\alpha + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2} \cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \bar{\nu}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L \nu_\alpha + \text{h.c.} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where the flavor indices are $\alpha, \beta = e, \mu, \tau$, $D = I + \eta v_{\text{EW}}^2 / \Lambda_6^2$ with I the 3×3 identity matrix, $m = \lambda v_{\text{EW}}^2 / \Lambda_5$, g is the $SU(2)_L$ gauge coupling, θ_W is the weak angle, $P_L = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (1 - \gamma^5)$ is

¹ This is in contrast to the case where kinematically accessible light sterile neutrinos which mix with the SM neutrinos are produced in the experiments and lead to apparent unitarity violation due to additional states that are not detected [33–36].

² The lepton flavors are defined by the corresponding charged lepton masses.

the left-handed projector, $\{\ell_e, \ell_\mu, \ell_\tau\} \equiv \{e^-, \mu^-, \tau^-\}$ are the charged leptons and W^\mp and Z are the charged and neutral weak bosons, respectively.

A canonical normalized kinetic term can be obtained by diagonalizing the kinetic term as $D = Y^\dagger \hat{D} Y$ where Y is unitary and \hat{D} is real positive and diagonal and then redefining the neutrino fields as $\tilde{\nu} = \sqrt{\hat{D}} Y \nu$. Next the symmetric mass matrix $\tilde{m} \equiv \sqrt{\hat{D}}^{-1} Y^* m Y^\dagger \sqrt{\hat{D}}^{-1}$ can be diagonalized by a unitary matrix V as $\tilde{m} = V^* \hat{m} V^\dagger$ where \hat{m} is real and diagonal. Denoting the neutrino fields in the mass basis as $\hat{\nu} \equiv V^\dagger \tilde{\nu}$, we have [8]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_\nu = & \frac{1}{2} (i \bar{\hat{\nu}}_i \not{\partial} \hat{\nu}_i - \bar{\hat{\nu}}_i^c \hat{m}_{ii} \hat{\nu}_i + \text{h.c.}) \\ & - \left[\frac{g}{2} W_\mu \bar{\ell}_\alpha \gamma^\mu P_L U_{\alpha i} \hat{\nu}_i + \frac{g}{\sqrt{2} \cos \theta_W} Z_\mu \bar{\hat{\nu}}_i (U^\dagger U)_{ij} \gamma^\mu P_L \hat{\nu}_j + \text{h.c.} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where we denote $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ to be the indices in mass basis and we have defined

$$U_{\alpha i} \equiv \left(Y^\dagger \sqrt{\hat{D}}^{-1} V \right)_{\alpha i}, \quad (5)$$

which is not unitary in general

$$U U^\dagger = Y^\dagger \hat{D}^{-1} Y, \quad U^\dagger U = V^\dagger \hat{D}^{-1} V. \quad (6)$$

unless $\hat{D} = I$.

III. NEUTRINO OSCILLATION WITH NONORTHOGONAL FLAVOR BASIS

From (4), the neutrino flavor states $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ are related to the mass eigenstates $|\nu_i\rangle$ as follows

$$|\nu_\alpha\rangle = \sum_i \bar{U}_{\alpha i}^* |\nu_i\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where we have defined $\bar{U}_{\alpha i} \equiv U_{\alpha i} / \sqrt{(U U^\dagger)_{\alpha\alpha}}$. From the orthogonality of mass eigenstates $\langle \nu_j | \nu_i \rangle = \delta_{ji}$, the flavor states (7) are properly normalized $\langle \nu_\alpha | \nu_\alpha \rangle = 1$ though they are in general *nonorthogonal*

$$\langle \nu_\beta | \nu_\alpha \rangle = (\bar{U} \bar{U}^\dagger)_{\beta\alpha} \equiv \mathcal{N}_{\beta\alpha}, \quad (8)$$

where \mathcal{N} is a 3×3 matrix with diagonal elements all equal to one. While the orthogonality of mass basis $\{|\nu_i\rangle\}$ implies the usual completeness relation

$$\sum_i |\nu_i\rangle \langle \nu_i| = \mathbf{I}, \quad (9)$$

with \mathbf{I} the identity operator, the nonorthogonality flavor basis (8) implies a modified completeness relation [36]³

$$\sum_{\alpha,\beta} |\nu_\alpha\rangle (\mathcal{N}^{-1})_{\alpha\beta} \langle \nu_\beta| = \mathbf{I}. \quad (10)$$

In quantum mechanics, probability is not an observable and there is no associated Hermitian operator. For orthonormal basis, the probability can be determined by inserting the projection operator $|\nu_\beta\rangle \langle \nu_\beta|$ in between $\langle \nu_\alpha|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ to obtain the probability of finding $|\nu_\beta\rangle$ in the original $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$: $P_{\beta\alpha} = |\langle \nu_\beta|\nu_\alpha\rangle|^2$ which is the Born rule. If the complete set $\{|\nu_\alpha\rangle\}$ are not orthogonal, from eq. (10), the projection operator is given by

$$P_\alpha \equiv \sum_{\beta} |\nu_\alpha\rangle (\mathcal{N}^{-1})_{\alpha\beta} \langle \nu_\beta|, \quad (11)$$

which satisfies $P_\alpha^2 = P_\alpha$ and $\sum_{\alpha} P_\alpha = \mathbf{I}$. Inserting P_α in between $\langle \nu_\alpha|\nu_\alpha\rangle$, we obtain

$$\langle \nu_\alpha|P_\beta|\nu_\alpha\rangle = |\langle \nu_\beta|\nu_\alpha\rangle|^2 + \sum_{\gamma \neq \beta} \langle \nu_\alpha|\nu_\beta\rangle (\mathcal{N}^{-1})_{\beta\gamma} \langle \nu_\gamma|\nu_\alpha\rangle, \quad (12)$$

where the second term is in general complex and cannot be interpreted as a probability. Besides being real and positive, the probabilities of finding $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ in all possible $|\nu_\beta\rangle$ should sum up to *unity* as required since the set $\{|\nu_\alpha\rangle\}$ is *complete*. We will discuss this construction in Section III B.

A. Evolution of neutrino flavor state

Let us give brief review of evolution of a flavor state. Starting from an initial state $|\nu_\alpha(0)\rangle = |\nu_\alpha\rangle$, the time-evolved state $|\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle$ is described by the Schrödinger equation

$$i \frac{d}{dt} |\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle = \mathcal{H} |\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle, \quad (13)$$

where the Hamiltonian is $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_I$ with \mathcal{H}_0 the free Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_0 |\nu_i\rangle = E_i |\nu_i\rangle$ and $E_i = \sqrt{\vec{p}_i^2 + m_i^2}$, and \mathcal{H}_I the interaction Hamiltonian with matrix elements $\langle \nu_\beta|\mathcal{H}_I|\nu_\alpha\rangle = V_{\beta\alpha}$ where $V_{\beta\alpha}^* = V_{\alpha\beta}$ since $\mathcal{H}_I^\dagger = \mathcal{H}_I$.

³ One can take $g^{\alpha\beta} \equiv (\mathcal{N}^{-1})_{\alpha\beta}$ as the metric which raises the indices of $|\alpha\rangle \equiv |\nu_\alpha\rangle$ as $|\alpha\rangle = g^{\alpha\beta} |\beta\rangle$ to form the dual vector. We will avoid using this notation in this work.

Multiplying $|\nu_\beta\rangle$ from the left of eq. (13) and inserting the completeness relations (9) and (10), we arrive at

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\langle\nu_\beta|\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle = \sum_\eta \left\{ \sum_i \bar{U}_{\beta i} E_i (\bar{U}^{-1})_{i\eta} + \sum_\gamma V_{\beta\gamma} (\mathcal{N}^{-1})_{\gamma\eta} \right\} \langle\nu_\eta|\nu_\alpha(t)\rangle. \quad (14)$$

Assuming relativistic neutrinos $E \gg m_i$, we expand $E_i \simeq E + \frac{m_i^2}{2E}$ and trade time for distance $t = x$ and obtain, in matrix notation

$$i\frac{dS(x)}{dx} = \left[\bar{U}\Delta\bar{U}^{-1} + V(\mathcal{N}^{-1}) \right] S(x), \quad (15)$$

where we have defined $S_{\beta\alpha}(x) \equiv \langle\nu_\beta|\nu_\alpha(x)\rangle$ and

$$\Delta \equiv \frac{1}{2E} \text{diag}(m_1^2, m_2^2, \dots, m_{3+N}^2) = \text{diag}(\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_{3+N}). \quad (16)$$

We have dropped the constant E which, as an overall phase in $S(x)$, is not observable.

From eq. (15), the Hamiltonian in the flavor basis given by

$$H \equiv \bar{U}\Delta\bar{U}^{-1} + V(\mathcal{N}^{-1}), \quad (17)$$

is not Hermitian $H^\dagger \neq H$. Through a similarity transformation, we obtain the Hamiltonian in the *vacuum mass basis*

$$\tilde{H} \equiv \bar{U}^{-1}H\bar{U} = \Delta + \bar{U}^{-1}V\bar{U}^{\dagger,-1}. \quad (18)$$

Since $\tilde{H} = \tilde{H}^\dagger$ is Hermitian, it can be diagonalized by a unitary matrix X and has real eigenvalues. So H has the same eigenvalues as \tilde{H} and the time evolution of the system is *unitary*. The apparent non-Hermiticity of H is just due to nonunitary transformation matrix U . Up to the eigenvalues, we can solve for S analytically for an arbitrary matter potential as shown in refs. [35, 36].

B. Oscillation probability

In refs. [39, 40], the theory of projected probabilities on nonorthogonal states are developed and applied to determine the atomic populations in molecules. We will follow their procedure to derive the neutrino oscillation probability. Given an arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$, the basic idea is to project it to a chosen $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ and to the corresponding orthogonal component

$|\nu_\alpha\rangle_\perp$. The orthogonal component is further projected to the (hyper)plane formed by the rest of the basis states and to the orthogonal component to this plane. Then the new orthogonal component is further projected to $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ and $|\nu_\alpha\rangle_\perp$ and so on. It turns out that for two and three states system, the probability operators have closed forms and we will refer the reader to the companion paper for details [36]. After solving the amplitude $S(x)$ as in Section III A, the probability of an initial state $|\nu_\alpha\rangle$ being detected as $|\nu_\beta\rangle$ at distance x can be written as

$$P_{\beta\alpha}(x) = \sum_{\xi,\lambda} S_{\alpha\xi}(x)(\hat{P}_\beta)_{\xi\lambda}S_{\lambda\alpha}(x), \quad (19)$$

where $\sum_\beta(\hat{P}_\beta)_{\xi\lambda} = (\mathcal{N}^{-1})_{\xi\lambda}$ which together with eq. (10) guarantees that $\sum_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}(x) = 1$ as required by unitarity. The appearance of $(\hat{P}_\beta)_{\xi\lambda}$ (which only depends on U) takes into account possible nonorthogonality of flavor states where for vanishing off-diagonal elements of \mathcal{N} , we have

$$(\hat{P}_\beta)_{\xi\lambda} = \delta_{\xi\beta}\delta_{\beta\lambda}, \quad (20)$$

and we recover the standard result. Utilizing eq. (20) for nonorthogonal flavor states will lead to inconsistent result $\sum_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}(x) \neq 1$. To prove this, it is sufficient to show the case for $x = 0$ in which we obtain

$$P_{\beta\alpha}(0) = |\mathcal{N}_{\beta\alpha}|^2, \quad (21)$$

which gives $\sum_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}(0) > 1$ since $\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\alpha} = 1$.

Next we define \mathcal{N}_α as a 2×2 submatrix formed from the matrix \mathcal{N} excluding the row and column involving ν_α state. Following the construction of refs. [39, 40], we obtain our main result (see the companion paper [36] for details)

$$(\hat{P}_\alpha)_{\xi\lambda} = \frac{1}{3} \left[(E_\alpha)_{\xi\lambda} + \sum_{\beta \neq \alpha} (F_{\alpha\beta})_{\xi\lambda} \right], \quad (22)$$

with

$$(E_\alpha)_{\xi\lambda} = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{X_\alpha^2}{1 - X_\alpha^2}, & \xi = \lambda = \alpha \\ \frac{|\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\xi} - \mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma\xi}|^2}{(\det \mathcal{N}_\alpha)^2 (1 - X_\alpha^2)}, \gamma \neq \{\alpha, \xi\}, & \xi = \lambda \neq \alpha \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda} - \mathcal{N}_{\xi\gamma\lambda}}{\det \mathcal{N}}, \gamma \neq \{\alpha, \xi\}, & \xi \neq \lambda \text{ and } (\xi = \alpha \text{ or } \lambda = \alpha) \\ \frac{(\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\lambda} - \mathcal{N}_{\alpha\xi\lambda})(\mathcal{N}_{\xi\alpha} - \mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda\alpha})}{(\det \mathcal{N}_\alpha)^2 (1 - X_\alpha^2)}, & \xi \neq \lambda \text{ and } \{\xi, \lambda\} \neq \alpha \end{cases}, \quad (23)$$

and for $\beta \neq \alpha$ and $\gamma \neq \{\alpha, \beta\}$

$$(F_{\alpha\beta})_{\xi\lambda} = \begin{cases} 1 + \frac{|\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^4}{1 - |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^4} + \frac{\langle (p_\alpha)_{\{\alpha,\gamma\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta} |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\beta} - \mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma\beta}|^2}{(\det \mathcal{N}_\beta)^2 (1 - X_\beta^2)}, & \xi = \lambda = \alpha \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 - |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^4} \left(\mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda} - \frac{1 + |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^2}{2} \mathcal{N}_{\xi\gamma\lambda} \right), & \xi\lambda = \alpha\beta \text{ or } \xi\lambda = \beta\alpha \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle (p_\alpha)_{\{\alpha,\gamma\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta} \mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda} - \mathcal{N}_{\xi\gamma\lambda}}{1 - X_\beta^2} \frac{1 + \langle p_{\alpha\gamma} \rangle_{\beta\beta}}{\det \mathcal{N}_\beta}, & \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda}}{\det \mathcal{N}_\beta} + \frac{\langle (p_\alpha)_{\{\alpha,\gamma\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta} (\mathcal{N}_{\xi\beta} - \mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda\beta}) (\mathcal{N}_{\beta\lambda} - \mathcal{N}_{\beta\xi\lambda})}{(\det \mathcal{N}_\beta)^2 (1 - X_\beta^2)}, & \xi\lambda = \alpha\gamma \text{ or } \xi\lambda = \gamma\alpha \\ \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{1 + \langle p_{\alpha\gamma} \rangle_{\beta\beta}^2}{1 - X_\beta^2} \right) \langle (p_\alpha)_{\{\alpha,\gamma\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta}, & \xi = \lambda = \beta \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{1 - |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^4} \left(|\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^2 \mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda} - \frac{1 + |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^2}{2} \mathcal{N}_{\xi\alpha\lambda} \right), & \xi\lambda = \beta\gamma \text{ or } \xi\lambda = \gamma\beta \\ -\frac{1}{2} \frac{\langle (p_\alpha)_{\{\alpha,\gamma\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta} \mathcal{N}_{\xi\lambda} - \mathcal{N}_{\xi\alpha\lambda}}{1 - X_\beta^2} \frac{1 + \langle p_{\alpha\gamma} \rangle_{\beta\beta}}{\det \mathcal{N}_\beta}, & \\ \frac{|\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^2}{1 - |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^4} + \frac{\langle (p_\alpha)_{\{\alpha,\gamma\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta} |\mathcal{N}_{\gamma\beta} - \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\alpha\beta}|^2}{(\det \mathcal{N}_\beta)^2 (1 - X_\beta^2)}, & \xi = \lambda = \gamma \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

where we have defined

$$\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\beta\gamma} \equiv \mathcal{N}_{\alpha\beta} \mathcal{N}_{\beta\gamma}, \quad (25)$$

$$\langle p_{\alpha\gamma} \rangle_{\beta\beta} \equiv \frac{|\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\beta}|^2 + |\mathcal{N}_{\beta\gamma}|^2 - 2\text{Re}(\mathcal{N}_{\beta\alpha} \mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\beta})}{1 - |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^2}, \quad (26)$$

$$\langle (p_\alpha)_{\{\alpha,\gamma\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta} \equiv \frac{|\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\beta}|^2 + |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma} \mathcal{N}_{\beta\gamma}|^2 - (1 + |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^2) \text{Re}(\mathcal{N}_{\beta\alpha} \mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma} \mathcal{N}_{\gamma\beta})}{1 - |\mathcal{N}_{\alpha\gamma}|^4}. \quad (27)$$

The subscript $\{\alpha, \gamma\}$ in the last expression are not indices but refers to the set of basis states of the corresponding operator. For example, with $\{\mu, \tau\}$, we can have $\langle (p_\mu)_{\{\mu,\tau\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta}$ or $\langle (p_\tau)_{\{\mu,\tau\}} \rangle_{\beta\beta}$. In the case where off-diagonal elements of \mathcal{N} are zero, we recover the standard result in eq. (20). This also shows that high scale nonunitarity scenario is only sensitive to off-diagonal elements of U and as shown in ref. [36], in the limit of vanishing off diagonal elements, the scenario is indistinguishable from the unitarity scenario.

Using the public code NuProbe [35, 44], in Figure 1, we plot the probability of $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\beta$ at a distance of 1300 km with a constant matter density of 3 g/cm³ for $\beta = e, \mu, \tau$ which correspond to purple cross, blue dot and red star curves, respectively. The solid curves are for the standard scenario with unitary U while the dashed curves are for the high scale unitarity violation scenario with nonunitary U . The black solid curves on the top denote




FIG. 1. The probability of $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\beta$ in matter with constant density $\rho = 3 \text{ g/cm}^3$ at a distance $x = 1300 \text{ km}$ as a function of neutrino energy E_ν with \hat{P}_β given by eq. (22) (left plot) or eq. (20) (right plot). The solid curves are for the standard scenario with unitary U while the dashed curves are for nonorthogonal flavor states with $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu} = (UU^\dagger)_{e\tau} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\tau} = 0.03e^{-i\pi/3}$ and $(UU^\dagger)_{ee} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = (UU^\dagger)_{\tau\tau} = 0.96$. The black solid curves at the top denote $\sum_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}$ for nonunitary U .

$\sum_\beta P_{\beta\alpha}$ for nonunitary U . The standard parameters are set to the global best fit values for Normal mass Ordering (NO) from [5, 45]. The nonorthogonal parameters are set to $(UU^\dagger)_{e\mu} = (UU^\dagger)_{e\tau} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\tau} = 0.03e^{-i\pi/3}$ and $(UU^\dagger)_{ee} = (UU^\dagger)_{\mu\mu} = (UU^\dagger)_{\tau\tau} = 0.96$. On the left plot, the expression (22) for \hat{P}_β is used while on the right plot, the expression (20) is used. As we can see, with nonunitary U , the latter expression gives rise to spurious result in which the total probability can be larger or smaller than 1 (black curve on the right plot). The deviations from the standard scenario are more apparent for appearance channels $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_e$ and $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\tau$.

In Figure 2, we repeat the calculations using the same neutrino parameters but for neutrino crossing through the Earth core with a simplified (Preliminary Reference Earth Model) PREM model [46] implemented in NuProbe [35, 44]. Even with nontrivial matter potential, unitarity is preserved as can be seen in the black curve on the left plot. We also see that matter effects noticeably enhance the differences between the standard and high scale unitarity violation scenario for all the channels.




FIG. 2. The probability of $\nu_\mu \rightarrow \nu_\beta$ for neutrino passing through the Earth core using simplified PREM model as a function of neutrino energy E_ν . The notations are the same as in Figure 1.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

To answer the question posted in the title, new physics can result in *nonunitary* lepton mixing matrix U which further implies *nonorthogonal* neutrino flavor states. This *high scale unitarity violation* scenario can be distinguished from the standard scenario although the theory itself remains unitary in time evolution and the total probability always sum up to unity. If new physics scale were beyond the energy reach of our current and foreseeable future experiments, one might have to focus on intensity frontier to carry out precision measurements. In such a scenario, neutrino sector might be the unique place that guarantees clues to new physics. Then precision measurements of neutrino oscillation phenomena rely on precise theoretical treatment and to prepare for discovery of new physics, one should use eq. (22) in the probability calculation which preserves unitarity.

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

C.S.F. acknowledges the support by grant 2019/11197-6 and 2022/00404-3 from São Paulo Research Foundation (FAPESP), and grant 301271/2019-4 and 407149/2021-0 from National Council for Scientific and Technological Development (CNPq). This work is inspired by a “dangerous idea” of Hisakazu Minakata who said “A closed theory without unitarity must

not make sense. With ignoring inelastic scattering, absorption, and decay, etc, the three neutrino system cannot lose the probability. To where probability loss goes?" He would like to thank Celso Nishi for reading and commenting on the manuscript. He also acknowledges support from the ICTP through the Associates Programme (2023-2028) while this work was being completed.

- [1] M. A. Acero *et al.*, “White Paper on Light Sterile Neutrino Searches and Related Phenomenology,” (2022), arXiv:2203.07323 [hep-ex].
- [2] C. A. Argüelles *et al.*, “Snowmass white paper: beyond the standard model effects on neutrino flavor: Submitted to the proceedings of the US community study on the future of particle physics (Snowmass 2021),” Eur. Phys. J. C **83**, 15 (2023), arXiv:2203.10811 [hep-ph].
- [3] Steven Weinberg, “Baryon and Lepton Nonconserving Processes,” Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 1566–1570 (1979).
- [4] Steven Weinberg, “Varieties of Baryon and Lepton Nonconservation,” Phys. Rev. D **22**, 1694 (1980).
- [5] Ivan Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, Michele Maltoni, Thomas Schwetz, and Albert Zhou, “The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations,” JHEP **09**, 178 (2020), arXiv:2007.14792 [hep-ph].
- [6] Matteo Agostini, Giovanni Benato, Jason A. Detwiler, Javier Menéndez, and Francesco Vissani, “Toward the discovery of matter creation with neutrinoless double-beta decay,” (2022), arXiv:2202.01787 [hep-ex].
- [7] Vincenzo Cirigliano *et al.*, “Neutrinoless Double-Beta Decay: A Roadmap for Matching Theory to Experiment,” (2022), arXiv:2203.12169 [hep-ph].
- [8] S. Antusch, C. Biggio, E. Fernandez-Martinez, M. B. Gavela, and J. Lopez-Pavon, “Unitarity of the Leptonic Mixing Matrix,” JHEP **10**, 084 (2006), arXiv:hep-ph/0607020.
- [9] A. Broncano, M. B. Gavela, and Elizabeth Ellen Jenkins, “The Effective Lagrangian for the seesaw model of neutrino mass and leptogenesis,” Phys. Lett. B **552**, 177–184 (2003), [Erratum: Phys.Lett.B 636, 332 (2006)], arXiv:hep-ph/0210271.
- [10] Stefan Antusch and Oliver Fischer, “Non-unitarity of the leptonic mixing matrix: Present bounds and future sensitivities,” JHEP **10**, 094 (2014), arXiv:1407.6607 [hep-ph].

- [11] Enrique Fernandez-Martinez, Josu Hernandez-Garcia, and Jacobo Lopez-Pavon, “Global constraints on heavy neutrino mixing,” *JHEP* **08**, 033 (2016), arXiv:1605.08774 [hep-ph].
- [12] André de Gouvêa, “Neutrino Mass Models,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **66**, 197–217 (2016).
- [13] E. Fernandez-Martinez, M. B. Gavela, J. Lopez-Pavon, and O. Yasuda, “CP-violation from non-unitary leptonic mixing,” *Phys. Lett. B* **649**, 427–435 (2007), arXiv:hep-ph/0703098.
- [14] Zhi-zhong Xing, “Correlation between the Charged Current Interactions of Light and Heavy Majorana Neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **660**, 515–521 (2008), arXiv:0709.2220 [hep-ph].
- [15] Srubabati Goswami and Toshihiko Ota, “Testing non-unitarity of neutrino mixing matrices at neutrino factories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **78**, 033012 (2008), arXiv:0802.1434 [hep-ph].
- [16] Stefan Antusch, Mattias Blennow, Enrique Fernandez-Martinez, and Jacobo Lopez-Pavon, “Probing non-unitary mixing and CP-violation at a Neutrino Factory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **80**, 033002 (2009), arXiv:0903.3986 [hep-ph].
- [17] Zhi-zhong Xing, “A full parametrization of the 6 X 6 flavor mixing matrix in the presence of three light or heavy sterile neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 013008 (2012), arXiv:1110.0083 [hep-ph].
- [18] F. J. Escrivuela, D. V. Forero, O. G. Miranda, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, “On the description of nonunitary neutrino mixing,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 053009 (2015), [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 93, 119905 (2016)], arXiv:1503.08879 [hep-ph].
- [19] Stephen Parke and Mark Ross-Lonergan, “Unitarity and the three flavor neutrino mixing matrix,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 113009 (2016), arXiv:1508.05095 [hep-ph].
- [20] Debajyoti Dutta and Pomita Ghoshal, “Probing CP violation with T2K, NO ν A and DUNE in the presence of non-unitarity,” *JHEP* **09**, 110 (2016), arXiv:1607.02500 [hep-ph].
- [21] Debajyoti Dutta, Pomita Ghoshal, and Samiran Roy, “Effect of Non Unitarity on Neutrino Mass Hierarchy determination at DUNE, NO ν A and T2K,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **920**, 385–401 (2017), arXiv:1609.07094 [hep-ph].
- [22] Shao-Feng Ge, Pedro Pasquini, M. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, “Measuring the leptonic CP phase in neutrino oscillations with nonunitary mixing,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95**, 033005 (2017), arXiv:1605.01670 [hep-ph].
- [23] Mattias Blennow, Pilar Coloma, Enrique Fernandez-Martinez, Josu Hernandez-Garcia, and Jacobo Lopez-Pavon, “Non-Unitarity, sterile neutrinos, and Non-Standard neutrino Interactions,” *JHEP* **04**, 153 (2017), arXiv:1609.08637 [hep-ph].

- [24] Ivan Martinez-Soler and Hisakazu Minakata, “Standard versus Non-Standard CP Phases in Neutrino Oscillation in Matter with Non-Unitarity,” PTEP **2020**, 063B01 (2020), arXiv:1806.10152 [hep-ph].
- [25] Ivan Martinez-Soler and Hisakazu Minakata, “Physics of parameter correlations around the solar-scale enhancement in neutrino theory with unitarity violation,” PTEP **2020**, 113B01 (2020), arXiv:1908.04855 [hep-ph].
- [26] Debajyoti Dutta and Samiran Roy, “Non-Unitarity at DUNE and T2HK with Charged and Neutral Current Measurements,” J. Phys. G **48**, 045004 (2021), arXiv:1901.11298 [hep-ph].
- [27] Sebastian A. R. Ellis, Kevin J. Kelly, and Shirley Weishi Li, “Current and Future Neutrino Oscillation Constraints on Leptonic Unitarity,” JHEP **12**, 068 (2020), arXiv:2008.01088 [hep-ph].
- [28] Yilin Wang and Shun Zhou, “Non-unitary leptonic flavor mixing and CP violation in neutrino-antineutrino oscillations,” Phys. Lett. B **824**, 136797 (2022), arXiv:2109.13622 [hep-ph].
- [29] D. V. Forero, C. Giunti, C. A. Ternes, and M. Tortola, “Nonunitary neutrino mixing in short and long-baseline experiments,” Phys. Rev. D **104**, 075030 (2021), arXiv:2103.01998 [hep-ph].
- [30] Peter B. Denton and Julia Gehrlein, “New oscillation and scattering constraints on the tau row matrix elements without assuming unitarity,” JHEP **06**, 135 (2022), arXiv:2109.14575 [hep-ph].
- [31] Sanjib Kumar Agarwalla, Sudipta Das, Alessio Giarnetti, and Davide Meloni, “Model-independent constraints on non-unitary neutrino mixing from high-precision long-baseline experiments,” JHEP **07**, 121 (2022), arXiv:2111.00329 [hep-ph].
- [32] Anirban Majumdar, Dimitrios K. Papoulias, Rahul Srivastava, and José W. F. Valle, “Physics implications of recent Dresden-II reactor data,” Phys. Rev. D **106**, 093010 (2022), arXiv:2208.13262 [hep-ph].
- [33] Chee Sheng Fong, Hisakazu Minakata, and Hiroshi Nunokawa, “A framework for testing leptonic unitarity by neutrino oscillation experiments,” JHEP **02**, 114 (2017), arXiv:1609.08623 [hep-ph].
- [34] Chee Sheng Fong, Hisakazu Minakata, and Hiroshi Nunokawa, “Non-unitary evolution of neutrinos in matter and the leptonic unitarity test,” JHEP **02**, 015 (2019), arXiv:1712.02798 [hep-ph].

- [35] Chee Sheng Fong, “Analytic Neutrino Oscillation Probabilities,” (2022), arXiv:2210.09436 [hep-ph].
- [36] Chee Sheng Fong, “Theoretical Aspect of Nonunitarity in Neutrino Oscillation,” (2023), arXiv:2301.12960 [hep-ph].
- [37] R. S. Mulliken, “Electronic population analysis on LCAO-MO molecular wave functions. IV. bonding and antibonding in LCAO and valence-bond theories,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **23**, 2343–2346 (1955), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.1741877>.
- [38] Keith R. Roby, “Quantum theory of chemical valence concepts,” *Molecular Physics* **27**, 81–104 (1974), <https://doi.org/10.1080/00268977400100071>.
- [39] N. De Leon and S.P. Neshyba, “Total projection probabilities on non-orthogonal states: Calculation of electronic populations in molecules,” *Chemical Physics Letters* **151**, 296–300 (1988).
- [40] R. S. Manning and N. De Leon, “Theory of projected probabilities on non-orthogonal states: Application to electronic populations in molecules,” *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry* **5**, 323–357 (1990).
- [41] Emilio Artacho and Lorenzo Miláns del Bosch, “Nonorthogonal basis sets in quantum mechanics: Representations and second quantization,” *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 5770–5777 (1991).
- [42] M. Soriano and J. J. Palacios, “Theory of projections with nonorthogonal basis sets: Partitioning techniques and effective hamiltonians,” *Physical Review B* **90** (2014), [10.1103/physrevb.90.075128](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.90.075128).
- [43] Emilio Artacho and David D. O'Regan, “Quantum mechanics in an evolving hilbert space,” *Physical Review B* **95** (2017), [10.1103/physrevb.95.115155](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevb.95.115155).
- [44] “NuProbe: Neutrino oscillation as a Probe of New Physics,” .
- [45] “NuFIT 5.2: Three-neutrino fit based on data available in November 2022,” .
- [46] A. M. Dziewonski and D. L. Anderson, “Preliminary reference earth model,” *Phys. Earth Planet. Interiors* **25**, 297–356 (1981).