

Charged Lepton Electric Dipole Moments from TeV Scale Right-handed Neutrinos

We-Fu Chang^{a,b} and John N. Ng^a

^a *TRIUMF Theory Group, 4004 Wesbrook Mall, Vancouver, BC V6T 2A3, Canada*

^b *Institute of Physics, Academia Sinica, Taipei 115, Taiwan*

Abstract

We study the connection between charged lepton electric dipole moments, d_l ($l = e, \mu, \tau$), and seesaw neutrino mass generation in a simple two Higgs doublet extension of the Standard Model plus three right-handed neutrinos (RHN) N_a , $a = 1, 2, 3$. For RHN with hierarchical masses and at least one with mass in the 10 TeV range we obtain the upper bounds of $|d_e| < 9 \times 10^{-30}$ e-cm and $|d_\mu| < 2 \times 10^{-26}$ e-cm. Our scenario favors the normal mass hierarchy for the light neutrinos. We also calculated the cross section for $e^-e^- \rightarrow W^-W^-$ in a high luminosity collider with constraints from neutrinoless double beta decay of nuclei included. Among the rare muon decay experiments we find that $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ is most sensitive and the upper limit is $< 8 \times 10^{-13}$.

1 Introduction

In the celebrated seesaw mechanism [1], the right handed Majorana neutrinos are essential to generating small Majorana masses for the active left-handed neutrinos of the Standard Model(SM). These fields are singlet under the SM gauge group and the exact number required is open to debate. Since the light neutrino masses are constrained to be less than an eV the masses of the right handed neutrinos have to be heavier than 10^{12} GeV. This fits in well with expectations of grand unified theory although the seesaw scale is lower than the GUT scale which is generally taken to be around 10^{16} GeV as required by proton stability. Moreover, the high scale also makes the seesaw mechanism impossible to test directly. The best we can hope for are indirect tests such as leptogenesis or renormalization effects. However, in order to make predictions in these latter studies additional assumptions have to be made and the results become highly model dependent. On the other hand, Majorana masses for the light active neutrinos can be tested in neutrinoless double beta decays of nuclei. Even in this case one has to eliminate other possible sources of lepton number violating new physics such as exotic scalars. Recently there are attempts to lower the masses of the right handed neutrinos to the TeV in leptogenesis studies [2]. They are particularly useful in supersymmetric models [3]. Clearly such low scale Majorana neutrinos are of phenomenological and theoretical interests in their own rights. They can be detected in high energy colliders and due to their rich CP properties effects in low energy experiments can also be searched for. The prominent example is the electric dipole moment(EDM) of a charged leptons denoted by d_l where $l = e, \mu, \tau$. Already the experimental limit on $|d_e|$ is an impressive $< 10^{-27}$ e-cm [4] and will be further improved in new round of experiments. In contrast, the limit on $|d_\mu| < 10^{-19}$ e-cm is much less stringent and dedicated experiments are now being proposed.

In this paper we investigate the contribution of TeV scale Majorana right handed neutrinos, N_R , to d_l . An immediate issue is to decide whether they are involved in generating active neutrino masses. Naively one expects that if they do so then the seesaw mechanism will restrict their Yukawa couplings to be very small and thereby making their contribution to d_l be minuscule. Thus, they can play an important role in the seesaw mechanism only in a subtle manner. Radiative effects on the left-handed part of the seesaw mass matrix was calculated in [5]. Previously it was pointed out [6] small Yukawa couplings can be avoided for more than one N_R . We shall display this in the context of a simple model which consist of the SM plus at least 3 right handed Majorana neutrinos, N_R , and an additional Higgs doublet. In order not to be confused with possible CP violating phases from the scalar potential we assume one Higgs doublet couples to l_R and the other to N_R . This is the natural flavor conserving extended two Higgs doublet studied in [7] and is also well known to be part of the minimal supersymmetric standard model. We shall see that one N_R can be arranged to be heavy and is responsible for the seesaw and the other two can be much lighter. Furthermore their Yukawa couplings can be of order unity. We do not attempt a detail fit to the neutrino mixing data which can be a separate study but merely to demonstrate the possibility of such a scenario. This very simple set up also gives rise to a nonvanishing d_l at the 2-loop level via a set of Feynman diagrams specific to Majorana fermions as pointed out by [8]; a mechanism which has been checked by

[9] and [10]. The latter also contains a detail discussion of the 2-loop integrals. However, we will concentrate more on the structure of CP violation that appears and will be satisfied with order of magnitude estimates. We will be able to give a ‘natural’ order of magnitude estimate of the upper limit on d_l coming from the possible existence of multi-TeV scale N_R .

One would wonder why do we add one more Higgs doublet in our construction. With only one Higgs doublet the 2-loop contribution to d_l from Majorana neutrinos is negligible [8, 10]. This is because now only the active neutrinos take part as they couple to the W bosons. Then d_l is proportional to their mass squared differences which are known to be small from neutrino oscillation data. Thus, in the SM extended to include seesaw neutrino mass although d_l happens at 2-loop it is still undetectably small. In contrast the SM with massless neutrinos d_l receives contribution at 4-loop or higher. With more than one Higgs doublet the physics changes. The right handed neutrinos do not decouple as we shall see later. This model can also serve as a prototype in studying the interplay between scalars and Majorana fermions in EDM’s.

In section 2 we describe in detail a model with three N_R ’s. We show how it works to generate sub-eV neutrino masses with one of them having mass in the 10 TeV range and the others can be much higher. For early pioneering work on Majorana neutrinos in gauge theories see [11].

Next we discuss the Majorana phases in the model and dive into the d_l estimates. Since the physics scale we are interested in is relatively low the expected renormalization group running of the parameters are not very significant and we shall ignore them. Another possible test of this mechanism can be done using the reaction $e^-e^- \rightarrow W^-W^-$; in the event that the right handed neutrinos are not kinematically accessible at LHC or the linear collider. This possibility has not been examined before and is discussed in section 4. No neutrino double beta decays ($0\nu\beta\beta$) of nuclei are discussed here. Section 5 examines the possible tests in the rare decays $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ and $\mu \rightarrow 3e$ using the constraint we found previously. Discussions of other low energy probes of Majorana phases can be found in [12]. Finally we give our conclusions.

2 A Simple Model with Right Handed Neutrinos

The model we study is the SM with two Higgs doublet denoted by ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 and 3 right handed neutrinos N_a with $a = 1, 2, 3$. The terms in the total Lagrangian of interest to us are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{2}} \overline{\nu_{Li}} \gamma^\mu e_i W_\mu^+ + H.c. \\ &+ y_e^{ij} \overline{L}_i \phi_1 e_{Rj} + \zeta'_{ia} \overline{L}_i \tilde{\phi}_2 N_a + H.c. \\ &- \frac{1}{2} (M_{ab} \overline{N}_a N_b^c + H.c.) - V(\phi_1, \phi_2) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\tilde{\phi}_2 = i\sigma_2 \phi_2^*$ and indices $i, j = 1, 2, 3$. The hypercharge of Higgs doublets are $Y_1 = Y_2 = 1/2$. This is the simplest of two Higgs doublet models (2HDM). The details of the scalar potential $V(\phi_1, \phi_2)$ is not important for us and will not spell out here. Note that a Z_2 symmetry can be applied to fields so that the lagrangian is invariant under the transformation:

$$L_i \rightarrow L_i, \phi_1 \rightarrow \phi_1, \phi_2 \rightarrow -\phi_2, N_a \rightarrow -N_a, e_R \rightarrow e_R. \quad (2)$$

In this example, the right-handed singlets only couple to ϕ_2 which is the simplest way to enforce natural flavor conservation. Other assignments to accommodate flavon models can also be applied. However, such details are not necessary for us. All the fermions are in the weak eigenbasis. M_{ab} is a complex symmetric 3×3 mass matrix for the right-handed singlets and $a, b = 1, 2, 3$. Without loss of generality, M_{ab} can be chosen to be $diag\{M_1, M_2, M_3\}$ where the eigenvalues M_a can be made real and positive. The Yukawa couplings y^{ij} and ζ'_{ia} are complex but the Higgs potential are taken to be real. In doing so the only source of possible CP violation come from the Yukawa couplings.

It is worthwhile to examine the number of physical phases in this class of models. The discussion is clearest by first going into the charged lepton mass basis. In this basis we denote the Yukawa coupling by $\zeta' \rightarrow \zeta$. Now consider the general case with N right-handed singlets and n left-handed active neutrinos coupling as above. The neutrino mass matrix is a $(n+N) \times (n+N)$ matrix in a block matrix form:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & v\zeta \\ v\zeta^T & M \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where $v\zeta$ is a $(n \times N)$ Dirac mass matrix and v is a generic vacuum expectation value of the Higgs fields. For instance, for the Higgs doublet model of Eq.(1) the following substitution should be made: $v \rightarrow v \sin \beta$ where $\tan \beta = v_2/v_1$. Returning to Eq.(3), the lower block matrix, M , is the $(N \times N)$ Majorana mass matrix of the N_R 's. It is symmetrical and complex and thus contain $N(N+1)/2$ phases. These can be completely absorbed by the $U(N)$ mixing among the number N of N_R states. Another way to view this is to use the freedom of phase choice in N_R to rotate away the N complex phases in the eigenvalues. Once that is done the phases of N_R are fixed. The phases of the active ν_L are still free. A phase redefinition of the ν_L will then remove n phases from $(n \times N)$ Yukawa terms. This leaves a total of $n(N-1)$ physical phases [13]. For the case of $n = 3$ and $N = 3$ we have 6 physical phases. It is customary to assign one phase to the light neutrino mixing matrix and leave the others in the mass eigenvalues. Moreover, the physics of EDM is seen more clearly using complex Yukawa couplings.

The light neutrino Majorana mass matrix can be solved from Eq.(3):

$$m_\nu = -v^2 \zeta M^{-1} \zeta^T. \quad (4)$$

Explicitly, the matrix elements are

$$m_{\nu,ij} = -v^2 \left(\frac{\zeta_{i1}\zeta_{j1}}{M_1} + \frac{\zeta_{i2}\zeta_{j2}}{M_2} + \frac{\zeta_{i3}\zeta_{j3}}{M_3} \right) \quad (5)$$

where $i, j = e, \mu, \tau$. The standard seesaw mechanism is to assume $M_1 \sim M_2 \sim M_3 \sim 10^{14}$ GeV and the Yukawa couplings are all of order unity so as to get sub eV masses for the active neutrinos. It is also noted by many that it hard to obtain the observed bilarge mixing of the active neutrinos with inverse hierarchical masses. Without more assumptions we can extract one more result, i.e.

$$|\det m_\nu| = \frac{v^6 (\det \zeta)^2}{M_1 M_2 M_3}. \quad (6)$$

which may be useful for constructing neutrino mass models.

On closer examination of Eq.(5) one discovers other ways of getting small neutrino masses. First we scale out the lowest of the three N_R masses which we call $M_<$. Thus, Eq.(5) becomes

$$m_{\nu,ij} = -\frac{v^2}{M_<} \left(\frac{\zeta_{i1}\zeta_{j1}}{r_1} + \frac{\zeta_{i2}\zeta_{j2}}{r_2} + \frac{\zeta_{i3}\zeta_{j3}}{r_3} \right) \quad (7)$$

where $r_a \equiv M_a/M_<$, $a = 1, 2, 3$ and $r_a \geq 1$ by construction. Each term in Eq.(7) can be viewed as a complex vector and it is a sum of three such vectors. If they form a triangle then the element vanishes. The smallness of the active neutrino masses can then be due to nearly closing of the complex triangle even with a value of $M_<$ in the TeV range. Similar techniques have been used to construct different hierarchies for the N_R to yield the experimentally acceptable mass matrices for m_ν [14]. We leave aside the question of whether this is fine tuning or manifestation of approximate family symmetry of the heavy neutrinos. We take it to be purely phenomenologically motivated.

As an example, we describe a scenario in which 3 N_R can generate sub-eV active neutrino mass but possesses the features that some of them are light enough, say \sim TeV, so that the seesaw mechanism can be amenable to testing in the near future. Assume that ζ_{ia} obey the following relation:

$$\frac{\zeta_{i1}}{\sqrt{r_1}} \left(1 - \frac{\delta_\nu}{2} \right) = \frac{\zeta_{i2}}{\sqrt{r_2}} \exp(i\pi/3) = \frac{\zeta_{i3}}{\sqrt{r_3}} \exp(i2\pi/3) \quad (8)$$

where δ_ν is a small parameter we introduced. Then the seesaw mass contribution to the light neutrino from the 3 N_R 's nearly cancel among themselves. In the limit $\delta_\nu = 0$, Eq.(8) has a geometrical interpretation, i.e. the three terms viewed as vectors in the complex plane form an equilateral triangle. Then a non-vanishing δ_ν is a measure of the deviation from this configuration. In our example the ζ_1 side is $(1 + \delta_\nu)$ longer than the sum of the other two and the small part left is responsible for small value of m_ν . As noted before the model has six physical phases and there are nine complex Yukawa couplings. For definiteness we will choose the three ζ_{i1} s to be real. Clearly the deviation δ_ν can be associated with either one of the M_a and our choice is for simplicity of discussion. To obtain an acceptable mass matrix we need further assumptions. Taking a hint from the charged leptons we assume the couplings ζ_{ea} are such that $\zeta_{ea} \ll \zeta_{\mu a} \sim \zeta_{\tau a} \cong \zeta_a$. Then a light neutrino mass matrix of the normal hierarchy type emerges

$$m_\nu \sim \frac{\delta_\nu \zeta_1^2 v^2}{r_1 M_<} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

It is well known that Eq.(9) gives the observed bilarge mixing angles. Notice the scale of m_ν is set by M_1 and the parameters δ_ν and ζ also play a crucial role in determining its magnitude. Moreover, it is important to note that the Yukawa couplings are complex as explicitly displayed in Eq.(8). These are physical phases which will enter into EDM considerations.

Interestingly we can extract more information about possible hierarchies in M_a . There are three cases we can imagine:




Figure 1: 1-loop diagrams which may give non-zero EDM.

- I. $M_1 \sim 10^{12}$ GeV and it sets the scale for light active neutrinos. If we take $\delta_\nu \sim \zeta_1 \sim 0.1$ then this is sufficient to ensure sub-eV neutrinos. As seen in Eq.(9) M_2 and M_3 play no role in determining m_ν ; thus they can be as light as a few TeV. However, Eq.(8) dictates that $\zeta_{1,2}$ will be very small and hence will not give a detectable d_l .
- II. $M_1 \ll M_2 \lesssim M_3$ with $M_1 \sim 10$ TeV. For light neutrinos masses in the sub-eV range Eq.(9) requires the product $\delta_\nu \zeta_1^2 \lesssim 10^{-9}$. Superficially one would expect that $\delta_\nu \sim \zeta_1 \sim 10^{-3}$. Since we do not have a theoretical basis for the values of these two parameters it is prudent to use experimental constraints. We shall see later that neutrinoless double beta decays limit $\zeta_1 < 0.1$. From Eq.(8) we see that even if M_3 is of order 10^8 GeV the corresponding ζ will be of order unity. This is the interesting case for d_l . Certainly we can lower M_1 by simultaneously reducing δ_ν or ζ_1 .
- III. $M_1 \sim M_2 \sim M_3$ and they are in the TeV range. In this case, either all the Yukawa couplings are small or GIM-like cancellation with small mass splittings will have to take place. Either case no interesting d_l arises.

The above discussion is sufficient to illustrate the connection between the seesaw mechanism and d_l we set forth to seek. Now we move on to the discussion of EDM.

3 EDMs of Charged Leptons

In models with charged scalars and Majorana neutrinos, d_l can begin at 1-loop. The relevant Feynman diagrams are given in Fig.1. We shall employ the mass eigenstates in our discussions. The mixings between the light active neutrinos and the heavy N_R 's are expected to be very small. Indeed from the simple case of one family seesaw this mixing is given by $\zeta v/M$. For the parameter values discuss in case (II) above we estimate mixing between an active neutrino and the right-handed singlet which we generically called θ to be $\lesssim 10^{-3}$.

As seen in Fig.(1a) both heavy right-handed neutrinos and light active neutrinos can enter. Moreover, the Yukawa couplings are conjugate of each other. Also the necessary helicity flip occurs in one of the external charged lepton lines; hence, there is no EDM from this diagram. For the W boson exchange diagram, see Fig.1(b), active neutrinos exchanges are dominant with

a small admixture of the right-handed neutrinos entering. In either case the two W vertices are also conjugate to each other and clearly there is no EDM from this diagram.

At the two loop level there are 4 distinct topology we have to consider as shown in Fig.2. Fig.2(b-d) do not give rise to d_l when the thin lines represent gauge bosons. This is well




Figure 2: The topology of 2 loop diagrams, the thick lines represent the fermion lines, and the thin ones could be scalars, gauge boson, or fermion loop(sub-diagram d).

known from the SM. When they represent scalar particles the Yukawa couplings involve come in conjugate pairs ; thus negating their contributions. Since we have no phases in the scalar sector we arrive at the result that Fig.2(b-d) give no EDM. This leaves only Fig.2(a) as the only type that can lead to a non-vanishing d_l .

To see the physics more clearly we put the details in Fig.3. The external photon can attach to any charged object in the loops. The Majorana mass insertions for the light neutrinos are




Figure 3: 2-loop diagrams which give non-vanishing EDM.

indicated by the open box. These also flip helicity and change lepton numbers by 2 units. The corresponding insertions for the heavy N_R 's are denoted by the filled boxes. The diagrams with the internal ν_j lines replaced by N_a or vice versa are multiplied by the mixing θ alluded in the discussions at the beginning of this section and will be suppressed.

It is instructive to examine the two W-boson diagram. It has two open box insertions which involve light active neutrinos. Summations over different neutrino species and the three charged

leptons l_i are to be taken. The active neutrino mixing matrix elements at the incoming and outgoing lepton vertices can be different; thus leading to a non-vanishing d_l . The open box insertions indicating the lepton number violating nature of the Majorana masses are mandatory for this to happen. They do not exist for Dirac neutrinos and thus d_l cannot happen at the two loop level with Dirac neutrinos. Explicit calculations [8, 10] show that this diagram gives a contribution proportional to m_ν^2 and hence is completely negligible. Similarly, the diagrams Fig.3(a) and (b) are suppressed by powers of m_ν/M_W and also $y_e \sim 10^{-6}$. These graphs can be neglected. This leaves only the two charged Higgs exchange diagram. The lepton EDM can be estimated as:

$$\frac{d_l}{e} \sim \sum_{a < b} \frac{m_l}{(16\pi^2)^2} \sum_{i=e,\mu,\tau} \text{Im}[\zeta_{la}^* \zeta_{lb} \zeta_{ia}^* \zeta_{ib}] \frac{M_a - M_b}{(M_a + M_b)^3} \ln \frac{M_H}{(M_a + M_b)} \quad (10)$$

in the limit that the N_R are heavier than the charged Higgs boson which we assume to be of the weak scale. Strictly speaking, in the mass eigenbasis, the Yukawa couplings should be modified due to the mixing with the active neutrinos. These are expected to be small, i.e. $\mathcal{O}(m_\nu/M)$, and can be neglected. Note that the imaginary part of the product of four Yukawa couplings flips sign when one exchanges indices $a \leftrightarrow b$. In other words, only the antisymmetric part in the loop integral yields the desired EDM operator. On the other hand, the factor $(M_a - M_b)$ also reflects that the CP violating effects go away when the masses of two right-handed neutrinos become degenerate. It is also interesting to note that the diagram with the photon attached to the internal charged lepton has no EDM contribution since the loop integral is completely symmetric in a and b .

From Eq.(10) we see that the EDM scales linearly as the mass of the charged lepton. For the hierarchical mass of case (II) and take $M_2 \sim M_3 \sim 10^8$ GeV and $M_H \sim 200$ GeV we obtain for the electron EDM

$$|d_e| \sim 9.2 \times 10^{-31} (10\text{TeV}/M_1)^2 |\zeta_{e1}/0.1|^2 |\zeta_1|^2 \text{ e-cm} . \quad (11)$$

The above estimate is not very sensitive to the values of M_H and $M_{2,3}$ since their dependence is logarithmic. Notice that we use a small value of ζ_{e1} as is required by the normal hierarchy solution and $0\nu\beta\beta$ (see next section). If the right-handed neutrino masses are hierarchical such as $M_1 \ll M_2 < M_3$ then we have

$$|d_e| \sim 9.2 \times 10^{-31} (10\text{TeV}/M_1)^2 (M_2/M_3) |\zeta_{e1}/0.1|^2 |\zeta_1|^2 \text{ e-cm} \quad (12)$$

and will be suppressed compared to Eq.(11). Our estimate of d_e is three orders of magnitude below current experimental limit [15] but is within reach of new plan experiments [16]. We note that Eq.(10) is a good approximation to the actual two Feynman integrals which cannot be given in analytical form. Our numerical investigations show that it is accurate for order of magnitude estimates.

We can also give an estimate of the muon EDM and it is

$$|d_\mu| \sim 1.8 \times 10^{-26} (10\text{TeV}/M_1)^2 |\zeta_1|^4 \text{ e-cm} . \quad (13)$$

In this case the internal τ and μ lines give important contributions. When combined the coupling involves ζ_1 which need not be small. In contrast ζ_{e1} which is small enters the calculation for d_e (see Eq.(12)). Thus it is possible that d_μ can be more enhanced than just the mass factor m_μ/m_e when compared to d_e . The earlier discussion on the mass scaling violation of muon EDM is given in [17]. This illustrates the importance of doing both types of measurements. We add that our estimate is six to seven orders of magnitude lower than current limit [18] and will be a challenge even for the newly proposed dedicated d_μ measurements [19].

4 $(0\nu\beta\beta)$ decay and its inverse

Here we discuss how low scale N_R affects the decay rates of $(0\nu\beta\beta)$ decays of nuclei. We will be concerned with the elementary quark level $dd \rightarrow eeuu$ transition, and not worry about the detail nuclear physics. At the fundamental fermion level the amplitude is given by the diagrams below




Figure 4: Tree level $(0\nu\beta\beta)$ decay amplitudes from Majorana neutrinos

An estimate of the amplitude for the 2W exchange diagram is

$$A_a \sim g^4 \frac{1}{M_W^4} \frac{m_{\nu,ee}}{\langle p \rangle^2} \quad (14)$$

where $\langle p \rangle$ is the average momentum of the exchange light neutrino. The corresponding diagram with N replacing ν line is suppressed by the M and θ^2 . For the amplitude of Fig.4(b) with ν exchange we estimate

$$A_b \sim g^2 \frac{m_q m_e}{M_W^2} \frac{1}{M_W^2 M_H^2} \frac{m_{\nu,ee}}{\langle p \rangle^2} \sim 3 \times 10^{-11} A_a, \quad (15)$$

where m_q represents the light quark mass, and with N exchange we obtain

$$A_b \sim g^2 \frac{m_q}{M_W} \frac{\zeta}{M_W^2 M_H^2} \frac{1}{M_N} \theta \sim 3 \times 10^{-4} A_a. \quad (16)$$

Similarly the dominant $2H$ exchange graph is associated with a N -line and it gives

$$A_c \sim g^2 \frac{m_q^2}{M_W^2} \frac{\zeta^2}{M_H^4} \frac{1}{M_N} \sim 6 \times 10^{-8} A_a . \quad (17)$$

In arriving the above estimation, we have used the following numerical numbers: $M_N \sim 10$ TeV, $M_W \sim 100$ GeV, $M_H \sim 200$ GeV, $m_{\nu,ee} \sim 10^{-10}$ GeV, the quark mass $m_q \sim 10^{-3}$ GeV and $\langle p \rangle \sim 0.1$ GeV [20] This analysis suggests that WW exchange with active Majorana neutrino exchange is still the dominated tree-level contribution to $(0\nu\beta\beta)$ decay.

Interestingly, for low scale right-handed Majorana neutrino important contribution to $(0\nu\beta\beta)$ decays can come from 1-loop diagrams depicted below




Figure 5: The box and triangle diagrams for $(0\nu\beta\beta)$ decay.

The effective Lagrangian the diagrams generate is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L} &= F_l \left(\bar{e}^c \hat{L} e \right) \epsilon_1 \cdot \epsilon_2 , \\ F_l &= \frac{cg^2}{32\pi^2} \sum_a \frac{\zeta_{ea}^2}{M_a} \ln \left(\frac{M_H}{M_a} \right) \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

where c is an order one constant which depends on the details of the 2HDM such as scalar mixings. The $\epsilon_{1,2}$ are polarization 4-vectors of the W bosons. We have also assumed $M_a \gg M_H$ with M_H denoting a common scalar mass. After dropping the $m_{\nu,ee}$ part the sum in the above equation yields

$$F_l = \frac{\alpha}{8\pi \sin^2 \theta_W} \frac{\zeta_{e1}^2}{M_1} \left[\ln r_2 e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{3}} + \ln r_3 e^{-\frac{4\pi i}{3}} \right] \quad (19)$$

by using Eq.(8) and assuming $c = 1$ for simplicity. If this is the dominant contribution to $(0\nu\beta\beta)$ decays then we can set the limit $\zeta_{e1} < 0.1$ for $M_1 = 10$ TeV. In comparison the low energy effective Lagrangian from the exchange of N_1 is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{tree} &= F_t \left(\bar{e}^c \gamma_\mu \gamma_\nu \hat{L} e \right) \epsilon_1^\mu \epsilon_2^\nu , \\ F_t &= \frac{4\pi\alpha}{\sin^2 \theta_W} \left(\frac{\theta^2}{M_1} \right) . \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The numerical absolute value of the square bracket in Eq.(19) is ~ 5 for a large range of r_2 and r_3 . For $\zeta_{e1} = .1$ and $M_1 = 10\text{TeV}$ we get $F_l = 6 \times 10^{-9}$ whereas $F_t = 4 \times 10^{-11}$ in units of GeV^{-1} . Thus, the loop diagram can be more important even when ζ_{e1} is not that large.

The effective Lagrangian of Eq.(18) can also give rise to 2 W-boson production in e^-e^- colliders even when N_1 is too heavy to be directly produced. The cross section can be easily calculated to be

$$\sigma(ee \rightarrow WW) = \frac{F_l^2}{128\pi} \frac{s^2}{M_W^4} \quad (21)$$

which is dominated by the longitudinal components of the W bosons. Although we have neglected the energy dependence in F_l this is sufficient for a ball park estimate of the cross section. For a linear collider with $\sqrt{s} = 2 \text{ TeV}$ and a luminosity of $10^{34}\text{sec}^{-1}\text{cm}^{-2}$ we obtain 1.3 events in a 100 days running for a 10 TeV Majorana neutrinos. As mandated by the transient high s behavior of Eq.(21) one would require the highest available energy for a given high luminosity collider to probe this physics. It is easy to check that the usual tree level t -channel N_R exchange mechanism in the seesaw scenario gives a even smaller cross section [21].

5 A Trio of Rare Muon Decays




Figure 6: Right-handed Majorana neutrino contribution to $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ decay.

The rare decays $\mu \rightarrow e + \gamma, 3e$ and $\mu - e$ conversion in nuclei have always been a favorite for testing models of lepton violation. If TeV scale Majorana N_R 's exist one also expects that these processes will occur. A general up to date review is given in [22] and we shall follow the notations used there.

We begin with $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$. The most general Lorentz and gauge invariant $\mu - e - \gamma$ interaction is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{M} = -eA_\lambda^* \bar{u}_e(p_e) \left\{ [f_{E0}(q^2) + f_{M0}(q^2)\gamma^5] \gamma_\nu \left(g^{\lambda\nu} - \frac{q^\lambda q^\nu}{q^2} \right) \right. \\ \left. + [f_{M1}(q^2) + f_{E1}(q^2)\gamma^5] \frac{i\sigma^{\lambda\nu} q_\nu}{m_\mu} \right\} u_\mu(p_\mu) \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where q^λ and A_λ are the photon 4-momentum and polarization respectively and $p_e = p_\mu - q$. For $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ only the form factors f_{M1} and f_{E1} contribute. They can be calculated from the

dominant diagram given by Fig.(6). The transition rate is

$$B(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) = \frac{3\alpha}{64\pi} \frac{|\zeta_{e1}\zeta_{\mu 1}^*|^2}{G_F^2 M_1^4} = 8.01 \times 10^{-11} |\zeta_{e1}\zeta_{\mu 1}^*|^2 \left(\frac{10\text{TeV}}{M_1}\right)^4. \quad (23)$$

In arriving at the last formula, we have ignored the small M_H/M_a term. The current experimental limit of $< 1.2 \times 10^{-11}$ [23] sets a loose constrain on the mixings. Alternatively we can take $\zeta_{e1} < 0.1$ as required by our model and $\zeta_{\mu 1} < 1$ so as not to have strong Yukawa; then we get an upper limit of 8×10^{-13} for a 10 TeV N_R . We note in passing similar decays for the τ are sensitive to the mixing $\zeta_{\tau 1}$ which will be hard to obtain from other experiments.

For $\mu - e$ conversion in nuclei the seesaw model belongs to the class where the photonic penguin diagram as given Fig.6 with the photon off shell dominates the transition rate. An explicit calculation gives

$$B_{\text{conv}} = \frac{m_\mu^5 G_F^2 F_p^2 \alpha^4 Z_{\text{eff}}^4 Z}{12\pi^3 \Gamma_{\text{capt}}} B(\mu \rightarrow e + \gamma). \quad (24)$$

For ${}^{48}_{22}\text{Ti}$, $F_p = 0.55$, $Z_{\text{eff}} = 17.61$ and $\Gamma_{\text{capt}} = 1.71 \times 10^{-18} \text{GeV}$ which implies $B_{\text{conv}}^{\text{Ti}} \sim 0.004 B(\mu \rightarrow e + \gamma)$.

Similarly for $\mu \rightarrow 3e$ the photonic penguin is the most important graph. The box diagram with two charged Higgs exchange is completely negligible. The Z-penguin graphs are also sub-dominant. Thus we obtain simply

$$B(\mu \rightarrow 3e) = \frac{2\alpha}{3\pi} \left(\ln \frac{m_\mu}{m_e} - \frac{11}{8} \right) B(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \quad (25)$$

or $B(\mu \rightarrow 3e) \sim 0.006 B(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma)$. Hence, $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ and $\tau \rightarrow \mu(e)\gamma$ are the most important processes to probe TeV scale seesaw.

6 Conclusions

In this paper we have given a detailed study of the connection between seesaw neutrino mass generation and charged lepton EDMs. The 2HDM we employed is simple and it captures the physics clearly and succinctly. It is expected to be a crucial part of any elaborate embedding of the seesaw mechanism into a grand unified picture. As noted previously if all the right-handed neutrinos have very high masses, i.e. $> 10^{10}$ GeV then d_l will be undetectably small. We found that it is crucial to have at least one N_R have a mass in 10 TeV or slightly lower range. In addition, not all the Yukawa couplings can be suppressed as in the charged leptons. The charged lepton EDM arises from two loop diagrams involving Majorana neutrinos and the associated physical phases that have no counter parts in the SM with Dirac neutrinos. Under favorable choice of parameters we estimated that the upper limits are $|d_e| < 9 \times 10^{-30}$ e-cm and $|d_\mu| < 1.8 \times 10^{-26}$ e-cm for a 10 TeV Majorana neutrino. The parameters involved are consistent with a normal mass hierarchy for the light active neutrinos.

Interestingly, a right-handed neutrino in the 10 TeV mass range may also be required for a successful leptogenesis [3]. It is reasonable to expect that the mass of the lowest Majorana neutrino is in the 10 TeV range especially in the supersymmetry context. Moreover, the direct production of N_1 is out of reach for high energy colliders under discussion. Even so we considered how a high luminosity e^-e^- collider in the TeV range can still probe their existence via the same sign $2W^-$ production. Complementing this we calculated that the rare muon decay $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ at the level of 10^{-13} is found to be sensitive test of the scenario we discussed. Similarly, one can contemplate the rare Z decays into $\tau\mu$ or τe . The signatures are clean and unmistakable. At 1-loop this proceeds via a similar diagram as given in Fig.(6). We estimate this to give a branching ratio of $< 10^{-16}$ which is too small even for a Z-factory.

Interestingly, the CP violation from the see-saw mechanism has negligible effect in the quark sector. This demonstrates clearly that the search of neutron and electron and muon EDM's are independent powerful probes of physics beyond the SM.

7 Acknowledgement

WFC wants to thank K. Cheung and C.Q. Geng for useful discussions. This work is supported in part by the Natural Science and Engineering Research Council of Canada.

References

- [1] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond and R. Slansky, in *Supergravity* ed. by P. van Nieuwenhuizen and D. Freedman (Noth-Holland 1979) 315;
S.L. Glashow, in *Quarks and Leptons* Cargèse Lectures, ed. M. Levy *et al*, (Plenum, New York 1980) 707;
T. Yanagida in *Proc. of the Workshop on the Unified Theory and the Baryon Number in the Universe* ed. O. Sawada and A. Sugamoto (KEK Repeort 79-18) 95;
R.N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **44**(1980) 912.
- [2] M. Fukugita and T. Yanagita, *Phys. Lett.*, **B174**(1986) 45;
A. Pilaftsis, *Phys. Rev. D* **56**, 5431 (1997).
- [3] L. Boubekur, T. Hambye, and G. Senjanovic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93** (2004) 111601;
T. Hambye, J. March-Russell and S.M. West, *JHEP* **0407** (2004) 070;
J. March-Russell and S.M. West, *Phys. Lett.* **593** (2004) 181;
M. Raidal, A. Strumia and K. Turzyński, hep-ph/0408015;
S.M. West, hep-ph/0408318.
- [4] M.V. Romalis, W.C. Griffith and E.N. Fortson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**(2001) 2505.
- [5] A. Pilaftsis, *Z. Phys. C* **55**, 275 (1992).
- [6] L.N. Chang, D. Ng and J.N. Ng, *Phys. Rev.* **D50**(1994) 4585;
W. Loinaz, N. Okamura, S. Rayyan, T. Takeuchi and L.C.R. Wijewardhana, *idid* **D68**(2003) 073001.

- [7] S.L. Glashow and S. Weinberg, Phys. Rev. **D15** (1977) 1958.
- [8] D. Ng and J.N. Ng, Mod. Phys. Lett., **A 11** (1996) 211.
- [9] A. Pilaftsis, Int. J. Mod. Phys. **A 14** (1999) 1811;
A. Pilaftsis and T. E. J. Underwood, Nucl. Phys. B **692**, 303 (2004).
- [10] J.P. Archaumbault, A. Czarnecki and M. Pospelov, hep-ph/0406089.
- [11] J. Schechter and J.W.F. Valle, Phys. Rev. **D 22** (1980) 2227; *ibid* **D 23** (1981) 1666, and
ibid **D 24** (1982) 774.
- [12] A. de Gouvea, B. Kayser and R.N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. **D67** (2003) 053004.
- [13] A. Santamria, Phys. Lett. **B305** (1993) 90.
- [14] S. Antush and S.F. King, New J. Phys. **6** (2004) 110.
- [15] B.C. Regan, E.D. Commins, C.J. Schmidt, and D. DeMille, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88** (2002) 071805.
- [16] M.G. Kozlov and D. DeMille, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89** (2002) 133001.
- [17] K. S. Babu, B. Dutta and R. N. Mohapatra, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 5064 (2000);
J. L. Feng, K. T. Matchev and Y. Shadmi, Nucl. Phys. B **613**, 366 (2001).
- [18] R.McNabb, hep-ex/0407008.
- [19] F.J.M. Farley *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93** (2004) 052001.
- [20] H. Päs, M. Hirsh, H.V. Klapdor-Kleingrothaus, and S.G. Kovalenko, Phys. Lett. **B453**
(1999) 194;
J. Vergados, Phys. Rep **C361** (2002) 1.
- [21] T.G. Rizzo, Phys. Lett. **B116** (1982) 23;
D. London, G. Belanger, and J.N. Ng, Phys. Lett. **B188** (1987) 155.
- [22] Y. Kuno and Y. Okada, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73** (2001) 151.
- [23] Particle Data Group, Phys. Lett. **B592** (2004) 409.