Analysis of NuFIT Best-fit points

Sho Iwamoto

1 Notation

Masses   We introduce the following notations on the two heavier neutrino masses[*1] M_I and the three lighter neutrino masses m_i, one of which is zero, as

$$\Delta M := M_2 - M_1 > 0 \qquad\qquad \delta M := \Delta M/M_1$$
$$\Delta M^2 := M_2^2 - M_1^2 \qquad\qquad \delta M^2 := \Delta M^2/M_1^2$$
$$\Delta m := m_{\text{heavier}} - m_{\text{lighter}} \qquad \rho_m := \Delta m/m_{\text{tot}}, \qquad\qquad m_{\text{tot}} := \sum_i m_i,$$
$$m_{\text{heavier}} = m_3\ (m_2), \qquad\qquad m_{\text{lighter}} = m_2\ (m_1) \qquad \text{for NH (IH).}$$

Numerically, for BFP of NH (IH), $\rho_m \simeq \sqrt{0.5}\ (0.0075)$ and $m_{\text{tot}} \simeq 5.9\ (9.9) \times 10^{-11}\,\text{GeV}$.

Yukawa   Yukawa matrix follows the notation of 1611 paper, and the CIP is given by

$$y = \mathrm{i}(v/\sqrt{2})^{-1}\sqrt{M_{\text{diag}}}R\sqrt{m_{\text{diag}}}U^\dagger \tag{1.1}$$

with $v = \sqrt{\langle\phi_0\rangle} \approx 246\,\text{GeV}$,

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & +\mathrm{c}_z & \zeta\mathrm{s}_z \\ 0 & -\mathrm{s}_z & \zeta\mathrm{c}_z \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for NH,} \qquad\qquad R = \begin{pmatrix} +\mathrm{c}_z & \zeta\mathrm{s}_z & 0 \\ -\mathrm{s}_z & \zeta\mathrm{c}_z & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{for IH.} \tag{1.2}$$

Here, $z \in \mathbb{C}$ and $\zeta = \pm 1$:
$$z = w + \mathrm{i}x; \qquad w \in \mathbb{R}, \quad x \in \mathbb{R}, \tag{1.3}$$
and $U = U_{\text{PMNS}}$ follows 1611 paper, i.e., PDG with a phase matrix $\text{diag}(1, \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}\sigma}, 1)$.

$$\gamma_I = \frac{(yy^\dagger)_{II}}{8\pi}, \qquad\qquad \Gamma_I = M_I\gamma_I.$$

Yukawa products   We define

$$W_1 = W_{11} = \cosh 2x - \rho_m \cos 2w, \qquad W_{12} = W_{21}^* = \mathrm{i}\sinh 2x + \rho_m \sin 2w,$$
$$W_2 = W_{22} = \cosh 2x + \rho_m \cos 2w, \qquad \mu_I = \frac{m_{\text{tot}}M_I}{8\pi v^2} \approx 3.9\ (6.5) \times 10^{-17}M_I/\text{GeV},$$

for NH (IH), which leads us to

$$(yy^\dagger)_{IJ} = \frac{m_{\text{tot}}\sqrt{M_I M_J}}{v^2}W_{IJ}, \qquad\qquad \Gamma_I = \frac{(yy^\dagger)_{II}}{8\pi}M_I = \mu_I W_I M_I. \tag{1.4}$$

[*1]We can safely neglect the differences between M_I and the (diagonalized) Majorana masses.

Effective neutrino masses   Remembering that m_i is given by

$$m_i = \left[U^* \left(-\frac{v^2}{2} y^{\mathrm{T}} M^{-1} y \right) U \right]_{ii} = U^*_{i\alpha} \left(-\frac{v^2}{2} \sum_I \frac{y_{I\alpha} y_{I\beta}}{M_I} \right) U_{\beta i}, \tag{1.5}$$

we define

$$\widetilde{m_I} := \frac{v^2}{2} \sum_\alpha \frac{|y_{I\alpha}|^2}{M_I} = \frac{v^2}{2} \frac{(yy^\dagger)_{II}}{M_I}, \qquad m_* := 1.66\sqrt{g_*} \frac{8\pi(v^2/2)}{M_{\mathrm{pl}}} \sim 1 \times 10^{-12}\,\mathrm{GeV}. \tag{1.6}$$

Note that these effective neutrino masses are related to

$$\widetilde{m_I} = \frac{m_{\mathrm{tot}}}{2} W_I. \tag{1.7}$$

2 Neutrino-option condition

The neutrino-option condition is given by, matching at $Q_0 = M_1\,\mathrm{e}^{-3/4}$,

$$\mu^2_{\mathrm{EFT}}(Q_0) = \frac{M_1^2}{16\pi^2}\,\mathrm{Tr}(yy^\dagger). \tag{2.1}$$

Defining

$$f(M_1) := \frac{8\pi^2 v^2 \cdot \mu^2_{\mathrm{EFT}}(Q_0)}{M_1^3}\bigg|_{Q=M_1 \exp(-3/4)}, \tag{2.2}$$

we can rewrite the neutrino-option condition as

$$f(M_1) = \frac{v^2}{2} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(yy^\dagger)}{M_1}. \tag{2.3}$$

The right-hand side is parameterized as[*2]

$$\frac{v^2}{2} \frac{\mathrm{Tr}(yy^\dagger)}{M_1} = m_{\mathrm{tot}} \left[\cosh 2x + \frac{\delta M}{2}(\cosh 2x + \rho_m \cos 2w) \right] > m_{\mathrm{tot}}. \tag{2.4}$$

Therefore, the neutrino-option condition gives a constraint

$$f(M_1) > m_{\mathrm{tot}}. \tag{2.5}$$

This is translated to an upper bound on M_1, which is

$$M_1 < 9.4\ (7.9) \times 10^6\,\mathrm{GeV} \quad \text{for NH (IH)} \tag{2.6}$$

Meanwhile, for $M_1 \ll 10^7\,\mathrm{GeV}$, we can fulfill the neutrino-option condition with

$$\cosh 2x \simeq \frac{f(M_1)}{m_{\mathrm{tot}}}. \tag{2.7}$$

For example, for $M_1 = 4\ (1) \times 10^6\,\mathrm{GeV}$, the condition is satisfied with $\cosh 2x \sim 10\ (1000)$.

[*2]Notice that $\cosh 2x = (\widetilde{m_1} + \widetilde{m_2})/m_{\mathrm{tot}}$, where $\widetilde{m_I}$ is an effective neutrino parameter.

3 Leptogenesis

The resulting lepton asymmetry is approximately given by

$$\delta\eta_l \simeq \sum_\alpha \frac{\sum_I \epsilon_{I\alpha}}{D_\alpha}, \tag{3.1}$$

where

$$\epsilon_{I\alpha} = F_{I\alpha} f_{IJ}^{\text{vertex}} + \left(F_{I\alpha} + \frac{M_I}{M_J} F'_{I\alpha}\right)(f_{IJ}^{\text{osc}} + f_{IJ}^{\text{mix}}), \qquad D_\alpha := K_\alpha^{\text{eff}} \min(z_c, z_\alpha). \tag{3.2}$$

For the numerator, we introduced

$$F_{I\alpha} := \left.\frac{\text{Im}\left[y_{I\alpha} y^*_{J\alpha} (yy^\dagger)_{IJ}\right]}{(yy^\dagger)_{II}(yy^\dagger)_{JJ}}\right|_{J=3-I}, \qquad\qquad F'_{I\alpha} := \left.\frac{\text{Im}\left[y_{I\alpha} y^*_{J\alpha} (yy^\dagger)_{JI}\right]}{(yy^\dagger)_{II}(yy^\dagger)_{JJ}}\right|_{J=3-I},$$

$$f_{IJ}^{\text{vertex}} := \frac{\Gamma_J}{M_I}\left[1 - \left(1 + \frac{M_J^2}{M_I^2}\right)\ln\left(1 + \frac{M_I^2}{M_J^2}\right)\right], \quad f_{IJ}^{\text{mix}} := \frac{R_{IJ}}{1 + R_{IJ}^2}, \quad f_{IJ}^{\text{osc}} := \frac{R_{IJ}}{1 + \rho_{\text{osc}} R_{IJ}^2},$$

$$R_{IJ} := \frac{M_I \Gamma_J}{M_I^2 - M_J^2}, \qquad\qquad \rho_{\text{osc}} = \left(\frac{M_J}{M_I} + \frac{\Gamma_I}{\Gamma_J}\right)\frac{\det\left[\text{Re}(yy^\dagger)\right]}{(yy^\dagger)_{11}(yy^\dagger)_{22}}.$$

while, for the denominator,

$$z_\alpha = 1.25 \log 25 K_\alpha^{\text{eff}}, \qquad\qquad z_c = \frac{M_1}{149\,\text{GeV}}, \qquad\qquad K_\alpha^{\text{eff}} = \kappa_\alpha \sum_I \frac{\Gamma_I}{H_N} \frac{|y_{I\alpha}|^2}{(yy^\dagger)_{II}}.$$

3.1 Numerator

In this subsection, we assume

- the contribution from vertex corrections is negligible,

- $\mu_1, \mu_2 \ll \delta M \ll 1$,

which we should discuss elsewhere (but SI checks the validity). Due to the second assumption, we expand the expressions in terms of μ_I, not of δM.

The numerator is simplified as

$$\sum_I \epsilon_{I\alpha} \simeq \sum_I \epsilon_{I\alpha}^{\cancel{\text{vertex}}} = \left(F_{I\alpha} + \frac{M_I}{M_J} F'_{I\alpha}\right)(f_{IJ}^{\text{osc}} + f_{IJ}^{\text{mix}}), \tag{3.3}$$

and, defining

$$f_{IJ} := f_{IJ}^{\text{mix}} + f_{IJ}^{\text{osc}}, \qquad\qquad F_\alpha^\pm := (F_{2\alpha} + F'_{2\alpha}) \pm (F_{1\alpha} + F'_{1\alpha}), \tag{3.4}$$

we evaluate

$$\sum_I \epsilon_{I\alpha}^{\text{vertex}} = \left(F_{I\alpha} + \frac{M_I}{M_J} F'_{I\alpha} \right) (f_{IJ}^{\text{osc}} + f_{IJ}^{\text{mix}}). \tag{3.5}$$

$$= \frac{f_{21} - f_{12}}{2} F_\alpha^- + \left(\frac{M_1 - M_2}{M_2} F'_{1\alpha} f_{12} + \frac{M_2 - M_1}{M_1} F'_{2\alpha} f_{21} \right), \tag{3.6}$$

where we used $F_\alpha^+ = 0$. Expanding in terms of μ_I (but not in δM),

$$\begin{aligned}
\sum_I \epsilon_{I\alpha}^{\text{vertex}} &= \left[\frac{M_1 M_2}{M_2^2 - M_1^2} (W_1 \mu_1 + W_2 \mu_2) + \mathcal{O}(\mu_I^3) \right] F_\alpha^- \\
&+ \left(\frac{2 M_1 \mu_2 W_2 F'_{1\alpha} + 2 M_2 \mu_1 W_1 F'_{2\alpha}}{M_1 + M_2} + \mathcal{O}(\mu_I^3) \right).
\end{aligned} \tag{3.7}$$

The remaining parts are evaluated as

$$F_\alpha^- = \frac{4 \operatorname{Re}(yy^\dagger)_{12} \operatorname{Im}(y_{1\alpha}^* y_{2\alpha})}{(yy^\dagger)_{11} (yy^\dagger)_{22}} \tag{3.8}$$

$$= \frac{4 \operatorname{Re} W_{12}}{W_1 W_2} \operatorname{Im} \left[\frac{2}{m_{\text{tot}}} \sum_{ij} R_{2i} \sqrt{m_i} (U^\dagger)_{i\alpha} U_{\alpha j} \sqrt{m_j} (R^\dagger)_{j1} \right] \tag{3.9}$$

$$= \frac{4 \operatorname{Re} W_{12}}{W_1 W_2} \left(G_\alpha^{(2)} \zeta \cosh 2x - G_\alpha^{(1)} \sinh 2x \right), \tag{3.10}$$

where

$$G_\alpha^{(1)} = \sum_i \frac{m_i}{m_{\text{tot}}} |U_{\alpha i}|^2, \qquad G_\alpha^{(2)} = \begin{cases} \left(2\sqrt{m_2 m_3}/m_{\text{tot}} \right) \operatorname{Im} \left(U_{\alpha 2} U_{\alpha 3}^* \right) & \text{(NH)} \\ \left(2\sqrt{m_1 m_2}/m_{\text{tot}} \right) \operatorname{Im} \left(U_{\alpha 1} U_{\alpha 2}^* \right) & \text{(IH)} \end{cases} \tag{3.11}$$

Note that $G_\alpha^{(1)} \geq |G_\alpha^{(2)}| \geq 0$. Also, for the sub-leading term,

$$F'_{I\alpha} = \frac{2}{m_{\text{tot}}} \sum_{i,j} \frac{\operatorname{Im} \left[W_{JI} \cdot R_{Ii} \sqrt{m_i} (U^\dagger)_{i\alpha} U_{\alpha j} \sqrt{m_j} (R^\dagger)_{jJ} W_{JI} \right]}{W_1 W_2}, \tag{3.12}$$

which however is not used hereafter.

3.2 Denominator

Now we are to evaluate

$$K_\alpha^{\text{eff}} = \kappa_\alpha \sum_I \frac{\Gamma_I}{H_N} \frac{|y_{I\alpha}|^2}{(yy^\dagger)_{II}} = \frac{\kappa_\alpha}{8\pi H_N} \sum_I \frac{2 M_I^2}{v^2} \sum_{i,j} \left[R_{Ii} \sqrt{m_i} (U^\dagger)_{i\alpha} U_{\alpha j} \sqrt{m_j} (R^\dagger)_{jI} \right], \tag{3.13}$$

where we can assume $M_1 \simeq M_2$ since μ_I does not appear in this expression. Hence,

$$K_\alpha^{\text{eff}} \approx \frac{\kappa_\alpha}{8\pi H_N} \frac{2 M_1^2}{v^2} \sum_{I,i,j} \left[R_{Ii} \sqrt{m_i} (U^\dagger)_{i\alpha} U_{\alpha j} \sqrt{m_j} (R^\dagger)_{jI} \right] \tag{3.14}$$

$$= \frac{\kappa_\alpha}{8\pi H_N} \frac{2 M_1^2}{v^2} \sum_{i,j} \left[U_{\alpha j} \sqrt{m_j} (R^\dagger R)_{ji} \sqrt{m_i} (U^\dagger)_{i\alpha} \right] \tag{3.15}$$

$$= \frac{\kappa_\alpha m_{\text{tot}}}{m_*} \left(G_\alpha^{(1)} \cosh 2x - G_\alpha^{(2)} \zeta \sinh 2x \right). \tag{3.16}$$

4

3.3 Result

We now have a simple analytic expression for $\delta\eta_l$ under the assumptions

- vertex contribution is negligible,

- $\mu_1, \mu_2 \ll \delta M \ll 1$,

- the term in the second line of Eq. 3.7 is negligible:

with $z_* = \min(z_c, z_\alpha)$,

$$\delta\eta_l \simeq -\sum_\alpha \frac{1}{\kappa_\alpha z_*} \frac{M_1 M_2}{M_2^2 - M_1^2} \frac{m_*}{m_{\text{tot}}} \frac{4(W_1\mu_1 + W_2\mu_2)\operatorname{Re}W_{12}}{W_1 W_2} \frac{G_\alpha^{(1)}\tanh 2x - \zeta G_\alpha^{(2)}}{G_\alpha^{(1)} - \zeta G_\alpha^{(2)}\tanh 2x} \qquad (3.17)$$

$$= -\sum_\alpha \frac{1}{\kappa_\alpha z_*} \frac{M_2}{M_2 - M_1} \frac{m_* M_1}{8\pi v^2} \frac{4\rho_m \cosh 2x \sin 2w}{\cosh^2 2x - \rho_m^2 \cos^2 2w} \left(1 + \frac{\rho_m \cos 2w}{2\cosh 2x}\delta' M\right) G_\alpha, \qquad (3.18)$$

where $\delta' M := 2\Delta M/(M_1 + M_2) \simeq \delta M$. Here, the PMNS-matrix dependence is contained in

$$G_\alpha := \frac{G_\alpha^{(1)}\tanh 2x - \zeta G_\alpha^{(2)}}{G_\alpha^{(1)} - \zeta G_\alpha^{(2)}\tanh 2x}. \qquad (3.19)$$

4 (a few) Discussion

4.1 Hierarchy

Let us evaluate the factors $G_\alpha^{(a)}$ at the NuFIT 4.0 best-fit points. For normal hierarchy,

$$G_\alpha^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.208 \\ 0.729 \\ 0.633 \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_\alpha^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} -0.0334 & -0.0477 \\ +0.0194 & +0.0314 \\ +0.0140 & -0.0266 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \cos\sigma \\ \sin\sigma \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \rho_m \\ m_{\text{tot}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.708 \\ 5.89\times 10^{-2}\,\text{eV} \end{pmatrix}$$

and for inverted hierarchy,

$$G_\alpha^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.685 \\ 0.459 \\ 0.533 \end{pmatrix}, \quad G_\alpha^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -0.452 \\ +0.0720 & +0.193 \\ -0.0720 & 0.259 \end{pmatrix}\begin{pmatrix} \cos\sigma \\ \sin\sigma \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \rho_m \\ m_{\text{tot}} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.00746 \\ 9.95\times 10^{-2}\,\text{eV} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Note that the leptogenesis works better in normal hierarchy due to the larger ρ_m,

4.2 Strict lower bound

Let us derive an analytic upper bound $\overline{\delta\eta_l}$, where the absolute value of analytic expression (3.18) is always smaller than it. Since $\sin 2w/(\cosh^2 2x - \rho_m^2 \cos^2 2w)$ is maximal for $w = \pi/4$,

$$\overline{\delta\eta_l} = \frac{1}{z_*} \frac{M_2}{M_2 - M_1} \frac{m_* M_1}{8\pi v^2} \frac{4\rho_m}{\cosh 2x} \left(1 + \frac{\rho_m \cos 2w}{2\cosh 2x} \delta' M\right) \sum_\alpha \frac{G_\alpha}{\kappa_\alpha}, \tag{4.1}$$

$$= \frac{1}{z_*} \frac{M_2}{M_2 - M_1} \frac{2.81 M_1 \rho_m}{10^{18}\,\text{GeV} \cdot \cosh 2x} \left(1 + \frac{\rho_m \cos 2w}{2\cosh 2x} \delta' M\right) \sum_\alpha \frac{G_\alpha}{\kappa_\alpha}. \tag{4.2}$$

Thus, assuming $M_1 \gg 10^{10}\,\text{GeV}$, we require $\delta M \ll 1$:

$$\overline{\delta\eta_l} \simeq \frac{1}{z_* \delta M} \frac{2.81 M_1 \rho_m}{10^{18}\,\text{GeV}} \sum_\alpha \frac{G_\alpha}{\kappa_\alpha \cosh 2x}. \tag{4.3}$$

We can numerically maximize $\sum_\alpha G_\alpha / \cosh 2x$ for x; around the best-fit point, its maximum value is ~ 1.5 for both hierarchies. Therefore, to get $\delta\eta_l \sim 3 \times 10^{-8}$, we need

$$\frac{M_1}{\delta M} \sim 2 \times 10^{10}\,\text{GeV} \quad (2 \times 10^{12}\,\text{GeV}) \tag{4.4}$$

for NH (IH) if G_α has no special cancellation.

4.3 With neutrino option

In Section 2, we saw that the neutrino-option condition is satisfied even for smaller M_1 with huge $\cosh 2x$:

$$\cosh 2x \simeq \frac{f(M_1)}{m_{\text{tot}}} = \frac{8\pi^2 v^2 \mu_{\text{EFT}}^2(Q_0)}{M_1^3 m_{\text{tot}}} \approx \frac{4.8 \times 10^{10}\,\text{GeV}^4}{M_1^3 m_{\text{tot}}} \tag{4.5}$$

This equality is precise for smaller δM, which we need to have an adequate $\delta\eta_l$:

$$\overline{\delta\eta_l} \simeq \frac{3 \times 10^{-8}}{z_*} \left(\frac{M_1/(\delta M)^{1/4}}{5.9 \times 10^7\,\text{GeV} \quad (1.6 \times 10^8\,\text{GeV})}\right)^4 \sum_\alpha \frac{G_\alpha}{\kappa_\alpha}\Big|_{\cosh 2x \text{ for n.o.}}. \tag{4.6}$$

Or, using the upper-bound value of M_1,

$$\overline{\delta\eta_l} \simeq \frac{3 \times 10^{-8}}{z_*} \left(\frac{M_1}{9.4 \times 10^6\,\text{GeV}}\right)^4 \frac{6.3 \times 10^{-4}}{\delta M} \sum_\alpha \frac{G_\alpha}{\kappa_\alpha}\Big|_{\cosh 2x \text{ for n.o.}}. \tag{4.7}$$

for NH and

$$\overline{\delta\eta_l} \simeq \frac{3 \times 10^{-8}}{z_*} \left(\frac{M_1}{7.9 \times 10^6\,\text{GeV}}\right)^4 \frac{5.6 \times 10^{-6}}{\delta M} \sum_\alpha \frac{G_\alpha}{\kappa_\alpha}\Big|_{\cosh 2x \text{ for n.o.}}. \tag{4.8}$$

for IH; therefore, for IH, we need a special cancellation in δM or G_α.[*3]

[*3] One may also notice that $G_\alpha \to 1$ for $\cosh 2x \gg 1$.

6