

Fakultät Physik Theoretische Physik III

Philipp Leser (TU Dortmund)

Discrete flavor symmetries and geometrical **CP** violation

I. de Medeiros Varzielas, D. Emmanuel-Costa, PL arXiv:1204.3633

Philipp Leser | FLASY12, Dortmund



#### **Discrete symmetries**

- Prominently and effectively used to explain masses and mixings of neutrinos, charged leptons and quarks.
- Can also be used to generate CP violation in a similar manner!
- Have looked at Δ(27) and Δ(54) symmetric Lagrangians to achieve that.



### CP violation from scalars

- Start with a CP-conserving Lagrangian.
- Break CP through VEVs of scalar fields that break the gauge symmetry spontaneously (SCPV).
- Geometrical CP violation (GCPV):
  - CP phases emerge from symmetry structure of scalar sector rather than arbitrary parameters.
  - Phases are calculable.



# GCPV from $\Delta(27)$

The groups  $\Delta(3n^2)$  are non-Abelian subgroups of SU(3).  $(\Delta(3) = Z_3, \Delta(12) \simeq A_4)$ 

$$\Delta(3n^2) \sim (Z_n \times Z_n) \rtimes Z_3$$

- Three generators:
- a, with  $a^3 = 1$ , generating  $Z_3$ .
- c, d, with  $c^n = d^n = 1$  and cd = dc, generating  $Z_3 \times Z_3$ .
- 2 triplets, 9 singlets.



### The scalar potential

 $H=(H^1, H^2, H^3) \in \mathbf{3}_{01}$  $H^{\dagger} \in \mathbf{3}_{02}$ 

Renormalizable potential invariant under  $\Delta(27)$ :

$$V_{\text{ren}} = H^{i}H^{\dagger}_{i} + (H^{i}H^{\dagger}_{i})(H^{j}H^{\dagger}_{j}) +$$
  
sum over indices  
 $\rightarrow Z_{3} \text{ structure}$   
 $(H^{i}H^{\dagger}_{i}H^{i}H^{\dagger}_{i}) + C_{\theta} \left[ \sum_{i \neq j \neq k} (H^{i})^{2}H^{\dagger}_{j}H^{\dagger}_{k} + \text{h.c.} \right]$ 

We parametrize VEVs as

$$\langle H^1 \rangle = v_1 e^{i\phi_1} \quad \langle H^2 \rangle = v_2 e^{i\phi_2} \quad \langle H^3 \rangle = v_3 e^{i\phi_3}$$



Minimization	$\begin{matrix} v_i^n \\ v_i^m v_j^n \\ u_i^l u_m^m u_n^n \end{matrix}$	+ (1, 1, 1) (0, 0, 1) (0	- (0, 0, 1) (0, 1, 1) (1, 1, 1)
	$v_1^l v_2^m v_3^n$	(0,0,1)/(0,1,1)	(1, 1, 1)

Minimizing the potential gives classes of VEVs:

$$\langle H \rangle = \frac{v}{\sqrt{3}} (1, \omega, \omega^2) \qquad \langle H \rangle = \frac{v}{\sqrt{3}} (\omega^2, 1, 1) \\ \omega \equiv e^{2\pi i/3}$$

Phases due to discrete symmetry  $\rightarrow$  geometrical

Also allowed: cyclic permutations or swapping of powers.



### Stability of the solutions

- For improved fermion mass structures, higher order terms might be needed in the Lagrangian.
- Thus, higher order terms cannot be avoided in the scalar potential.
- Do the solutions including the calculable phases hold at higher orders?



### Stability of the solutions

There are three types of phase independent terms in the invariants that favor different VEVs:

$$(H^{1}H_{1}^{\dagger})^{2} + c.p.$$
  

$$(H^{1}H_{1}^{\dagger})(H^{2}H_{2}^{\dagger}) + c.p.$$
  

$$(H^{1}H_{1}^{\dagger})(H^{2}H_{2}^{\dagger})(H^{3}H_{3}^{\dagger}) \leftarrow \text{appears at order 6}$$

Potential can be sorted in terms of these expressions.



(H301 ⊗ H301) ⊗ (H302 ⊗ H302), ((H301 ⊗ (H301 ⊗ H301)) ⊗ H302 ⊗ H302 ⊗ H302), (H301 ⊗ H302) ⊗ (H301 ⊗ H302), (((H301 ⊗ H301) ⊗ H302) ⊗ H301 ⊗ H302 ⊗ H302),  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301)$   $(H301 \otimes H302 \otimes H301 \otimes H301 \otimes H302 \otimes H302)$ ,  $(H302 \otimes H301 \otimes H301 \otimes H301 \otimes H302 \otimes H302),$  $(((H302 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes H302) \otimes H301 \otimes H302),$  $((H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes H301 \otimes H302),$  $(H302 \otimes H302 \otimes H301 \otimes H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes H302)),$  $(H302 \otimes H301 \otimes H302 \otimes H301 \otimes H302 \otimes H301),$  $(H302 \otimes H301 \otimes H301 \otimes H302 \otimes H302 \otimes H301)$ 

- Use multiplication rules to expand these expressions.
- Filter for invariants.
- Sort them in a useful way!
- Great simplification:
  - Order 6: 110  $\rightarrow$  34
  - Order 8: 1066  $\rightarrow$  75

 $((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes ((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)),$  $(H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)),$  $(H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes ((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302))),$  $(H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $(H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H301 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302))),$  $(((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301)), (((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302))) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302))) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302))),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H302 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301))),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (((((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H301) \otimes H302) \otimes H302),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes ((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes ((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes ((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes ((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes ((H301 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H302)),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$ (H301 ⊗ H302) ⊗ (H302 ⊗ H301) ⊗ (H302 ⊗ H301) ⊗ (H302 ⊗ H301),  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes (H302 \otimes H301) \otimes ((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes ((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)) \otimes (H301 \otimes H302),$ (H301 ⊗ H302) ⊗ ((H302 ⊗ H302) ⊗ (H301 ⊗ H301)) ⊗ (H302 ⊗ H301).  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes ((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes H301) \otimes (H302 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301)),$  $(H301 \otimes H302) \otimes ((H302 \otimes H302) \otimes H302) \otimes (H301 \otimes (H301 \otimes H301))$ 



#### Stability of the solutions



- (1, 1, 1) and (0, 0, 1) appear naturally due to the dominance of  $v_i^n$ .
- Other VEVs need fine-tuning of the parameters.



▶  $v_i^n$  (+) and  $v_1^l v_2^m v_3^n$  (-) work together to easily produce (1, 1, 1).  $\vee v_i^n$  (+) overpowers  $v_1^l v_2^m v_3^n$  (+), even though  $v_i^n$  coefficient is numerically much

smaller.

Reverse sign to get (0, 0, 1).







#### Phase dependent terms

At renormalizable order one phase combination:  $\Delta_1 = 2 \Delta_2 + \Delta_2 + \Delta_3$ 

$$\Theta_i \equiv -2\varphi_i + \varphi_j + \varphi_k$$
 (-) favors (1,  $\omega$ ,  $\omega^2$ )

At higher orders, additional patterns arise:

$$\theta_i^n \equiv -2n\phi_i + n\phi_j + n\phi_k$$

$$\eta_i^n \equiv 3n\phi_i - 3n\phi_j + 0\phi_k$$

suppressed by higher scale

If one is willing to choose appropriate signs, VEVs with calculable phases can be preserved to arbitrarily high order.



# Conclusion

- Δ(27) and Δ(54) can lead to a scalar sector with VEVs that have geometrical phases determined by the symmetry.
- We have classified the possible invariants and reordered them in a way that greatly reduces the number of relevant parameters.
- All terms appearing at higher orders can be classified into groups according to their effect on the VEVs.
- The geometrical phases can be naturally preserved to arbitrarily high order.





### Group generators

$$a = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \qquad \begin{array}{l} 2 \text{ triplets} \\ \eta \equiv e^{2\pi i/n} \\ c = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^l & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta^k & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \eta^{-k-l} \end{pmatrix} \\ d = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^{-k-l} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \eta^l & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \eta^k \end{pmatrix}$$

9 singlets  $a = \omega^r$  $c = d = \omega^s$ 



# $(1, \omega, \omega^2)$ is not CP-violating

- If the VEV is self-conjugate, it does not violate CP:
- Moreover, consider this transformation:

$$U\left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array}\right) = \left(\begin{array}{c} \\ \end{array}\right)^*$$

- If U is a symmetry of the Lagrangian, the VEV is not CP-violating either. This applies to (1, ω, ω<sup>2</sup>), because U is one of the generators.
- The VEV (1, 1,  $\omega$ ) does not have this problem.