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We study the phenomenological implications of the presence of two zeros in a magic neutrino mass matrix. We find that only two such patterns of the neutrino mass matrix are experimentally acceptable. We express all the neutrino observables as functions of one unknown parameter \( \theta_{13} \) and two known parameters \( \Delta m^2_{12}, r = \Delta m^2_{12}/\Delta m^2_{23} \). In particular, we find \( \sin^2 2\theta_{13} = (2/3)r/(1 + r) \). We also present a mass model for the allowed textures based upon the group \( A_4 \) using type I+II seesaw mechanism.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The observation of non-zero reactor mixing angle \( \theta_{13} \) \(^1\) was an important landmark in neutrino physics as it excluded the possibility of the \( \mu - \tau \) symmetry \(^2\) as an exact symmetry of the neutrino mass matrix. Before this discovery, the tri-bimaximal (TBM) mixing \(^3\) was an important feature in the neutrino mass models as it correctly predicted the solar mixing angle \( \theta_{13} \) and the atmospheric mixing angle \( \theta_{23} \). TBM mixing was thought to be a signature of some flavor symmetry in the Lagrangian that expresses itself as a residual symmetry in the neutrino mass matrix. However, TBM mixing is in itself a combination of the following two symmetries:

1. **Magic symmetry**. The sum of elements in any row or column of the neutrino mass matrix is identical \(^4\).

2. **\( \mu - \tau \) symmetry**. The neutrino mass matrix remains invariant after the interchange of the \( \mu - \tau \) indices \(^5\).

The neutrino mass matrix with \( \mu - \tau \) symmetry implies a vanishing value of \( \theta_{13} \) and a maximal value of \( \theta_{23} \). Such a mass matrix has bi-maximal eigenvector \( v = (0 \quad -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})^T \). After the measurement of a relatively large value of \( \theta_{13} \), the neutrino mass matrix cannot have exact \( \mu - \tau \) symmetry. However, the neutrino mass matrix can still have the magic symmetry. The corresponding mixing pattern, called trimaximal (TM) mixing, has its middle column identical to that of TBM mixing. The other two columns are arbitrary within the unitarity constraints. TM mixing has been intensively studied in the literature \(^6\) and corresponding magic mass matrix has been realized in many neutrino mass models \(^7\). The main limitation of the magic symmetry is that it is not much predictive. It predicts TM mixing that implies two sum-rules: one between the mixing angles \( \theta_{12} \) and \( \theta_{13} \) and another between the mixing angle \( \theta_{23} \) and the CP violating Dirac phase \( \delta \). To make the magic symmetry more predictive, we can combine it with some additional constraint. The simplest constraint that could combine with magic symmetry was the \( \mu - \tau \) symmetry. But, the observation of a non-vanishing \( \theta_{13} \) has already ruled out this possibility. Another constraint can be the presence of zeros \(^8\) in the magic neutrino mass matrix. In this work, we study this possibility.

In Section II we highlight the salient features of TBM mixing pattern and review its relation with TM mixing. We identify the phenomenologically allowed textures of two zeros in the magic neutrino mass matrix in Section III. Then, we study the phenomenology of the viable textures in Section IV and construct a mass model for them in Section V. Finally, we conclude in section VI.

II. FROM TBM TO TM MIXING

TBM mixing matrix is

\[
U_{TBM} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}.
\]

It is called the tri-bimaximal mixing matrix because the corresponding neutrino mass matrix

\[
M_{TBM} = U_{TBM}^* M_{\text{diag}} U_{TBM}^T
\]

has a trimaximal eigenvector \( u = (\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}})^T \) and a bimaximal eigenvector \( v = (0 \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \quad \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}})^T \). Here,

\[
M_{\text{diag}} = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2i\alpha} m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{2i\beta} m_3 \end{pmatrix},
\]

\(^1\) arXiv:1607.08328v2 [hep-ph] 24 Aug 2016
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where \( m_1, m_2, \) and \( m_3 \) are the three neutrino masses and \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are two Majorana phases. TBM mass matrix \( M_{\text{TBM}} \) is invariant under the transformations \( G_u \) and \( G_v \); i.e. \( G_u^T M_{\text{TBM}} G_u = M_{\text{TBM}} \) and \( G_v^T M_{\text{TBM}} G_v = M_{\text{TBM}} \) where \( G_u = 1 - 2 u u^T \) and \( G_v = 1 - 2 v v^T \). The transformation \( G_u \) corresponds to the magic symmetry and the transformation \( G_v \) corresponds to the \( \mu - \tau \) symmetry. A diagonal charged lepton mass matrix will be invariant under the transformation \( F = \text{diag}(1,\omega,\omega^2) \) where \( \omega = \exp(\frac{2\pi i}{3}) \). In this way, the combined symmetry group generated by \( G_u, G_v \) and \( F \) is \( S_4 \) [10]. Such neutrino mass models, where some of the generators of a symmetry group are directly preserved in the lepton sector, are called direct models. Other set of models, where the observed symmetry in the lepton sector emerges accidentally, are called indirect models. For detailed discussion of this classification, see the references [11, 12].

Since the neutrino oscillation experiments have measured a non-zero \( \theta_{13} \), the neutrino mass matrix \( M_\nu \) cannot be invariant under the \( \mu - \tau \) symmetry transformation \( G_v \). However, \( M_\nu \) can still be invariant under the magic symmetry transformation \( G_u \). The magic symmetry is still allowed experimentally. The mixing matrix corresponding to the magic symmetry is called trimaximal mixing (TM) and is given by

\[
U_{\text{TM}} = \begin{pmatrix}
\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \cos \theta & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} e^{-i \theta} \\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} e^{-i \phi} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} e^{-i \phi} \\
-\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} e^{-i \phi} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} e^{i \phi}
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(4)

Since, the middle column of TM mixing matrix is fixed to its TBM value \( (u) \), the mixing matrix still has two free parameters (\( \theta \) and \( \phi \)) after the unitarity constraints are taken into account. The corresponding neutrino mass matrix for TM mixing is called the magic mass matrix and is given as

\[
M_{\text{magic}} = U_{\text{TM}}^* M_{\text{diag}} U_{\text{TM}}^T.
\]

(5)

### III. ZEROS OF THE MAGIC MASS MATRIX

In the basis where the charged lepton mass matrix is diagonal, there are seven mass matrices with two zeros [7, 8] that are consistent with the current experimental data [13]. They have been further classified in the three classes which have been depicted in Table I. When we combine the magic symmetry and the texture zeros, not all of the seven textures will be allowed.

A most general magic mass matrix can be parameterized as [4]

\[
M_{\text{magic}} = \begin{pmatrix}
a & b & c \\
b & d & a + c - d \\
a + c - d & b - c + d
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(6)

We can obtain the constraining equations for the various allowed textures of two zeros in the magic mass matrix by substituting the respective constraints from Table I in Eq. (6).

| Type | Constraining Equations |
|------|------------------------|
| A1   | \( M_{ee} = 0, M_{\mu\mu} = 0 \) |
| A2   | \( M_{ee} = 0, M_{\tau\tau} = 0 \) |
| B1   | \( M_{\tau\tau} = 0, M_{\mu\mu} = 0 \) |
| B2   | \( M_{\mu\mu} = 0, M_{\tau\tau} = 0 \) |
| B3   | \( M_{\ell\ell} = 0, M_{\mu\mu} = 0 \) |
| B4   | \( M_{\ell\ell} = 0, M_{\tau\tau} = 0 \) |
| C    | \( M_{\mu\mu} = 0, M_{\tau\tau} = 0 \) |

(7)

### TABLE I. Seven allowed mass matrices with two zeros classified into three classes.

A. Class A

Magic neutrino mass matrices having textures \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) can be expressed as

\[
M_{A_1} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & c \\
0 & d & c - d \\
c & c - d & c + d
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(7)

and

\[
M_{A_2} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & b & 0 \\
b & d & -d \\
0 & -d & b + d
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(8)

respectively. The mass matrix for the magic \( A_1 \) texture can be rewritten as

\[
M_{A_1} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & c \\
0 & c - \Delta & \Delta \\
c & \Delta & -\Delta
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(9)

where \( \Delta = c - d \). This redefinition brings our representations of the textures \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) at equal footing. These two magic zero textures are allowed experimentally for normal hierarchy. Their phenomenology is studied in the Section IV.

B. Class B

The four magic mass matrices of class B are

\[
M_{B_1} = \begin{pmatrix}
a & b & 0 \\
b & 0 & a \\
0 & a & b
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(10)

\[
M_{B_2} = \begin{pmatrix}
a & 0 & c \\
c & a & 0 \\
0 & c & a
\end{pmatrix},
\]

(11)
This mass matrix has the transformations translated: one can obtain the predictions for $A$.

Hence, it is not allowed.

$$r = \Delta m_{12}^2 / \Delta m_{23}^2$$

when $\theta_{13}$ is small. We illustrate this tension between $r$ and $\theta_{13}$ for the magic mass matrices of type $B_3$ and $B_4$ in Section IV.

C. Class C

The magic mass matrix of class C is

$$M_{\text{magic}}^C = \begin{pmatrix} a & b & b \\ b & 0 & a+b \\ b & a+b & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$ (14)

This mass matrix has $\mu - \tau$ symmetry and implies $\theta_{13} = 0$. Hence, it is not allowed.

IV. PHENOMENOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The phenomenology of the textures $A_1$ and $A_2$ is related: one can obtain the predictions for $A_2$ by making the transformations

$$\theta_{23} \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2} - \theta_{23}, \delta = \pi - \delta$$ (15)

on the predictions of texture $A_1$. Hence, we study the phenomenological implications for texture $A_1$ only.

The above transformation [Eq. (15)] also relates the predictions for textures $B_3$ and $B_4$. So, we show the incompatibility of the magic mass matrix of type $B_3$ with the experimental data at the end of this section. Then, the Eq. (15) automatically implies that the magic mass matrix of type $B_4$ is also inconsistent with the experimental data.

A. Diagonalization of a magic mass matrix

Any magic mass matrix $M$ can be diagonalized by a trimaximal mixing matrix $U = U_{TM}$ given in Eq. (1) using the relation

$$U^T M U = M_{\text{diag}}$$ (16)

where $M_{\text{diag}}$ is the diagonal mass matrix given by Eq. (3).

The mixing angles can be calculated from $U$ using the relations:

$$s_{12}^2 = \frac{|U_{12}|^2}{1 - |U_{13}|^2}, s_{23}^2 = \frac{|U_{23}|^2}{1 - |U_{13}|^2} \text{ and } s_{13}^2 = |U_{13}|^2.$$ (17)

Substituting the elements of TM mixing matrix in the above equation, we get

$$s_{12}^2 = \frac{1}{3 - 2 \sin^2 \theta},$$ (18)

$$s_{23}^2 = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\sqrt{3} \sin 2\theta \cos \phi}{3 - 2 \sin^2 \theta}\right),$$ (19)

and

$$s_{13}^2 = \frac{2}{3} \sin^2 \theta.$$ (20)

The CP violating phase $\delta$ can be calculated from the Jarlskog rephasing invariant measure of CP violation [14]

$$J = \text{Im}(U_{11} U_{12}^* U_{21} U_{22}^*)$$ (21)

using the relation

$$J = s_{12} s_{23} s_{13} c_{12} c_{23} c_{13}^2 \sin \delta.$$ (22)

Substituting the elements of TM mixing matrix in Eq. [21], we obtain

$$J = \frac{1}{6 \sqrt{3}} \sin 2\theta \cos \phi.$$ (23)

From Eqs. (22) and (23), we get

$$\csc^2 \delta = \csc^2 \phi - \frac{3 \sin^2 2\theta \cot^2 \phi}{(3 - 2 \sin^2 \theta)^2}.$$ (24)

B. Analysis of Class A_1

We reconstruct the magic neutrino mass matrix using the Eq. (5) viz.

$$M_{\nu} = U^* M_{\text{diag}} U$$ (25)

where $M_{\nu} = M_{\text{magic}}$ and $U = U_{TM}$. To obtain the predictions for the neutrino mass matrix of the type $A_1$ given by Eq. (9), we have to solve the two complex equations: $M_{\nu 11} = 0$ and $M_{\nu 12} = 0$. Solving the equation $M_{\nu 11} = 0$, we get

$$\frac{m_1}{m_2} = \frac{\sin 2(\alpha - \beta)}{2 \sin 2\beta \cos^2 \theta}$$ (26)

and

$$\frac{m_2}{m_3} = -\frac{2 \sin 2\beta \sin^2 \theta}{\sin 2\alpha}.$$ (27)
Using these two equations, we evaluate $m_1/m_3$ and invert the resulting relation to obtain
\[
\cot 2\alpha = \cot 2\beta + \frac{m_1}{m_3} \csc 2\beta \cot^2 \theta. \tag{28}
\]

We note that the presence of a zero at (1,1) entry in a magic mass matrix, through Eqs. (26) and (27), imply a beautiful sum-rule on neutrino masses:
\[
\sin 2(\alpha - \beta) - \frac{2 \sin 2\beta}{m_2} - \frac{\sin 2\alpha}{m_3} = 0. \tag{29}
\]
The texture zero at (1,1) entry in a magic mass matrix also gives a nice prediction for the ratio $r = \Delta m^2_{12}/\Delta m^2_{23}$. From Eqs. (26) and (27), we obtain
\[
r = -\frac{\sin^2 2(\alpha - \beta) + 4 \cos^2 \theta \sin^2 2\beta}{\cot^2 \theta \sin^2 2\alpha - 4 \cos^2 \theta \sin^2 2\beta}. \tag{30}
\]

Instead of solving the second equation $M_{\nu_{12}} = 0$, we solve the equivalent complex equation $M\nu_{11} = M\nu_{22}$ by equating the real and imaginary parts of the two sides. After a little algebra, we obtain
\[
m_1/m_3 = \frac{\sqrt{3} \sin 2\beta \tan \theta + \sin(2\beta - \phi)}{\sin \phi} \tag{31}
\]
and
\[
\tan 2\beta = -\frac{\sqrt{3} \sin \phi}{\sqrt{3} \cos 2\theta \cos \phi + \sin 2\theta}. \tag{32}
\]

Using Eq. (31) to simplify Eq. (28), we obtain
\[
\cot 2\alpha = \cot \theta + \frac{\cot \theta \csc \phi}{\sqrt{3}} \tag{33}
\]

Equations (32) and (33) express the two Majorana phases in terms of the two TM parameters ($\theta$ and $\phi$). Substituting these two equation in Eq. (30), we obtain the most important result of this work as
\[
r = \tan^2 \theta. \tag{34}
\]
It is interesting that $r$ comes out to be independent of the phase $\phi$.

We also substitute Eqs. (32) and (33) in the three mass ratios given by Eqs. (26), (31), and (27) to calculate the three neutrino masses. Finally, we express $\theta$ in terms of $r$ everywhere using Eq. (34). Hence, we can express the three neutrino masses in terms of the three parameters: $\Delta m^2_{12}$, $r$ and $\phi$. We obtain
\[
m_1 = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{12}} \sqrt{\frac{1 + 3r + 2\sqrt{3} \sqrt{r} \cos \phi}{3 - 3r - 2\sqrt{3} \sqrt{r} \cos \phi}}, \tag{35}
\]
and
\[
m_3 = \sqrt{\Delta m^2_{12}} \sqrt{\frac{3 + r - 2\sqrt{3} \sqrt{r} \cos \phi}{3 - 3r - 2\sqrt{3} \sqrt{r} \cos \phi}}. \tag{37}
\]

Now, we can use the experimental data $[13]$ for $\Delta m^2_{12}$ and $\Delta m^2_{23}$. Since, $\Delta m^2_{12} = (7.50 \pm 0.18) \times 10^{-5} eV^2$ and $r = (3.149 \pm 0.098) \times 10^{-3}$ $[13]$, the three masses are essentially functions of the phase $\phi$ (Fig. 1). We also depict the sum of the three neutrino masses $\sum_{i=1}^{3} m_i$ as a function of $\phi$ in Fig. 2.

The three mixing angles, calculated from Eqs. (18-20), are
\[
\sin^2 \theta_{12} = \frac{1 + r}{3 + r}, \tag{38}
\]
\[
\sin^2 \theta_{23} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{3} \sqrt{r} \cos \phi}{3 + r}, \tag{39}
\]
and
\[
\sin^2 \theta_{13} = \frac{2r}{3(r + 1)}. \tag{40}
\]

The two mixing angles $\theta_{12}$ and $\theta_{13}$ are functions of $r$ only. Substituting the value of $r$, we obtain $\theta_{12} = 35.67^o \pm 0.01^o$ and $\theta_{13} = 8.20^o \pm 0.12^o$. For comparison, the experimental values are $\theta_{12} = 33.48^o \pm 0.78^o$ and $\theta_{13} = 8.50^o \pm 0.21^o$. The predicted and experimental values of $\theta_{12}$ become compatible at about $2.8\sigma$ C.L. This discrepancy is, however, a generic feature of TM mixing. One possible way to diffuse this tension with the data is to consider charged lepton corrections. We have presented our textures in a basis in which the charged lepton mass matrix is diagonal and the effective neutrino mass matrix is magic with two zeros. However, in a model realization of these textures, the charged lepton mass matrix can have small off-diagonal terms that will give corrections to the neutrino mixing angles. One can arrange these corrections to bring $\theta_{12}$ to its experimental value while keeping other two angles within the allowed ranges.

The mixing angle $\theta_{23}$ is a function of the phase $\phi$ after substituting for $r$. We depict the mixing angle $\theta_{23}$ as the function of phase $\phi$ in Fig. 2.

We can calculate the three CP violating phases from Eqs. (33), (32), and (24). We obtain
\[
\cot 2\alpha = \cot \phi + \frac{\csc \phi}{\sqrt{3}}, \tag{41}
\]
\[
\tan 2\beta = -\frac{\sqrt{3}(1 + r) \sin \phi}{2\sqrt{r} + \sqrt{3}(1 - r) \cos \phi}, \tag{42}
\]
and
\[
\tan \delta = \frac{3 + r}{3 - r} \tan \phi. \tag{43}
\]
Using these expressions, we express the ratio
The three CP violating phases (α, β, and δ) depend upon
The three CP violating phases (α, β, and δ) depend upon
The high level of predictability makes these textures
good candidates for model-building. It is rarely seen that
a neutrino mass model can predict the nine neutrino pa-
terms using just two inputs from the experiments:
\[ \Delta m^2_{12} \text{ and } \Delta m^2_{23} \]. We present an \( A_4 \) based model for
these two textures in the next section.

C. Inconsistency of Class \( B_3 \)
The magic mass matrix of type \( B_3 \) has zeros at (1, 2)
and (2, 2) entries. This implies following two complex equations:

\[
\frac{m_1}{m_2} e^{2i\alpha} = \frac{2(\sqrt{3} e^{-i\phi} \sin^2 \theta + \sqrt{3} e^{i\phi} \cos^2 \theta + 2 \sin 2\theta)}{(1 - 3e^{2i\phi}) \sin 2\theta + 2\sqrt{3} e^{i\phi} \cos 2\theta}
\]

and

\[
\frac{m_2}{m_3} e^{2i\beta} = \frac{\sqrt{3} + 3 e^{i\phi} \cot \theta}{\sqrt{3} - 3 e^{i\phi} \cot \theta}
\]

Using absolute squares of these ratios, we can calculate the ratio \( r \) as

\[
r = 1 - \left| \frac{m_1}{m_2} e^{2i\alpha} \right|^2 - \frac{1}{\left( \frac{m_2}{m_3} e^{2i\beta} \right)^{-1} - 1}.
\]

Using these expressions, we express \( r \) as a function of
the point for \( \theta_{13} \in [40^\circ, 50^\circ] \). As \( \theta_{13} \) decreases, the minimum
value of \( r \) increases. It is clear that we cannot have both
\( r \) and \( \theta_{13} \) in their experimentally allowed ranges simulta-
neously. Hence, this texture is inconsistent with the
experimental data.

V. THE \( A_4 \) MODEL
We present an \( A_4 \) model in the framework of type-
I+II see-saw mechanism [13, 16] to obtain the neutrino
mass matrices studied in this work. Apart from the three
left-handed lepton doublets \( D_L \) and three right-handed
charged leptons \( l_R \) (where \( l = e, \mu \) and \( \tau \)), we intro-
duce six \( SU(2)_L \) doublet Higgs fields \( \psi_i \) and \( \varphi_i \),
where \( i = 1, 2 \) and 3) and a \( SU(2)_L \) triplet Higgs field \( \Delta \). We
depict the transformation properties of the fields present in our model in Table I. In addition to \( A_4 \) symmetry, we also need
a \( Z_2 \) symmetry to prevent the coupling of the charged leptons (neutrinos) with scalars \( \varphi_i (\psi_i) \).
These transformation properties lead to the following La-
grangian for the leptons that is invariant under \( A_4 \) and
\( Z_2 \).

\[
-\mathcal{L} = y_1(\overline{D}_{eL} \psi_1 + \overline{D}_{\mu L} \psi_2 + \overline{D}_{\tau L} \psi_3) \nu_{R_i} + y_2(\overline{D}_{eL} \psi_1 + \omega^2 \overline{D}_{\mu L} \psi_2 + \omega \overline{D}_{\tau L} \psi_3) \nu_{R_{12}} + y_3(\overline{D}_{eL} \psi_1 + \omega \overline{D}_{\mu L} \psi_2 + \omega^2 \overline{D}_{\tau L} \psi_3) \nu_{R_{13}} + y_4(\overline{D}_{eL} \varphi_1 + \overline{D}_{\mu L} \varphi_2 + \overline{D}_{\tau L} \varphi_3) \nu_{R_1} - y_5(D^T_{eL} C^{-1} D_{eL} + \omega^2 D^T_{\mu L} C^{-1} D_{\mu L} + \omega D^T_{\tau L} C^{-1} D_{\tau L}) \nu_{R_1} + \nu_{R_1} \nu_{R_1} + \text{h.c.}
\]

where \( \varphi_i = i \tau_2 \phi^* \).

We assume the following vacuum expectation values
(vevs) of the Higgs fields: \( \langle \psi_i \rangle = v_\psi (1, 1, 1)^T \) which
leads to the charged lepton mass matrix

\[
m_l = \begin{pmatrix}
y_1 v_\psi & y_2 v_\psi & y_3 v_\psi \\
y_1 v_\psi & y_2 v_\psi & y_3 v_\psi \\
y_1 v_\psi & y_2 v_\psi & y_3 v_\psi \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]
FIG. 2. The neutrino parameters $\sum_{i=1}^{3} m_i$, $\theta_{23}$, $\alpha$, $\beta$, $\delta$, and $J_{CP}$ as functions of $\phi$. All phases and angles are in degrees. The dark (gray) bands depict the 1σ (3σ) allowed regions.

For the type-I see-saw contribution, we assume that $\varphi_i$ develop vevs along the direction $\langle \varphi \rangle_o = v_\varphi (0, -1, 1)^T$. Such a vacuum alignment has been obtained in references [17] for $SU(2)_L$ and $A_4$ triplet scalars by allowing specific terms in the scalar potential which break $A_4$ softly. This choice of vevs leads to the following Dirac neutrino mass matrix

$$m_D = y_4 v_\varphi (0, -1, 1)^T. \quad (50)$$

We have only one right handed neutrino with mass $m_R$. Using the type-I see-saw mechanism, the effective neutrino mass matrix is $m_\nu^I \approx m_D m_R^{-1} m_D^T$.

For $SU(2)_L$ triplets $H_3$ and $A_4$, the effective neutrino mass matrix is

$$m_\nu^I = c \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (51)$$

where $c = y_4^2 v_\varphi^2 / m_R$. When the $SU(2)_L$ triplet Higgs acquires a non-zero and small vev, we get the following type-II see-saw contribution to the effective neutrino
mass matrix:

\[
m^U_\nu = \Delta \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \omega^2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \omega
\end{pmatrix}
\]  

where \(\Delta = y_\Delta \nu_\Delta\). The combined effective neutrino mass matrix \(m_\nu = m^U_\nu + m^L_\nu\) from type-I+II seesaw mechanism becomes

\[
m_\nu = \begin{pmatrix}
\Delta & 0 & 0 \\
0 & c + \omega^2 \Delta & -c \\
0 & -c & c + \omega \Delta
\end{pmatrix}.
\]  

In the symmetry basis, the charged lepton mass matrix \(m_l\) is not diagonal. We make a transformation to the basis where the charge lepton mass matrix is diagonal with the transformation \(M_l = U_L^T m_l U_R\), where

\[
U_L = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 1 & 1 \\
1 & \omega & \omega^2 \\
1 & \omega^2 & \omega
\end{pmatrix},
\]  

and \(U_R\) is a unit matrix. In this basis where \(M_l\) is diagonal, the effective neutrino mass matrix becomes:

\[
M_\nu = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & c \\
0 & c - \Delta & \Delta \\
c & \Delta & -\Delta
\end{pmatrix}.
\]  

This is the mass matrix of type \(A_1\) having magic symmetry and two texture zeros.

A similar mechanism with \(SU(2)_L\) triplet Higgs \(\Delta\) transforming as \(1''\) instead of \(1\) will give the neutrino mass matrix:

\[
M_\nu = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & b & 0 \\
b & -a & a \\
0 & a & b - a
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

This is the mass matrix of type \(A_2\) having magic symmetry and two texture zeros.

Our model requires 6 Higgs doublets, 3 of which couple to charged leptons [Table II]. In such multi Higgs models, the flavor changing neutral currents can contribute to charged lepton flavor violating decays. However, an explicit calculation is beyond the scope of present work due to the complexity of Higgs sector of our model. Nevertheless, there exist models in literature e.g. Ref. [18] where the charged lepton Yukawa Lagrangian (including the \(A_4\) assignments of charged lepton and scalar fields) are similar to our model. The flavor violating decays of leptons for our model can be studied in a manner similar to Ref. [18].

### VI. CONCLUSIONS

We study the phenomenological implications of two texture zeros in the magic neutrino mass matrix. In absence of magic symmetry, there are seven allowed patterns for the presence of two zeros in the neutrino mass matrix. The additional constraint of magic symmetry disallows five of these patterns. The two allowed patterns are of the type \(A_1\) and \(A_2\). The combination of magic symmetry and texture zeros make these classes very predictive. We can express all the nine neutrino observables (the three masses, the three mixing angles, and the three CP violating phases) as the function of \(\phi\) by plugging in just two experimental parameters (\(\Delta m^2_{12}\) and \(\Delta m^2_{23}\)). In particular, \(\theta_{12}\) and \(\theta_{13}\) do not even depend upon the phase \(\phi\) and can be expressed as functions of the ratio \(r = \Delta m^2_{12}/\Delta m^2_{23}\) as \(\sin^2 \theta_{12} = \frac{1 + r}{3(r + 1)}\) and \(\sin^2 \theta_{13} = \frac{2r}{3(r + 1)}\).

Finally, we have derived these highly predictive mass matrices from a neutrino mass model based upon the symmetry group \(A_4\).
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A THE GROUP $A_4$

$A_4$ is the group of even permutations of four objects having twelve elements. Geometrically, it can be viewed as the group of rotational symmetries of the tetrahedron. $A_4$ has four inequivalent irreducible representations (IRs) which are three singlets, 1, $1'$, and $1''$, and one triplet 3. The group $A_4$ is generated by two generators $S$ and $T$ such that

$$S^2 = T^3 = (ST)^3 = 1.$$  

The one dimensional unitary IRs are

$$1 \quad S = 1 \quad T = 1, \quad 1' \quad S = 1 \quad T = \omega, 1'' \quad S = 1 \quad T = \omega^2.$$  

The three dimensional unitary IR is

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

The multiplication rules of the IRs are as follows

$$1' \otimes 1' = 1'', \quad 1'' \otimes 1'' = 1', \quad 1' \otimes 1'' = 1.$$  

The product of two 3's gives

$$3 \otimes 3 = 1 \oplus 1' \oplus 1'' \oplus 3_s \oplus 3_a,$$  

where $s(a)$ denotes the symmetric(anti-symmetric) product. Let $(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ and $(y_1, y_2, y_3)$ denote the basis vectors of two 3's. Then the IRs obtained from their products are

$$(3 \otimes 3)_1 = x_1 y_1 + x_2 y_2 + x_3 y_3$$  

$$(3 \otimes 3)' = x_1 y_1 + \omega x_2 y_2 + \omega^2 x_3 y_3$$  

$$(3 \otimes 3)'' = x_1 y_1 + \omega^2 x_2 y_2 + \omega x_3 y_3$$  

$$(3 \otimes 3)_3 = (x_2 y_3 + x_3 y_2, x_3 y_1 + x_1 y_3, x_1 y_2 + x_2 y_1)$$  

$$(3 \otimes 3)_a = (x_2 y_3 - x_3 y_2, x_3 y_1 - x_1 y_3, x_1 y_2 - x_2 y_1).$$
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