Perturbative generation of $\theta_{13}$ from tribimaximal neutrino mixing
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Abstract

Solar and atmospheric neutrino oscillations are consistent with a tribimaximal form of the mixing matrix $U$ of the lepton sector. Exact tribimaximal mixing leads to $\theta_{13} = 0$. Recent results from the Daya Bay and RENO experiments have established a non-zero value of $\theta_{13}$. Keeping the leading behaviour of $U$ as tribimaximal we perform a model-independent perturbative calculation to incorporate a non-vanishing $\theta_{13}$. We identify the nature of the perturbation matrix and consider the possibility of the solar neutrino splitting also resulting from it. We calculate up to first order in perturbation theory and evaluate the deviations proportional to $\sin\theta_{13}$ while including CP-nonconservation. Finally, we briefly discuss a gauge model where such an addition to the neutrino mass matrix arises through one-loop effects.
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Experimental data of solar, atmospheric, accelerator, and reactor neutrinos \([1]\) translate to information about neutrino masses and mixing which can be summarised as \([2, 3]\):

\[
\begin{align*}
\Delta m_{21}^2 &= (7.59 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2, \quad \theta_{12} = (34.4 \pm 1.0)^\circ, \\
|\Delta m_{31}^2| &= (2.46 \pm 0.12) \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2, \quad \theta_{23} = (42.8^{+4.7}_{-2.7})^\circ, \\
\theta_{13} &= (5.6^{+3.0}_{-2.7})^\circ, \quad \delta \text{ unknown.}
\end{align*}
\]

These values of the mixing angles are consistent with a mixing matrix of tribimaximal form \([4]\),

\[
U^0 = \begin{pmatrix}
\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & 0 \\
-\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & 0 \\
0 & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

which predicts the third mixing angle \(\theta_{13}\) to be exactly vanishing.

Of late, the situation has taken a different turn. Results from the Double Chooz \([5]\) collaboration and more recently the Daya Bay \([6]\) experiment indicate that \(\theta_{13}\) is, in fact, inconsistent with zero by more than 5\(\sigma\) - \(\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.092 \pm 0.016\) (stat) \(\pm 0.005\) (syst) \([6]\). Therefore, in view of these significant findings, it has to be concluded that the simple-minded tribimaximal picture fails to adequately capture the observed neutrino mixing. The smallness of \(\theta_{13}\) compared to the other two mixing angles encourages us to examine here whether the former could arise from a small perturbation on the basic tribimaximal structure and could lead to a realistic neutrino mixing matrix.

We work in a flavor basis in which the charged lepton mass matrix is diagonal\(^2\). If the left-handed neutrino Majorana masses be \(m_1, m_2, m_3\) then from eq. \((2)\) the mass matrix \(M^0\), satisfying tribimaximal mixing, when expressed in the flavor basis has the general form,

\[
M^0 = U^0 \begin{pmatrix}
m_1 \\
m_2 \\
m_3
\end{pmatrix} U^{0T} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{2m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2} & \frac{m_2 - m_1}{m_1 + m_2} & \frac{m_2 - m_1}{m_1 + m_2} \\
\frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2} & \frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2} & \frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2} \\
\frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2} & \frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2} & \frac{m_1 + m_2}{m_1 + m_2}
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where we have set

\[
m_0 = (m_1 + m_2 + m_3)/3, \quad \Delta_{32} \equiv (m_3 - m_2) \text{ and } \Delta_{31} \equiv (m_3 - m_1).\]

\(\text{Ab initio,}\) the mass eigenvalues, \(m_1, m_2, m_3,\) can be complex in which case they can be rendered real and positive by a diagonal phase transformation, \(D = \text{diag}(e^{i\lambda_1}, e^{i\lambda_2}, 1)\), where the \(\lambda_i\) are Majorana phases, which do not affect neutrino oscillations.

We approximate \(\Delta_{32} \simeq \Delta_{31} \equiv \Delta,\) which is not unreasonable since \(|\Delta_{32}| \gg \Delta_{21} \equiv (m_2 - m_1).\) \(\Delta\) sets the scale for atmospheric neutrino oscillations\(^3\). We start with this limit and write the unperturbed

\(^1\)Very recently the RENO collaboration has measured \(\sin^2 2\theta_{13} = 0.113 \pm 0.013\) (stat) \(\pm 0.019\) (syst) \([7]\).

\(^2\)This fixes the singlet right-handed charged leptons and the left-handed lepton doublets in flavor space. In this basis, mixing in the lepton sector is determined entirely by the neutrino mass matrix.

\(^3\)\(\Delta\) is positive (negative) for the normal (inverted) ordering of neutrino masses.
mass matrix in the flavor basis as:

$$M^0 \sim \begin{pmatrix}
    m_0 - \frac{\Delta}{3} & 0 & 0 \\
    0 & m_0 + \frac{\Delta}{6} & \frac{\Delta}{2} \\
    0 & \frac{\Delta}{2} & m_0 + \frac{\Delta}{6}
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

At this level, \(m^{(0)}_1 = m^{(0)}_2 = m_0 - \frac{\Delta}{3}\) and \(m^{(0)}_3 = m_0 + \frac{2\Delta}{3}\) and the solar mass splitting is absent. Our goal is to also generate this splitting through the same perturbation Hamiltonian that is responsible for \(\theta_{13} \neq 0\). We take \(m^{(0)}_1, m^{(0)}_2, \) and \(m^{(0)}_3\) to be real and positive.

The purpose of this paper is not to explain how \(M^0\) emerges from a fundamental model; even though there is no doubt that we consider it as the dominant part of the neutrino mass matrix. There are many models from which one can obtain the tribimaximal form of the mixing matrix \([8]\). Our discussion below will be independent of the specific mechanism by which \(M^0\) arises.

In terms of the three mixing angles and the complex phase \(\delta\) the Pontecorvo, Maki, Nakagawa, Sakata (PMNS) mixing matrix is conventionally parametrized as,

$$U = \begin{pmatrix}
    c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\
    -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & s_{23}c_{13} \\
    s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13}e^{i\delta} & c_{23}c_{13}
\end{pmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

As noted, the tribimaximal mixing matrix, \(U^0\) in eq. (2), fixes the element \(U^0_{e3} = 0\). The rôle of a non-vanishing \(U_{e3}\), or equivalently \(\theta_{13}\), is manifold. It is essential for CP-nonconservation in neutrino oscillations and may be invoked to explain leptogenesis\(^4\). Also, \(\theta_{13} \neq 0\) will be similar to the quark sector where mixing between all three generations and CP-violation is a well-verified result, though the mixing angles in the two sectors are vastly different. For CP-violation, of course, both \(\theta_{13}\) and the complex phase \(\delta\) should be non-vanishing. Besides, a reasonably large \(\theta_{13}\) opens the door for an easier measurement of the neutrino mass ordering, i.e., the sign of \(\Delta m^2_{31}\).

A large number of attempts have been made to generate \(\theta_{13} \neq 0\) in diverse ways starting from an initial tribimaximal form. Some of these are the following. A perturbative analysis in which one of the columns or rows of \(U^0\) is left unchanged has been examined in [9]. An alternative which involves a sequential ‘integrating out’ of heavy neutrino states has been proposed in [10]. Another approach has been to parametrize the deviation from the tribimaximal form in a particular way [11]. Deviations from tribimaximal mixing due to charged lepton effects and Renormalization Group running have been other directions of study [12]. Alternative explorations have been based on the \(A(4)\) symmetry in [13, 14], and on other discrete symmetries in [15, 16].

Our strategy here is to use perturbation theory to identify the structure of the Majorana mass matrix, \(M = M^0 + M'\), where \(M' \ll M^0\), so that \(\theta_{13}\) and the solar mass splitting are obtained. Both \(M^0\) and \(M'\) will be symmetric and could, in general, be complex. However, \(M^0\) as obtained in eq. (5) from the tribimaximal mixing form is real and symmetric, i.e., hermitian. We will consider the cases of real and complex \(M'\) separately.

\(^4\)The Majorana phases alluded to earlier could produce CP-violation in \(\Delta L = 2\) processes.
For our later discussions the eigenstates of $M^0$, the unperturbed mass eigenstates, in the mass basis are found useful. These are simply:

$$
\psi_1^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_2^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_3^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},
$$

(7)

of which the first two are degenerate. So, the basis vectors $\psi_1^{(0)}$ and $\psi_2^{(0)}$ are not unique and are chosen with the knowledge that they reproduce the correct solar mixing. The physical basis is fixed by the perturbation. When we discuss lifting of the degeneracy, we consider $M'$ to be such that $\psi_1^{(0)}$ and $\psi_2^{(0)}$ are its non-degenerate eigenstates: $<\psi_i^{(0)}|M'|\psi_j^{(0)}> = m_i^{(1)} \delta_{ij} (i, j = 1, 2)$, with $m_1^{(1)} \neq m_2^{(1)}$. We also take $(M')_{33} = 0$ in this mass basis, so what remain are $(M')_{13}$ and $(M')_{23}$ to which we will first turn.

It is helpful to bear in mind that eigenstates in eq. (7) when expressed in the flavor basis are simply the columns of $U$, namely,$$
\psi_1^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_2^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \psi_3^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}
$$

in flavor basis.

The goal we have set ourselves is to obtain as the perturbed mass eigenstates, when written in the flavour basis, the columns of the matrix in eq. (6) with $\theta_{13} \neq 0$. To this end, initially, let us take $M'$, which is symmetric, to be real and therefore hermitian. Needless to say, this may generate a non-zero $\theta_{13}$ but will have no CP-violation and hence yield $\delta = 0$. For the perturbation expansion we retain terms up to linear in $s_{13}$. To first order we have,

$$
\psi_3 = \psi_3^{(0)} + \sum_{j \neq 3} O_{3j} \psi_j^{(0)}.
$$

(9)

Here

$$
O_{3j} = \frac{<\psi_j^{(0)}|M'|\psi_3^{(0)}>}{m_3^{(0)} - m_j^{(0)}} = -O_{j3}, \quad (j \neq 3).
$$

(10)

The coefficients $O_{3j}$ are real in this case. In the mass basis $O_{ij}$ is proportional to $M_{ij}$.

The eigenstate, $\psi_3$, should correspond to the third column of the mixing matrix $U$ in eq. (3), with $\delta = 0$. $O_{31}$ and $O_{32}$ are readily determined using eq. (9) in the flavor basis. Written explicitly we get the matrix equation,

$$
\begin{bmatrix}
  s_{13} \\
  s_{23}c_{13} \\
  c_{23}c_{13}
\end{bmatrix}
= \begin{bmatrix}
  0 & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \\
  \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} \\
  \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}
\end{bmatrix}
\begin{bmatrix}
  1 \\
  O_{31} \\
  O_{32}
\end{bmatrix}.
$$

(11)

By inverting the above equation one obtains, to order linear in $s_{13}$, $O_{31} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} s_{13}$ and $O_{32} = \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}} s_{13}$, where maximality of the atmospheric mixing angle ($s_{23} = c_{23} = 1/\sqrt{2}$) has been used. This translates to $M'_{13} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} s_{13} \Delta$ and $M'_{23} = \sqrt{\frac{5}{3}} s_{13} \Delta$ in the mass basis.

\footnote{Note that a negative $s_{13}$ with $\delta = 0$ is equivalent to a positive $s_{13}$ and $\delta = \pi$.}
To extend this discussion to the case of \( \delta \neq 0 \), we have to bear in mind that now \( M' \) is complex symmetric and not hermitian and the same holds for the total Majorana mass matrix \( M = M^0 + M' \). The columns of the mixing matrix \( U \) (eq. (9)) are eigenvectors of \( M'M = M'^0M^0 + M'^0M + M'M^0 \), where we have dropped a term which is \( O(M')^2 \). To proceed, we recall that \( M^0 \) is hermitian and therefore the eigenstates of the unperturbed \( M'^0M^0 \) are the same \( \psi_i^{(0)} \) considered earlier – eq. (8) – but now corresponding to eigenvalues \( (m_1^{(0)})^2, (m_2^{(0)})^2 \) and \( (m_3^{(0)})^2 \). In place of eq. (10) we have

\[
O_{3j} = \frac{<\psi_j^{(0)}| (M'^0M' + M'^tM^0)|\psi_3^{(0)}>}{(m_3^{(0)})^2 - (m_j^{(0)})^2} = -O_{j3}^*, \quad (j \neq 3),
\]

which is to be used in eq. (9) now. Requiring that \( \psi_3 \) be reproduced to first order and using the appropriate variant of eq. (11) we get in this case \( O_{31} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} s_{13} e^{-i\delta} \) and \( O_{32} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} s_{13} e^{-i\delta} \).

To relate the above to the elements of the perturbation \( M' \) one notes:

\[
<\psi_j^{(0)}| (M'^0M' + M'^tM^0)|\psi_i^{(0)}> = m_j^{(0)} <\psi_j^{(0)}| M'|\psi_i^{(0)}> + m_i^{(0)} <\psi_j^{(0)}| M'^t|\psi_i^{(0)}>,
\]

and thus in the mass basis

\[
O_{3j} \left[ (m_3^{(0)})^2 - (m_j^{(0)})^2 \right] = m_j^{(0)} (M')_{j3} + m_3^{(0)} (M')^*_{j3}, \quad (j \neq 3),
\]

where the symmetric nature of \( M' \) has been used. Writing \( M'_{13} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} s_{13}' \Delta e^{i\phi} \) and \( M'_{23} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} s_{13}' \Delta e^{i\phi} \) using eq. (14) one finds to leading order in \( \Delta/m_0 \)

\[
\delta = \tan^{-1} \left( \frac{\Delta}{2m_0} \tan \phi \right), \quad \text{and} \quad s_{13} = f(\phi) s_{13}',
\]

where

\[
f(\phi) = \frac{\left[ (m_1^{(0)})^2 + (m_3^{(0)})^2 + 2m_1^{(0)} m_3^{(0)} \cos 2\phi \right]^{1/2}}{(m_1^{(0)}) + (m_3^{(0)})}.
\]

The approximate formulae in (15) indicate that \( s_{13} \leq s_{13}' \), with the equality holding only when \( \phi = 0 \), and though the range of \( \phi - \) which is \( \{0, 2\pi\} \) – is the same as that of \( \delta \) the latter is suppressed compared to the corresponding \( \phi \). The suppression is higher as the neutrino masses approach the quasi-degenerate regime (\( \Delta \ll m_0 \)).

So far we have concentrated on obtaining \( \theta_{13} \neq 0 \) through a perturbation starting from the tribimaximal form. Now we consider the solar mass splitting. We choose the perturbation such that \( (M')_{12} = (M')_{21} = 0 \). The first order corrections to the neutrino mass are obtained from

\[
m_1^{(1)} = <\psi_1^{(0)}| M'|\psi_1^{(0)}>. \quad \text{We demand that the following mass corrections arise at this order}
\]

\[
m_1^{(1)} = m_3^{(1)} = 0 \quad \text{and} \quad m_2^{(1)} \neq 0.
\]

In the mass basis this implies that out of the diagonal elements only \( (M')_{22} \neq 0 \). Such a correction ensures that a nonzero solar mass splitting \( m_2 - m_1 = m_2^{(1)} \) is induced. Solar neutrino observations establish \( \Delta m_{21}^2 = (m_2)^2 - (m_1)^2 \) is positive.
Putting all this together we have for the full perturbation matrix in the mass basis as

\[ M' = s'_{13} \Delta \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} e^{i\phi} \\ 0 & x/3 & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} e^{i\phi} \\ \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} e^{i\phi} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} e^{i\phi} & 0 \end{pmatrix} \]

in mass basis, \( \text{(18)} \)

and

\[ x \equiv m^{(1)}_2 / s'_{13} \Delta . \] \( \text{(19)} \)

The dimensionless parameter \( x \) is fixed by the solar splitting. In general it can be complex implying that the Majorana mass \( m^{(1)}_2 \equiv |m^{(1)}_2| \exp(i\chi) \). If we write \( m_2 = m^{(0)}_2 + m^{(1)}_2 \equiv |m_2| \exp(i\lambda) \) and recall \( m^{(0)}_1 = m^{(0)}_2 \) then one has:

\[ |m_2| = \left[ (m^{(0)}_1)^2 + (|m^{(1)}_2|)^2 + 2m^{(0)}_1 m^{(1)}_2 \cos \chi \right]^{1/2}, \quad \lambda = \tan^{-1} \left[ \frac{|m^{(1)}_2| \sin \chi}{m^{(0)}_1 + |m^{(1)}_2| \cos \chi} \right]. \] \( \text{(20)} \)

\( \lambda \) is a Majorana phase of \( \nu_2 \) which arises from the perturbation.

There are thus two real parameters introduced here: \( |m^{(1)}_2| \) and \( \chi \). For any phase angle \( \chi \) demanding that the solar splitting is correctly obtained determines \( |m^{(1)}_2| \) provided \( m^{(0)}_1 \) is known, i.e., the mass ordering is specified and the mass of the lightest neutrino, \( m_1 \), is given. Thus \( \chi, s'_1, \) and \( \phi \) suffice to fix the full perturbation matrix \( M' \).

Using \( M' \) in eq. \( \text{18} \) and degenerate perturbation theory \( \text{[17]} \) we get for the mixing matrix with \( \delta \neq 0 \):

\[ U_{\delta \neq 0} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} s_{13} e^{i\phi} & s_{13} e^{-i\phi} \\ -\sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} & -\sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} s_{13} e^{i\phi} & s_{13} e^{-i\phi} \\ \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}} s_{13} e^{i\phi} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \] \( \text{(21)} \)

\( U_{\delta \neq 0} \) is consistent with the observed mixing angles and is unitary up to order \( s_{13} \). The non-zero CP-phase \( \delta \) brings the lepton sector in line with the quarks, where CP-violation has been established for long. \( \delta \) is usually invoked for processes such as leptogenesis. A matrix of exactly the form of \( U_{\delta \neq 0} \) has been discussed in \( \text{[18]} \) from a different motivation and its consistency with the experimentally required mixing angles noted.

The basis independent measure of CP-violation, the leptonic Jarlskog \( \text{[19]} \) invariant, arising from \( U_{\delta \neq 0} \) (eq. \( \text{21} \)) is

\[ J = \text{Im}[U_{e1} U_{\mu2} U_{e2}^* U_{\mu1}^*] = -\frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} s_{13} \sin \delta = \frac{1}{3\sqrt{2}} s'_{13} f(\phi) \frac{\Delta m_{21}}{2 m_0} \sin \phi \cos^2 \phi + \left(\frac{\Delta m_{21}}{2 m_0}\right)^2 \sin^2 \phi, \] \( \text{(22)} \)

signifying that both \( s'_{13} \) and \( \phi \) have to be non-vanishing in order for CP-violation to be present in the lepton sector. Moreover, in the quasi-degenerate regime the observation of CP-violation is less likely.

The above discussion is valid when the solar mass splitting and the mixing angle \( \theta_{13} \) are unrelated. In the following we do not examine mass matrices of the associated general form – eq. \( \text{18} \). Nonetheless,
So, for any mass ordering the two remaining parameters are $\chi$ to mass models it is more convenient to first rewrite $M$. The special case $m_3(15)$. As noted, $s\sim O(1)$.

Here the first matrix on the right-hand-side is responsible for $\theta_{13}$ and the second for $\Delta m_{31}^2$.

We see from eq. (23) that, aside from the diagonal part which is proportional to the identity matrix,[4] and can be subsumed in $M^0$, the perturbation is of the form:

$$M' = s_{13}' \Delta \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} e^{i\phi} & \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} e^{i\phi} \\ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} e^{i\phi} & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} e^{i\phi} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} x & x & -x \\ x & x & -x \\ -x & -x & x \end{pmatrix}\right]$$

in flavor basis. (23)

where $A$, $B$, and $C$ are complex in general. Such a texture of $M'$ can follow from a Zee-type model[20] as we discuss later. In such models $(M')_{\alpha\beta}$ is proportional to $(m_\alpha^2 - m_\beta^2)$, where $m_\alpha$ is the mass of the charged lepton $\alpha$. As $m_\tau \gg m_\mu, m_e$, unless other couplings are of vastly different order from each other, one must have $B \sim C \gg A$. Such a form of the mass matrix can be reproduced by the choice $\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}} e^{i\phi} + x = \epsilon$, where $\epsilon$ is small, when the perturbation matrix eq. (23) reduces to:

$$M' = \frac{s_{13}' \Delta}{3\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \epsilon & 6 e^{i\phi} + \epsilon \\ \epsilon & 0 & 3 e^{i\phi} - \epsilon \\ 6 e^{i\phi} + \epsilon & 3 e^{i\phi} - \epsilon & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$ (25)

The special case $\epsilon = 0$ is quite predictive. From eq. (19) this requires

$$-\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}} s_{13}' \Delta e^{i\phi} = m_2^{(1)} = m_2^{(1)} | e^{i\chi}.$$ (26)

Thus $s_{13}' = \sqrt{2} |m_2^{(1)}|/|\Delta|$ and $\phi = \pi + \chi$ ($\phi = \chi$) for the normal (inverted) ordering.

Due to these relationships, $\chi$ and $m_1^{(0)}$ besides determining $|m_2^{(1)}|$ now also fix $s_{13}$ and $\delta$ through eq. (19). As noted, $m_1^{(0)}$ is known when the mass ordering and the lightest neutrino mass, $\tilde{m}$, are fixed. So, for any mass ordering the two remaining parameters are $\chi$ and the lightest neutrino mass.

---

6This result is only indicative. The full flexibility of variation of $\phi$ and $\chi$ is not taken into account.

7Such a piece proportional to the identity does not affect the mixing and makes a constant contribution to all three neutrino mass eigenvalues.
Figure 1: One loop contributions to the neutrino Majorana mass matrix $M'$ in the Zee model. For $M'_{e\mu}$ the dominant contribution is proportional to $m_\mu$ while for $M'_{e\tau}$ and $M'_{\mu\tau}$ it is proportional to $m_\tau$.

We show now that $\chi$ and $\tilde{m}$ can be chosen such that one has consistency with both the solar mass splitting and the measured $\theta_{13}$. In our discussion below we use the central values of the atmospheric and solar mass splittings from eq. (1) and seek an acceptable $\theta_{13}$. We do not attempt an exhaustive listing of the entire consistent ranges of the parameters in this work but rather present some typical solutions for both mass orderings.

We find that with $\epsilon = 0$, in the normal mass ordering case ($m_1^{(0)} = \tilde{m}$) taking $m_1^{(0)} = 10^{-2}$ eV and $115^\circ \leq \chi \leq 137^\circ$, $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ varies from 0.057 to 0.130, which includes the 1$\sigma$ experimentally allowed range, while the Jarlskog CP-violation parameter $J$ remains more or less constant around -0.026. The replacement $\chi \leftrightarrow (2\pi - \chi)$ with $m_1^{(0)}$ fixed keeps $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ unchanged and replaces $J$ by $-J$.

For the inverted mass ordering (which we will not present), on the other hand, taking $0 \leq m_3^{(0)} \leq 10^{-3}$ eV and $\chi \sim 94^\circ$ one obtains $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sim 0.054$, which is allowed at 2$\sigma$, with $J \sim -0.028$. For $m_3^{(0)} = 3 \times 10^{-2}$ eV and $\chi \sim 101^\circ$ one has $\sin^2 2\theta_{13} \sim 0.09$ within 1$\sigma$ and $J \sim -0.029$. For any $m_3^{(0)}$, replacing $\chi$ by $(2\pi - \chi)$ results in the same $\sin^2 2\theta_{13}$ but $J$ changes sign.

We now briefly note how $M'$ of the texture in eq. (24) can follow from a Zee-type model. It bears repetition that here the Zee model provides a subleading contribution, $M'$, to a leading tribimaximal mass matrix $M^0$ of a different origin. The Zee model has a simple $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$-invariant structure. For this, a second scalar $SU(2)_L$ doublet and a charged singlet scalar $\chi^+$ are introduced. The latter couples to a pair of lepton doublets, where the coupling $f_{\alpha \beta}$ is antisymmetric in the generation index. Likewise due to $SU(2)$ antisymmetry the charged scalar also couples to a pair of Higgs doublets $h_u$ and $h_d$ antisymmetrically. In this model a contribution to the neutrino mass -- $M'$ -- arises radiatively from one loop diagrams such as Fig. 1 and can be expressed as:

$$M'_{\alpha \beta} = \frac{1}{M_\delta} \mu (m_\alpha^2 - m_\beta^2) f_{\alpha \beta} \frac{v_u}{v_d} I. \tag{27}$$

---

8In this case, $\tilde{m} = m_1^{(0)}$ and $\Delta < 0$.

9An alternative way to generate a non-zero $\theta_{13}$ using the Zee model has been examined in [21].

10Models can be constructed which accommodate both $M^0$ and $M'$. An $A(4)$ based example can be found in [13].
Here $f_{\alpha\beta}$ is the antisymmetric coupling in $f_{\alpha\beta}L_{\alpha}L_{\beta}\chi$, where $L$ is the left handed lepton doublet. Also, $\mu$ is the trilinear scalar coupling in $\mu h_u h_d\chi$, $M_s$ a typical scalar mass, and $I$ a dimensionless factor arising from the loop integral. $v_u, v_d$ are the vacuum expectation values of the two Higgs doublets $h_u$ and $h_d$. The vertex $f$ violates lepton number by two units. This diagram gives rise to a mass matrix $M'$ which is off-diagonal and symmetric, as required. $(M')_{12}$ can be neglected compared to $(M')_{13}$ and $(M')_{23}$ because the latter will receive contribution from diagrams with a $\tau$-lepton.[1] Thus, the correction obtained in this fashion is naturally of the desired form with $\epsilon \sim 0$. Further, the coupling $f_{\alpha\beta}$ can be complex which can lead to an $M'$ of the form in eq. (24) – which is complex symmetric. The interference of $M'$ with the matrix $M^0$ – eq. (12) – leads to CP-violation in the neutrino sector. It is worth bearing in mind that $M'$ is suppressed compared to the leading term in $M^0$ by $O(s_{13}\Delta/m)$. Taking $s_{13} \sim 0.1$, $\Delta \sim 0.1$ eV and $\mu \sim 100$ GeV, unless other factors in eq. (27) are tuned to suppress the contribution, one requires $M_s \sim O(10^6$ GeV), which puts the additional scalars of the model beyond the reach of the current experiments.

In conclusion, we have shown that $\theta_{13}$ consistent with experiments, a CP-phase $\delta$, and the solar mass splitting can all be the outcome of a specific perturbation to a basic neutrino mass matrix, the latter associated with tribimaximal mixing. This leads to a non-zero Jarlskog invariant and opens the door for CP-violation in the lepton sector. In particular, a constrained version of this perturbation relates the neutrino Majorana phase to the solar mass splitting as well as $\theta_{13}$ and $\delta$. Some sample solutions which meet all requirements have been presented. We have provided an example where the requisite perturbation contributions to the neutrino Majorana mass matrix can arise from a Zee-type model through radiative corrections.
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