

Naturally low scale type I seesaw mechanism and its viability in the 3-3-1 model with right-handed neutrinos

E. Cabrera^a, D. Cogollo^{b,c}, C. A. de S. Pires^{d*}

^a *Departamento de Física, Pontifícia Universidade Católica do Rio de Janeiro,
22452-970, Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil,*

^b *Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal de Campina Grande,
Caixa Postal 10071, 58109-970, Campina Grande, PB, Brazil,*

^c *Northwestern University, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
2145 Sheridan Road, Evanston, IL 60208, USA,*

^d *Departamento de Física, Universidade Federal da Paraíba,
Caixa Postal 5008, 58051-970, João Pessoa, PB, Brazil*

(Dated: May 1, 2023)

Abstract

Seesaw mechanisms are the simplest and the most elegant way of generating small masses for the active neutrinos (m_ν). In these mechanisms m_ν is inversely proportional to the lepton number breaking scale (M) that, in the particular case of the type I seesaw mechanism, is the Majorana mass of the right-handed neutrinos. In the canonical case right-handed neutrinos are supposed to be heavy belonging to the GUT scale. With the advent of the LHC people began to suppose these neutrinos having mass at TeV scale. In this case very tiny Yukawa couplings are required. As far as we know there are no constraints on the energy scales associated to the seesaw mechanisms. In what concern 3-3-1 models, when we trigger the type I seesaw mechanism the lepton number breaking scale that suppresses active neutrino masses contributes to the masses of the standard gauge bosons. Current data on m_W demands the mechanism to be performed at GeV scale. As main implication we may have right handed neutrinos with mass varying from few keVs up to hundreds of GeVs. We also investigate the viability of the mechanism and found as interesting result that in the case in which the right-handed neutrino masses belong to the range keV-MeV scale, viability of the mechanism demands that the lightest of the right-handed neutrinos be stable, which makes of it a natural dark matter candidate, and that the lightest of the active neutrinos be much lighter than the other two active neutrinos.

*Electronic address: cpires@fisica.ufpb.br

I. INTRODUCTION

The canonical expression for the neutrino masses provided by the type I seesaw mechanism, $m_\nu \propto \frac{v^2}{M}$ [1, 2], involves two energy parameters v and M with M being a lepton-number breaking scale. In principle v and M are unknown parameters but the common assumption is that $v \ll M$ which may leads to neutrino masses at eV scale for certain values of v and M . For example, for Yukawa coupling of order of unity M at GUT scale requires v at the electroweak scale and M at TeV scale requires v at MeV. This last case was promoted by the advent of the LHC[3]. It would be great if we had a scenario that could shed some light on these energy parameters v and M .

In its original version the $SU(3)_C \times SU(3)_L \times U(1)_N(3-3-1)$ model with right-handed neutrinos(331RHN for short) involves three triplets of scalars[4, 5]. They are not sufficient to generate correct mass for the neutrinos. We can solve this problem by adding one sextet of scalars to the particle content of the model which has the nice feature of generating neutrino masses by means of the canonical seesaw mechanisms[6–12].

In this work we show that, when the type I seesaw mechanism is implemented into the 331RHN by means of the sextet of scalars, the energy parameters v and M contribute to the masses of the standard gauge bosons W^\pm and Z^0 . Current value of the mass of W^\pm provides a constraint on the energy scale M demanding that it belongs to the GeV scale. As main implication of this we have that right-handed neutrinos may develop masses in the range keV-GeV. We discuss cosmological implications of the lightest right-handed neutrinos and analyse its contribution to the neutrinoless double beta decay.

This work is organized in the following way. In Sec. II we present the main aspects of the model and derive a constraint on the energy seesaw scale. In Sec. III we develop the type I seesaw mechanism and discuss the profile of the mass and mixing of the neutrinos involved in the mechanism. In Sec. IV we present the implications of light right-handed neutrinos in the neutrinoless double beta decay and in Sec. V we present our conclusions.

II. THE MAIN ASPECTS OF THE MODEL AND THE CONSTRAINT ON THE SEESAW ENERGY SCALE

A. Particle content and neutrino masses

The leptonic content of the model is arranged in triplets and singlets of leptons in the following form

$$f_{aL} = \begin{pmatrix} \nu_a \\ \ell_a \\ \nu_a^c \end{pmatrix}_L \sim (1, 3, -1/3), \quad e_{aR} \sim (1, 1, -1), \quad (1)$$

with $a = e, \mu, \tau$ representing the three SM generations of leptons.

In the hadronic sector, anomaly cancellation requires one family transforming differently from the other two[13, 14]. This fact allows three possible arrangements for the quark family[15, 16]. Here we present the arrangement where the third generation comes in triplet and the other two come in an anti-triplet representation of $SU(3)_L$,

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{iL} &= \begin{pmatrix} d_i \\ -u_i \\ d'_i \end{pmatrix}_L \sim (3, \bar{3}, 0), \quad u_{iR} \sim (3, 1, 2/3), \\ d_{iR} &\sim (3, 1, -1/3), \quad d'_{iR} \sim (3, 1, -1/3), \\ Q_{3L} &= \begin{pmatrix} u_3 \\ d_3 \\ u'_3 \end{pmatrix}_L \sim (3, 3, 1/3), \quad u_{3R} \sim (3, 1, 2/3), \\ d_{3R} &\sim (3, 1, -1/3), \quad u'_{3R} \sim (3, 1, 2/3), \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where the index $i = 1, 2$ is restricted to only two generations. The primed quarks are new heavy quarks with the usual $(+\frac{2}{3}, -\frac{1}{3})$ electric charges.

The scalar sector of the 331RHN that lead to the type I seesaw mechanism is composed

by three triplets and one sextet of scalars[7–9]:

$$\eta = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^0 \\ \eta^- \\ \eta'^0 \end{pmatrix}, \rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho^+ \\ \rho^0 \\ \rho'^+ \end{pmatrix}, \chi = \begin{pmatrix} \chi^0 \\ \chi^- \\ \chi'^0 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} \Delta^0 & \Delta^- & \Phi^0 \\ \Delta^- & \sqrt{2} \Delta^{--} & \Phi^- \\ \Phi^0 & \Phi^- & \sqrt{2} \sigma^0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

with η and χ transforming as $(1, 3, -1/3)$, ρ as $(1, 3, 2/3)$ and S transforming as $(1, 6, -2/3)$. The sextet S generates mass exclusively for the neutrinos. When only Δ^0 and σ^0 develop VEVs neutrinos gain mass by means of the type II seesaw mechanism[10]. When only Φ^0 and σ^0 develop VEVs neutrinos gain mass by means of the type I seesaw mechanism. We focus on the type I seesaw mechanism.

Before present the type I mechanism, let us present the Yukawa sector of the model which involves the following terms:

$$- \mathcal{L}^Y = f_{ij} \bar{Q}_{iL} \chi^* d'_{jR} + f_{33} \bar{Q}_{3L} \chi u'_{3R} + g_{ia} \bar{Q}_{iL} \eta^* d_{aR} + h_{3a} \bar{Q}_{3L} \eta u_{aR} \\ + g_{3a} \bar{Q}_{3L} \rho d_{aR} + h_{ia} \bar{Q}_{iL} \rho^* u_{aR} + G^l \bar{f}_{lL} \rho e_{lR} + G_{ab}^s (\bar{f}_L^a) (f_L^b)^c S + \text{H.c.}, \quad (4)$$

where $a = 1, 2, 3$. The discrete symmetry $\eta, \rho \rightarrow -(\eta, \rho)$ is sufficient to guarantee such simple Lagrangian. For the sake of simplicity, we considered the charged leptons in a diagonal basis. After spontaneous breaking of the symmetry by means of adequate choice of the VEVs such content of scalar generates masses for all massive particles of the model including fermions and gauge bosons. For our proposal here we assume that only $\eta^0, \rho^0, \chi'^0, \Phi^0$ and σ^0 develop VEV,

$$\eta^0, \rho^0, \chi'^0, \Phi^0, \sigma^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(v_{\eta, \rho, \chi', \Phi^0, \sigma^0} + R_{\eta, \rho, \chi', \Phi^0, \sigma^0} + i I_{\eta, \rho, \chi', \Phi^0, \sigma^0} \right). \quad (5)$$

This set of VEVs generates the type I seesaw mechanism.

As it was showed in Refs. [7–9] when Φ_0 and σ_0 develop VEV the Yukawa interaction $G_{ab}^s \bar{f}_{aL} S (f_{bL})^c$ generates the type I seesaw mechanism for neutrino masses once neutrinos

gain masses by means of the mass matrix

$$\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \overline{\nu_L} & \overline{(\nu_R)^c} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & m_D^T \\ m_D & M_R \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (\nu_L)^c \\ \nu_R \end{pmatrix} + \text{H.c.} = \frac{1}{2} \bar{S}_L M_\nu S_L^C + \text{H.c.}, \quad (6)$$

where $S_L = (\nu_L, (\nu_R)^c)^T$ with $\nu_L = (\nu_{e_L}, \nu_{\mu_L}, \nu_{\tau_L})^T$ and $(\nu_R)^c = ((\nu_{e_R})^c, (\nu_{\mu_R})^c, (\nu_{\tau_R})^c)^T$.

As an interesting aspect, note that both m_D and M_R in M_ν have the same texture

$$m_D = v_\phi(G_{ab}), \quad M_R = \sqrt{2}v_\sigma(G_{ab}), \quad (7)$$

once both matrices share the same Yukawa coupling G . In other words, the mass of the heavy neutrinos are closely connected to the masses of the active neutrinos. This is a remarkable aspect of the model.

On assuming that $M_R \gg m_D$ the block diagonalization of this matrix leads to

$$m_{light} = -m_D^T M_R^{-1} m_D = -\frac{v_\phi^2}{\sqrt{2}v_\sigma} G \quad \text{and} \quad M_{heavy} = \sqrt{2}v_\sigma G. \quad (8)$$

This is the canonical type I seesaw mechanism for generation of small masses for the active neutrinos. In it the VEV v_σ is the lepton number breaking scale. There is no bounds on this scale in the literature. We show below that this is not the case of the type I seesaw mechanism generated in the 331RHN.

B. Gauge sector and the upper bound on v_σ

The gauge sector of the 331RHN is composed by four charged gauge bosons, W^\pm and V^\pm , four neutral gauge bosons, $U^0, U^{\dagger 0}, Z, Z'$ and the photon A . Their masses and mixing are obtained from the Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_{\phi}^{\eta, \rho, \chi} (\mathcal{D}_\mu \phi) (\mathcal{D}^\mu \phi)^\dagger + \text{Tr}[(\mathcal{D}_\mu S) (\mathcal{D}^\mu S)^\dagger] \quad (9)$$

As it is well developed in the literature, after η^0, ρ^0 and χ^0 develop VEVs, the charged gauge bosons W^\pm and V^\pm gain the following mass expression $m_W^2 = \frac{g^2}{4}(v_\eta^2 + v_\rho^2)$ and $m_V^2 = \frac{g^2}{4}(v_{\chi'}^2 + v_\rho^2)$ [17]. The novelty here is that when Φ^0 and σ^0 develop VEVs, they switch on a mixing between W^\pm and V^\pm given by

$$\frac{g^2}{4} \begin{pmatrix} W_\mu & V_\mu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} (v_\eta^2 + v_\rho^2 + v_\Phi^2) & \sqrt{2}v_\Phi v_\sigma \\ \sqrt{2}v_\Phi v_\sigma & (v_{\chi'}^2 + v_\rho^2 + v_\Phi^2 + 2v_\sigma^2) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} W^\mu \\ V^\mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

After diagonalizing this mass matrix we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
m_{\tilde{W}}^2 &\approx \frac{g^2}{4}(v_\eta^2 + v_\rho^2 + v_\Phi^2 + \frac{v_\sigma^4}{v_{\chi'}^2}), \\
m_{\tilde{V}}^2 &\approx \frac{g^2}{4}(v_{\chi'}^2 + v_\rho^2 + v_\Phi^2 + 2v_\sigma^2).
\end{aligned}
\tag{11}$$

The transformation we used to diagonalize the mass matrix (10) is:

$$\begin{pmatrix} W_\mu \\ V_\mu \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} C_\theta & S_\theta \\ -S_\theta & C_\theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \tilde{W}_\mu \\ \tilde{V}_\mu \end{pmatrix},
\tag{12}$$

where the mixing angle is given by:

$$\tan 2\theta \sim \frac{2\sqrt{2}v_\Phi v_\sigma}{v_{\chi'}^2}.
\tag{13}$$

Now comes the interesting point. Remember that $v_\eta^2 + v_\rho^2 \approx (246)^2 \text{ GeV}^2$. Consequently, from the new contribution terms for the mass of \tilde{W} presented above we must have that $v_\Phi \ll v_\eta, v_\rho$ and $v_\sigma < v_{\chi'}$. For we have a more precise idea of the relation among v_σ and $v_{\chi'}$, we resort to the recent CDF collaboration report that claims a new result for the mass of W^\pm , $m_{W_{CDF}} = 80.4335 \pm 0.0094 \text{ GeV}$ [18], which deviated from the standard prediction $m_{W_{SM}} = 80.357 \pm 0.006 \text{ GeV}$ [19], at 7σ . Considering the central value of the prediction, the deviation is $\Delta W = 0.09635 \text{ GeV}$. For v_Φ smaller than the other VEV's, as required by seesaw mechanism, in such a way that its contribution to m_W may be neglected, the term $\frac{g}{2} \frac{v_\sigma^2}{v_{\chi'}}$ is solely responsible by the deviation. In this case, once the current LHC bound on $m_{Z'}$ requires $v_{\chi'} \approx 12 \text{ TeV}$ [20] or less[21], we then have that such deviation may be accommodated by the model for $v_\sigma \approx 60 \text{ GeV}$ at most. What is interesting here is that, once v_Φ and v_σ are involved in the seesaw mechanism for neutrino masses, as discussed in the next section, such constraint on v_σ is demanding that the seesaw mechanism be performed at GeV scale. This is nice because the signature of the mechanism, the right-handed neutrinos, may be probed by many via as, for example, collider, astrophysical and cosmological data.

Moreover, for $v_\sigma \approx 60 \text{ GeV}$, neutrino mass at eV scale requires v_Φ around 10^{-5} GeV . In addition, as LHC constraint on the mass of Z' requires $v_{\chi'} \approx 10^4 \text{ GeV}$ [20] implies $\tan 2\theta \approx 10^{-11}$, which is very small and then may be neglected without any loss for the phenomenology of the model. From now on we consider such scenario.

For sake of completeness, we briefly discuss the impact of such VEV's in the gauge neutral sector composed by Z^0 , Z' and U^0 . It is well known that Z^0 and Z' mix between themselves giving rise to Z_1 and Z_2 , see Ref. [17]. The novelty here is that the VEVs v_Φ and v_σ provide a mixing among Z^0 , Z' and U^0 once the physical gauge bosons are obtained after diagonalize the mass matrix

$$\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} Z^0 & Z'_\mu & U^0_\mu \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_{Z^0}^2 & \delta_{Z^0 Z'}^2 & \delta_{Z^0 U^0}^2 \\ \delta_{Z' Z^0}^2 & m_{Z'}^2 & \delta_{Z' U^0}^2 \\ \delta_{U^0 Z^0}^2 & \delta_{U^0 Z'}^2 & m_{U^0}^2 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} Z^{0\mu} \\ Z'^\mu \\ U^{0\mu\dagger} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} m_{Z^0}^2 &= \frac{g^2}{4C_W^2} (v_\eta^2 + v_\rho^2 + v_\Phi^2), \\ m_{Z'}^2 &= \frac{g^2}{4h_W} \left[\frac{(v_\rho^2 + v_\Phi^2)}{C_W^2} + \frac{v_\eta^2 (1 - 2S_W^2)^2}{C_W^2} + 4C_W^2 (v_{\chi'}^2 + 4v_\sigma^2) \right], \\ m_{U^0}^2 &= \frac{g^2}{2} (v_{\chi'}^2 + 2v_\sigma^2 + v_\eta^2 + 4v_\Phi^2), \\ \delta_{Z^0 Z'}^2 &= \frac{g^2}{4C_W^2 \sqrt{h_W}} [v_\eta^2 (1 - 2S_W^2) - v_\rho^2 - v_\Phi^2] = \delta_{Z' Z^0}^2, \\ \delta_{Z^0 U^0}^2 &= \frac{g^2}{2C_W} (v_\Phi v_\sigma) = \delta_{U^0 Z^0}^2, \\ \delta_{Z' U^0}^2 &= -\frac{g^2}{2C_W \sqrt{h_W}} v_\Phi v_\sigma (1 + 4C_W^2) = \delta_{U^0 Z'}^2 \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $h_W = 3 - 4S_W^2$. Such mixing will have deep implications in flavor physics.

Concerning neutrino masses, the problem we must take care is with the masses of the heavy neutrinos determined by the expression $M_{heavy} = \sqrt{2}Gv_\sigma$. The Yukawa couplings G 's are determined by the mixing angles and squared mass differences of the standard neutrinos provided by atmospheric, solar and reactor neutrino oscillation experiments. Depending on the choice of v_Φ the values of the Yukawa couplings G 's may render heavy neutrinos with mass at GeV, MeV or keV scales. Heavy neutrinos with mass at GeV scale face no problem at all, but heavy neutrinos with mass at MeV scale must have lifetime bigger than the lifetime of the universe. If this is the case, such neutrino is a nice candidate for the dark matter of the universe. If this is not the case, such neutrino must have a lifetime around 0.1s in order to obey big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) constraints. We check now under what conditions such cases can be realized.

III. THE TYPE I SEESAW MECHANISM AND THE PROFILE OF NEUTRINO MASS AND MIXING

Let us focus on the diagonalization of M_ν which is a 6×6 mass matrix with G being a symmetric matrix formed by the Yukawa couplings G_{ab} . As it is very well known, the diagonalization of M_ν , for the case $v_\sigma \gg v_\Phi$, leads to a relation among these VEVs known as the see-saw mechanism [1, 2]. Such diagonalization is done in two stages. Firstly M_ν is block diagonalized. For this purpose let us define the matrix W ,

$$W \simeq \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \frac{1}{2}RR^\dagger & R \\ -R^\dagger & 1 - \frac{1}{2}R^\dagger R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

where $R = m_D^\dagger (M_R^\dagger)^{-1}$. Such matrix W diagonalizes M_ν :

$$\frac{1}{2}W^T M_\nu W = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} m_{light} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{heavy} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

with $m_{light} = -m_D^T M_R^{-1} m_D = -\frac{v_\Phi^2}{\sqrt{2}v_\sigma} G$ and $M_{heavy} = M_R = \sqrt{2}v_\sigma G$. The second stage is the diagonalization of the block diagonalized matrix in Eq. (17) through the rotation matrix U ,

$$\frac{1}{2}U^T \begin{pmatrix} m_{light} & 0 \\ 0 & M_{heavy} \end{pmatrix} U = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} m_\nu & 0 \\ 0 & M_\nu \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

where, now, $m_\nu = \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3)$ and $M_\nu = \text{diag}(M_1, M_2, M_3)$. Perceive that the job can be done with a unique unitary matrix $V = WU$, such that $V^T M_{\nu_{6 \times 6}} V = m_{diagonal_{6 \times 6}}$ with U defined as,

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} U_{PMNS} & 0 \\ 0 & U_R \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

with U_{PMNS} being the well known PMNS matrix that diagonalizes m_{light} while U_R diagonalizes M_{heavy} . In the end of the day we have that M_ν is directly diagonalized by the following rotation matrix V given by,

$$V \simeq \begin{pmatrix} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}RR^\dagger\right) U_{PMNS} & RU_R \\ -R^\dagger U_{PMNS} & \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}R^\dagger R\right) U_R \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

For simplicity, we will define the matrix V by the following form:

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} V^{\nu\nu} & V^{\nu N} \\ V^{N\nu} & V^{NN} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

The rotation matrix V relates the flavor basis $S_L = (\nu_L, (\nu_R)^c)^T$ with the physical basis $\hat{S}_L = (n_1, n_2, n_3, N_1, N_2, N_3)^T$ given by $S_L = V\hat{S}_L$.

$$\begin{pmatrix} \nu_L \\ (\nu_R)^c \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V^{\nu\nu} & V^{\nu N} \\ V^{N\nu} & V^{NN} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} n_L \\ (N_R)^c \end{pmatrix} \quad (22)$$

We now discuss the viability of such mechanism. Our worry here is with the mass of the heavy neutrinos which obey the expression $M_{heavy} = \sqrt{2}Gv_\sigma$. For v_σ at tens of GeVs the masses of the heavy neutrinos depend of the Yukawa coupling G which will be determined the physics of the active neutrinos. That is all about the theory of type I seesaw mechanism. From now on we insert data.

Neutrino oscillation experiments provide us with three mixing angles and two mass squared differences. Neglecting CP-phases, according to current data the central values of the mixing angles are[22]

$$\theta_{12} \approx 35^\circ, \quad \theta_{23} \approx 45^\circ \quad \text{and} \quad \theta_{13} \approx 8.5^\circ. \quad (23)$$

This translates in the following pattern of neutrino mixing U_{PMNS}

$$U_{PMNS} = \begin{pmatrix} 0.81 & 0.57 & 0.15 \\ -0.49 & 0.52 & 0.69 \\ 0.32 & -0.64 & 0.69 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (24)$$

Unlike neutrino mixing where the three angles are very well determined, neutrino mass experiments cannot determine the absolute values of the three neutrino masses, they provide two quadratic mass squared $|\Delta m_{sol}^2| \approx (7.4 - 7.9) \times 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2$ and $|\Delta m_{atm}^2| \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$ [22] which allow us fix only two neutrino masses. This fact generates an enormous amount of arbitrariness in neutrino physics. In our case we have seven free parameters, namely six Yukawa couplings, G 's, and one VEV v_Φ (We are assuming that v_σ is fixed by m_W discussed above), and five constraints, namely three angles and two quadratic mass squared. Then

once we have more free parameters than constraints, in order to continue we have to consider scenarios. It is this approach we are going to apply next.

For the neutrino masses we use as illustrative example the following set of eigenvalues:

$$m_1 \approx 3 \times 10^{-4} \text{eV}, \quad m_2 \approx 8.6 \times 10^{-3} \text{eV} \quad \text{and} \quad m_3 \approx 0.05 \text{eV}, \quad (25)$$

which provides $|\Delta m_{\text{sol}}^2| \approx (7.4 - 7.9) \times 10^{-5} \text{eV}^2$ and $|\Delta m_{\text{atm}}^2| \approx 2.5 \times 10^{-3} \text{eV}^2$.

Next, we will analyze three different mass regimes for the right handed neutrinos and discuss the physical implications of each case.

A. GeV Scale RHN

According to previous section, v_σ must lie at ~ 60 GeV scale if we want that our model solves the recently reported W boson mass anomaly[18]. Moreover v_σ is the energy scale of lepton number violation, in other words, it is the energy scale that suppresses neutrino masses in the type I seesaw mechanism. The masses of the heavy neutrinos (RHN) are given by $M_{\text{heavy}} = \sqrt{2}v_\sigma G$, then, it is natural to have RHN at the GeV scale.

On the other hand, as showed above, light neutrino masses take the simple form $m_\nu \approx -\frac{v_\Phi^2}{\sqrt{2}v_\sigma}G$. By assuming that $\frac{v_\Phi^2}{\sqrt{2}v_\sigma}$ is of the order of $\sim 1.5 \times 10^{-11}$ GeV, it will imply in $v_\Phi \approx 3.5 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV. For such scenario recovers neutrino mass and mixing showed above we need, for example, the following set of Yukawa couplings:

$$G \approx - \begin{pmatrix} 0.270051 & 0.510939 & 0.149391 \\ 0.510939 & 1.83167 & 1.4805 \\ 0.149391 & 1.4805 & 1.9088 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

This scenario accommodates standard neutrino physics data. Let us see the implications on the RHNs. The set of Yukawa couplings in (26) implies for $M_{\text{heavy}} = \sqrt{2}v_\sigma G$,

$$M_{heavy} \approx \begin{pmatrix} -22.9146 & -43.3546 & -12.6762 \\ -43.3546 & -155.422 & -125.625 \\ -12.6762 & -125.625 & -161.967 \end{pmatrix} \text{ GeV} \quad (27)$$

whose eigenvalues are:

$$|M_1| \approx 1.69 \text{ GeV}, \quad |M_2| \approx 48.64 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{and} \quad |M_3| \approx 282.843 \text{ GeV}. \quad (28)$$

Note that this illustrative case posses right-handed neutrinos with masses varying from few GeV's up to some hundred of GeV's. The mixing among the right-handed neutrinos and the active ones is given by,

$$V^{\nu N} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 3.40 & 2.39 & 0.63 \\ -2.06 & 2.18 & 2.90 \\ 1.34 & -2.69 & 2.90 \end{pmatrix} \times 10^{-7}. \quad (29)$$

In view of all this we must check if our scenario respect current constraints. The first constraint we consider relates to the values of the matrix $\frac{1}{2}RR^\dagger$ which measures the deviation from unitarity of the U_{PNMS} matrix[23]. In our case the order of magnitude of all the elements of the matrix $\frac{1}{2}RR^\dagger$ is about $\sim 10^{-14}$ satisfying from far the requirement. Also, the neutrinoless double beta decay imposes constraints on the matrix (29). For neutrinos in the GeV scale $\frac{\sum_i U_{ei}^2}{M_i} \leq 10^{-8}$ [24]. In our illustrative examples this constraint is also fulfilled from far. As for the rare decay $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ exist the constraint $Br(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \leq 4.2 \times 10^{-13}$ [25]. In our model $Br(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \sim 10^{-31}$.

In summary, the scenario where the heavy neutrinos belong to the GeV scale with mass varying from few GeVs up to hundredes of GeVs is completely viable and these heavy neutrinos may be probed at the LHC by means of the processes $pp \rightarrow Z' \rightarrow NN \rightarrow l^\pm l^\mp l^\mp \nu_{ljj}$ or $pp \rightarrow Z' \rightarrow NN \rightarrow l^\pm l^\pm W^\mp W^\mp$ [26–29]. All this means that such scenario is promising and interesting.

B. MeV and keV right-handed neutrino

Here we discuss scenarios where the lightest of the heavy neutrinos, N_1 , has mass at keV or MeV scale. This is quite possible since v_σ lies at GeV scale or lower. Nevertheless, in

what follow we keep assuming $v_\sigma = 60$ GeV. We then show that our seesaw model is able to generate RHN in both scales and that in both cases a DM candidate is possible if the active neutrino m_1 is very light, which is quite plausible from the experimental point of view.

Let us first consider that our lightest RHN (N_1) has mass inside the range ($1.023 \lesssim M_1 \leq 100$) MeV¹. In this case N_1 decays through the channels $N_1 \rightarrow \nu_\alpha e^- e^+$ (with contributions of both neutral and charged currents, with $\alpha = e^-, \mu^-, \tau^-$), $N_1 \rightarrow \nu \nu \bar{\nu}$ (only through the neutral current), and $N_1 \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \gamma$ ($\alpha = e^-, \mu^-, \tau^-$). The first two widths are the dominant ones. The first width is derived from the general expression[30, 31]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma(N_1 \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \ell_\beta^- \ell_\beta^+) &= \frac{G_F^2 M_1^5 |V_{\alpha 1}^{\nu N}|^2}{192\pi^3} \cdot \left[\left(C_1(1 - \delta_{\alpha\beta}) + C_3\delta_{\alpha\beta} \right) \times \right. \\ &\quad \left((1 - 14y_\ell^2 - 2y_\ell^4 - 12y_\ell^6) \sqrt{1 - 4y_\ell^2} + 12y_\ell^4(y_\ell^4 - 1)L \right) \\ &\quad + 4 \left(C_2(1 - \delta_{\alpha\beta}) + C_4\delta_{\alpha\beta} \right) \times \left(y_\ell^2 (2 + 10y_\ell^2 - 12y_\ell^4) \sqrt{1 - 4y_\ell^2} \right. \\ &\quad \left. \left. + 6y_\ell^4 (1 - 2y_\ell^2 + 2y_\ell^4) L \right) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

with, $\left(y_\ell \equiv \frac{m_{\ell\beta}}{M_1} \right)$, and:

$$\begin{aligned} C_1 &= \frac{1}{4} (1 - 4 \sin^2 \theta_w + 8 \sin^4 \theta_w), & C_2 &= \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \theta_w (2 \sin^2 \theta_w - 1), \\ C_3 &= \frac{1}{4} (1 + 4 \sin^2 \theta_w + 8 \sin^4 \theta_w), & C_4 &= \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \theta_w (2 \sin^2 \theta_w + 1), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where θ_w is the Weinberg angle, and

$$L = \log \left[\frac{1 - 3y_\ell^2 - (1 - y_\ell^2) \sqrt{1 - 4y_\ell^2}}{y_\ell^2 (1 + \sqrt{1 - 4y_\ell^2})} \right]. \quad (32)$$

As for the second and third width, we have:

$$\Gamma \left(N_1 \rightarrow \sum_\beta \nu_\alpha \nu_\beta \bar{\nu}_\beta \right) = \frac{G_F^2 M_1^5 |V_{\alpha 1}^{\nu N}|^2}{192\pi^3}, \quad (33)$$

and

¹ For N_1 above 100 MeV it decays very fast recovering practically the GeV case discussed above.

$$\Gamma(N_1 \rightarrow \nu_\alpha \gamma) = \frac{9\alpha_{EM}G_F^2 M_1^5 |V_{\alpha 1}^{\nu N}|^2}{512\pi^2}, \quad (34)$$

respectively. The total width considered by us is:

$$\Gamma = 2 \times \left(\sum_{\alpha} \Gamma \left(N_1 \rightarrow \sum_{\beta} \nu_{\alpha} \nu_{\beta} \bar{\nu}_{\beta} \right) + \sum_{\alpha} (\Gamma_{\nu_{\alpha} e^{-} e^{+}} + \Gamma_{\nu_{\alpha} \gamma}) \right), \quad (35)$$

We show below that bounds on Γ translate into a relationship between M_1 and m_1 .

Let us first discuss the case when the mass of N_1 lies at MeV scale. In this case, for the model to be safe, N_1 needs to have lifetime bigger than the universe ($\tau \gtrsim 10^{17}$ s) or decay fast with a lifetime $\tau \lesssim 0.1$ s [32]. We check now if such cases are phenomenologically viable. The care we must have is due to the fact that active and heavy neutrinos share the same Yukawa coupling G which means that both mass matrices m_{light} and M_{heavy} are diagonalized by U_{PMNS} . In other words, $U_R = U_{PMNS}$. In order to be more precise, let us proceed in the following way: suppose the existence in the model of N_1 with mass at MeV scale and decaying with a total width (35) (this means that $(1.023 \lesssim M_1 \leq 100)$ MeV). In our model $V_{\alpha 1}^{\nu N} = \frac{v_{\phi}}{\sqrt{2}v_{\sigma}}(U_R)_{\alpha 1}$, $m_{\nu} \approx -\frac{v_{\Phi}^2}{\sqrt{2}v_{\sigma}}G$ and $M_{heavy} \approx \sqrt{2}v_{\sigma}G$. Observe that the eigenvalue m_1 can be written as $m_1 = \frac{v_{\Phi}^2}{\sqrt{2}v_{\sigma}}(U_R^T G U_R)_{11}$ and isolating v_{Φ} we get that $v_{\Phi}^2 = \frac{m_1 \sqrt{2}v_{\sigma}}{(U_R^T G U_R)_{11}}$, which allow us to write $(V_{\alpha 1}^{\nu N})^2 = \frac{m_1 (U_R)_{\alpha 1}^2}{\sqrt{2}v_{\sigma} (U_R^T G U_R)_{11}} = \frac{m_1 (U_R)_{\alpha 1}^2}{M_1}$. Replacing $V_{\alpha 1}^{\nu N}$ in the total width (35) above we have that the total width (or the lifetime $\tau = \frac{1}{\Gamma}$) depends exclusively on M_1 and m_1 . We allow M_1 varying in the range $(1.023 \lesssim M_1 \leq 100)$ MeV and ask if m_1 at sub-eV scale is compatible with N_1 decaying before big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN) or being stable. We used $G_F = 1.166 \times 10^{-5} \text{GeV}^{-2}$ and $\alpha_{EM} = \frac{e^2}{4\pi}$. We first check for what values of m_1 are compatible with N_1 decaying before big bang nucleosynthesis (BBN). As interesting results we obtain that for N_1 (with M_1 in the range $(1.023 \lesssim M_1 \leq 100)$ MeV) decaying before BBN it demands an active neutrino with mass above eV scale. For example, for $M_1 \approx 1.023$ MeV a lifetime of $\tau \lesssim 0.1$ s requires $m_1 \gtrsim 126.65$ GeV, and at the other extreme, when $M_1 \approx 100$ MeV, a lifetime of $\tau \lesssim 0.1$ s requires $m_1 \gtrsim 0.957$ keV. Then the mechanism developed here does not support M_1 in the range $(1.023 \lesssim M_1 \leq 100)$ MeV respecting BBN. This hypothesis is discarded.

The other possibility is N_1 stable. If this is the case, the model may have an interesting dark matter candidate with mass belonging to the MeV scale. We can check that this

is possible for m_1 very light. For example, for an N_1 with $M_1 \approx 10$ MeV to be stable, it demands $m_1 \lesssim 9.6 \times 10^{-12}$ eV. Nevertheless, very tiny m_1 may require large Yukawa couplings, disfavoring the implementation of the seesaw mechanisms in the model. Of course that this depend of the value of v_σ . The case we are discussing here, with $v_\sigma = 60$ GeV, the model favors a scenario with N_1 having mass around 1 MeV. To see this observe that, for $M_1 \approx 1.023$ MeV to be stable demands $m_1 \lesssim 1.26 \times 10^{-7}$ eV. This is quite plausible because neutrino oscillation experiments support at least one very light or even null neutrino eigenvalue. This is an interesting result because we are constraining the viability of the type I seesaw to the existence of dark matter in the form of RHN with mass belonging to the MeV scale (more precisely among $(1.023 \lesssim M_1 \leq 100)\text{MeV}$), and of this being associated to a very light active neutrino.

Let us present an illustrative scenario for $M_1 \approx 1.023$ MeV and $m_1 \approx 1.26 \times 10^{-7}$ eV. First, for m_2 and m_3 we used the same set of values in (25), as well as the same mixing matrix (24) and mixing angles (23) and $v_\sigma = 60$ GeV. Second, the relationship $\frac{m_1}{M_1} = \frac{v_\Phi^2}{(\sqrt{2}v_\sigma)^2}$ implies $v_\Phi \approx 2.9 \times 10^{-5}$ GeV. Taking all this into account, the Yukawa couplings are:

$$G \approx - \begin{pmatrix} 0.368799 & 0.744819 & 0.207011 \\ 0.744819 & 2.62189 & 2.12943 \\ 0.207011 & 2.12943 & 2.7367 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

This set of Yukawa couplings implies

$$M_{heavy} \approx \begin{pmatrix} -31.2937 & -63.2 & -17.5655 \\ -63.2 & -222.475 & -180.688 \\ -17.5655 & -180.688 & -232.217 \end{pmatrix} \text{ GeV} \quad (37)$$

whose eigenvalues are:

$$|M_1| \approx 0.001023 \text{ GeV}, \quad |M_2| \approx 69.8238 \text{ GeV} \quad \text{and} \quad |M_3| \approx 405.952 \text{ GeV}. \quad (38)$$

In this case, the active-RHN mixing is:

$$V^{\nu N} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 2.84271 & 2.00043 & 0.526428 \\ -1.71966 & 1.82495 & 2.42157 \\ 1.12305 & -2.24609 & 2.42157 \end{pmatrix} \times 10^{-7}, \quad (39)$$

The set of eigenvalues in (38) and the mixing matrix in (39) guarantee that N_1 is in agreement with current constraint. For example, such scenario predicts $\text{Br}(\mu \rightarrow e\gamma) \sim 10^{-31}$ which is far from current bound.

Now, let us deal with the case for ($100 \leq M_1 \leq 1000$) keV. In this case, N_1 decays only through the channels $N_1 \rightarrow \nu\nu\bar{\nu}$, and $N_1 \rightarrow \nu_\alpha\gamma$ ($\alpha = e^-, \mu^-, \tau^-$). As in the previous case, for N_1 decaying before BBN, it demands an active neutrino with mass above eV scale. For $M_1 \approx 100$ keV, for example, a lifetime of $\tau \lesssim 0.1$ s requires a value of $m_1 \gtrsim 1.3 \times 10^6$ GeV, and for $M_1 \approx 1000$ keV, a lifetime of $\tau \lesssim 0.1$ s requires a value of $m_1 \gtrsim 133$ GeV, then, besides the seesaw mechanism is able to generate N_1 with mass in the range ($100 \leq M_1 \leq 1000$) keV in the model, such possibility does not respect the BBN bounds. On the other hand, stable candidates are possibles. For example, for N_1 with $M_1 \approx 150\text{K}$ keV to be stable demands $m_1 \lesssim 2.64 \times 10^{-4}$ eV. As in the previous case, we present an illustrative scenario for $M_1 \approx 150$ keV and $m_1 \approx 2.64 \times 10^{-4}$ eV. For m_2 and m_3 we used again the same set of values in (25), as well as the same mixing matrix (24) and mixing angles (23) and $v_\sigma = 60$ GeV. The Yukawa couplings we found are:

$$G \approx - \begin{pmatrix} 0.0000269489 & 0.0000514267 & 0.0000149359 \\ 0.0000514267 & 0.000183909 & 0.000148746 \\ 0.0000149359 & 0.000148746 & 0.000191695 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (40)$$

which implies a $v_\Phi \approx 3.5 \times 10^{-3}$ GeV, and a mass matrix M_{heavy} :

$$M_{heavy} \approx \begin{pmatrix} -0.00228669 & -0.0043637 & -0.00126735 \\ -0.0043637 & -0.0156052 & -0.0126215 \\ -0.00126735 & -0.0126215 & -0.0162659 \end{pmatrix} \text{ GeV} \quad (41)$$

whose eigenvalues are:

$$|M_1| \approx 150 \text{ KeV}, \quad |M_2| \approx 4.88 \text{ MeV} \quad \text{and} \quad |M_3| \approx 28.40 \text{ MeV}. \quad (42)$$

As for the mixing matrix $V^{\nu N}$ we obtain:

$$V^{\nu N} \approx \begin{pmatrix} 3.39814 & 2.39128 & 0.62928 \\ -2.05567 & 2.18152 & 2.89471 \\ 1.34248 & -2.68495 & 2.89471 \end{pmatrix} \times 10^{-5}, \quad (43)$$

In summary, the cases of RHN with masses in the range of keV or MeV are physically viable only for when the lightest of the RHN has a lifetime bigger than the age of the universe. In other words, the viability of the scenarios demand the existence of a dark matter candidate which is a nice result. Moreover, new interactions (self-interactions) among active neutrinos existent in the 331RHN may allow non-thermal production of N_1 by means of the Dodelson-Widrow mechanism to constitute 100% of the dark matter of the universe[33]. In the case of N_1 belonging to MeV scale its production follow the procedure done in Ref.[34].

IV. NEUTRINOLESS DOUBLE BETA DECAY IMPLICATIONS

In this section we analyse the contributions to the neutrinoless double beta decay due to the presence of the RHN that we studied in the previous sections. We follow the procedure developed in [35]. As is well know, RHN mixing with active neutrinos contribute to this rare processes and the magnitude of the contribution depends on the size of the mixing and also on the mass of the RHN. Moreover, besides the standard W boson charged current, the model has a novel boson V that also mediates charged currents. In order to clarify the idea, let us show the total charged current from which we derived all the contributions to the process[36],

$$\mathcal{L}_{CC}^{331RH\nu} = \frac{-g}{\sqrt{2}} \{ \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu \nu_{aL} W_\mu^- + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu (\nu_{aR})^c V_\mu^- + \bar{d}_{aL} \gamma^\mu u_{aL} W_\mu^- + \text{H.c.} \}, \quad (44)$$

with $a = 1, 2, 3$. Before proceeding, it is important to remember that W and V mix among themselves. The transformation (12) was used to diagonalize the mass matrix (10). It

happens that the prediction $\tan 2\theta \sim 10^{-11}$ is very small, which allow us to neglect any contribution to the process whose amplitude is proportional to $\tan \theta$ or $\sin \theta$. Considering this, let us firstly write (44) in terms of the physical eigenstates of the gauge bosons

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{CC}^{331RH\nu} = & \frac{-g}{\sqrt{2}} \{ \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu \nu_{aL} C_\theta \tilde{W}_\mu^- + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu \nu_{aL} S_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- \\ & + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu (\nu_{aR})^c (-S_\theta) \tilde{W}_\mu^- + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu (\nu_{aR})^c C_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- \\ & + \bar{d}_{aL} \gamma^\mu u_{aL} C_\theta \tilde{W}_\mu^- + \bar{d}_{aL} \gamma^\mu u_{aL} S_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- + \text{H.c.} \}. \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

The first and third line of (45) are contributions coming from the currents involving the W boson, and we will call these currents of J^μ . The second line is a current generated by the V boson and we will call this current of $(J^\mu)^c$. Applying (22) on (45) we obtain an expression of the charged current in the physical base. For leptons we have:

$$\begin{aligned} J_\ell^\mu = & \frac{-g}{\sqrt{2}} \{ \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{ak}^{\nu\nu} n_{kL} C_\theta \tilde{W}_\mu^- + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{am}^{\nu N} (N_{mR})^c C_\theta \tilde{W}_\mu^- \\ & + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{ak}^{\nu\nu} n_{KL} S_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{am}^{\nu N} (N_{mR})^c S_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- \}, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

$$\begin{aligned} (J^\mu)_\ell^c = & \frac{-g}{\sqrt{2}} \{ \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{ak}^{N\nu} n_{kL} (-S_\theta) \tilde{W}_\mu^- + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{am}^{NN} (N_{mR})^c (-S_\theta) \tilde{W}_\mu^- \\ & + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{ak}^{N\nu} n_{kL} C_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- + \bar{\ell}_{aL} \gamma^\mu V_{am}^{NN} (N_{mR})^c C_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- \}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

and for the charged currents involving the quarks, we obtained:

$$J_q^\mu = \frac{-g}{\sqrt{2}} \{ \bar{d}_{aL} \gamma^\mu u_{aL} C_\theta \tilde{W}_\mu^- + \bar{d}_{aL} \gamma^\mu u_{aL} S_\theta \tilde{V}_\mu^- \}. \quad (48)$$

With all these currents at hand we proceed to calculate the contributions to the neutrinoless double beta decay in each one of the three scenarios we discussed in section (III). The standard contribution involves the exchange of light neutrinos through the J^μ current mediated by the \tilde{W}_μ^- boson (this means the first term of equation (46))², and its amplitude is:

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(1) = 8G_F^2 C_\theta^4 \frac{\langle m_\nu \rangle}{q^2} \quad (49)$$

² The light neutrinos we are referring here are the active neutrinos

with

$$\langle m_\nu \rangle = \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 (V_{ei}^{\nu\nu})^2 m_i \right|, \quad (50)$$

and q^2 being the momentum transfer which is of the order of $\sim (100-200)$ MeV for the $0\nu\beta\beta$ process.

The second dominant contribution is similar to standard one, but considering the exchange of heavy neutrinos through the J^μ current mediated by \tilde{W}_μ^- boson (this means the second term of equation (46))³. Its amplitude must be divided in two parts, depending on $q \gg M$ or $q \ll M$. For the case $q \ll M$ the amplitude is given by:

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(2) = -8G_F^2 C_\theta^4 \left\langle \frac{1}{M_\nu} \right\rangle, \quad (51)$$

where

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{M_\nu} \right\rangle = \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{(V_{ei}^{\nu N})^2}{M_i} \right|, \quad (52)$$

and for the case $q \gg M$ the amplitude is:

$$\mathcal{A}'_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(2) = 8G_F^2 C_\theta^4 \frac{\langle M_\nu \rangle}{q^2} \quad (53)$$

with

$$\langle M_\nu \rangle = \left| \sum_{i=1}^3 (V_{ei}^{\nu N})^2 M_i \right|. \quad (54)$$

All the the other contributions to the process depend on $\sin \theta$ or $\tan \theta$, and as we showed, are negligible. For the sake of completeness we show all then in appendix A, but we did not analyse them.

Now, realize that $\frac{\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(2)}{\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(1)}$ will be always a number multiplied by q^2 . This analysis can be done for the case when the RHN are all in the GeV scale. Then, for the set of parameters studied in the section (III A) the ratio between the amplitudes is:

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(2)}{\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(1)} = -1.68 \times 10^{-2} \text{GeV}^{-2} q^2. \quad (55)$$

³ The heavy neutrinos we are referring to here are the RHN with masses from keV up to GeV

For $q \sim 200\text{MeV}$ we get $\frac{\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(2)}{\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(1)} \sim 10^{-4}$. As expected, RHN with mass at GeV scale gives a tiny contribution to the neutrinoless double beta decay.

For the MeV case studied in the section (III B), there are two different amplitudes that we must take into account. For the lightest RHN ($M_1 \sim 1.023\text{ MeV}$) the amplitude is of the form given in (53), and when compared with the standard one we found that it is $\sim 10^5$ times smaller. The second amplitude is due to the presence of the other two RHN whose eigenvalues are $M_2 \sim 69.82\text{ GeV}$ and $M_3 \sim 405.95\text{ GeV}$. In this case the amplitude is of the form given in (51) and for an estimated value of $q \sim 200\text{ MeV}$, the amplitude is $\sim 10^6$ times smaller than the standard one, too.

Finally, for the keV case studied in the section (III B), the amplitude, that is of the form given in (53) (since all the eigenvalues (42) are $\ll q$), may be of the same order of magnitude that the standard one. For our illustrative example we got

$$\frac{\mathcal{A}'_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(2)}{\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(1)} \sim 1.00064, \quad (56)$$

which is an interesting result. All this contributes to the enrichment of the 331RHN model.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this work we revisited the implementation of the type I seesaw mechanism into the 331RHN. As new element we observed that the mechanism must be performed at low energy scale, more precisely around tens of GeVs but can be lower. As far as we know this result is a novelty in the literature.

When the sextet of scalars is added to the 331RHN, the type I seesaw mechanism can be triggered with specific choices of the VEVs of the neutral components of the sextet. It happens that the VEV that generates Majorana mass for the right-handed neutrinos (the one that is responsible by the suppression of the active neutrino masses in the type I seesaw mechanism) also contributes to the mass of the gauge bosons of the model, and, in particular, to the mass of the standard charged gauge boson W^\pm . Consequently such VEV much lies at GeV scale, more precisely around tens of GeV if we wish to explain the recent CDF result concerning W mass.

As particular feature of the 331RHN the right-handed neutrinos as well as left-handed ones compose the same leptonic triplet and the neutrino masses is achieved by means of

the Yukawa interaction $G\bar{f}^C S^* f$. As result, the mass expression for active neutrinos as well as for the right-handed neutrinos share the same Yukawa couplings G . This fact connects the masses of the active neutrinos to the masses of the right-handed ones and has deep implications in the viability of the mechanism. Once the mechanism is performed at GeV scale, then right-handed neutrinos may develop masses in the range from few keVs up to GeV scale. In the case of GeV scale, there is no problem at all and the mechanism is perfectly viable. In the case when at least one right-handed neutrino (the lightest of them) belongs to keV or MeV scale we showed that the mechanism is viable only if the lightest right-handed neutrino is stable. This is very interesting because stability is a conditions to a neutral particle be a dark matter candidate of the universe. Another peculiar fact is that such stability require that the lightest of the active neutrino be very light. Then this scenario has two signature, namely the existence of right-handed neutrino as dark matter and a very light active neutrino. Future experiments seeking for absolute neutrino mass and the search for the discovery of the nature of dark matter may probe this proposal. We also checked the contribution of the right-handed neutrinos to the neutrinoless double beta decay, which may receive a robust contribution from RHN with masses at keV scale. In summary, the type I seesaw mechanism when implemented into the 331RHN model has remarkable implications in physics beyond the standard model.

Appendix A: More contributions to the Neutrinoless double beta decay

The following sketch was made for the case where RHN fulfill the condition $q \ll M$, and we called them heavy neutrinos, while active neutrinos are called light neutrinos. For the case when $q \gg M$, a subdivision of the amplitudes must be done as we did in the text of the article. Said that, we proceed as follow:

There is one contribution involving \tilde{W}_μ^- boson, but now interacting with the two charged currents J^μ and $(J^\mu)^C$ exchanging light neutrinos :

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(3) = 8G_F^2 \frac{\langle m'_\nu \rangle}{q^2} C_\theta^3 S_\theta \quad (\text{A1})$$

with

$$\langle m'_\nu \rangle = \sum_{i=1}^3 V_{ei}^{\nu\nu} V_{ei}^{N\nu} m_i \quad (\text{A2})$$

Similar to the previous contribution, we have another new one but now exchanging heavy neutrinos

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(4) = -8G_F^2 C_\theta^3 S_\theta \left\langle \frac{1}{M'_\nu} \right\rangle \quad (\text{A3})$$

with

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{M'_\nu} \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{V_{ei}^{\nu N} V_{ei}^{NN}}{M_i} \quad (\text{A4})$$

Let us consider contributions with \tilde{W} via J^μ and \tilde{V} via $J^{\mu C}$. In this case, for light neutrinos exchanged we have:

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(5) = 8G_F^2 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{W}}}{m_{\tilde{V}}} \right)^2 \frac{\langle m'_\nu \rangle}{q^2} C_\theta^3 S_\theta, \quad (\text{A5})$$

and with heavy neutrinos exchanged:

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(6) = -8G_F^2 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{W}}}{m_{\tilde{V}}} \right)^2 \left\langle \frac{1}{M'_\nu} \right\rangle C_\theta^3 S_\theta \quad (\text{A6})$$

As the last two contributions we show one involving only \tilde{V} but exchanging light neutrinos

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(7) = 8G_F^2 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{W}}}{m_{\tilde{V}}} \right)^4 \frac{\langle m''_\nu \rangle}{q^2} S_\theta^2 C_\theta^2 \quad (\text{A7})$$

where

$$m''_\nu = \sum_{i=1}^3 (V_{ei}^{N\nu})^2 m_i \quad (\text{A8})$$

and the other exchanging heavy neutrinos :

$$\mathcal{A}_{(\beta\beta)0\nu}(8) = -8G_F^2 \left(\frac{m_{\tilde{W}}}{m_{\tilde{V}}} \right)^4 \left\langle \frac{1}{M''_\nu} \right\rangle S_\theta^2 C_\theta^2 \quad (\text{A9})$$

with

$$\left\langle \frac{1}{M''_\nu} \right\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^3 \frac{(V_{ei}^{NN})^2}{M_i} \quad (\text{A10})$$

Acknowledgments

C.A.S.P was supported by the CNPq research grants No. 311936/2021-0. E.C. thanks the support received by the CNPq scholarship No. 140121/2022-6. D.C thanks the Department of Physics and Astronomy at Northwestern University for the hospitality during this period in which the project was carried out, especially André de Gouvêa for the useful discussions, time and motivation to develop this work.

-
- [1] P. Minkowski, *Phys. Lett. B* **67**, 421 (1977).
 - [2] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44**, 912 (1980).
 - [3] J. Kersten and A. Y. Smirnov, *Phys. Rev. D* **76**, 073005 (2007), 0705.3221.
 - [4] M. Singer, J. W. F. Valle, and J. Schechter, *Phys. Rev. D* **22**, 738 (1980).
 - [5] R. Foot, H. N. Long, and T. A. Tran, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, R34 (1994), hep-ph/9402243.
 - [6] J. C. Montero, F. Pisano, and V. Pleitez, *Phys. Rev. D* **47**, 2918 (1993), hep-ph/9212271.
 - [7] P. V. Dong and H. N. Long, *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 057302 (2008), 0801.4196.
 - [8] D. Cogollo, H. Diniz, C. A. de S. Pires, and P. S. Rodrigues da Silva, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **58**, 455 (2008), 0806.3087.
 - [9] N. A. Ky and N. T. H. Van, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 115017 (2005), hep-ph/0512096.
 - [10] D. Cogollo, H. Diniz, and C. A. de S. Pires, *Phys. Lett. B* **677**, 338 (2009), 0903.0370.
 - [11] C. A. de Sousa Pires, F. Ferreira De Freitas, J. Shu, L. Huang, and P. Wagner Vasconcelos Olegário, *Phys. Lett. B* **797**, 134827 (2019), 1812.10570.
 - [12] M. M. Ferreira, T. B. de Melo, S. Kovalenko, P. R. D. Pinheiro, and F. S. Queiroz, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 955 (2019), 1903.07634.
 - [13] J. T. Liu and D. Ng, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 548 (1994), hep-ph/9401228.
 - [14] D. Ng, *Phys. Rev. D* **49**, 4805 (1994), hep-ph/9212284.
 - [15] H. N. Long and V. T. Van, *J. Phys. G* **25**, 2319 (1999), hep-ph/9909302.
 - [16] V. Oliveira and C. A. d. S. Pires (2022), 2208.00420.
 - [17] H. N. Long, *Phys. Rev. D* **53**, 437 (1996), hep-ph/9504274.
 - [18] T. Aaltonen et al. (CDF), *Science* **376**, 170 (2022).
 - [19] J. de Blas, M. Pierini, L. Reina, and L. Silvestrini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **129**, 271801 (2022),

2204.04204.

- [20] Y. A. Coutinho, V. Salustino Guimarães, and A. A. Nepomuceno, *Phys. Rev. D* **87**, 115014 (2013), 1304.7907.
- [21] A. Alves, L. Duarte, S. Kovalenko, Y. M. Oviedo-Torres, F. S. Queiroz, and Y. S. Villamizar, *Phys. Rev. D* **106**, 055027 (2022), 2203.02520.
- [22] R. L. Workman et al. (Particle Data Group), *PTEP* **2022**, 083C01 (2022).
- [23] E. Fernandez-Martinez, J. Hernandez-Garcia, and J. Lopez-Pavon, *JHEP* **08**, 033 (2016), 1605.08774.
- [24] P. Benes, A. Faessler, F. Simkovic, and S. Kovalenko, *Phys. Rev. D* **71**, 077901 (2005), hep-ph/0501295.
- [25] J. Adam et al. (MEG), *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 201801 (2013), 1303.0754.
- [26] F. F. Freitas, C. A. de S. Pires, and P. Vasconcelos, *Phys. Rev. D* **98**, 035005 (2018), 1805.09082.
- [27] A. Das, N. Okada, and D. Raut, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **78**, 696 (2018), 1711.09896.
- [28] A. Das, N. Okada, and D. Raut, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 115023 (2018), 1710.03377.
- [29] P. Cox, C. Han, and T. T. Yanagida, *JHEP* **01**, 037 (2018), 1707.04532.
- [30] D. Gorbunov and M. Shaposhnikov, *JHEP* **10**, 015 (2007), [Erratum: *JHEP* **11**, 101 (2013)], 0705.1729.
- [31] J. M. Berryman, A. de Gouvêa, K. J. Kelly, and Y. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. D* **96**, 075010 (2017), 1706.02722.
- [32] O. Ruchayskiy and A. Ivashko, *JCAP* **10**, 014 (2012), 1202.2841.
- [33] A. De Gouvêa, M. Sen, W. Tangarife, and Y. Zhang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 081802 (2020), 1910.04901.
- [34] M. Dutra, V. Oliveira, C. A. de S. Pires, and F. S. Queiroz, *JHEP* **10**, 005 (2021), 2104.14542.
- [35] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, *Phys. Rev. D* **25**, 2951 (1982).
- [36] A. G. Dias, A. Doff, C. A. de S. Pires, and P. S. Rodrigues da Silva, *Phys. Rev. D* **72**, 035006 (2005), hep-ph/0503014.