

A Two-Higgs Doublet Model With Remarkable CP Properties

P. M. Ferreira^{a,b} and João P. Silva^{a,c}

^a Instituto Superior de Engenharia de Lisboa,
Rua Conselheiro Emídio Navarro, 1900 Lisboa, Portugal

^b Centro de Física Teórica e Computacional,
Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Prof. Gama Pinto 2, 1649-003 Lisboa, Portugal

^c Centro de Física Teórica de Partículas,
Instituto Superior Técnico, P-1049-001 Lisboa, Portugal

October 30, 2018

Abstract. We analyze generalized CP symmetries of two-Higgs doublet models, extending them from the scalar to the fermion sector of the theory. We show that, with a single exception, those symmetries imply massless fermions. The single model which accommodates a fermionic mass spectrum compatible with experimental data possesses a remarkable feature. It displays a new type of spontaneous CP violation, which occurs not in the scalar sector responsible for the symmetry breaking mechanism but, rather, in the fermion sector.

1 Introduction

Although the Standard Model (SM) of electroweak interactions has had extraordinary experimental confirmation, the Higgs mechanism of the symmetry breaking responsible for giving mass to the particles remains largely untested. In particular, there is no fundamental reason why the SM should have only one Higgs. In fact, one of the simplest extensions of the SM is the Two-Higgs Doublet Model (THDM) proposed by Lee [1], where there are five scalar particles (three neutral and one charged). One of the main features of this model, and the main reason Lee proposed it, is that it allows for the possibility of the vacuum of the theory spontaneously breaking the CP symmetry .

The most general scalar potential in the THDM contains 14 real parameters, as opposed to the 2 in the SM potential. There is thus a great interest in reducing the number of free parameters in the THDM, through the imposition of some symmetry in the theory. One such class of symmetries are the so-called generalized CP (GCP) transformations - field transformations which combine CP with unitary transformations. As far as we know, GCP were first discussed in [2]. Their explicit use for quarks appeared in [3] and GCP in the scalar sector was initially developed by the Viena group in [4, 5, 6]. GCP symmetries are quite interesting in that they reduce immensely to number of free parameters in the potential. Recently [7, 8] it was shown that, from the point of view of the scalar potential, these GCP symmetries fall unto three categories, designated in [8] by CP1, CP2 and CP3. The CP1 class corresponds to the standard CP transformation. The CP3 models, unlike CP1 and CP2, correspond to a continuous symmetry.

In this paper we will show that CP2 cannot be extended from the scalar sector to the fermionic one without forcing at least one fermion to have zero mass. Likewise, it will be shown that, out of the infinite number of possible CP3 models, only one can be extended to the

fermionic sector without inducing zero fermion masses. Thus we are able to drastically curtail the number of models which includes an acceptable fermion sector.

Having found only one acceptable GCP THDM, we will then proceed to analyze its CP properties. We conclude that the model has a new type of spontaneous CP breaking. In this model, CP violation does not emerge from explicit CP breaking in the Yukawa sector, as it does in the SM; nor does it emerge from spontaneous CP violation in the scalar sector, induced by the vacuum of the model, as in the Lee model. Rather, in the model herein presented, the lagrangian is explicitly CP conserving and the scalar sector preserves CP, even after spontaneous symmetry breaking. Nonetheless, the vacuum expectation values generated by the scalar sector induce a CP violating phase in the quark sector. As far as we know, this is the first illustration in the literature of this peculiar type of spontaneous CP violation.

This paper is structured as follows: in section 2 we present the scalar potential of the theory and review recent results on its possible symmetries, as well as the impact that GCP has on its parameters. In section 3 we show how GCP can be extended to the fermion sector, and we prove that, with a single exception, GCP always implies massless fermions; we also perform a fast fit to experimental constraints. In section 4 we discuss the CP properties of this model, and show that it has a new type of spontaneous CP breaking. We present our conclusions in section 5.

2 The scalar potential

Let us first review the scalar sector of the THDM, and what is known of its symmetries. In the THDM one introduces two hypercharge $Y = 1/2$ Higgs scalar doublets. The most general THDM scalar potential which is renormalizable and compatible with the gauge symmetries of the SM is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
V_H = & m_{11}^2 \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1 + m_{22}^2 \Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2 - \left[m_{12}^2 \Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2 + \text{H.c.} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_1 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \lambda_2 (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 \\
& + \lambda_3 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1) (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) + \lambda_4 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_1) + \left[\frac{1}{2} \lambda_5 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2)^2 + \lambda_6 (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_1) (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) \right. \\
& \left. + \lambda_7 (\Phi_2^\dagger \Phi_2) (\Phi_1^\dagger \Phi_2) + \text{H.c.} \right], \tag{1}
\end{aligned}$$

and it involves 14 parameters. Here m_{11}^2 , m_{22}^2 , and $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_4$ are real parameters, while, in general, m_{12}^2 , λ_5 , λ_6 and λ_7 are complex. ‘‘H.c.’’ stands for Hermitian conjugation.

This large number of parameters may be reduced by requiring that the model be invariant for some type of symmetry. Namely, we may require invariance for field transformations of the form

$$\Phi_a \rightarrow S_{ab} \Phi_b, \tag{2}$$

for an S matrix belonging to $U(2)$, which are known as Higgs family symmetries. Another possibility¹ consists on the so-called generalized CP symmetries [2, 3, 4, 5, 6], requiring invariance under the following field transformations:

$$\Phi_a \rightarrow X_{ab} \Phi_b^*, \tag{3}$$

with $X \in U(2)$ as well. Each of these symmetries corresponds to a different model, with different phenomenology. One may wonder *how many* different choices of scalar potentials can one make in the THDM. Recently it has been shown that applying the symmetries with any possible

¹Both field transformations discussed here obey a basic requirement, namely leaving the kinetic terms of the lagrangian unaffected.

choices for S and X leads only to six classes of scalar potentials [7, 8]. The impact of the six classes on the parameters are given in Table 1, for specific basis choices. This result is already

Table 1: Impact of the symmetries on the coefficients of the Higgs potential in a specific basis. See Ref. [8] for more details.

symmetry	m_{11}^2	m_{22}^2	m_{12}^2	λ_1	λ_2	λ_3	λ_4	λ_5	λ_6	λ_7
Z_2			0						0	0
$U(1)$			0					0	0	0
$U(2)$		m_{11}^2	0		λ_1		$\lambda_1 - \lambda_3$	0	0	0
CP1			real					real	real	real
CP2		m_{11}^2	0		λ_1					$-\lambda_6$
CP3		m_{11}^2	0		λ_1		$\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4$ (real)		0	0

extremely important: there are only six possible different types of physical models in the scalar sector. The first three may be obtained from family symmetries alone, and are not the subject of this work. The next three may be obtained from GCP symmetries alone, and we will study them in detail. Let us begin by explaining what the difference is between them. Since any basis of fields $\{\Phi_1, \Phi_2\}$ has to give the same physical results, we will use that liberty of basis choice to simplify the GCP field transformations of Eq. (3). In fact it has been shown that there is always a basis of scalar fields, for which the most general GCP transformation matrix X may be brought to the form

$$X_\theta = \begin{bmatrix} c_\theta & s_\theta \\ -s_\theta & c_\theta \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi/2$ [9]. Henceforth, $c = \cos$, $s = \sin$ and the subindices indicate the angle. The classes CP1, CP2, and CP3, arise respectively from X_0 , $X_{\pi/2}$, and X_θ for any one (or several) θ excluding 0 and $\pi/2$. CP1 is the usual CP symmetry. CP2, like CP1, is a discrete symmetry, although it eliminates far more parameters in the potential than CP1 does. CP3 corresponds to an infinite number of possibilities, since the angle θ varies in a continuous interval. We will now analyze the extension of these symmetries to the fermion sector. Although we will only look at the quark sector, the same conclusions can be trivially extended to leptons.

3 Yukawa interactions

In the previous section we have seen that there are only three classes of models with GCP symmetries. However, that study considered only the scalar sector, not the whole lagrangian. We will now show how GCP can be extended to the fermion sector, and what consequences arise thereof. The scalar-quark Yukawa interactions of the THDM may be written as

$$-\mathcal{L}_Y = \bar{q}_L(\Gamma_1\Phi_1 + \Gamma_2\Phi_2)n_R + \bar{q}_L(\Delta_1\tilde{\Phi}_1 + \Delta_2\tilde{\Phi}_2)p_R + \text{H.c.}, \quad (5)$$

where $q_L = (p_L, n_L)^\top$ (n_R and p_R) is a vector in the 3-dimensional generation space of left-handed doublets (right-handed charge $-1/3$ and $+2/3$) quarks. Γ_1 , Γ_2 , Δ_1 , and Δ_2 are 3×3 matrices.

We now wish to impose GCP on scalars and also on fermions. For the quark fields, the GCP transformations take the form

$$\begin{aligned} q_L &\rightarrow X_\alpha \gamma^0 C q_L^*, \\ n_R &\rightarrow X_\beta \gamma^0 C n_R^*, \\ p_R &\rightarrow X_\gamma \gamma^0 C p_R^*, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where γ^0 (C) is the Dirac (charge-conjugation) matrix. As was the case with the scalar GCP transformations, we can also simplify the above with an appropriate basis choice for the fermion fields. In fact, we may take X to the simple form [9]

$$X_\alpha = \begin{bmatrix} c_\alpha & s_\alpha & 0 \\ -s_\alpha & c_\alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

where $0 \leq \alpha \leq \pi/2$, and similarly for X_β and X_γ . GCP is a good symmetry of \mathcal{L}_Y if and only if $\Gamma_b^* = (X_\theta)_{ab} X_\alpha^\dagger \Gamma_a X_\beta$, which we may write as

$$\begin{aligned} X_\alpha \Gamma_1^* - (c_\theta \Gamma_1 - s_\theta \Gamma_2) X_\beta &= 0, \\ X_\alpha \Gamma_2^* - (s_\theta \Gamma_1 + c_\theta \Gamma_2) X_\beta &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Since they are complex, this gives us 36 equations in the 36 unknown real and imaginary parts of the various entries of the Γ matrices. Because of Eq. (7), they break into four blocks, which we designate by mn , $m3$, $3n$, and 33 , where m and n can take the values 1 or 2. In each block we have a system of homogeneous linear equations; the parameters are zero unless the determinant of the system vanishes. For instance, the real (Re) and imaginary (Im) parts of $(\Gamma_1)_{33}$ and $(\Gamma_2)_{33}$ in Eq. (8) give the following set of linear equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{bmatrix} 1 - c_\theta & s_\theta \\ -s_\theta & 1 - c_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Re}(\Gamma_1)_{33} \\ \text{Re}(\Gamma_2)_{33} \end{bmatrix} &= 0, \\ \begin{bmatrix} 1 + c_\theta & -s_\theta \\ s_\theta & 1 + c_\theta \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \text{Im}(\Gamma_1)_{33} \\ \text{Im}(\Gamma_2)_{33} \end{bmatrix} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

The determinant of the first of these matrices gives $2(1 - c_\theta)$, whereas the second one is equal to $2(1 + c_\theta)$. Because of the limited range of variation of θ , the second determinant is never zero - which means that the Γ_{33} coefficients will always be real. As for the first of these determinants, it is only zero if $\theta = 0$ (the standard CP definition). For any other case, the 33 entries of the Γ matrices will be zero.

A similar reasoning applies to the $m3$ entries. Eq. (8) gives us a set of 4×4 equations on the real and imaginary parts of the Yukawa couplings, with corresponding determinants given by $4(c_\alpha - c_\theta)^2$ and $4(c_\alpha + c_\theta)^2$, respectively. Since α has the same range of variation than θ , these determinants only vanish in very specific situations; they vanish when $\alpha = \theta$ or $\alpha = \theta = \pi/2$, respectively. In the same manner, the $3n$ equations give rise to determinants equal to $4(c_\beta - c_\theta)^2$ and $4(c_\beta + c_\theta)^2$ for the real and imaginary parts, respectively, with analogous conditions for vanishing determinants.

Finally, the mn block from Eq. (8) gives us a set of 8×8 equations for the real and imaginary parts of the corresponding Yukawas. The corresponding determinants are

$$16 (c_\theta \pm c_{\alpha+\beta})^2 (c_\theta \pm c_{\alpha-\beta})^2, \quad (10)$$

with the “+” signs corresponding to the equations for the imaginary parts. We performed a thorough analysis of the conditions for vanishing determinants, and the results are summarized in Table 2. Similar results hold for the charged $+2/3$ quark matrices Δ_1 and Δ_2 , with $\beta \rightarrow \gamma$.

After spontaneous symmetry breaking, the fields acquire the vacuum expectation values (vevs) $v_1/\sqrt{2}$ and $v_2 e^{i\delta}/\sqrt{2}$; where v_1 and v_2 are real, without loss of generality. It is convenient to rotate into the so-called Higgs basis $\{H_1, H_2\}$ through $\Phi_a = U_{ab} H_b$, where

$$U^\dagger = \frac{1}{v} \begin{bmatrix} v_1 & v_2 e^{-i\delta} \\ v_2 & -v_1 e^{-i\delta} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

Table 2: Impact of the GCP symmetry on Γ_1 and Γ_2 . We separate real (Re) and imaginary (Im) components.

Γ_a matrix element	component	condition for vanishing determinant
33	Im	impossible
	Re	$\theta = 0$
13, 23	Im	$\alpha = \theta = \pi/2$
	Re	$\alpha = \theta$
31, 32	Im	$\beta = \theta = \pi/2$
	Re	$\beta = \theta$
11, 12, 21, 22	Im	$\theta = \pi - \alpha - \beta$
	Re	$\theta = \alpha + \beta$ or $\theta = \alpha - \beta$
		or $\theta = \beta - \alpha$

is unitary, and $v = \sqrt{v_1^2 + v_2^2} = (\sqrt{2}G_F)^{-1/2}$. This rotates the vev into H_1 allowing us to parametrize

$$H_1 = \begin{bmatrix} G^+ \\ (v + H^0 + iG^0)/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad H_2 = \begin{bmatrix} H^+ \\ (R + iI)/\sqrt{2} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where G^+ and G^0 are the Goldstone bosons, which, in the unitary gauge, become the longitudinal components of the W^+ and of the Z^0 , and H^0 , R and I are real neutral fields. In the new scalar basis, the Yukawa coupling matrices become $\Gamma_a^H = \Gamma_b U_{ba}$, $\Delta_a^H = \Delta_b U_{ba}^*$, and the scalar couplings are also rotated. Finally, the fermion mass basis is obtained through transformations U_α with $\alpha = d_L, d_R, u_L, u_R$ that diagonalize the quark couplings to H_1 ,

$$\begin{aligned} (v/\sqrt{2}) U_{d_L}^\dagger \Gamma_1^H U_{d_R} &= D_d = \text{diag}(m_d, m_s, m_b), \\ (v/\sqrt{2}) U_{u_L}^\dagger \Delta_1^H U_{u_R} &= D_u = \text{diag}(m_u, m_c, m_t), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

while the couplings to H_2 become (we follow the notation of [10, 11])

$$\begin{aligned} (v/\sqrt{2}) U_{d_L}^\dagger \Gamma_2^H U_{d_R} &= N_d, \\ (v/\sqrt{2}) U_{u_L}^\dagger \Delta_2^H U_{u_R} &= N_u. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The Yukawa lagrangian may then be written as

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{v}{\sqrt{2}} \mathcal{L}_Y &= (\bar{u}_L V, \bar{d}_L)(D_d H_1 + N_d H_2) d_R \\ &+ (\bar{u}_L, \bar{d}_L V^\dagger)(D_u \tilde{H}_1 + N_u \tilde{H}_2) u_R + H.c., \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $V = U_{u_L}^\dagger U_{d_L}$ is the CKM matrix. Thus N_d and N_u are responsible for flavor changing neutral currents (FCNC) involving the scalars R and I .

Let us now look back at Table 2. We see that $\theta = 0$, corresponding to the usual definition of CP, forces all Yukawa couplings to be real. This is well known, but it requires that CP violation arise spontaneously. This theory leads to FCNC, which are constrained by experiment. This could be cured with further discrete symmetries. It is known that imposing the absence of FCNC is inconsistent with GCP for three quark families and any number of Higgs fields [6]. Here we

will take the view that the scalar masses may be large enough to suppress FCNC, and consider the most general couplings.

The case of $\theta = \pi/2$ corresponds to CP2. As we have seen, this forces $(\Gamma_1)_{33} = (\Gamma_2)_{33} = 0$. If $\alpha = \beta = \pi/2$ then the mn block vanishes. Thus the determinant of D_d vanishes, forcing one quark mass to zero. This is excluded by experiment. If $\alpha \neq \pi/2$ and/or $\beta \neq \pi/2$, then the last column and/or the last row of D_d vanishes, which leads again to a zero mass quark. As a result, *it is impossible to extend CP2 to the quark sector* in a way consistent with experiment. This zero mass problem had already been faced in [12, 13], for a particular extension of CP2. We note that CP2 could be consistently extended to the fermion sector provided there were four fermion families.

Now we come to the most interesting case: consider $0 < \theta < \pi/2$. Here $(\Gamma_1)_{33} = (\Gamma_2)_{33} = 0$ and, in order for the $m3$ and $3n$ entries to differ from zero (otherwise there would be at least a zero mass quark), we need to have $\alpha = \beta = \theta$. In this case, the determinants for the mn block in Eq. (10) simplify to

$$\text{Imaginary: } 256 (c_{\theta/2})^8 (1 - 2c_\theta)^2 \quad (16)$$

$$\text{Real: } 256 (s_{\theta/2})^8 (1 + 2c_\theta)^2. \quad (17)$$

The second determinant never vanishes, which implies that the mn entries will only have imaginary parts. And the first determinant, Eq. (16), only vanishes if $\theta = \pi/3$. For all other cases, the quark mass matrices will have zero eigenvalues. Notice that the fact that the angles α , β and θ are constrained to be in the interval $[0, \pi/2]$ was fundamental in this demonstration.

Therefore, out of the infinite number of GCP symmetries, only one survives: the case where one has $\theta = \alpha = \beta = \pi/3$. For this model the Yukawa matrices have the form:

$$\Gamma_1 = \begin{bmatrix} ia_{11} & ia_{12} & a_{13} \\ ia_{12} & -ia_{11} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & 0 \end{bmatrix},$$

$$\Gamma_2 = \begin{bmatrix} ia_{12} & -ia_{11} & -a_{23} \\ -ia_{11} & -ia_{12} & a_{13} \\ -a_{32} & a_{31} & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

Notice that Γ_1 has 2 (4) independent imaginary (real) entries and that Γ_2 does not involve any new parameter. Similar parametrizations hold for Δ_1 and Δ_2 , involving 6 new parameters ($a \rightarrow b$). We stress that this is the only possible extension of GCP into the fermion sector consistent with the fact that the quarks have non-vanishing masses, and it leads to a very tightly constrained “minimal” model.

Our theory has only 12 Yukawa parameters and two independent vevs. Indeed, v_1 may be made real without loss of generality; given v^2 , this fixes v_2 , and we only need the phase δ . In order to perform a numerical fit, we define the matrices

$$H_d = \frac{v^2}{2} \Gamma_1^H (\Gamma_1^H)^\dagger = U_{dL} D_d^2 U_{dL}^\dagger,$$

$$H_u = \frac{v^2}{2} \Delta_1^H (\Delta_1^H)^\dagger = U_{uL} D_u^2 U_{uL}^\dagger. \quad (19)$$

The eigenvalues of these matrices give the square of the quark masses, providing six constraints. There are four other experimental constraints arising from the four independent parameters parametrizing the CKM matrix V . We can take these as the eigenvalues of $H_u H_d$, and also the CP-violating quantity [3]

$$J = \text{Tr}[H_u, H_d]^3 = 6i(m_t^2 - m_c^2)(m_t^2 - m_u^2)(m_c^2 - m_u^2) \\ \times (m_b^2 - m_s^2)(m_b^2 - m_d^2)(m_s^2 - m_d^2) \text{Im}(V_{us} V_{cb} V_{ub}^* V_{cs}^*). \quad (20)$$

Using Eq. (18) in Eq. (20), we have shown that $\delta = 0$ implies $J = 0$. Said otherwise, spontaneous CP violation is required in order to have CP violation in the CKM matrix, and this only occurs if we add a soft symmetry breaking term to the scalar potential. However, the CP properties of this model are far from obvious, and will be discussed in the following section.

Using a fast numerical fit, we have found that setting $a_{11} = 4.6927 \times 10^{-6}$, $a_{12} = -5.9799 \times 10^{-4}$, $a_{13} = -2.32 \times 10^{-2}$, $a_{23} = -6.6 \times 10^{-3}$, $a_{31} = -8.815 \times 10^{-5}$, $a_{32} = 5.1193 \times 10^{-6}$ in the down-quark sector and $b_{11} = 7.3 \times 10^{-3}$, $b_{12} = 7.6445 \times 10^{-5}$, $b_{13} = 9.578 \times 10^{-1}$, $b_{23} = 2.325 \times 10^{-1}$, $b_{31} = 1.3446 \times 10^{-4}$, $b_{32} = 5.9491 \times 10^{-4}$, in the up-quark sector, and $v_1 = 173.944$, $v_2 \cos \delta = -0.8467$, $v_2 \sin \delta = -0.9565$, we obtain $m_d = 0.00298$, $m_s = 0.10511$, $m_b = 4.19701$, $m_u = 0.00200$, $m_c = 1.27439$, $m_t = 171.451$, for the masses, and the magnitudes of the CKM matrix elements are

$$|V| = \begin{bmatrix} 0.97430 & 0.22521 & 0.00339 \\ 0.22516 & 0.97348 & 0.04039 \\ 0.00579 & 0.04011 & 0.99918 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

All masses and vevs are in GeV. The values of $v^2 = v_1^2 + v_2^2$, the masses, and the magnitudes of the CKM matrix elements are in very good agreement with the experimental data [14]. One may wonder whether the vevs we used above can be generated by the scalar potential. As we mentioned earlier, we need to introduce soft breaking terms in the scalar potential to generate δ , namely by setting $m_{11}^2 \neq m_{22}^2$ and $\text{Re}(m_{12}^2) \neq 0$. It is easy to find values for the potential's parameters which generate the desired vevs: they can be reproduced by $m_{11}^2 = -28791$, $m_{22}^2 = 5679.5$, $\text{Re}(m_{12}^2) = -167.8012$, $\text{Im}(m_{12}^2) = 0$, $\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 0.9516$, $\lambda_3 = 0.0176$, and $\lambda_4 = 0.3643$ (the quadratic parameters are expressed in units of GeV^2).

The numerical fit is quite successful, but the exception is $|V_{td}|$ which, due to the hierarchical nature of the CKM matrix elements, becomes much more difficult to fit ². A related problem occurs with the CP-violating quantity $J_{ckm} = \text{Im}(V_{us}V_{cb}V_{ub}^*V_{cs}^*)$. For our choice of parameters, one obtains $J_{ckm} = -5.9 \times 10^{-8}$, while the experimental data leads to $J_{ckm} = (3.05 \pm 0.20) \times 10^{-5}$. The reason has to do with the sensitivity of our fit procedure to the input parameters. We have fit Z_{us} , Z_{ub} , Z_{cs} , and Z_{cb} , where $Z_{ij} = |V_{ij}|^2$. These four elements can be used to parametrize completely the CKM matrix [15, 16, 17]. In particular [18],

$$4J_{ckm}^2 = 4Z_{us}Z_{ub}Z_{cs}Z_{cb} - (1 - Z_{us} - Z_{ub} - Z_{cs} - Z_{cb} + Z_{us}Z_{cb} + Z_{ub}Z_{cs})^2. \quad (22)$$

Using the experimental values for the CKM matrix elements [14], one can show that to first order

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\Delta J_{ckm}}{J_{ckm}} &\sim 540.95 \frac{\Delta Z_{us}}{Z_{us}} + 0.7 \frac{\Delta Z_{ub}}{Z_{ub}} \\ &+ 10065.9 \frac{\Delta Z_{cs}}{Z_{cs}} + 18.0 \frac{\Delta Z_{cb}}{Z_{cb}}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

This shows how extremely sensitive J_{ckm} is to the exact value of V_{cs} , explaining why it is easy to perform a fast fit to the latter, but thus inducing a large error on the former.

4 A New Type of Spontaneous CP Violation

We now come to the most remarkable feature of this model, namely its spontaneous CP violation properties. We have already mentioned that, to obtain a non-zero value for the Jarlskog invariant

²Notice that the direct measurement of $|V_{td}|$ comes from the mixing in the B system, which occurs in the SM through a box diagram. This mixing can receive contributions involving the second Higgs, thus altering the value of $|V_{td}|$.

J , Eq. (20), we need the vevs of the scalar fields to have a relative phase. Usually, this fact by itself is taken to be a sign of spontaneous CP violation in the scalar sector. The model we are now discussing behaves, however, in a very different fashion. Regardless of its possible future experimental relevance as a viable description of nature, this model serves as a theoretical example of a new kind of spontaneous CP violation.

First, let us demonstrate that the lagrangian of this model is explicitly CP-conserving, *i.e.* that it is possible to write it in a field basis where all parameters are real. We see in the CP3 entry in Table 1 that the scalar potential only has real parameters. As was mentioned above, the soft breaking terms we introduced are also real, so there are no complex phases in the scalar sector, prior to SESB.

Now for the Yukawa sector. It might seem, looking at the form of the Yukawa matrices in Eq. (18), that one cannot avoid the presence of complex numbers in the Lagrangian. However, we are free to choose a different quark basis, by performing transformations of the type

$$q_L \rightarrow U_L q_L, \quad n_R \rightarrow U_R n_R, \quad (24)$$

with $U(3)$ matrices U_L and U_R . This changes the Yukawa matrices according to

$$\Gamma_k \rightarrow U_L^\dagger \Gamma_k U_R. \quad (25)$$

By choosing $U_L^\dagger = U_R = \text{diag}(e^{-i\pi/4}, e^{-i\pi/4}, e^{i\pi/4})$, we remove all factors of i from the Γ matrices and are left with

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_1 &\rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{12} & -a_{11} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \\ \Gamma_2 &\rightarrow \begin{bmatrix} a_{12} & -a_{11} & -a_{23} \\ -a_{11} & -a_{12} & a_{13} \\ -a_{32} & a_{31} & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where all parameters are real. We stress that the basis choice that leads to this result involves only the fermion fields, and as such does not introduce any phases in the scalar potential. An identical fermion basis choice may be used to render real the Yukawa matrices in the up-quark and leptonic sectors. Hence, we have proved that it is possible to find a basis where all parameters in the lagrangian are real - the model is explicitly CP conserving.

After SESB, with the soft breaking we discussed, we introduce a complex phase δ in the theory, from the vevs $v_1/\sqrt{2}$ and $v_2 e^{i\delta}/\sqrt{2}$. One might wonder whether $\delta \neq 0$ implies the presence of spontaneous CP violation in the scalar sector. This is best investigated with the basis-invariant quantities developed by Lavoura and Silva [19] and by Botella and Silva [11]. Their explicit calculation shows that they all vanish - thus, with the proposed soft breaking of the CP3 symmetry there is no CP violation in the scalar sector, whether explicit or spontaneous. A simple way to confirm this is by changing to the Higgs basis, as given by the transformation in Eq. (11). In that basis, the potential, with the soft breaking terms already included, becomes

$$\begin{aligned} V_H &= \bar{m}_{11}^2 H_1^\dagger H_1 + \bar{m}_{22}^2 H_2^\dagger H_2 - \left[\bar{m}_{12}^2 H_1^\dagger H_2 + \text{H.c.} \right] + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\lambda}_1 (H_1^\dagger H_1)^2 + \frac{1}{2} \bar{\lambda}_2 (H_2^\dagger H_2)^2 \\ &+ \bar{\lambda}_3 (H_1^\dagger H_1)(H_2^\dagger H_2) + \bar{\lambda}_4 (H_1^\dagger H_2)(H_2^\dagger H_1) + \left[\frac{1}{2} \bar{\lambda}_5 (H_1^\dagger H_2)^2 + \bar{\lambda}_6 (H_1^\dagger H_1)(H_1^\dagger H_2) \right. \\ &+ \left. \bar{\lambda}_7 (H_2^\dagger H_2)(H_1^\dagger H_2) + \text{H.c.} \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

All coefficients are real, except \bar{m}_{12}^2 , $\bar{\lambda}_5$, $\bar{\lambda}_6$, and $\bar{\lambda}_7$. The stationarity conditions for the vacuum impose $2\bar{m}_{12}^2 = \bar{\lambda}_6 v^2$. Thus, to study CP we need only the phases of

$$\begin{aligned} -\bar{\lambda}_7 = \bar{\lambda}_6 &= \frac{2}{v^4} v_1 v_2 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4) \sin \delta \eta, \\ \bar{\lambda}_5 &= -\frac{1}{v^4} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4) \eta^2, \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where

$$\eta = -i \left(v_1^2 e^{i\delta} + v_2^2 e^{-i\delta} \right). \quad (29)$$

The only phases invariant under a trivial rephasing of H_2 and, thus, possibly signaling CP violation are $\text{Im}(\bar{\lambda}_6 \bar{\lambda}_7^*)$, $\text{Im}(\bar{\lambda}_5^* \bar{\lambda}_6^2)$, and $\text{Im}(\bar{\lambda}_5^* \bar{\lambda}_7^2)$. These are precisely the three quantities introduced by Lavoura and Silva [19] to probe all possible sources of CP violation in the scalar sector in a basis-invariant way. Since these quantities are all zero, we conclude that there is no CP violation in the scalar sector of the theory, even after SESB. This means, in particular, that one can find a field basis where there is no mixing between the CP-even and CP-odd neutral scalar particles.

One may then ask whether the phase δ is at all relevant in the model. The answer is yes because, due to the interplay between the scalar and Yukawa sectors of the theory, there is no choice of field basis through which one can absorb δ . In fact, the CP-violating quantity J of Eq. (20) is directly proportional to $\sin \delta$. Notice, too, that as long as $\delta \neq 0$ the FCNC involving N_d and N_u , in Eq. (14), will also, in general, involve complex phases and as such may well serve as further sources of CP violation.³ But all possible sources of CP violation vanish if $\delta = 0$, even though no CP breaking occurs in the scalar sector.

This, then, is a new type of CP violation:

- It is not like that of the SM, since there CP is explicitly broken at the lagrangian level;
- It is not like the CP violation that occurs in Lee-type mechanisms, since there CP is spontaneously broken in the scalar sector.

In the model herein presented, it is the fermion sector which exhibits the CP violation that arises spontaneously. And the CKM matrix is generated through a spontaneous breaking of CP, not an explicit one as is the case of the SM. Of course, these results were obtained at tree level. Still, it is interesting that the scalar sector does the deed (spontaneously break the symmetry) but it is the fermion sector which pays the consequence (providing CP violation). To the best of our knowledge, this type of CP violation is unheard of in the literature.

5 Conclusions

We have shown that, for the most part, the generalized CP symmetries of the scalar sector cannot be extended to the quark sector with three generations, while keeping all six quarks massive. This reduces dramatically the types of available models. We have found the only exception: the only THDM with GCP which leads to an acceptable fermion mass spectrum. We have shown that the model has very few parameters, both in the scalar and Yukawa sectors, and that it can give a good fit to the known quark masses and mixings. Due to the hierarchical nature

³If the masses of the new scalars are large enough, then these sources of CP violation will have a small impact on current experiments, including those currently used to constrain V . Our aim in this section is to highlight a new scenario for spontaneous CP violation and not a particular implementation thereof.

of the masses and CKM matrix elements, very precise numerical fits are needed. This model has FCNC which might have considerable impact on its experimental predictions for hadron phenomenology. A detailed study of its impact on such observables is therefore needed, and will be presented elsewhere [20].

We have also shown that this model has the peculiar feature that the scalar sector by itself is both explicitly and spontaneously CP-conserving, but that it generates a symmetry breaking which induces CP violation in the quark sector. This constitutes a new type of spontaneous CP violation, different from the SM or the usual findings of the THDM. As such this model, regardless of its experimental relevance, serves as the first example of a new way of generating CP violation. It is not unique in that respect: in fact, it is a trivial exercise to build a three-Higgs doublet model which displays exactly the same CP properties.

There is a further motivation for studying in detail models of spontaneous CP violation. The excellent agreement between the SM and all CP violating experiments has been taken as a definitive confirmation of the SM's CP violation mechanism, *i.e.* the existence of explicitly CP violating Yukawa couplings. Models of CP violation, like the one presented here, where J could be the dominant source of CP violation raise the tantalizing possibility that, contrary to widespread belief, the current experiments on CP violation confirm the Cabibbo-Kobayashi-Maskawa source of CP violation but not its origin in the explicit CP breaking of the Yukawa interactions.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to L. Lavoura for reading and commenting on the manuscript. The work of P.M.F. is supported in part by the Portuguese *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (FCT) under contract PTDC/FIS/70156/2006. The work of J.P.S. is supported in part by FCT under contract CFTP-Plurianual (U777).

References

- [1] T. D. Lee, “A Theory of Spontaneous T Violation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **8**, 1226 (1973), .
- [2] T. D. Lee and G. C. Wick, “Space Inversion, Time Reversal, And Other Discrete Symmetries In Local Field Theories,” *Phys. Rev.* **148**, 1385 (1966).
- [3] J. Bernabéu, G. C. Branco, and M. Gronau, “Cp Restrictions On Quark Mass Matrices,” *Phys. Lett.* **169B**, 243 (1986).
- [4] G. Ecker, W. Grimus, and W. Konetschny, “Quark Mass Matrices In Left-Right Symmetric Gauge Theories,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B191**, 465 (1981).
- [5] G. Ecker, W. Grimus and H. Neufeld, “Spontaneous CP Violation In Left-Right Symmetric Gauge Theories,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **247**, 70 (1984).
- [6] H. Neufeld, W. Grimus and G. Ecker, “Generalized CP invariance, neutral flavor conservation and the structure of the mixing matrix”, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **3**, 603 (1988).
- [7] I. P. Ivanov, “Minkowski space structure of the Higgs potential in 2HDM: II. Minima, symmetries, and topology,” *Phys. Rev. D* **77**, 015017 (2008) [arXiv:0710.3490 [hep-ph]].
- [8] P. M. Ferreira, H. E. Haber and J. P. Silva, “Generalized CP symmetries and special regions of parameter space in the two-Higgs-doublet model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79**, 116004 (2009) [arXiv:0902.1537 [hep-ph]].

- [9] G. Ecker, W. Grimus and H. Neufeld, “A Standard Form For Generalized CP Transformations,” *J. Phys. A* **20**, L807 (1987).
- [10] L. Lavoura, “Models of CP violation exclusively via neutral scalar exchange,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **9**, 1873 (1994).
- [11] F. J. Botella and J. P. Silva, “Jarlskog - like invariants for theories with scalars and fermions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **51**, 3870 (1995) [arXiv:hep-ph/9411288].
- [12] M. Maniatis, A. von Manteuffel and O. Nachtmann, “A new type of CP symmetry, family replication and fermion mass hierarchies,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **57**, 739 (2008) [arXiv:0711.3760 [hep-ph]].
- [13] M. Maniatis and O. Nachtmann, “On the phenomenology of a two-Higgs-doublet model with maximal CP symmetry at the LHC,” *JHEP* **0905**, 028 (2009) [arXiv:0901.4341 [hep-ph]].
- [14] C. Amsler *et al.* [Particle Data Group], “Review of particle physics,” *Phys. Lett. B* **667**, 1 (2008).
- [15] G. C. Branco and L. Lavoura, “Rephasing Invariant Parametrization Of The Quark Mixing Matrix,” *Phys. Lett. B* **208**, 123 (1988).
- [16] L. Lavoura, “Parametrization of the four generation quark mixing matrix by the moduli of its matrix elements,” *Phys. Rev. D* **40**, 2440 (1989).
- [17] L. Lavoura, “On The Reconstruction Of The Four Generation Ckm Matrix From The Moduli Of Its Matrix Elements: Existence Of Discrete Ambiguities,” *Phys. Lett. B* **223**, 97 (1989).
- [18] G. C. Branco, L. Lavoura, and J. P. Silva, *CP Violation* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1999).
- [19] L. Lavoura and J. P. Silva, “Fundamental CP violating quantities in a SU(2) x U(1) model with many Higgs doublets”, *Phys. Rev. D* **50**, 4619 (1994) [arXiv:9404276 [hep-ph]].
- [20] P. M. Ferreira and J. P. Silva, in preparation.