Underlying symmetry among the quark and lepton mixing angles (Seven year update)

J. S. Markovitch
P.O. Box 2411
West Brattleboro, VT 05303[*]

(Dated: December 27, 2014)

In 2007 a single mathematical model encompassing both quark and lepton mixing was described. This model exploited the fact that when a 3×3 rotation matrix whose elements are squared is subtracted from its transpose, a matrix is produced whose non-diagonal elements have a common absolute value, where this value is an intrinsic property of the rotation matrix. For the traditional CKM quark mixing matrix with its second and third rows interchanged (i.e., c - t interchange) this value equals one-third the corresponding value for the leptonic matrix (roughly, 0.05 versus 0.15). This model was distinguished by three such constraints on mixing. As seven years have elapsed since its introduction, it is timely to assess the model's accuracy. Despite large conflicts with experiment at the time of its introduction, and significant improvements in experimental accuracy since then, the model's six angles collectively fit experiment well; but one angle, incorrectly forecast, did require toggling (in 2012) the sign of an integer exponent. The model's mixing angles in degrees are 45, 33.210 911, 8.034 394 (the angle affected) for leptons; and 12.920 966, 2.367 442, 0.190 986 for quarks.

PACS numbers: 12.15.Ff, 14.60.Pq

[*]Electronic address: jsmarkovitch@gmail.com

Contents

I. INTRODUCTION

A mathematical model encompassing both quark and lepton mixing was introduced in 2007 [1] and extended to include CP-violating phases in 2011 [2]. As seven years have elapsed since its introduction it is timely to issue an update:

- to review the status of the model's predictions.
- to reference new results showing that a key equation employed by the mixing model occurs independently in connection with the solution to a nonstandard cubic equation [3, 4].

II. FINE STRUCTURE CONSTANT DERIVED FROM $g_{12} = 1/10$ AND $g_{13} = 1/30\,000$

Experiment reveals that the quark and lepton mixing angles occupy a wide range [5, 6]

$$\sim\!45^\circ > \sim\!33^\circ > \sim\!13^\circ > \sim\!8^\circ > \sim\!2^\circ > \sim\!0.2^\circ \quad .$$

In order to produce model angles fitting these experimental angles we begin by defining

$$\left.\begin{aligned} g_{12} &= \frac{1}{10} \\ g_{13} &= \frac{1}{30\,000} \end{aligned}\right\} \quad . \tag{1a}$$

These definitions partly derive from this fine structure constant inverse α^{-1} approximation (accurate to within about seven parts per billion)

$$\left[\frac{1}{3g_{12}} - \frac{g_{13}}{3}\right]^3 + \left[\frac{1}{g_{12}} - g_{13}\right]^2 =$$
$$\left[\frac{10}{3} - \frac{1}{3\times 30\,000}\right]^3 + \left[10 - \frac{1}{30\,000}\right]^2 = \alpha^{-1} = 137.036\,000\,0023\ldots \quad ,$$

where the 2010 CODATA value for α^{-1} equals 137.035 999 074 [7].

More importantly, new results [3, 4] show that this equation — including 137.036 — occurs naturally in connection with the solution to a nonstandard cubic equation $(m+x)^3/3m + (m+x)^2 = Z$. This underscores that the above values for g_{12} and g_{13} were not merely "*chosen* to fit the data."

TABLE I: The six angles below are constrained by the requirement that (a) the values of the first two rows sum to equal the values of the third; (b) the values of each row fulfill Eq. (1b); (c) the values of rows one, two, and three produce the identities of Eqs. (2d), (3d), and (4d), respectively. With the exception of θ_{13}^L these angles are the predicted mixing angles.

g_{12}	g_{13}	θ_{23}^L	θ_{13}^L [a]	θ_{12}^L	θ_{23}^Q	θ_{13}^Q	θ_{12}^Q
1/10 [b]	0	$45° + 90°$	0°	33.210 911°	$+ 90°$	0°	12.920 966°
0 [c]	1/30 000	$- 90°$	0.013 665°	0°	2.367 442°	0.190 986°	0°
1/10 [d]	1/30 000	45°	0.013 665°	33.210 911°	$2.367\,442° + 90°$	0.190 986°	12.920 966°

[a]But it is $\varphi_{13}^L = 8.034\,394°$ that is expected to match experiment. See Sec. VI
[b]This row's values match Eq. (2a) and produce Eq. (2d).
[c]This row's values match Eq. (3a) and produce Eq. (3d).
[d]This row's values match Eq. (4a) and produce Eq. (4d).

TABLE II: In Eqs. (2d), (3d), and (4d) the nonzero quark matrix elements equal 1/3[rd] the nonzero leptonic elements.

Identity	Quark matrix elements	Leptonic matrix elements	g_{12}	g_{13}
Eq. (2d)	0.05	0.15	1/10	0
Eq. (3d)	$1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8}$	$5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8}$	0	1/30 000
Eq. (4d)	0.049 963 56	0.149 8907	1/10	1/30 000

The above definitions, in turn, aid in the definition of the four '12" and "13" mixing angles of Table I

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \sin\theta_{12}^L &= \sqrt{3g_{12}} \\ \sin\theta_{13}^Q &= \sqrt{g_{13}/3} \\ \sin\theta_{12}^Q &= \sqrt{g_{12}} \times \sin\theta_{23\text{ offset}}^L \\ \sin\theta_{13}^L &= \sqrt{g_{13}} \times \sin^{+1}\theta_{23\text{ offset}}^Q \end{aligned}\right\} \tag{1b}$$

where g_{12} helps define the "12" mixing angles, and g_{13} the "13" mixing angles. Now let

$$\sin\varphi_{13}^L = \sqrt{g_{13}} \times \sin^{-1}\theta_{23\text{ offset}}^Q \quad , \tag{1c}$$

where it will be φ_{13}^L that will actually fit the smallest neutrino mixing angle. Note that the definitions of θ_{13}^L and φ_{13}^L differ just slightly: in the sign of an exponent (± 1).

At this point the reader perhaps has noticed that to calculate all four "12" and "13" angles from Eqs. (1a) and (1b) we need only also know the two "23" angles. Their values will be

$$\left.\begin{aligned} \theta_{23\text{ offset}}^L &= 45° \\ \theta_{23\text{ offset}}^Q &= 2.367\,442° \end{aligned}\right\} \quad . \tag{1d}$$

We now have enough information to deduce all six angles of Table I.

But how to justify this odd value for $\theta_{23\text{ offset}}^Q$ and the peculiar form of Eq. (1b)? In fact, neither is freely chosen. As will now be shown, the mixing angles of Table I produce leptonic matrices having a property that is three times larger than the corresponding property for the quark matrices *in three closely-related ways.* This property mirrors the way that the sum of the charges of the leptons

$$-1 + 0 = -1$$

is threefold larger than the sum of the charges of the quarks

$$-\frac{2}{3} + \frac{1}{3} = -\frac{1}{3} \quad .$$

Importantly, it is the restrictions posed by Eq. (1b) that automatically produce this hidden threefold symmetry for various g_{12}, g_{13}, and $\theta_{23\text{ offset}}^Q$. This threefold symmetry, in turn, underscores that Eq. (1b) was not merely "*designed* to fit the data." The next three sections will examine these three types symmetry in detail, while Tables I and II will summarize these results in their three rows.

III. MIXING MATRICES DERIVED FROM $g_{12} = 1/10$ AND $g_{13} = 0$

Define the usual CKM mixing matrix [5], *but without its phase*, as

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{bmatrix} ,$$

where $s_{12} \equiv \sin\theta^Q_{12}$, $c_{12} \equiv \cos\theta^Q_{12}$, etc., and where θ^Q_{23}, θ^Q_{13}, and θ^Q_{12} are the CKM mixing angles. And define the usual leptonic mixing matrix [6], *also without its phase*, as

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{23}s_{13} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{23}s_{13} & s_{23}c_{13} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}c_{23}s_{13} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}c_{23}s_{13} & c_{23}c_{13} \end{bmatrix} ,$$

where $s_{12} \equiv \sin\theta^L_{12}$, $c_{12} \equiv \cos\theta^L_{12}$, etc., and where θ^L_{23}, θ^L_{13}, and θ^L_{12} are the leptonic mixing angles. Now consider that the following matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ u \\ t \\ c \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} d & s & b \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0.95 & 0.05 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1.00 \\ 0.05 & 0.95 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

results if the above CKM matrix *with its elements squared* has its angles determined by these values

$$\left.\begin{aligned} g_{12} &= 1/10 \\ g_{13} &= 0 \\ \theta^L_{23} &= \theta^L_{23\,\text{offset}} + 90^\circ \\ \theta^Q_{23} &= 90^\circ \end{aligned}\right\} \textbf{Row one of Table I} \tag{2a}$$

and by Eq. (1b). Observe that the above matrix's second and third rows (i.e., its c- and t-quarks) are interchanged relative to convention, a consequence of $\theta^Q_{23} = 90^\circ$. Subtracting this matrix from its transpose gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.95 & 0.05 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1.00 \\ 0.05 & 0.95 & 0 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0.95 & 0 & 0.05 \\ 0.05 & 0 & 0.95 \\ 0 & 1.00 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +0.05 & -0.05 \\ -0.05 & 0 & +0.05 \\ +0.05 & -0.05 & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \tag{2b}$$

Now consider that the following matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ \nu_e \\ \nu_\tau \\ \nu_\mu \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} \nu_1 & \nu_2 & \nu_3 \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 0.70 & 0.30 & 0 \\ 0.15 & 0.35 & 0.50 \\ 0.15 & 0.35 & 0.50 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

results if the above leptonic matrix *also with its elements squared* has its angles also determined by **row one of Table I** and Eq. (1b). Observe that the above matrix's second and third rows (i.e., ν_μ and ν_τ) also are interchanged relative to convention, but this time it is a consequence of $\theta^L_{23} = \theta^L_{23\,\text{offset}} + 90^\circ$. Subtracting the above matrix from its transpose gives

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0.70 & 0.30 & 0 \\ 0.15 & 0.35 & 0.50 \\ 0.15 & 0.35 & 0.50 \end{bmatrix} - \begin{bmatrix} 0.70 & 0.15 & 0.15 \\ 0.30 & 0.35 & 0.35 \\ 0 & 0.50 & 0.50 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +0.15 & -0.15 \\ -0.15 & 0 & +0.15 \\ +0.15 & -0.15 & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \tag{2c}$$

Now the right-hand-sides of Eqs. (2b) and (2c) combine to form the identity

$$3 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +0.05 & -0.05 \\ -0.05 & 0 & +0.05 \\ +0.05 & -0.05 & 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +0.15 & -0.15 \\ -0.15 & 0 & +0.15 \\ +0.15 & -0.15 & 0 \end{bmatrix} , \tag{2d}$$

where the nonzero matrix elements on the quark side are exactly one-third those of the leptonic side. This is the first of the three key constraints distinguishing the mixing model. These values occupy **row one of Table II**.

IV. MIXING MATRICES DERIVED FROM $g_{12} = 0$ AND $g_{13} = 1/30\,000$

Consider that the following matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ u \\ c \\ t \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} d & s & b \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 9.999\,889 \times 10^{-1} & 0 & 1.111\,111 \times 10^{-5} \\ 1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & 9.982\,937 \times 10^{-1} & 1.706\,323 \times 10^{-3} \\ 1.109\,215 \times 10^{-5} & 1.706\,342 \times 10^{-3} & 9.982\,826 \times 10^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

results if the earlier CKM matrix *with its elements squared* has its angles determined by

$$\left.\begin{array}{l} g_{12} = 0 \\ g_{13} = 1/30\,000 \\ \theta^L_{23} = -90^\circ \\ \theta^Q_{23} = \theta^Q_{23\text{ offset}} \end{array}\right\} \textbf{Row two of Table I} \tag{3a}$$

and by Eq. (1b). Subtracting the above matrix from its transpose gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} 9.999\,889 \times 10^{-1} & 0 & 1.111\,111 \times 10^{-5} \\ 1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & 9.982\,937 \times 10^{-1} & 1.706\,323 \times 10^{-3} \\ 1.109\,215 \times 10^{-5} & 1.706\,342 \times 10^{-3} & 9.982\,826 \times 10^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &- \begin{bmatrix} 9.999\,889 \times 10^{-1} & 1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & 1.109\,215 \times 10^{-5} \\ 0 & 9.982\,937 \times 10^{-1} & 1.706\,342 \times 10^{-3} \\ 1.111\,111 \times 10^{-5} & 1.706\,323 \times 10^{-3} & 9.982\,826 \times 10^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & +1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} \\ +1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & 0 & -1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} \\ -1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & +1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \end{aligned} \tag{3b}$$

Now consider that the following matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ \nu_e \\ \nu_\tau \\ \nu_\mu \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} \nu_1 & \nu_2 & \nu_3 \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 9.999\,999 \times 10^{-1} & 0 & 5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} \\ 5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 0 & 9.999\,999 \times 10^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

results if the earlier leptonic matrix *also with its elements squared* has its angles also determined by **row two of Table I** and Eq. (1b). Observe that the above matrix's second and third rows (i.e., ν_μ and ν_τ) are interchanged relative to convention, a consequence of $\theta^L_{23} = -90^\circ$. Subtracting the above matrix from its transpose gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} 9.999\,999 \times 10^{-1} & 0 & 5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} \\ 5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 0 & 9.999\,999 \times 10^{-1} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &- \begin{bmatrix} 9.999\,999 \times 10^{-1} & 5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 9.999\,999 \times 10^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & +5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} \\ +5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 0 & -5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} \\ -5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & +5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \end{aligned} \tag{3c}$$

Now the right-hand-sides of Eqs. (3b) and (3c) combine to form the identity

$$\begin{aligned} &3 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & +1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} \\ +1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & 0 & -1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} \\ -1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & +1.895\,936 \times 10^{-8} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & +5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} \\ +5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 0 & -5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} \\ -5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & +5.687\,808 \times 10^{-8} & 0 \end{bmatrix} , \end{aligned} \tag{3d}$$

where the nonzero matrix elements on the quark side are (again) exactly one-third those of the leptonic side. This is the second of the three key constraints distinguishing the mixing model. These values occupy **row two of Table II**.

V. MIXING MATRICES DERIVED FROM $g_{12} = 1/10$ AND $g_{13} = 1/30\,000$

Consider that the following matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ u \\ t \\ c \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} \quad d \quad & \quad\quad s \quad\quad & \quad b \quad \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 9.499\,894 \times 10^{-1} & 4.999\,944 \times 10^{-2} & 1.111\,111 \times 10^{-5} \\ 3.588\,691 \times 10^{-5} & 1.681\,548 \times 10^{-3} & 9.982\,826 \times 10^{-1} \\ 4.997\,467 \times 10^{-2} & 9.483\,190 \times 10^{-1} & 1.706\,323 \times 10^{-3} \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

results if the CKM matrix *with its elements squared* has its angles determined by

$$\left.\begin{aligned} g_{12} &= 1/10 \\ g_{13} &= 1/30\,000 \\ \theta_{23}^{L} &= \theta_{23\text{ offset}}^{L} \\ \theta_{23}^{Q} &= \theta_{23\text{ offset}}^{Q} + 90^\circ \end{aligned}\right\} \textbf{Row three of Table I} \tag{4a}$$

and by Eq. (1b). Observe that the above matrix's second and third rows (i.e., its c- and t-quarks) are interchanged relative to convention, a consequence of $\theta_{23}^{Q} = \theta_{23\text{ offset}}^{Q} + 90^\circ$. Subtracting the above matrix from its transpose gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} 9.499\,894 \times 10^{-1} & 4.999\,944 \times 10^{-2} & 1.111\,111 \times 10^{-5} \\ 3.588\,691 \times 10^{-5} & 1.681\,548 \times 10^{-3} & 9.982\,826 \times 10^{-1} \\ 4.997\,467 \times 10^{-2} & 9.483\,190 \times 10^{-1} & 1.706\,323 \times 10^{-3} \end{bmatrix} \\ &- \begin{bmatrix} 9.499\,894 \times 10^{-1} & 3.588\,691 \times 10^{-5} & 4.997\,467 \times 10^{-2} \\ 4.999\,944 \times 10^{-2} & 1.681\,548 \times 10^{-3} & 9.483\,190 \times 10^{-1} \\ 1.111\,111 \times 10^{-5} & 9.982\,826 \times 10^{-1} & 1.706\,323 \times 10^{-3} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & -4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} \\ -4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & 0 & +4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} \\ +4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & -4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \end{aligned} \tag{4b}$$

Now consider that the following matrix

$$\begin{array}{c} \\ \nu_e \\ \nu_\mu \\ \nu_\tau \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \begin{array}{ccc} \quad \nu_1 \quad & \quad\quad \nu_2 \quad\quad & \quad \nu_3 \quad \end{array} \\ \begin{bmatrix} 6.999\,999\,602 \times 10^{-1} & 2.999\,999\,829 \times 10^{-1} & 5.687\,808\,086 \times 10^{-8} \\ 1.501\,093\,103 \times 10^{-1} & 3.498\,907\,181 \times 10^{-1} & 4.999\,999\,716 \times 10^{-1} \\ 1.498\,907\,295 \times 10^{-1} & 3.501\,092\,990 \times 10^{-1} & 4.999\,999\,716 \times 10^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \end{array}$$

results if the earlier leptonic matrix *also with its elements squared* has its angles also determined by **row three of Table I** and Eq. (1b). Subtracting the above matrix from its transpose gives

$$\begin{aligned} &\begin{bmatrix} 6.999\,999\,602 \times 10^{-1} & 2.999\,999\,829 \times 10^{-1} & 5.687\,808\,086 \times 10^{-8} \\ 1.501\,093\,103 \times 10^{-1} & 3.498\,907\,181 \times 10^{-1} & 4.999\,999\,716 \times 10^{-1} \\ 1.498\,907\,295 \times 10^{-1} & 3.501\,092\,990 \times 10^{-1} & 4.999\,999\,716 \times 10^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &- \begin{bmatrix} 6.999\,999\,602 \times 10^{-1} & 1.501\,093\,103 \times 10^{-1} & 1.498\,907\,295 \times 10^{-1} \\ 2.999\,999\,829 \times 10^{-1} & 3.498\,907\,181 \times 10^{-1} & 3.501\,092\,990 \times 10^{-1} \\ 5.687\,808\,086 \times 10^{-8} & 4.999\,999\,716 \times 10^{-1} & 4.999\,999\,716 \times 10^{-1} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +1.498\,906\,726 \times 10^{-1} & -1.498\,906\,726 \times 10^{-1} \\ -1.498\,906\,726 \times 10^{-1} & 0 & +1.498\,906\,726 \times 10^{-1} \\ +1.498\,906\,726 \times 10^{-1} & -1.498\,906\,726 \times 10^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} . \end{aligned} \tag{4c}$$

Now the right-hand-sides of Eqs. (4b) and (4c) combine to form the identity

$$\begin{aligned} &3 \times \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & -4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} \\ -4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & 0 & +4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} \\ +4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & -4.996\,356 \times 10^{-2} & 0 \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 & +1.498\,907 \times 10^{-1} & -1.498\,907 \times 10^{-1} \\ -1.498\,907 \times 10^{-1} & 0 & +1.498\,907 \times 10^{-1} \\ +1.498\,907 \times 10^{-1} & -1.498\,907 \times 10^{-1} & 0 \end{bmatrix} , \end{aligned} \tag{4d}$$

where the nonzero matrix elements on the quark side are (again) exactly one-third those of the leptonic side. This is the third of the three key constraints distinguishing the mixing model. These values occupy **row three of Table II**.

VI. PREDICTED VALUE FOR θ^L_{13}

As promised earlier, the angles θ^L_{13}, θ^L_{12}, etc. have been shown to possess the same property in three closely-related ways. This justifies the value for $\theta^Q_{23\text{ offset}}$ — and the form of Eq. (1b) — introduced at the outset. Given that $g_{12} = 1/10$ and $g_{13} = 1/30\,000$ originated in connection with the cubic equation and 137.036 [3, 4], this leaves precious little wiggle room for fitting the precisely-measured mixing angles turned up by experiment — and yet the model does fit these angles.

It only remains to calculate φ^L_{13} to complete the list of *predicted* mixing angles. Substituting the earlier values for g_{13} and $\theta^Q_{23\text{ offset}}$ into Eq. (1c) gives

$$\begin{aligned}\sin^2\varphi^L_{13} &= g_{13}\times\frac{1}{\sin^2\theta^Q_{23\text{ offset}}}\\ &\approx \frac{1}{30\,000}\times\frac{1}{\sin^2 2.367\,442^\circ}\\ &\approx 0.0195\quad ,\end{aligned}\tag{5}$$

so that $\varphi^L_{13}\approx 8.034\,394^\circ$.

At this point the reader may object that the above definition of φ^L_{13} was arbitrarily chosen in 2012 to fit the (then new) $\sim 9^\circ$ Daya Bay measurement of the smallest leptonic mixing angle [8]. But φ^L_{13} is interesting and economical in its own right, as it neatly combines with the other mixing angles to produce this α^{-1} approximation

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\frac{1}{\sin^2\theta^L_{12}} - \sin^2\theta^Q_{13}\right]^3\\ &+\left[\frac{1}{\sin^2\theta^Q_{12}}\times\sin^2\theta^L_{23\text{ offset}} - \sin^2\varphi^L_{13}\times\sin^{+2}\theta^Q_{23\text{ offset}}\right]^2\\ &= 137.036\,000\,0023\ldots\quad .\end{aligned}\tag{6a}$$

In this way the 2012 mixing model retains the original model's ability to produce α^{-1} from the sines squared of the predicted mixing angles, where the 2007 method instead used θ^L_{13} as follows

$$\begin{aligned}&\left[\frac{1}{\sin^2\theta^L_{12}} - \sin^2\theta^Q_{13}\right]^3\\ &+\left[\frac{1}{\sin^2\theta^Q_{12}}\times\sin^2\theta^L_{23\text{ offset}} - \sin^2\theta^L_{13}\times\sin^{-2}\theta^Q_{23\text{ offset}}\right]^2\\ &= 137.036\,000\,0023\ldots\quad .\end{aligned}\tag{6b}$$

Observe that these two equations are equally simple, where it is only the differing exponents (± 2) in the expressions in light blue that caused $\sin^2\varphi^L_{13}$ and $\sin^2\theta^L_{13}$ to be defined differently in Eqs. (1c) and (1b), respectively. The 2012 mixing model is, therefore, only a slightly modified version of the 2007 model, retaining five of six of its predictions, while constraining φ^L_{13} in *almost* the identical way that θ^L_{13} was constrained in 2007 (see Eq. (9) in [1]).

VII. HOW HAVE THE PREDICTIONS FARED?

In order to compare the mixing model predictions against experiment it is helpful to know that the angles of Table I produce these CKM matrix elements:

$$\begin{aligned}|V_{us}| &\approx \sin 12.920\,966^\circ\times\cos 0.190\,986^\circ \approx 0.223\,61\\ |V_{ub}| &\approx \sin 0.190\,986^\circ \approx 0.003\,333\\ |V_{cb}| &\approx \sin 2.367\,442^\circ\times\cos 0.190\,986^\circ \approx 0.041\,31\end{aligned}$$

TABLE III: Model predictions from 2007 compared against CKM mixing data.

Year	$\lvert V_{us}\rvert$	$\lvert V_{ub}\rvert$	$\lvert V_{cb}\rvert$
2007 Prediction	0.223 61	0.003 333	0.04131
2014 Feb.[a]	$0.225\,36^{+0.000\,61}_{-0.000\,61}$	$0.003\,55^{+0.000\,15}_{-0.000\,15}$	$0.0414^{+0.0012}_{-0.0012}$
Error in SD	2.9	1.4	0.1
2012 [b]	$0.225\,34^{+0.000\,65}_{-0.000\,65}$	$0.003\,51^{+0.000\,15}_{-0.000\,14}$	$0.0412^{+0.0011}_{-0.0005}$
Error in SD	2.7	1.3	0.2
2010 [c]	$0.2253^{+0.0007}_{-0.0007}$	$0.00347^{+0.000\,16}_{-0.000\,12}$	$0.0410^{+0.0011}_{-0.0007}$
Error in SD	2.4	1.1	0.3
2008 [d]	$0.2257^{+0.0010}_{-0.0010}$	$0.00359^{+0.000\,16}_{-0.000\,16}$	$0.0415^{+0.0010}_{-0.0011}$
Error in SD	2.1	1.6	0.2
2006 [e]	$0.2272^{+0.0010}_{-0.0010}$	$0.00396^{+0.000\,09}_{-0.000\,09}$	$0.04221^{+0.0001}_{-0.0008}$
Error in SD	3.6	7.0	1.1

[a]Ref. [5]. Particle Data Group 1σ global fit.
[b]Ref. [9]. Particle Data Group 1σ global fit.
[c]Ref. [10]. Particle Data Group 1σ global fit.
[d]Ref. [11]. Particle Data Group 1σ global fit.
[e]Ref. [12]. Particle Data Group 1σ global fit.

TABLE IV: Model predictions from 2007 (and 2012) compared against leptonic mixing data. Normal hierarchy.

Year	$\sin^2\theta^L_{23}$	$\sin^2\theta^L_{13}$	$\sin^2\theta^L_{12}$
2007 (2012) Prediction	0.5	(0.0195)	0.3
2014 Sept.[a]	$0.452^{+0.052}_{-0.028}$	$0.0218^{+0.0010}_{-0.0010}$	$0.304^{+0.013}_{-0.012}$
Error in SD	0.9	2.3	0.3
2012 [b]	$0.427^{+0.034}_{-0.027}$ [c]	$0.0246^{+0.0029}_{-0.0028}$	$0.320^{+0.016}_{-0.017}$
Error in SD	2.1	1.8	1.2
2010 [d]	$0.50^{+0.07}_{-0.06}$	$0.013^{+0.013}_{-0.009}$	$0.318^{+0.019}_{-0.016}$
Error in SD	0	0.5	1.1
2008 [e]	$0.50^{+0.07}_{-0.06}$	$0.010^{+0.016}_{-0.011}$	$0.304^{+0.022}_{-0.016}$
Error in SD	0	0.6	0.25
2006 [f]	$0.50^{+0.08}_{-0.07}$	≤ 0.025 [g]	$0.300^{+0.020}_{-0.030}$
Error in SD	0		0

[a]Ref. [6]. A 1σ global fit.
[b]Ref. [13]. A 1σ global fit.
[c]Ref. [13]. One of two minima, the other being $0.613^{+0.022}_{-0.040}$. In 2012, $\theta^L_{23} = 45°$ was excluded at $\sim$90% C.L.
[d]Ref. [14]. A 1σ global fit. This source includes 2008 and 2010 data.
[e]Ref. [14]. A 1σ global fit. This source includes 2008 and 2010 data.
[f]Ref. [15]. A 1σ global fit.
[g]Ref. [15]. A 2σ global fit.

Tables III and IV also help in the comparison of mixing model predictions against experiment:

- In 2007 the model's value for $|V_{us}|$ had a 3.6σ disagreement with experiment. This value is now off by 2.9σ, its absolute error having been reduced by 51%.
- In 2007 the model's value for $|V_{ub}|$ had an improbable 7.0σ disagreement with experiment (naively assuming a Gaussian probability distribution). This value is now off by 1.4σ, its absolute error having been reduced by 65%.
- The 2012 value for $\sin^2\theta^L_{13}$ had a 1.8σ disagreement with experiment. Despite a tripling of the accuracy of this measurement since 2012, its value is now off by just 2.3σ, its absolute error having been reduced by 55%.
- The remaining values $|V_{cb}|$, $\sin^2\theta^L_{23}$, and $\sin^2\theta^L_{12}$, which posed no early conflicts with experiment, are all within 1.0σ.

There is a pattern to the above results: All three predictions with a 1.8σ or greater conflict with experiment when first proposed have benefited from an over 50% reduction in absolute error; the remaining three predictions had no early conflict with experiment — nor do they now.

[1] J. S. Markovitch, "Underlying symmetry of the quark and lepton mixing angles" (2007) http://lss.fnal.gov/archive/other/jm-ph-2007-72.pdf.
[2] J. S. Markovitch, "A mathematical model of the quark and lepton mixing angles (2011 update)" (2011) http://www.vixra.org/abs/1102.0021.
[3] J. S. Markovitch, "A nonstandard cubic equation" (2014) http://www.vixra.org/abs/1412.0253.
[4] J. S. Markovitch, "The cubic equation's relation to the fine structure constant, the mixing angles, and Weinberg angle" (2014) http://www.vixra.org/abs/1406.0033.
[5] A. Ceccucci, Z. Ligeti, and Y. Sakai, "The CKM Quark-Mixing Matrix" in "Review of Particle Physics," Chin. Phys. C **38**, 090001 (2014).
[6] M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni and T. Schwetz, "Updated fit to three neutrino mixing: status of leptonic CP violation," JHEP **1411**, 052 (2014) [arXiv:1409.5439 [hep-ph]].
[7] P. J. Mohr, B. N. Taylor, and D. B. Newell (2011), "The 2010 CODATA Recommended Values of the Fundamental Physical Constants" (Web Version 6.0). This database was developed by J. Baker, M. Douma, and S. Kotochigova. Available: http://physics.nist.gov/constants [Friday, 22-Jul-2011 10:04:27 EDT]. National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, MD 20899.
[8] D. M. Webber [Daya Bay Collaboration], "An Improved Measurement of Electron Antineutrino Disappearance at Daya Bay," Nucl. Phys. Proc. Suppl. **233**, 96 (2012) [arXiv:1211.1609 [hep-ex]].
[9] A. Ceccucci, Z. Ligeti, and Y. Sakai, "The CKM Quark-Mixing Matrix" in J. Beringer *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys. Rev. D **86**, 010001 (2012).
[10] A. Ceccucci, Z. Ligeti, and Y. Sakai, "The CKM Quark-Mixing Matrix" in K. Nakamura *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. **G37**:075021 (2010).
[11] A. Ceccucci, Z. Ligeti, and Y. Sakai, "The CKM Quark-Mixing Matrix" in C. Amsler, *et al.* (Particle Data Group), Phys, Lett. B **667**, 1 (2008).
[12] A. Ceccucci, Z. Ligeti, and Y. Sakai, "The CKM Quark-Mixing Matrix" in W.-M. Yao, *et al.* (Particle Data Group), J. Phys. G **33**, 1 (2006).
[13] D. V. Forero, M. Tortola and J. W. F. Valle, "Global status of neutrino oscillation parameters after Neutrino-2012," arXiv:1205.4018 [hep-ph].
[14] T. Schwetz, M. A. Tortola, and J. W. F. Valle, "Three-flavour neutrino oscillation update," New J. Phys. **10**, 113011 (2010) [arXiv:0808.2016 [hep-ph]].
[15] T. Schwetz, "Global fits to neutrino oscillation data," Phys. Scripta **T127**, 1 (2006) [arXiv:hep-ph/0606060].