arXiv:2405.06675v1 [math-ph] 4 May 2024

A note on hidden classes in spinor classification

R. J. Bueno Rogerio*
Centro Universitário UNIFAAT, Atibaia-SP, 12954-070, Brazil.

R. T. Cavalcanti†
Instituto de Matemática e Estatística, Universidade do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (UERJ), Rio de Janeiro-RJ, 20550-900, Brazil. and Departamento de Física, Universidade Estadual Paulista (Unesp), Guaratinguetá 12516-410, Brazil

C. H. Coronado Villalobos‡
Universidad Tecnológica del Perú, Lima-Perú.

J. M. Hoff da Silva§
Departamento de Física, Universidade Estadual Paulista (UNESP), Guaratinguetá-SP, 12516-410, Brazil.
(Dated: May 14, 2024)

The Lounesto classification is a well-established scheme for categorizing spinors based on their physical content, which are determined by their associated bilinear forms. It consists of six disjoint classes encompassing the known spinors within the context of the standard model of high-energy physics. However, advancements in theories beyond the standard model have opened the door to potential new spinorial adjoint structures, leading to new unforeseen classess. These developments indicate the potential for extending the standard Lounesto classification. In this paper, we explore all possible subclasses that could extend the Lounesto scheme. We highlight the most relevant subclasses by imposing constraints to their corresponding dual structures, thus broadening our understanding of spinor and its applications in theoretical physics.

I. INTRODUCTION

Spinors and fermionic particles modeled by spinors are fundamental building blocks in describing high-energy physics. These objects are essential in understanding the dynamical laws associated with particle interactions and the kinematic laws associated with space-time symmetries. However, beyond their theoretical and phenomenological importance, spinors are also well-defined mathematical objects, with a rich and fascinating structure. Although Dirac's monumental work has been central, guiding much of our understanding of spinors, it is important to recognize that the spinor landscape is broader than the standard Dirac one. For instance, investigations carried out in the last decade have delved into fermions identified as having mass dimension one [1–5]. This exploration is driven by the aim of constructing a potential quantum field theory that might explain dark matter [6–8].

The physics carried by spinors is closely related to an often overlooked fundamental aspect: individual spinors cannot be observed directly. Their composite nature, through the bilinear covariants, transforms them into physically observable objects. Standard protocols involve determining the so-called Dirac dual of a spinor and then defining the associated bilinear covariants. This common understanding of spinor fields can be found in textbooks on quantum field theory. Moreover, from the mathematical side, a remarkable theorem called the inversion theorem, proposed by Takahashi, provides an illuminating perspective on spinors and bilinears [9]. It states that, under certain conditions, one can derive spinors from the bilinears they generate. Using this theorem and based on the behavior of their bilinear covariants [10], Lounesto introduced a classification for spinors into six disjoint classes. Their main representatives are the Dirac spinors (classes 1, 2, and 3), flag-dipole spinors (class 4), Majorana or flag-pole spinors (class 5), and Weyl or dipole spinors (class 6). The Fierz-Pauli-Kofink (FPK) identities govern the interplay between different bilinear configurations and potential spinor variants [9, 11], which give quadratic relations that the bilinear covariants must obey. The possibility of only six classes is strongly tied to the fact that Lounesto used the dual structure of Dirac to classify spinors. While the traditional approach anchored on the Dirac dual structure has been fundamental in modern high-energy physics, the emerging beyond the standard model theories beckons a reconsideration of this foundation. The potential inclusion of new dual structures might not just be a mathematical exercise [12, 13], but also a path leading to deeper insights into relevant theoretical extensions.

* rodolforogerio@gmail.com
† rogerio.cavalcanti@ime.uerj.br
‡ ccoronado@utp.edu.pe
§ julio.hoff@unesp.br

In establishing a spinor dual, it is relevant to envisage some peculiarities calling attention to possible generalizations [14]. For the argument, starting from $\tilde{\psi} = \psi^\dagger \eta$ as an (almost) standard dual candidate, the requirement that the norm is boosted invariant leads to[1] $\{K_i, \eta\} = 0$ (for $i = x, y, z$), where $\vec{K}$ is the boost generator. Such a constraint, along with the imposition of $\tilde{\psi}\psi \in \mathbb{R}$ (i. e., real norm), reduces η to

$$\eta = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{0}_{2\times 2} & n\mathbb{1}_{2\times 2} \\ m\mathbb{1}_{2\times 2} & \mathbb{0}_{2\times 2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{1}$$

where n and m are real numbers. The norm invariance under rotations requirement does not furnish additional constraints to η than the invariance under boosts. Then, further imposing parity invariance to the norm, one arrives at $n = m$ leading to $\eta \sim \gamma^0$, and the Dirac standard dual is reached $\tilde{\psi} = \bar{\psi}$, after a simple scaling. The point to be stressed here is that from the purely algebraic point of view, there are possibilities for the dual, other than the standard Dirac one. The price to pay is sometimes a lack of Lorentz invariance [15], or loss of a discrete symmetry invariance (as mentioned above), and finally, the possibility of non-hermitian (eventually pseudo-hermitian [16]) terms in a lagrangian is also in order [17]. These departures from the standard case are very often, and quite reasonably, avoided. Nevertheless, they can also serve as first principle sources of theories beyond the standard model since their impacts may be accommodated into a broader physical scope, with manageable and delimited drawbacks. Whatever physical scenario results from these models, if the departure point comes from spinor duals, the formulation's algebraic aspects remain important compasses. The results presented in this paper follow this reasoning, retaining γ_0 as the 'metric' and opening the possibility for discrete symmetry operators composing the dual. This line of investigation is a continuation of a program started in Ref. [18] and, as we shall see, presents the algebraic possibility of hidden subclasses. We shall keep our analysis in the classical realm, understanding this as an essential starting point in a robust approach to fermionic quantum field expansion coefficients.

In the exploration of different duals, some formal aspects are now well established [12, 18]. In particular, beyond the Fierz-Pauli-Kofink (FPK) identities, a dual given by $\vec{\psi} = [\Delta\psi]^\dagger\gamma_0$ is such that the dual operator Δ must obey the algebraic constrain [12]

$$\gamma_0 \Delta^\dagger \gamma_0 = \Delta. \tag{2}$$

Equivalently, taking Δ as a general complex matrix, the above algebraic constrain makes Δ to have the form of a block matrix, as represented by

$$\Delta = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & A^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \text{ with } B^\dagger = B \text{ and } C^\dagger = C. \tag{3}$$

As a consequence, the possible duals are restricted to those obeying both the FPK identities and the algebraic constraint. In the present paper, we are particularly interested in using this fact to find a finer version of the standard Lounesto classification and investigate new subclasses made possible by redefining the Dirac dual structure. We emphasize that from now on, we will be interested in new mathematical possibilities, sometimes foregoing the standard physical content carried by bilinear forms.

The paper is organized as follows: In the following section, we shall introduce the basics of the space-time Clifford algebra, delve into the Lounesto classification, and key aspects of the FPK identities. Then, in Sec. III, we exploit the possible subclasses of the standard Lounesto classification, establishing which ones are allowed by the FPK identities and the algebraic constraint of the general spinor dual [12, 18]. As mentioned, we are particularly interested in redefining the duals by applying combinations of the discrete symmetry operators, C, P, T, and elements of the space-time algebra. Finally, in Sec. IV, we scrutinize the consequences of the new subclasses built upon the new duals.

II. BASIC CONCEPTIONS OF THE USUAL SPINOR CLASSIFICATION

Let M represent the Minkowski space-time. Spinor fields are objects of the spinor bundle $\mathbf{P}_{\mathrm{Spin}^e_{1,3}}(M) \times_\tau \mathbb{C}^4$ associated with M, carrying $\tau = (1/2, 0) \oplus (0, 1/2)$ representations of the spin group [19–21]. It is well-known that their observable properties are encoded in the bilinear covariants, known as sections of the exterior bundle $\Omega(M)$

[1] Up to additional freedom, particularly relevant for discussions including physics with Lorentz subgroups invariance.

[10, 11]. These symmetry-preserving bilinear covariants arise from the multi-vector structure of the space-time Clifford algebra. In the standard Dirac theory, they are given by

$$\sigma = \psi^\dagger\gamma_0\psi \in \Omega^0(M), \tag{4}$$
$$\omega = -\psi^\dagger\gamma_0\gamma_{0123}\psi \in \Omega^4(M), \tag{5}$$
$$\mathbf{J} = \psi^\dagger\gamma_0\gamma_\mu\psi\,\gamma^\mu \in \Omega^1(M), \tag{6}$$
$$\mathbf{K} = \psi^\dagger\gamma_0\gamma_\mu i\gamma_{0123}\psi\,\gamma^\mu \in \Omega^3(M), \tag{7}$$
$$\mathbf{S} = \psi^\dagger\gamma_0 i\gamma_{\mu\nu}\psi\gamma^\mu\wedge\gamma^\nu \in \Omega^2(M). \tag{8}$$

Bearing in mind that the Lounesto classification is built upon the usual Dirac adjoint $\bar{\psi} = \psi^\dagger\gamma_0$. Other extensions of the spinor classification can be found in [22, 23].

Let $\mathcal{M}(4,\mathbb{C})$ represent the algebra of 4×4 matrices with complex entries. We consider the set $\mathbb{1}, \gamma_I$, where $I \in \mu, \mu\nu, \mu\nu\rho, 5$ is a composite index. This set serves as a basis for $\mathcal{M}(4,\mathbb{C})$, satisfying the Clifford algebra relation $\{\gamma_\mu\gamma_\nu\} = 2\eta_{\mu\nu}\mathbb{1}$, where $\eta_{\mu\nu}$ represents the Minkowski metric in the mostly negative signature. According to the usual conventions, the homogeneous elements of the space-time Clifford algebra are chosen in accordance with the above construction [11]

$$\Gamma = \{\mathbb{1}, \gamma_\mu, \gamma_{0123}, \gamma_\mu\gamma_{0123}, \gamma_\mu\gamma_\nu\}. \tag{9}$$

The well-established classes of spinors include the Weyl, Dirac, and Majorana spinors; however, as mentioned before, Lounesto has presented a compelling argument showcasing an alternative classification framework achieved through the implementation of bilinear covariants [10]. Notably, this classification scheme solely relies upon the multi-vector structure inherent in the space-time Clifford algebra. Consequently, the widely acknowledged Lounesto classification offers a highly valuable tool for comprehending and elucidating the properties of spinor fields. Following the usual Lounesto classification, regular spinors are those with at least one of the bilinear covariants σ or ω non-vanishing, encompassing classes 1, 2, and 3. On the other hand, singular spinors are those with both σ and ω vanishing quantities, furnishing the classes 4, 5, and 6.

The six classes of the usual Lounesto classification are all defined below

1. $\sigma \neq 0, \quad \omega \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{J} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{K} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{S} \neq 0;$
2. $\sigma \neq 0, \quad \omega = 0, \quad \mathbf{J} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{K} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{S} \neq 0;$
3. $\sigma = 0, \quad \omega \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{J} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{K} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{S} \neq 0;$
4. $\sigma = 0 = \omega, \quad \mathbf{J} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{K} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{S} \neq 0;$
5. $\sigma = 0 = \omega, \quad \mathbf{J} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{K} = 0, \quad \mathbf{S} \neq 0;$
6. $\sigma = 0 = \omega, \quad \mathbf{J} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{K} \neq 0, \quad \mathbf{S} = 0,$

In the context of the Dirac theory, it is pertinent to recall that the aforementioned bilinear covariants are commonly attributed with the standard physical interpretations. However, it is crucial to emphasize that such interpretations are solely applicable to the electron and cannot be generalized beyond that specific context.

A fundamental requirement for Lounesto's spinors classification is that all the bilinear covariants must satisfy quadratic algebraic relations, the FPK identities, which read

$$\mathbf{J}^2 = \omega^2 + \sigma^2, \quad \mathbf{K}^2 = -\mathbf{J}^2, \quad \mathbf{J}\lrcorner\mathbf{K} = 0, \quad \mathbf{J}\wedge\mathbf{K} = -(\omega + \sigma\gamma_{0123})\mathbf{S}. \tag{10}$$

The three last relations above can be re-written, in terms of the vector components, as follows

$$K_\mu K^\mu = -J_\mu J^\mu, \quad J_\mu K^\mu = 0, \quad J_\mu K_\nu - K_\mu J_\nu = -\omega S_{\mu\nu} - \frac{\sigma}{2}\epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}S^{\alpha\beta}. \tag{11}$$

In fact, from the bilinear covariants, we can define a multi-vector object denoted by $\mathbf{Z}$ and known as Fierz aggregate [10, 11] assuming that the bilinear covariants $\sigma, \omega, \mathbf{J}, \mathbf{S}, \mathbf{K}$ satisfy the FPK identities

$$\mathbf{Z} = \sigma + \mathbf{J} + i\mathbf{S} + i\mathbf{K}\gamma_{0123} + \omega\gamma_{0123}. \tag{12}$$

We highlight that for singular spinors, the FPK identities are, in general, replaced by the more general conditions[2] [11]:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathbf{Z}^2 &= 4\sigma\mathbf{Z},\\ \mathbf{Z}\gamma_\mu\mathbf{Z} &= 4J_\mu\mathbf{Z},\\ \mathbf{Z}i\gamma_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{Z} &= 4S_{\mu\nu}\mathbf{Z},\\ \mathbf{Z}i\gamma_{0123}\gamma_\mu\mathbf{Z} &= 4K_\mu\mathbf{Z},\\ \mathbf{Z}\gamma_{0123}\mathbf{Z} &= -4\omega\mathbf{Z}.\end{aligned} \tag{14}$$

The aggregate plays a central role within the Lounesto classification since, in order to complete the classification itself, $\mathbf{Z}$ have to be promoted to a boomerang, satisfying the relation $\mathbf{Z}^2 = 4\sigma\mathbf{Z}$. This condition is trivially satisfied for the regular spinors case, and $\mathbf{Z}$ is automatically a boomerang. Nonetheless, for singular spinors case, it is not such a straightforward procedure [10].

III. SUBCLASSES: CONSTRAINTS AND CONSEQUENCES

In this section, our aim is to elucidate the potential expansion of Lounesto's classification by scrutinizing the new subclasses unveiled by alternative duals. Moving beyond Lounesto's original framework, which was primarily anchored in the Dirac spinor, and thus in the interpretation of the electron, we will embrace a broader classification encompassing not just particles with electric charges but also those devoid of such charges. Our approach hinges on a meticulous examination of the constraints set forth by the FPK identities. It forbids arbitrary sets of bilinear covariants and, thus, arbitrary classes. After reviewing these constraints, we introduce the following set of allowed subclasses as shown in Table I. It represents the starting point of any theory in which spinors must obey the FKP identities. Table II, on the other hand, represents its complementary set, the set of bilinear covariants configurations such that the corresponding spinors are incompatible with the FPK identities. Such subclasses are thus *forbidden* from the algebraic point of view. More precisely, such subclasses can not have $\mathbf{J} = 0$ and $\mathbf{K} \neq 0$ or $\mathbf{J} \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{K} = 0$, these conditions violate $\mathbf{K}^2 = -\mathbf{J}^2$, and thus bringing consequences to σ and ω bilinears. Just to mention, there are spinors not obeying the FPK equations [24, 25], but we shall pursue the objective of not preclude from the guide provided by algebra. We further develop the discussion of algebraic constraints at the end of the present section.

Allowed classes	$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$	$\boldsymbol{\omega}$	**J**	**K**	**S**
1.	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
1.1	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$
1.2	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$
1.3	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$
1.4	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
1.5	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$
1.6	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$
1.7	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$
2.	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
2.1	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$
3.	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
3.1	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$
4.	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
4.1	$= 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
5.	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$
5.1	$= 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$
6.	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$
6.1	$= 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$
7.	$= 0$	$= 0$	$\neq 0$	$= 0$	$= 0$

Table I. All the classes allowed according to FPK identities, including the standard Lounesto classes and their new subclasses.

[2] An useful relation derived from the identities above (assuming $\mathbf{Z}^{-1}$ exists), reads

$$\begin{aligned}\mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{Z}) &= 4\sigma,\\ \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{Z}\gamma_\mu) &= 4J_\mu,\\ \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{Z}i\gamma_{\mu\nu}) &= 4S_{\mu\nu},\\ \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{Z}i\gamma_{0123}\gamma_\mu) &= 4K_\mu,\\ \mathrm{tr}(\mathbf{Z}\gamma_{0123}) &= -4\omega.\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Forbiden classes	$\boldsymbol{\sigma}$	$\boldsymbol{\omega}$	**J**	**K**	**S**
*2.2**	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$
*2.3**	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$
*2.4**	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
*2.5**	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$
*2.6**	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$
*2.7**	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$	$=0$	$=0$
*3.2**	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$
*3.3**	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$
*3.4**	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$\neq 0$
*3.5**	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$
*3.6**	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$	$\neq 0$
*3.7**	$=0$	$\neq 0$	$=0$	$=0$	$=0$

Table II. All the subclasses forbidden according to FPK identities, indicating to which of the standard Lounesto classes it belongs.

We shall explicitly construct a realization of Table I by choosing the appropriate Δ operator for the dual definition. Our starting point for the general case is the multi-vector elements of the space-time algebra, as shown in equation (9), as it generates the whole algebra. Nevertheless, individually, they do not carry any physical interpretation. Thus, we choose to combine them, without loss of generality, with the discrete operators[3]. In fact, bearing in mind the following relations: $\{\mathcal{C},\mathcal{P}\}=0$, $[\mathcal{C},\mathcal{T}]=0$ and $[\mathcal{P},\mathcal{T}]=0$, we can check all the possible combinations among discrete symmetries and the Dirac gamma matrices, which may compose the Δ operator. It brings to light the aforementioned dual operators as shown in Table III (we are adopting $\gamma_5 := -i\gamma_{0123} = -i\gamma_0\gamma_1\gamma_2\gamma_3$). It should be emphasized that we do not restrict our investigation by covariance symmetries, real bilinears, or any other constraints from standard high-energy physics since, as argued in the Introduction, manageable departures from usual physical requirements are being studied in several different and relevant contexts. We focus on fundamental formal constraints since we aim to uncover possible dual candidates for alternative theories.

	$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	γ_0	γ_i	γ_5	γ_{0i}	γ_{ij}	γ_{5i}
$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	γ_0	γ_i	γ_5	γ_{0i}	γ_{ij}	γ_{5i}
$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathbb{1}$	-$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	-$\mathcal{C}$	-$\mathcal{CPT}$	$\mathcal{T}$	-$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_0$	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_{0i}$	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_{ij}$	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_{5i}$
$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_0$	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_{0i}$	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_{ij}$	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_{5i}$
$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	-$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	-$\mathcal{C}$	-$\mathcal{P}$	-$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_0$	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_{0i}$	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_{ij}$	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_{5i}$
$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathcal{C}$	-$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	-$\mathbb{1}$	-$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	-$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_0$	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_{0i}$	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_{ij}$	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_{5i}$
$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	$\mathcal{T}$	-$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	-$\mathbb{1}$	-$\mathcal{CP}$	-$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_0$	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_{0i}$	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_{ij}$	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_{5i}$
$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{T}$	-$\mathcal{CPT}$	-$\mathcal{P}$	-$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{CP}$	-$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_0$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_{0i}$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_{ij}$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_{5i}$
$\mathcal{CPT}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	-$\mathcal{PT}$	-$\mathcal{CP}$	-$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{P}$	-$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_0$	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_i$	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_{0i}$	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_{ij}$	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_{5i}$

Table III. All possible combinations for the Δ operator, where $\gamma_i\gamma_j$ is abbreviated as γ_{ij} with obvious extension to other γ's.

Now, our aim is to filter the relevant dual operators Δ from Table III. It is accomplished by taking into account the algebraic constraint, as given in equation (2). From Table III, we check all the combinations holding simultaneously the FPK identities and the algebraic constraint, furnishing the results finally summarized in Table IV. We emphasize that if two or more operators satisfy the algebraic constraint, then the sum of these operators must also satisfy the given constraint. Thus, we can also define Δ as being a sum of two or more distinct operators and not only their product.

---

[3] A spinorial realization of discrete operators may be given by [14] $\mathcal{P} = m^{-1}\gamma_\mu p^\mu$ (returning γ_0 in the rest frame), $\mathcal{C} = \gamma_2 K$, where K complex conjugate from the left, and $\mathcal{T} = -\frac{1}{4!}\epsilon_{\alpha\beta\rho\sigma}\gamma^\alpha\gamma^\beta\gamma^\rho\gamma^\sigma\mathcal{C}$. Besides, we use

$$\gamma_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{0}_{2\times 2} & \mathbb{1}_{2\times 2} \\ \mathbb{1}_{2\times 2} & \mathbb{0}_{2\times 2} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{15}$$

and

$$\vec{\gamma} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbb{0}_{2\times 2} & \vec{\sigma} \\ -\vec{\sigma} & \mathbb{0}_{2\times 2} \end{pmatrix}. \tag{16}$$

	$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{T}$	$\mathcal{CP}$	$\mathcal{CT}$	$\mathcal{PT}$	$\mathcal{CPT}$	γ_0	γ_i	γ_5	γ_{0i}	γ_{ij}	γ_{5i}
$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathbb{1}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{C}$	-	-	-	-	-	γ_0	γ_1, γ_2	-	-	-	-
$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathcal{P}$	$\mathbb{1}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_0$	-	-	$\mathcal{P}\gamma_{01}$, $\mathcal{P}\gamma_{02}$	-	-
$\mathcal{C}$	$\mathcal{C}$	-	$\mathbb{1}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_2$	-	-	$\mathcal{C}\gamma_{12}$	-
$\mathcal{T}$	-	-	-	-$\mathbb{1}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_{03}$	-	$\mathcal{T}\gamma_{52}$
$\mathcal{CP}$	-	-	-	-	-$\mathbb{1}$	-	-	-	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_0$	-	-	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_{02}$	$\mathcal{CP}\gamma_{13}$	-
$\mathcal{CT}$	-	-	-	-	-	-$\mathbb{1}$	-	-	-	-	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_5$	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_{05}$	-	$\mathcal{CT}\gamma_{51}$, $\mathcal{CT}\gamma_{52}$
$\mathcal{PT}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-$\mathbb{1}$	-	-	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_3$	-	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_{02}$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_{13}$	$\mathcal{PT}\gamma_{50}$
$\mathcal{CPT}$	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	$\mathbb{1}$	-	-	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_5$	-	$\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_{13}$, $\mathcal{CPT}\gamma_{23}$	-

Table IV. Combinations for a Δ operator that satisfies the FKP identities and the algebraic constraint (2) simultaneously.

.

As it is clear from the above constructions, the new subclasses shown in Table I can only be accessed if we abandon the Dirac's dual structure and instead employ a more involved dual structure such as $\bar{\psi}= [\Delta\psi]^\dagger\gamma_0$, in which $\Delta \neq \mathbb{1}$. The reader is reefed to [13, 22, 23] for explicit examples related to the definition of new dual structures. We emphasize that such a fact can be an aggravating factor when attempting to define the spinor through the Inversion theorem [9] since we must also try to define the dual structure that acts upon the spinor in order to bring it to that class. In this scenario, as discussed, we are abstaining from the usual physics carried by bilinear forms since we are outside the scope carried by Lounesto and its respective interpretations. That being said, it is possible to reach well-behaved bilinear forms even if they are complex numbers. It is to be reinforced, however, that physical scenarios can also be accompanied by such generalizations, as shown in the example presented [26], fitting subclass *1.6*.

Regarding the allowed subclasses, as one can see, class 1 is the most comprehensive one, meaning it has the highest number of possible subclasses due to the conditions of both $\sigma \neq 0$ and $\omega \neq 0$. This fact opens up the possibility of extending the subclasses to $\mathbf{J} = 0$ since, according to the FPK identities, if $\mathbf{J}^2 = 0$, then $\sigma = \pm i\omega$. The algebraic conditions reads:

I) If $\mathbf{J} = 0$ and $\mathbf{K} \neq 0$ or $\mathbf{J} \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{K} = 0$ or $\mathbf{J} = 0$ and $\mathbf{K} = 0$, we are restricted to the following relation $2iS_{\mu\nu} = \epsilon_{\mu\nu\alpha\beta}S^{\alpha\beta}$, where $\mathbf{S} = \mathbf{0}$ or $\mathbf{S} \neq \mathbf{0}$.

II) If $\mathbf{J} \neq 0$, $\mathbf{K} \neq 0$ and $\mathbf{S} = 0$ we are restricted to $J_\mu K_\nu = J_\nu K_\mu$.

Classes 2 and 3 require more attention than class 1 case. As one can see, the relation $\mathbf{J}^2 = 0$ is no longer valid. In the class 2 case, we would have $\mathbf{J}^2 = \sigma^2 = 0$ leading to $\sigma = 0$, and for class 3, we would have $\mathbf{J}^2 = \omega^2 = 0$ furnishing $\omega = 0$, which are two strong contradictions; another relevant condition that arises from the classes mentioned above is the fact that $\mathbf{K} = 0$ is not allowed. Such a condition contradicts $\mathbf{J}^2 = -\mathbf{K}^2$, once $\mathbf{J} \neq 0$. Also, for classes 2 and 3:

III) If $\mathbf{S} = 0$, again, it leads to $J_\mu K_\nu = J_\nu K_\mu$, as above.

The singular sector of Lounesto classification, classes 4, 5, and 6, exhibit a significant restrictive character, as the only possibility for alteration is to set $\mathbf{J} = 0$, with all the other bilinear forms unchanged. Any other bilinear form modification would result in the mixing of classes. We highlight that all subclasses hold $\mathbf{Z}^2 = 4\sigma\mathbf{Z}$.

IV. FINAL REMARKS

This research explored extra subclasses within the Lounesto classification, specifically when diverse dual spinors are permitted. As illustrated in Tables I and IV, while these newly identified subclasses offer interesting mathematical avenues, it is relatively secure to ensure that none of them shall be relevant within the realm of usual quantum field theory. As far as we know, there is no definitive assurance that these subclasses encompass spinors with coherent dynamics, especially in the regular sector. Nevertheless, stressing this viewpoint again, the generality provided by the mathematical standpoint allows us to present the new classes to the community as potentially relevant in future studies on theories beyond the standard model. They fundamentally resonate with the algebraic bounds set by the FPK identities, underscoring the intricate balance and relationship between physical phenomena and their mathematical descriptions.

In a scenario where physical theories beyond the standard model are in order, it seems a good (and conservative) approach to speculating new possibilities based on a solid mathematical substrate, serving as a starting point for new developments in theoretical physics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors acknowledge (in memory) Professor Dharam Vir Ahluwalia, whose invaluable contributions to the field continue to inspire and guide our endeavors. RJBR thanks the generous hospitality offered by UNIFAAT and Professor Renato Medina. JMHS thanks to CNPq (grant No. 307641/2022-8) for financial support.

[1] D. V. Ahluwalia, The theory of local mass dimension one fermions of spin one half, Adv. Appl. Clifford Algebras **27**, 2247 (2017), arXiv:1601.03188 [hep-th].

[2] C.-Y. Lee and M. Dias, Constraints on mass dimension one fermionic dark matter from the Yukawa interaction, Phys. Rev. D **94**, 065020 (2016), arXiv:1511.01160 [hep-ph].

[3] C.-Y. Lee, Symmetries and unitary interactions of mass dimension one fermionic dark matter, Int. J. Mod. Phys. A **31**, 1650187 (2016), arXiv:1510.04983 [hep-th].

[4] C.-Y. Lee, A Lagrangian for mass dimension one fermionic dark matter, Phys. Lett. B **760**, 164 (2016), arXiv:1404.5307 [hep-th].

[5] C. H. Coronado Villalobos, J. M. Hoff da Silva, and R. a. da Rocha, Questing mass dimension 1 spinor fields, Eur. Phys. J. C **75**, 266 (2015), arXiv:1504.06763 [hep-th].

[6] D. V. Ahluwalia and D. Grumiller, Spin half fermions with mass dimension one: Theory, phenomenology, and dark matter, JCAP **07**, 012, arXiv:hep-th/0412080.

[7] D. V. Ahluwalia, C.-Y. Lee, and D. Schritt, Self-interacting Elko dark matter with an axis of locality, Phys. Rev. D **83**, 065017 (2011), arXiv:0911.2947 [hep-ph].

[8] B. Agarwal, P. Jain, S. Mitra, A. C. Nayak, and R. K. Verma, ELKO fermions as dark matter candidates, Phys. Rev. D **92**, 075027 (2015), arXiv:1407.0797 [hep-ph].

[9] Y. Takahashi, Reconstruction of Spinor From Fierz Identities, Phys. Rev. D **26**, 2169 (1982).

[10] P. Lounesto, *Clifford Algebras and Spinors*, 2nd ed. (Cambridge Univesity Press, 2001).

[11] J. P. Crawford, On the algebra of Dirac bispinor densities: factorization and inversion theoremsS, J. Math. Phys. **26**, 1439 (1985).

[12] J. M. Hoff da Silva and R. T. Cavalcanti, Further investigation of mass dimension one fermionic duals, Phys. Lett. A **383**, 1683 (2019), arXiv:1904.03999 [physics.gen-ph].

[13] J. M. Hoff da Silva, R. J. Bueno Rogerio, and N. C. R. Quinquiolo, Spinorial discrete symmetries and adjoint structures, Phys. Lett. A **452**, 128470 (2022), arXiv:2203.02065 [hep-th].

[14] D. Ahluwalia, *Mass Dimension One Fermions*, Vol. 229 (Cambridge University Press, 2019) arXiv:2007.15098 [hep-th].

[15] D. Colladay and V. A. Kostelecký, Lorentz-violating extension of the standard model, Physical Review D **58**, 116002 (1998).

[16] D. V. Ahluwalia and C.-Y. Lee, Spin-half bosons with mass dimension three-half: Evading the spin-statistics theorem, Europhysics Letters **140**, 24001 (2022).

[17] A. Mostafazadeh, Pseudo-hermiticity versus pt symmetry: the necessary condition for the reality of the spectrum of a non-hermitian hamiltonian, Journal of Mathematical Physics **43**, 205 (2002).

[18] R. T. Cavalcanti and J. M. Hoff da Silva, Unveiling mapping structures of spinor duals, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 325 (2020), arXiv:2004.00385 [physics.gen-ph].

[19] R. A. Mosna and W. A. Rodrigues, Jr, The bundles of algebraic and dirac-hestenes spinor fields, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 2945 (2004), arXiv:math-ph/0212033.

[20] W. A. Rodrigues, Jr, Algebraic and Dirac-Hestenes spinors and spinor fields, J. Math. Phys. **45**, 2908 (2004), arXiv:math-ph/0212030.

[21] J. Vaz, Jr. and R. da Rocha, *An Introduction to Clifford Algebras and Spinors* (OUP, 2016).

[22] C. H. Coronado Villalobos, R. J. Bueno Rogerio, A. R. Aguirre, and D. Beghetto, On the generalized spinor classification: beyond the Lounesto's classification, Eur. Phys. J. C **80**, 228 (2020), arXiv:1906.11622 [hep-th].

[23] R. J. B. Rogerio, R. T. Cavalcanti, J. M. H. da Silva, and C. H. C. Villalobos, Revisiting Takahashi's inversion theorem in discrete symmetry-based dual frameworks, Physics Letters A **481**, 129028 (2023).

[24] A. Crumeyrolle, *Orthogonal and symplectic Clifford algebras: Spinor structures*, Vol. 57 (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).

[25] W. A. Rodrigues, Q. A. de Souza, J. Vaz, and P. Lounesto, Dirac-Hestenes spinor fields on Riemann-Cartan manifolds, International Journal of Theoretical Physics **35**, 1849 (1996).

[26] D. V. Ahluwalia, A new class of mass dimension one fermions, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **476**, 20200249 (2020), arXiv:2008.01525 [physics.gen-ph].