

# Large and small hierarchies from finite modular symmetries

Tetsutaro Higaki<sup>a</sup>, Junichiro Kawamura<sup>b</sup>, Tatsuo Kobayashi<sup>c</sup>,  
Kaito Nasu<sup>c</sup> and Riku Sakuma<sup>c</sup>

<sup>a</sup>*Department of Physics, Keio University, Yokohama 223-8533, Japan*

<sup>b</sup>*Center for Theoretical Physics of the Universe, Institute for Basic Science (IBS), Daejeon 34051, Korea*

<sup>c</sup>*Department of Physics, Hokkaido University, Sapporo 060-0810, Japan*

## Abstract

We study the moduli stabilization by the radiative corrections due to the moduli dependent vector-like masses invariant under the finite modular symmetry. The radiative stabilization mechanism can stabilize the modulus  $\tau$  of the finite modular symmetry  $\Gamma_N$  ( $N \in \mathbb{N}$ ) at  $\text{Im } \tau \gg 1$ , where the shift symmetry  $\tau \rightarrow \tau + 1$  remains unbroken approximately. The shift symmetry can be considered as the residual  $\mathbb{Z}_N$  symmetry which realizes the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism with the hierarchy parameter  $e^{-2\pi \text{Im } \tau / N} \ll 1$ . In this work, we study the stabilization of multiple moduli fields, so that various hierarchical values of the modular forms coexist in a model. For example, one modulus stabilized at  $\text{Im } \tau_1 \sim 3$  is responsible for the hierarchical structure of the quarks and leptons in the Standard Model, and another modulus stabilized at  $\text{Im } \tau_2 \sim 15$  can account for the flatness of the  $\text{Re } \tau_2$  direction which may be identified as the QCD axion.

# 1 Introduction

The finite modular symmetries have been intensively studied to explain the flavor structure of the quarks and leptons in the Standard Model (SM) [1]. Under the modular symmetry, coupling constants, typically Yukawa couplings, are promoted to the modular forms, which are holomorphic functions of modulus  $\tau$ . Some of the finite modular symmetries  $\Gamma_N$ , with level  $N \in \mathbb{N}$ , are known to be isomorphic to the non-Abelian discrete symmetries, such as  $\Gamma_3 \simeq A_4$ , which have been used in bottom-up approaches of flavor model building [2–6]. It has been shown that the finite modular symmetric models can realize masses and mixing of quarks and leptons using the modular forms of  $\Gamma_{2,4} \simeq S_{3,4}$  [7, 8],  $\Gamma_{3,5} \simeq A_{4,5}$  [1, 9],  $\Gamma_6$  [10], and their double coverings [11–14]<sup>1</sup>. Recently, it has been pointed out that the hierarchical flavor structure can be explained by the Froggatt-Nielsen (FN) mechanism due to the residual Abelian discrete symmetry [17–28]. The FN mechanism is realized when the modulus is stabilized nearby one of the fixed points,  $\tau = i, e^{2\pi i/3}$  or  $i\infty$ . In particular, the residual  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  symmetry, corresponding to  $T$  transformation  $\tau \rightarrow \tau + 1$ , remains unbroken if the modulus is stabilized at  $\text{Im } \tau \gg 1$ .

The stabilization of the modulus is important for the flavor structure. In general, the moduli stabilization is a critical problem in models with extra dimensions, such as superstring theory, where the modulus describes the geometry of extra dimensions. The moduli stabilization by the modular invariant non-perturbative superpotential in 4D low-energy effective field theory of superstring theory is discussed in Refs. [29–31]. Recently, the stabilization scenarios are revisited for modular flavor models using the modular invariant function and the modular forms coupled to a matter field in Refs. [32–40]. The stabilization by the three-form flux backgrounds [41] is also studied in Ref. [42, 43]. Interestingly, these modulus potentials may be applicable for the inflation in the early universe [44–48]. Also, it is found in Ref. [49] that the moduli dependent mass of matter fields will result in the moduli trapping behavior.

The radiative corrections may also be important to stabilize the modulus. The Coleman-Weinberg (CW) potential can deviate the modulus from a fixed point stabilized by a tree-level potential [50]. It is shown in Refs. [51, 52] that the CW potential from the mass terms alone can stabilize the modulus at  $\text{Im } \tau \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(1)$ , where the residual  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  symmetry is unbroken, if the mass is given by a certain modular form whose  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  charge is non-zero. Interestingly, the potential along  $\text{Re } \tau$  direction is very flat due to the accidental  $U(1)$  symmetry originated from the residual  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  symmetry. The accidental  $U(1)$  symmetry could be identified as the PQ symmetry so that the strong CP problem is solved by the QCD axion  $\sim \text{Re } \tau$  [51]<sup>2</sup>. The majoron is realized if the accidental  $U(1)$  is identified as the global  $U(1)_{B-L}$  symmetry [52]. Typically,  $\text{Im } \tau \gtrsim \mathcal{O}(10)$  is required to realize the very flat direction in the potential to be identified as the axion, while  $\text{Im } \tau \sim \mathcal{O}(3)$  is preferable to explain the hierarchical structure of the quarks and leptons. For example,  $\text{Im } \tau \sim 3$  is favored to explain the flavor hierarchies under  $\Gamma_6$  [20, 25].

---

<sup>1</sup>See for reviews Refs. [15, 16].

<sup>2</sup>The strong CP problem may also be solved by forbidding the CP violating  $\theta$  angle by the finite modular symmetry [53–58].

Thus, we may need more than one modulus to address the problems in the SM in a model.

In this paper, we extend the radiative stabilization scenario in Ref. [51] to the multiple moduli case. We consider the direct product of the finite modular symmetry  $\Gamma_{N_1} \times \Gamma_{N_2} \times \cdots \times \Gamma_{N_n}$ , where each symmetry has its modulus  $\tau_i$ <sup>3</sup>. We first discuss some necessary conditions to stabilize the moduli in the model, and then we demonstrate the stabilization of two moduli under  $\Gamma_6 \times \Gamma_6$  as an illustrating example. The flatness of  $\text{Re } \tau_i$  direction is also discussed.

This paper is organized as follows. We briefly review the finite modular symmetry in Section 2. In Section 3, we discuss the moduli stabilization by the CW potential. Section 4 is devoted to conclusion. In Appendix A, we show the modular forms of  $\Gamma_6$  used in our analysis.

## 2 Finite modular symmetry

In this section, we briefly review the modular symmetry. We consider the modular group  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$  consisting of the  $2 \times 2$  matrices parametrized as

$$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

where  $a, b, c, d$  are integers satisfying  $ad - bc = 1$ . This modular group is generated by three generators

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R = \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.2)$$

The modulus  $\tau$  ( $\text{Im } \tau > 0$ ) transforms under the modular transformation  $\gamma \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ ,

$$\tau \rightarrow \gamma\tau = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}. \quad (2.3)$$

We then introduce the congruence subgroup:

$$\Gamma(N) := \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}), \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{N} \right\}, \quad (2.4)$$

where the integer  $N$  is called level. The finite modular symmetry is defined as the quotient group  $\Gamma_N := \bar{\Gamma}/\Gamma(N)$  where  $\bar{\Gamma} := \Gamma(1)/\mathbb{Z}_2^R$ . Here  $\mathbb{Z}_2^R$  is the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  symmetry generated by  $R$ . The modular form, with the representation  $r$  under  $\Gamma_N$  and the modular weight  $k \in \mathbb{Z}$ , is the holomorphic function of  $\tau$ , which transforms as

$$Y_r^{(k)}(\tau) \rightarrow Y_r^{(k)}(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k \rho(r) Y_r^{(k)}(\tau), \quad (2.5)$$

where  $\rho(r)$  is the representation matrix of  $\Gamma_N$ . We study models with supersymmetry so that Yukawa couplings in the superpotential are identified as the modular forms, which are

---

<sup>3</sup>It will be interesting to consider the Siegel modular group to stabilize multiple modulus fields, but this is not a scope of this paper. The flavor structures from the Siegel modular group are discussed in Refs. [27, 59–63], and the moduli stabilization is studied in Ref. [64].

holomorphic functions of the modulus  $\tau$ . We assume that the chiral superfield  $Q$  with weight  $-k_Q^i$  and representation  $r_Q^i$  transforms as

$$Q \xrightarrow{\gamma} \left( \prod_i (c_i \tau_i + d_i)^{-k_Q^i} \rho(r_Q^i) \right) Q, \quad (2.6)$$

under the modular transformation.

### 3 Radiative moduli stabilization

We study the finite modular symmetric model with the pairs of chiral matter fields  $(Q_a, \bar{Q}_a)$  which are vector-like under the SM gauge group. In this paper, we will consider a direct product of the finite modular groups  $\Gamma_{N_1} \times \Gamma_{N_2} \times \cdots \times \Gamma_{N_n}$  where each  $\Gamma_{N_i}$  has its modulus  $\tau_i$  with  $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$ . This setup with  $n \leq 3$  is motivated by the toroidal compactification of the 6D extra-dimension space  $T^2 \times T^2 \times T^2$ , where each torus may has its  $\Gamma_{N_i}$ .

We study the simple supergravity model with the following Kähler potential and superpotential:

$$K = - \sum_i h_i \log(-i\tau_i + i\tau_i^\dagger) + \sum_a \left( \frac{Q_a^\dagger Q_a}{\prod_i (-i\tau_i + i\tau_i^\dagger)^{k_{Q_a}^i}} + \frac{\bar{Q}_a^\dagger \bar{Q}_a}{\prod_i (-i\tau_i + i\tau_i^\dagger)^{\bar{k}_{Q_a}^i}} \right), \quad (3.1)$$

$$W = \sum_a \Lambda_{Q_a} \left[ \left( \prod_i Y_{r_a^i}^{(k_a^i)}(\tau_i) \right) \bar{Q}_a Q_a \right]_{1_0}, \quad (3.2)$$

where  $h_i \in \mathbb{N}$  and  $\Lambda_{Q_a}$  is the mass scale of the vector-like mass for  $(Q_a, \bar{Q}_a)$ . Here,  $r_a^i$  and  $k_a^i$  are respectively the representation and the modular weight of the modular form under the finite modular symmetry  $\Gamma_{N_i}$ . We use the unit of  $M_p = 1$  with  $M_p$  being the reduced Planck scale. In general, we take the trivial-singlet combinations of the product denoted by  $[\cdots]_{1_0}$ , but we focus on the case of the singlets  $1_t$ , with  $t$  being  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  charge, and no flavor mixing for simplicity<sup>4</sup>. In this case, the charges under the  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  symmetry and the modular weights satisfy

$$t_a^i + t_{Q_a}^i + \bar{t}_{Q_a}^i \equiv 0, \quad k_a^i = -h_i + k_{Q_a}^i + \bar{k}_{Q_a}^i, \quad (3.3)$$

for any  $a$ 's, so that  $G := K + \log |W|^2$  is invariant under the modular symmetry. Here, the  $\mathbb{Z}_{N_i}^T$  charges of the modular form,  $Q_a$  and  $\bar{Q}_a$  are defined as  $t_a^i, t_{Q_a}^i, \bar{t}_{Q_a}^i$ , respectively, and  $\equiv$  is understood as mod  $N_i$ . First, we study the single modulus case  $n = 1$ , then the multi-moduli case is discussed later.

---

<sup>4</sup>Under  $\Gamma_6$  which will be used in our numerical analysis, there are singlet representations  $1_t$  with  $t = 0, 1, 2, \dots, 5$ . In the notation in Ref. [10], they correspond to  $1_0 = 1_0^0, 1_1 = 1_2^1, 1_2 = 1_1^0, 1_3 = 1_0^1, 1_4 = 1_2^0, 1_5 = 1_1^1$ , where the upper (lower) index is the charge under the  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  ( $\mathbb{Z}_3$ ) symmetry of  $\mathbb{Z}_6^T \simeq \mathbb{Z}_2 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$ . See Refs. [10, 20, 25] for the details of  $\Gamma_6$  and its double covering  $\Gamma_6'$ .

### 3.1 Single modulus case

We first discuss the single modulus case, so we omit the index  $i$  in this section. The vector-like mass terms in the superpotential induce the Coleman-Weinberg (CW) potential:

$$V_{\text{CW}} = \frac{1}{32\pi^2} \sum_a \left[ (m_a^2 + m_{Q_a}^2(\tau))^2 \left\{ \log \left( \frac{m_a^2 + m_{Q_a}^2(\tau)}{\mu^2} \right) - \frac{3}{2} \right\} - (m_{Q_a}^2(\tau))^2 \left\{ \log \left( \frac{m_{Q_a}^2(\tau)}{\mu^2} \right) - \frac{3}{2} \right\} \right], \quad (3.4)$$

where the first and second terms are due to bosonic and fermionic contributions, respectively. Here, we consider the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme and  $\mu$  denotes the renormalization scale. The canonically normalized mass square of the vector-like fermion  $(Q_a, \overline{Q}_a)$  is given by

$$m_{Q_a}^2(\tau) = \Lambda_{Q_a}^2 (-i\tau + i\tau^\dagger)^{k_a} \left| Y_{1_{t_a}}^{(k_a)}(\tau) \right|^2, \quad (3.5)$$

and the scalar mass squared is given by  $m_a^2 + m_{Q_a}^2(\tau)$ , where  $m_a^2$  is the soft supersymmetry breaking mass squared. For simplicity, we assume that  $m_a^2$  is independent of  $\tau$ <sup>5</sup>.

The potential has a minimum at  $\text{Im } \tau \gg 1$  as shown in Refs. [51, 52]. To illustrate this, we start from the simplest case with only one vector-like pair, so the index  $a$  is omitted hereafter. We parametrize the potential as

$$V_{\text{CW}} =: \frac{\Lambda_Q^4}{16\pi^2} U(X), \quad (3.6)$$

with

$$U(X) := \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\alpha + X)^2 \left\{ \log(\alpha + X) + L_\mu - \frac{3}{2} \right\} - X^2 \left( \log X + L_\mu - \frac{3}{2} \right) \right], \quad (3.7)$$

where  $\alpha := m^2/\Lambda_Q^2$ ,  $L_\mu := \log \Lambda_Q^2/\mu^2$  and

$$X = X(\tau) := (-i\tau + i\tau^\dagger)^k \left| Y_{1_t}^{(k)}(\tau) \right|^2 \quad (3.8)$$

is the fermion mass squared normalized by  $\Lambda_Q^2$ . The first derivative of  $U(X)$  with respect to  $X$  is given by

$$U'(X) = (\alpha + X) \log(\alpha + X) - X \log X + \alpha(L_\mu - 1) = \alpha \log \frac{m_{Q_a}^2(\tau)}{\mu^2} + \mathcal{O}(\alpha^2), \quad (3.9)$$

where  $\alpha \ll 1$  is assumed in the last equality. Thus the CW potential may have the minimum where the vector-like mass  $m_{Q_a}^2(\tau)$  is at the renormalization scale  $\mu^2$ . The second derivatives of the normalized potential  $U$  at this point is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \partial_{\text{Re } \tau}^2 & \partial_{\text{Re } \tau} \partial_{\text{Im } \tau} \\ \partial_{\text{Re } \tau} \partial_{\text{Im } \tau} & \partial_{\text{Im } \tau}^2 \end{pmatrix} U(X) = \log \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha}{X} \right) \begin{pmatrix} (\partial_{\text{Re } \tau} X)^2 & (\partial_{\text{Re } \tau} X)(\partial_{\text{Im } \tau} X) \\ (\partial_{\text{Re } \tau} X)(\partial_{\text{Im } \tau} X) & (\partial_{\text{Im } \tau} X)^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.10)$$

<sup>5</sup>See Ref. [65], for discussions about supersymmetry breaking parameters transformed under the modular symmetry.




Figure 1: Approximated values of  $\text{Im } \tau$  from Eq. (3.13).

Since this matrix is rank one, it has one massless mode and positive mass along the massive direction. In Ref [51], the massless mode is identified as the QCD axion, so that the massless mode gets massive due to the QCD effect and the minuscule contribution from the sub-dominant CW potential. We also note that the extremum with  $dX/d\tau = 0$  and  $U'(X) \neq 0$  is the maximum [51].

The potential has a minimum at large  $\text{Im } \tau$  for  $m^2 \ll \mu^2 \ll \Lambda_Q^2$  as shown in Eq. (3.9). For  $\text{Im } \tau \gtrsim 1$ , the singlet modular form can be expanded as

$$Y_{1_t}^{(k)}(\tau) = c_t^k q^{t/N} (1 + b_1 q + b_2 q^2 + \dots), \quad (3.11)$$

where  $q := e^{2\pi i \tau}$ . The real coefficients  $c_t^k$  and  $b_\ell$  ( $\ell = 1, 2, \dots$ ) are determined by the explicit form of  $Y_{1_t}^{(k)}$ . Hence, the normalized mass squared  $X$  is given by

$$X = (c_t^k)^2 (2\text{Im } \tau)^k e^{-\frac{4\pi t \text{Im } \tau}{N}} (1 + 2b_1 |q| \cos(2\pi \text{Re } \tau) + \mathcal{O}(|q|^2)), \quad (3.12)$$

where  $|q| = e^{-2\pi \text{Im } \tau} \ll 1$ . Hence the solution of  $U'(X) = 0$  in Eq. (3.9) is formally given by

$$\text{Im } \tau_0 := -\frac{kN}{4\pi t} \mathcal{W} \left( -\frac{2\pi t}{kN} \left( \frac{\mu}{c_t^k \Lambda_Q} \right)^{2/k} \right) + \mathcal{O}(|q|, \alpha), \quad (3.13)$$

where  $\mathcal{W}$  is the Lambert W function satisfying  $\mathcal{W}(z)e^{\mathcal{W}(z)} = z$  and we take one of the branches with a negative value. Typical values of  $\text{Im } \tau_0$  are shown in Fig. 1, where the value is larger for larger  $kN/t$  or smaller  $(\mu/c_t^k \Lambda_Q)^{1/k}$ . Around this minimum, the potential is expanded as

$$U(X) = U(X_0) + U'(X_0)(X(\tau) - X_0) + \mathcal{O}(|q|^2), \quad (3.14)$$

where  $X_0 := X(\text{Im } \tau_0)$ . Since  $U'(X_0) = 0$ ,  $\text{Re } \tau$  dependence of the potential appears at  $\mathcal{O}(|q|^2)$  if there is only one vector-like term is involved to generate the potential. While if there are more




Figure 2: The shape of the potential along  $\text{Im } \tau$  direction at  $\text{Re } \tau = 0$  for  $t = 5$  (left) and  $t = 1$  (right) with  $k = 10$ ,  $\mu/\Lambda_Q = 10^{-2}$  and  $m^2/\Lambda_Q^2 = 10^{-8}$ . The minimums are at  $\text{Im } \tau_0 \simeq 2.4$  (left) and  $\text{Im } \tau_0 \simeq 22.6$  (right).

than one term as discussed in Ref. [51],  $\text{Re } \tau$  dependence appears at  $\mathcal{O}(|q|)$  from the second dominant vector-like mass.

For illustration, we consider the case of  $N = 6$ . The explicit forms of the singlet modular forms of  $\Gamma_6$  are shown in Appendix A. Figure 2 shows the potential along the  $\text{Im } \tau$  direction at  $\text{Re } \tau = 0$ , but the potential is extremely flat along the  $\text{Re } \tau$  direction. The left (right) panel is the potential generated from the modular forms  ${}^6_6, Y_{15}^{(10)} (Y_{11}^{(10)})$ , which realizes its minimum at  $\text{Im } \tau_0 = 2.4$  ( $\text{Im } \tau_0 = 22.6$ ). The ratios of the scale parameters are chosen to  $\mu/\Lambda_Q = 10^{-2}$  and  $m^2/\Lambda_Q^2 = 10^{-8}$ . Thus we see that the value of  $\text{Im } \tau$  at the minimum can be  $\mathcal{O}(1-10)$  by choosing the representation and weight. For the flavor structure, the minimal unit for the hierarchy is  $\epsilon := |q|^{1/N}$ . For  $N = 6$ ,  $\text{Im } \tau \sim 3$  is moderate to explain the hierarchies in the SM quarks and leptons [20, 25]. While it can be used to realize the axion-like direction for  $\text{Im } \tau \sim \mathcal{O}(10)$ , so that it contributes to the dark matter and/or solves the strong CP problem [51, 52]. These hierarchical structures supported by the finite modular symmetry would be applied for generating other scales much smaller than a fundamental scale, such as the Planck scale or string scale, or perhaps for explaining the tiny cosmological constant. To address more than one hierarchy issues in the SM at the same time, e.g. explain both flavor hierarchy and strong CP problem in a model, we have to realize two different hierarchies at once. Another possibility is that the coexistence of the two hierarchies may allow to explain the flavor hierarchy and spontaneous CP violation due to the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism [28]. We will demonstrate this by simply extending the radiative stabilization scenario with multi-moduli.

### 3.2 Multi moduli case

Now, we discuss the stabilization mechanism for the multiple moduli, i.e.  $n > 1$ . The CW potential generated from the general setup in Eq. (3.1) only with the singlet representations

<sup>6</sup>Note that  $k = 10$  is the smallest weight which has the non-trivial singlet  $1_5 = 1_1^1$ , see Appendix A.

are the same form as Eq. (3.4), but the vector-like masses are generalized to

$$m_{Q_a}^2(\tau) = \Lambda_{Q_a}^2 \prod_i (2\text{Im } \tau_i)^{k_a^i} \left| Y_{1_{t_a^i}}^{(k_a^i)}(\tau_i) \right|^2 =: \Lambda_{Q_a}^2 X_a(\tau), \quad (3.15)$$

where  $a = 1, 2, \dots, A$  runs over the vector-like pairs. Without loss of generality, we can take  $\Lambda_{Q_a} = \Lambda_Q$  by absorbing it to the normalization of the modular forms. Then, we define the normalized potential as

$$V_{\text{CW}}(\tau) =: \frac{\Lambda_Q^4}{16\pi^2} U(\tau), \quad U(\tau) =: \sum_{a=1}^A U_a(X_a), \quad (3.16)$$

with

$$U_a(X) := \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\alpha_a + X_a)^2 \left\{ \log(\alpha_a + X_a) + L_\mu - \frac{3}{2} \right\} - X_a^2 \left( \log X_a + L_\mu - \frac{3}{2} \right) \right], \quad (3.17)$$

where  $\alpha_a := m_a^2/\Lambda_Q^2$ . The first derivative is given by

$$\partial_{\tau_i} U(X) =: \sum_a U'_a \partial_{\tau_i} X_a(\tau) =: \sum_a C_{ia}(\tau_i) \frac{dU_a}{d \log X_a}, \quad (3.18)$$

where the derivative  $U'_a := dU_a/dX_a$  can be obtained by formally replacing  $\alpha \rightarrow \alpha_a$ ,  $X \rightarrow X_a$  in Eq. (3.9). Here, we define the  $n \times A$  matrix  $[C]_{ia}$  with

$$\partial_{\tau_i} X_a(\tau) = \left( \partial_{\tau_i} \log Y_{1_{t_a^i}}^{(k_a^i)}(\tau_i) - \frac{ik_a^i}{2\text{Im } \tau_i} \right) X_a(\tau) =: C_{ia}(\tau) X_a(\tau), \quad (3.19)$$

which is approximately given by

$$C_{ia}(\tau_i) = \frac{2\pi i t_a^i}{N_i} \left( 1 - \frac{k_a^i N_i / t_a^i}{4\pi \text{Im } \tau_i} \right) + \mathcal{O}(|q_i|). \quad (3.20)$$

The minimization condition Eq. (3.18) has the trivial solution, i.e.  $U'_a(X_a) = 0$ , as the simultaneous  $n$  linear equations, which can be achieved only if  $n \geq A$ . Whereas the non-trivial solution can exist if  $\text{rank } C < A$ .

At the minimum  $U'_a = 0$ , the second derivatives of the potential are given by

$$\begin{aligned} & \begin{pmatrix} \partial_{\text{Re } \tau_i} \partial_{\text{Re } \tau_j} & \partial_{\text{Re } \tau_i} \partial_{\text{Im } \tau_j} \\ \partial_{\text{Im } \tau_i} \partial_{\text{Re } \tau_j} & \partial_{\text{Im } \tau_i} \partial_{\text{Im } \tau_j} \end{pmatrix} U(X) \\ & = \sum_a \log \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_a}{X_a} \right) \begin{pmatrix} (\partial_{\text{Re } \tau_i} X_a)(\partial_{\text{Re } \tau_j} X_a) & (\partial_{\text{Re } \tau_i} X_a)(\partial_{\text{Im } \tau_j} X_a) \\ (\partial_{\text{Im } \tau_i} X_a)(\partial_{\text{Re } \tau_j} X_a) & (\partial_{\text{Im } \tau_i} X_a)(\partial_{\text{Im } \tau_j} X_a) \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (3.21)$$

The  $2n \times 2n$  mass matrix for the modulus is rank  $A$ . Thus  $n \geq A$  is necessary to make  $\text{Im } \tau_i$ 's massive at  $\mathcal{O}(|q|^0)$ . Altogether, we find that the minimum  $U'_a = 0$  can stabilize all of the modulus with  $n$  massless modes only if  $n = A$ . For  $A > n$ , the minimization condition may be



satisfied in the non-trivial way,  $U'_a(X_a) \neq 0$  and the massless modes will obtain masses from the CW potential <sup>7</sup>. In this work, we will focus on the case of  $n = A$  as the minimal example to stabilize multiple moduli.

The simplest example is that  $C_{ia}$  is a diagonal matrix, i.e. the normalized mass can be written as

$$X_a(\tau) = X_a(\tau_a) = (2\text{Im } \tau_a)^{k_a} \left| Y_{1_{t_a}}^{(k_a)}(\tau_a) \right|^2. \quad (3.22)$$

Hence, the normalized potential can be written as

$$U(\tau) = \sum_a U_a(X_a(\tau_a)), \quad (3.23)$$

and the mass of the modulus  $\tau_a$  is generated only from  $U_a(\tau_a)$ . Thus in this case, the result in the single modulus case can be directly applied for each sector labeled by  $a$ .

Now, let us discuss the non-diagonal case. The trivial solution  $U'_a(X_a) = 0$  reads as

$$\frac{\mu^2}{\Lambda_Q^2} = X_a(\tau) + \mathcal{O}(\alpha_a). \quad (3.24)$$

This implies that the masses of the  $A$  vector-like pairs are nearly degenerate at the minimum. To proceed, we assume the universal modular weight  $k^i := k_a^i$  for  $a$  for simplicity. In this case,

$$X_a(\tau) = \prod_i (2\text{Im } \tau_i)^{k^i} \left| Y_{1_{t_a^i}}^{(k^i)}(\tau_i) \right|^2 = \prod_i \left| c_{t_a^i}^{k^i} \right|^2 (2\text{Im } \tau_i)^{k^i} e^{-\frac{4\pi t_a^i}{N_i} \text{Im } \tau_i} (1 + \mathcal{O}(q_i)) \quad (3.25)$$

Hence, the minimization condition requires that

$$\ell_a = \sum_i \left( \frac{4\pi t_a^i}{N_i} \right) \text{Im } \tau_i =: \sum_i P_{ai} \text{Im } \tau_i, \quad \ell_a := \log \left( \frac{\Lambda_Q^2}{\mu^2} \prod_i (2\text{Im } \tau_i)^{k^i} \left| c_{t_a^i}^{k^i} \right|^2 \right), \quad (3.26)$$

for  $a = 1, 2, \dots, A$ , so

$$\sum_a [P^{-1}]_{ia} \ell_a > 0 \quad (3.27)$$

is required for  $\text{Im } \tau_i > 0$ . Note that  $\ell_a$  only logarithmically depends on  $\text{Im } \tau_i$ . For  $n = 2$ ,  $N_1 = N_2 =: N$  and  $c_{t_a^i}^{k^i} = 1$ , this condition is simplified to

$$(t_1^1 - t_2^1)(t_2^2 - t_1^2) > 0 \quad \text{and} \quad (t_1^1 - t_2^1)(t_1^1 t_2^2 - t_2^1 t_1^2) > 0. \quad (3.28)$$

---

<sup>7</sup>The case of  $(n, A) = (1, 2)$  is discussed in Ref. [51], where one of the vector-like pair dominates the other and the leading  $\text{Re } \tau$  dependence is generated from the lighter one with the suppression of  $\mathcal{O}(q^{1+t_2^1/N})$ .




Figure 3:  $\log_{10}(U - U_{\min})$  on  $(\text{Im } \tau_1, \text{Im } \tau_2)$  plane for  $N = 6$ ,  $k = 10$ ,  $\alpha = 10^{-4} \times \mu^2/\Lambda_Q^2$ . The  $\mathbb{Z}_6^T$ -charges are chosen as  $(t_1^1, t_1^2, t_2^1, t_2^2) = (3, 3, 5, 1)$  and  $(0, 3, 5, 2)$  on the left and right panels, respectively.  $\mu/\Lambda = 10^{-1}$  ( $10^{-9}$ ) in the left (right) panel.

The solution is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Im } \tau_1 &= -\frac{(k^1 + k^2)N}{4\pi} \frac{t_1^2 - t_2^2}{t_1^1 t_2^2 - t_2^1 t_1^2} \mathcal{W} \left( -\frac{4\pi}{(k^1 + k^2)N} \frac{t_1^1 t_2^2 - t_2^1 t_1^2}{t_1^2 - t_2^2} \left( \frac{t_2^2 - t_1^2}{t_1^1 - t_2^1} \right)^{\frac{k^2}{k^1 + k^2}} \left( \frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q} \right)^{\frac{2}{k^1 + k^2}} \right), \\ \text{Im } \tau_2 &= -\frac{(k^1 + k^2)N}{4\pi} \frac{t_2^1 - t_1^1}{t_1^1 t_2^2 - t_2^1 t_1^2} \mathcal{W} \left( -\frac{4\pi}{(k^1 + k^2)N} \frac{t_1^1 t_2^2 - t_2^1 t_1^2}{t_2^2 - t_1^1} \left( \frac{t_1^1 - t_2^1}{t_2^2 - t_1^1} \right)^{\frac{k^1}{k^1 + k^2}} \left( \frac{\mu}{\Lambda_Q} \right)^{\frac{2}{k^1 + k^2}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.29)$$

and then

$$\frac{\text{Im } \tau_2}{\text{Im } \tau_1} = \frac{t_1^1 - t_2^1}{t_2^2 - t_1^1}. \quad (3.30)$$

The qualitative features for more general cases will be similar to those obtained for this simple case.

Now we numerically show the existence of the minimum. We focus on the case of  $N_1 = N_2 = 6$ ,  $k_a^i = 10$ , where there are five singlet modular forms with  $t = 0, 1, 2, 3, 5$ . The normalization of the modular forms are chosen such that  $c_t^{10} = 1$  with the universal scale factor  $\Lambda_Q$ . Figure 3 shows the potentials in the case of  $(t_1^1, t_1^2, t_2^1, t_2^2) = (3, 3, 5, 1)$  and  $(0, 3, 5, 2)$  on the left and right panels, respectively. In this figure, we choose  $\alpha = 10^{-4} \times \mu^2/\Lambda_Q^2$  and  $\mu/\Lambda_Q = 10^{-1}$  ( $10^{-9}$ ) on the left (right) panel. On the left panel, the minimum is at  $(\text{Im } \tau_1, \text{Im } \tau_2) \simeq (3.43, 3.43)$ , where  $\text{Im } \tau_1/\text{Im } \tau_2 \simeq 1$  as expected from Eq. (3.30). The minimum is at  $(\text{Im } \tau_1, \text{Im } \tau_2) \simeq (2.96, 14.8)$  where  $\text{Im } \tau_1/\text{Im } \tau_2 \simeq 5$  on the right panel. Note that the largest ratio is  $5 = N - 1$  for  $N = 6$

in this setup, and the ratio can change from these values by changing the modular weights, normalizations of the modular forms and  $N_i$  in more general cases. We have shown the simplest cases which can realize the two patterns of  $\text{Im } \tau_i$ . We set  $\text{Re } \tau_i = 0$  for the numerical plots, but there is no visible difference for  $\text{Re } \tau_i \neq 0$ .

As for the single modulus case, the potential has the flat direction with  $U'_a = 0$  which is approximately along the  $\text{Re } \tau_i$  directions for  $\text{Im } \tau_i \gg 1$ . For  $n = A$  and the minimum  $U'_a = 0$  is realized, the normalized potential can be expanded around the minimum  $\tau = \text{Im } \tau_0$  as

$$U(X) \simeq \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \log \left( 1 + \frac{\alpha_a}{X_a(\tau_0)} \right) (X_a(\tau) - X_a(\tau_0))^2 \sim \frac{1}{2} \sum_a \alpha_a X_a(\tau_0) \left( \frac{X_a(\tau)}{X_a(\tau_0)} - 1 \right)^2, \quad (3.31)$$

where the constant term is omitted and  $\alpha_a \ll 1$  is assumed in the second equality. Expanding the modular form as

$$Y_{1_{i_a}^{k_a}}(\tau_i) = q^{t_a^i/N} (1 + b_a^i q_i + \mathcal{O}(q_i^2)), \quad (3.32)$$

the leading  $\text{Re } \tau_i$  dependence appear in the potential as

$$V_{\text{CW}}(\text{Re } \tau_i) \simeq \sum_a \frac{m_a^2 m_{Q_a}^2(\tau)}{8\pi^2} \left( \sum_i b_a^i |q_i| \cos(2\pi \text{Re } \tau_i) \right)^2. \quad (3.33)$$

Thus the leading potential for  $\text{Re } \tau_i$  is estimated as

$$V(\text{Re } \tau_i) \sim \max_{a,j} \left[ \frac{m_a^2 m_{Q_a}^2(\tau)}{4(1 + \delta_{ij})\pi^2} b_a^i b_a^j |q_i q_j| \cos(2\pi \text{Re } \tau_i) \cos(2\pi \text{Re } \tau_j) \right]. \quad (3.34)$$

If  $\text{Re } \tau_i$  is identified as the QCD axion, there exists the scalar potential

$$V_{\text{QCD}} \sim -\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^4 \cos \left( \theta_0 + 2\pi \sum_{a,i} \frac{t_a^i}{N_i} \text{Re } \tau_i \right), \quad (3.35)$$

where  $\theta_0 = \mathcal{O}(1)$  and  $\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}$  is the QCD scale. Hence, the massless mode is stabilized by the QCD effect and can solve the strong CP problem if

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta\theta_{\text{QCD}} &\sim \frac{m_a^2 m_{Q_a}^2}{4\pi^2 \Lambda_{\text{QCD}}^4} b_a^i b_a^j |q_i q_j| \\ &\sim 10^{-10} \times b_a^i b_a^j \left( \frac{m_a}{10^7 \text{ GeV}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{m_{Q_a}}{10^9 \text{ GeV}} \right)^2 \left( \frac{0.2 \text{ GeV}}{\Lambda_{\text{QCD}}} \right)^4 \left( \frac{|q_i q_{\text{max}}|}{10^{-45}} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (3.36)$$

where  $q_{\text{max}} = \max_i(q_i)$ , is smaller than the experimental bound  $\Delta\theta_{\text{QCD}} < 10^{-10}$  [66]. The critical value  $|q_i q_j| \sim 10^{-45}$  corresponds to  $\text{Im } \tau_i + \text{Im } \tau_j \simeq 16$ . Note that  $\text{Re } \tau_i$  with the smallest potential will be identified as the QCD axion. Hence, the case of the right panel in Fig. 3 with  $(\text{Im } \tau_1, \text{Im } \tau_2) \simeq (2.96, 14.8)$  could resolve the strong CP problem and  $\text{Re } \tau_2$  is predominantly the QCD axion. If  $A > n$ , then the minimum is not at the one with  $U'_a \neq 0$ . The potential for  $\text{Re } \tau_i$  will be suppressed only by  $\mathcal{O}(q_i)$ , and thus  $|q_i| \lesssim \mathcal{O}(10^{-45})$ , i.e.  $\text{Im } \tau_i \gtrsim 16$  is necessary to be identified as the QCD axion.

## 4 Conclusion

In this paper, we study the multiple moduli stabilization scenario by the radiative corrections from the masses invariant under direct products of the finite modular symmetries  $\Gamma_{N_1} \times \cdots \Gamma_{N_n}$ . We showed that we need at least  $n$  independent mass terms to stabilize  $n$  moduli associated with the direct product group. There are  $2n - A$  massless modes at the minimum  $U'_a(X_a) = 0$ , where  $A$  is the number of the mass terms generating the CW potential. These massless directions could obtain their masses dominantly by the non-perturbative effects in the same way as the QCD axion. The stabilization by the CW potential tends to have light direction due to the residual  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  symmetry which is a good symmetry for  $\text{Im } \tau \gg 1$ . In general, the potential along  $\text{Re } \tau$  direction is suppressed by  $|q| = e^{-2\pi \text{Im } \tau}$  compared with that along  $\text{Im } \tau$  direction. The flat direction could be identified as the QCD axion to solve the strong CP problem if  $|q|$  is sufficiently small,  $\text{Im } \tau \gtrsim 15$ .

In the minimal case  $n = A$ , there is only the trivial solution satisfying  $U'_a(X_a) = 0$  for  $a = 1, 2, \dots, n$ , see Eq. (3.18). In addition, the condition in Eq. (3.27) should be satisfied for  $\text{Im } \tau_i > 0$ . We explicitly studied the case of  $n = 2$  under the additional assumptions to simplify the condition Eq. (3.27) to Eq. (3.28) which constrains  $\mathbb{Z}_N^T$  charges. We showed explicit examples that have the minimum at both  $\text{Im } \tau_1 \sim \text{Im } \tau_2$  and  $\text{Im } \tau_1 \ll \text{Im } \tau_2$ . The former case would be applicable to explain both hierarchical flavor structure and spontaneous CP violation [21, 28]. The latter could be applicable to address the flavor hierarchy and the strong CP problem in a model. It will be straightforward to extend the scenario to  $n = 3$ , so that all of the three problems are addressed simultaneously. In such case, the strong QCD problem would be addressed by combination of the QCD axion and vanishing QCD  $\theta$  angle before the symmetry breaking due to the spontaneous CP violation. Note that  $n = 3$  may be motivated from toroidal compactification  $T^2 \times T^2 \times T^2$ , where each torus provides a modulus.

In this work, we focused on the stabilization of the moduli which could be applied for models to address the problems in the SM. In addition, it will be interesting to study cosmological consequences of the moduli and axion fields, as studied for the simplest case in Ref. [52], which are expected to be much lighter than the fundamental scale of a model. Regarding the multiple moduli setup, it will also be interesting to study models with the Siegel modular group based on  $\text{Sp}(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ ,  $g \in \mathbb{N}$ , instead of  $\text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z})$ .

## Acknowledgement

This work was supported in part JSPS KAKENHI Grant Numbers No. JP22K03601 (T.H.), JP23K03375 (T.K.) and JP24KJ0249 (K.N.). The work of J.K. was supported by IBS under the project code, IBS-R018-D1.

## A Modular forms of $\Gamma_6$

We show  $\Gamma_6$  modular forms [10]. First, we define Dedekind eta function  $\eta(\tau)$  below:

$$\eta(\tau) := q^{1/24} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n), \quad q := e^{2\pi i \tau}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

We define the following functions from  $\eta(\tau)$ :

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\tau) &= 3 \frac{\eta^3(3\tau)}{\eta(\tau)} + \frac{\eta^3(\tau/3)}{\eta(\tau)}, \\ Y_2(\tau) &= 3\sqrt{2} \frac{\eta^3(3\tau)}{\eta(\tau)}, \\ Y_3(\tau) &= 3\sqrt{2} \frac{\eta^3(6\tau)}{\eta(2\tau)}, \\ Y_4(\tau) &= -3 \frac{\eta^3(6\tau)}{\eta(2\tau)} - \frac{\eta^3(2\tau/3)}{\eta(2\tau)}, \\ Y_5(\tau) &= \sqrt{6} \frac{\eta^3(6\tau)}{\eta(2\tau)} - \sqrt{6} \frac{\eta^3(3\tau/2)}{\eta(\tau/2)}, \\ Y_6(\tau) &= -\sqrt{3} \frac{\eta^3(6\tau)}{\eta(2\tau)} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\eta^3(\tau/6)}{\eta(\tau/2)} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \frac{\eta^3(2\tau/3)}{\eta(2\tau)} + \sqrt{3} \frac{\eta^3(3\tau/2)}{\eta(\tau/2)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Then we can construct the singlet modular forms of  $\Gamma_6$ ,

$$Y_{1_1}^{(2)}(\tau) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(Y_3 Y_6 - Y_4 Y_5), \quad (\text{A.3})$$

for  $k = 2$ ,

$$Y_{1_0}^{(4)}(\tau) = Y_1(Y_1^3 + 2\sqrt{2}Y_2^3), \quad Y_{1_2}^{(4)}(\tau) = Y_{1_1}^{(2)}(\tau)^2, \quad (\text{A.4})$$

for  $k = 4$ ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{1_0}^{(6)}(\tau) &= (Y_1 Y_4 - Y_2 Y_3) \{3(Y_1 Y_6 - Y_2 Y_5)^2 - (Y_1 Y_4 - Y_2 Y_3)^2\}, \\ Y_{1_1}^{(6)}(\tau) &= Y_{1_1}^{(2)}(\tau) Y_{1_0}^{(4)}(\tau), \quad Y_{1_3}^{(6)}(\tau) = Y_{1_1}^{(2)}(\tau) Y_{1_2}^{(4)}(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.5})$$

for  $k = 6$ , and

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{1_0}^{(10)}(\tau) &= Y_{1_0}^{(4)}(\tau) Y_{1_0}^{(6)}(\tau), \quad Y_{1_1}^{(10)}(\tau) = Y_{1_0}^{(4)}(\tau) Y_{1_1}^{(6)}(\tau), \quad Y_{1_2}^{(10)}(\tau) = Y_{1_2}^{(4)}(\tau) Y_{1_0}^{(6)}(\tau), \\ Y_{1_3}^{(10)}(\tau) &= Y_{1_0}^{(4)}(\tau) Y_{1_3}^{(6)}(\tau), \quad Y_{1_5}^{(10)}(\tau) = Y_{1_2}^{(4)}(\tau) Y_{1_3}^{(6)}(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.6})$$

for  $k = 10$ . These for the other weights are not shown here since we do not use them in this work. Note that there are ambiguities of their normalizations. Here, we employ the normalization that the leading order in the  $q$ -expansion is simply given by

$$Y_{1_t}^{(k)}(\tau) \sim q^{t/6} (1 + \mathcal{O}(q)), \quad (\text{A.7})$$

i.e.  $c_t^k = 1$  in Eq. (3.11).

## References

- [1] F. Feruglio, *Are neutrino masses modular forms?*, pp. 227–266. 2019. [arXiv:1706.08749](#).
- [2] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, *Discrete Flavor Symmetries and Models of Neutrino Mixing*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82** (2010) 2701–2729, [[arXiv:1002.0211](#)].
- [3] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, Y. Shimizu, H. Okada, and M. Tanimoto, *Non-Abelian Discrete Symmetries in Particle Physics*, *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **183** (2010) 1–163, [[arXiv:1003.3552](#)].
- [4] D. Hernandez and A. Y. Smirnov, *Lepton mixing and discrete symmetries*, *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 053014, [[arXiv:1204.0445](#)].
- [5] S. F. King and C. Luhn, *Neutrino Mass and Mixing with Discrete Symmetry*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **76** (2013) 056201, [[arXiv:1301.1340](#)].
- [6] T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, H. Okada, Y. Shimizu, and M. Tanimoto, *An Introduction to Non-Abelian Discrete Symmetries for Particle Physicists*. 1, 2022.
- [7] T. Kobayashi, K. Tanaka, and T. H. Tatsuishi, *Neutrino mixing from finite modular groups*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018), no. 1 016004, [[arXiv:1803.10391](#)].
- [8] J. T. Penedo and S. T. Petcov, *Lepton Masses and Mixing from Modular  $S_4$  Symmetry*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **939** (2019) 292–307, [[arXiv:1806.11040](#)].
- [9] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, S. T. Petcov, and A. V. Titov, *Modular  $A_5$  symmetry for flavour model building*, *JHEP* **04** (2019) 174, [[arXiv:1812.02158](#)].
- [10] C.-C. Li, X.-G. Liu, and G.-J. Ding, *Modular symmetry at level 6 and a new route towards finite modular groups*, *JHEP* **10** (2021) 238, [[arXiv:2108.02181](#)].
- [11] X.-G. Liu and G.-J. Ding, *Neutrino Masses and Mixing from Double Covering of Finite Modular Groups*, *JHEP* **08** (2019) 134, [[arXiv:1907.01488](#)].
- [12] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, and S. T. Petcov, *Double cover of modular  $S_4$  for flavour model building*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **963** (2021) 115301, [[arXiv:2006.03058](#)].
- [13] X.-G. Liu, C.-Y. Yao, and G.-J. Ding, *Modular invariant quark and lepton models in double covering of  $S_4$  modular group*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), no. 5 056013, [[arXiv:2006.10722](#)].
- [14] X. Wang, B. Yu, and S. Zhou, *Double covering of the modular  $A_5$  group and lepton flavor mixing in the minimal seesaw model*, *Phys. Rev. D* **103** (2021), no. 7 076005, [[arXiv:2010.10159](#)].

- [15] T. Kobayashi and M. Tanimoto, *Modular flavor symmetric models*, 7, 2023. [arXiv:2307.03384](#).
- [16] G.-J. Ding and S. F. King, *Neutrino mass and mixing with modular symmetry*, *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **87** (2024), no. 8 084201, [[arXiv:2311.09282](#)].
- [17] F. Feruglio, V. Gherardi, A. Romanino, and A. Titov, *Modular invariant dynamics and fermion mass hierarchies around  $\tau = i$* , *JHEP* **05** (2021) 242, [[arXiv:2101.08718](#)].
- [18] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, and S. T. Petcov, *Fermion mass hierarchies, large lepton mixing and residual modular symmetries*, *JHEP* **04** (2021) 206, [[arXiv:2102.07488](#)].
- [19] S. T. Petcov and M. Tanimoto,  *$A_4$  modular flavour model of quark mass hierarchies close to the fixed point  $\tau = \omega$* , *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023), no. 7 579, [[arXiv:2212.13336](#)].
- [20] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, *Quark hierarchical structures in modular symmetric flavor models at level 6*, *Phys. Rev. D* **107** (2023), no. 5 055014, [[arXiv:2301.03737](#)].
- [21] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, J. Kawamura, and T. Kobayashi, *Quark masses and CKM hierarchies from  $S'_4$  modular flavor symmetry*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** (2023), no. 12 1140, [[arXiv:2301.07439](#)].
- [22] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, *Quark mass hierarchies and CP violation in  $A_4 \times A_4 \times A_4$  modular symmetric flavor models*, *JHEP* **07** (2023) 134, [[arXiv:2302.03326](#)].
- [23] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, J. Kawamura, and T. Kobayashi, *Quark and lepton hierarchies from  $S'_4$  modular flavor symmetry*, *Phys. Lett. B* **842** (2023) 137977, [[arXiv:2302.11183](#)].
- [24] S. T. Petcov and M. Tanimoto,  *$A_4$  modular flavour model of quark mass hierarchies close to the fixed point  $\tau = i\infty$* , *JHEP* **08** (2023) 086, [[arXiv:2306.05730](#)].
- [25] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, J. Kawamura, and T. Kobayashi, *Fermion hierarchies in  $SU(5)$  grand unification from  $\Gamma'_6$  modular flavor symmetry*, *JHEP* **08** (2023) 097, [[arXiv:2307.01419](#)].
- [26] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, M. Levy, J. T. Penedo, and S. T. Petcov, *Quarks at the modular  $S_4$  cusp*, *JHEP* **09** (2023) 196, [[arXiv:2307.14410](#)].
- [27] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, S. Takada, and H. Uchida,  *$Sp(6, Z)$  modular symmetry in flavor structures: quark flavor models and Siegel modular forms for  $\tilde{\Delta}(96)$* , *JHEP* **04** (2024) 045, [[arXiv:2310.17978](#)].
- [28] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, and K. Nasu, *CP phase in modular flavor models and discrete Froggatt-Nielsen models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024), no. 11 115018, [[arXiv:2312.11809](#)].

- [29] A. Font, L. E. Ibanez, D. Lust, and F. Quevedo, *Supersymmetry Breaking From Duality Invariant Gaugino Condensation*, *Phys. Lett. B* **245** (1990) 401–408.
- [30] S. Ferrara, N. Magnoli, T. R. Taylor, and G. Veneziano, *Duality and supersymmetry breaking in string theory*, *Phys. Lett. B* **245** (1990) 409–416.
- [31] M. Cvetič, A. Font, L. E. Ibanez, D. Lust, and F. Quevedo, *Target space duality, supersymmetry breaking and the stability of classical string vacua*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **361** (1991) 194–232.
- [32] T. Kobayashi, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, and T. H. Tatsuishi,  *$A_4$  lepton flavor model and modulus stabilization from  $S_4$  modular symmetry*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019), no. 11 115045, [[arXiv:1909.05139](#)]. [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 101, 039904 (2020)].
- [33] T. Kobayashi, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, T. H. Tatsuishi, and H. Uchida, *CP violation in modular invariant flavor models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **101** (2020), no. 5 055046, [[arXiv:1910.11553](#)].
- [34] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, and S. T. Petcov, *Modular flavour symmetries and modulus stabilisation*, *JHEP* **03** (2022) 149, [[arXiv:2201.02020](#)].
- [35] V. Knapp-Perez, X.-G. Liu, H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, and M. Ratz, *Matter matters in moduli fixing and modular flavor symmetries*, *Phys. Lett. B* **844** (2023) 138106, [[arXiv:2304.14437](#)].
- [36] S. F. King and X. Wang, *Modulus stabilization in the multiple-modulus framework*, *Phys. Rev. D* **110** (2024), no. 7 076026, [[arXiv:2310.10369](#)].
- [37] J. M. Leedom, N. Righi, and A. Westphal, *Heterotic de Sitter beyond modular symmetry*, *JHEP* **02** (2023) 209, [[arXiv:2212.03876](#)].
- [38] Y. Abe, K. Goto, T. Higaki, T. Kobayashi, and K. Nasu, *Moduli stabilization in finite modular symmetric models*, [arXiv:2405.08316](#).
- [39] T. Higaki, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, and H. Otsuka, *Spontaneous CP violation and partially broken modular flavor symmetries*, *JHEP* **09** (2024) 024, [[arXiv:2405.18813](#)].
- [40] H. J. Fan, F. Wang, and Y. K. Zhang, *Natural solution of SUSY  $\mu$  problem from modulus stabilization in modular flavor model*, [arXiv:2412.07642](#).
- [41] S. Gukov, C. Vafa, and E. Witten, *CFT's from Calabi-Yau four folds*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **584** (2000) 69–108, [[hep-th/9906070](#)]. [Erratum: *Nucl.Phys.B* 608, 477–478 (2001)].
- [42] K. Ishiguro, T. Kobayashi, and H. Otsuka, *Landscape of Modular Symmetric Flavor Models*, *JHEP* **03** (2021) 161, [[arXiv:2011.09154](#)].



- [43] K. Ishiguro, H. Okada, and H. Otsuka, *Residual flavor symmetry breaking in the landscape of modular flavor models*, *JHEP* **09** (2022) 072, [[arXiv:2206.04313](#)].
- [44] T. Kobayashi, D. Nitta, and Y. Urakawa, *Modular invariant inflation*, *JCAP* **08** (2016) 014, [[arXiv:1604.02995](#)].
- [45] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, F. Kaneko, T. Kobayashi, and H. Otsuka, *Moduli inflation from modular flavor symmetries*, *JHEP* **06** (2023) 187, [[arXiv:2303.02947](#)].
- [46] G.-J. Ding, S.-Y. Jiang, and W. Zhao, *Modular invariant slow roll inflation*, *JCAP* **10** (2024) 016, [[arXiv:2405.06497](#)].
- [47] S. F. King and X. Wang, *Modular invariant hilltop inflation*, *JCAP* **07** (2024) 073, [[arXiv:2405.08924](#)].
- [48] G. F. Casas and L. E. Ibáñez, *Modular Invariant Starobinsky Inflation and the Species Scale*, [arXiv:2407.12081](#).
- [49] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, and Y. Yamada, *Moduli trapping mechanism in modular flavor symmetric models*, *JHEP* **08** (2023) 081, [[arXiv:2307.13230](#)].
- [50] T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, R. Sakuma, and Y. Yamada, *Radiative correction on moduli stabilization in modular flavor symmetric models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023), no. 11 115038, [[arXiv:2310.15604](#)].
- [51] T. Higaki, J. Kawamura, and T. Kobayashi, *Finite modular axion and radiative moduli stabilization*, *JHEP* **04** (2024) 147, [[arXiv:2402.02071](#)].
- [52] T. H. Jung and J. Kawamura, *Finite modular majoron*, *JHEP* **07** (2024) 145, [[arXiv:2405.03996](#)].
- [53] T. Kobayashi and H. Otsuka, *Common origin of the strong CP and CKM phases in string compactifications*, *Phys. Lett. B* **807** (2020) 135554, [[arXiv:2002.06931](#)].
- [54] F. Feruglio, A. Strumia, and A. Titov, *Modular invariance and the QCD angle*, *JHEP* **07** (2023) 027, [[arXiv:2305.08908](#)].
- [55] S. T. Petcov and M. Tanimoto,  *$A_4$  modular invariance and the strong CP problem*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **84** (2024), no. 9 914, [[arXiv:2404.00858](#)].
- [56] J. T. Penedo and S. T. Petcov, *Finite modular symmetries and the strong CP problem*, *JHEP* **10** (2024) 172, [[arXiv:2404.08032](#)].
- [57] F. Feruglio, M. Parriciatu, A. Strumia, and A. Titov, *Solving the strong CP problem without axions*, *JHEP* **08** (2024) 214, [[arXiv:2406.01689](#)].

- [58] F. Feruglio and R. Ziegler, *CPon Dark Matter*, [arXiv:2411.08101](#).
- [59] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, *Modular symmetry in magnetized T2g torus and orbifold models*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024), no. 6 065011, [[arXiv:2309.16447](#)].
- [60] G.-J. Ding, F. Feruglio, and X.-G. Liu, *Automorphic Forms and Fermion Masses*, *JHEP* **01** (2021) 037, [[arXiv:2010.07952](#)].
- [61] G.-J. Ding, F. Feruglio, and X.-G. Liu, *CP symmetry and symplectic modular invariance*, *SciPost Phys.* **10** (2021), no. 6 133, [[arXiv:2102.06716](#)].
- [62] M. Ricky Devi, *Neutrino Masses and Higher Degree Siegel Modular Forms*, [arXiv:2401.16257](#).
- [63] G.-J. Ding, F. Feruglio, and X.-G. Liu, *Universal predictions of Siegel modular invariant theories near the fixed points*, *JHEP* **05** (2024) 052, [[arXiv:2402.14915](#)].
- [64] S. Funakoshi, J. Kawamura, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, and H. Otsuka, *Moduli stabilization and light axion by Siegel modular forms*, [arXiv:2409.19261](#).
- [65] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, H. Otsuka, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, *Modular symmetry of soft supersymmetry breaking terms*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022), no. 12 123B02, [[arXiv:2203.14667](#)].
- [66] C. Abel et al., *Measurement of the Permanent Electric Dipole Moment of the Neutron*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124** (2020), no. 8 081803, [[arXiv:2001.11966](#)].