

PREPARED FOR SUBMISSION TO JHEP

An Unfamiliar Way to Generate the Hierarchy of Standard Model Fermion Masses

S. Baek^{a,b} **J. Kersten**^{b,c,d} **P. Ko**^{b,e} **L. Velasco-Sevilla**^{f,g}

^a*Department of Physics, Korea University, Seoul 01841, South Korea*

^b*School of Physics, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 02455, South Korea*

^c*Department of Physics and Technology, University of Bergen, 5020 Bergen, Norway*

^d*Department of Physics, Yonsei University, Seoul 03722, South Korea*

^e*Quantum Universe Center, Korea Institute for Advanced Study, Seoul 02455, South Korea*

^f*Center for Quantum Spacetime, Sogang University, Seoul 121-742, South Korea*

^g*Department of Physics, Sogang University, Seoul 121-742, South Korea*

E-mail: sbaek1560@gmail.com, joern.kersten@uib.no,
pko@kias.re.kr, lilianak@sogang.ac.kr

ABSTRACT: While the properties of the observed Higgs boson agree with the Standard Model predictions, the hierarchy of fermion masses lacks an explanation within the model. In this work, we consider a fresh approach to this problem, involving a different Higgs doublet responsible for each quark mass. We construct a model with a gauged, non-anomalous $U(1)$ family symmetry that fixes which fermion couples to which doublet with an $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Yukawa coupling. The hierarchy of masses is generated by the hierarchy of vacuum expectation values of the Higgs fields. The model generically predicts a light, weakly coupled pseudoscalar. We verify that the model satisfies constraints from flavour changing neutral currents, Higgs phenomenology and electroweak precision tests.

ARXIV EPRINT: [2309.07788](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.07788)

Contents

1	Introduction	1
2	Anomaly Cancellation and Matter Content	3
2.1	General Model	3
2.2	A Simple Parameterization to Cancel Anomalies	7
3	Solutions for the Constraints on the Form of Yukawa Matrices	9
3.1	Specific Example	10
4	Scalar Potential and Phenomenology	13
4.1	Scalar Potential	13
4.2	Phenomenology	15
4.3	Additional Benchmark Points	18
5	Flavour-Changing Neutral Currents and CP Violation	18
6	Electroweak Precision Observables	24
7	Conclusions	26
A	Numerical Form of Mass Matrices	28
B	Benchmark Points	28
C	Charges for Additional Model Building	29
	References	29

1 Introduction

In the Standard Model (SM) the electroweak (EW) gauge symmetry is broken by a single Higgs doublet of scalar fields. The vacuum expectation value (vev), $v/\sqrt{2}$, of the neutral component can explain the appearance of fermion and gauge boson masses. The properties of the observed Higgs boson with a mass of 125 GeV agree with the SM predictions. However, it would be too early to exclude additional Higgs bosons beyond the SM. To motivate the essence of this work, consider the top Yukawa coupling $y_t h \bar{t}_R t_L$. Once the Higgs field acquires a vev, a top mass $m_t = y_t v/\sqrt{2} \simeq y_t \cdot 174$ GeV arises. Experimentally, $m_t \simeq 173$ GeV, and thus the

Yukawa coupling y_t is an $O(1)$ number. In contrast, the Yukawa coupling of the up quark is of order 10^{-5} in the SM.

The origin of this hierarchy has been tackled in many ways, for example, by accidental flavor models [1], radiative mass models [2], warped compactification [3, 4], partial compositeness [5], clockwork mechanisms [6], and modular symmetries [7–9]. One widely-used approach employs family symmetries together with the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism [10]. This mechanism uses additional scalars (flavons), θ_i , which do not contribute to EW symmetry breaking but acquire vevs at some high scale, M , such that the Yukawa couplings of the SM fermions are given by $(\langle\theta_i\rangle/M)^p$, with p determined by the charges of a gauged family symmetry. For a sufficiently small ratio $\langle\theta_i\rangle/M$ (or large enough p), this results in the observed hierarchy of Yukawa couplings. However, only in a few studies, e.g., [11–17], the production of flavons in high-energy experiments has been discussed. The vast majority of models aim for predictions of hierarchies and mixings, but not for the prospects of detecting flavons since the breaking scales of the symmetries involved are very high. We therefore have no direct experimental test of these models. As an alternative, less-explored route and in view of the basic observation that there are three families of fermions, we pursue the idea that there are also three families of Higgs fields, each containing one doublet with hypercharge $\mathcal{Y} = \frac{1}{2}$ and one doublet with $\mathcal{Y} = -\frac{1}{2}$. The doublets couple to the SM fermions such that the hierarchy of their vevs controls the hierarchy of fermion masses with all Yukawa couplings of $\mathcal{O}(1)$. Thus, we postulate

$$m_d \sim v_1 \quad , \quad m_u \sim v_2 \quad , \quad m_s \sim v_3 \quad , \quad m_c \sim v_4 \quad , \quad m_b \sim v_5 \quad , \quad m_t \sim v_6 \quad (1.1)$$

and

$$v_1 \sim v_2 \ll v_3 \ll v_4 \ll v_5 \ll v_6 . \quad (1.2)$$

Multi-Higgs models with this motivation [18–22] or with the idea that each fermion has its corresponding Higgs [23–26] have been considered in the past. In particular, ref. [18] presented a supersymmetric model with six doublets and analyzed the EW breaking as well as the most important constraints from flavour-changing neutral currents. The structure of the Yukawa couplings relied on a Fritzsch texture [27]. We take the work of ref. [18] as a basis but consider a non-supersymmetric model with a gauged family symmetry that yields the required form of the fermion mass matrices. Specifically, we employ a $U(1)_F$ extension of the SM gauge group that is family-dependent. Its role is not to fix the Yukawa coupling hierarchies but rather to determine the textures of the Yukawa matrices. Having a gauged family symmetry forces us to ensure the cancellation of all gauge anomalies, which restricts the assignment of $U(1)_F$ charges and thus reduces the number of free parameters.

The structure of the work is as follows. After presenting the $U(1)_F$ model, we discuss the cancellation of anomalies in Sec. 2. In Sec. 3, we investigate how to obtain Yukawa matrices that are consistent with the observed quark masses and

mixings, arriving at a concrete realization of the model that is analyzed in detail in the following sections. First, we discuss the scalar potential in Sec. 4 and show that it is possible to find parameters leading to successful EW symmetry breaking and a realistic scalar mass spectrum. Second, we consider the constraints from flavour-changing neutral currents and CP violation in Sec. 5. Third, we determine the changes of EW precision observables and discuss whether the anomalous value of the W boson mass reported by the CDF experiment [28] can be accommodated in the model. Finally, we conclude in Sec. 7.

2 Anomaly Cancellation and Matter Content

2.1 General Model

We aim for building a model for which the necessity of any particular fermion comes with a reason. In this respect, we first aim at finding solutions where only the SM fermions are present. We will then talk about how other exotic fermions can enter the picture and the purpose they can serve. Our model is like the SM plus the additional Higgs doublets, singlet scalars and the additional Abelian gauge boson corresponding to $U(1)_F$. For clarity of the presentation we write the terms in the Lagrangian that are modified with respect to the SM Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = \sum_f i\bar{\psi}_f \gamma^\mu D_\mu \psi_f + \sum_{m=1}^6 (D^\mu H_m)^\dagger D_\mu H_m + \sum_{n=1}^3 (D^\mu \phi_n)^\dagger D_\mu \phi_n - V(H_m, \phi_n) + \mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}}, \quad (2.1)$$

where $V(H_m, \phi_n)$ is the Higgs potential involving Higgs doublets H_m and singlets ϕ_n , which we will specify in Sec. 4. The mass terms of the SM fermions come from \mathcal{L}_{Yuk} given below in Eq. (2.6). The action of the covariant derivative D_μ on the Higgs doublets H_m , the singlets ϕ_n , and the SM fermions ψ_f is respectively given by

$$\begin{aligned} D_\mu H_m &= (\partial_\mu - ig_2 W_\mu(x) \cdot \tau - ig_1 \mathcal{Y}_{H_m} B_\mu(x) - ig_F c_{H_m} Z'_\mu(x)) H_m, \\ D_\mu \phi_n &= (\partial_\mu - ig_1 \mathcal{Y}_{\phi_n} B_\mu(x) - ig_F c_{\phi_n} Z'_\mu(x)) \phi_n, \\ D_\mu \psi_{fL} &= (\partial_\mu - ig_3 k G_{\mu a} \lambda_a - ig_2 W_\mu(x) \cdot \tau - ig_1 \mathcal{Y}_{\psi_{fL}} B_\mu(x) - ig_F c_{\psi_{fL}} Z'_\mu(x)) \psi_{fL}, \\ D_\mu \psi_{fR} &= (\partial_\mu - ig_3 k G_{\mu a} \lambda_a - ig_1 \mathcal{Y}_{\psi_{fR}} B_\mu(x) - ig_F c_{\psi_{fR}} Z'_\mu(x)) \psi_{fR}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.2)$$

where $\tau^i = (1/2) \sigma^i$ are the $SU(2)_L$ generators. Besides, \mathcal{Y}_{H_m} , \mathcal{Y}_{ϕ_n} , $\mathcal{Y}_{\psi_{fL}}$, and $\mathcal{Y}_{\psi_{fR}}$ are the hypercharges of the scalar doublets and singlets as well as the left- and handed-fermions, see Tab. 1. Of course gluons, $G_{\mu a}$, only couple to quarks, so $k = 0$ for leptons and $k = 1/2$ for quarks. The new gauge interaction, with boson $Z'_\mu(x)$ and coupling g_F , fixes the charges $c_{\psi_{fL,R}}$, see also Tab. 1, of the fermions of the SM according to anomaly cancellation conditions.

Anomaly cancellation of course does not restrict the scalar sector of the theory, but just as it happens with the families of the SM, we consider that the scalar sector

	u_{Li}	u_{Ri}	d_{Li}	d_{Ri}	ν_{Li}	e_{Li}	e_{Ri}
Q_f	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	0	-1	-1
\mathcal{Y}_f	$\frac{1}{6}$	$\frac{2}{3}$	$\frac{1}{6}$	$-\frac{1}{3}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	-1
I_3^f	$\frac{1}{2}$	0	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0	$\frac{1}{2}$	$-\frac{1}{2}$	0
$U(1)_F$	$c_{Q_{Li}}$	$c_{u_{Ri}}$	$c_{Q_{Li}}$	$c_{d_{Ri}}$	$c_{L_{Li}}$	$c_{L_{Li}}$	$c_{e_{Ri}}$

Table 1: Quantum numbers of the model.

contains three Higgs doublets with hypercharge $+1/2$ and three Higgs doublets with hypercharge $-1/2$, coupling to down quarks and up quarks, respectively

$$H_{1(3,5)} = \begin{pmatrix} H_{1(3,5)}^+ \\ H_{1(3,5)}^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_{2(4,6)} = \begin{pmatrix} H_{2(4,6)}^0 \\ H_{2(4,6)}^- \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.3)$$

As we will see later on in Sec. 4, in order to achieve a realistic scalar mass spectrum, we need also scalar singlets. For the particular model of Sec. 3.1 we need three singlets. The charges of this example are given in Tab. 2. We decompose the neutral parts of the doublets in Eq. (2.3) in terms of component fields as

$$H_l^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_l + \sigma_l + i\varphi_l), \quad H_k^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-v_k - \sigma_k + i\varphi_k), \quad (2.4)$$

where $l = 1, 3, 5$ and $k = 2, 4, 6$. The minus signs in the decomposition of the $\mathcal{Y} = -1/2$ Higgs fields H_k ($k = 2, 4, 6$) are introduced in such a way that the $\mathcal{Y} = 1/2$ fields

$$\tilde{H}_k = \epsilon H_k^* = \begin{pmatrix} H_k^+ \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_k + \sigma_k + i\varphi_k) \end{pmatrix} \quad (2.5)$$

have the same sign convention as H_l ($l = 1, 3, 5$) (here ϵ is the anti-symmetric tensor in two dimensions, $\epsilon_{12} = -\epsilon_{21} = 1$, $\epsilon_{ii} = 0$). In this way, we follow the sign convention in [29], which enables us to use the results of that work to determine the EW precision parameters in Sec. 6.

The matter Lagrangian involving the fields Q_L , L_L (quark and lepton $SU(2)_L$ doublets, respectively), u_R , d_R (quark singlets) and e_R (lepton singlets) is given by

$$\begin{aligned} -\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}} = & \bar{Q}_{Li} [(Y_1^d)_{ij} H_1 + (Y_3^d)_{ij} H_3 + (Y_5^d)_{ij} H_5] d_{Rj} \\ & + \bar{L}_{Li} [(Y_1^e)_{ij} H_1 + (Y_3^e)_{ij} H_3 + (Y_5^e)_{ij} H_5] e_{Rj} \\ & + \bar{Q}_{Li} [(Y_2^u)_{ij} H_2 + (Y_4^u)_{ij} H_4 + (Y_6^u)_{ij} H_6] u_{Rj} + \text{h.c.}, \end{aligned} \quad (2.6)$$

where $Y_n^{q(e)}$ are the Yukawa matrices associated with each Higgs field H_n . We choose $U(1)_F$ charges such that couplings of the type

$$\bar{Q}_{Li} \epsilon H_k^* d_{Rj}, \quad \bar{Q}_{Li} \epsilon H_l^* u_{Rj} \quad l \in \{1, 3, 5\}, k \in \{2, 4, 6\} \quad (2.7)$$

are forbidden by the gauged family symmetry.¹ Otherwise, $\langle H_6 \rangle$ would contribute equally to the bottom and top quark masses, which does not comply with our idea on the fermion mass hierarchies.

The electric charges are related to weak isospin and hypercharge by

$$Q_f = I_3^f + \mathcal{Y}_f. \quad (2.8)$$

The cancellation conditions of triangle mixed anomalies, with external gauge boson lines and internal lines of a SM fermion, of the type $U(1)_F - G_{\text{SM}}^i - G_{\text{SM}}^i$, where $G_{\text{SM}}^i = U(1)_Y, SU(2)_L, SU(3)_C$, are given by $A^i = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [T^F \{T_a^i, T_b^i\}] = 0$. Here T_a^i are the generators of the SM groups and T_a^F of $U(1)_F$ and we have used the normalizations $\{Y, Y\} = 2\mathcal{Y}^2$ and $\text{Tr}(T_a T_b) = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab}$ such that $\{T_a, T_b\} = \frac{1}{2} \delta_{ab}$. Also $A_F = \frac{1}{2} [T^{U(1)_Y} \{T_a^F, T_b^F\}]$, $A_F^3 = \frac{1}{2} [T^F \{T_a^F, T_b^F\}]$ and $\text{Tr}[T^{U(1)_F}]$ must cancel. For example, we have

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [T^F \{T_a^{U(1)_Y}, T_b^{U(1)_Y}\}] = \frac{1}{2} \text{Tr} [T^F \mathcal{Y}^2] = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\text{ferm.}} [c_{\text{ferm.}} \mathcal{Y}_{\text{ferm.}}^2], \quad (2.9)$$

where ‘‘ferm.’’ are all the fermions, both those of the SM and the BSM ones. We write the familiar anomaly cancellation expressions in terms of the family-dependent charges²,

$$A_1 = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{i=1}^3 [c_{Q_L i} - 8 c_{u_R i} - 2 c_{d_R i} + 3 c_{L_L i} - 6 c_{e_R i}] + X_1, \quad (2.10)$$

$$A_2 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 [3 \times c_{Q_L i} + c_{L_L i}] + X_2, \quad (2.11)$$

$$A_3 = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 [2 \times c_{Q_L i} - c_{u_R i} - c_{d_R i}] + X_3, \quad (2.12)$$

$$A_F = \sum_{i=1}^3 [c_{Q_L i}^2 - 2 c_{u_R i}^2 + c_{d_R i}^2 - c_{L_L i}^2 + c_{e_R i}^2] + X_F, \quad (2.13)$$

$$A_F^3 = \sum_{i=1}^3 [6 c_{Q_L i}^3 - 3 (c_{u_R i}^3 + c_{d_R i}^3) + 2 c_{L_L i}^3 - c_{e_R i}^3] + X_F^3, \quad (2.14)$$

Here X_i accounts for the contribution of fermions that are not present in the SM, hence *exotic* fermions, but could be needed for anomaly cancellation. For A_1 and A_F

¹Distinguishing two Higgs doublets by additional Higgs gauge symmetries was proposed as an alternative solution to the Higgs-mediated FCNC problems in 2HDM, generalizing the usual softly broken Z_2 symmetry [30].

²They are written in such a way that $A_1 = 5/3 A_3$. We use this parametrization because it is set up for gauge coupling unification. An atlas of flavour-dependent $U(1)$ charges has been given in [31].

color and doublet factors have been included and factorized, for example for A_F :

$$\begin{aligned}
& 2U(1)_F^2 U(1)_Y = \\
& \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^3 \left[3 \times 2 \times c_{Q_L i}^2 \frac{1}{3} + 3 \times c_{u_R i}^2 \frac{-4}{3} + 3 \times c_{d_R i}^2 \frac{2}{3} + 2 \times c_{L_L i} (-1) + c_{e_R i} 2 \right] \\
& + X_F.
\end{aligned} \tag{2.15}$$

If we have

$$A_2 = A_3 = \frac{3}{5} A_1, \tag{2.16}$$

we can achieve gauge coupling unification.

Assuming N_g generations of exotic *leptons*, each containing N_D left-handed doublets F_L and N_S right-handed singlets f_R ,

$$\begin{aligned}
X_1 &= \sum_{g=1}^{N_g} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_D} \mathcal{Y}_{F_{Lg,i}}^2 (2 c_{F_{Lg,i}}) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \mathcal{Y}_{f_{Rg,i}}^2 (c_{f_{Rg,i}}) \right], \\
X_2 &= \sum_{g=1}^{N_g} \sum_{i=1}^{N_D} (c_{F_{Lg,i}}), \\
X_3 &= 0, \\
X_F &= \sum_{g=1}^{N_g} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_D} \mathcal{Y}_{F_{Lg,i}} (2 c_{F_{Lg,i}}^2) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \mathcal{Y}_{f_{Rg,i}} (c_{f_{Rg,i}}^2) \right], \\
X_F^3 &= \sum_{g=1}^{N_g} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_D} (2 c_{F_{Lg,i}}^3) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} (c_{f_{Rg,i}}^3) \right], \\
X_Y &= \sum_{g=1}^{N_g} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_D} 2 \mathcal{Y}_{F_{Lg,i}} - \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} \mathcal{Y}_{f_{Rg,i}} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{2.17}$$

where X_Y is the contribution from possible exotic fermions to the cubic $U(1)_Y$ anomaly, which is like Eq. (2.14) with the replacement $c_f \rightarrow \mathcal{Y}_f$, and that we will denote by $U(1)_Y^3$. Additionally, we have the $U(1)_F$ gauge-gravity anomaly

$$A_{GG} = \sum_{i=1}^3 [6 c_{Q_L i} - 3 (c_{u_R i} + c_{d_R i}) + 2 c_{L_L i} - c_{e_R i}] + X_{GG}, \tag{2.18}$$

where

$$X_{GG} = \sum_{g=1}^{N_g} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_D} (2 c_{F_{Lg,i}}) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} (c_{f_{Rg,i}}) \right]. \tag{2.19}$$

If there are also exotic *quarks*, we obtain

$$X_3 = \sum_{g=1}^{N_g} \left[\sum_{i=1}^{N_{Dg}} \left(2 c_{F_{Lg,i}} \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{N_{Sg}} \left(c_{f_{Rg,i}} \right) \right] \quad (2.20)$$

and have to modify Eqs. (2.17) and (2.19) to include factors of 3 for the number of colors.

Potential dark matter candidates are the $U(1)_F$ gauge boson Z' and the lightest exotic neutral fermion mass eigenstate. We will not investigate this aspect in this work, however.

We have to avoid mass mixing between electrically charged SM fermions and exotic fermions, since this would lead to unacceptably large tree-level flavour-changing neutral currents. Hence, the total $U(1)_F$ charge of those combinations

$$\overline{F}_{\text{SM}\alpha} H_\beta f_{R\gamma} \quad , \quad \overline{F}_{L\alpha} H_\beta f_{\text{SM}\gamma} \quad , \quad \overline{F}_{\text{SM}\alpha} \phi_\beta F_{L\gamma}^c \quad , \quad \overline{f}_{\text{SM}\alpha} \phi_\beta f_{R\gamma}^c$$

that are not forbidden by the SM gauge symmetry has to be non-zero, where α, β and γ run over all the possible fermions and scalars, and $F_{\text{SM}}, f_{\text{SM}}$, represent respectively SM doublets or singlets.

In order to make the exotics sufficiently heavy, we have to be able to write down mass terms with masses much larger than the EW scale. Thus, the total $U(1)_F$ charge of a sufficient number of combinations

$$\overline{F}_{L\alpha} \phi_\beta F_{L\gamma}^c \quad , \quad \overline{f}_{R\alpha} \phi_\beta f_{R\gamma}^c \quad , \quad \overline{F}_{L\alpha} F_{L\gamma}^c \quad , \quad \overline{f}_{R\alpha} f_{R\gamma}^c$$

has to vanish.

The easiest possibility to satisfy the complete set of anomaly cancellation conditions and further constraints is to introduce two singlet fermions with opposite hypercharges and $U(1)_F$ charges. This is because the triangle anomaly $U(1)_Y^3$ is cancelled by the SM matter content, so every additional matter with non-trivial hypercharge needs to come in pairs to satisfy the anomaly of $U(1)_Y^3$. This condition can easily be seen from the last equation of Eqs. (2.17).

2.2 A Simple Parameterization to Cancel Anomalies

In the context of family-dependent $U(1)$ symmetries, generating the hierarchy of masses through the powers of an expansion parameter inversely proportional to the Planck scale, Jain and Shrock introduced fermion mass matrices based on a flavour- and generation-dependent $U(1)$ [32]. They found that the following parametric sums solve the equations (2.10–2.13):

$$\sum_{i=1}^3 c_{Q_L i} = x + v, \quad \sum c_{d_R i} = -(w + y), \quad \sum c_{u_R i} = -(2v + x), \quad \sum c_{L i} = y,$$

$$\sum c_{e_R i} = -x. \quad (2.21)$$

In the supersymmetric case, the terms X_1 , X_2 and X_F in Eqs. (2.10–2.11) and Eq. (2.13) respectively would correspond to

$$\begin{aligned} X_1 &= c_{H_u} + c_{H_d}, \\ X_2 &= c_{H_u} + c_{H_d}, \\ X_F &= c_{H_d}^2 - c_{H_u}^2, \end{aligned} \quad (2.22)$$

where c_{H_i} are the charges of the Higgsinos and having only one family in that case, we have³

$$c_{H_d} = (v + w) + z, \quad c_{H_u} = -z. \quad (2.23)$$

Taking the parameterizations of Eq. (2.21) only, and not that of the Higgsinos as this would apply only to the supersymmetric case, we have⁴

$$\begin{aligned} 6 A_1 &= 17v + 2w + 5(3x + y) + X_1, \\ 2 A_2 &= 3x + y + 3v + X_2, \\ 2 A_3 &= 3v + 3x + y + X_3, \\ 2 A_F &= -7v^2 - 6vx + w(w + 2y) + X_F. \end{aligned} \quad (2.24)$$

What is important to notice is that the parameterizations of Eq. (2.21) are general, and hence independent of whether the theory is supersymmetric or not. In particular, it can have different solutions. One of these solutions, which fits our needs of having extra singlets but not doublets or triplets, is to parameterize

$$X_1 = v + w = 0 \rightarrow v = -w. \quad (2.25)$$

Then the rest of the conditions to satisfy Eqs. (2.10–2.13), in the form of Eq. (2.24), provided $X_2 = X_3 = 0$, can be encoded in the equation

$$v = -\frac{1}{3}(3x + y). \quad (2.26)$$

We then need to independently satisfy $X_F = 0$.⁵ A_F^3 also needs to be satisfied independently. We can rename the variables or make some shifts, but the number of variables remains the same. The rest of the anomalies to cancel, which are independent of the above parameterization, are X_F , X_Y , and X_F^3 given in Eq. (2.17) as well as X_{GG} given in Eq. (2.19). The simplest and most straightforward non-trivial solution is to consider two fields with vanishing hypercharge, hence avoiding large couplings to the Z boson, and opposite $U(1)_F$ charges:

$$X_F = 0, \quad X_Y = 0, \quad X_F^3 = 0, \quad X_{GG} = 0 \rightarrow c_{f_1} = -c_{f_2}. \quad (2.27)$$

³We have rescaled the solutions of Eq. (2.21) and the following with respect to those in [32] by an overall factor of 3, and hence $z/3 \rightarrow z$.

⁴In the supersymmetric case X_1 , X_2 and X_F would be $X_1 = v + w + z$, $X_2 = -z$, $X_F = (v + w)^2 - 2z(v + w)$ and $X_3 = 0$.

⁵Note that $2A_F - X_F$ is reduced to $-2v(3(v + x) + y) = -2v(-(3x + y) + 3x + y) = 0$.

3 Solutions for the Constraints on the Form of Yukawa Matrices

The motivation of this work is to have a Higgs field coupling to its own generation, except for those with the lightest vevs, which could have couplings to each family, such that the Yukawa matrices have the form

$$Y_5^d, Y_6^u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) \end{pmatrix}, Y_3^d, Y_4^u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \\ 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \end{pmatrix}, Y_1^d, Y_2^u = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \\ \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \\ \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.1)$$

Note that in this case the elements above and below the diagonal have the same charge combination, that is they are *charge symmetric*. Hence, one simple way to realise the texture of Eq. (3.1) is to consider

$$M^d = \frac{v_1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \\ \mathcal{O}(1) & 0 & 0 \\ \mathcal{O}(1) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \\ 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{v_5}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.2)$$

and the same structure for M^u with the changes $M^d \rightarrow M^u$, $v_1 \rightarrow v_2$, $v_3 \rightarrow v_4$ and $v_5 \rightarrow v_6$. However, we find these structures are too restrictive in the sense that cancellation of anomalies requires all the charges to be the same. This is simply because if all elements in the positions (i, j) for $i \neq j$ are allowed then this forces all charges to be the same, and hence all the families would end up coupling to all the Higgs bosons. Another possibility is to have

$$M^d = \frac{v_1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \\ \mathcal{O}(1) & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \frac{v_5}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{O}(1) & \mathcal{O}(1) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.3)$$

and that could also suit the u sector. However in the particular realization of Sec. 3.1 we choose a diagonal u sector. The structure in Eq. (3.3) imposes the constraints

$$\begin{aligned} c_{Q_L 3} &\neq c_{Q_L 2} \neq c_{Q_L 1} \\ c_{d_R 3} &= c_{d_R 2} \neq c_{d_R 1}, \\ c_{u_R 3} &= c_{u_R 2} \neq c_{u_R 1}, \\ c_{H_5} &\neq c_{H_3} \neq c_{H_1}, \\ c_{H_6} &\neq c_{H_4} \neq c_{H_2}, \\ c_{H_n} &\neq -c_{H_m}, \\ n \in \{1, 3, 5\}, \quad m \in \{2, 4, 6\}, \end{aligned} \quad (3.4)$$

where the last condition is necessary to forbid couplings of the type (2.7). We note, however, that this condition is necessary but not sufficient, so we still need to ensure

that each term in Eq. (2.7) vanishes. While we can have exactly the same structure for M^d and M^u , we find that is easier to fit the CKM matrix if we assign the mixing only to one sector, so one of the conditions $c_{d_R 3} = c_{d_R 2}$ or $c_{u_R 3} = c_{u_R 2}$ must be lifted. In this case, we have 14 charges that are parameterized in terms of x, v, y , via the equations Eq. (2.21). In this case, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
-c_{Q_L 1,2} + c_{d_R 1} + c_{H_{n,m}} &\neq 0, \\
-c_{Q_L 3} + c_{d_R 1} + c_{H_3} &= 0, \\
-c_{Q_L 1} + c_{d_R 2} + c_{H_1} &= 0, \\
-c_{Q_L 2} + c_{d_R 2} + c_{H_5} &= 0, \\
-c_{Q_L 1} + c_{d_R 3} + c_{H_1} &= 0, \\
-c_{Q_L 2} + c_{d_R 3} + c_{H_3} &= 0, \\
-c_{Q_L 3} + c_{d_R 3} + c_{H_5} &= 0,
\end{aligned} \tag{3.5}$$

for $n = 1, 3, 5$ and $m = 2, 4, 6$ such that no coupling to any Higgs is possible for the combinations of the first line in Eq. (3.5).

In the absence of doublet exotics, $F_{L,R}$, beyond the SM and hypercharged exotics, $f_{L,R}$, the only term leading to mass mixing between SM fermions and exotics would be $\bar{F}_{\text{SM}\alpha} H_\beta f_{R_\gamma}$. The only possible choice of F_{SM} is a lepton doublet with $\mathcal{Y} = -1/2$. Consequently, the Higgs doublet has to have $\mathcal{Y} = -1/2$ as well, which implies that its vev is in the upper component. Thus, this term can only result in unproblematic ν_L - f_R mixing. As a consequence, it need not be forbidden and thus no any additional condition on the $U(1)_F$ charges has to be imposed in this case.

A possible exotic mass term could appear from a term like $\bar{F}_{L_\alpha} \phi F_{R_\gamma}$, but since we do not have exotic doublets this is not an issue for our model. Hence, it remains to ensure that, for example, $\bar{f}_{R_\alpha} \phi f_{R_\gamma}^c$ or $\bar{f}_{R_\alpha} f_{R_\gamma}^c$ is allowed by $U(1)_F$, which results in conditions of the form

$$-c_{f_{R_{g,i}}} + c_{\phi_n} - c_{f_{R_{h,j}}} = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad c_{f_{R_{g,i}}} + c_{f_{R_{h,j}}} = 0. \tag{3.6}$$

However, these conditions do not have to be satisfied for *all* possible combinations of g, h, i, j . As we have $N_g N_S$ right-handed exotics, a suitable subset of $N_g N_S$ conditions is sufficient.

Given these conditions, specifically the solutions for the charges in Eq. (3.5) lead us to finding fifteen different solutions that we specify in Tabs. 15 and 16. In the following subsection we present an specific example which corresponds to the eleventh case in Tab. 16.

3.1 Specific Example

In Tab. 2 we specify the charges for example A. They allow the form of the matrices in Eq. (3.3) for the d sector while keeping the u sector diagonal. This is only one

Generation/Charges	c_{QLi}	$c_{u_{Ri}}$	$c_{d_{Ri}}$	c_{LLi}	$c_{e_{Ri}}$	c_{H_n}	c_{H_m}
$i = 1$	7	0	-2	-10	-6	$c_{H_1} = 5$	$c_{H_2} = 7$
$i = 2$	-2	-1	2	4	4	$c_{H_3} = -4$	$c_{H_4} = -1$
$i = 3$	-6	-3	2	9	8	$c_{H_5} = -8$	$c_{H_6} = -3$
New fermions	c_{χ_1}	c_{χ_2}					
	-1	1					
Scalars breaking $U(1)_F$	c_{ϕ_1}	c_{ϕ_2}	c_{ϕ_3}				
	-2	7	3				

Table 2: Family symmetry charges for model $U(1)_F$ A. All new fermions and scalar singlets have vanishing hypercharge.

example of charges. We have found 15 different anomaly-free solutions that satisfy the conditions of Eq. (3.5). Example A contains one family of right-handed exotics with opposite charges, allowing them to become sufficiently heavy by means of the gauge-invariant mass term

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}}^{\chi} = \bar{\chi}_1 M_{\chi} \chi_2^c + \text{h.c.} \quad (3.7)$$

Additional contributions to the exotics masses come from coupling to one of the scalar singlets,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}}^{\chi} = \bar{\chi}_1 \phi_1 \chi_1^c + \bar{\chi}_2 \phi_1^{\dagger} \chi_2^c + \text{h.c.} \quad (3.8)$$

The charge assignment also cancels the gravitational anomaly $X_{GG} = c_{\chi_1} + c_{\chi_2}$ and cubic anomaly $X_F^3 = c_{\chi_1}^3 + c_{\chi_2}^3$. All the other anomalies cancel automatically since the exotics have zero hypercharge.

We do not impose additional conditions to obtain particular forms of the lepton mass matrices because the purpose of this work is to give a proof of principle that there exist solutions with the desired hierarchy for the *quark* sector. We only verify that the $U(1)_F$ charge assignment allows for a sufficient number of non-vanishing mass terms. For the charged leptons, the allowed combinations in example A are

$$\bar{L}_{L3} H_1 e_{R2} \quad , \quad \bar{L}_{L1} H_3 e_{R1} \quad , \quad \bar{L}_{L2} H_3 e_{R3} \quad , \quad \bar{L}_{L3} \epsilon H_4^* e_3 \quad ,$$

i.e., the charged lepton mass matrix has the form

$$M^e = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} Y_{11}^e v_3 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & Y_{23}^e v_3 \\ 0 & Y_{32}^e v_1 & Y_{33}^e v_4 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.9)$$

which can give the right eigenvalues. Indeed they can be easily computed to yield

$$m_e = \frac{v_3}{\sqrt{2}} Y_{11}^e,$$

$$m_\tau, m_\mu = \frac{v_4}{2\sqrt{2}} Y_{33}^e \pm \frac{\sqrt{4v_1v_3Y_{23}^eY_{32}^e + v_4^2(Y_{33}^e)^2}}{2\sqrt{2}}, \quad (3.10)$$

which shows that it is possible to fit the charged lepton masses.

For generality, we assume that some heavy fields lead to dimension-5 operators of the form

$$(\overline{L}_L \epsilon H_l^*) \kappa (H_{l'}^\dagger \epsilon L_L^c) \quad , \quad (\overline{L}_L H_k) \kappa' (H_{k'}^T L_L^c) \quad , \quad (\overline{L}_L H_k) \kappa'' (H_l^\dagger \epsilon L_L^c)$$

with $l, l' \in \{1, 3, 5\}$ and $k, k' \in \{2, 4, 6\}$, which respect the $U(1)_F$ symmetry.⁶ The couplings κ , κ' , and κ'' are symmetric matrices in flavour space. These operators yield Majorana neutrino masses after EW symmetry breaking.

Given the charge assignments of model A, the resulting neutrino mass matrix in the gauge eigenstate basis has the form

$$M^\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a & b \\ a & d & 0 \\ b & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.11)$$

According to Eq. (3.9), changing to the charged lepton mass eigenstate basis requires a rotation in the 2-3 plane. Denoting the corresponding rotation angle of the lepton doublets by θ , this changes the neutrino mass matrix to

$$\tilde{M}^\nu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & a \cos \theta - b \sin \theta & a \sin \theta + b \cos \theta \\ a \cos \theta - b \sin \theta & d \cos^2 \theta & d \sin \theta \cos \theta \\ a \sin \theta + b \cos \theta & d \sin \theta \cos \theta & d \sin^2 \theta \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.12)$$

This matrix is subject to the renormalization group evolution from the symmetry-breaking scale to low energy. The changes are expected to be sizable due to the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Yukawa couplings. As a consequence, determining whether the resulting neutrino mass parameters can be compatible with observations requires a dedicated study beyond the scope of this paper.

For the quark sector, we work out the specific form of the mass matrices. Using the definition (2.3), we write the quark part of the Yukawa Lagrangian (2.6) as

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{Yuk}} = - \sum_{l=1,3,5} H_l^0 \overline{d}'_L Y_l^d d'_R - \sum_{k=2,4,6} H_k^0 \overline{u}'_L Y_k^u u'_R + \text{h.c.}, \quad (3.13)$$

where the primes on the quark fields (understood to be vectors in flavour space here) denote interaction eigenstates. Once the scalar doublets have received vevs⁷ $v_n \in \mathbb{R}$ as specified in Eq. (2.4), we can write

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = -\overline{d}'_L M^d d'_R - \overline{u}'_L M^u u'_R + \text{h.c.},$$

⁶This is expected for operators generated by the exchange of scalar $SU(2)_L$ triplets or gauge-singlet fermions. For fermions charged under $U(1)_F$, the discussion becomes model-dependent and more complicated.

⁷We assume a CP-conserving scalar potential for simplicity, implying real vevs.

$$M^d = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{l=1,3,5} v_l Y_l^d \quad , \quad M^u = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_{k=2,4,6} v_k Y_k^u \quad , \quad (3.14)$$

where

$$\sum_{n=1}^6 \frac{v_n^2}{2} = (175 \text{ GeV})^2 \quad . \quad (3.15)$$

Note the sign in the expression for M^u in Eq. (3.14), which comes from our definition of H_k^0 in Eq. (2.4). Following the conditions (3.5) the form of the down-type quark mass matrix becomes

$$M^d = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & v_1(Y_1^d)_{12} & v_1(Y_1^d)_{13} \\ 0 & v_3(Y_3^d)_{22} & v_3(Y_3^d)_{23} \\ v_3(Y_3^d)_{31} & v_5(Y_5^d)_{32} & v_5(Y_5^d)_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad , \quad (3.16)$$

and the up-type mass matrix has a diagonal form,

$$M^u = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} v_2(Y_2^u)_{11} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & v_4(Y_4^u)_{22} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & v_6(Y_6^u)_{33} \end{pmatrix} \quad . \quad (3.17)$$

Note that for $M_i^u > 0$ we need to set $(Y^u)_{ii} < 0$, since $v_{2,4,6} > 0$. For the diagonalisation of the mass matrices we use the convention

$$\begin{aligned} \widehat{M}^q &= V_L^q M^q V_R^{q\dagger} \quad , \quad q = u, d \quad , \\ V_L^q q'_L &= q_L \quad , \quad V_R^q q'_R = q_R \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (3.18)$$

where q_L and q_R are mass eigenstates and \widehat{M}^q is diagonal and real. In this convention, $V_{\text{CKM}} = V_L^u V_L^{d\dagger}$. In this way, it is easy to fit numerical values of the matrices, since the square of the down-sector mass matrix is given only in terms of the mass values and the CKM matrix,

$$M^d M^{d\dagger} = V_{\text{CKM}} \left(\widehat{M}^d \widehat{M}^{d\dagger} \right) V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger \quad . \quad (3.19)$$

In the appendix we give the explicit numerical values of the matrix M^d obtained in terms of the matrix of Eq. (3.19) above.

4 Scalar Potential and Phenomenology

4.1 Scalar Potential

A complete analysis of the scalar potential is beyond the scope of this paper, so we restrict ourselves to a general discussion and present a benchmark point that may be

phenomenologically viable. First of all, the general potential with only one singlet can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \mu_\phi^2 \phi^\dagger \phi + \mu_{nr}^2 H_n^\dagger H_r + (\tilde{\mu}_{nr}^2 H_n^T \epsilon H_r + \text{h.c.}) \\
& + [\mu_{\phi nr} \phi H_n^\dagger H_r + (\tilde{\mu}_{\phi nr} \phi + \tilde{\mu}'_{\phi nr} \phi^\dagger) (H_n^T \epsilon H_r) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + b_\phi (\phi^\dagger \phi)^2 + b_{nrms} (H_n^\dagger H_r) (H_m^\dagger H_s) + b_{\phi nr} (\phi^\dagger \phi) (H_n^\dagger H_r) \\
& + [b'_{\phi nr} \phi \phi (H_n^\dagger H_r) + (\tilde{b}'_{\phi nr} \phi \phi + \tilde{b}''_{\phi nr} \phi^\dagger \phi^\dagger) (H_n^T \epsilon H_r) + \tilde{b}_{\phi nr} (\phi^\dagger \phi) (H_n^T \epsilon H_r) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + [\tilde{b}_{nrms} (H_n^\dagger H_r) (H_m^T \epsilon H_s) + b'_{nrms} (H_n^T \epsilon H_r) (H_m^T \epsilon H_s) + \text{h.c.}],
\end{aligned}$$

where of course some couplings are forbidden by the gauge symmetry. This potential is not phenomenologically viable since it contains several accidental symmetries that are spontaneously broken, leading to the appearance of massless pseudoscalars. Hence, we are forced to introduce several singlets and assign charges such that no accidental global symmetries appear. The model $U(1)_F$ A presented in Tab. 2 satisfies this requirement. For this model, the potential is

$$\begin{aligned}
V = & \sum_{p=1}^3 \mu_{\phi_p}^2 \phi_p^\dagger \phi_p + \sum_{n=1}^6 \mu_{nn}^2 H_n^\dagger H_n + [\mu_{\phi_1 64} \phi_1 H_6^\dagger H_4 + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + [\tilde{\mu}_{\phi_1 16} \phi_1 (H_1^T \epsilon H_6) + \tilde{\mu}_{\phi_2 36} \phi_2 (H_3^T \epsilon H_6) + \tilde{\mu}'_{\phi_3 23} \phi_3^\dagger (H_2^T \epsilon H_3) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \sum_{p=1}^3 \sum_{q=p}^3 b_{\phi_p \phi_q} (\phi_p^\dagger \phi_p) (\phi_q^\dagger \phi_q) + [b_{\phi_1 \phi_1 \phi_2 \phi_3} \phi_1^2 \phi_2 \phi_3^\dagger + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^6 \sum_{m=n}^6 b_{nnmm} (H_n^\dagger H_n) (H_m^\dagger H_m) + \sum_{n=1}^5 \sum_{m=n+1}^6 b_{nmmn} (H_n^\dagger H_m) (H_m^\dagger H_n) \\
& + \sum_{n=1}^6 \sum_{p=1}^3 b_{\phi_p nn} \phi_p^\dagger \phi_p (H_n^\dagger H_n) \\
& + [b_{\phi_1 \phi_2 13} \phi_1^\dagger \phi_2 (H_1^\dagger H_3) + b'_{\phi_1 \phi_1 53} \phi_1 \phi_1 (H_5^\dagger H_3) + b'_{\phi_2 \phi_3 26} \phi_2 \phi_3 (H_2^\dagger H_6) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + [\tilde{b}'_{\phi_1 \phi_1 14} \phi_1 \phi_1 (H_1^T \epsilon H_4) + \tilde{b}'_{\phi_1 \phi_2 34} \phi_1 \phi_2 (H_3^T \epsilon H_4) + \tilde{b}'_{\phi_1 \phi_3 25} \phi_1 \phi_3 (H_2^T \epsilon H_5) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + [\tilde{b}_{\phi_1 \phi_2 45} \phi_1^\dagger \phi_2 (H_4^T \epsilon H_5) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + [\widehat{b}_{3514} (H_3^\dagger H_5) (H_1^T \epsilon H_4) + \widehat{b}_{3154} (H_3^\dagger H_1) (H_5^T \epsilon H_4) + \widehat{b}_{4616} (H_4^\dagger H_6) (H_1^T \epsilon H_6) + \text{h.c.}] \\
& + [\widehat{b}_{3415} (H_3^\dagger H_4) (H_1^T \epsilon H_5) + \text{h.c.}]. \tag{4.1}
\end{aligned}$$

All of the possible terms of the type \tilde{b}_{nrms} with the possible interchanging of sub-indices n, r, m and s have been grouped in the terms \widehat{b}_{nrms} . Expanding the terms with couplings \widehat{b}_{3514} and \widehat{b}_{3154} into their components, we see that they differ only in

terms containing two charged and two neutral scalars; consequently, only the sum of the couplings appears in the neutral scalar and pseudoscalar masses, and we could omit one of them when analyzing these masses. Besides, the expansion of the term with coupling \widehat{b}_{3415} contains only contributions with charged scalars; thus, this term is irrelevant for neutral scalar masses as well.

After symmetry breaking, scalars and pseudoscalars mix in general. Assuming CP conservation in the scalar potential for simplicity, we arrive at the mass eigenstates

$$\begin{aligned} h_m^s &= (S_\sigma)_{mn} \sigma_n \quad , \quad h_m^p = (S_\varphi)_{mn} \varphi_n \quad , \quad m, n = 1, \dots, 9, \\ h_m^+ &= (S_+)_{ma} H_a^+ \quad , \quad m, a = 1, \dots, 6, \end{aligned} \quad (4.2)$$

where σ_n , φ_n and H_a^+ are the interaction eigenstates, and S_σ , S_φ and S_+ are orthogonal matrices. The decomposition of the neutral components of the Higgs doublets into real fields is given in Eq. (2.4). For the SM singlets breaking $U(1)_F$, we use

$$\phi_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (v_7 + \sigma_7 + i\varphi_7) \quad (4.3)$$

and analogously for ϕ_2 and ϕ_3 .

4.2 Phenomenology

In this section we discuss constraints related to the scalar mass spectrum and possible observational implications. The study of constraints from flavour-changing neutral currents and CP violation is left for Sec. 5. Obviously, the scalar potential has a huge number of free parameters and dedicated analyses would be required to study its phenomenology thoroughly. As this is not our purpose (and also as model $U(1)_F$ A is unlikely to be the most elegant realization of the scenario), we restrict ourselves to present one acceptable benchmark point as a proof of principle. That is, we set all parameters to particular values resulting in a scalar sector that is not in conflict with observations. These values are given in Tab. 6. The lightest scalar h_1^s with a mass of about 125 GeV is composed predominantly of the doublet component σ_6 coupling to the top quark. The admixtures of the other doublet components $\sigma_1, \dots, \sigma_5$ have the correct values to ensure SM-like couplings of h_1^s to all SM fermions. All additional scalars, including the charged ones, and most of the pseudoscalars have masses in the multi-TeV range and are thus unaffected by bounds from current collider searches. However, the masses of the third-lightest scalar and the second-lightest pseudoscalar, which are mainly composed of the doublet H_5 , are around 15 TeV. Hence, these particles can be produced at a next-generation collider such as the Future Circular Collider (FCC) with center of mass energy 100 TeV.

There is one pseudoscalar, $h_3^p \equiv a$,⁸ whose mass cannot be raised above the EW scale, which is one of the unique features of our model. At the presented benchmark point, it is about 15 GeV. When $b_{\phi_1\phi_1\phi_2\phi_3} \rightarrow 0$, the scalar potential gets an additional $U(1)$ symmetry which can be identified with the Peccei-Quinn symmetry [33]. The light pseudoscalar becomes a massless Goldstone boson, so the small mass is technically natural. However, this state is mainly composed of the singlet components φ_8 and φ_9 . Its admixture of φ_6 is of order 10^{-6} , which suppresses the coupling to the top quark. The largest admixture of a doublet component is of order 10^{-3} , which ensures highly suppressed couplings to the EW gauge bosons as well.

Since the coupling of the light pseudoscalar to the top quark is suppressed, the cross section for producing this particle at the LHC is much smaller than the cross section for producing the observed Higgs boson and thus compatible with experimental bounds. The contribution to invisible Higgs decays is sufficiently suppressed by choosing small values for the relevant couplings $b_{\phi_2 66}$ and $b_{\phi_3 66}$. These coefficients have no impact on the masses of the lightest scalar and pseudoscalar. For the example we present, we fix both of them to 10^{-5} .

The light pseudoscalar can be searched for in decays of the SM-like lightest scalar h_1^s . Its main decay channel is $a \rightarrow b\bar{b}$. The relevant interaction is

$$\mathcal{L} \supset -\frac{1}{2}\mu_{haa} h_1^s aa + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}w_{abb} a \bar{b}\gamma_5 b \quad (4.4)$$

with $\mu_{haa} \simeq -1.5$ GeV and $w_{abb} = 0.0027$ for the benchmark point. The predicted branching fraction is $\mathcal{B}(h_1^s \rightarrow aa) \simeq 0.038$ setting the total width of h_1^s equal to the SM Higgs width of 4.6 MeV.

We obtain the total decay width of a to be $\Gamma_a = 6.5 \times 10^{-3}$ MeV, showing that it decays promptly inside the detector. The branching fractions are $\mathcal{B}(a \rightarrow f\bar{f}) = 0.88, 0.00032, 0.12, 0.00043$ for $f = b, s, \tau, \mu$, respectively. The decays of a into other channels are negligible. The current experimental bounds on $\sigma_{h_1^s}/\sigma_h^{\text{SM}}\mathcal{B}(h_1^s \rightarrow aa \rightarrow ff'f')$ are collected in [34]. Assuming the production cross section of the lightest scalar to be the same as that of the SM Higgs, our model prediction is about one order of magnitude below the current bound for $h_1^s \rightarrow aa \rightarrow bb\tau\tau$ and further below the bounds for the other channels. The HL-LHC, where the luminosity is increased by a factor 10 compared to the LHC's design value, may be promising for detecting the light pseudoscalar in the $bb\tau\tau$ channel. In Fig. 1 we show the total decay width of a and the branching fractions of the main decay channels as a function of m_a for five benchmark masses.

We do not have to worry about Z decays into the light pseudoscalar either. First, a spin-1 particle cannot decay into a pair of identical scalar bosons because of total angular momentum conservation and the spin-statistics theorem. If $Z \rightarrow aa$

⁸The pseudoscalars h_1^p and h_2^p are the would-be Nambu-Goldstone bosons that are eaten by the Z and the Z' , respectively.




Figure 1: The total decay width of the lightest pseudoscalar a , Γ_{tot} (left panel), and the branching fractions of the main decay channels of a , $\mathcal{B}(a \rightarrow f\bar{f})$ with $f = b, \tau, \mu, s$ (circles, diamonds, triangles, and squares, respectively; right panel). Both are plotted as a function of m_a .

happens, $J(Z) = J(aa) = L(aa) = 1$ since a has no spin. Then the wavefunction of the aa system will have the factor $(-1)^2 \times (-1)^{L(aa)} = -1$ under the exchange of two identical a 's, which contradicts the spin-statistics theorem. This is analogous to the Landau-Yang theorem, and it is the reason why $\rho^0(770)$ decays into $\pi^+\pi^-$ and not into $\pi^0\pi^0$ even though it is kinematically allowed. Second, a similar argument holds for $Z \rightarrow aaa$. For example, $Z \rightarrow aaa$ will be described by

$$Z_\mu \partial^\mu a^3 = -(\partial^\mu Z_\mu) a^3 = 0 \quad , \quad Z_{\mu\nu} (\partial^\mu) (a \partial^\nu a) a = 0, \text{ etc.}$$

in terms of the Lagrangian. Third, $Z^0 \rightarrow a\gamma$ occurs only at the one-loop level. Thus, all Z decays involving the light pseudoscalar are strongly suppressed not only by the small coupling but also by the fact that they have final states with at least three particles or proceed via loops.

For pseudoscalar masses below the Υ mass (9.460 GeV), the decay $\Upsilon \rightarrow \gamma a$ becomes allowed in principle, but it is strongly suppressed as well. Its decay rate normalized to $\Upsilon \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-$ is given by (ignoring QCD corrections to both decays) [35–37]

$$\frac{\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \rightarrow \gamma a)}{\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-)} = \frac{|w_{abb}|^2}{4\pi\alpha} \left(1 - \frac{m_a^2}{m_\Upsilon^2}\right), \quad (4.5)$$

so

$$\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \rightarrow \gamma a) \lesssim 2 \times 10^{-6} \quad (4.6)$$

for $|w_{abb}| \simeq 3 \times 10^{-3}$ and $\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \rightarrow \mu^+\mu^-) \simeq 2.48\%$ [38]. This is compatible with the current upper limit [38]

$$\mathcal{B}(\Upsilon(1S) \rightarrow \gamma a \rightarrow \gamma\mu^+\mu^-) < 9 \times 10^{-6},$$

but could be reachable in the future at high-luminosity B factories such as Belle II. Constraints from flavour observables will be discussed in the next section.

We have checked numerically that the potential grows for large field values and is thus bounded from below. The only remaining constraint, which would require a dedicated analysis, is the absence of charge-breaking minima.

A striking signature of the model could be flavour-violating Higgs decays or Higgs-mediated flavour-changing neutral currents, but they are strongly suppressed. To see this we refer to Fig. 3 and Eqs. (5.3–5.4) in the next section. The rotation to the mass eigenstate basis of scalars and quarks leaves only very small off-diagonal terms in the coupling matrix of the lightest scalar. In particular, the decay $h_1^s \rightarrow bs$, which appears to be the most likely one according to the form of the mass matrix M^d in Eq. (3.16), is governed by $(\mathcal{V}_d)_{bs}^1$ and $(\mathcal{V}_d)_{sb}^1$ from Eq. (5.4). For the example presented here, taking into account the parameter values of Tabs. 5 and 6, these couplings are suppressed with respect to $(\mathcal{V}_d)_{bb}^1$ by at least 5 orders of magnitude. Therefore, the decay is unlikely to be observable by future Higgs factories [39].

4.3 Additional Benchmark Points

The goal of this work is to present an example of our framework, but in order to study how the phenomenology could be altered we present four different benchmark points that differ in the spectra of scalars and/or pseudoscalars. We present these benchmark points in Appendix B. From Fig. 1 we can see that the dominant decay of $a \rightarrow f\bar{f}$ above the m_b threshold is the decay to $f = b$, while the total decay width increases with the increase of the mass m_a .

We note that this kind of models has the potential to undergo first order phase transitions. In fact, a potential for a scalar field, ϕ that has the form $V(\phi) = m^2\phi^2 + E\phi^3 + \lambda\phi^4$, with the appropriate temperature corrections (see for example [40]), can lead to phase transitions depending on the importance of the cubic term. We find that for some directions, the potential exhibits this behavior. For example, for benchmark point 5 there is a scalar around 10^5 GeV (see Tab. 13). For temperatures corresponding to this scale this can lead to gravitational waves peaking around a frequency equal to 0.1 Hz, and therefore accessible to LISA [41]. Given the intensity of research in this direction, once a realistic model for all fermion sectors is achieved, a study of gravitational waves in this context will be worthwhile.

5 Flavour-Changing Neutral Currents and CP Violation

The multi-Higgs scenario induces flavour-changing neutral currents (FCNC) and CP violation at tree level, which can lead to stringent constraints. We consider bounds obtained from indirect CP violation in the neutral kaon system (ϵ_K) and from the mass differences of neutral B mesons (Δm_{B_q} for B_q^0 , where $q = d, s$). These observables follow from the matrix elements $\langle K^0 | H_{\Delta S=2}^{ds} | \overline{K^0} \rangle$ and $\langle B_q^0 | H_{\Delta B=2}^{qb} | \overline{B_q^0} \rangle$, respectively, where $H_{\Delta S=2}^{ds}$ and $H_{\Delta B=2}^{qb}$ are the relevant effective Hamiltonians.

Vector contributions Kinetic and/or mass mixing between Z and Z' does lead to FCNC via Z exchange, but this will be a subdominant contribution as long as they are small. At the one-loop level, the usual SM FCNC are generated by W exchange.




Figure 2: Tree-level contributions to FCNC observables from Z' exchange. The quark assignments for the meson systems we consider are given in Tab. 3.

Z' exchange (fig. 2) leads to FCNC due to the generation-dependent $U(1)_F$ charges. Schematically, the amplitude is of the form $\frac{|g_{sd}|^2}{m^2}$. This yields the dominant vector contribution unless the Z' mass is much larger than m_Z .

The interactions between Z' and the SM quarks are given by [42]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &\supset -g_F Z'_\mu \left[\bar{u}'_L Q_L^u \gamma^\mu u'_L + \bar{u}'_R Q_R^u \gamma^\mu u'_R + \bar{d}'_L Q_L^d \gamma^\mu d'_L + \bar{d}'_R Q_R^d \gamma^\mu d'_R \right] \\
&= -g_F Z'_\mu \left[\bar{u}_L \left(V_L^u Q_L^u V_L^{u\dagger} \right) \gamma^\mu u_L + \bar{u}_R \left(V_R^u Q_R^u V_R^{u\dagger} \right) \gamma^\mu u_R \right. \\
&\quad \left. + \bar{d}_L \left(V_L^d Q_L^d V_L^{d\dagger} \right) \gamma^\mu d_L + \bar{d}_R \left(V_R^d Q_R^d V_R^{d\dagger} \right) \gamma^\mu d_R \right] \\
&\equiv -g_F Z'_\mu \left[(g_L^u)_{ij} \bar{u}_{Li} \gamma^\mu u_{Lj} + (g_R^u)_{ij} \bar{u}_{Ri} \gamma^\mu u_{Rj} + (g_L^d)_{ij} \bar{d}_{Li} \gamma^\mu d_{Lj} + (g_R^d)_{ij} \bar{d}_{Ri} \gamma^\mu d_{Rj} \right], \tag{5.1}
\end{aligned}$$

where $u'_{L(R)} \equiv (u', c', t')_{L(R)}$, $d'_{L(R)} \equiv (d', s', b')_{L(R)}$ are fields in the interaction basis. Similarly for the fields in the mass basis, we have $u_{L(R)}^T = (u, c, t)_{L(R)}$, $d_{L(R)}^T = (d, s, b)_{L(R)}$.

The Z' charge matrices in the interaction basis are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
Q_L^u &= Q_L^d = \text{diag}(c_{Q_L,1}, c_{Q_L,2}, c_{Q_L,3}) \quad , \quad Q_R^u = \text{diag}(c_{u_R,1}, c_{u_R,2}, c_{u_R,3}), \\
Q_R^d &= \text{diag}(c_{d_R,1}, c_{d_R,2}, c_{d_R,3}), \tag{5.2}
\end{aligned}$$

and those in the mass basis are given by

$$g_L^u \equiv V_L^u Q_L^u V_L^{u\dagger} \quad , \quad g_R^u \equiv V_R^u Q_R^u V_R^{u\dagger} \quad , \quad g_L^d \equiv V_L^d Q_L^d V_L^{d\dagger} \quad , \quad g_R^d \equiv V_R^d Q_R^d V_R^{d\dagger} \quad ,$$

respectively.

Scalar contributions From Eqs. (2.4), (3.13), (3.18), and (4.2), we obtain the interaction Lagrangian for quarks, scalars, and pseudoscalars [18]

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{L} &= - \sum_{l=1,3,5} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[(S_\sigma^T)_{lm} h_m^s + i (S_\varphi^T)_{lm} h_m^p \right] \bar{d}_L \left(V_L^d Y_l^d V_R^{d\dagger} \right) d_R \\
&\quad - \sum_{k=2,4,6} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[- (S_\sigma^T)_{km} h_m^s + i (S_\varphi^T)_{km} h_m^p \right] \bar{u}_L \left(V_L^u Y_k^u V_R^{u\dagger} \right) u_R + \text{h.c.}
\end{aligned}$$




Figure 3: Feynman rules for the interactions between down-type quarks and scalars (top) and pseudoscalars (bottom). The indices i and j label flavour, α and β are color indices, and m indicates the scalar mass eigenstate.

$$\begin{aligned}
&= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[h_m^s \bar{d}_i (\mathcal{V}_d)_{ij}^m P_L d_j + h_m^s \bar{d}_i (\mathcal{V}_d^*)_{ji}^m P_R d_j \right. \\
&\quad \left. + h_m^p \bar{d}_i (\mathcal{W}_d)_{ij}^m P_L d_j - h_m^p \bar{d}_i (\mathcal{W}_d^*)_{ji}^m P_R d_j + \dots \right], \quad (5.3)
\end{aligned}$$

where i, j denote quark mass eigenstates (flavours) and $P_{L,R}$ are the chirality projectors. The dots represent analogous terms for the up-type quarks. This Lagrangian yields the Feynman rules for down-type quark interactions in Fig. 3. The couplings of scalars and pseudoscalars to down-type quarks are⁹

$$(\mathcal{V}_d)_{ij}^m = \sum_{l=1,3,5} \left(V_R^d Y_l^{d\dagger} V_L^{d\dagger} \right)_{ij} (S_\sigma)_{ml} \quad , \quad (\mathcal{W}_d)_{ij}^m = - \sum_{l=1,3,5} \left(V_R^d Y_l^{d\dagger} V_L^{d\dagger} \right)_{ij} (S_\varphi)_{ml} . \quad (5.4)$$

The couplings to up-type quarks are analogous, except that the doublet indices are summed over $k = 2, 4, 6$ and that there is an extra minus sign in \mathcal{V}_u . The matrices that diagonalise the quark mass matrices do not diagonalise the corresponding Yukawa couplings in general. Hence, both scalar and pseudoscalar interactions with quarks are expected to violate flavour, leading to tree-level FCNC and CP violation by scalar and pseudoscalar exchange, as shown in Fig. 4.

Effective Hamiltonian We first calculate the amplitude of a $\Delta F = 2$ process ($F = S, B$) mediated by Z' , scalar, and pseudoscalar exchange in the UV-complete theory (Figs. 2 and 4), and afterwards match onto the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{\Delta F=2}^{ij} = [H_{\Delta F=2}^{ij}]_{\text{SM}} + \sum_{r=1}^5 C_r^{ij}(\mu) O_r^{ij} + \sum_{r=1}^3 \tilde{C}_r^{ij}(\mu) \tilde{O}_r^{ij}, \quad (5.5)$$

⁹ $(\mathcal{V}_d)^m$ etc. are understood to be matrices in flavour space if the lower indices are omitted.




Figure 4: Tree-level contributions to FCNC observables from scalar and pseudoscalar exchange.

where the first term on the right-hand side denotes the contribution from SM particles and where no sum is implied over the flavour indices. The Hamiltonian contains the $\Delta F = 2$ operators [43]

$$\begin{aligned}
O_1^{ij} &= \bar{d}_i^\alpha \gamma_\mu P_L d_j^\alpha \bar{d}_i^\beta \gamma^\mu P_L d_j^\beta, \\
O_2^{ij} &= \bar{d}_i^\alpha P_L d_j^\alpha \bar{d}_i^\beta P_L d_j^\beta, \\
O_3^{ij} &= \bar{d}_i^\alpha P_L d_j^\beta \bar{d}_i^\beta P_L d_j^\alpha, \\
O_4^{ij} &= \bar{d}_i^\alpha P_L d_j^\alpha \bar{d}_i^\beta P_R d_j^\beta, \\
O_5^{ij} &= \bar{d}_i^\alpha P_L d_j^\beta \bar{d}_i^\beta P_R d_j^\alpha,
\end{aligned} \tag{5.6}$$

where α and β are color indices. The operators \tilde{O}_r^{ij} are obtained from the corresponding O_r^{ij} by exchanging P_L and P_R .

The calculation of the Feynman diagrams in Fig. 2 gives the Z' contribution to the Wilson coefficients

$$\begin{aligned}
C_1^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) &= \frac{g_F^2}{2m_{Z'}^2} (g_L^d)_{ij}^2, \\
\tilde{C}_1^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) &= \frac{g_F^2}{2m_{Z'}^2} (g_R^d)_{ij}^2, \\
C_5^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) &= -\frac{2g_F^2}{m_{Z'}^2} (g_L^d)_{ij} (g_R^d)_{ij}.
\end{aligned} \tag{5.7}$$

From the diagrams in Fig. 4, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
C_2^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) &= -\frac{1}{4} \left[\sum_{m=1}^9 \left(\frac{1}{m_m^s} \right)^2 \left((\mathcal{V}_d)_{ij}^m \right)^2 - \sum_{m=3}^9 \left(\frac{1}{m_m^p} \right)^2 \left((\mathcal{W}_d)_{ij}^m \right)^2 \right], \\
\tilde{C}_2^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) &= -\frac{1}{4} \left[\sum_{m=1}^9 \left(\frac{1}{m_m^s} \right)^2 \left((\mathcal{V}_d^*)_{ji}^m \right)^2 - \sum_{m=3}^9 \left(\frac{1}{m_m^p} \right)^2 \left((\mathcal{W}_d^*)_{ji}^m \right)^2 \right], \\
C_4^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) &= -\frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_{m=1}^9 \left(\frac{1}{m_m^s} \right)^2 (\mathcal{V}_d)_{ij}^m (\mathcal{V}_d^*)_{ji}^m + \sum_{m=3}^9 \left(\frac{1}{m_m^p} \right)^2 (\mathcal{W}_d)_{ij}^m (\mathcal{W}_d^*)_{ji}^m \right].
\end{aligned} \tag{5.8}$$

The Wilson coefficients C_3^{ij} and \tilde{C}_3^{ij} are not generated and thus vanish at the matching scale, which we take to be the EW scale $\mu_{\text{ew}} = 160$ GeV. This implies that we

System	ij	P_1^{ij}	P_2^{ij}	P_3^{ij}	P_4^{ij}	P_5^{ij}	Units	$(\Delta M_{ij})_{\text{exp}}$
$K^0-\bar{K}^0$	ds	0.102	-4.32	1.09	14.14	4.28	10^{13} GeV^2	$3.484 \times 10^{-15} \text{ GeV}$
$B^0-\bar{B}^0$	db	2.67	-4.99	1.12	12.75	5.15	10^{11} GeV^2	$3.334 \times 10^{-13} \text{ GeV}$
$B_s^0-\bar{B}_s^0$	sb	1.15	-2.24	0.51	5.22	2.10	10^{10} GeV^2	$1.1683 \times 10^{-11} \text{ GeV}$

Table 3: Numerical values needed for the master formula (5.9) [44, 45]. The P_r^{ij} are given at the scale μ_{ew} .

neglect the running of the Wilson coefficients between the different masses of the heavy scalars and pseudoscalars. While desirable, a precise calculation would have to compute the running with several intermediate mass scales, making it a complex task beyond the scope of this work.

We plug the results for the Wilson coefficients into the master formula for $\Delta F = 2$ transitions valid below the EW scale [44],

$$[M_{12}^{ij}]_{\text{BSM}} = \frac{1}{2} (\Delta M_{ij})_{\text{exp}} \left[\sum_{r=1}^5 P_r^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) C_r^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) + \sum_{r=1}^3 P_r^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) \tilde{C}_r^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) \right], \quad (5.9)$$

where $(\Delta M_{ij})_{\text{exp}}$ are the experimentally measured values of the neutral meson mass differences and

$$P_r^{ij}(\mu_{\text{ew}}) = \frac{\langle M^0 | O_r^{ij} | \bar{M}^0 \rangle(\mu_{\text{ew}})}{M_{M^0} (\Delta M_{ij})_{\text{exp}}} \quad (5.10)$$

are the hadronic matrix elements of the $\Delta F = 2$ operators RG-evolved to the EW scale, up to a normalization factor. Here M^0 denotes the relevant neutral meson. The numerical values of the P coefficients are given in Tab. 3. Note that since QCD conserves P and CP and since we only take into account the QCD contribution to the RG evolution, the matrix elements and thus the P coefficients are the same for O_r and \tilde{O}_r .

The quantity $[M_{12}^{ij}]_{\text{BSM}}$ contributes to the mass matrix element

$$M_{12}^{ij} = [M_{12}^{ij}]_{\text{SM}} + [M_{12}^{ij}]_{\text{BSM}} = \frac{\langle M^0 | H_{\Delta F=2}^{ij} | \bar{M}^0 \rangle}{2M_{M^0}}, \quad (5.11)$$

which determines the observables. We neglect the contributions of operators of dimension 8 or higher, which results in good accuracy for ϵ_K and Δm_{B_q} .

For the neutral kaon system¹⁰ [38, 44],

$$\epsilon_K \simeq \frac{e^{i\pi/4}}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\text{Im } M_{12}^{ds}}{\Delta M_{ds}}. \quad (5.12)$$

¹⁰The expression for ϵ_K follows the PDG convention and is only valid in a phase convention where $\phi_2 = 0$, corresponding to a real $V_{ud}V_{us}^*$, and in the approximation that also $\phi_0 = 0$. The phase of ϵ , $\arg(\epsilon) \approx \arctan(-2\Delta m/\Delta\Gamma)$, is determined by non-perturbative QCD dynamics and is experimentally determined to be about $\pi/4$.

Observable	SM / experimental values	Model contribution
$[\Delta m_{B_d}]_{\text{SM}}$	$(0.543 \pm 0.029) \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [48] $= (3.57 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{-13} \text{ GeV}$	$2 [M_{12}^{db}]_{\text{BSM}} =$ $4 \times 10^{-16} \text{ GeV}$
$(\Delta M_{db})_{\text{exp}}$	$(50.65 \pm 0.19) \times 10^{10} \text{ } \hbar s^{-1}$ [38] $= (3.33 \pm 0.013) \times 10^{-13} \text{ GeV}$	
$[\Delta m_{B_s}]_{\text{SM}}$	$(18.77 \pm 0.86) \text{ ps}^{-1}$ [48] $= (1.235 \pm 0.057) \times 10^{-11} \text{ GeV}$	$2 [M_{12}^{sb}]_{\text{BSM}} =$ $7 \times 10^{-16} \text{ GeV}$
$(\Delta M_{sb})_{\text{exp}}$	$(17.765 \pm 0.006) \times 10^{12} \text{ } \hbar s^{-1}$ [38] $= (1.169 \pm 0.0004) \times 10^{-11} \text{ GeV}$	
$ \epsilon_K _{\text{SM}}$	$(2.170 \pm 0.065_{\text{pert.}} \pm 0.076_{\text{nonpert.}} \pm 0.153_{\text{param.}}) \times 10^{-3}$ [49] $= (2.170 \pm 0.1828) \times 10^{-3}$	$ \epsilon_K _{\text{BSM}} =$ 4×10^{-4}
$ \epsilon_K _{\text{exp}}$	$(2.228 \pm 0.0011) \times 10^{-3}$ [49]	

Table 4: SM, experimental and model values of flavour observables.

For neutral B mesons [44],

$$\Delta m_{B_q} = 2 \left| M_{12}^{qb} \right|. \quad (5.13)$$

In Tab. 4 we present the values for the flavour observables that we obtain for the benchmark point presented in Sec. 4. To compare BSM and SM contributions to the B meson mass differences, we show the quantity $2 | [M_{12}^{qb}]_{\text{BSM}} |$. Although the total mass difference depends on $|M_{12}^{qb}| \neq |[M_{12}^{qb}]_{\text{SM}}| + |[M_{12}^{qb}]_{\text{BSM}}|$, we see that the BSM contribution is so small as to be safely within the limits. In contrast, the CP violation parameter ϵ_K , for which we show $|\epsilon_K|_{\text{BSM}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} | \text{Im} [M_{12}^{ds}]_{\text{BSM}} | / (\Delta M_{ds})_{\text{exp}}$ as a rough estimate, receives a significant BSM contribution that is in tension with the constraints at the $(2 \dots 3) \sigma$ level. The sign of the BSM contribution to ϵ_K is well-determined. At the benchmark point, it is negative. Changing the model parameters can alter the sign and the size of the contribution. Interestingly, this contribution is dominated by the operator O_5 arising from Z' exchange, despite the very large mass of this boson, about $2.2 \times 10^8 \text{ GeV}$. As precise computations of Δm_K are difficult due to unknown long-distance contributions and non-negligible contributions from dimension-8 operators [44, 46], we do not consider this observable but anticipate a significant BSM contribution to it as well. This discussion demonstrates that the large masses of the new particles do not prevent experimental tests of the model. This is similar to supersymmetric models, where the kaon sector is able to yield constraints even for a large squark mass scale of order 10^4 GeV (see, e.g., [47]).

6 Electroweak Precision Observables

The EW precision tests are a useful way to constrain new physics parameters when the new particles couple to the SM Z and/or W^\pm bosons. Since in our model the new physics scale is much higher than the EW scale, the three parameters, S , T , and U [50] can encapsulate the oblique corrections at the one-loop level. The best fit values are [38]

$$\begin{aligned} S &= -0.02 \pm 0.10, \\ T &= 0.03 \pm 0.12, \\ U &= 0.02 \pm 0.11. \end{aligned} \tag{6.1}$$

Since the Higgs doublets are charged under both the SM gauge group and $U(1)_F$, the Z and Z' gauge bosons mix with each other. Writing the mass parameters as

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \frac{1}{2} M_Z^2 Z_\mu Z^\mu + \frac{1}{2} M_{Z'}^2 Z'_\mu Z'^\mu + \delta M^2 Z_\mu Z'^\mu, \tag{6.2}$$

we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} M_Z^2 &= \frac{g^2}{4c_W^2} \sum_{i=1}^6 v_i^2, \\ \delta M^2 &= -\frac{gg_F}{c_W} \sum_{i=1}^6 Q_{X_i} v_i^2, \\ M_{Z'}^2 &= g_F^2 \sum_{i=1}^9 Q_{X_i}^2 v_i^2, \end{aligned} \tag{6.3}$$

where $Q_{X_i} = (-1)^{i-1} c_{H_i}$ ($i = 1, \dots, 6$) and $Q_{X_{i+6}} = c_{\phi_i}$ ($i = 1, 2, 3$). Then the physical masses and the mixing angle are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} M_{Z_{1(2)}}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \left(M_Z^2 + M_{Z'}^2 \mp \sqrt{(M_Z^2 - M_{Z'}^2)^2 + 4(\delta M^2)^2} \right), \\ \tan 2\xi &= \frac{2\delta M^2}{M_{Z'}^2 - M_Z^2}. \end{aligned} \tag{6.4}$$

At tree level the $Z - Z'$ mixing induces the T parameter

$$\alpha T = \xi^2 \left(\frac{M_{Z_2}^2}{M_{Z_1}^2} - 1 \right), \tag{6.5}$$

where we have used $\xi \ll 1$. For the parameter space region we consider, $\alpha M_{Z'}^2 \gg M_Z^2$, and hence the tree-level T parameter is negligible.

Instead, the most stringent constraint comes from the loop-induced T parameter [51]. The multi-Higgs contribution to the T parameter can be found in [29, 51]. From [29] we read off

$$\begin{aligned}
T = & \frac{1}{16\pi s_W^2 m_W^2} \left\{ \sum_{m=2}^6 \sum_{n=1}^9 \left[\sum_{a=1}^6 (S_+)_{ma} (S_\sigma)_{na} \right]^2 F((m_m^+)^2, (m_n^s)^2) \right. \\
& + \sum_{m=2}^6 \sum_{n=3}^9 \left[\sum_{a=1}^6 (S_+)_{ma} (S_\varphi)_{na} \right]^2 F((m_m^+)^2, (m_n^p)^2) \\
& - 2 \sum_{m=1}^9 \sum_{n=3}^9 \left[\sum_{a=1}^6 (S_\sigma)_{ma} (S_\varphi)_{na} \right]^2 F((m_m^s)^2, (m_n^p)^2) \\
& + 3 \sum_{m=1}^9 \left[\sum_{a=1}^6 (S_\sigma)_{ma} (S_\varphi)_{1a} \right]^2 \left[F(m_Z^2, (m_m^s)^2) - F(m_W^2, (m_m^s)^2) \right] \\
& \left. - 3 \left[F(m_Z^2, m_h^2) - F(m_W^2, m_h^2) \right] \right\}, \tag{6.6}
\end{aligned}$$

where m_m^+ , m_n^s , and m_n^p are charged, scalar, and pseudoscalar masses, respectively. We identify the SM-like scalar h with h_1^s , so $m_h \equiv m_1^s = 125\text{GeV}$ for viable parameter space points. Note that the would-be Nambu-Goldstone bosons $h_{1,2}^p$ (eaten by the Z and the Z' , respectively) and h_1^+ (eaten by the W^+) do not contribute, as we can see from the absence of terms including $m_{1,2}^p$ or m_1^+ . The mixing matrices S_σ , S_φ , and S_+ of the scalars are defined in eqs. (4.2). The loop function is given by

$$F(x, y) = \frac{x+y}{2} - \frac{xy}{x-y} \ln \frac{x}{y} \tag{6.7}$$

and $F(x, x) = 0$.

Since the scalar contribution to the S parameter is suppressed compared to the T parameter [51] we do not consider S in this paper. The exotic fermions do not couple to W^\pm and Z and thus do not contribute to the oblique parameters.

The recent W mass measurement by the CDF collaboration, $M_W = (80\,433.5 \pm 9.4)\text{ MeV}$ [28], shows a 7σ discrepancy with the SM prediction $M_W^{\text{SM}} = (80\,357 \pm 6)\text{ MeV}$. The new physics contribution to M_W is related to the oblique parameters as [52]

$$\Delta M_W = -\frac{\alpha M_W^{\text{SM}}}{4(c_W^2 - s_W^2)} \left(S - 2c_W^2 T - \frac{c_W^2 - s_W^2}{2s_W^2} U \right). \tag{6.8}$$

With a sizable value for the T parameter only, we have

$$\Delta M_W \approx 450 T \text{ MeV}, \tag{6.9}$$

showing that a positive value $T \approx 0.17 \pm 0.02$ can explain the M_W anomaly. We can see that a large enhancement is required compared with the central value of T

in eq. (6.1). For the benchmark point of our model the T parameter is negative and consistent with eq. (6.1) at the 2σ level. Thus, the CDF measurement cannot be accommodated. However, this conclusion changes if we accept a smaller mass of order 1 GeV for the lightest pseudoscalar. In this case, T can be raised towards the required value by a suitable choice of parameters.

7 Conclusions

The discovery of the 125 GeV Higgs boson marked the last milestone of the SM as we know it. But it has left open many questions that seem unfeasible to answer with the LHC experiments. Among them is the question of how it is possible that the masses of the SM fermions are so hierarchical if they couple to the same Higgs field. This question has been tackled in some ways, among others the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism [10], that allows to fix the hierarchy of Yukawa couplings through the vacuum expectation values of scalars, *flavons*. They acquire their vevs at a very high energy, making it impossible to shed light on them directly. Lowering the scale at which a flavon can obtain a vev is very challenging due to the severe constraints from flavour-changing neutral currents (FCNC), but could offer the possibility of associated signals that could be detected at low energies. In this work, we have shown that adding more Higgs fields to the SM can explain the hierarchy of the fermion masses that we observe. The kind of models that we propose follow the same guiding principle as the SM, that is, renormalizable tree-level couplings to SM fermions. The hierarchy of fermion masses is fixed not by powers of the flavon vev as in Froggatt-Nielsen models, but by allowing fermions to couple with only a given Higgs field. This is achieved by introducing a family gauge group $U(1)_F$ and fixing the coupling of fermions and Higgs fields with suitable charge assignments, respecting the condition of anomaly cancellation. This a kind of minimal condition.

The hierarchy of fermion masses and mixings is hence determined by the hierarchy of Higgs vevs as we assume $\mathcal{O}(1)$ Yukawa couplings. The hierarchy of Higgs vevs is in turn determined from observational constraints, including the condition to give a spectrum of scalars consistent with observations, that is, a light scalar of around 125 GeV and heavy scalars with masses beyond the current bounds. It is well known that tree-level couplings to different Higgs fields can induce large FCNC and CP violation. To study this in detail, we have constructed the effective $\Delta F = 2$ Lagrangian with vector contributions mediated by the extra $U(1)_F$ gauge boson and scalar contributions mediated by the extra Higgs fields. The effective $\Delta F = 2$ Lagrangian arising from scalar exchange has been studied previously in the context of supersymmetric models [18], but not in the context of non-supersymmetric models. Besides, the way we tackle how Yukawa couplings are generated is different from previously considered mechanisms. We have given general expressions for the Wilson

coefficients that can be used for further model building with any number of Higgs doublets and scalars.

One salient feature of our model, and in general of the kind of models we propose, is the appearance of a light pseudoscalar that constrains some couplings of the theory but could offer an interesting way to discern it from other theories for the generation of fermion masses and mixings, which often do not have any physical consequence at low energy. While not constrained by current bounds, this pseudoscalar could be detectable in non-standard Higgs decays or Υ decays in the future. The mass of this particle is correlated with the electroweak precision observable T and thus with the W mass. The best-fit value of T and in particular the larger positive value required to explain the CDF anomaly appear to favor a smaller pseudoscalar mass.

The model introduced in Sec. 3.1 is not minimal and additional symmetries or different charge assignments may be able to make it more predictive, but it serves as a proof of principle that more commonly explored extensions of the SM are not alone in the quest to explain the masses of the SM particles.

The specific model we have analyzed could lead not only to FCNC but also to flavour-violating Higgs decays. The latter phenomena turn out to be strongly suppressed, but FCNC and CP violation in the neutral kaon sector in particular appear promising to probe the parameter space, which motivates more precise calculations. We have found that ϵ_K receives a significant BSM contribution, estimated to be in $(2 \dots 3)\sigma$ tension with constraints at the parameter space point we have considered. This contribution turns out to stem mainly from Z' exchange, despite the very large mass of this particle of order 10^8 GeV. An important step in further developing these theories is to understand whether this is a general feature of this class of models and which part of the parameter space remains viable. Further investigations are undoubtedly warranted, especially in view of the fact that Higgs factories will be a great opportunity to test this kind of theories. We have briefly mentioned the possibility of getting Gravitational Waves peaking around 0.1 Hz, that is in the LISA region.

Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Per Osland for useful discussions. S.B. is grateful to the Korea Institute for Advanced Study for the support and warm hospitality shown during his visit. S.B. was supported in part by the National Research Foundation of Korea (NRF) grant funded by the Korean government (MSIT), Grant No. NRF-2018R1A2A3075605 and RS-2023-00270569. J.K. and L.V.-S. acknowledge support from the “Fundamental Research Program” of the Korea Institute for Advanced Study and the warm hospitality and stimulating environment during the early stages of this work. The research of L.V.-S. was supported by the Basic Science Research Program through the NRF grants NRF-2023R1A2C200536011, NRF-

2020R1A6A1A03047877 (CQUeST) and NRF-RS-2023-00273508. L.V.-S. also acknowledges the routes 110A and 110B of the Seoul Transportation Authority for the reliable internet connection and the inspiring atmosphere. J.K. and P.K. were supported by the NRF through Grant No. NRF-2019R1A2C3005009.

A Numerical Form of Mass Matrices

The numerical form of the mass matrices can be worked out from Eq. (3.19), using that $H = M^d M^{d\dagger}$ is a Hermitian matrix and the Cholesky decomposition to write it as $H = L^\dagger L$, where L is a upper triangular matrix. Note that the combination $V_{\text{CKM}}^\dagger \widehat{M}^d$ in Eq. (3.19) is in fact very close to an upper triangular, hence this form can be obtained by a multiplication of L by a unitary matrix U such that

$$H = L^\dagger U U^\dagger L. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Specifically, to obtain the upper triangular matrix of the form Eq. (3.16) we use

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ 0 & -\sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\varphi_{3,2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-i\varphi_{3,3}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A.2})$$

where the first matrix after the equal sign brings the lower triangular matrix to an upper triangular form, the second matrix sets the element $M_{1,2}^d$ different from zero and hence achieves the form of Eq. (3.16). We have some freedom in setting the value of θ , as long as all the coefficients in the matrices Y_n^d remain of $\mathcal{O}(1)$. This constraint restricts the parameter space for the angle θ . We checked that all of the observable quantities vary only slightly under changes of the $\mathcal{O}(1)$ numbers in the matrices Y_n^d . To find the final form of M^d we then have

$$M^d = L^\dagger U^\dagger. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

The numerical values of the CKM matrix, the mass eigenvalues, the numerical form of M^d and the values of the vevs are given in Tab. 5. Note that just from the quark sector it is not possible to define uniquely the value of Yukawa couplings appearing in Eq. (3.16) and Eq. (3.17), since the quantities that are fixed are the combinations $v_n Y_{jk}^f$.

B Benchmark Points

In the following tables, Tab. 6–14, we specify five different benchmark points that illustrate the possible phenomenology of our class of models.

V_{CKM}	$\text{Diag}(M^f(M_Z))$
$\sin \theta_{12} = 0.22500 \pm 0.00067, \sin \theta_{13} = 0.00369 \pm 0.00011$ $\sin \theta_{23} = 0.04182^{+0.00085}_{-0.00074}, \delta = 1.144 \pm 0.027$ $\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{23} & s_{23} \\ 0 & -s_{23} & c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{13} & 0 & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ -s_{13}e^{-i\delta} & 0 & c_{13} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -s_{12} & c_{12} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} m_d & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_s & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_b \end{pmatrix}$ $=$ $\begin{pmatrix} 0.0028 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.055 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2.85 \end{pmatrix}$ $\begin{pmatrix} m_u & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_t \end{pmatrix}$ $=$ $\begin{pmatrix} 0.0013 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0.63 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 171.46 \end{pmatrix}$
M^d	v_f
$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & -0.00238672 - 0.0145524i & 0.00714217 - 0.0000167i \\ 0 & 0.0561265 - 0.0331034i & 0.105408 + 0.0291736i \\ 0.316899 & 1.87105 & 2.12316 \end{pmatrix}$	$\begin{pmatrix} 0.005 \\ 0.05 \\ 1.0 \end{pmatrix}_d, \begin{pmatrix} 0.005 \\ 0.05 \\ 245.997 \end{pmatrix}_u$

Table 5: Numerical values of V_{CKM} and M^d . All masses and vevs are given in GeV. The value of v_6 has been obtained from $v_6^2 = v^2 - \sum_{i=1}^5 v_i^2$, $v = 246.0$ GeV.

C Charges for Additional Model Building

We found that there are fifteen solutions that satisfy the requirements of Eq. (3.3) and Eq. (3.5) for the mass matrix of M^d and the conditions of no simultaneous couplings of the Higgs coupling to the d and u sectors. For each of the models presented in Tab. 15 and Tab. 16 the Higgs potential will be different and hence the associated specific features that we detail in Sec. 3.1 for the specific model that we present there.

References

- [1] L. Ferretti, S.F. King and A. Romanino, *Flavour from accidental symmetries*, *JHEP* **11** (2006) 078 [[hep-ph/0609047](#)].
- [2] K.S. Babu and E. Ma, *Radiative Mechanisms for Generating Quark and Lepton Masses: Some Recent Developments*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **4** (1989) 1975.
- [3] M. Carena, A. Delgado, E. Ponton, T.M.P. Tait and C.E.M. Wagner, *Warped fermions and precision tests*, *Phys. Rev. D* **71** (2005) 015010 [[hep-ph/0410344](#)].

BP1					
Vevs / couplings		Quartic couplings			
v_7	1.10×10^8 GeV	$b_{\phi_1\phi_1\phi_2\phi_3}$	-0.400	b_{1221}	4.67
v_8	200 GeV	b_{ϕ_155}	4.53	b_{1331}	4.51
v_9	1.50×10^3 GeV	b_{ϕ_166}	-1.10	b_{1441}	3.46
$\tilde{\mu}_{\phi_116}$	-1.00×10^3 GeV	b_{ϕ_144}	4.03	b_{1551}	3.12
$\tilde{\mu}_{\phi_236}$	-10.0 GeV	b_{ϕ_111}	4.42	b_{1661}	1.20
$\tilde{\mu}'_{\phi_323}$	5.00×10^8 GeV	b_{ϕ_122}	1.07	b_{2332}	4.91
μ_{ϕ_164}	0.100 GeV	b_{ϕ_133}	4.11	b_{2442}	0.440
$b_{\phi_1\phi_1}$	1.18	b_{ϕ_2nn} ($n=1,\dots,5$)	1.00	b_{2552}	2.28
$b_{\phi_1\phi_2}$	1.31	b_{ϕ_266}	1.00×10^{-5}	b_{2662}	2.17
$b_{\phi_1\phi_3}$	1.00	b_{ϕ_3nn} ($n=1,\dots,5$)	1.00	b_{3443}	1.51
$b_{\phi_2\phi_2}$	1.04	b_{ϕ_366}	1.00×10^{-5}	b_{3553}	0.097
$b_{\phi_2\phi_3}$	1.00	b_{1122}	1.43	b_{3663}	0.700
$b_{\phi_3\phi_3}$	2.41	b_{1133}	1.46	b_{4554}	1.74
b_{1111}	3.61	b_{1144}	3.47	b_{4664}	0.530
b_{2222}	4.25	b_{1155}	1.09	b_{5665}	3.87
b_{3333}	1.70	b_{1166}	4.01	\widehat{b}_{3514}	3.64
b_{4444}	3.70	b_{2233}	1.23	\widehat{b}_{3154}	0
b_{5555}	1.49	b_{2244}	2.71	\widehat{b}_{3415}	0
b_{6666}	0.403	b_{2255}	0.550	\widehat{b}_{4616}	2.14
		b_{2266}	2.67	$\tilde{b}'_{\phi_1\phi_114}$	-1.35
		b_{3344}	2.27	$\tilde{b}'_{\phi_1\phi_234}$	-7.03
		b_{3355}	3.27	$\tilde{b}'_{\phi_1\phi_245}$	0.100
		b_{3366}	0.840	$b'_{\phi_1\phi_153}$	-3.00
		b_{4455}	1.92	$\tilde{b}'_{\phi_1\phi_325}$	4.71
		b_{4466}	1.02	$b'_{\phi_2\phi_326}$	0.590
		b_{5566}	0.150	$b_{\phi_1\phi_213}$	1.30

Table 6: Numerical values of scalar potential parameters that were used to obtain the spectrum in Tab. 7. The mass parameters $\mu_{\phi_p}^2$ and μ_{nn}^2 are determined by the conditions $\partial V/\partial\sigma_k = 0$, where σ_k are the real components of the neutral scalar fields, see Eqs. (2.4) and (4.3). The vevs v_i for $i = 1, \dots, 6$ are given in Tab. 5.

BP1					
Scalar masses		Pseudoscalar masses		Charged scalar masses	
m_1^s	125.2 GeV				
m_2^s	3.15×10^3 GeV	m_3^p	14.7 GeV		
m_3^s	1.56×10^4 GeV	m_4^p	1.56×10^4 GeV	m_2^+	1.56×10^4 GeV
m_4^s	6.02×10^6 GeV	m_5^p	6.02×10^6 GeV	m_3^+	6.02×10^6 GeV
m_5^s	9.11×10^6 GeV	m_6^p	9.11×10^6 GeV	m_4^+	9.11×10^6 GeV
m_6^s	1.36×10^8 GeV	m_7^p	1.36×10^8 GeV	m_5^+	2.94×10^8 GeV
m_7^s	1.69×10^8 GeV	m_8^p	2.94×10^8 GeV	m_6^+	6.03×10^8 GeV
m_8^s	2.94×10^8 GeV	m_9^p	6.03×10^8 GeV		
m_9^s	6.03×10^8 GeV				

Table 7: Spectrum for the example in Sec. 4.2 (benchmark point 1) with the values of the coefficients in Tab. 5 and Tab. 6.

BP2					
Vev/couplings		Scalar masses		Pseudoscalar masses	
$\tilde{\mu}'_{\phi_{323}}$	7×10^8 GeV	m_1^s	125.0 GeV	m_1^p	17.2 GeV

Table 8: Benchmark point 2. The parameter $\tilde{\mu}'_{\phi_{323}}$ controls to a great extent the mass of the lightest pseudoscalar. Increasing its value increases the lightest pseudoscalar mass. All of the other parameters are like in Tab. 6. The rest of the resulting spectrum is like that of Tab. 7 and so we do not repeat it here. In this case the T parameter is -0.21 , within 2σ of the experimental value.

BP3			
Vevs / couplings		Quartic couplings	
v_7	2.1×10^6 GeV	b_{6666}	0.405

Table 9: Benchmark point 3. The parameter v_7 has the important role of reducing drastically the mass of the lightest pseudoscalar and at the same time the value of $|T|$, leading to $T = -0.003$ for this case. All of the other parameters are like in Tab. 6. The spectrum for this case changes with respect to the previous benchmark points and we present it in Tab. 10.

- [4] P.R. Archer, *The Fermion Mass Hierarchy in Models with Warped Extra Dimensions and a Bulk Higgs*, *JHEP* **09** (2012) 095 [[1204.4730](#)].
- [5] F. Goertz, A. Pastor-Gutiérrez and J.M. Pawłowski, *Flavor hierarchies from emergent fundamental partial compositeness*, *Phys. Rev. D* **108** (2023) 095019 [[2307.11148](#)].
- [6] K.M. Patel, *Clockwork mechanism for flavor hierarchies*, *Phys. Rev. D* **96** (2017) 115013 [[1711.05393](#)].
- [7] S.J.D. King and S.F. King, *Fermion mass hierarchies from modular symmetry*, *JHEP* **09** (2020) 043 [[2002.00969](#)].
- [8] G.-J. Ding, S.F. King, J.-N. Lu and B.-Y. Qu, *Leptogenesis in $SO(10)$ models with*

BP3					
Scalar masses		Pseudoscalar masses		Charged scalar masses	
m_1^s	125.0 GeV				
m_2^s	2.7×10^3 GeV	m_3^p	7 GeV		
m_3^s	3.16×10^3 GeV	m_4^p	2.1×10^3 GeV	m_2^+	2.10×10^3 GeV
m_4^s	4.42×10^5 GeV	m_5^p	4.42×10^5 GeV	m_3^+	4.42×10^5 GeV
m_5^s	2.47×10^6 GeV	m_6^p	2.47×10^6 GeV	m_4^+	2.59×10^6 GeV
m_6^s	2.59×10^6 GeV	m_7^p	2.59×10^6 GeV	m_5^+	9.83×10^6 GeV
m_7^s	3.07×10^6 GeV	m_8^p	9.83×10^6 GeV	m_6^+	1.10×10^7 GeV
m_8^s	1.10×10^7 GeV	m_9^p	1.10×10^7 GeV		
m_9^s	1.10×10^7 GeV				

Table 10: Spectrum for the example in Tab. 9.

BP4			
Vevs / couplings		Quartic couplings	
v_7	2.1×10^6 GeV	b_{6666}	0.405
$\tilde{\mu}'_{\phi_3 23}$	2.7×10^3 GeV		

Table 11: Benchmark point 4. Changing simultaneously v_7 and $\tilde{\mu}'_{\phi_3 23}$ can lower even to 1 GeV the mass of the lightest pseudoscalar and change the sign of the T parameter. For this case we have $T = 0.028$. All of the other parameters are like in Tab. 6. The spectrum for this case changes with respect to the previous benchmark points and we present it in Tab. 12.

BP4					
Scalar masses		Pseudoscalar masses		Charged scalar masses	
m_1^s	125.0 GeV				
m_2^s	1.45×10^3 GeV	m_3^p	1 GeV		
m_3^s	3.15×10^3 GeV	m_4^p	1.45×10^3 GeV	m_2^+	1.5×10^3 GeV
m_4^s	2.40×10^5 GeV	m_5^p	2.4×10^5 GeV	m_3^+	2.4×10^5 GeV
m_5^s	8.55×10^5 GeV	m_6^p	8.55×10^5 GeV	m_4^+	8.55×10^5 GeV
m_6^s	1.24×10^6 GeV	m_7^p	1.24×10^6 GeV	m_5^+	5.48×10^6 GeV
m_7^s	1.54×10^6 GeV	m_8^p	5.48×10^6 GeV	m_6^+	6.45×10^6 GeV
m_8^s	5.48×10^6 GeV	m_9^p	6.45×10^6 GeV		
m_9^s	6.45×10^6 GeV				

Table 12: Spectrum for the example in Tab. 11.

BP5			
Vevs / couplings		Quartic couplings	
v_7	1×10^6 GeV	b_{6666}	0.405
$\tilde{\mu}'_{\phi_3 23}$	3×10^7 GeV		

Table 13: Benchmark point 5. We achieve $m_a = 3.1$ GeV for this case. The corresponding T value is $T = 0.028$. All of the other parameters are like in Tab. 6. The spectrum for this case changes with respect to the previous benchmark points and we present it in Tab. 14.

BP5					
Scalar masses		Pseudoscalar masses		Charged scalar masses	
m_1^s	125.0 GeV				
m_2^s	1.45×10^3 GeV	m_3^p	3.1 GeV		
m_3^s	2.4×10^5 GeV	m_4^p	1.45×10^3 GeV	m_2^+	1.5×10^3 GeV
m_4^s	1.0×10^6 GeV	m_5^p	2.4×10^5 GeV	m_3^+	2.4×10^5 GeV
m_5^s	1.24×10^6 GeV	m_6^p	1.01×10^6 GeV	m_4^+	1.01×10^6 GeV
m_6^s	1.24×10^6 GeV	m_7^p	1.24×10^6 GeV	m_5^+	5.48×10^6 GeV
m_7^s	1.54×10^6 GeV	m_8^p	5.48×10^6 GeV	m_6^+	6.45×10^6 GeV
m_8^s	5.48×10^6 GeV	m_9^p	6.45×10^6 GeV		
m_9^s	6.45×10^6 GeV				

Table 14: Spectrum for the example in Tab. 13.

A_4 modular symmetry, *JHEP* **10** (2022) 071 [2206.14675].

- [9] G.-J. Ding, F.R. Joaquim and J.-N. Lu, *Texture-zero patterns of lepton mass matrices from modular symmetry*, *JHEP* **03** (2023) 141 [2211.08136].
- [10] C.D. Froggatt and H.B. Nielsen, *Hierarchy of Quark Masses, Cabibbo Angles and CP Violation*, *Nucl. Phys.* **B147** (1979) 277.
- [11] K. Tsumura and L. Velasco-Sevilla, *Phenomenology of flavon fields at the LHC*, *Phys. Rev.* **D81** (2010) 036012 [0911.2149].
- [12] E.L. Berger, S.B. Giddings, H. Wang and H. Zhang, *Higgs-flavon mixing and LHC phenomenology in a simplified model of broken flavor symmetry*, *Phys. Rev. D* **90** (2014) 076004 [1406.6054].
- [13] M. Bauer, T. Schell and T. Plehn, *Hunting the Flavon*, *Phys. Rev.* **D94** (2016) 056003 [1603.06950].
- [14] V.V. Khoze and M. Spannowsky, *Higgspllosion: Solving the hierarchy problem via rapid decays of heavy states into multiple Higgs bosons*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **926** (2018) 95 [1704.03447].
- [15] T.-Q. Li and C.-X. Yue, *Flavons and LFV decays and productions of pseudoscalar mesons*, *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **34** (2019) 1950288.

	Generation/Charges	$c_{Q_{Li}}$	$c_{u_{Ri}}$	$c_{d_{Ri}}$	$c_{L_{Li}}$	$c_{e_{Ri}}$	c_{H_n}	c_{H_m}
I	$i=1$	3	-1	-2	-3	-3	1	4
	$i=2$	0	2	2	3	4	-2	-2
	$i=3$	-4	-5	2	3	5	-6	1
II	$i=1$	0	2	-4	-2	1	-4	-2
	$i=2$	3	-3	4	2	2	-1	6
	$i=3$	-5	-7	4	6	9	-9	2
III	$i=1$	-5	2	-2	-2	0	-7	-7
	$i=2$	4	-2	2	-1	0	2	6
	$i=3$	0	-4	2	6	6	-2	4
IV	$i=1$	-5	6	-2	-2	-8	-7	-11
	$i=2$	4	-4	2	-1	6	2	8
	$i=3$	0	-6	2	6	8	-2	6
V	$i=1$	5	1	-2	-6	-3	3	4
	$i=2$	-1	-1	2	3	3	-3	0
	$i=3$	-5	-4	2	6	6	-7	-1
VI	$i=1$	5	5	-2	0	-4	3	0
	$i=2$	-1	-2	2	1	1	-3	1
	$i=3$	-5	-7	2	2	9	-7	2
VII	$i=1$	5	-3	-2	-6	-5	3	8
	$i=2$	-1	3	2	3	5	-3	-4
	$i=3$	-5	-4	2	6	6	-7	-1
VIII	$i=1$	5	-4	-2	-2	-5	3	9
	$i=2$	-1	5	2	2	5	-3	-6
	$i=3$	-5	-5	2	3	6	-7	0

Table 15: $U(1)_F$ family symmetry charges that we find that satisfy the structure of Eq. (3.3). All new fermions and scalar singlets have vanishing hypercharge.

- [16] S.J.D. King, S.F. King, S. Moretti and S.J. Rowley, *Discovering the origin of Yukawa couplings at the LHC with a singlet Higgs and vector-like quarks*, *JHEP* **21** (2020) 144 [[2102.06091](#)].
- [17] N. Koivunen and M. Raidal, *Production and decays of 146 GeV flavons into $e\mu$ final state at the LHC*, [2305.00014](#).
- [18] N. Escudero, C. Munoz and A.M. Teixeira, *FCNCs in supersymmetric multi-Higgs doublet models*, *Phys. Rev.* **D73** (2006) 055015 [[hep-ph/0512046](#)].
- [19] N. Escudero, C. Munoz and A.M. Teixeira, *Phenomenological viability of orbifold models with three Higgs families*, *JHEP* **07** (2006) 041 [[hep-ph/0512301](#)].
- [20] C.T. Hill, P.A. Machado, A.E. Thomsen and J. Turner, *Where are the Next Higgs Bosons?*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 015051 [[1904.04257](#)].

	Generation/Charges	$c_{Q_{Li}}$	$c_{u_{Ri}}$	$c_{d_{Ri}}$	$c_{L_{Li}}$	$c_{e_{Ri}}$	c_{H_n}	c_{H_m}
IX	$i = 1$	5	-4	-2	-7	-4	3	5
	$i = 2$	-1	-2	2	1	0	-3	0
	$i = 3$	-5	2	2	9	10	-7	-2
X	$i = 1$	7	6	-2	-4	-4	5	1
	$i = 2$	-2	-4	2	3	0	-4	2
	$i = 3$	-6	-6	2	4	10	-8	0
XI	$i = 1$	7	0	-2	-10	-6	5	7
	$i = 2$	-2	-1	2	4	4	-4	-1
	$i = 3$	-6	-3	2	9	8	-8	-3
XII	$i = 1$	-8	2	-4	-6	0	-12	-10
	$i = 2$	7	-2	4	6	3	3	9
	$i = 3$	-1	-8	4	6	9	-5	7
XIII	$i = 1$	-8	1	-4	-6	3	-12	-9
	$i = 2$	7	-2	4	6	3	3	9
	$i = 3$	-1	-7	4	6	6	-5	6
XIV	$i = 1$	8	4	-4	-5	0	4	4
	$i = 2$	-1	-3	4	5	2	-5	2
	$i = 3$	-9	-9	4	5	10	-13	0
XV	$i = 1$	8	-8	-8	-10	0	4	9
	$i = 2$	-1	0	4	6	5	-5	2
	$i = 3$	-9	0	8	10	7	-13	-5

Table 16: Continuation from Tab. 15.

- [21] C.T. Hill, P.A.N. Machado, A.E. Thomsen and J. Turner, *Scalar Democracy*, *Phys. Rev. D* **100** (2019) 015015 [[1902.07214](#)].
- [22] W. Altmannshofer, S.A. Gadam, S. Gori and N. Hamer, *Explaining $(g - 2)_\mu$ with multi-TeV sleptons*, *JHEP* **07** (2021) 118 [[2104.08293](#)].
- [23] R.A. Porto and A. Zee, *The Private Higgs*, *Phys. Lett. B* **666** (2008) 491 [[0712.0448](#)].
- [24] R.A. Porto and A. Zee, *Neutrino Mixing and the Private Higgs*, *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 013003 [[0807.0612](#)].
- [25] Y. BenTov and A. Zee, *Lepton Private Higgs and the discrete group $\Sigma(81)$* , *Nucl. Phys. B* **871** (2013) 452 [[1202.4234](#)].
- [26] Y. BenTov and A. Zee, *Private Higgs at the LHC*, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **28** (2013) 1350149 [[1207.0467](#)].
- [27] H. Fritzsch, *Weak-interaction mixing in the six-quark theory*, *Phys. Lett. B* **73** (1978) 317.

- [28] CDF collaboration, *High-precision measurement of the W boson mass with the CDF II detector*, *Science* **376** (2022) 170.
- [29] W. Grimus, L. Lavoura, O.M. Ogreid and P. Osland, *A Precision constraint on multi-Higgs-doublet models*, *J. Phys. G* **35** (2008) 075001 [[0711.4022](#)].
- [30] P. Ko, Y. Omura and C. Yu, *A Resolution of the Flavor Problem of Two Higgs Doublet Models with an Extra $U(1)_H$ Symmetry for Higgs Flavor*, *Phys. Lett. B* **717** (2012) 202 [[1204.4588](#)].
- [31] B.C. Allanach, J. Davighi and S. Melville, *An Anomaly-free Atlas: charting the space of flavour-dependent gauged $U(1)$ extensions of the Standard Model*, *JHEP* **02** (2019) 082 [[1812.04602](#)].
- [32] V. Jain and R. Shrock, *Models of fermion mass matrices based on a flavor- and generation-dependent $U(1)$ gauge symmetry*, *Phys. Lett. B* **352** (1995) 83 [[hep-ph/9412367](#)].
- [33] U. Ellwanger, C. Hugonie and A.M. Teixeira, *The Next-to-Minimal Supersymmetric Standard Model*, *Phys. Rept.* **496** (2010) 1 [[0910.1785](#)].
- [34] M. Cepeda, S. Gori, V.I. Martinez Outschoorn and J. Shelton, *Exotic Higgs Decays*, *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **72** (2022) 119 [[2111.12751](#)].
- [35] F. Wilczek, *Decays of Heavy Vector Mesons into Higgs Particles*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **39** (1977) 1304.
- [36] M.I. Vysotsky, *Strong interaction corrections to semiweak decays: Calculation of the $V \rightarrow H\gamma$ decay rate to order α_s* , *Phys. Lett. B* **97** (1980) 159.
- [37] P. Nason, *QCD radiative corrections to upsilon decay into scalar plus gamma and pseudoscalar plus gamma*, *Phys. Lett. B* **175** (1986) 223.
- [38] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, *Review of Particle Physics*, *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [39] J.F. Kamenik, A. Korajac, M. Szewc, M. Tammara and J. Zupan, *Flavor-violating Higgs and Z boson decays at a future circular lepton collider*, *Phys. Rev. D* **109** (2024) L011301 [[2306.17520](#)].
- [40] A.D. Linde, *Particle physics and inflationary cosmology*, [hep-th/0503203](#).
- [41] LISA COSMOLOGY WORKING GROUP collaboration, *Cosmology with the Laser Interferometer Space Antenna*, *Living Rev. Rel.* **26** (2023) 5 [[2204.05434](#)].
- [42] P. Ko, Y. Omura and C. Yu, *Chiral $U(1)$ flavor models and flavored Higgs doublets: the top FB asymmetry and the Wjj* , *JHEP* **01** (2012) 147 [[1108.4005](#)].
- [43] F. Gabbiani, E. Gabrielli, A. Masiero and L. Silvestrini, *A Complete analysis of FCNC and CP constraints in general SUSY extensions of the standard model*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **477** (1996) 321 [[hep-ph/9604387](#)].
- [44] J. Aebischer, C. Bobeth, A.J. Buras and J. Kumar, *SMEFT ATLAS of $\Delta F = 2$ transitions*, *JHEP* **12** (2020) 187 [[2009.07276](#)].

- [45] PARTICLE DATA GROUP collaboration, *Review of Particle Physics*, *Phys. Rev. D* **98** (2018) 030001.
- [46] J.F. Donoghue, E. Golowich and B.R. Holstein, *Dynamics of the Standard Model*, Cambridge University Press (2023), [10.1017/9781009291033](https://doi.org/10.1017/9781009291033).
- [47] J. Kersten and L. Velasco-Sevilla, *Flavour constraints on scenarios with two or three heavy squark generations*, *Eur. Phys. J. C* **73** (2013) 2405 [[1207.3016](https://arxiv.org/abs/1207.3016)].
- [48] A. Lenz and G. Tetlalmatzi-Xolocotzi, *Model-independent bounds on new physics effects in non-leptonic tree-level decays of B-mesons*, *JHEP* **07** (2020) 177 [[1912.07621](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.07621)].
- [49] J. Brod, S. Kvedaraite, Z. Polonsky and A. Youssef, *Electroweak corrections to the Charm-Top-Quark Contribution to ϵ_K* , *JHEP* **12** (2022) 014 [[2207.07669](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.07669)].
- [50] M.E. Peskin and T. Takeuchi, *Estimation of oblique electroweak corrections*, *Phys. Rev. D* **46** (1992) 381.
- [51] W. Grimus, L. Lavoura, O.M. Ogreid and P. Osland, *The oblique parameters in multi-Higgs-doublet models*, *Nucl. Phys. B* **801** (2008) 81 [[0802.4353](https://arxiv.org/abs/0802.4353)].
- [52] I. Maksymyk, C.P. Burgess and D. London, *Beyond S, T and U*, *Phys. Rev. D* **50** (1994) 529 [[hep-ph/9306267](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/9306267)].