

# The axion flavour connection

Luc Darmé,<sup>1,\*</sup> Enrico Nardi,<sup>2,†</sup> and Clemente Smarra<sup>3,4,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Institut de Physique des 2 Infinis de Lyon (IP2I), UMR5822, CNRS/IN2P3, F-69622 Villeurbanne Cedex, France*

<sup>2</sup>*INFN, Laboratori Nazionali di Frascati, C.P. 13, 100044 Frascati, Italy*

<sup>3</sup>*SISSA International School for Advanced Studies, Via Bonomea 265, 34136, Trieste, Italy*

<sup>4</sup>*INFN - Sezione di Trieste, Via Bonomea 265, 34136, Trieste, Italy*

A local flavour symmetry acting on the quarks of the Standard Model can automatically give rise to an accidental global  $U(1)$  which remains preserved from sources of explicit breaking up to a large operator dimension, while it gets spontaneously broken together with the flavour symmetry. Such non-fundamental symmetries are often endowed with a mixed QCD anomaly, so that the strong CP problem is automatically solved via the axion mechanism. We illustrate the general features required to realise this scenario, and we discuss a simple construction based on the flavour group  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_F$  to illustrate how mass hierarchies can arise while ensuring at the same time a high quality Peccei-Quinn symmetry.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Fermion family replication suggests that quarks belong to representations of some non-Abelian symmetry group, while the absence of degenerate multiplets in the mass spectrum hints to spontaneous breaking (SB) of the symmetry. Identifying the structure of a hidden symmetry just from data grounded in the broken phase can be an awfully difficult task. Complying with some theoretically well motivated principles might thus provide a crucial guide to advance in this endeavour. Here we put forth the idea that a flavour<sup>1</sup> gauge symmetry  $\mathcal{G}_F$  acting on particles carrying colour, as well as on certain scalar multiplets responsible for the SB of  $\mathcal{G}_F$ , automatically enforces the invariance under a global  $U(1)$  of all gauge invariant operators constructed with quarks and scalar fields, up to some suitably large dimension. Such a symmetry, being non-fundamental, can be endowed with a mixed  $U(1)$ - $SU(3)_{\text{QCD}}$  anomaly, and being broken spontaneously by the same vacuum expectation values (VEVs) that break  $\mathcal{G}_F$ , will give rise to an axion [1–4]. Local flavour groups of this type, if they exist, will thus automatically provide a solution to the strong CP problem [5, 6] via the Peccei-Quinn (PQ) mechanism.

It is well known that in benchmark axion models, like the Kim-Shifman-Vainshtein-Zakharov (KSVZ) [7, 8] and Dine-Fischler-Srednicki-Zhitnitsky (DFSZ) [9, 10] models, in which the axion is mainly hosted in a complex scalar gauge singlet  $\Phi$ , the origin of the PQ symmetry remains mysterious. This is because there is no reason to forbid renormalizable operators like  $\mu^3\Phi, \mu^2\Phi^2, \dots$  since they do not violate any fundamental principle. However, if present, such operators would destroy the PQ symmetry together with the axion solution. A satisfactory explanation of the *origin* of the PQ symmetry would arise if,

given a suitable extension of the Standard Model (SM), all renormalizable Lagrangian terms respecting first principles (Lorentz and local gauge invariance) automatically preserve also a global  $U(1)$  with the required properties. Moreover, in order to solve the strong CP problem,  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  must be of a very high *quality*, in the sense that any source of explicit breaking (besides the QCD anomaly) must be extremely suppressed. This results in the requirement that PQ breaking effective operators of dimension  $D \lesssim 10$  should remain forbidden [11–15]. Different approaches have been put forth to tackle the PQ origin and quality problems. Composite models assume that there are no axion-related fundamental scalars. In this case besides local symmetries the PQ quality is also assisted by Lorentz invariance, which helps to raise the dimension of PQ symmetry breaking operators [16–22]. If instead the axion sits in one or more fundamental scalars, then to generate and protect  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  up to some operator dimension  $D$ , one can rely only on local symmetries. Discrete gauge symmetries  $\mathbb{Z}_D$  [23–30], Abelian gauge symmetries with multiple complex scalars with values of the gauge charges of order  $D$  [12], non-Abelian local symmetries generally of degree not less than  $D$  [31–33], gauge symmetries assisted by supersymmetry [34–36] or by higher dimensional constructions [37–39] have been used for this scope.<sup>2</sup> There are some unsatisfactory aspects common to most of these solutions. For example they generally introduce a completely new sector, which is functional to generate  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  but is otherwise loosely connected to other SM properties. Moreover, as regards the level of protection, it is often controlled by some ad hoc feature which involves numbers of order  $D$  (the degree of a gauge group, the value of Abelian charges, etc.)

In Ref. [41] it was pointed out that a certain type of semi-simple local symmetries acting on a suitable set of

\* l.darme@ip2i.in2p3.fr

† Enrico.Nardi@lnf.infn.it

‡ csmarra@sissa.it

<sup>1</sup> In this work ‘flavour’ refers to a replication of the known quarks as well as of new exotic quarks.

<sup>2</sup> Recently, it has also been argued that the axion quality problem can be automatically solved in an alternative formulation in which the axion is introduced as a 2-form  $B_{\mu\nu}$ , whose Lagrangian enjoys an invariance under a gauge shift  $B_{\mu\nu} \rightarrow B_{\mu\nu} + \Omega_{\mu\nu}$  which protects the axion mechanism [40].

scalar multiplets and of fermions carrying colour, are well suited to generate and protect a  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$ , even when each group factor in the semi-simple decomposition has degree much smaller than  $D$ . This suggests the interesting possibility of enforcing accidentally a PQ symmetry by exploiting group factors of degree  $\leq 3$ , which can thus be interpreted as flavour symmetries acting on the SM quark generations. In this work, we study the viability of such a scenario, we state some necessary conditions for its realisation and, as an example, we construct a flavor model based on a particularly simple flavour group in which a global  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  arises accidentally and remains protected up to operator dimension  $D = 10$ , while mass hierarchies compatible with those observed in the quark sector are generated upon minimization of a scalar potential. The paper is organised as follows. In Section II we state some conditions which must be matched by theoretical constructions that aim to realise this idea. In Section III we describe the main steps through which flavour models of this type can be constructed. In Section IV we present a concrete realisation, and finally in Section V we summarise the main results and draw our conclusions.

## II. THE NEED FOR AN ABELIAN FACTOR

An important step towards an explanation of the origin of the axion, is the search for a scalar potential that respects automatically a global  $U(1)$ . A class of semi-simple symmetries that, when imposed as local symmetries acting on a certain set of scalar multiplets, features particularly interesting properties to achieve this goal, was studied in Ref. [41]. They have the generic structure  $\mathcal{G}_F = SU(m) \times SU(n)$  with  $m \neq n$ . For example the potential for a scalar multiplet transforming in the bi-fundamental  $Y \sim (m, \bar{n})$  features an *exact* accidental  $U(1)$  corresponding to a global rephasing  $Y \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} Y$ . This follows from the fact that all gauge invariant operators, e.g.  $\text{Tr}(Y^\dagger Y)$ ,  $\text{Tr}(Y^\dagger Y Y^\dagger Y)$ , are Hermitian, since for  $m \neq n$  the would-be non-Hermitian determinant operator  $\sim \epsilon^{\alpha_1 \alpha_2 \dots \alpha_m} \epsilon_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_m} Y_{\alpha_1}^{i_1} Y_{\alpha_2}^{i_2} \dots$  vanishes identically. This is a promising observation; however, a model aiming to provide a satisfactory explanation of the origin of the PQ symmetry needs to satisfy additional requirements, the most important of which are:

- (i) The accidental  $U(1)$  symmetry enforced by  $\mathcal{G}_F$  must have a colour anomaly;
- (ii) All fermions carrying colour must be massive;
- (iii)  $U(1)$  must remain preserved up to operators of dimension  $D \gtrsim 10$  without introducing a too large number of chiral quarks.

While the potential of a single scalar multiplet transforming under a *rectangular* gauge group does satisfy the quality requirement [41], its Yukawa sector unavoidably yields some massless quarks and fails to satisfy the requirement (ii). Thus, additional scalars must be intro-

duced. In general, this opens up the possibility of writing also non-Hermitian operators, and then the issue whether a global  $U(1)$  does arise, and up to which operator dimension it remains preserved, becomes non-trivial. The main reason for the last requirement (iii) is to improve with respect to existing models. For example, the model discussed in Ref. [31], which is based on the gauge symmetry  $SU(D)_L \times SU(D)_R$ , contains exotic quark multiplets transforming as  $Q_L \sim (D, 1)$   $Q_R \sim (1, D)$  coupled to a scalar multiplet  $Y \sim (D, \bar{D})$ . This model satisfies (i) and (ii) while the first PQ-breaking operator ( $\det Y$ ) arises at dimension  $D$ . Here we seek more economical constructions involving fermion representations of dimension much smaller than  $D$ , suitable to host the SM quarks.

We will now prove that semi-simple gauge groups  $\mathcal{G}_F$  do not suffice to enforce an accidental  $U(1)$  symmetry while satisfying simultaneously the three requirements (i)-(iii). Let us consider a generic semi-simple gauge group  $\mathcal{G}_F = [\prod_\ell SU(M_\ell)]_L \times [\prod_r SU(N_r)]_R$  acting on a certain set of scalar multiplets  $Y^{\ell r} \sim (m_\ell, \bar{n}_r)$  in the fundamental ( $m_\ell = M_\ell$ ,  $n_r = N_r$ ) or trivial ( $m_\ell, n_r = 1$ ) representation of pairs of group factors, and a set of left-handed (LH) and right-handed (RH) quarks  $Q_L, Q_R$  of a given electric charge in the fundamental (or trivial) representation of a single group factor.<sup>3</sup> To prevent a QCD gauge anomaly and to ensure that each LH quark has a RH chiral partner, so that no quark is prevented from acquiring a mass, we require  $n_Q \equiv \sum_\ell m_\ell = \sum_r n_r$ . Let us consider the set of gauge invariant Yukawa terms:

$$\sum_{\{\ell r\}} \eta^{\ell r} \bar{Q}_L Y^{\ell r} Q_R, \quad (1)$$

where  $\eta^{\ell r}$  are coupling constants.<sup>4</sup> Upon SB of  $\mathcal{G}_F$  ( $\text{Tr} Y^\dagger Y \rightarrow \langle \text{Tr} Y^\dagger Y \rangle \neq 0$ ) the Yukawa operators generate a mass matrix for the quarks. By arranging the LH and RH fermions in two vectors  $\Psi_{L,R}$ , the mass term can be written as:

$$\bar{\Psi}_L \mathcal{M}(\eta \langle Y \rangle) \Psi_R, \quad (2)$$

with  $\mathcal{M}$  a  $n_Q \times n_Q$  square matrix. Although this matrix can have one or more vanishing  $m_\ell \times n_r$  blocks (corresponding for example to the absence of a  $Y \sim (m_\ell, n_r)$  scalar multiplet) the requirement that all the quarks are massive implies  $\det \mathcal{M} \neq 0$ . Then the sum

$$\epsilon_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_{n_Q}} \epsilon_{j_1 j_2 \dots j_{n_Q}} \mathcal{M}_{i_1 j_1} \mathcal{M}_{i_2 j_2} \dots \mathcal{M}_{i_{n_Q} j_{n_Q}} \quad (3)$$

<sup>3</sup> We assume for definiteness that all fields transform in the fundamental or trivial representation of the group factors. Because of superselection rules considering one quark sector of a given electric charge is without loss of generality.

<sup>4</sup> Here  $\{\ell r\}$  are not matrix indices. They label the specific coupling that multiplies the Yukawa operator, as well as the particular fermion and scalar multiplets involved. In case  $Q_L, Q_R$  belong to the same representation under  $\mathcal{G}_F$  and under the  $SU(2)_L$  electroweak group, then  $(\eta Y)^{\ell r}$  represents an invariant mass term. If instead one  $Q_{L,R}$  is a  $SU(2)_L$  doublet and the other one a singlet, then  $Y^{\ell r}$  represents a Higgs doublet.

must contain at least one non-vanishing term. Suppressing the coupling constants ( $\eta \rightarrow 1$ ) so that each block  $\mathcal{M}_{\ell r}$  is replaced by  $\langle Y \rangle_{\ell r}$ , Eq. (3) ensures that one can write down a gauge invariant scalar operator of dimension  $n_Q$  whose VEV does not vanish. Let us now denote by  $\mathcal{X}_\psi$  the charge of the field  $\psi$  under the accidental  $U(1)$ . From Eq. (2) we see that this operator must carry a global charge equal to  $\sum_{Q_{L\ell}} m_\ell \mathcal{X}_{Q_{L\ell}} - \sum_{Q_{Rr}} n_r \mathcal{X}_{Q_{Rr}} = \mathcal{A}$ , where  $\mathcal{A}$  is the  $U(1)$ -QCD anomaly coefficient.<sup>5</sup> We are thus left with the following options: (i)  $\mathcal{A} = 0$ : the operator does not break the accidental symmetry, however, the symmetry is non-anomalous and hence it is not a PQ symmetry; (ii)  $\mathcal{A} \neq 0$ :  $U(1)$  can be promoted to a PQ symmetry which, however, is unavoidably broken at dimension  $n_Q$  by the operator in Eq. (3). Clearly this brings back the issue that to enforce the required  $U(1)_{PQ}$  protection one needs to introduce  $n_Q \geq D$  chiral quarks for any given electric charge.

This unpleasant result can be circumvented by extending the flavour symmetry to include an Abelian gauge factor  $\mathcal{G}_F \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_F \times U(1)_F$  such that the Yukawa operators in Eq. (1) are  $U(1)_F$ -invariant and thus allowed, while the scalar operator corresponding to Eq. (3) is not  $U(1)_F$  invariant and remains forbidden. The search for suitable  $U(1)_F$  symmetries that can realise this picture plays a central role in the present study.

### III. MODEL BUILDING

In this section we describe a general strategy to construct models that can realise an axion-flavour connection. With the exception of the top mass, all other SM quark masses have values well below the scale of the electroweak (EW) VEV  $v \sim 246$  GeV, that is the dimensional scale to which all SM masses should be related. This observation suggests the possibility that the SM fermion masses could be forbidden at the renormalizable level because of some flavour symmetry, and that they could arise from effective operators that are switched on after the flavour symmetry gets spontaneously broken. This scenario requires the introduction of a certain set of exotic quarks with electric charge  $+2/3$  and  $-1/3$ , and of SM singlet scalars transforming in some representation of the flavour group to generate the effective operators, and to break spontaneously the flavour symmetry. In each charge sector the determinant of the  $n_Q \times n_Q$  mass matrix should have a parametric dependence  $\det(\mathcal{M}) \sim v^3 \Lambda^{n_Q-3}$ , where  $\Lambda$  represents some large mass scale unrelated to the EW VEV  $v$ . Note that requiring that there are no massless quarks ( $\det(\mathcal{M}) \neq 0$ ) already imposes some relevant constraints on the viability of the model.

Let us clarify these points with an example.

#### A. A simple example

Let us consider for definiteness the up-quark sector, leaving understood that the same construction is replicated in the down-quark sector. The simplest flavour symmetry of the form  $\mathcal{G}_F \times U(1)_F$  where  $\mathcal{G}_F$  denotes a semi-simple *rectangular* group, corresponds to  $\mathcal{G}_F = SU(3) \times SU(2)$ . Let us assume that the LH quark doublets  $q_L$  transform in the fundamental of  $SU(3)$  while the RH quarks  $u_R$  belong to a fundamental of  $SU(2)$ . Then one RH quark  $t_R$  is a singlet under  $\mathcal{G}_F$ . To render  $\mathcal{G}_F$  anomaly free, the simplest choice is to ‘mirror’ this quark content by introducing a minimal set of exotic quarks  $(U_R, U_L, T_L)$ . Under  $SU(3) \times SU(2)$  of flavour the quarks transform as

$$\begin{aligned} q_L &\sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}), & u_R &\sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}), & t_R &\sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}), \\ U_R &\sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}), & U_L &\sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}), & T_L &\sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that while  $q_L = (u, d)_L^T$  is an EW doublet, the other five up-type quark multiplets are  $SU(2)_L$  singlets. Five down-type  $SU(2)_L$  singlets  $d_R, b_R, D_R, D_L, B_L$  complete the fermion content of the model, but they are irrelevant for the following discussion. Let us now introduce (besides the Higgs) the following scalar multiplets:

$$Y \sim (\mathbf{3}, \bar{\mathbf{2}}), \quad Z \sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}), \quad X \sim (\mathbf{1}, \bar{\mathbf{2}}). \quad (5)$$

Although the multiplet  $X$ , together with the Higgs, would suffice to provide masses for all the quarks, to generate hierarchical masses other fields transforming like  $Y$  and  $Z$  are also needed, so we introduce them from the start. Denoting with lower case letters the VEVs of the components of the scalar fields, e.g.  $\langle X \rangle = (x_1, x_2)$  etc., and choosing the field basis in which  $\langle Y_1^1 \rangle = y_1$ ,  $\langle Y_2^2 \rangle = y_2$  with all other entries vanishing, the  $6 \times 6$  mass matrix consistent with invariance under  $\mathcal{G}_F$  reads:

$$\mathcal{M} = \begin{pmatrix} u_R & u_R & t_R & U_R & U_R & U_R \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & v & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v \\ \Lambda_u & 0 & x_1^* & y_1^* & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda_u & x_2^* & 0 & y_2^* & 0 \\ x_1 & x_2 & \Lambda_t & z_1^* & z_2^* & z_3^* \end{pmatrix} \begin{matrix} q_L \\ q_L \\ q_L \\ U_L \\ U_L \\ T_L \end{matrix} \quad (6)$$

where  $\Lambda_{u,t}$  are invariant mass terms, and Yukawa couplings multiplying the VEVs components are left understood. Already this simple construction has some nice features: there are no tree level masses for the ‘light’ fields  $q_L, u_R, t_R$ , and since by assumption  $v \ll x_i, y_i, z_i, \Lambda_{u,t}$  the matrix has a see-saw like structure that strongly suppresses light-heavy LH mixings, ensuring the approximate unitarity of the light quarks mixing matrix. The determinant  $\det(\mathcal{M}) = v^3 \Lambda_u [|X|^2 - \Lambda_t \Lambda_u]$  has the correct parametric dependence  $\sim v^3 \Lambda^3$  to give

<sup>5</sup> Strictly speaking  $\mathcal{A}$  is the contribution to the anomaly coefficient of one sector of quarks with the same electric charge. Applying this argument sector by sector one reaches the same conclusion.

rise to three light and three heavy eigenstates. From the determinant we can read off which operators in the Yukawa Lagrangian must be allowed by  $U(1)_F$  to ensure  $\det(\mathcal{M}) \neq 0$ . They are:

$$\mathcal{L} \supset \bar{q}_L H_u U_R + \Lambda_u \bar{U}_L u_R + \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \Lambda_t \bar{T}_L t_R \\ \bar{T}_L X u_R + \bar{U}_L X^\dagger t_R. \end{array} \right. \quad \text{or} \quad (7)$$

Consider now a generic  $U(1)$  that is unbroken by the Yukawa terms in Eq. (7). Denoting the  $U(1)$  charge of a field with the same symbol that denotes the field, the following charge relations must be satisfied:<sup>6</sup>

$$q_L - U_R = H_u, \quad U_L - u_R = 0, \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} T_L - t_R = 0 \\ T_L - u_R = t_R - U_L = X. \end{array} \right. \quad \text{or} \quad (8)$$

The generic expression for the coefficient of the mixed  $U(1) \times SU(3)_c$  anomaly is

$$\mathcal{A} = 3q_L - 2u_R - t_R + 2U_L + T_L - 3U_R, \quad (9)$$

and after imposing the conditions in Eq. (8), we obtain

$$\mathcal{A} = \left\{ \begin{array}{l} 3H_u + (T_L - t_R) = 3H_u \\ 3H_u + (T_L - u_R) + (U_L - t_R) = 3H_u. \end{array} \right. \quad \text{or} \quad (10)$$

Now, under the assumption that the down-quark sector replicates the same Yukawa structure than the up-sector, the total anomaly is  $\mathcal{A} = 3(H_u + H_d)$ . Let us recall that for the local  $U(1)_F$  we need  $\mathcal{A}_F = 0$ , while for  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  we need  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PQ}} \neq 0$ . This requires two Higgs doublets ( $H_u \neq \tilde{H}_d$ ) with opposite  $F$ -charges  $F_{H_u} = -F_{\tilde{H}_d}$ . The bilinear term  $H_u \tilde{H}_d$  would then be permitted by  $SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y \times U(1)_F$  invariance, however, since  $\mathcal{X}_{H_u} + \mathcal{X}_{\tilde{H}_d} \neq 0$ , it would badly break the PQ symmetry at  $D = 2$ . Thus this simple model, although presenting some interesting features, does not allow to establish an axion-flavour connection. Nevertheless, this example illustrates rather clearly which strategy should be followed to study the viability of other constructions.

## B. Strategy for model building

Models of flavour in which a local gauge symmetry can automatically yield a high-quality QCD-axion can be constructed by implementing the following steps:

(1) *Mass matrix determinant and anomaly conditions.* Given a set of scalar and fermion multiplets transforming under a semi-simple flavour factor  $\mathcal{G}_F$ , write down the most general  $\mathcal{G}_F$  invariant Yukawa potential, and

verify that the leading terms of the determinant of the fermion mass matrix have the parametric structure  $\sim v^3 \Lambda^{n_Q-3} + \dots$  where the ellipsis represent possible terms of  $O(v^4)$  or higher, while terms  $v^j \Lambda^{n_Q-j}$  with  $0 \leq j \leq 2$ , if present, must eventually be forbidden by the  $U(1)_F$  symmetry. Next, for each choice of the Yukawa terms that can yield the correct parametric dependence, find which accidental  $U(1)$ 's arise, and verify that  $U(1)$  charge relations allow for solutions of the anomaly coefficient conditions  $\mathcal{A}_F = 0$  and  $\mathcal{A}_{\text{PQ}} \neq 0$ .

(2) *Identifying  $U(1)_F$  and  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$ .* The gauge invariant kinetic term for the set of  $n = n_\psi + n_\phi$  fermion and scalar multiplets enjoys a  $U(1)^n$  rephasing symmetry. Each Yukawa operator and each non-Hermitian scalar operator, when allowed, imposes one condition on the otherwise arbitrary phase redefinitions, and reduces the number of the  $U(1)$  symmetries by one unit. We aim to find a set of  $n - 4$  Yukawa and scalar operators that will reduce the  $U(1)^n$  symmetry down to  $U(1)_Y \times U(1)_\psi \times U(1)_{\text{PQ}} \times U(1)_F$ . The first factor is hypercharge, for which we have  $\mathcal{Y}_{H_d} = -\mathcal{Y}_{H_u} = \frac{1}{2}$  (in the case of a single Higgs doublet  $H_d = \tilde{H}_u$ ), while all the exotic scalars have  $\mathcal{Y} = 0$ . The second factor is fermion number, under which all the fermion multiplets have the same charge while all the scalars are neutral. Note that when only the quark sector is considered,  $U(1)_\psi$  can be simply identified with baryon number.  $U(1)_\psi$  is automatically preserved because Lorentz invariant fermion operators of the Majorana type cannot appear in the quark sector. The third factor is the sought PQ symmetry. Note that the  $U(1)_\psi$  and  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  charges, being global, can always be redefined by means of a shift proportional to hypercharge or  $F$ -charge. Now, requiring that a specific set of  $n - 4$  Yukawa and scalar operators are allowed by  $U(1)_Y$  and by a certain  $U(1)_F$  local symmetry, provides  $n - 4$  constraints. It follows that the charges of all the fermions ( $\Psi_f$ ) can be expressed in terms of linear combinations of four reference charges. The charges of the Higgs doublets, that do not carry fermion number, depend on three reference charges, while for the SM singlet scalars ( $\Phi_s$ ) two charges suffice, since they do not carry neither fermion number nor hypercharge. We will choose the charge  $\zeta$  of one fermion multiplet to represent fermion number and the charge of one SM singlet scalar  $\varphi$ , to represent one combination of the  $F$ - and PQ charges. For the remaining two reference charges we define  $h_+ = H_d + H_u$  and  $h_- = H_d - H_u$ . Note that for  $h_+$  the hypercharge contribution cancels, so that  $h_+$  can be taken as a second combination of  $F$ - and PQ. Note also that since  $h_-$  contains a hypercharge contribution, it cannot appear in the charge combinations  $\Phi_s$ .<sup>7</sup> All in

<sup>6</sup> Whenever no confusion can arise, we will use the same symbol to denote a field multiplet and its generic  $U(1)$  charge. We will instead use respectively  $F_\phi$  and  $\mathcal{X}_\phi$  to denote the  $U(1)_F$  and  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  charges of the field  $\phi$ .

<sup>7</sup> In models with a single Higgs doublet  $H$  one should replace  $h_+$  with the charge of a second hyperchargeless scalar, and  $h_- \rightarrow H$ .

all we can write:

$$\Psi_f = a_f \varphi + b_f h_+ + c_f h_- + d_f \zeta, \quad (11)$$

$$\Phi_s = a_s \varphi + b_s h_+, \quad (12)$$

$$\mathcal{A} = a \varphi + b h_+ = \mathcal{A}_F + \mathcal{A}_{\text{PQ}}, \quad (13)$$

where the coefficients  $a_{f,s}, b_{f,s}, c_f, d_f$  and  $a, b$ , are determined by the  $n - 4$  conditions on the charges. The anomaly coefficient in the last expression does not depend on  $\zeta$  and  $h_-$  since fermion number and hypercharge have no QCD anomaly while, as it is put in evidence in the second equality, it can receive contributions from the other two  $U(1)$ 's. If the coefficients  $c_f$  are all proportional to the corresponding hypercharges  $y_f$ , then  $h_-$  can be identified with the hypercharge generator. To achieve this a suitable shift of the global charge  $\zeta$  might be needed, e.g.  $\zeta \rightarrow \psi - \alpha h_-$  in such a way that for all fields  $c_f - \alpha d_f = y_f$ . Finally, the  $U(1)_F$  charges are identified by the condition  $\mathcal{A}_F = 0$ , which yields  $f \propto a h_+ - b \varphi$  and  $\chi \propto b h_+ + a \varphi$ , where  $f$  and  $\chi$  are normalization factors for the  $U(1)_F$  and  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  generators.

One should next verify that PQ breaking operators  $O_{\text{PQ}}$  will only appear at a sufficiently high operator dimension. The search for such operators is greatly simplified by the fact that their overall charge must be proportional to the anomaly coefficient  $\mathcal{A}$ , since this is the necessary condition for  $O_{\text{PQ}}$  being allowed by the gauge symmetry while carrying an overall PQ charge.

(3) *Identifying the physical axion.* As we have mentioned above, the PQ charges are not uniquely defined since any combination of the accidental  $U(1)$  and of the diagonal generators associated with the gauge symmetries defines a new global symmetry [42–44]. The *physical* axion must be, however, a massless state orthogonal to the Goldstone bosons of the broken flavour symmetries. This implies the following conditions:

$$\sum_S \langle S^\dagger T_C S \rangle \mathcal{X}_S = \sum_S \langle S^\dagger S \rangle F_S \mathcal{X}_S = 0, \quad (14)$$

where  $S$  represents any scalar field and  $T_C$  are the Cartan generators of the non-Abelian subgroups. These conditions can be satisfied via a redefinition of the PQ charges, that will then identify the particular  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  whose Goldstone boson is physical axion.<sup>8</sup> Let us note at this point that it is mandatory that at least one among the scalars with VEVs  $V \gg v$  will have the coefficient  $b_s$  of its charge  $\Phi_s$  (see Eq. (12)) different from zero, otherwise one global  $U(1)_{h_+}$  would remain unbroken below the scale  $V$ . The surviving symmetry will eventually get broken at the EW scale, however,

the resulting axion would then lie in the Higgs direction. Formally, this occurs because the orthogonality conditions Eq. (14) imply that after redefinition, the PQ charges of the Higgs doublets (and consequently also the charges of the SM fermions coupled to the Higgs) become extremely large, of  $O(V^2/v^2)$ . It can be shown that the axion would then couple to the SM fields with an effective suppression scale of  $O(1/v)$  so that, much alike the Weinberg-Wilczek axion [3, 4], it would be phenomenologically ruled out.

(4) *Flavour structure.* After constructing the axion sector according to the previous steps, it remains to be seen which flavour structure can arise from the model. To carry out this study one should write down the most general scalar potential in terms of the complete set of  $\mathcal{G}_F \times U(1)_F$  invariant scalar operators, which will be also PQ conserving by construction. Minimisation of the potential will then yield a fermion mass matrix, of which Eq. (6) is one example. The goal is to obtain the correct hierarchies among the light quark masses without the need of strong hierarchies among the parameters of the scalar potential or among the couplings of the Yukawa operators. Previous studies carried out within a model based on the flavour symmetry  $SU(3)_Q \times SU(3)_u \times SU(3)_d$  (but with no axion) have proven to be successful in this endeavour [45–47], and indicate that there should be no fundamental impediment to achieve the same result with  $\mathcal{G}_F \times U(1)_F$ . However, in the present case carrying out such a study is remarkably more complicated. This is because since we need to keep trace of the PQ anomaly, we have to work with the complete renormalizable UV theory, rather than much more simply with an effective theory involving only the SM quarks, as was done e.g. in Refs. [45–47]. We anticipate that this step requires a computationally intense analysis, since it involves multiple minimisations of a complicated multi-fields scalar potential to find the structure of the VEVs, nested with minimisations with respect to the couplings of the scalar and Yukawa potentials to find the set of parameters that can reproduce the SM quark flavour structure. Proper minimisation of the scalar potential requires a careful parametrisation of the scalar multiplets, so that they will contain only physical degrees of freedom, with all redundant components that can be gauged away removed. In the Appendix we derive explicit expressions for the field multiplets containing only non-redundant degrees of freedom. This parametrisation has been used in the numerical minimisation.

#### IV. A VIABLE $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)_F$ MODEL

As a concrete application, let us describe a model in which  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  arises automatically and is protected up to  $D = 10$ , while strong mass hierarchies arise upon minimisation of the scalar potential of a set of EW singlet scalars. The flavour group is the same  $SU(3) \times$

<sup>8</sup> If the model contains two or more PQ charged Higgs doublets, upon EW symmetry breaking their charges must be further redefined to satisfy  $\sum_i \mathcal{Y}_{H_i} \mathcal{X}_{H_i} v_i^2 = 0$ , to ensure that the axion does not mix with the Goldstone boson of  $U(1)_y$  [9, 10].

$SU(2) \times U(1)_F$  of the model discussed in Section III, but we extend the fermion content of Eq. (4) by including a pair of flavour singlets EW doublets  $Q_L = (t, b)_L^T$  and  $Q_R = (T, B)_R^T$ . The up-type quark sector thus contains the following fields:

$$\begin{aligned} q_L &\sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}), \quad u_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}), \quad t_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}), \quad Q_L \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}), \\ U_R &\sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1}), \quad U_L \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}), \quad T_L \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}), \quad Q_R \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Together with the down-type singlets  $d_R, b_R, D_R, D_L, B_L$ , this set of fermions is manifestly free from QCD and  $\mathcal{G}_F$  gauge anomalies. Let us also assume the same scalar sector given in Eq. (5). The most general Lagrangian invariant under  $\mathcal{G}_F = SU(3) \times SU(2)$  yields the following mass matrix:

$$\mathcal{M}_u = \begin{pmatrix} u_R & u_R & t_R & U_R & U_R & U_R & Q_R & \\ \left( \begin{array}{cccccc} 0 & 0 & 0 & v & 0 & 0 & z_1 & q_L \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v & 0 & z_2 & q_L \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & v & z_3 & q_L \\ 0 & 0 & v & 0 & 0 & 0 & M & Q_L \\ \Lambda_u & 0 & x_1^* & y_1^* & 0 & 0 & 0 & U_L \\ 0 & \Lambda_u & x_2^* & 0 & y_2^* & 0 & 0 & U_L \\ x_1 & x_2 & \Lambda_t & z_1^* & z_2^* & z_3^* & v & T_L \end{array} \right) \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

where all Yukawa couplings are left understood. The determinant of this mass matrix has the required parametric structure  $\det \mathcal{M}_u \sim O(v^3 \Lambda^4) + O(v^5 \Lambda^2)$ . Each entry in  $\mathcal{M}_u$  corresponds to one Yukawa operator allowed by  $\mathcal{G}_F$ , but not necessarily by  $U(1)_F$ . For each operator that we require to be also  $U(1)_F$  invariant, we get one condition on the Abelian charges. Let us see how many conditions should arise from the Yukawa sector. In Eq. (15) we have three fermion doublets plus five singlets. Taking into account the additional five down-type  $SU(2)_L$  singlets we have a total of thirteen fermion multiplets. We should impose no more than twelve linearly independent conditions on the charges of the Yukawa operators, in order to allow for an unbroken  $U(1)_\psi$  acting on the fermions.<sup>9</sup> We should also impose no less than twelve conditions to avoid two independent  $U(1)_\psi \times U(1)_{\psi'}$ , which would imply the existence of a new ‘baryon number’ that could stabilize some exotic quarks, giving rise to dangerous strongly interacting long lived relics [48–50]. The following operators are mandatory:

$$[H_u \bar{q}_L^\alpha U_{R,\alpha}, \quad \Lambda_u \bar{U}_L^i u_{R,i}, \quad H_u \bar{Q}_L t_R], \quad \bar{q}_L^\alpha Z_\alpha Q_R, \quad (17)$$

where for the sake of clarity we have written explicitly the flavour indices (Latin indices  $i, j, \dots$  refer to  $SU(2)$ , Greek indices  $\alpha, \beta, \dots$  to  $SU(3)$ ). The first three operators in the square brackets are specific of the up sector, and should be mirrored in the down-quark sector, ( $U_{L,R} \rightarrow D_{L,R}$ ,  $u_R \rightarrow d_R$ ,  $t_R \rightarrow b_R$ ,  $H_u \rightarrow H_d$ ) providing

three additional conditions. The fourth one already involves both the up- and down-type quark doublets. The first two operators in Eq. (17) are necessary to ensure that  $\det \mathcal{M}_u \neq 0$ . The third one gives rise to a mass term of  $O(v)$  at tree level. This accounts for the fact that the mass of one up-type quark (the top) is not suppressed with respect to the EW scale, and hence it should not originate from an effective operator. The presence of this operator, together with the previous two, also suffice to ensure a non-vanishing determinant. The last operator is needed to ensure that only three up-type quarks will be present below the EW scale. In fact it removes one linear combination of the three  $q_L$  from the low energy spectrum by providing a mass  $O(\Lambda)$ .

The operators in Eq. (17) do not involve the quark  $T_L$ , nor the  $X, Y$  scalars that would not contribute to dynamical generation of the mass hierarchies. This is remedied by requiring the following additional operators

$$[\bar{U}_L Y^\dagger U_R, \quad \bar{T}_L X u_R], \quad \Lambda_t \bar{T}_L t_R. \quad (18)$$

The first two in the square brackets suffice to have a  $X, Y$ -dependent Yukawa Lagrangian and to couple  $T_L$ . They are replicated in the down-quark sector ( $U_{L,R} \rightarrow D_{L,R}$ ,  $T_L \rightarrow B_L$ ,  $u_R \rightarrow d_R$ ). The last one completes the required list of twelve operators yielding linearly independent charge conditions (seven from Eq. (17) and five from Eq. (18)). Although the presence of the corresponding down-type operator  $\Lambda_b \bar{B}_L b_R$  is not imposed, one can verify that it arises by accident.

Let us now assume that there is only one Higgs doublet ( $H_u = \tilde{H}_d$ ). Together with  $X, Y, Z$  and the thirteen fermion multiplets, there are seventeen fields. Then, on top of the twelve Yukawa conditions, we need to impose one additional condition in the scalar sector to reduce  $U(1)^{17} \rightarrow U(1)^4$ . The set of scalar fields in Eq. (5) does not allow to write a non-Hermitian operator involving the Higgs doublet, the only possibilities (with obvious contraction of the  $SU(3) \times SU(2)$  indices) are  $XY^\dagger Z$ ,  $XYZ^\dagger$ ,  $ZYY$ ,  $X(YY^\dagger)X$ . By choosing to allow in turn each one of these operators, and solving the set of thirteen linearly independent constraint on the charges, one can verify that the first operator yields a vanishing overall anomaly  $\mathcal{A} = 0$ , and thus there is no PQ symmetry. For each one of the other three possibilities, one obtains that at least one of the three remaining operators acquires an overall charge proportional to the anomaly coefficient. Thus, after imposing the condition  $\mathcal{A}_F = 0$ , this operator will be allowed by  $U(1)_F$ ; however, since it will have to carry a non-vanishing PQ charge  $\propto \mathcal{A}_{PQ} \neq 0$ , it will break  $U(1)_{PQ}$  at the renormalizable level. We can conclude that with a single Higgs doublet, the model does not allow to establish an axion-flavour connection.

In order to proceed, let us then assume two Higgs doublets  $H_u, H_d$ . To reduce the grand total of eighteen rephasing symmetries to  $U(1)^4$  we now need to impose *two* additional conditions on the scalar couplings. Even with two Higgs doublets the set of fields in Eq. (5) still

<sup>9</sup> In general, a certain number of additional Yukawa operators corresponding to conditions that are linearly dependent from the ones imposed will also be allowed by accident.

does not allow to write a non-Hermitian operator involving the Higgs fields. This implies that the two scalar conditions will involve only  $X, Y, Z$ . As a consequence the charges of these fields will depend on a single charge  $\varphi$  (i.e. in Eq. (12)  $b_s = 0$ ). As explained in point (3) of the previous section, this implies that an accidental  $U(1)$  symmetry remains unbroken by the large VEVs, resulting in an axion that mainly sits in the Higgs doublets, and that couples too strongly to the SM fields.

A simple way to avoid this issue is to introduce a non-Hermitian coupling between the Higgs doublets and the EW singlet scalars, that will ensure  $b_s \neq 0$ . This can be easily done with a further enlargement of the field content. We choose to add to the set in Eq. (5) a scalar multiplet  $K_\alpha \sim (\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{1})$  transforming like  $Z_\alpha$ . We can then write the operator  $(Z^\dagger K)(H_u H_d)$  (see Eq. (20) below) which forces the charges of the heavy scalars to acquire a dependence on  $h_+$ . We couple this new scalar to the Yukawa sector by replacing one of the previous Yukawa operators with a new one involving  $K$ , more precisely  $\bar{B}_L X d_R \rightarrow \bar{B}_L K^\dagger D_R$ . The five conditions corresponding to Eq. (18) now are:

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{U}_L Y^\dagger U_R, \bar{T}_L X u_R, \quad \Lambda_t \bar{T}_L t_R, \\ \bar{D}_L Y^\dagger D_R, \bar{B}_L K^\dagger D_R. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

After imposing the corresponding charge conditions, two additional Yukawa operators  $\bar{U}_L X^\dagger t_R$  and  $\bar{D}_L X^\dagger b_R$  are also allowed by accident. Note that the set of Yukawa operators is not completely symmetrical between the up and down sectors.  $\Lambda_t \bar{T}_L t_R$  and  $\bar{T}_L X u_R$  are not mirrored in the down sector, which instead includes  $\bar{B}_L K^\dagger D_R$  that has no counterpart in the up sector.

We now need to impose three conditions among the scalars. We require  $U(1)_F$  invariance of the following operators:

$$Z^\dagger K_\alpha H_u H_d, \quad \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} X_i^\dagger Y_\alpha^i Z_\beta K_\gamma, \quad \epsilon_{ij} X^i Y_\alpha^j Y_k^{\dagger\alpha} X^k, \quad (20)$$

Once the corresponding charge conditions are imposed, the additional operator  $\epsilon_{ij} \epsilon^{\alpha\beta\gamma} X^i Y_\alpha^j K_\beta Z_\gamma$  is also accidentally allowed. This completes the list of the allowed Yukawa and scalar operators of the model.

As for the PQ origin and quality issues, we have verified that (with natural values of the charges)  $U(1)_F$  forbids all renormalizable PQ breaking operators, so that indeed the origin of  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  is accidental. Moreover, the first PQ breaking operators arise at  $D = 11$ , so that  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  is sufficiently protected, and the quality issue solved.<sup>10</sup>

Carrying out the minimisation of the full scalar potential, inserting the resulting VEVs in the mass matrices

	model	experimental
$m_b(\text{GeV})$	1.5	1.5
$m_c(\text{GeV})$	0.5	0.4
$m_s(\text{MeV})$	20	30
$m_d(\text{MeV})$	0.5	1.5
$m_u(\text{MeV})$	0.3	0.7

TABLE I. Quarks mass values obtained in the reference model (see text) and their experimental values evolved at the scale  $\Lambda = 10^8 \text{ GeV}$ . A top mass value  $m_t(\Lambda) = 102.5 \text{ GeV}$  [51] has been used to fix the overall fermion mass scale.

$\mathcal{M}_{u,d}$  and extracting the light  $O(v)$  eigenvalues, yields the quark masses displayed in Table I.<sup>11</sup> Notice that the reference values of the quark masses are evolved (in the  $\overline{\text{MS}}$  scheme) up to  $10^8 \text{ GeV}$  [51].

Although in our model we set the scale where the first breaking of the flavour symmetry occurs at  $10^{11} \text{ GeV}$ , the complete breaking proceeds in various steps, separated by hierarchical energy gaps. The reference scale of  $10^8 \text{ GeV}$  is a rough average between the highest and the lowest breaking scales, and thus representative of the scale where the quark Yukawa couplings are generated. The comparison between the results of the minimisation and the values of the running masses in Table I is thus affected by various uncertainties, and should be taken with a grain of salt. The important point is that in the numerical study the ratios between the dimensionless Lagrangian couplings were constrained to never exceed a factor of  $\mathcal{O}(10)$ , so that the hierarchical pattern arises dynamically. In fact, starting from non-hierarchical values of the fundamental parameters, we obtain for the VEVs components  $|x_1|, |y_{1,2}|, |z_3|, |k_2| \sim O(\Lambda)$ ,  $|x_2|, |z_{1,2}| \sim O(10^{-5}\Lambda)$ ,  $|k_{1,3}| \sim O(10^{-6}\Lambda)$  with  $\Lambda = 10^{11} \text{ GeV}$ . We also find remarkable that the same set of VEVs allows to reproduce both the stronger mass hierarchy of the up sector, and the milder hierarchy of the down sector, which in terms of a small parameter  $\epsilon \sim 0.2$  (of the order of the Cabibbo angle) can be written as:

$$\begin{aligned} m_u : m_c : m_t &= \epsilon^7 : \epsilon^3 : 1 \\ m_d : m_s : m_b &= \epsilon^6 : \epsilon^4 : \epsilon^2. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

This is possible thanks to the asymmetry between the

<sup>10</sup> The  $D = 11$  PQ breaking operators contain the  $\mathcal{G}_F$  invariant factor  $(KZ^\dagger)^4$  joined to one of the three  $\mathcal{G}_F$  invariant strings  $KYY$ ,  $Z^\dagger YX$  or  $Z^\dagger YX^\dagger$ . Each power of  $(KZ^\dagger)$  can also be replaced by  $(H_u H_d)$  since it carries the same  $U(1)_F$  and PQ charges. However, the effects of these additional operators are suppressed by powers of  $v^2/V^2$  and are thus irrelevant.

<sup>11</sup> In addition to the non-Hermitian scalar operators discussed above, the scalar potential also contains many additional Hermitian operators. Being  $U(1)_F$  neutral they play no role in determining  $U(1)_F$  and  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$ , and they are generally also ‘flavour irrelevant’ in the sense of Ref. [47]. This happens when an operator is accidentally invariant under a symmetry larger than  $\mathcal{G}_F$  (e.g.  $Z^{\alpha\dagger} Z_\alpha$  that carries an  $O(6)$  symmetry), so that its contribution to the potential energy does not depend on the particular configuration of the VEVs components. (Details on the numerical minimisation procedure can be provided upon request.)

operators contributing to the mass matrices in the up and down sectors mentioned above.

We finally note that although the model contains two Higgs doublets, it is fundamentally different from well known 2 Higgs Doublet Models (2HDM) obtained by enlarging the SM Higgs sector. In first place the scalar potential of 2HDM does not carry a PQ symmetry, and hence all the scalars are massive. Here, instead, the usual PQ breaking operators  $m^2 H_u H_d$  and  $\lambda_5 (H_u H_d)^2$  are forbidden by the  $U(1)_F$  symmetry, and a massless axion then arises.  $U(1)_F$  also ensures, without the need of additional assumptions, that the Yukawa sector features natural flavour conservation [52]. However, as in 2HDM, there are additional massive Higgs scalars that must be sufficiently heavy to have so far escaped detection. These results allow us to conclude that an axion-flavour connection can be a realistic *ansatz* to tackle the strong CP problem and the puzzle of the flavour mass hierarchies in one fell swoop. On another note, it is clear that the different structure of  $\mathcal{M}_u$  and  $\mathcal{M}_d$  implies that their diagonalisation will involve structurally different bi-unitary rotations  $\mathcal{V}_{L,R}^{u,d}$ , and this might yield a too large relative misalignment between the up and down LH mixing matrices. Indeed, by denoting as  $\mathcal{V}_L^{u,d}$  the restriction of  $\mathcal{V}_L^{u,d}$  to the subspace of the three light eigenvalues, we find that in our model  $V_{\text{CKM}} = V_L^u V_L^{d\dagger}$  does not give a satisfactory description of the experimental quark mixing matrix.<sup>12</sup> This hints to the fact that the flavour symmetry on which we have based our model might be too simple. Since  $\mathcal{G}_F$  does not distinguish between the two sectors (only  $U(1)_F$  does), a single set of VEVs contributes to both the mass matrices, and this seems too constraining to account for the two different hierarchical patterns in Eq. (21) while keeping at the same time a sufficient similarity between the matrix structures  $\mathcal{M}_d \sim \mathcal{M}_u$ . For example, splitting the  $SU(2)$  factor in  $\mathcal{G}_F$  according to  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \rightarrow SU(3) \times SU(2)_u \times SU(2)_d$  would imply doubling the scalar fields carrying  $SU(2)$  indices  $X, Y \rightarrow X_u, Y_u, X_d, Y_d$ , and this can provide a way to circumvent the hierarchies/mixings clash [53].

## V. OUTLOOK AND CONCLUSIONS

The *origin* and *quality* problems of the PQ symmetry can be solved by postulating a new local symmetry, suitable to enforce automatically the invariance of the renormalizable Lagrangian under a global anomalous  $U(1)$  symmetry, and able to protect this symmetry from explicit breaking by effective operators up to some remarkably large dimension. We have shown that a class of symmetries that can yield this result are based on a

semi-simple *rectangular* gauge group  $\mathcal{G}_F$  extended by a local  $U(1)_F$  factor. Since neither group factors of large degree nor large fermion representations are required, such symmetries can be straightforwardly interpreted as flavour symmetries acting on the SM quarks. The VEVs of the scalar multiplets that break the flavour symmetry also break  $U(1)_{\text{PQ}}$  giving rise to an axion, while the structure of these VEVs can be responsible for the SM flavour hierarchies that are generated dynamically, without the need of hierarchical fundamental parameters. We have provided one example in which the SM mass ratios are reproduced as a result of minimisation of the scalar potential. Clearly, other models can be constructed along the same lines outlined in this paper, and we are currently exploring the landscape of possible models in search for the most economical and elegant realisations. From the phenomenological point of view, it is interesting to note that while the flavour (and PQ) breaking scale must be sufficiently large to render the axion invisible  $f_a \sim V \gg v$ , experimental signatures of this type of constructions can still be within experimental reach. This is because small mass ratios like  $m_u/m_t \sim 10^{-5}$  must originate from a hierarchy between the VEVs of some scalar multiplets components. Then, even if we assume that the largest VEVs are of the order of the axion scale, e.g.  $f_a \sim 10^{10}$  GeV, some scalar component must acquire a much smaller VEV, of the order of  $f_a m_u/m_t \lesssim 100$  TeV. Hence, it is not unreasonable to speculate that some flavoured gauge bosons could have a mass below the 100 TeV scale, and could then give rise to observable effects in high precision flavour-related measurement. Clearly, after a VEV structure that is able to reproduce the SM flavour parameters has been identified, it would be not difficult to reconstruct, from the values of the VEVs of the scalar components, the spectrum of the flavoured gauge bosons, and derive phenomenological predictions. This type of phenomenological studies is left for future work.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We acknowledge several discussions with F.P. Di Meglio, G. Grilli di Cortona, L. di Luzio and A. Salvio. L.D. is supported by the European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation programme under the Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement No 101028626 from 01.09.2021. E.N. is supported by the INFN Iniziativa Specifica Theoretical Astroparticle Physics (TAsP-LNF). C.S. acknowledges hospitality and partial financial support from the LNF theory group.

<sup>12</sup>  $V_{\text{CKM}}$  is also non-unitary. However, deviations from unitarity are of  $O(v/V)$  and thus negligible.



**APPENDIX: PARAMETRIZATION OF THE SCALAR FIELDS**

In this Appendix we describe the parametrization for a set of scalar multiplets transforming under a gauge symmetry  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ . We first write the matrices of fields in their general singular value decomposition (SVD), next we manipulate the resulting expressions so that they will provide a faithful parametrization of the scalar multiplets by eliminating the redundant degrees of freedom (d.o.f.). Finally we make use of the full local gauge symmetry to gauge away additional d.o.f. This last step fixes completely the gauge. We carry out this study for the set of scalar representations corresponding to the multiplets  $Y, Z, K, X$  introduced in the model of Section IV, however, this example is sufficiently general to render clear how one should proceed with other sets of multiplets.

The SVD gives the following forms for the scalar fields (recall that in terms of the number of rows and columns the field matrices are  $Y = Y_{3 \times 2}, Z = Z_{3 \times 1}, K = K_{3 \times 1}, X = X_{1 \times 2}$ ):

$$Y = \mathcal{V}_Y^\dagger \hat{Y} e^{i\xi_Y} \mathcal{U}_Y, \quad [6_R + 6_I \text{ vs. } 6_R + 8_I], \quad \mathcal{V}_Y \in SU(3), \quad \mathcal{U}_Y \in SU(2), \quad \hat{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} y_1 & 0 \\ 0 & y_2 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (22)$$

$$Z = \mathcal{V}_Z^\dagger \hat{Z} e^{i\xi_Z}, \quad [3_R + 3_I \text{ vs. } 4_R + 6_I], \quad \mathcal{V}_Z \in SU(3) \quad \hat{Z} = \begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

$$K = \mathcal{V}_K^\dagger \hat{K} e^{i\xi_K}, \quad [3_R + 3_I \text{ vs. } 4_R + 6_I], \quad \mathcal{V}_K \in SU(3) \quad \hat{K} = \begin{pmatrix} k_1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

$$X = \hat{X} e^{i\xi_X} \mathcal{U}_X, \quad [2_R + 2_I \text{ vs. } 2_R + 3_I], \quad \mathcal{U}_X \in SU(2) \quad \hat{X} = (x_1 \ 0). \quad (25)$$

In the square brackets we have indicated the number of real (R) and imaginary (I) d.o.f. of the multiplet, versus the number of parameters entering their SVD. The number of redundant parameters in the SVD is:  $(+2_I)$  for  $Y$ ,  $(+1_R, +3_I)$  for  $Z$  and  $K$  and  $(+1_I)$  for  $X$ . The redundancies can be eliminated by constraining the matrices  $\mathcal{V}$  and  $\mathcal{U}$  to depend on a reduced number of parameters with respect to general special unitary matrices (3 real angles and 5 phases for  $SU(3)$ , 1 real angle and 2 phases for  $SU(2)$ ). The matrices  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{V}$  can be thought as describing general  $SU(2)$  and  $SU(3)$  finite transformations, and can be parametrized in the following way [54]:

$$\mathcal{U} = \Theta U, \quad \mathcal{V} = \Phi V_x V_z V_y, \quad (26)$$

with

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} c_{\alpha_u} & -s_{\alpha_u} e^{-i\beta_u} \\ s_{\alpha_u} e^{i\beta_u} & c_{\alpha_u} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Theta = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\theta} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\theta} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{cases} -\pi \leq \alpha_u < \pi \\ -\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \beta_u, \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \end{cases} \quad (27)$$

$$V_x = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c_{\alpha_x} & -s_{\alpha_x} e^{-i\beta_x} \\ 0 & s_{\alpha_x} e^{i\beta_x} & c_{\alpha_x} \end{pmatrix}, \quad V_y = \begin{pmatrix} c_{\alpha_y} & 0 & -s_{\alpha_y} e^{-i\beta_y} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ s_{\alpha_y} e^{i\beta_y} & 0 & c_{\alpha_y} \end{pmatrix},$$

$$V_z = \begin{pmatrix} c_{\gamma_z} & -s_{\gamma_z} e^{-i\beta_z} & 0 \\ s_{\gamma_z} e^{i\beta_z} & c_{\gamma_z} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \Phi = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\varphi_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\varphi_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-i(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{cases} -\pi \leq \alpha_x, \alpha_y < \pi \\ -\frac{\pi}{2} \leq \gamma_z, \beta_{x,y,z}, \varphi_{1,2} \leq \frac{\pi}{2} \end{cases}. \quad (28)$$

One should pay attention to the ordering in  $\mathcal{V} \sim (V_x \cdot V_z \cdot V_y)$  and to the fact that the angle  $\gamma_z \in V_z$  is a ‘‘latitude’’ angle that ranges in the interval  $\gamma_z \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$  while  $\alpha_x, \alpha_y \in V_{x,y}$  are ‘‘longitude’’ angle whose range is  $[-\pi, \pi)$ . The two phases  $\xi_Y$  and  $\theta_Y \in \mathcal{U}_Y$  can be eliminated from the SVD in Eq. (22) by redefining in the diagonal matrix of phases  $\Phi_Y \varphi_1 \rightarrow \tilde{\varphi}_1 = \varphi_1 - \xi_Y - \theta_Y$  and  $\varphi_2 \rightarrow \tilde{\varphi}_2 = \varphi_2 - \xi_Y + \theta_Y$ , eliminating the  $(2_I)$  redundancy. For  $Z$  (and similarly for  $K$ ) the phases  $\varphi_2, -(\varphi_1 + \varphi_2) \in \Phi_Z$  as well as the matrix  $V_x^\dagger$ , can be dropped since they act on the vanishing entries of  $\hat{Z}$ , and we can redefine  $\xi_Z \rightarrow \tilde{\xi}_Z = \xi_Z - \varphi_1$  thus eliminating the redundant  $(1_R, 3_I)$  parameters. Finally the redundant phase in  $X$  can be absorbed by redefining  $\theta_X \rightarrow \tilde{\theta}_X = \theta_X + \xi_X$ . All in all we have

$$Y = \mathcal{V}_Y^\dagger \hat{Y} U_Y, \quad Z = (V_Z V_{Zy})^\dagger \hat{Z} e^{i\xi_Z}, \quad K = (V_K V_{Ky})^\dagger \hat{K} e^{i\xi_K}, \quad X = \hat{X} \Theta U_X = \hat{X} \tilde{U}_X \Theta, \quad (29)$$

where in the last relation  $\tilde{U}_X = \Theta U_X \Theta^\dagger = U_X(\alpha_u, \beta_u - 2\theta)$ .

Let us now proceed with  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  gauge fixing. We can use a full  $SU(3)$  transformation  $\mathcal{V}$  to remove  $\mathcal{V}_Y$  and the  $U$  piece of the  $SU(2)$  transformation  $\mathcal{U} = \Theta U$  to remove  $U_Y$ , so that  $Y = \hat{Y}$ . Next we can use the  $\Theta$  part of the  $\mathcal{U}$  transformation to set  $X = \hat{X}\tilde{U}_X$ , and finally we can use the  $U(1)$  gauge symmetry to eliminate  $\xi_Z$ . Resuming, after gauging away  $(4_R + 8_I)$  components we have:

$$Y = \hat{Y}, \quad Z = (V_{Zz} V_{Zy})^\dagger \hat{Z}, \quad K = (V_{Kz} V_{Ky})^\dagger \hat{K} e^{i\xi_K} \quad (-\pi \leq \xi_K < \pi), \quad X = \hat{X}\tilde{U}_X. \quad (30)$$

Note that the  $U(1)$  phase  $\xi_K$  ranges in the full  $2\pi$  interval, and this is because  $\gamma_{Kz} \in [-\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}]$ , so that the effect of  $\xi_K \rightarrow \xi_K + \pi$  cannot be reproduced by a  $\pi$ -shift of  $\gamma_{Kz}$ .

In summary, we started with a total of  $(14_R, 14_I)$  scalar d.o.f.. By means of the  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  symmetry we have gauged away  $(3_R + 5_I) + (1_R + 2_I) + 1_I$  d.o.f. leaving  $(10_R + 6_I)$  d.o.f.: 5 moduli  $(y_1, y_2, z_1, k_1, x_1)$ , 5 angles of which 3 of longitude  $(\alpha_{Zy}, \alpha_{Ky}, \alpha_u)$  and two of latitude  $(\gamma_{Zz}, \gamma_{Kz})$  and 6 phases, one of longitude  $(\xi_K)$  and 5 of latitude  $(\beta_{Zy}, \beta_{Zz}, \beta_{Ky}, \beta_{Kz}, \beta_u)$ . This matches the counting of the parameters in Eq. (30). Note that since at this stage we have used the whole gauge freedom, any other scalar multiplet transforming under  $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$  has to be parametrised in the non-redundant SVD form given in Eq. (29).

- 
- [1] R. D. Peccei and Helen R. Quinn, “CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **38**, 1440–1443 (1977).
- [2] R. D. Peccei and Helen R. Quinn, “Constraints Imposed by CP Conservation in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev.* **D16**, 1791–1797 (1977).
- [3] Steven Weinberg, “A New Light Boson?” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 223–226 (1978).
- [4] Frank Wilczek, “Problem of Strong p and t Invariance in the Presence of Instantons,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 279–282 (1978).
- [5] Curtis G. Callan, Jr., R. F. Dashen, and David J. Gross, “The Structure of the Gauge Theory Vacuum,” *Phys. Lett.* **B63**, 334–340 (1976), [357(1976)].
- [6] R. Jackiw and C. Rebbi, “Vacuum Periodicity in a Yang-Mills Quantum Theory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **37**, 172–175 (1976), [353(1976)].
- [7] Jihn E. Kim, “Weak Interaction Singlet and Strong CP Invariance,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **43**, 103 (1979).
- [8] Mikhail A. Shifman, A. I. Vainshtein, and Valentin I. Zakharov, “Can Confinement Ensure Natural CP Invariance of Strong Interactions?” *Nucl. Phys.* **B166**, 493 (1980).
- [9] A. R. Zhitnitsky, “On Possible Suppression of the Axion Hadron Interactions. (In Russian),” *Sov. J. Nucl. Phys.* **31**, 260 (1980), [*Yad. Fiz.*31,497(1980)].
- [10] Michael Dine, Willy Fischler, and Mark Srednicki, “A Simple Solution to the Strong CP Problem with a Harmless Axion,” *Phys. Lett.* **B104**, 199–202 (1981).
- [11] Michael Dine and Nathan Seiberg, “String Theory and the Strong CP Problem,” *Nucl. Phys.* **B273**, 109–124 (1986).
- [12] Stephen M. Barr and D. Seckel, “Planck scale corrections to axion models,” *Phys. Rev.* **D46**, 539–549 (1992).
- [13] Marc Kamionkowski and John March-Russell, “Planck scale physics and the Peccei-Quinn mechanism,” *Phys. Lett.* **B282**, 137–141 (1992), [arXiv:hep-th/9202003 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [14] Richard Holman, Stephen D. H. Hsu, Thomas W. Kephart, Edward W. Kolb, Richard Watkins, and Lawrence M. Widrow, “Solutions to the strong CP problem in a world with gravity,” *Phys. Lett.* **B282**, 132–136 (1992), [arXiv:hep-ph/9203206 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] S. Ghigna, Maurizio Lusignoli, and M. Roncadelli, “Instability of the invisible axion,” *Phys. Lett.* **B283**, 278–281 (1992).
- [16] Lisa Randall, “Composite axion models and Planck scale physics,” *Phys. Lett.* **B284**, 77–80 (1992).
- [17] Michele Redi and Ryosuke Sato, “Composite Accidental Axions,” *JHEP* **05**, 104 (2016), [arXiv:1602.05427 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [18] Benjamin Lillard and Tim M. P. Tait, “A High Quality Composite Axion,” *JHEP* **11**, 199 (2018), [arXiv:1811.03089 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] Hye-Sung Lee and Wen Yin, “Peccei-Quinn symmetry from a hidden gauge group structure,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99**, 015041 (2019), [arXiv:1811.04039 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] M. B. Gavela, M. Ibe, P. Quilez, and T. T. Yanagida, “Automatic Peccei-Quinn symmetry,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **79**, 542 (2019), [arXiv:1812.08174 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [21] Luca Vecchi, “Axion quality straight from the GUT,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81**, 938 (2021), [arXiv:2106.15224 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] Roberto Contino, Alessandro Podo, and Filippo Revello, “Chiral models of composite axions and accidental Peccei-Quinn symmetry,” *JHEP* **04**, 180 (2022), [arXiv:2112.09635 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] Lawrence M. Krauss and Frank Wilczek, “Discrete Gauge Symmetry in Continuum Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 1221 (1989).
- [24] E. J. Chun and A. Lukas, “Discrete gauge symmetries in axionic extensions of the SSM,” *Phys. Lett. B* **297**, 298–304 (1992), [arXiv:hep-ph/9209208](#).
- [25] Alex G. Dias, V. Pleitez, and M. D. Tonasse, “Naturally light invisible axion in models with large local discrete symmetries,” *Phys. Rev.* **D67**, 095008 (2003), [arXiv:hep-ph/0211107 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] Linda M. Carpenter, Michael Dine, and Guido Festuccia, “Dynamics of the Peccei Quinn Scale,” *Phys. Rev.* **D80**, 125017 (2009),

- arXiv:0906.1273 [hep-th].
- [27] Keisuke Harigaya, Masahiro Ibe, Kai Schmitz, and Tsutomu T. Yanagida, “Peccei-Quinn symmetry from a gauged discrete R symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88**, 075022 (2013), arXiv:1308.1227 [hep-ph].
- [28] A. G. Dias, A. C. B. Machado, C. C. Nishi, A. Ringwald, and P. Vaudrevange, “The Quest for an Intermediate-Scale Accidental Axion and Further ALPs,” *JHEP* **06**, 037 (2014), arXiv:1403.5760 [hep-ph].
- [29] Keisuke Harigaya, Masahiro Ibe, Kai Schmitz, and Tsutomu T. Yanagida, “Peccei-Quinn Symmetry from Dynamical Supersymmetry Breaking,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92**, 075003 (2015), arXiv:1505.07388 [hep-ph].
- [30] Andreas Ringwald and Ken’ichi Saikawa, “Axion dark matter in the post-inflationary Peccei-Quinn symmetry breaking scenario,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93**, 085031 (2016), [Addendum: *Phys. Rev. D* **94**, no. 4, 049908 (2016)], arXiv:1512.06436 [hep-ph].
- [31] Luca Di Luzio, Enrico Nardi, and Lorenzo Ubaldi, “Accidental Peccei-Quinn symmetry protected to arbitrary order,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 011801 (2017), arXiv:1704.01122 [hep-ph].
- [32] Marco Ardu, Luca Di Luzio, Giacomo Landini, Alessandro Strumia, Daniele Teresi, and Jin-Wei Wang, “Axion quality from the (anti)symmetric of  $SU(\mathcal{N})$ ,” *JHEP* **11**, 090 (2020), arXiv:2007.12663 [hep-ph].
- [33] Wen Yin, “Scale and quality of Peccei-Quinn symmetry and weak gravity conjectures,” *JHEP* **10**, 032 (2020), arXiv:2007.13320 [hep-ph].
- [34] Benjamin Lillard and Tim M. P. Tait, “A Composite Axion from a Supersymmetric Product Group,” *JHEP* **11**, 005 (2017), arXiv:1707.04261 [hep-ph].
- [35] Yuichiro Nakai and Motoo Suzuki, “Axion Quality from Superconformal Dynamics,” *Phys. Lett. B* **816**, 136239 (2021), arXiv:2102.01329 [hep-ph].
- [36] Gongjun Choi and Tsutomu T. Yanagida, “High Quality Axion in Supersymmetric Models,” (2022), arXiv:2209.09290 [hep-ph].
- [37] Christopher T. Hill and Adam K. Leibovich, “Deconstructing 5-D QED,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 016006 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0205057.
- [38] Christopher T. Hill and Adam K. Leibovich, “Natural Theories of Ultralow Mass PNCB’s: Axions and Quintessence,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66**, 075010 (2002), arXiv:hep-ph/0205237.
- [39] Masaki Yamada and Tsutomu T. Yanagida, “A natural and simple UV completion of the QCD axion model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **816**, 136267 (2021), arXiv:2101.10350 [hep-ph].
- [40] Gia Dvali, “Strong-CP with and without gravity,” (2022), arXiv:2209.14219 [hep-ph].
- [41] Luc Darmé and Enrico Nardi, “Exact accidental  $U(1)$  symmetries for the axion,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 055013 (2021), arXiv:2102.05055 [hep-ph].
- [42] Jihn E. Kim, “Natural embedding of Peccei-Quinn symmetry in flavor grand unification,” *Phys. Rev. D* **26**, 3221 (1982).
- [43] Anne Ernst, Andreas Ringwald, and Carlos Tamarit, “Axion Predictions in  $SO(10) \times U(1)_{PQ}$  Models,” *JHEP* **02**, 103 (2018), arXiv:1801.04906 [hep-ph].
- [44] Luca Di Luzio, “Accidental  $SO(10)$  axion from gauged flavour,” *JHEP* **11**, 074 (2020), arXiv:2008.09119 [hep-ph].
- [45] Enrico Nardi, “Naturally large Yukawa hierarchies,” *Phys. Rev. D* **84**, 036008 (2011), arXiv:1105.1770 [hep-ph].
- [46] Jose R. Espinosa, Chee Sheng Fong, and Enrico Nardi, “Yukawa hierarchies from spontaneous breaking of the  $SU(3)_L \times SU(3)_R$  flavour symmetry?” *JHEP* **02**, 137 (2013), arXiv:1211.6428 [hep-ph].
- [47] Chee Sheng Fong and Enrico Nardi, “Quark masses, mixings, and CP violation from spontaneous breaking of flavor  $SU(3)^3$ ,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89**, 036008 (2014), arXiv:1307.4412 [hep-ph].
- [48] Enrico Nardi and Esteban Roulet, “Are exotic stable quarks cosmologically allowed?” *Phys. Lett. B* **245**, 105–110 (1990).
- [49] Chen Jacoby and Shmuel Nussinov, “The Relic Abundance of Massive Colored Particles after a Late Hadronic Annihilation Stage,” (2007), arXiv:0712.2681 [hep-ph].
- [50] Motohiko Kusakabe and Tomohiro Takesako, “Resonant annihilation of long-lived massive colored particles through hadronic collisions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **85**, 015005 (2012), arXiv:1112.0860 [hep-ph].
- [51] Guo-yuan Huang and Shun Zhou, “Precise Values of Running Quark and Lepton Masses in the Standard Model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103**, 016010 (2021), arXiv:2009.04851 [hep-ph].
- [52] Sheldon L. Glashow and Steven Weinberg, “Natural Conservation Laws for Neutral Currents,” *Phys. Rev. D* **15**, 1958 (1977).
- [53] Luc Darmé, Francesco Paolo Di Meglio, Enrico Nardi, Alberto Salvio, and Clemente Smarra, “The Axion flavour connection: The Sequel.” (In preparation).
- [54] F.D. Murnaghan, *The Unitary and Rotation Groups*, Lectures on applied mathematics (Spartan Books, 1962).