

Neutrino Mass and Mixing with Modular Symmetry

Gui-Jun Ding^a Stephen F. King^b

^a*Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, China*

^b*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton, SO17 1BJ, U.K.*

E-mail: dinggj@ustc.edu.cn, king@soton.ac.uk

ABSTRACT: This is a review article about neutrino mass and mixing and flavour model building strategies based on modular symmetry. After a brief survey of neutrino mass and lepton mixing, and various Majorana seesaw mechanisms, we construct and parameterise the lepton mixing matrix and summarise the latest global fits, before discussing the flavour problem of the Standard Model. We then introduce some simple patterns of lepton mixing, introduce family (or flavour) symmetries, and show how they may be applied to direct, semi-direct and tri-direct CP models, where the simple patterns of lepton mixing, or corrected versions of them, may be enforced by the full family symmetry or a part of it, leading to mixing sum rules. We then turn to the main subject of this review, namely a pedagogical introduction to modular symmetry as a candidate for family symmetry, from the bottom-up point of view. After an informal introduction to modular symmetry, we introduce the modular group, and discuss its fixed points and residual symmetry, assuming supersymmetry throughout. We then introduce finite modular groups of level N and modular forms with integer or rational modular weights, corresponding to simple geometric groups or their double or metaplectic covers, including the most general finite modular groups and vector-valued modular forms, with detailed results for $N = 2, 3, 4, 5$. The interplay between modular symmetry and generalized CP symmetry is discussed, deriving CP transformations on matter multiplets and modular forms, highlighting the CP fixed points and their implications. In general, compactification of extra dimensions generally leads to a number of moduli, and modular invariance with factorizable and non-factorizable multiple moduli based on symplectic modular invariance and automorphic forms is reviewed. Modular strategies for understanding fermion mass hierarchies are discussed, including the weighton mechanism, small deviations from fixed points, and texture zeroes. Then examples of modular models are discussed based on single modulus A_4 models, a minimal S'_4 model of leptons (and quarks), and a multiple moduli model based on three S_4 groups capable of reproducing the Littlest Seesaw model. We then extend the discussion to include Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) based on modular (flipped) $SU(5)$ and $SO(10)$. Finally we briefly mention some issues related to top-down approaches based on string theory, including eclectic flavour symmetry and moduli stabilisation, before concluding.

KEYWORDS: Beyond the Standard Model, Supersymmetric Models, Neutrino Physics

¹Review article submitted for publication in Reports on Progress in Physics

Contents

1	Introduction to neutrino mass and lepton mixing	2
1.1	A brief survey of neutrino mass and mixing	2
1.2	Majorana seesaw mechanisms	6
1.2.1	Type I seesaw	6
1.2.2	Minimal seesaw extension of the Standard Model	7
1.2.3	(Constrained) Sequential Dominance	9
1.2.4	Type II seesaw mechanism	9
1.2.5	Other Majorana seesaw mechanisms	10
1.3	Constructing the Lepton Mixing Matrix	11
1.4	Neutrino mass and lepton mixing - the global fits	12
1.5	The flavour puzzle of the Standard Model	13
2	Neutrino Mass and Mixing Models without Modular Symmetry	14
2.1	Simple patterns of lepton mixing	14
2.2	Symmetry of the lepton mass matrices	15
2.3	Direct Models	16
2.4	Semi-direct and tri-direct CP models	17
3	Introduction to modular symmetry	18
3.1	What is modular symmetry?	18
3.2	The modular group	20
3.3	Fixed points of modulus and residual modular symmetry	23
3.4	Modular invariant supersymmetric theories	25
4	Modular forms and finite modular groups	26
4.1	Modular forms	26
4.2	Even weight modular forms and inhomogeneous finite modular group	29
4.2.1	Constructing even weight modular forms of level 3	30
4.3	Integer weight modular forms and homogeneous finite modular groups	34
4.4	Half-integer weight modular form and metaplectic cover	35
4.5	Multiplier system and explicit form of the rational weight modular forms	39
4.6	Most general finite modular group and vector-valued modular form (VVMF)	41
5	CP symmetry and modular invariance	46
5.1	Generalized CP symmetry compatible with modular invariance	47
5.2	CP transformations of matter chiral multiplets φ	49
5.3	CP transformations of modular form $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$	51
5.4	CP fixed points	52
5.5	Implications for flavor mixing at CP fixed points	55

6	Modular invariance with multiple moduli	56
6.1	Factorizable moduli	56
6.2	Symplectic modular invariance	58
6.2.1	Siegel modular forms and gCP in symplectic modular invariant theory	60
6.2.2	Invariant loci in moduli space and reduced finite Siegel modular group	61
6.3	Multiple moduli and automorphic forms	63
7	Fermion mass hierarchies and texture zeros from modular symmetry	66
7.1	Weighton mechanism	66
7.2	Mass hierarchies, large lepton mixing and residual modular symmetry	68
7.3	Texture zeros and modular symmetry	72
8	Examples of modular models	74
8.1	General model building considerations and overview of models	74
8.2	Overview of A_4 modular models	75
8.3	Minimal S'_4 modular model for leptons	81
8.4	Extension of S'_4 modular model to quark sector without GUTs	84
8.5	Littlest seesaw model with modular S_4^3 symmetry and three moduli	86
9	Modular GUT	90
9.1	Modular $SU(5)$	92
9.2	Modular $SO(10)$	93
9.2.1	$SO(10)$ GUT with A_4 modular symmetry	96
9.3	Modular flipped $SU(5)$	98
10	Top-down approaches	99
10.1	Modular symmetry from String theory	99
10.2	Eclectic flavor symmetry	100
10.3	Modulus stabilization	103
11	Summary and conclusion	103
A	Derivation of Eq. (4.23)	108
B	Derive the gCP transformation of the modulus τ from consistency condition	109
C	Finite modular groups Γ'_N and Γ_N and modular forms of level N	111
C.1	$N = 2$	111
C.2	$N = 3$	112
C.3	$N = 4$	117
C.3.1	Integer weight modular forms of level 4	121
C.4	$N = 5$	123
C.4.1	Integer weight modular forms of level 5	141

1 Introduction to neutrino mass and lepton mixing

Neutrino physics holds a unique place in particle physics as the only sector which demands new physics beyond the Standard Model (BSM). We know this is the case since the origin of neutrino mass and mixing is not present in the SM and is so far unknown. Moreover, neutrino physics forms a part of the flavour puzzle, the unexplained origin of the three fermion families, and their puzzling pattern of hierarchical masses and mixing parameters, namely the mixing angles and CP violating phases. In this section we first give a brief survey of neutrino mass and lepton mixing, and then discuss various Majorana seesaw mechanisms. We then construct and parameterise the lepton mixing matrix and summarise the latest global fits, before discussing the flavour problem of the Standard Model.

1.1 A brief survey of neutrino mass and mixing

A brief history of neutrino oscillation discoveries in the period 1998-2012 indicates the rapid development of this field, from the SM starting point of zero neutrino mass and mixing, to the BSM situation where three neutrino mixing is required:

- 1998 Atmospheric ν_μ disappear, large atmospheric mixing (SK)
- 2002 Solar ν_e disappear, large solar mixing (SK, after Homestake and Gallium)
- 2002 Solar ν_e appear as ν_μ and ν_τ (SNO)
- 2004 Reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$ oscillations observed (KamLAND)
- 2004 Accelerator ν_μ disappear (K2K)
- 2006 Accelerator ν_μ disappearance confirmed (MINOS)
- 2010 Accelerator ν_μ appear as ν_τ (OPERA)
- 2011 Accelerator ν_μ appear as ν_e (T2K, MINOS)
- 2012 Reactor $\bar{\nu}_e$ disappear, reactor mixing measured (Daya Bay, RENO)

It is known that neutrino oscillations only depend on the two mass squared differences $\Delta m_{21}^2 \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2$, which is constrained by data to be positive, and $\Delta m_{31}^2 \equiv m_3^2 - m_1^2$, which current data allows to take a positive (normal) or negative (inverted) value. The neutrino oscillation data may be further parameterised by three lepton mixing angles, and one CP violating phase, whose precise definitions will be discussed later. The 1998 atmospheric neutrino oscillation data was consistent with equal bi-maximal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing, corresponding to a maximal atmospheric mixing angle θ_{23} of roughly 45° [1]. The 2002 solar neutrino oscillation data was consistent with equal tri-maximal $\nu_e - \nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ mixing, corresponding to a solar mixing angle θ_{12} determined to be roughly 35° [2]. The 2012 reactor oscillation




Figure 1. Neutrino oscillation data allows two possible orderings of neutrino squared masses (normal on the left and inverted on the right). In each case the colour coded ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ probability composition of each of the mass eigenstates is shown. Neutrino oscillation data is consistent with an approximate tri-bimaximal mixing pattern, namely roughly equal $\nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ composition for one mass eigenstate and roughly equal $\nu_e - \nu_\mu - \nu_\tau$ for another. Neutrino oscillation experiments do not determine the absolute neutrino mass scale, only the mass squared differences.

experiments were consistent with a reactor mixing angle θ_{13} of around 8.5° [3, 4]. Note that no single experiment to date is able to determine the CP violating oscillation phase. Our present understanding of neutrino mass and mixing is summarised in figure 1.

These milestones have led to a remarkable transformation of our knowledge of the neutrino sector, from the pre-1998 situation where neutrino masses could be zero, in accordance with the SM expectation, to our present understanding which may be characterised as follows:

- Neutrinos have exceptionally small masses, a million times smaller than m_e .
- At least two neutrino masses are not so hierarchical, unlike charged fermion masses.
- Neutrino masses break individual lepton numbers L_e, L_μ, L_τ
- Neutrino masses may or may not respect total lepton number $L = L_e + L_\mu + L_\tau$, depending on them being Dirac or Majorana in nature.
- Neutrinos are observed to mix a lot, within a three-neutrino mixing paradigm, where the largest (atmospheric and solar) mixing angles are much larger than any mixing in the quark sector, and the smallest lepton mixing angle (the reactor angle) being comparable to the largest quark mixing angle (the Cabibbo angle).

Although we have learned quite a lot about the lepton mixing angles and neutrino masses, it is worth summarising what we still don't know:

- Is leptonic \mathcal{CP} symmetry violated?
- Does θ_{23} belong to the first octant ($< 45^\circ$) or the second octant ($> 45^\circ$)?
- Are the neutrino mass squareds normal ordered (NO) or inverted ordered (IO)?
- What is the lightest neutrino mass value?
- Are the neutrino masses of the Dirac or Majorana type?

In the SM, there are three neutrinos ν_e, ν_μ, ν_τ which all massless and are distinguished by separate lepton numbers L_e, L_μ, L_τ . The neutrinos and antineutrinos are distinguished by total lepton number $L = \pm 1$. Clearly we must go beyond the SM to understand the origin of the tiny neutrino masses. It is important to recall that, in the SM, neutrinos are massless for three reasons:

- There are no right-handed (RH) sterile neutrinos ν_R in the SM;
- In the SM there are no Higgs in $SU(2)_L$ triplet representation;
- The SM Lagrangian is renormalisable.

In order to account for neutrino mass and mixing, at least one or more of these conditions must therefore be relaxed. For instance, if RH (sterile) neutrinos ν_R are included, then the usual Higgs mechanism of the SM yields Dirac neutrino mass in the same way as for the electron mass m_e . This would break L_e, L_μ, L_τ , but preserve L and $B - L$. According to this simplest possibility, the Yukawa term would be $Y_\nu \bar{L} H_u \nu_R$, in the standard notation, and $Y_\nu \sim 10^{-12}$. By comparison, the electron mass has a Yukawa coupling eigenvalue Y_e of about 10^{-6} .

According to the above argument, Dirac neutrino Yukawa couplings are a million times smaller than that of the electron. However there have been many attempts which yield Dirac neutrinos without relying on such tiny Yukawa couplings [5–27]. For example, a Dirac seesaw mechanism has been proposed as an ultraviolet completion of the dimension-five operator $\frac{1}{\Lambda} \bar{L} \nu_R H S$, where S is a scalar and Λ denotes the scale of heavy intermediate particles, and renormalisable Dirac terms are forbidden by an extra symmetry. Although there are several types of Dirac seesaw mechanisms, the minimal models all rely on a Z_2 symmetry [24], under which ν_R and S are odd, where the S vacuum expectation value (VEV) spontaneously breaks the symmetry. This leads to cosmological domain wall formation, where a soft Z_2 breaking term leads to their annihilation, resulting in gravitational waves with a peaked spectrum [28], unlike those produced from spontaneous breaking of $U(1)_{B-L}$ or $U(1)_L$ in Majorana models which leads to cosmic strings and a flatter spectrum.

As mentioned above, neutrinos may have a Majorana mass which would break L and $B - L$, leading to neutrinoless double beta decay. Indeed, having introduced RH neutrinos (also called sterile neutrinos, since they are SM singlets), something must prevent (large) Majorana mass terms $M_R \nu_R \nu_R$ where M_R could take any value up to the Planck scale. A conserved symmetry such as $U(1)_{B-L}$ would forbid RH neutrino masses, but if gauged (in order to be a robust symmetry) it would have to be broken at the TeV scale




Figure 2. Diagram illustrating the type I (or more precisely type Ia) seesaw mechanism. The type Ib seesaw mechanism involves replacing one of the two Higgs doublets H_u with a charge conjugated second Higgs doublet H_d^c . In the type III seesaw mechanism, the electroweak singlet RH neutrinos are replaced with fermion electroweak triplets.

or higher, allowing Majorana masses at the $U(1)_{B-L}$ breaking scale. If the symmetry is broken spontaneously this would also lead to cosmic strings and gravitational waves.

Indeed it is possible to generate left-handed (LH) Majorana neutrino masses, even without RH neutrinos. For instance, introducing a Higgs triplet Δ (written as a 2×2 matrix), LH Majorana neutrino masses arise from the term $y_M L^T(\Delta)L$, where y_M is a dimensionless coupling. Majorana masses occur once the lepton doublets L are contracted with the neutral component of the Higgs triplet which develops a VEV.

Majorana mass can also arise from non-renormalisable dimension five operators proportional to a dimensionful coupling constant κ , first proposed by Weinberg [29],

$$-\kappa L^T(HH)L = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda} \right) L^T(HH)L, \quad (1.1)$$

where λ is a dimensionless coupling constant, Λ is a mass scale and (HH) is an $SU(2)_L$ triplet combination of two Higgs doublets (written as a 2×2 matrix). This is a non-renormalisable operator, which is the lowest dimension operator which may be added to the renormalisable SM Lagrangian. We require $(\frac{\lambda}{\Lambda}) \sim 1/(10^{14}\text{GeV})$ for $m^\nu \sim 0.1$ eV. The elegant type I seesaw mechanism [30–35] identifies the mass scale Λ with the RH neutrino Majorana mass $\Lambda = M_N$, and λ with the product of Dirac Yukawa couplings $\lambda = Y_\nu^2$. Of course the situation is rather more complicated in practice since there may be three RH neutrinos and both M_N and Y_ν may be a 3×3 matrices. In this case, after integrating out the RH neutrinos [30–35], we reproduce the Weinberg operator in Eq. (1.1). This is called the type I seesaw mechanism and is discussed in more detail in the next subsection.

In general there are three classes of proposals in the literature for the new physics at the scale Λ :

- Several types of Majorana seesaw mechanisms [30–41]; also in addition low (TeV) scale seesaw mechanisms [42] (with the Weinberg operator resulting from the mass M of a heavy particle exchanged at tree-level with $\Lambda = M$). For example the type I

seesaw mechanism is illustrated diagrammatically in figure 2. To be precise, this is the type Ia seesaw mechanism since it involves two insertions of the same Higgs doublet H_u . The type Ib seesaw mechanism involves replacing one of the Higgs doublets by a charge conjugated second Higgs doublet H_d^c in the framework of a two Higgs doublet model [41], leading to a new kind of effective Weinberg operator involving the factor $(H_u H_d^c)$.

- R -parity violating supersymmetry [43] ($\Lambda = \text{TeV}$ Majorana mass neutralinos χ).
- Loop mechanisms involving new fields with masses of order the TeV-scale [44, 45] (in which the Weinberg operator arises from loop diagrams involving additional Higgs doublets/singlets);

In addition there are two classes of early¹ string-inspired explanations for neutrino mass:

- Extra dimensions [46–50] with RH neutrinos in the bulk leading to suppressed Dirac Yukawa Y_ν ;
- String inspired mechanisms [51–54].

1.2 Majorana seesaw mechanisms

There are several different kinds of seesaw mechanism in the literature. Here we shall focus on the type I and II seesaw mechanisms, which are used later in the review, although we shall also briefly discuss other seesaw mechanisms.

1.2.1 Type I seesaw

If we introduce right-handed neutrino fields then there are two sorts of additional neutrino mass terms that are possible. There are additional Majorana masses of the form

$$M_N \overline{\nu_R^c} \nu_R \sim M_N \nu_R \nu_R, \quad (1.2)$$

where ν_R is a right-handed neutrino field and ν_R^c is the CP conjugate of a right-handed neutrino field, in other words a left-handed antineutrino field. In addition there are Dirac masses arising from the Yukawa couplings which, after the Higgs VEVs are inserted, take the form in LR convention,

$$M_D \overline{\nu_L} \nu_R. \quad (1.3)$$

Such Dirac mass terms conserve lepton number, and are not forbidden by electric charge conservation even for the charged leptons and quarks.

Once this is done then the types of neutrino mass discussed in Eqs. (1.2,1.3) are permitted, and we have the mass matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{\nu_L} & \overline{\nu_R^c} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_D \\ M_D^T & M_N \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L^c \\ \nu_R \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.4)$$

¹We shall discuss some recent developments later.

Since the right-handed neutrinos are electroweak singlets the Majorana masses of the right-handed neutrinos M_N may be orders of magnitude larger than the electroweak scale. In the approximation that $M_N \gg M_D$ the matrix in Eq. (1.4) may be diagonalised to yield the approximate light effective 3×3 Majorana mass matrix,

$$M_\nu \approx -M_D M_N^{-1} M_D^T. \quad (1.5)$$

The effective left-handed Majorana masses M_ν are naturally suppressed by the heavy scale M_N . In a one family example if we take $M_D \sim M_W$ (where M_W is the mass of the W boson) and $M_N \sim M_{\text{GUT}}$ then we find $M_\nu \sim 10^{-3}$ eV which looks good for solar neutrinos. Atmospheric neutrino masses would require a right-handed neutrino with a mass below the GUT scale.

The type I seesaw mechanism can be formally derived from the following Lagrangian

$$\mathcal{L} = -\bar{\nu}_L M_D \nu_R - \frac{1}{2} \nu_R^T M_N \nu_R + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1.6)$$

where ν_L represents left-handed neutrino fields (arising from electroweak doublets), ν_R represents right-handed neutrino fields (arising from electroweak singlets), in a matrix notation where the M_D matrix elements are typically of order the charged lepton masses, while the M_N matrix elements may be much larger than the electroweak scale, and maybe up to the Planck scale. The number of right-handed neutrinos is not fixed, but the number of left-handed neutrinos is equal to three. Below the mass scale of the right-handed neutrinos we can integrate them out using the equations of motion

$$\frac{d\mathcal{L}}{d\nu_R} = 0, \quad (1.7)$$

which gives

$$\nu_R^T = -\bar{\nu}_L M_D M_N^{-1}, \quad \nu_R = -M_N^{-1} M_D^T \bar{\nu}_L^T. \quad (1.8)$$

Substituting back into the original Lagrangian we find

$$\mathcal{L} = -\frac{1}{2} \bar{\nu}_L M_\nu \nu_L^c + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1.9)$$

with M_ν as in Eq. (1.5). Note that if we had assumed a RL convention for Dirac masses this would have led to a charge conjugated definition of M_ν , where both conventions appear frequently in the literature.

1.2.2 Minimal seesaw extension of the Standard Model

We now briefly discuss what the Standard Model looks like, assuming a minimal seesaw extension. In the Standard Model Dirac mass terms for charged leptons and quarks are generated from Yukawa type couplings to Higgs doublets whose vacuum expectation value gives the Dirac mass term. Neutrino masses are zero in the Standard Model because right-handed neutrinos are not present, and also because the Majorana mass terms of left-handed neutrinos require Higgs triplets in order to be generated at the renormalisable level. The simplest way to generate neutrino masses from a renormalisable theory is to introduce

right-handed neutrinos, as in the type I seesaw mechanism, which we assume here. The Lagrangian for the lepton sector of the Standard Model containing three right-handed neutrinos with heavy Majorana masses in Weyl fermion notation is²

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = - \left[\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{Y}_e^{ij} H_d^\alpha L_i^\beta e_j^c - \epsilon_{\alpha\beta} \tilde{Y}_\nu^{ij} H_u^\alpha L_i^\beta \nu_j^c + \frac{1}{2} \nu_i^c \tilde{M}_N^{ij} \nu_j^c \right] + \text{h.c.} , \quad (1.10)$$

where $\epsilon_{\alpha\beta} = -\epsilon_{\beta\alpha}$, $\epsilon_{12} = 1$, and the remaining notation is standard except that the 3 right-handed neutrinos ν_R^i have been replaced by their CP conjugates ν_i^c , and \tilde{M}_N^{ij} is a complex symmetric Majorana matrix. When the two Higgs doublets get their VEVs $\langle H_u^{\alpha=2} \rangle = v_u$, $\langle H_d^{\alpha=1} \rangle = v_d$, where the ratio of VEVs is defined to be $\tan \beta \equiv v_u/v_d$, we find the terms

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = -v_d \tilde{Y}_e^{ij} e_i e_j^c - v_u \tilde{Y}_\nu^{ij} \nu_i \nu_j^c - \frac{1}{2} \tilde{M}_N^{ij} \nu_i^c \nu_j^c + \text{h.c.} . \quad (1.11)$$

Replacing CP conjugate fields we can write in a matrix notation

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = -\bar{e}_L v_d \tilde{Y}_e^* e_R - \bar{\nu}_L v_u \tilde{Y}_\nu^* \nu_R - \frac{1}{2} \nu_R^T M_N \nu_R + \text{h.c.} , \quad (1.12)$$

where $M_N = \tilde{M}_N^*$. It is convenient to work in the diagonal charged lepton basis

$$\text{diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau) = V_{eL}^\dagger v_d \tilde{Y}_e^* V_{eR} , \quad (1.13)$$

and the diagonal right-handed neutrino basis

$$\text{diag}(M_1, M_2, M_3) = V_{\nu R}^T M_N V_{\nu R} , \quad (1.14)$$

where $V_{eL}, V_{eR}, V_{\nu R}$ are unitary transformations. This is commonly referred to as the flavour basis. In the flavour basis the neutrino Yukawa couplings are given by

$$Y_\nu = V_{eL}^\dagger \tilde{Y}_\nu^* V_{\nu R} , \quad (1.15)$$

and the Lagrangian in this basis is

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = & - (\bar{e}_L \ \bar{\mu}_L \ \bar{\tau}_L) \text{diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau) (e_R \ \mu_R \ \tau_R)^T \\ & - (\bar{\nu}_{eL} \ \bar{\nu}_{\mu L} \ \bar{\nu}_{\tau L}) v_u Y_\nu (\nu_{R1} \ \nu_{R2} \ \nu_{R3})^T \\ & - \frac{1}{2} (\nu_{R1} \ \nu_{R2} \ \nu_{R3}) \text{diag}(M_1, M_2, M_3) (\nu_{R1} \ \nu_{R2} \ \nu_{R3})^T + \text{h.c.} . \end{aligned} \quad (1.16)$$

After integrating out the right-handed neutrinos (the seesaw mechanism) we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}_{\text{mass}} = & - (\bar{e}_L \ \bar{\mu}_L \ \bar{\tau}_L) \text{diag}(m_e, m_\mu, m_\tau) (e_R \ \mu_R \ \tau_R)^T \\ & - \frac{1}{2} (\bar{\nu}_{eL} \ \bar{\nu}_{\mu L} \ \bar{\nu}_{\tau L}) M_\nu (\nu_{eL}^c \ \nu_{\mu L}^c \ \nu_{\tau L}^c)^T + \text{h.c.} , \end{aligned} \quad (1.17)$$

where the light effective left-handed Majorana neutrino mass matrix in the above basis is given by the following seesaw formula which is equivalent to Eq. (1.5),

$$M_\nu = -v_u^2 Y_\nu \text{diag}(M_1^{-1}, M_2^{-1}, M_3^{-1}) Y_\nu^T . \quad (1.18)$$

²We introduce two Higgs doublets as in the supersymmetric Standard Model, since the usual formulation of modular symmetry as discussed later requires supersymmetry. For the same reason we express the Standard Model Lagrangian in terms of left-handed fields, replacing right-handed fields ψ_R by their CP conjugates ψ^c , where the subscript R has been dropped. In the case of the minimal standard type Ia seesaw model with only one Higgs doublet, the other Higgs doublet in Eq. (1.10) is obtained by charge conjugation, i.e. $H_u \equiv H_d^c$.

1.2.3 (Constrained) Sequential Dominance

Although the type I seesaw mechanism can qualitatively explain the smallness of neutrino masses through the heavy right-handed neutrinos (RHNs), if one doesn't make other assumptions, it contains too many parameters to make any particular predictions for neutrino mass and mixing. The sequential dominance (SD) [55, 56] of right-handed neutrinos proposes that the mass spectrum of heavy Majorana neutrinos in the basis of Eq. (1.18) is strongly hierarchical, i.e. $M_1 \ll M_2 \ll M_3$, where the lightest RHN with mass M_1 is dominantly responsible for the heaviest physical neutrino mass m_3 , that with mass M_2 is mainly responsible for the second heaviest physical mass m_2 , and a third largely decoupled RHN of mass M_3 gives a very suppressed lightest neutrino mass. It leads to an effective two right-handed neutrino (2RHN) model [57, 58] with a natural explanation for the physical neutrino mass hierarchy, with normal ordering and the lightest neutrino being approximately massless, $m_1 = 0$. This is a good starting point to make predictions for the mixing angles, as follows.

After decoupling the third right-handed neutrino, the Dirac neutrino mass matrix or Yukawa matrix Y^ν in the flavour basis consists of a 3×2 matrix with the elements of the first column (d, e, f) describing the Yukawa couplings of $(\nu_{eL}, \nu_{\mu L}, \nu_{\tau L})$ to the first RH neutrino of mass M_1 , and the elements of the second column (a, b, c) describing the Yukawa couplings of $(\nu_{eL}, \nu_{\mu L}, \nu_{\tau L})$ to the second RH neutrino of mass M_2 . Then according to SD, we expect that the atmospheric mixing angle is given by $\tan \theta_{23} \sim |e|/|f|$, and the solar mixing angle is given by $\tan \theta_{12} \sim \sqrt{2}|a|/|b-c|$. Maximal atmospheric mixing suggests that $|e| \sim |f|$ and tri-maximal solar mixing suggests that $|b-c| \sim 2|a|$. Assuming $d = 0$ then the reactor angle is given by $\tan \theta_{13} \lesssim m_2/m_3$ in agreement with the data.

A very predictive structure for the minimal type I seesaw model with two right-handed neutrinos and one texture zero is the so-called constrained sequential dominance (CSD) model [59–68]. Motivated by the SD results above, the CSD(n) scheme assumes that the two columns of the Dirac neutrino mass matrix or Yukawa matrix Y^ν are accurately proportional to $(d, e, f) \propto (0, 1, 1)$ which yields approximately maximal atmospheric mixing and $(a, b, c) \propto (1, n, n-2)$ or $(a, b, c) \propto (1, n-2, n)$ where the parameter n is a real number which cancels in the formula $\tan \theta_{12} \sim \sqrt{2}|a|/|b-c|$ to yield approximate tri-maximal solar mixing. The reactor angle is given by $\tan \theta_{13} \sim (n-1)\sqrt{2}m_2/(3m_3)$. A phenomenologically viable reactor angle requires $n \approx 3$, and such models are called the Littlest Seesaw. For example the CSD(3) [61–65], CSD(2.5) [69] and CSD($1 + \sqrt{6}$) \approx CSD(3.45) [70–73], as suggested by modular symmetry, can give rise to phenomenologically viable predictions for lepton mixing parameters and the two neutrino mass squared differences Δm_{21}^2 and Δm_{31}^2 , in terms of three real input parameters [74], as discussed later in the review.

1.2.4 Type II seesaw mechanism

It is also possible to generate the dimension 5 operator in Eq. (1.1) by the exchange of heavy Higgs triplets of $SU(2)_L$, referred to as the type II seesaw mechanism [35–38]. In the




Figure 3. Diagram leading to a type II contribution M_L to the neutrino mass matrix via an induced VEV of the neutral component of a triplet Higgs Δ .

type II seesaw the general neutrino mass matrix is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \overline{\nu}_L & \overline{\nu}_R^c \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} M_L & M_D \\ M_D^T & M_N \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \nu_L^c \\ \nu_R \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.19)$$

Under the assumption that the mass eigenvalues M_i of M_N are very large compared to the components of M_L and M_D , the mass matrix can approximately be diagonalised yielding the light effective Majorana 3×3 mass matrix

$$M_\nu \approx M_L - M_D M_N^{-1} M_D^T \quad (1.20)$$

which may be compared to the type I result in Eq. (1.5). The new direct mass term M_L can provide a naturally small contribution to the light neutrino masses if it stems e.g. from a seesaw suppressed induced VEV, see figure 3. The general case, where both possibilities are allowed, is generally referred to as the type II seesaw mechanism, although people also talk about type II dominance or type I dominance, if the first or second term in Eq. (1.20) dominates.

1.2.5 Other Majorana seesaw mechanisms

It is possible to implement the Majorana seesaw in a two-stage process by introducing additional neutrino singlets S beyond the three right-handed neutrinos ν_R^i that we have considered so far. If the singlets have Majorana masses M_S , but the right-handed neutrinos have a zero Majorana mass $M_N = 0$, the seesaw mechanism may proceed via mass couplings of singlets to right-handed neutrinos M . In the basis (ν_L^c, ν_R, S) the mass matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & M_D & 0 \\ M_D^T & 0 & M \\ 0 & M^T & M_S \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.21)$$

There are two different cases often considered:

(i) Assuming $M_S \gg M$ the light physical left-handed Majorana neutrino masses are then,

$$M_\nu = -M_D M_N^{-1} M_D^T, \quad (1.22)$$

where

$$M_N = -M M_S^{-1} M^T. \quad (1.23)$$

The mass matrix of the light physical left-handed Majorana neutrino masses is then,

$$M_\nu = M_D (M^T)^{-1} M_S M^{-1} M_D^T, \quad (1.24)$$

which has a double suppression. This is called the double seesaw mechanism [75]. It is often used in GUT or string inspired neutrino mass models to explain why M_N is below the GUT or string scale.

(ii) Assuming $M_S \ll M$, the matrix has one light and two heavy quasi-degenerate states for each generation. In the limit that $M_S \rightarrow 0$ all neutrinos become massless and lepton number symmetry is restored. Close to this limit $M_S \approx 0$ one may have acceptable light neutrino masses for $M \sim 1$ TeV, allowing a testable low energy seesaw mechanism referred to as the inverse seesaw mechanism [51]. If one allows the 1-3 elements of Eq. (1.21) to be filled in by a matrix M' [76] then one obtains another version of the low energy seesaw mechanism called the linear seesaw mechanism [76, 77] with

$$M_\nu = M_D (M' M^{-1})^T + (M' M^{-1}) M_D^T. \quad (1.25)$$

1.3 Constructing the Lepton Mixing Matrix

In this subsection we discuss lepton mixing from first principles. For definiteness we consider Majorana masses, since Dirac neutrinos are completely analogous to the SM description of quarks. Consider the effective Lagrangian, in some general basis,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{lepton}}^{\text{mass}} = -v_d Y_{ij}^e \bar{e}_L^i e_R^j - \frac{1}{2} M_{ij}^\nu \bar{\nu}_L^i \nu_L^j + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1.26)$$

which is valid below the EW symmetry breaking scale, where i, j are flavour indices. We do not yet specify the mechanism responsible for the above complex symmetric Majorana neutrino matrix³ M^ν . The mass matrices may be diagonalised by unitary matrices,

$$U_{e_L}^\dagger Y^e U_{e_R} = \begin{pmatrix} y_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y_\mu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & y_\tau \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_{\nu_L}^\dagger M^\nu U_{\nu_L}^* = \begin{pmatrix} m_1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & m_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & m_3 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (1.27)$$

The charged current (CC) couplings to W^- in the flavour basis are given by $-\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \bar{e}_L^i \gamma^\mu W_\mu^- \nu_L^i$, which becomes in the mass basis, where e_L, μ_L, τ_L and ν_i are now mass eigenstates,

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{lepton}}^{CC} = -\frac{g}{\sqrt{2}} \left(\bar{e}_L \ \bar{\mu}_L \ \bar{\tau}_L \right) U_{\text{PMNS}} \gamma^\mu W_\mu^- \begin{pmatrix} \nu_{1L} \\ \nu_{2L} \\ \nu_{3L} \end{pmatrix} + \text{h.c.} \quad (1.28)$$

³For example it could arise from a seesaw mechanism as in Eq. (1.17) where here we are not in the flavour basis but in some general basis. The choice of superscript or subscript ν has no significance, thus $M^\nu = M_\nu$.

The Pontecorvo-Maki-Nakagawa-Sakata (PMNS) lepton mixing matrix is identified as⁴,

$$U_{\text{PMNS}} = U_{eL}^\dagger U_{\nu L}. \quad (1.29)$$

It is possible to remove three of the lepton phases in U_{PMNS} , using the phase invariance of m_e, m_μ, m_τ . For example, $m_e \bar{e}_L e_R$, is unchanged by $e_L \rightarrow e^{i\phi_e} e_L$ and $e_R \rightarrow e^{i\phi_e} e_R$. The three such phases $\phi_e, \phi_\mu, \phi_\tau$ may be chosen in various ways to yield an assortment of possible PMNS parameterisations one of which is the PDG standard choice discussed below. This does not apply to the Majorana mass terms $-\frac{1}{2} m_i \bar{\nu}_{iL} \nu_{iL}^c$ where m_i are real and positive, and thus the PMNS matrix may be parametrised as in Eq. (1.31) but with an extra Majorana phase matrix [79]:

$$U_{\text{PMNS}} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}c_{13} & s_{12}c_{13} & s_{13}e^{-i\delta} \\ -s_{12}c_{23} - c_{12}s_{13}s_{23}e^{i\delta} & c_{12}c_{23} - s_{12}s_{13}s_{23}e^{i\delta} & c_{13}s_{23} \\ s_{12}s_{23} - c_{12}s_{13}c_{23}e^{i\delta} & -c_{12}s_{23} - s_{12}s_{13}c_{23}e^{i\delta} & c_{13}c_{23} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\frac{\alpha_{21}}{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i\frac{\alpha_{31}}{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1.30)$$

where α_{21} and α_{31} are irremovable Majorana phases. The mixing angles θ_{13} and θ_{23} must lie between 0 and $\pi/2$, while (after reordering the masses) θ_{12} lies between 0 and $\pi/4$. The phases all lie between 0 and 2π , however we shall equivalently express δ in the range $-\pi$ to π . There is no current constraint on the Majorana phases, α_{21} and α_{31} , nor is there likely to be in the foreseeable future. The first step will be to experimentally show that neutrinos are Majorana particles, which will most likely require neutrinoless double beta decay to be discovered. Then, only after precision studies of neutrinoless double beta decay rates, will there be any hope of determining the Majorana phases α_{21} and α_{31} [80].

1.4 Neutrino mass and lepton mixing - the global fits

Neutrino physics has made remarkable progress since the discovery of neutrino mass and mixing in 1998. The reactor angle is accurately measured by Daya Bay: $\theta_{13} \approx 8.2^\circ - 8.9^\circ$ [81]. The other lepton mixing angles are determined from global fits to be in the three sigma ranges: $\theta_{12} \approx 31^\circ - 36^\circ$ and $\theta_{23} \approx 37^\circ - 52^\circ$, but the CP-violating (CPV) phase is allowed in the three sigma range $\delta \approx 108^\circ - 404^\circ$ (corresponding to a sizeable three sigma excluded region $\delta \approx 45^\circ - 107^\circ$). The best global fit values with one sigma errors are given in table 1 [82] where the meaning of the angles is given in figure 4.

The measurement of the reactor angle had a major impact on models of neutrino mass and mixing as reviewed in [83–87] (for earlier reviews see e.g. [88–90]). Despite the enormous progress in the measurement of neutrino mass and mixing, further higher precision measurements are required in order to test the hypothesis that the lepton sector is controlled by symmetry, as discussed in [74]. Fortunately, a large program of future neutrino experiments is in progress and higher accuracy is expected over the next few years.

⁴Different physically equivalent conventions appear in the literature, we follow the conventions in [78].

		Normal Ordering (best fit)		Inverted Ordering ($\Delta\chi^2 = 2.7$)	
		bfp $\pm 1\sigma$	3σ range	bfp $\pm 1\sigma$	3σ range
without SK atmospheric data	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	$0.303^{+0.012}_{-0.011}$	0.270 \rightarrow 0.341	$0.303^{+0.012}_{-0.011}$	0.270 \rightarrow 0.341
	$\theta_{12}/^\circ$	$33.41^{+0.75}_{-0.72}$	31.31 \rightarrow 35.74	$33.41^{+0.75}_{-0.72}$	31.31 \rightarrow 35.74
	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	$0.572^{+0.018}_{-0.023}$	0.406 \rightarrow 0.620	$0.578^{+0.016}_{-0.021}$	0.412 \rightarrow 0.623
	$\theta_{23}/^\circ$	$49.1^{+1.0}_{-1.3}$	39.6 \rightarrow 51.9	$49.5^{+0.9}_{-1.2}$	39.9 \rightarrow 52.1
	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	$0.02203^{+0.00056}_{-0.00059}$	0.02029 \rightarrow 0.02391	$0.02219^{+0.00060}_{-0.00057}$	0.02047 \rightarrow 0.02396
	$\theta_{13}/^\circ$	$8.54^{+0.11}_{-0.12}$	8.19 \rightarrow 8.89	$8.57^{+0.12}_{-0.11}$	8.23 \rightarrow 8.90
	$\delta_{\text{CP}}/^\circ$	197^{+42}_{-25}	108 \rightarrow 404	286^{+27}_{-32}	192 \rightarrow 360
	$\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2}$	$7.41^{+0.21}_{-0.20}$	6.82 \rightarrow 8.03	$7.41^{+0.21}_{-0.20}$	6.82 \rightarrow 8.03
$\frac{\Delta m_{3\ell}^2}{10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2}$	$+2.511^{+0.028}_{-0.027}$	+2.428 \rightarrow +2.597	$-2.498^{+0.032}_{-0.025}$	-2.581 \rightarrow -2.408	
		Normal Ordering (best fit)		Inverted Ordering ($\Delta\chi^2 = 7.1$)	
		bfp $\pm 1\sigma$	3σ range	bfp $\pm 1\sigma$	3σ range
with SK atmospheric data	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	$0.303^{+0.012}_{-0.012}$	0.270 \rightarrow 0.341	$0.303^{+0.012}_{-0.011}$	0.270 \rightarrow 0.341
	$\theta_{12}/^\circ$	$33.41^{+0.75}_{-0.72}$	31.31 \rightarrow 35.74	$33.41^{+0.75}_{-0.72}$	31.31 \rightarrow 35.74
	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	$0.451^{+0.019}_{-0.016}$	0.408 \rightarrow 0.603	$0.569^{+0.016}_{-0.021}$	0.412 \rightarrow 0.613
	$\theta_{23}/^\circ$	$42.2^{+1.1}_{-0.9}$	39.7 \rightarrow 51.0	$49.0^{+1.0}_{-1.2}$	39.9 \rightarrow 51.5
	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	$0.02225^{+0.00056}_{-0.00059}$	0.02052 \rightarrow 0.02398	$0.02223^{+0.00058}_{-0.00058}$	0.02048 \rightarrow 0.02416
	$\theta_{13}/^\circ$	$8.58^{+0.11}_{-0.11}$	8.23 \rightarrow 8.91	$8.57^{+0.11}_{-0.11}$	8.23 \rightarrow 8.94
	$\delta_{\text{CP}}/^\circ$	232^{+36}_{-26}	144 \rightarrow 350	276^{+22}_{-29}	194 \rightarrow 344
	$\frac{\Delta m_{21}^2}{10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2}$	$7.41^{+0.21}_{-0.20}$	6.82 \rightarrow 8.03	$7.41^{+0.21}_{-0.20}$	6.82 \rightarrow 8.03
$\frac{\Delta m_{3\ell}^2}{10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2}$	$+2.507^{+0.026}_{-0.027}$	+2.427 \rightarrow +2.590	$-2.486^{+0.025}_{-0.028}$	-2.570 \rightarrow -2.406	

Table 1. The NuFIT 5.2 results [82].

1.5 The flavour puzzle of the Standard Model

In PDG convention, the CKM matrix for quarks has a similar form to the PMNS matrix but without the Majorana phases:

$$U_{\text{CKM}} = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12}^q c_{13}^q & s_{12}^q c_{13}^q & s_{13}^q e^{-i\delta^q} \\ -s_{12}^q c_{23}^q - c_{12}^q s_{13}^q s_{23}^q e^{i\delta^q} & c_{12}^q c_{23}^q - s_{12}^q s_{13}^q s_{23}^q e^{i\delta^q} & c_{13}^q s_{23}^q \\ s_{12}^q s_{23}^q - c_{12}^q s_{13}^q c_{23}^q e^{i\delta^q} & -c_{12}^q s_{23}^q - s_{12}^q s_{13}^q c_{23}^q e^{i\delta^q} & c_{13}^q c_{23}^q \end{pmatrix} \quad (1.31)$$

where $s_{13}^q = \sin \theta_{13}^q$, etc. are quark mixing angles which are very different from the lepton mixing angles in Eq. (1.30).

It is interesting to compare quark mixing, which is small,

$$s_{12}^q = \lambda, \quad s_{23}^q \sim \lambda^2, \quad s_{13}^q \sim \lambda^3 \quad (1.32)$$




Figure 4. Neutrino mixing angles may be represented as Euler angles relating the states in the charged lepton mass basis $(\nu_e, \nu_\mu, \nu_\tau)$ to the mass eigenstate basis states (ν_1, ν_2, ν_3) .

where the Wolfenstein parameter is $\lambda = 0.226 \pm 0.001$, to lepton mixing, which is large⁵,

$$s_{13} \sim \lambda/\sqrt{2}, \quad s_{23} \sim 1/\sqrt{2}, \quad s_{12} \sim 1/\sqrt{3}. \quad (1.33)$$

The smallest lepton mixing angle θ_{13} (the reactor angle), is of order the largest quark mixing angle $\theta_{12}^q = \theta_C = 13.0^\circ$ (the Cabibbo angle, where $\sin \theta_C = \lambda$). There have been attempts to relate quark and lepton mixing angles such as postulating a reactor angle $\theta_{13} = \theta_C/\sqrt{2}$ [91], and the CP violating lepton phase $\delta \sim -\pi/2$ (c.f. the well measured CP violating quark phase $\delta^q \sim (\pi/2)/\sqrt{2}$).

2 Neutrino Mass and Mixing Models without Modular Symmetry

2.1 Simple patterns of lepton mixing

Various simple ansatzes for the PMNS matrix were proposed, the most simple one involving a zero reactor angle and bimaximal atmospheric mixing, $s_{13} = 0$ and $s_{23} = c_{23} = 1/\sqrt{2}$, leading to a PMNS matrix of the form,

$$U_0 = \begin{pmatrix} c_{12} & s_{12} & 0 \\ -\frac{s_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{c_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{s_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{c_{12}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.1)$$

where the zero subscript reminds us that this form has $\theta_{13} = 0$ (and $\theta_{23} = 45^\circ$).

For tri-bimaximal (TB) mixing [92–94], one assumes $s_{12} = 1/\sqrt{3}$, $c_{12} = \sqrt{2/3}$ ($\theta_{12} = 35.26^\circ$) in Eq. (2.1),

$$U_{\text{TB}} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.2)$$

⁵As in section 1 lepton parameters are denoted without a superscript l .

For bimaximal (BM) mixing (see e.g. [95–98] and references therein), one has $s_{12} = c_{12} = 1/\sqrt{2}$ ($\theta_{12} = 45^\circ$) into Eq. (2.1),

$$U_{\text{BM}} = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{2} & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (2.3)$$

For golden ratio (GRa) mixing [99–103], the solar angle is given by $\tan \theta_{12} = 1/\phi$, where $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the golden ratio which implies $\theta_{12} = 31.7^\circ$. There are two alternative versions where $\cos \theta_{12} = \phi/2$ and $\theta_{12} = 36^\circ$ [104] which we refer to as GRb mixing, and GRc where $\cos \theta_{12} = \phi/\sqrt{3}$ and $\theta_{12} \approx 20.9^\circ$.

Finally another pattern studied in the literature with $\theta_{13} = 0$ (and $\theta_{23} = 45^\circ$) is the hexagonal mixing (HEX) where $\theta_{12} = \pi/6$ [105, 106].

As we discuss in the next subsection, these simple patterns may be enforced by discrete non-Abelian family symmetry. Although these simple patterns are excluded by current data, mainly because of the non-zero reactor angle, it is possible that some relic of these patterns may survive, either due to charged lepton mixing corrections, or due to the first or second column of these matrices surviving, where these situations correspond to a controlled symmetry breaking as discussed in the next subsection.

2.2 Symmetry of the lepton mass matrices

The starting point for family symmetry models is to consider the symmetry of the mass matrices. In a basis where the charged lepton mass matrix M_e is diagonal, the symmetry is,

$$T^\dagger (M_e^\dagger M_e) T = M_e^\dagger M_e \quad (2.4)$$

where $T = \text{diag}(1, \omega^2, \omega)$ and $\omega = e^{i2\pi/n}$. For example for $n = 3$ clearly T generates a cyclic group Z_3^T .

In the diagonal charged lepton mass basis, assuming $U_{e_L} = I$,

$$U_{\text{PMNS}}^\dagger m^\nu U_{\text{PMNS}}^* = \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3) \quad (2.5)$$

and the neutrino mass matrix in this basis may be expressed as

$$m^\nu = U_{\text{PMNS}} \text{diag}(m_1, m_2, m_3) U_{\text{PMNS}}^T = m_1 G_1 + m_2 G_2 + m_3 G_3 \quad (2.6)$$

where $G_i = G_i^T = \Phi_i \Phi_i^T$ and Φ_i are the three columns of $U_{\text{PMNS}} \equiv (\Phi_1, \Phi_2, \Phi_3)$ with $\Phi_i^\dagger \Phi_j = \delta_{ij}$.

The Klein symmetry $Z_2^S \times Z_2^U$ of the light Majorana neutrino mass matrix defined in Eq. (1.26) is given by the four element group (I, S, U, SU) [107],

$$m^\nu = S^\dagger m^\nu S^*, \quad m^\nu = U^\dagger m^\nu U^*, \quad m^\nu = (SU)^\dagger m^\nu (SU)^* \quad (2.7)$$

where

$$S = U_{\text{PMNS}} \text{diag}(-1, +1, -1) U_{\text{PMNS}}^\dagger = -G'_1 + G'_2 - G'_3 \quad (2.8)$$

$$U = U_{\text{PMNS}} \text{diag}(-1, -1, +1) U_{\text{PMNS}}^\dagger = -G'_1 - G'_2 + G'_3 \quad (2.9)$$

$$SU = U_{\text{PMNS}} \text{diag}(+1, -1, -1) U_{\text{PMNS}}^\dagger = G'_1 - G'_2 - G'_3 \quad (2.10)$$

with $G'_i = G_i^\dagger = \Phi_i \Phi_i^\dagger$ and $G'_i G'_j = \delta_{ij} G'_i$. Note that we have $G_i = G'_i$ in the limit that the lepton mixing matrix U_{PMNS} is real. One can check that S and U generate a Klein four group and they satisfy the following identities:

$$S^2 = U^2 = \mathbb{1}, \quad SU = US. \quad (2.11)$$

If the generators S, U, T are identified with the generators of S_4 , then the Klein symmetry enforces TB mixing. Note also that the S_4 subgroups Z_2^S and Z_2^{SU} enforce TM_2 and TM_1 mixing, respectively, where the preserved column of the TB matrix in each case is given by the eigenvector associated with the $+1$ eigenvalue which preserves the symmetry.

2.3 Direct Models




Figure 5. The diagram illustrates the so called direct approach to models of lepton mixing. For example, for the flavor symmetry group $G = S_4$, this structure leads to tri-bimaximal mixing. To avoid the bad prediction that $\theta_{13} = 0$, one or more of the generators S, T, U must be broken, as discussed in the main text.

The idea of “direct models” [83], illustrated in figure 5, is that the three generators S, T, U introduced above are embedded into a discrete family symmetry G which is broken by new Higgs fields called “flavons” of two types: ϕ^l whose VEVs preserve T and ϕ^ν whose VEVs preserve S, U . These flavons are segregated such that ϕ^l only appears in the charged lepton sector and ϕ^ν only appears in the neutrino sector, thereby enforcing the symmetries of the mass matrices. Note that the full Klein symmetry $Z_2^S \times Z_2^U$ of the neutrino mass matrix is enforced by symmetry in the direct approach.

There are many choices of the group G , with some examples given in figure 6 (right panel), with each choice leading to different lepton mixing being predicted. For example,




Figure 6. The diagram shows some possible choices of the flavor symmetry group G . As discussed later in this review, the blue groups can emerge at level $N = 2, 3, 4, 5, 7$ of the finite modular symmetry group $PSL(2, N)$, which is the projective special linear group of 2×2 matrices with integer elements mod N , with unit determinant, where positive and negative matrices are identified. The coloured shapes for the real groups are the regular geometric shapes which enjoy the symmetries indicated. The simple group $\Sigma(168)$ has complex representations, so does not have any simple geometrical interpretation.

consider the group S_4 whose irreducible triplet representations are⁶:

$$S = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix}, \quad U = \mp \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2.12)$$

where $\omega = e^{i2\pi/3}$. Assuming these S_4 matrices, the Z_3^T symmetry of the charged lepton mass matrix and the Klein symmetry $Z_2^S \times Z_2^U$ of the neutrino mass matrix leads to the prediction of TB mixing (indeed one can check that S and U are diagonalised by U_{TB} as in Eqs. (2.8,2.9)).

2.4 Semi-direct and tri-direct CP models

In the “semi-direct” approach [83], in order to obtain a non-zero reactor angle, one of the generators T or U of the residual symmetry is assumed to be broken. For example, consider the following two interesting possibilities:

1. The Z_3^T symmetry of the charged lepton mass matrix is broken, but the full Klein symmetry $Z_2^S \times Z_2^U$ in the neutrino sector is respected. This corresponds to having charged lepton corrections, with solar sum rules as discussed recently [74].

⁶There are precise group theory rules for establishing the irreducible representations of any group, but here we shall only state the results for S_4 in the T -diagonal basis, see [90] for proofs, other examples and bases (e.g. dropping the U generator leads to the A_4 subgroup).

2. The Z_2^U symmetry of the neutrino mass matrix is broken, but the Z_3^T symmetry of the charged lepton mass matrix is unbroken. In addition either Z_2^S or Z_2^{SU} (with SU being the product of S and U) is preserved. This leads to either TM_1 mixing (if Z_2^{SU} is preserved [108]); or TM_2 mixing (if Z_2^S is preserved [109]). Then we have the atmospheric sum rules as discussed recently [74].

The “semi-direct approach” may be extended to include a generalised CP symmetry X such that $(M^\nu)^* = X^T M^\nu X$, with a separate flavour and CP symmetry in the neutrino and charged lepton sectors [110, 111] (see also [112–125]). Such models typically tend to predict maximal CP violation $\delta = \pm\pi/2$ (the first example of such generalised CP symmetry is mu-tau reflection symmetry discussed in the following subsection). The combination of flavor symmetry and generalized CP symmetry allows to predict both lepton mixing angles and CP violation phases [126–128], it provides a plenty of possible residual symmetries which constrain the lepton mixing matrix to depend on few free parameters [129–131]. It is notable that both quark and lepton mixing could be explained if the flavor and CP symmetry are broken down to $Z_2 \times CP$ subgroups in the up type quark sector, down type quark sector, charged lepton sector and neutrino sectors [132, 133]. The resulting quark and lepton mixing matrices only depend on two rotation angles separately, and the minimal flavor symmetry group is the dihedral group D_{14} [133].

In the “tri-direct” CP approach [69, 134, 135], a separate flavour and CP symmetry is assumed for each right-handed neutrino sector (in the framework of two right-handed neutrino models [57]) in addition to the charged lepton sector.

While early family symmetry models focussed on continuous non-Abelian gauge theories such as $SO(3)$ [59] or $SU(3)$ [136], non-Abelian discrete symmetries [90] have been widely used to account for the large lepton mixing angles, as discussed above. However, the proliferation of flavons is rather undesirable, and the theoretical origin of such non-Abelian discrete symmetries remains as open questions. Recently modular symmetry has been proposed to address both of these questions, and this forms the subject of the remainder of this review.

3 Introduction to modular symmetry

In this section, we first give an informal introduction to modular symmetry. We then introduce the modular group, and discuss its fixed points and residual symmetry. Finally we write down the form of the supersymmetric action, including the Kähler potential and the conditions that the superpotential must satisfy.

3.1 What is modular symmetry?

As we have already discussed, the Standard Model (SM), despite its many successes, does not account for the origin of neutrino mass nor the quark and lepton family replication, and gives no insight into the fermion masses and mixing parameters. We have already introduced the idea of a family symmetry which may be a finite discrete or continuous, gauged or global, Abelian or non-Abelian, and we have noted that large lepton mixing

has motivated studies of non-Abelian finite discrete groups such as A_4, S_4, A_5 (for reviews see e.g. [83, 137]). However, as we have seen, such family symmetries must eventually be spontaneously broken by new Higgs fields called flavons, and it turns out that the vacuum alignment of such flavon fields plays a crucial role determining the physical predictions of such models.

In the remainder of this review we shall turn to another interesting class of symmetries which arise from the modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, which is the group of familiar 2×2 matrices with positive or negative integer elements, but with unit determinant. Geometrically, this is the symmetry of a torus, which has a flat geometry in two dimensions when it is cut open. The symmetry $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ corresponds to the discrete coordinate transformations which leave the torus invariant, which allows for different choices of two dimensional lattice vectors τ describing the same torus. In fact it turns out that an overall minus sign in the matrices makes no difference to the transformation and when such matrices are identified the group is called the projective special linear group $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, often denoted as $\bar{\Gamma}$.

The two dimensional space of the torus may be identified as the real and imaginary directions of the complex plane, where the lattice vectors τ correspond to complex vectors in the upper half of the Argand plane. This is sufficient to describe all the symmetries of the torus, and this leads to the the idea of holomorphicity, where complex conjugation is forbidden, as in supersymmetry. The principal congruence subgroup of level N corresponds to the subset of matrices $\Gamma(N)$ which belong to $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and which are equal to the unit matrix mod N , where these matrices also act on the complex variable τ in the upper half of the complex plane. If the positive and negative unit matrices are identified then the resulting group is called $\bar{\Gamma}(N)$.

At first sight the modular symmetry groups do not look like a promising starting point for a family symmetry. Firstly they are all infinite groups, since there are an infinite number of 2×2 matrices with integer elements and unit determinant. Secondly, it might seem that the symmetry of a torus has nothing to do with particle physics. However in the framework of superstring theory and extra dimensions, the second point seems more reasonable since orbifold compactifications of six extra dimensions are often performed as three factorisable products of two extra dimensions compactified on three tori [138, 139]. Each torus may be described by a single lattice vector (where by convention the other lattice vector has unit length and lies along the real axis) which is identified as a modulus field τ , whose vacuum expectation value (VEV) is determined by a supergravity potential which fixes the geometry of the torus [140–142]. As regards the first point, it is possible to obtain a finite discrete group from the infinite modular group as discussed below.

For a given choice of level $N > 2$, the infinite modular symmetry may be rendered finite by removing the infinite matrices which are trivially related to the unit matrix, leaving only a small finite number of interesting matrices which form a closed finite group. This is achieved by considering the quotient group $\Gamma_N = PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\bar{\Gamma}(N)$ which is finite and may be identified with the groups $\Gamma_N = A_4, S_4, A_5$ for levels $N = 3, 4, 5$, and so on for higher levels [143]. These finite modular groups, may then be applied to neutrino and flavour models in the usual way, except that now such theories offer the promise that the only flavon present is the single modulus field τ , whose VEV fixes the value of Yukawa couplings which

form representations of Γ_N and are modular forms, leading to very predictive theories [143].

Following the above observations [143], there has been considerable activity in applying modular symmetry to flavour models, and also in extending the framework to more general settings. There have already appeared some very good early reviews [86] in the context of neutrino physics. The purpose of the present review is to provide a dedicated and comprehensive review of the literature relating to the bottom-up approach to modular symmetry flavour models, starting from the basic ideas, through the most recent more sophisticated approaches, before discussing some applications to neutrino and flavour models.

3.2 The modular group

Following the informal introduction to the modular group of the previous subsection, we now provide a more rigorous exposition, setting out the mathematical formalism in some detail. As mentioned above, the modular group is ubiquitous in string theory. It is the invariance group of a lattice $\Lambda = \{m_1\omega_1 + m_2\omega_2 \mid m_{1,2} \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ in the complex plane \mathbb{C} , where ω_1 and ω_2 are the basis vectors of the lattice with $\tau \equiv \omega_1/\omega_2$ and we may assume $\text{Im}(\tau) > 0$ by swapping ω_1 and ω_2 if necessary. As shown in figure 7, the two lattices $\Lambda = \{m_1\omega_1 + m_2\omega_2 \mid m_{1,2} \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ and $\Lambda' = \{m_1\omega'_1 + m_2\omega'_2 \mid m_{1,2} \in \mathbb{Z}\}$ are identical if and only if

$$\begin{pmatrix} \omega'_1 \\ \omega'_2 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_1 \\ \omega_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3.1)$$

which implies⁷

$$\tau \mapsto \gamma\tau = \gamma(\tau) = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}, \quad \text{Im}(\tau) > 0. \quad (3.2)$$

where a, b, c, d are integers and they fulfill $ad - bc = 1$. A complex torus is a quotient \mathbb{C}/Λ of the complex plane \mathbb{C} by a lattice Λ , it is obtained by gluing both opposite pairs of edges of the fundamental parallelogram depicted in gray in figure 7. Obviously each linear fractional transformation of Eq. (3.2) is associated with a 2×2 matrix $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ with integer coefficients and determinant 1. All the linear fractional transformations form the full modular group Γ which is isomorphic to $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, i.e.

$$SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \mid a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}, ad - bc = 1 \right\}. \quad (3.3)$$

Notice that γ and $-\gamma$ act in the same way on the modulus τ , the faithful action group is the projective special linear group $\bar{\Gamma} \equiv PSL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong SL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\{\mathbf{1}_2, -\mathbf{1}_2\}$, where $\mathbf{1}_2$ stands for the two-dimensional identity matrix. Note that the modular group is defined to be $\bar{\Gamma}$ in some literature. The modular group is an infinite discrete group and it can be generated by two elements S and T [144, 145]

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.4)$$

⁷This modular transformation is well-defined, as it fulfills $\text{Im}(\gamma(\tau)) = \frac{\text{Im}(\tau)}{|c\tau + d|^2} > 0$ and $(\gamma\gamma')(\tau) = \gamma(\gamma'(\tau))$.




Figure 7. Two equivalent lattices generated by the base vectors $\{\omega_1, \omega_2\}$ and $\{-\omega_2, \omega_1 - 2\omega_2\}$, the corresponding modular transformation is $\tau \rightarrow -1/(\tau - 2)$.

Note that S and T are often referred to as modular inversion and translation respectively,

$$S : \tau \mapsto -\frac{1}{\tau}, \quad T : \tau \mapsto \tau + 1. \quad (3.5)$$

It is straightforward to check that the two generators satisfy the following relations

$$S^4 = (ST)^3 = \mathbb{1}_2, \quad S^2T = TS^2 \quad (3.6)$$

and also $(TS)^3 = \mathbb{1}_2$ which is equivalent to $(ST)^3 = \mathbb{1}_2$. The corresponding relations in $\bar{\Gamma}$ are $S^2 = (ST)^3 = \mathbb{1}_2$, since $\mathbb{1}_2$ and $-\mathbb{1}_2$ are indistinguishable in $\bar{\Gamma}$. Moreover, one can find that the inverse of a modular transformation is

$$\gamma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} d & -b \\ -c & a \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3.7)$$

The modular group Γ has a series of infinite normal subgroups $\Gamma(N)$ ($N = 1, 2, 3, \dots$) defined by,

$$\Gamma(N) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}), \quad \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{N} \right\}, \quad (3.8)$$

which is the principal congruence subgroup of level N . Note that for $N = 1$ the principal congruence subgroup is just equal to the full modular group, $\Gamma = \Gamma(1)$. Also the element T^N belongs to $\Gamma(N)$, i.e. $T^N \in \Gamma(N)$.

The groups $\bar{\Gamma}(N)$ of linear fractional transformations are slightly different from the groups $\Gamma(N)$. We have $\bar{\Gamma}(N) = \Gamma(N)/\{\mathbb{1}_2, -\mathbb{1}_2\}$ for $N = 1, 2$, while $\bar{\Gamma}(N) = \Gamma(N)$ for $N > 2$ because in this case $-\mathbb{1}_2$ doesn't belong to $\Gamma(N)$.

The quotient groups

$$\Gamma_N \equiv PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\bar{\Gamma}(N) \equiv \bar{\Gamma}/\bar{\Gamma}(N) \quad (3.9)$$

are the so-called inhomogeneous finite modular groups and are isomorphic to $PSL(2, N)$. The group Γ_N can be generated by two element S and T satisfying

$$S^2 = (ST)^3 = T^N = 1, \quad (3.10)$$

where here 1 denotes the identity element. Notice that additional relations are necessary in order to render the group Γ_N finite for $N \geq 6$ [146]. We see that Γ_1 is a trivial group comprising only the identity element, Γ_2 is isomorphic to S_3 . For small values of N , the groups Γ_N are isomorphic to permutation groups: $\Gamma_3 \cong A_4$, $\Gamma_4 \cong S_4$ and $\Gamma_5 \cong A_5$ [146]. The finite modular groups Γ_N as flavor symmetry have been widely studied to explain neutrino mixing.

The quotient groups

$$\Gamma'_N \equiv SL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\Gamma(N) \quad (3.11)$$

are the so-called homogeneous finite modular groups. They can be regarded as the group of two-by-two matrices with entries that are integers modulo N and determinant equal to one modulo N , and they are isomorphic to $SL(2, N)$.

We see $\Gamma_2 \cong \Gamma'_2$, and Γ_N for $N > 2$ is isomorphic to the quotient of Γ'_N over its center $\{\mathbb{1}_2, -\mathbb{1}_2\}$, i.e., $\Gamma_N \cong \Gamma'_N/\{\mathbb{1}_2, -\mathbb{1}_2\}$ in matrix form. Hence Γ'_N has double the number of group elements as Γ_N with $|\Gamma'_N| = 2|\Gamma_N|$. The group Γ'_N can be obtained from Γ_N by including another generator R which is related to $-\mathbb{1}_2 \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and commutes with all elements of the $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ group, such that the generators S , T and R of Γ'_N obey the following relations⁸ [147],

$$S^2 = R, \quad (ST)^3 = T^N = R^2 = 1, \quad RT = TR. \quad (3.12)$$

Note that additional relations are needed for $N \geq 6$. We summarize the finite modular groups Γ_N , Γ'_N and their orders in table 2.

As shown in figure 8, the Γ orbit of every modulus τ has a representative in the standard fundamental domain \mathcal{D} ⁹.

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ \tau \mid \text{Im}(\tau) > 0, |\text{Re}(\tau)| \leq \frac{1}{2}, |\tau| \geq 1 \right\}, \quad (3.14)$$

which is bounded by the vertical lines $\text{Re}(\tau) = -\frac{1}{2}$, $\text{Re}(\tau) = \frac{1}{2}$ and the circle $|\tau| = 1$ in the upper half plane \mathcal{H} . Every point in the upper half plane is equivalent to a point of \mathcal{D} under the action of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, and no two points inside \mathcal{D} differ by a linear fraction transformation.

⁸The multiplication rules of Γ'_N can also be written as $S^4 = (ST)^3 = T^N = 1, S^2T = TS^2$.

⁹More precisely, each orbit has a unique representative in the standard fundamental domain

$$\mathcal{D} = \left\{ \tau \mid |\tau| > 1, -\frac{1}{2} \leq \text{Re}(\tau) < \frac{1}{2} \right\} \cup \left\{ \tau \mid |\tau| = 1, \text{Re}(\tau) \leq 0 \right\}, \quad (3.13)$$

N	Γ_N	$ \Gamma_N $	Γ'_N	$ \Gamma'_N $
2	S_3	6	S_3	6
3	A_4	12	T'	24
4	S_4	24	S'_4	48
5	A_5	60	A'_5	120
6	$S_3 \times A_4$	72	$S_3 \times T'$	144
7	$PSL(2, Z_7) \cong \Sigma(168)$	168	$SL(2, Z_7)$	336

Table 2. The finite modular groups Γ_N and Γ'_N and their orders up to $N = 7$.

The transformation T pairs the two vertical lines $\text{Re}(\tau) = \pm\frac{1}{2}$, and the transformation S maps the arc of $|\tau| = 1$ from i to $e^{\pi i/3}$ into the arc from i to $e^{2\pi i/3}$. Notice that the fundamental domain is not unique, the transformed region $\gamma\mathcal{D}$ by any element γ of Γ can also be taken as the fundamental domain.

3.3 Fixed points of modulus and residual modular symmetry

The modular symmetry is spontaneously broken by the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of the modulus τ . There is no allowed value of τ which preserves the whole modular group (for example $\tau = 0$ is not allowed since it is not in the fundamental domain). However, some value τ_0 of the modulus is invariant under the action of certain $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ transformation γ_0 , i.e.

$$\gamma_0\tau_0 = \tau_0. \quad (3.15)$$

Thus the modular group Γ is partially broken and the residual symmetry generated by γ_0 is preserved. We call τ_0 is the fixed point of γ_0 and the subgroup generated by γ_0 as the stabilizer of τ_0 with

$$\text{Stab}(\tau_0) \equiv \{\gamma_0 \in \Gamma | \gamma_0\tau_0 = \tau_0\}. \quad (3.16)$$

Using the identity $\Im(\gamma\tau) = \frac{\Im\tau}{|c\tau + d|^2}$, from Eq. (3.15) we find $|c_0\tau_0 + d_0| = 1$ and consequently $c_0\tau_0 + d_0$ must be a phase. Moreover the explicit expression of Eq. (3.15) for the fixed point τ_0 is

$$\frac{a_0\tau_0 + b_0}{c_0\tau_0 + d_0} = \tau_0. \quad (3.17)$$

Thus τ_0 is determined to be

$$\tau_0 = \begin{cases} \frac{b_0}{d_0 - a_0}, & c_0 = 0 \\ \frac{a_0 - d_0 \pm \sqrt{(a_0 + d_0)^2 - 4}}{2c_0}, & c_0 \neq 0 \end{cases}. \quad (3.18)$$

In the fundamental region \mathcal{D} , the fixed points τ_0 and the corresponding stabilizers γ_0 are summarized in table 3 [70]. It is remarkable that the subgroup $Z_2^{S^2}$ is unbroken for any value of τ . The fixed points $\tau_S = i$, $\tau_{ST} = e^{2\pi i/3} = -\frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ and $\tau_T = i\infty$ are additionally




Figure 8. The fundamental domain \mathcal{D} of the modular group Γ .

invariant under the action of S , ST and T . Notice the fixed point of TS is $\tau_{TS} = e^{\pi i/3} = \frac{1}{2} + i\frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}$ which is related to τ_{ST} by T transformation [70]. Moreover, we find that all the infinite fixed points τ_f in the upper half complex plane and the corresponding modular transformation γ_f satisfying $\gamma_f \tau_f = \tau_f$, are given by [70, 148],

$$\tau_f = \gamma' \tau_0, \quad \gamma_f = \gamma' \gamma_0 \gamma'^{-1}, \quad \gamma' \in \Gamma, \quad (3.19)$$

where γ' is an arbitrary modular symmetry element. Hence all fixed points are related to τ_S , τ_{ST} and τ_T by modular transformations. In the case of single modulus, they are equivalent to the fixed points in the fundamental domain. However, in the case of multiple moduli, not all the fixed points of moduli can be moved to the fundamental domains in the presence of flavons, as discussed in sections 6 and 8.5. From Eq. (3.19) we see that only the modular symmetry transformation conjugate to γ_0 can have fixed point. In other words,

τ_0	γ_0	$\text{Stab}(\tau_0)$
i	S	$Z_4^S = \{1, S, S^2, S^3\}$
$e^{2\pi i/3}$	ST, S^2	$Z_3^{ST} \times Z_2^{S^2} = \{1, ST, (ST)^2, S^2, S^3T, S^2(ST)^2\}$
$i\infty$	T, S^2	$Z^T \times Z_2^{S^2} = \{1, S^2, T, S^2T, T^2, S^2T^2, \dots\}$
others	S^2	$Z_2^{S^2} = \{1, S^2\}$

Table 3. The fixed points τ_0 in the fundamental domain \mathcal{D} and the corresponding stabilizers $\text{Stab}(\tau_0)$ which are abelian subgroups of Γ [70]. Notice that the cyclic Z_m^g has the presentation rule $Z_m^g = \{g|g^m = 1\}$. The stabilizer $Z_3^{ST} \times Z_2^{S^2}$ of $\tau_0 = e^{2\pi i/3}$ is isomorphic to the cyclic group $Z_6^{S^3T}$, and the Z^T denotes the infinite cyclic group generated by the translation T .

γ_f and γ_0 must belong to the same conjugacy class. It is straightforward to see that the stabilizer $\text{Stab}(\tau_f) = \gamma' \text{Stab}(\tau_0) \gamma'^{-1}$ is isomorphic $\text{Stab}(\tau_0)$, and the isomorphism is given by a conjugation with γ' . The alignment of the modular form at the symmetric points are fixed so that the lepton mass matrices and mixing parameters are strongly constrained, the phenomenological implications of the residual symmetry fixed points would be discussed later.

3.4 Modular invariant supersymmetric theories

We work in the framework of the modular invariant supersymmetric theory [138, 139, 143]. In the context of $N = 1$ global supersymmetry, the most general form of the action is

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \mathcal{K}(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau}) + \left[\int d^4x d^2\theta \mathcal{W}(\Phi_I, \tau) + \text{h.c.} \right], \quad (3.20)$$

where $\mathcal{K}(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau})$ is the Kähler potential, it is a real gauge invariant function of the chiral superfields Φ_I , the modulus τ and their hermitian conjugates $\bar{\Phi}_I, \bar{\tau}$. $\mathcal{W}(\Phi, \tau)$ stands for the superpotential, and it is a holomorphic gauge invariant function of the chiral superfields Φ_I and τ . The action \mathcal{S} should be modular invariant and respect the SM (or GUT) gauge symmetry. The transformation properties of Φ_I are specified by its modular weight $-k_I$ and the representation \mathbf{r}_I under Γ'_N ,

$$\tau \rightarrow \gamma\tau = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}, \quad \Phi_I \rightarrow (c\tau + d)^{-k_I} \rho_{\mathbf{r}_I}(\gamma) \Phi_I. \quad (3.21)$$

The Kähler potential to be the minimal form [143],

$$\mathcal{K}_{\min}(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau}) = -h\Lambda^2 \log(-i\tau + i\bar{\tau}) + \sum_I (-i\tau + i\bar{\tau})^{-k_I} |\Phi_I|^2, \quad (3.22)$$

where h is a positive constant. Given the modular transformation $(\tau - \bar{\tau}) \rightarrow (\tau - \bar{\tau})/|c\tau + d|^2$ shown in the footnote 6, one can see that the minimal Kähler potential \mathcal{K}_{\min} is invariant under modular symmetry up to Kähler transformation, i.e.

$$\mathcal{K}_{\min} \rightarrow \mathcal{K}_{\min} + h\Lambda^2 \log(c\tau + d) + h\Lambda^2 \log(c\bar{\tau} + d). \quad (3.23)$$

The last two terms give null contribution after integration over Grassmannian coordinates θ and $\bar{\theta}$. Once the modulus τ gets a vacuum expectation, this Kähler potential gives the

kinetic terms for the scalar components of the supermultiplet Φ_I and the modulus field τ . Notice the Kähler potential is loosely constrained by the modular symmetry, there are additional terms consistent with modular symmetry [149]. However, the Kähler potential \mathcal{K} is subject to strong constraint in some top-down models motivated by string theory [150–152], and the above minimal Kähler potential as the leading order contribution could possibly be achieved. The superpotential \mathcal{W} can be expanded into power series of supermultiplets Φ_I

$$\mathcal{W}(\Phi_I, \tau) = \sum_n Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau) \Phi_{I_1} \dots \Phi_{I_n}. \quad (3.24)$$

Modular invariance requires the function $Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau)$ should be a modular form (defined in the next section) of weight k_Y of level N and in the representation \mathbf{r}_Y of Γ'_N :

$$Y(\tau) \rightarrow Y(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^{k_Y} \rho_{\mathbf{r}_Y}(\gamma) Y(\tau), \quad (3.25)$$

where k_Y and \mathbf{r}_Y should satisfy the conditions

$$k_Y = k_1 + \dots + k_n, \quad \rho_{\mathbf{r}_Y} \otimes \rho_{\mathbf{r}_{I_1}} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_{\mathbf{r}_{I_n}} \ni \mathbf{1}. \quad (3.26)$$

Clearly the concept of modular forms is a crucial element which enables the modular transformations of matter fields to be compensated so that modular invariance is preserved. Accordingly, the next section is devoted to modular forms.

4 Modular forms and finite modular groups

In this section we discuss the concept of modular forms in some detail, especially in relation to the finite modular groups. We first give a formal definition of modular forms. We then discuss the simplest even weight modular forms, before progressing to integer, half integer and general fractional weight modular forms, before discussing general vector valued modular forms associated with general finite modular groups which are defined by the quotient procedure using more general normal subgroups than the principal congruence subgroup.

4.1 Modular forms

A modular form $f(\tau)$ of weight k and level N may be defined as a holomorphic function of the complex variable τ , where under $\Gamma(N)$ it transforms in the following way

$$f(h\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k f(\tau) \quad \text{for } \forall h = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma(N), \quad (4.1)$$

where $k \geq 0$ is a non-negative integer. As mentioned previously for $N = 1$ we have $\Gamma = \Gamma(1)$, so that the above transformation also applies to the full modular group in this case. It is notable that each modular form of the full modular group Γ can be written as a polynomial of $E_4(\tau)$ and $E_6(\tau)$ which are Eisenstein series of weight 4 and 6 respectively [144].

The square of the modular symmetry generator S can be represented by $S^2 = -\mathbf{1}_2 \in \Gamma(N)$ for levels $N = 1, 2$ (see the comment above Eq. (3.9)). In this case for $N = 1, 2$, Eq. (4.1) with $h = S^2$ leads to

$$f(\tau) = (-1)^k f(\tau). \quad (4.2)$$

We conclude that there are no non-vanishing modular forms of odd weight at both level 1 and level 2.

However, the groups $\Gamma(N)$ for $N > 2$ have non-vanishing modular forms with odd weight because $S^2 \notin \Gamma(N > 2)$ and the condition in Eq. (4.2) is not necessary to be fulfilled. The modular forms of weight k and level N form a linear space $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N))$, and its dimension is [144, 153],

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{2k}(\Gamma(2)) = k + 1, \quad N = 2, k \geq 1, \quad (4.3a)$$

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N)) = \frac{(k-1)N+6}{24} N^2 \prod_{p|N} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right), \quad N > 2, k \geq 2, \quad (4.3b)$$

Notice that there is no general dimension formula for weight one modular form, but Eq. (4.3b) is still applicable to the case of $N < 6$. The linear space $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N))$ of the modular form has been constructed explicitly in [153]. Let us denote the linearly independent modular forms of integral weight k and level N as $f_i(\tau)$ with $i = 1, 2, \dots, \dim \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N))$, and we define $F_{i\gamma}(\tau) \equiv J^{-k}(\gamma, \tau) f_i(\gamma\tau)$ for any element $\gamma \in \Gamma$, and $J(\gamma, \tau)$ is the so-called automorphy factor defined as

$$J(\gamma, \tau) = c\tau + d. \quad (4.4)$$

It is straightforward to check that $J(h, \tau)$ satisfies the following properties

$$J(\gamma_1\gamma_2, \tau) = J(\gamma_1, \gamma_2\tau)J(\gamma_2, \tau), \quad \gamma_1, \gamma_2 \in \Gamma, \quad (4.5a)$$

$$J(\gamma^{-1}, \gamma\tau) = J^{-1}(\gamma, \tau). \quad (4.5b)$$

Under a generic modular transformation $h \in \Gamma(N)$ and using Eqs. (4.5a, 4.5b), one find¹⁰

$$F_{i\gamma}(h\tau) = J^k(h, \tau) F_{i\gamma}(\tau). \quad (4.6)$$

This implies that the holomorphic functions $F_{i\gamma}(\tau)$ are weight k modular forms of level N . Hence $F_{i\gamma}(\tau)$ can be expressed as linear combinations of $f_i(\tau)$, i.e.

$$F_{i\gamma}(\tau) = \rho_{ij}(\gamma) f_j(\tau), \quad (4.7)$$

which leads to

$$f_i(\gamma\tau) = J^k(\gamma, \tau) \rho_{ij}(\gamma) f_j(\tau). \quad (4.8)$$

The linear combination matrix $\rho(\gamma)$ depends on the modular transformation γ , and from Eq. (4.5b) we know $\rho(\gamma)$ is a representation of the modular group and it satisfies¹¹,

$$\rho(\gamma_1\gamma_2) = \rho(\gamma_1)\rho(\gamma_2). \quad (4.9)$$

¹⁰

$$\begin{aligned} F_{i\gamma}(h\tau) &= J^{-k}(\gamma, h\tau) f_i(\gamma h\tau) = J^{-k}(\gamma, h\tau) f_i(\gamma h\gamma^{-1}\tau) = J^{-k}(\gamma, h\tau) J^k(\gamma h\gamma^{-1}, \tau) f_i(\gamma\tau) \\ &= J^k(h\gamma^{-1}, \gamma\tau) f_i(\gamma\tau) = J^k(h, \tau) J^{-k}(\gamma, \tau) f_i(\gamma\tau) = J^k(h, \tau) F_{i\gamma}(\tau). \end{aligned}$$

¹¹Using Eq. (4.8), we can obtain

$$f(\gamma_1\gamma_2\tau) = J_k(\gamma_1\gamma_2, \tau) \rho(\gamma_1\gamma_2) f(\tau),$$

Moreover, comparing Eq. (4.8) with the definition of modular form in Eq. (4.1), we obtain that $\rho(h)$ should be unit matrix of dimension $\dim \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N))$, i.e.,

$$\rho(h) = 1, \quad \forall h \in \Gamma(N), \quad (4.10)$$

Hence the representation matrix $\rho(\gamma)$ differs from identity matrix only if the element γ is in the quotient group $\Gamma'_N = \Gamma/\Gamma(N)$. Given that $S^4 = (ST)^3 = 1$, $RT = TR$ and $T^N \in \Gamma(N)$ with $R = S^2$, we have

$$\rho^4(S) = \rho^3(ST) = \rho^N(T) = 1, \quad \rho(R)\rho(T) = \rho(T)\rho(R). \quad (4.11)$$

The representation ρ satisfies the same rules of Eq. (3.12) as Γ'_N . Therefore ρ essentially is a linear representation of the homogeneous finite modular group Γ'_N . Since each representation of the finite group can be decomposed into a direct sum of irreducible unitary representations. As a result, by properly choosing basis, ρ can be written into a block diagonal form,

$$\rho \sim \rho_{\mathbf{r}_1} \oplus \rho_{\mathbf{r}_2} \oplus \dots, \quad \text{with} \quad \sum_i \dim \rho_{\mathbf{r}_i} = \dim \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N)), \quad (4.12)$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{r}_i}$ denotes an irreducible unitary representation of Γ'_N . Consequently it is always possible to choose a basis $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) \equiv (f_1(\tau), f_2(\tau), \dots)^T$ in the modular form space $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N))$ so that $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ transforms under the full modular group Γ as [143, 147]

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma, \quad (4.13)$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$ is an irreducible representation of Γ'_N and γ is a representative element of Γ'_N . In practice, it is sufficient to focus on the modular generators S and T such that we have,

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(S\tau) = (-\tau)^k \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S) Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau), \quad Y_{\mathbf{r}}(T\tau) = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T) Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau). \quad (4.14)$$

Applying Eq. (4.13) for $\gamma = R$, we find that the non-vanishing modular form $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ requires

$$\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(R) = (-1)^k, \quad (4.15)$$

which is +1 and -1 for even k and odd k respectively.

At the fixed point τ_f , Eq. (4.13) implies that the modular multiplet $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau_f)$ is an eigenvector of $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma_f)$ with the eigenvalue $J^{-k}(\gamma_f, \tau_f)$, where $J(\gamma, \tau) = c\tau + d$ is the automorphy factor. It is remarkable that $J(\gamma_f, \tau_f)$ is a phase with unit absolute value¹² and particularly the identity $J(\gamma_f, \tau_f) = J(\gamma_0, \tau_0)$ is fulfilled with

$$J(S, \tau_S) = -i, \quad J(ST, \tau_{ST}) = e^{4\pi i/3}, \quad J(T, \tau_T) = 1. \quad (4.16)$$

and

$$f(\gamma_1\gamma_2\tau) = J_k(\gamma_1, \gamma_2\tau)\rho(\gamma_1)f(\gamma_2\tau) = J_k(\gamma_1, \gamma_2\tau)J_k(\gamma_2, \tau)\rho(\gamma_1)\rho(\gamma_2)f(\tau) = J_k(\gamma_1\gamma_2, \tau)\rho(\gamma_1)\rho(\gamma_2)f(\tau).$$

Comparing the above two formulas, we arrive at the following result,

$$\rho(\gamma_1\gamma_2) = \rho(\gamma_1)\rho(\gamma_2).$$

¹²From the identity $\text{Im}(\gamma_f(\tau_f)) = \text{Im}(\tau_f)/|c_f\tau_f + d_f|^2 = \text{Im}(\tau_f)$ we know $|c_f\tau_f + d_f| = 1$ and consequently $c_f\tau_f + d_f$ must be a phase with unit absolute value.

N	$\dim \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N))$	Γ_N	modular multiplets		
			$k = 2$	$k = 4$	$k = 6$
2	$k/2 + 1$	S_3	$Y_2^{(2)}$	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_2^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{1'}^{(6)}, Y_2^{(6)}$
3	$k + 1$	A_4	$Y_3^{(2)}$	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_{1'}^{(4)}, Y_3^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{3I}^{(6)}, Y_{3II}^{(6)}$
4	$2k + 1$	S_4	$Y_2^{(2)}, Y_3^{(2)}$	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_2^{(4)}, Y_3^{(4)}, Y_{3'}^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{1'}^{(6)}, Y_2^{(6)}, Y_{3I}^{(6)}, Y_{3II}^{(6)}, Y_{3'}^{(6)}$
5	$5k + 1$	A_5	$Y_3^{(2)}, Y_{3'}^{(2)}, Y_5^{(2)}$	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_3^{(4)}, Y_{3'}^{(4)}, Y_4^{(4)}, Y_{5I}^{(4)}, Y_{5II}^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{3I}^{(6)}, Y_{3II}^{(6)}, Y_{3'}^{(6)}, Y_{4I}^{(6)}, Y_{4II}^{(6)}, Y_{5I}^{(6)}, Y_{5II}^{(6)}$
6	$6k$	$S_3 \times A_4$	$Y_{1\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}, Y_{2_0}^{(2)}, Y_{3_0}^{(2)}, Y_6^{(2)}$	$Y_{1_0}^{(4)}, Y_{1_1}^{(4)}, Y_{2_0}^{(4)}, Y_{2_2}^{(4)}, Y_{3_0}^{(4)}, Y_{3_1}^{(4)}, Y_{6I}^{(4)}, Y_{6II}^{(4)}$	$Y_{1_0}^{(6)}, Y_{1_1}^{(6)}, Y_{1_2}^{(6)}, Y_{2_0}^{(6)}, Y_{2_1}^{(6)}, Y_{2_2}^{(6)}, Y_{3_0i}^{(6)}, Y_{3_0ii}^{(6)}, Y_{3_1}^{(6)}, Y_{6i}^{(6)}, Y_{6ii}^{(6)}, Y_{6iii}^{(6)}$
7	$14k - 2$	$\Sigma(168)$	$Y_3^{(2)}, Y_7^{(2)}, Y_{8a}^{(2)}, Y_{8b}^{(2)}$	$Y_{1a}^{(4)}, Y_{3a}^{(4)}, Y_{6a}^{(4)}, Y_{6b}^{(4)}, Y_{7a}^{(4)}, Y_{7b}^{(4)}, Y_{8a}^{(4)}, Y_{8b}^{(4)}, Y_{8c}^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{3a}^{(6)}, Y_{3b}^{(6)}, Y_3^{(6)}, Y_{6a}^{(6)}, Y_{6b}^{(6)}, Y_{7a}^{(6)}, Y_{7b}^{(6)}, Y_{7c}^{(6)}, Y_{7d}^{(6)}, Y_{8a}^{(6)}, Y_{8b}^{(6)}, Y_{8c}^{(6)}, Y_{8d}^{(6)}$

Table 4. Even weight modular forms of level N up to weight 6 and the decomposition under the inhomogeneous finite modular group Γ_N . The conventions for the irreducible representations follow [154] for Γ_2 , [155] for Γ_3 , [156] for Γ_4 , [157] for Γ_5 , [158] for Γ_6 and [159] for Γ_7 .

4.2 Even weight modular forms and inhomogeneous finite modular group

If the modular weight k is an even positive integer, Eq. (4.15) gives us

$$\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(R) = (-1)^k = 1. \quad (4.17)$$

Thus the homogeneous finite modular group Γ'_N reduces to inhomogeneous finite modular group Γ_N , and the even weight modular forms can be arranged into multiplets of Γ_N up to the automorphy factor $(c\tau + d)^k$. Remarkably for $N \leq 5$, the inhomogeneous finite modular groups are isomorphic to permutation groups: $\Gamma_2 \cong S_3$, $\Gamma_3 \cong A_4$, $\Gamma_4 \cong S_4$ and $\Gamma_5 \cong A_5$, as shown in table 2.

There are no modular forms of negative weights, and the weight zero modular form is a constant. Modular forms of weight $2k$ and level N form a linear space $\mathcal{M}_{2k}(\Gamma(N))$ of finite dimension, and the dimensions $\dim \mathcal{M}_{2k}(\Gamma(N))$ for lower levels N are shown in table 4. The product of two modular forms of level N and weights $2k, 2k'$ is a modular form of level N and weight $2(k + k')$ and the set $\mathcal{M}(\Gamma(N))$ of all modular forms of level N is a ring

$$\mathcal{M}(\Gamma(N)) = \bigoplus_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{M}_{2k}(\Gamma(N)) \quad , \quad (4.18)$$

generated by few elements. For instance $\mathcal{M}(\Gamma)$ is generated by two modular forms $E_4(\tau)$ and $E_6(\tau)$ of weight 4 and 6 respectively, so that each modular form in $\mathcal{M}_{2k}(\Gamma)$ can be written as a polynomial $\sum_{ij} c_{ij} E_4(\tau)^{n_i} E_6(\tau)^{n_j}$, with powers satisfying $2k = 4n_i + 6n_j$.

Hence one only needs to know the lowest weight two modular form to construct the even weight modular forms of level N .

4.2.1 Constructing even weight modular forms of level 3

As an example of the general procedure, we now explicitly construct the even weight modular forms of level 3. The Dedekind eta-function $\eta(\tau)$ is frequently used to construct modular forms, it was introduced by Dedekind in 1877 and it is defined as follow [144, 145, 160],

$$\eta(\tau) = q^{1/24} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n), \quad q \equiv e^{i2\pi\tau}. \quad (4.19)$$

The $\eta(\tau)$ function can also be written into the following infinite series,

$$\eta(\tau) = q^{1/24} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{+\infty} (-1)^n q^{n(3n-1)/2}. \quad (4.20)$$

Under the S and T transformations, $\eta(\tau)$ behaves as [144, 145, 160]

$$\eta(\tau + 1) = e^{i\pi/12} \eta(\tau), \quad \eta(-1/\tau) = \sqrt{-i\tau} \eta(\tau). \quad (4.21)$$

Hence $\eta^{24}(\tau)$ is a modular form of weight 12.

In this section, we follow the method of Ref. [143] to explicitly construct a basis of weight 2 for $\Gamma(3)$. From table 4 we know the dimension $\dim \mathcal{M}_2(\Gamma(3)) = 3$, in the following we find out three linearly independent modular forms of weight 2 and level 3. We start by observing that if $f(\tau)$ transforms as¹³

$$f(\tau) \rightarrow e^{i\alpha} (c\tau + d)^k f(\tau), \quad (4.22)$$

then

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \log f(\tau) \rightarrow (c\tau + d)^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} \log f(\tau) + kc(c\tau + d). \quad (4.23)$$

The deviation of this formula is given in Appendix A. Furthermore, we can linearly combine several $f_i(\tau)$ with weights k_i as follow

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \sum_i \alpha_i \log f_i(\tau) \rightarrow (c\tau + d)^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} \sum_i \alpha_i \log f_i(\tau) + \left(\sum_i \alpha_i k_i \right) c(c\tau + d) \quad , \quad (4.24)$$

with

$$\sum_i \alpha_i k_i = 0. \quad (4.25)$$

Then the inhomogeneous term can be removed and consequently weight 2 modular forms can be obtained. The seed functions for the modular forms of weight 2 and level 3 are given by [143]

$$f_1(\tau) = \eta\left(\frac{\tau}{3}\right), \quad f_2(\tau) = \eta\left(\frac{\tau+1}{3}\right)$$

¹³Notice that here $f(\tau)$ is not a modular form of weight k because of the presence of the constant factor $e^{i\alpha}$.

$$f_3(\tau) = \eta\left(\frac{\tau+2}{3}\right), \quad f_4(\tau) = \eta(3\tau). \quad (4.26)$$

They are closed under the modular group, and each of them is mapped to itself under the action of $\Gamma(3)$. Moreover, under T they transform as

$$f_1(\tau) \xrightarrow{T} f_2(\tau), \quad f_2(\tau) \xrightarrow{T} f_3(\tau), \quad f_3(\tau) \xrightarrow{T} e^{i\pi/12} f_1(\tau), \quad f_4(\tau) \xrightarrow{T} e^{i\pi/4} f_4(\tau). \quad (4.27)$$

From Eq. (4.21), we know that they transform under S in the following way,

$$\begin{aligned} f_1(\tau) &\xrightarrow{S} \sqrt{3} \sqrt{-i\tau} f_4(\tau), & f_2(\tau) &\xrightarrow{S} e^{-i\pi/12} \sqrt{-i\tau} f_3(\tau), \\ f_3(\tau) &\xrightarrow{S} e^{i\pi/12} \sqrt{-i\tau} f_2(\tau), & f_4(\tau) &\xrightarrow{S} \sqrt{1/3} \sqrt{-i\tau} f_1(\tau) \end{aligned} \quad (4.28)$$

Hence the most general form of weight 2 and level 3 modular forms can be written as

$$\mathcal{F}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4|\tau) = \frac{d}{d\tau} \sum_i \alpha_i \log f_i(\tau) \quad (4.29)$$

with $\sum_{i=1}^4 \alpha_i = 0$ to eliminate the inhomogeneous term. Under the action of modular generators S and T , we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4|\tau) &\xrightarrow{S} \tau^2 \mathcal{F}(\alpha_4, \alpha_3, \alpha_2, \alpha_1|\tau) \\ \mathcal{F}(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4|\tau) &\xrightarrow{T} \mathcal{F}(\alpha_3, \alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_4|\tau). \end{aligned} \quad (4.30)$$

As shown in Eq. (4.13), it is always possible to choose a basis in the linear space of modular form such that the independent basis vectors form irreducible multiplets of the finite modular group up to the automorphy factor. For the present case, there are three independent modular forms $Y_i(\tau)$ which can be arranged into a A_4 triplet $Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau) = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)^T$ satisfying

$$Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(-1/\tau) = \tau^2 \rho_{\mathbf{3}}(S) Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau), \quad Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau+1) = \rho_{\mathbf{3}}(T) Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau), \quad (4.31)$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{3}}(S)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{3}}(T)$ are the unitary representation matrices of S and T in the triplet representation of A_4 given in Appendix C.2,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{3}}(S) = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho_{\mathbf{3}}(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega = e^{2\pi i/3}. \quad (4.32)$$

Solving Eq. (4.31), we can obtain the explicit form of modular forms $Y_i(\tau)$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\tau) &= \frac{3i}{2\pi} \mathcal{F}(1, 1, 1, -3|\tau) = \frac{i}{2\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{3})} + \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{3})} + \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+2}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+2}{3})} - \frac{27\eta'(3\tau)}{\eta(3\tau)} \right], \\ Y_2(\tau) &= -\frac{3i}{\pi} \mathcal{F}(1, \omega^2, \omega, 0|\tau) = \frac{-i}{\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{3})} + \omega^2 \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{3})} + \omega \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+2}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+2}{3})} \right], \\ Y_3(\tau) &= -\frac{3i}{\pi} \mathcal{F}(1, \omega, \omega^2, 0|\tau) = \frac{-i}{\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{3})} + \omega \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{3})} + \omega^2 \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+2}{3})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+2}{3})} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (4.33)$$

up to an overall constant which can be chosen freely. In numerical calculation, one usually needs q -expansion of Y_i ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\tau) &= 1 + 12q + 36q^2 + 12q^3 + 84q^4 + 72q^5 + 36q^6 + 96q^7 + 180q^8 + 12q^9 + 216q^{10} + \dots, \\ Y_2(\tau) &= -6q^{1/3} (1 + 7q + 8q^2 + 18q^3 + 14q^4 + 31q^5 + 20q^6 + 36q^7 + 31q^8 + 56q^9 + 32q^{10} + \dots), \\ Y_3(\tau) &= -18q^{2/3} (1 + 2q + 5q^2 + 4q^3 + 8q^4 + 6q^5 + 14q^6 + 8q^7 + 14q^8 + 10q^9 + 21q^{10} + \dots) \end{aligned} \quad (4.34)$$

From the above q -expansion we see that the modular forms $Y_i(\tau)$ satisfy the constraint:

$$Y_2^2 + 2Y_1Y_3 = 0. \quad (4.35)$$

The whole ring of even weight modular forms of level 3 can be generated from the products of the weight 2 modular forms $Y_{1,2,3}(\tau)$. At weight 4, the tensor product of $Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}$ gives rise to three independent modular multiplets,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} = Y_1^2 + 2Y_2Y_3, \\ Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} = Y_3^2 + 2Y_1Y_2, \\ Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)} &= \frac{1}{2}(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{3}_S} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3 \\ Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2 \\ Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.36)$$

There are seven linearly independent modular forms of level 3 and weight 6 and they decompose as $\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}$ under A_4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}} = Y_1^3 + Y_2^3 + Y_3^3 - 3Y_1Y_2Y_3, \\ Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)} &= Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)} = (Y_1^2 + 2Y_2Y_3) \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \\ Y_3 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)} &= Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(4)} = (Y_3^2 + 2Y_1Y_2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_3 \\ Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.37)$$

The weight 8 modular forms can be arranged into three singlets $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{1}'$, $\mathbf{1}''$ and two triplets $\mathbf{3}$ of A_4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(8)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}} = (Y_1^2 + 2Y_2Y_3)^2, \\ Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(8)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}'} = (Y_1^2 + 2Y_2Y_3)(Y_3^2 + 2Y_1Y_2), \\ Y_{\mathbf{1}''}^{(8)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}''} = (Y_3^2 + 2Y_1Y_2)^2, \\ Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(8)} &= Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(6)} = (Y_1^3 + Y_2^3 + Y_3^3 - 3Y_1Y_2Y_3) \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \\ Y_3 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(8)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{3}_A} = (Y_3^2 + 2Y_1Y_2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3 \\ Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3 \\ Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4.38)$$

The weight 10 modular forms of level 3 decompose as $\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}$ under A_4 , and they are

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(10)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(8)})_{\mathbf{1}} = (Y_1^2 + 2Y_2 Y_3)(Y_1^3 + Y_2^3 + Y_3^3 - 3Y_1 Y_2 Y_3), \\
Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(10)} &= (Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{3}I'}^{(8)})_{\mathbf{1}'} = (Y_3^2 + 2Y_1 Y_2)(Y_1^3 + Y_2^3 + Y_3^3 - 3Y_1 Y_2 Y_3), \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(10)} &= Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(8)} = (Y_1^2 + 2Y_2 Y_3)^2 \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \\ Y_3 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(10)} &= Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(8)} = (Y_1^2 + 2Y_2 Y_3)(Y_3^2 + 2Y_1 Y_2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_3 \\ Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}III}^{(10)} &= Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{1}''}^{(8)} = (Y_3^2 + 2Y_1 Y_2)^2 \begin{pmatrix} Y_2 \\ Y_3 \\ Y_1 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.39}$$

Higher weight modular forms can be constructed analogously, and one should consider the nonlinear constraints such as Eq. (4.35) to pick out the linearly independent modular forms from all possible tensor products. It is straightforward although tedious.

In the same fashion, the weight two modular forms of level 2 and level 4 can be constructed. There are two independent modular forms of weight 2 at level 2 [154],

$$\frac{i}{4\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{2})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{2})} + \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{2})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{2})} - \frac{8\eta'(2\tau)}{\eta(2\tau)} \right], \quad \frac{\sqrt{3}i}{4\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{2})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{2})} - \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{2})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{2})} \right], \tag{4.40}$$

which form a S_3 doublet. The basis of the weight 2 modular forms at level 4 can be chosen as [161, 162]

$$\begin{aligned}
& -\frac{i}{8\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{4})} + \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{4})} + \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+2}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+2}{4})} + \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+3}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+3}{4})} - \frac{8\eta'(\tau + \frac{1}{2})}{\eta(\tau + \frac{1}{2})} - \frac{32\eta'(4\tau)}{\eta(4\tau)} \right], \\
& \frac{\sqrt{3}i}{8\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{4})} - \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{4})} + \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+2}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+2}{4})} - \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+3}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+3}{4})} \right], \\
& \frac{i}{\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\tau + \frac{1}{2})}{\eta(\tau + \frac{1}{2})} - \frac{4\eta'(4\tau)}{\eta(4\tau)} \right], \\
& -\frac{\sqrt{2}i}{8\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{4})} - i \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{4})} - \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+2}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+2}{4})} + i \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+3}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+3}{4})} \right], \\
& -\frac{\sqrt{2}i}{8\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau}{4})} + i \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+1}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+1}{4})} - \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+2}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+2}{4})} - i \frac{\eta'(\frac{\tau+3}{4})}{\eta(\frac{\tau+3}{4})} \right],
\end{aligned} \tag{4.41}$$

which can be organized into a doublet and a triplet of S_4 [161, 162]. For $N \geq 5$, the linear combinations of the logarithmic derivatives of η function is not enough generate the whole modular form space, and consequently other seed functions such as Klein forms and Jacobi constants are necessary. See Refs. [157, 163] and [159] for the construction of modular forms

of level 5 and level 7 respectively. We summarize the even weight modular forms and their decompositions under Γ_N in table 4 for $N \leq 7$.

4.3 Integer weight modular forms and homogeneous finite modular groups

N	$\dim \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(N))$	Γ'_N	modular multiplets		
			$k = 1$	$k = 2$	$k = 3$
3	$k + 1$	T'	$Y_2^{(1)}$	$Y_3^{(2)}$	$Y_2^{(3)}, Y_{2''}^{(3)}$
4	$2k + 1$	S'_4	$Y_{\hat{3}'}^{(1)}$	$Y_2^{(2)}, Y_3^{(2)}$	$Y_{\hat{1}'}^{(3)}, Y_{\hat{3}}^{(3)}, Y_{\hat{3}'}^{(3)}$
5	$5k + 1$	A'_5	$Y_6^{(1)}$	$Y_3^{(2)}, Y_{3'}^{(2)}, Y_5^{(2)}$	$Y_{4'}^{(3)}, Y_{6I}^{(3)}, Y_{6II}^{(3)}$
6	$6k$	$S_3 \times T'$	$Y_{20}^{(1)}, Y_{41}^{(1)}$	$Y_{1\frac{1}{2}}^{(2)}, Y_{20}^{(2)}, Y_{30}^{(2)}, Y_6^{(2)}$	$Y_{21}^{(3)}, Y_{20}^{(3)}, Y_{21}^{(3)}, Y_{40}^{(3)}, Y_{41}^{(3)}, Y_{42}^{(3)}$

Table 5. Integer weight modular forms of level N and the decomposition under the homogeneous finite modular group Γ'_N . Notice that odd weight modular form doesn't exist for $\Gamma(2)$. The conventions for the irreducible representations follow [147] for Γ'_3 , [164] for Γ'_4 , [165] for Γ'_5 and [158] for Γ'_6 .

As shown in the beginning of section 4, the principal congruence subgroups $\Gamma(N)$ for $N > 2$ have odd weight modular forms because of $S^2 \notin \Gamma(N > 2)$, and the general integer weight modular forms of level N can be arranged into irreducible multiplets of the homogeneous finite modular group Γ'_N which is the double cover of Γ_N . The groups Γ'_N for lower levels N are summarized in in table 2, they could be realized in orbifold compactifications on $T^2 \times T^2$ with magnetic fluxes [166]. Notice that the odd weight and even weight modular forms are in the representations $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(R) = -1$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(R) = 1$ respectively. All the modular forms can be obtained from the products of the lowest weight 1 modular forms and they can be constructed from the Dedekind η function and Klein forms for small levels $N \leq 6$. In the following, we present the linearly independent basis for the linear space $\mathcal{M}_1(\Gamma(N))$ of weight 1 modular forms [153, 158],

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{M}_1(\Gamma(3)) &= \left\{ \frac{\eta^3(3\tau)}{\eta(\tau)}, \frac{\eta^3(\tau/3)}{\eta(\tau)} \right\}, \\
\mathcal{M}_1(\Gamma(4)) &= \left\{ \frac{\eta^4(4\tau)}{\eta^2(2\tau)}, \frac{\eta^{10}(2\tau)}{\eta^4(4\tau)\eta^4(\tau)}, \frac{\eta^4(2\tau)}{\eta^2(2\tau)} \right\}, \\
\mathcal{M}_1(\Gamma(5)) &= \left\{ \frac{\eta^{15}(5\tau)}{\eta^3(\tau)} \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{5}{5},0}^5(5\tau), \frac{\eta^{15}(5\tau)}{\eta^3(\tau)} \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{1}{5},0}^5(5\tau) \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{4}{5},0}^4(5\tau), \frac{\eta^{15}(5\tau)}{\eta^3(\tau)} \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{1}{5},0}^2(5\tau) \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{3}{5},0}^3(5\tau), \right. \\
&\quad \left. \frac{\eta^{15}(5\tau)}{\eta^3(\tau)} \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{1}{5},0}^3(5\tau) \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{2}{5},0}^2(5\tau), \frac{\eta^{15}(5\tau)}{\eta^3(\tau)} \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{1}{5},0}^4(5\tau) \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{2}{5},0}(5\tau), \frac{\eta^{15}(5\tau)}{\eta^3(\tau)} \mathfrak{k}_{\frac{1}{5},0}^5(5\tau) \right\}, \\
\mathcal{M}_1(\Gamma(6)) &= \left\{ \frac{\eta^3(3\tau)}{\eta(\tau)}, \frac{\eta^3(\tau/3)}{\eta(\tau)}, \frac{\eta^3(6\tau)}{\eta(2\tau)}, \frac{\eta^3(\tau/6)}{\eta(\tau/2)}, \frac{\eta^3(2\tau/3)}{\eta(2\tau)}, \frac{\eta^3(3\tau/2)}{\eta(\tau/2)} \right\}, \quad (4.42)
\end{aligned}$$

where the Klein form $\mathfrak{k}_{(r_1, r_2)}(\tau)$ is a holomorphic function which has no zeros and poles on the upper half complex plane. The Klein form can be written into an infinite product

expansion [160, 167–169]:

$$\mathfrak{k}_{(r_1, r_2)}(\tau) = q_z^{(r_1-1)/2} (1 - q_z) \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n q_z) (1 - q^n q_z^{-1}) (1 - q^n)^{-2}, \quad (4.43)$$

with $q_z = e^{2\pi iz}$ with $z = r_1\tau + r_2$. The integer weight modular forms up to weight 3 and the decomposition under Γ'_N are listed in table 5.

4.4 Half-integer weight modular form and metaplectic cover

Let us first consider the problem for half-integer weight modular forms for the purposes of illustration. Then later we provide the solution for half-integer weight modular forms using the metaplectic cover.

Similar to integer weight modular form, one may attempt to define the half-integer weight modular form as a holomorphic function of τ and satisfying

$$Y(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^{k/2} Y(\tau) = J^{k/2}(\gamma, \tau) Y(\tau), \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \quad (4.44)$$

for a positive integer k . We see that the square root of the $c\tau + d$ appears in the above transformation formula. It is known that the function of the square root has two branches $\sqrt{z} = \{z^{1/2}, -z^{1/2}\}$ for a complex number z . It is crucial to deal with the two branches for the square root in a systematic way. The most common choice and the one we will always use is to choose the principal branch of the square root, i.e.,

$$z^{1/2} \equiv |z|^{1/2} \exp\left(i \frac{\text{Arg}(z)}{2}\right), \quad -\pi < \text{Arg}(z) \leq \pi. \quad (4.45)$$

Then $z^{1/2}$ for real $z < 0$ is a pure positive imaginary number and $(-1)^{1/2} = i$. Hence $(z_1 z_2)^{1/2}$ is equal to $z_1^{1/2} z_2^{1/2}$ only up to a sign ± 1 , i.e.,

$$(z_1 z_2)^{1/2} = \begin{cases} z_1^{1/2} z_2^{1/2}, & -\pi < \text{Arg}(z_1) + \text{Arg}(z_2) \leq \pi \\ -z_1^{1/2} z_2^{1/2}, & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (4.46)$$

For an (even or odd) integer k , $z^{k/2}$ always refer to $(z^{1/2})^k$. Note that this is not always equal to $(z^k)^{1/2}$ for k odd. Because of the multivaluedness of the square root function, $J^{k/2}(\gamma, \tau) = (c\tau + d)^{k/2}$ doesn't satisfy the cocycle relation [170, 171]

$$J^{k/2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2\tau) J^{k/2}(\gamma_2, \tau) = \zeta_{1/2}^k(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) J^{k/2}(\gamma_1\gamma_2, \tau) \neq J^{k/2}(\gamma_1\gamma_2, \tau), \quad \gamma_{1,2} \in \Gamma, \quad (4.47)$$

where the two-cocycle $\zeta_{1/2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ can only take values $+1$ and -1 , and its explicit expression is given in [172]. Notice that $\zeta_{1/2}^k(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)$ is always equal to 1 for any values of γ_1 and γ_2 if k is even. As a consequence, and the definition in Eq. (4.44) is inconsistent, i.e.

$$Y(\gamma_1(\gamma_2(\tau))) \neq Y(\gamma_1\gamma_2(\tau)). \quad (4.48)$$

Hence $(c\tau + d)^{k/2}$ is not the automorphy factor anymore. It turns out that the half-integral weight modular forms can only be defined on the principal congruence subgroup $\Gamma(4N)$,

and a multiplier is generally needed. The weight $k/2$ weight modular form $Y(\tau)$ with k positive integer is a holomorphic function of τ and satisfies the following condition [173]:

$$Y(h\tau) = v^k(h)(c\tau + d)^{k/2}Y(\tau) = v^k(h)J^{k/2}(h, \tau)Y(\tau), \quad h = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma(4N), \quad (4.49)$$

where $v(h) = \left(\frac{c}{d}\right)$ is the Kronecker symbol, it is 1 or -1 here and its more detailed properties can be found in [172]. The Kronecker symbol $v(h)$ fulfills the following identity [170, 171]:

$$v(h_1 h_2) = \zeta_{1/2}(h_1, h_2)v(h_1)v(h_2), \quad h_{1,2} \in \Gamma(4N). \quad (4.50)$$

Thus one can check that $v^k(h)(c\tau + d)^{k/2}$ is the correct automorphy factor and it satisfies the cocycle relation, and the ambiguity caused by half-integral weight is eliminated by the factor $v(h)$.

Now we provide the solution to the problem of modular forms for half-integer modular weights using metaplectic cover. In order to consistently define the half-integer modular forms, one should consider both branches of the square root function and consider the metaplectic (twofold) cover group of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ [173], and it usually denoted as $\text{Mp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ in the literature. For notation simplicity, we shall denote $\text{Mp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ as $\tilde{\Gamma}$ in the following. It is well-known that can be realized as the group of pairs (γ, ϵ) , where $\epsilon = \pm 1$ stands for the branch of the square root function. Consequently the group element of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ can be written in the form [173–175]:

$$\tilde{\Gamma} \equiv \{[\gamma, \epsilon] \mid \gamma \in \Gamma, \epsilon \in \{\pm 1\}\}. \quad (4.51)$$

Obviously each element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ corresponds to two elements $\tilde{\gamma} = [\gamma, \pm 1]$ of the metaplectic group $\tilde{\Gamma}$. The multiplication law of arbitrary two elements, $[\gamma_1, \epsilon_1], [\gamma_2, \epsilon_2] \in \tilde{\Gamma}$, is defined by¹⁴

$$[\gamma_1, \epsilon_1][\gamma_2, \epsilon_2] = [\gamma_1 \gamma_2, \zeta_{1/2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2)\epsilon_1 \epsilon_2]. \quad (4.52)$$

Using the generators S and T of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, the metaplectic group $\tilde{\Gamma}$ can also be generated by two generators \tilde{S} and \tilde{T} [170, 176]:

$$\tilde{S} = \left[\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, -1 \right], \quad \tilde{T} = \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, +1 \right]. \quad (4.53)$$

One can check that the generators \tilde{S} and \tilde{T} obey the following relations [172]

$$\tilde{S}^8 = (\tilde{S}\tilde{T})^3 = 1, \quad (4.54)$$

¹⁴Alternative but equivalent definition of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is given by [173]

$$\tilde{\Gamma} = \left\{ \tilde{\gamma} = (\gamma, \epsilon J^{1/2}(\gamma, \tau)) \mid \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma, \epsilon = \pm 1 \right\}.$$

The multiplication rule accordingly is

$$\begin{aligned} (\gamma_1, \epsilon_1 J^{1/2}(\gamma_1, \tau))(\gamma_2, \epsilon_2 J^{1/2}(\gamma_2, \tau)) &= (\gamma_1 \gamma_2, \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 J^{1/2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \tau) J^{1/2}(\gamma_2, \tau)) \\ &= (\gamma_1 \gamma_2, \epsilon_1 \epsilon_2 \zeta_{1/2}(\gamma_1, \gamma_2) J^{1/2}(\gamma_1 \gamma_2, \tau)), \end{aligned}$$

Consequently \tilde{S} is of order 8, and particularly we have

$$\tilde{R} \equiv \tilde{S}^2 = \left[\begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, -1 \right], \quad \tilde{S}\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}\tilde{S}, \quad \tilde{T}\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}\tilde{T}. \quad (4.55)$$

Consequently the center of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ is the Z_4 subgroup generated by \tilde{R} . Moreover, we have the identities

$$\tilde{R}^2 = \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, -1 \right], \quad \tilde{R}^2[\gamma, \epsilon] = [\gamma, -\epsilon] \quad (4.56)$$

Therefore the modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is isomorphic to the quotient of $\text{Mp}_2(\mathbb{Z})$ over the Z_2 subgroup $Z_2^{\tilde{R}^2} = \{1, \tilde{R}^2\}$,

$$\text{Mp}_2(\mathbb{Z})/Z_2^{\tilde{R}^2} \cong \text{SL}(2, \mathbb{Z}). \quad (4.57)$$

It is known that metaplectic congruence subgroup of level $4N$ is [170, 176]:

$$\tilde{\Gamma}(4N) = \left\{ \tilde{h} = [h, v(h)] \mid h \in \Gamma(4N) \right\}, \quad (4.58)$$

$\tilde{\Gamma}(4N)$ is an infinite normal subgroup of $\tilde{\Gamma}$ and it is isomorphic to the principal congruence subgroup $\Gamma(4N)$. Likewise the finite metaplectic group is the quotient group $\tilde{\Gamma}_{4N} \equiv \tilde{\Gamma}/\tilde{\Gamma}(4N)$. We can check \tilde{T}^{4N} is an element of $\tilde{\Gamma}(4N)$:

$$\tilde{T}^{4N} = \left[\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 4N \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, +1 \right] \in \tilde{\Gamma}(4N). \quad (4.59)$$

Hence the generator \tilde{T} of the finite metaplectic group $\tilde{\Gamma}_{4N}$ additionally fulfills

$$\tilde{T}^{4N} = 1. \quad (4.60)$$

For the smallest value $N = 1$, the finite metaplectic group $\tilde{\Gamma}_4$ denoted as \tilde{S}_4 is a group of order 96 with group ID [96, 67] in the computer algebra program GAP [177]. See [172] for more details about group theory of \tilde{S}_4 . For larger N , the relations in Eqs. (4.54, 4.60) are not sufficient and addition relations are needed to render the group $\tilde{\Gamma}_{4N}$ finite. For example, in the case of $N = 2$, the multiplication rules of $\tilde{\Gamma}_8$ for the generators \tilde{S} and \tilde{T} are [172]

$$\tilde{S}^2 = \tilde{R}, \quad (\tilde{S}\tilde{T})^3 = \tilde{R}^4 = \tilde{T}^8 = \tilde{R}^2\tilde{S}\tilde{T}^6\tilde{S}\tilde{T}^4\tilde{S}\tilde{T}^2\tilde{S}\tilde{T}^4 = 1, \quad \tilde{T}\tilde{R} = \tilde{R}\tilde{T}. \quad (4.61)$$

Thus $\tilde{\Gamma}_8$ is a group of order 768 and its group ID is [768, 1085324] in GAP.

The weight $k/2$ modular forms of $\tilde{\Gamma}(4N)$ span a linear space $\mathcal{M}_{k/2}(\tilde{\Gamma}(4N))$ of finite dimension $k + 1$, where k is a non-negative integer. In the same manner as shown in the beginning of section 4, it is always possible to choose the basis of $\mathcal{M}_{k/2}(\tilde{\Gamma}(4N))$ so that the modular forms of weight $k/2$ can be arranged into multiplets of the finite metaplectic group $\tilde{\Gamma}_{4N}$ [172], i.e.

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tilde{\gamma}\tau) = (\epsilon\sqrt{c\tau + d})^k \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\tilde{\gamma}) Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau), \quad \tilde{\gamma} = [\gamma, \epsilon] \in \tilde{\Gamma}, \quad (4.62)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}\tau = \gamma\tau$, and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$ is an irreducible representation of $\tilde{\Gamma}_{4N}$. Applying Eq. (4.62) for $\tilde{\gamma} = \tilde{R}$, we obtain

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tilde{R}\tau) = Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) = (-i)^k \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\tilde{R}) Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau), \quad (4.63)$$

which implies

$$\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\tilde{R}) = i^k, \quad \begin{cases} k \text{ odd} : \rho^4(\tilde{R}) = 1, \\ k \text{ even} : \rho^2(\tilde{R}) = 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.64)$$

From the dimension formula, we know that there are only two linearly independent weight 1/2 modular forms of level 4 and they can be expressed in terms of the Jacobi theta functions [172, 178]:

$$Y_1(\tau) = \theta_3(0|2\tau), \quad Y_2(\tau) = -\theta_2(0|2\tau), \quad (4.65)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_2(0|2\tau) &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{2\pi i \tau (m + \frac{1}{2})^2} = 2q^{1/4} (1 + q^2 + q^6 + q^{12} + \dots), \\ \theta_3(0|2\tau) &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{2\pi i \tau m^2} = 1 + 2q + 2q^4 + 2q^9 + 2q^{16} + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (4.66)$$

It turns out that $Y_1(\tau)$ and $Y_2(\tau)$ can be arranged into a doublet $\hat{\mathbf{2}}$ of the finite metaplectic group $\tilde{\Gamma}_4 \equiv \tilde{S}_4$ [172],

$$Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(\tau) \equiv \begin{pmatrix} Y_1(\tau) \\ Y_2(\tau) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.67)$$

which transforms in the two-dimensional irreducible representation $\hat{\mathbf{2}}$ of \tilde{S}_4 ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(\tau) &\xrightarrow{S} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(-1/\tau) = -\sqrt{-\tau} \rho_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}(\tilde{S}) Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(\tau), \\ Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(\tau) &\xrightarrow{T} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(\tau + 1) = \rho_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}(\tilde{T}) Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (4.68)$$

where the unitary representation matrices $\rho_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}(\tilde{S})$ and $\rho_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}(\tilde{T})$ are given in Ref. [172]. All half-integer and integer weight modular forms of level 4 can be generated from the tensor products of $Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})}(\tau)$. For example, we find the weight 1 modular forms make up a triplet $\hat{\mathbf{3}}'$ of \tilde{S}_4 ,

$$Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}'}^{(1)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(\frac{1}{2})} \end{pmatrix}_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}'} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_2 \\ Y_1^2 \\ -Y_2^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.69)$$

It is straightforward to check that $Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}'}^{(1)}$ is the same as the original weight one modular forms given in [178] up to a permutation, the discrepancy arises from the different convention for the representation matrices of the generators S and T . In a similar fashion, we can obtain higher weights modular forms and decompose them into different irreducible multiplets of \tilde{S}_4 , see Ref. [172] for the details. It is remarkable that $Y_1(\tau)$ and $Y_2(\tau)$ are algebraically independent, and each modular form of integral weight $k/2$ and level 4 can be written as a polynomial of degree $k + 1$ in $Y_1(\tau)$ and $Y_2(\tau)$:

$$\sum_{i=0}^k c_i Y_1^i(\tau) Y_2^{k-i}(\tau), \quad (4.70)$$

where c_i are free coefficients. As a result, the construction of higher weight modular forms from $Y_1(\tau)$ and $Y_2(\tau)$ naturally bypasses the need to search for non-linear constraints relating redundant higher weight multiplets.

4.5 Multiplier system and explicit form of the rational weight modular forms

Now we turn to the solution to the problem of modular forms for general rational modular weights. The previous procedure may be followed analogously for the case of modular forms of rational weight r for certain congruence subgroups. Similar to Eq. (4.49), a multiplier system $v(\gamma)$ is needed such that $v(\gamma)(c\tau + d)^r$ is the correct automorphy factor satisfying the cocycle relation, and the ambiguity of multi-valued branches caused by the rational power is properly eliminated. For the principal congruence subgroup $\Gamma(N)$ of level odd integer $N \geq 5$, a unified construction of multiplier systems denote by $v_N(\gamma)$ has been given in [179], and it is found that the corresponding modular forms are of weight $(N-3)/(2N)$. Specifically, v_N is given by the following formula

$$v_N(\gamma) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } c = 0, \\ \exp\left(-2\pi i \frac{3 \operatorname{sign}(c)(N^2 - 1)}{8N}\right) \exp\left(2\pi i \frac{N^2 - 1}{8N} \Phi(\gamma)\right) & \text{if } c \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.71)$$

where $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma(N)$, and $\Phi(\gamma)$ is given by

$$\Phi(\gamma) = \begin{cases} \frac{b}{d} & \text{if } c = 0, \\ \frac{a+d}{c} - 12 \operatorname{sign}(c) s(d, |c|) & \text{if } c \neq 0, \end{cases} \quad (4.72)$$

where $s(d, |c|)$ is the Dedekind sum with

$$s(h, k) = \sum_{\mu=1}^k \left(\left(\frac{h\mu}{k} \right) \right) \left(\left(\frac{\mu}{k} \right) \right), \quad (4.73)$$

for integers $h, k (k \neq 0)$. Here $((x))$ is the sawtooth function defined by

$$((x)) = \begin{cases} x - [x] - \frac{1}{2} & \text{if } x \notin \mathbb{Z}, \\ 0 & \text{if } x \in \mathbb{Z}, \end{cases} \quad (4.74)$$

with $[x]$ the floor function. Note that the multiplier system $v_N(\gamma)$ is an N -th root of unity, consequently $v_N(\gamma)^N = 1$ for all $\gamma \in \Gamma(N)$. In short, $v_N(\gamma)(c\tau + d)^{(N-3)/2N}$ is the automorphy factor for the modular form of weight $(N-3)/(2N)$ at level odd integer $N \geq 5$.

Moreover, for any odd integer $5 \leq N \leq 13$, the ring of the modular forms of rational weight $r = (N-3)/(2N)$ for the principal congruence subgroup $\Gamma(N)$ can be constructed from the holomorphic functions $f_n^{(N)}(\tau)$ [179],

$$f_n^{(N)}(\tau) = \theta_{\left(\frac{n}{2N}, \frac{1}{2}\right)}(N\tau) / \eta(\tau)^{\frac{3}{N}}, \quad (4.75)$$

N	weight r	$\dim \mathcal{M}_r(\Gamma(N))$	$\mathcal{M}_r(\Gamma(N)) _{k=1}$	$\tilde{\Gamma}_N$	$ \tilde{\Gamma}_N $	GAP ID
4	$k/2$	$k+1$	$\{\theta_3(0 2\tau), \theta_2(0 2\tau)\}$	\tilde{S}_4	96	[96,67]
5	$k/5$	$k+1$	$\{f_1^{(5)}(\tau), f_3^{(5)}(\tau)\}$	$Z_5 \times \Gamma'_5$	600	[600,54]
7	$2k/7$	$\begin{cases} 4k-2 & (\text{for } k \geq 2) \\ 3 & (\text{for } k = 1) \end{cases}$	$\{f_1^{(7)}(\tau), f_3^{(7)}(\tau), f_5^{(7)}(\tau)\}$	$Z_7 \times \Gamma_7$	1176	[1176,212]
9	$k/3$	$\begin{cases} 9k-9 & (\text{for } k \geq 3) \\ 10 & (\text{for } k = 2) \\ 4 & (\text{for } k = 1) \end{cases}$	$\{f_1^{(9)}(\tau), f_3^{(9)}(\tau), f_5^{(9)}(\tau), f_7^{(9)}(\tau)\}$	$\tilde{\Gamma}_9$	1944	[1944,2976]

Table 6. The dimension formula of the rational weight modular form linear $\dim \mathcal{M}_r(\Gamma(N))$ for $N = 4, 5, 7, 9$, the linear space $\mathcal{M}_r(\Gamma(N))|_{k=1}$ of the lowest fractional weight modular forms, and the finite metaplectic group $\tilde{\Gamma}_N$. Notice that $\theta_{2,3}(0|2\tau)$ and $f_n^{(N)}(\tau)$ are defined in Eq. (4.66) and Eq. (4.75) respectively.

where n are odd integers with $1 \leq n \leq N-2$, and the theta constant with characteristic (m', m'') is defined by

$$\theta_{(m', m'')}(\tau) = \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{2\pi i \tau (\frac{1}{2}(m+m')^2 \tau + (m+m')m'')}, \quad (4.76)$$

and Dedekind eta function is

$$\eta(\tau) = e^{\pi i \tau / 12} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - e^{2\pi i n \tau}). \quad (4.77)$$

Consequently there are $(N-1)/2$ linearly independent modular forms $f_1^{(N)}, f_3^{(N)}, \dots, f_{N-2}^{(N)}$ of rational weight $r = (N-3)/(2N)$, and the graded rings of modular forms $\mathcal{M}(\Gamma(N)) = \bigoplus_{m \geq 1} \mathcal{M}_{m \frac{N-3}{2N}}(\Gamma(N))$ can be generated by the tensor products of these lowest weight modular forms. The dimension formula of $\mathcal{M}_{m \frac{N-3}{2N}}(\Gamma(N))$ for any odd integer $N \geq 5$ and any integer $m > \frac{4(N-6)}{N-3}$ is given by [179, 180]

$$\dim \mathcal{M}_{m \frac{N-3}{2N}}(\Gamma(N)) = \frac{N^2 [m(N-3) - 2(N-6)]}{48} \prod_{p|N} (1 - \frac{1}{p^2}), \quad (4.78)$$

where the product is over the prime divisors p of N . As shown in Eq. (4.62), we expect that rational weight modular forms can be organized into different irreducible multiplets of the finite metaplectic congruence subgroup. We summarize the dimension formula, modular forms of rational weight $r = (N-3)/(2N)$ and the corresponding finite metaplectic group in table 6. The finite metaplectic groups can arise from compactifications on tori with magnetic background fluxes [175, 181]. The theory of modular forms with real weight and even complex weight has been developed as well [182], and then the modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ should be extended to the universal covering groups. Some concrete examples are given in [183, 184].

4.6 Most general finite modular group and vector-valued modular form (VVMF)

Let ρ denote a d -dimensional representation of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. Mathematically this means that each element γ of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is mapped onto its image consisting of one $d \times d$ matrix $\rho(\gamma)$. A vector-valued modular form $Y(\tau) = (Y_1(\tau), \dots, Y_d(\tau))^T$ of weight k in representation ρ is a holomorphic vector-valued function in the upper half-plane \mathcal{H} , and transforms as [185–190]

$$Y(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k \rho(\gamma)Y(\tau), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma, \quad (4.79)$$

where k is called the modular weight and $\rho(\gamma)$ is the irreducible representation matrix of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. Moreover, $Y(\tau)$ is generally required to satisfy the so-called moderate growth condition, i.e., there exists an integer n such that for each components $Y_j(\tau)$ we have $|Y_j(\tau)| < \text{Im}(\tau)^n$ for any fixed τ with $\text{Im}(\tau) \gg 0$. In other word, $Y_j(\tau)$ is bounded as $\text{Im}(\tau) \rightarrow +\infty$.

In the present work, we will focus on the case that k is a non-negative integer and ρ has finite image. Finite image means that, although there are infinitely many elements γ , there are only a finite number of representation matrices $\rho(\gamma)$. Note that ρ can be taken to be unitary since the image of ρ is finite, and it is also completely reducible by Maschke's theorem [191], i.e., it can be decomposed into a direct sum of irreducible representations. Therefore, we can further restrict ρ to the unitary irreducible representations without loss of generality. Also the representation matrix $\rho(\gamma)$ should have finite order for any $\gamma \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ so that one can always work in the basis where $\rho(T)$ is diagonal, and the eigenvalues of $\rho(T)$ are roots of unity. Finally, the finiteness of the image of ρ implies that the kernel $\ker(\rho)$ is a normal subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ with finite index.

In the original paradigm of modular flavor symmetry [143], the modular form of level N satisfying the condition in Eq. (4.1) is assumed, $\ker(\rho)$ is chosen to be the principal subgroup $\Gamma(N)$, and the representation matrices $\rho(\gamma)$ form finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N . In the framework of VVMF, $\Gamma(N)$ and the corresponding modular forms are not required, and we start from the more general VVMF obeying Eq. (4.79).

The theory of the VVMF has been developed by Mason et al [187, 192] in recent years, and the explicit form of VVMF can be obtained by solving the so-called modular linear differential equation [187, 192, 193]. In the following, we report the results for VVMF of low dimensions [193].

- one-dimensional irreducible VVMFs

It is known that the modular generators S and T the relations $S^4 = (ST)^3 = 1$. Consequently the $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ group has 12 one-dimensional irreducible representations denoted as $\mathbf{1}_p$ with

$$\mathbf{1}_p : \quad \rho_{\mathbf{1}_p}(S) = i^p, \quad \rho_{\mathbf{1}_p}(T) = e^{\frac{i\pi}{6}p}, \quad (4.80)$$

where $p = 0, 1, \dots, 11$. The lowest weight of the VVMFs in the representation $\mathbf{1}_p$ is equal to p and accordingly the minimal weight VVMF Y is found to take the following form

$$Y = \eta^{2p}. \quad (4.81)$$

We would like to mention that η is the famous Dedekind-eta function defined in Eq. (4.19). One can check that $\eta^{2p}(\tau)$ satisfies the following transformation form

$$\begin{aligned}\eta^{2p}(S\tau) &= (-\tau)^p i^p \eta^{2p}(\tau) = (-\tau)^p \rho_{\mathbf{1}_p}(S) \eta^{2p}(\tau), \\ \eta^{2p}(T\tau) &= e^{\frac{i\pi}{6}p} \eta^{2p}(\tau) = \rho_{\mathbf{1}_p}(T) \eta^{2p}(\tau).\end{aligned}\quad (4.82)$$

Hence $\eta^{2p}(\tau)$ is indeed the weight p one-dimensional VVMFs in the singlet irrep $\mathbf{1}_p$. The free module theorem implies that all one-dimensional VVMFs can be expressed as [187]:

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{1}_p) = \mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6] \eta^{2p}, \quad p = 0, 1, \dots, 11. \quad (4.83)$$

Here $\mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6]$ denotes the polynomial of the Eisenstein series $E_4(\tau)$ and $E_6(\tau)$ [171]:

$$\begin{aligned}E_4(\tau) &= 1 + 240 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_3(n) q^n = 1 + 240q + 2160q^2 + 6720q^3 + 17520q^4 + \dots, \\ E_6(\tau) &= 1 - 504 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_5(n) q^n = 1 - 504q - 16632q^2 - 122976q^3 - 532728q^4 + \dots\end{aligned}\quad (4.84)$$

where $\sigma_k(n) = \sum_{d|n} d^k$ is the sum of the k th power of the divisors of n and $q = e^{2\pi i \tau}$. Notice that $E_4(\tau)$ and $E_6(\tau)$ are scalar-valued modular forms of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ with modular weight 4 and 6 respectively.

- two-dimensional irreducible VVMFs

All the 2-d irreducible unitary representations of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ with finite image have been fully obtained in Ref. [194]. It is known that there are 54 inequivalent 2-d irreps and up to a possible similar transformation the representation matrices are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\rho(T) &= \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r_1} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i r_2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq r_1, r_2 < 1, \\ \rho(S) &= \frac{(\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^2}{\lambda_2 - \lambda_1} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{-(\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^5 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 - 1} \\ \sqrt{-(\lambda_1 \lambda_2)^5 (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2)^2 - 1} & -1 \end{pmatrix},\end{aligned}\quad (4.85)$$

with $\lambda_{1,2} = e^{2\pi i r_{1,2}}$. We will denote the 2-d irreducible representation (irrep) as $\mathbf{2}_{(r_1, r_2)}$, and the allowed values of the unordered pair (r_1, r_2) are given in [193]. We can read out the exponent matrix L as $L = \text{diag}(r_1, r_2)$ and the minimal weight $k_0 = 6\text{Tr}(L) - 1 = 6(r_1 + r_2) - 1$. The corresponding minimal weight VVMF in the doublet representation $\mathbf{2}_{(r_1, r_2)}$ is found to be [193]:

$$Y(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^{12(r_1+r_2)-2} K^{\frac{6(r_1-r_2)+1}{12}} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{6(r_1-r_2)+1}{12}, \frac{6(r_1-r_2)+5}{12}; r_1 - r_2 + 1; K\right) \\ C \eta^{12(r_1+r_2)-2} K^{\frac{6(r_2-r_1)+1}{12}} {}_2F_1\left(\frac{6(r_2-r_1)+1}{12}, \frac{6(r_2-r_1)+5}{12}; r_2 - r_1 + 1; K\right) \end{pmatrix}\quad (4.86)$$

up to an overall irrelevant constant. The coefficient C depends on the explicit form of the representation matrix $\rho(S)$, and its value can be fixed to satisfy the condition

Eq. (4.79) of VVMF for $\gamma = S$. The function $K(\tau)$ is defined as $K(\tau) = 1728/j(\tau)$, where $j(\tau)$ is the modular j -invariant [171] with the q -expansion:

$$j(\tau) = q^{-1} + 744 + 196884q + 21493760q^2 + \dots \quad (4.87)$$

${}_nF_{n-1}$ is the generalized hypergeometric series and it is defined by the formula

$${}_nF_{n-1}(a_1, \dots, a_n; b_1, \dots, b_{n-1}; z) = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{\prod_{j=1}^n (a_j)_m}{\prod_{k=1}^{n-1} (b_k)_m} \frac{z^m}{m!}, \quad (4.88)$$

and $(a)_m$ is the Pochhammer symbol defined by

$$(a)_m = \begin{cases} 1, & m = 0, \\ a(a+1)\dots(a+m-1), & m \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (4.89)$$

Hence we know the module of two-dimensional VVMFs is given by

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{2}_{(r_1, r_2)}) = \mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6]Y \oplus \mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6]D_{k_0}Y, \quad (4.90)$$

where D_{k_0} is the modular differential operators acting on the VVMFs of weight k_0 [144],

$$D_{k_0} \equiv \theta - \frac{k_0 E_2}{12}, \quad \theta \equiv q \frac{d}{dq} = \frac{1}{2\pi i} \frac{d}{d\tau}, \quad k_0 \in \mathbb{Z}, \quad (4.91)$$

with $E_2(\tau)$ being the well-known quasi-modular Eisenstein series of weight 2 [171]

$$E_2(\tau) = 1 - 24 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \sigma_1(n) q^n = 1 - 24q - 72q^2 - 96q^3 - 168q^4 - 144q^5 + \dots \quad (4.92)$$

For example, the group $\Gamma_2 \cong S_3$ has doublet irreducible representation with [154]

$$\rho(S) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & -\sqrt{3} \\ -\sqrt{3} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.93)$$

which implies $r_1 = 0$ and $r_2 = 1/2$ and the weight $k_0 = 6(r_1 + r_2) - 1 = 2$. From the general expression of two-dimensional VVMF in Eq. (4.86) and considering the S transformation, we can fix the parameter $C = \frac{1}{3}$ and

$$Y_{\mathbf{2}_{(0, 1/2)}}(\tau) = 2\sqrt{3} \begin{pmatrix} \eta^4 K^{-1/6} {}_2F_1(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}; K) \\ \frac{1}{3} \eta^4 K^{1/3} {}_2F_1(\frac{1}{3}, \frac{2}{3}, \frac{3}{2}; K) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.94)$$

where an overall constant $2\sqrt{3}$ is multiplied. The q -expansion of $Y_{\mathbf{2}_{(0, 1/2)}}(\tau)$ is found to be

$$Y_{\mathbf{2}_{(0, 1/2)}}(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + 24q + 24q^2 + 96q^3 + 24q^4 + 144q^5 + \dots \\ 8\sqrt{3} q^{1/2} (1 + 4q + 6q^2 + 8q^3 + 13q^4 + 12q^5 + \dots) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4.95)$$

It agrees, up to an overall factor, with the q -expansion derived in [154], where the $Y_{(0, 1/2)}(\tau)$ is the weight 2 modular form of level 2 and it is expressed in terms of the eta-function and its derivative.

- three-dimensional irreducible VVMFs

Similar to the 2-d case, the 3-d irreps of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ are determined by the three rational numbers r_1, r_2 and r_3 [195]. In the T diagonal basis, the 3-d representation matrix $\rho(T)$ can be parameterized as

$$\rho(T) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{2\pi i r_1} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i r_2} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{2\pi i r_3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad 0 \leq r_1, r_2, r_3 < 1, \quad (4.96)$$

where the parameters $r_{1,2,3}$ have to fulfill the following constraint:

$$r_1 + r_2 + r_3 \in \frac{1}{12}\mathbb{Z}. \quad (4.97)$$

This 3-d irrep is denoted as $\mathbf{3}_{(r_1, r_2, r_3)}$. The exponential matrix is $L = \text{diag}(r_1, r_2, r_3)$ and the minimal weight $k_0 = 4\text{Tr}(L) - 2 = 4(r_1 + r_2 + r_3) - 2$. The minimal weight VVMF Y in the triplet representation $\mathbf{3}_{(r_1, r_2, r_3)}$ is determined to be [193]

$$Y(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \eta^{8(r_1+r_2+r_3)-4} K^{\frac{a_1+1}{6}} {}_3F_2\left(\frac{a_1+1}{6}, \frac{a_1+3}{6}, \frac{a_1+5}{6}; r_1 - r_2 + 1, r_1 - r_3 + 1; K\right) \\ C_1 \eta^{8(r_1+r_2+r_3)-4} K^{\frac{a_2+1}{6}} {}_3F_2\left(\frac{a_2+1}{6}, \frac{a_2+3}{6}, \frac{a_2+5}{6}; r_2 - r_3 + 1, r_2 - r_1 + 1; K\right) \\ C_2 \eta^{8(r_1+r_2+r_3)-4} K^{\frac{a_3+1}{6}} {}_3F_2\left(\frac{a_3+1}{6}, \frac{a_3+3}{6}, \frac{a_3+5}{6}; r_3 - r_1 + 1, r_3 - r_2 + 1; K\right) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.98)$$

with $a_1 = 4r_1 - 2r_2 - 2r_3$, $a_2 = 4r_2 - 2r_1 - 2r_3$ and $a_3 = 4r_3 - 2r_1 - 2r_2$. The constants $C_{1,2}$ are fixed by the representation matrix of $\rho(S)$ in the T -diagonal basis. Hence the 3-d VVMFs module is of the form

$$\mathcal{M}(\mathbf{3}_{(r_1, r_2, r_3)}) = \mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6]Y \oplus \mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6]D_{k_0}Y \oplus \mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6]D_{k_0}^2Y. \quad (4.99)$$

It is known that there are three linearly independent weight 2 modular forms of level 3 and they can be arranged into a A_4 triplet with the following representation matrices for the modular generators,

$$\rho(S) = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \rho(T) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega = e^{2\pi i/3}, \quad (4.100)$$

which is given by Eq. (C.13). This implies $r_1 = 0$, $r_2 = \frac{1}{3}$ and $r_3 = \frac{2}{3}$ and the modular weight $k_0 = 4(r_1 + r_2 + r_3) - 2 = 2$. Taking into account the modular transformation S , we find $C_1 = -\frac{1}{2}$, $C_2 = -\frac{1}{8}$, and the VVMF in the triplet representation of A_4 is given by

$$Y_{\mathbf{3}_{(0, 1/3, 2/3)}}(\tau) = 2\sqrt{3} \begin{pmatrix} \eta^4 K^{-1/6} {}_3F_2\left(-\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}; \frac{2}{3}, \frac{1}{3}; K\right) \\ -\frac{1}{2}\eta^4 K^{1/6} {}_3F_2\left(\frac{1}{6}, \frac{1}{2}, \frac{5}{6}; \frac{2}{3}, \frac{4}{3}; K\right) \\ -\frac{1}{8}\eta^4 K^{1/2} {}_3F_2\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{5}{6}, \frac{7}{6}; \frac{5}{3}, \frac{4}{3}; K\right) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.101)$$

where the overall factor $2\sqrt{3}$ is included. We find that the q -expansion of $Y_{\mathbf{3}_{(0,1/3,2/3)}}(\tau)$ reads as

$$Y_{\mathbf{3}_{(0,1/3,2/3)}}(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 + 12q + 36q^2 + 12q^3 + 84q^4 + 72q^5 + \dots \\ -6q^{1/3} (1 + 7q + 8q^2 + 18q^3 + 14q^4 + 31q^5 + \dots) \\ -18q^{2/3} (1 + 2q + 5q^2 + 4q^3 + 8q^4 + 6q^5 + \dots) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4.102)$$

which exactly coincides with the q -expansion derived in [143], where $Y_{\mathbf{3}_{(0,1/3,2/3)}}(\tau)$ is expressed in terms of the eta-function and its derivative. We see that the theory of VVMF provides a convenient way to obtain the explicit expression of modular forms which is the crucial element of modular invariant model.

Finally we summarise some more general finite modular groups. Since the irrep ρ of $\Gamma = SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ has finite image, the image $\text{Im}(\rho)$ forms a discrete finite group and it can play the role of discrete flavor symmetry. Due to a fundamental theorem of homomorphism we can define $\text{Im}(\rho)$ as the quotient group $\text{Im}(\rho) \cong \Gamma / \ker(\rho)$ where $\Gamma = SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and $\ker(\rho)$ is a normal subgroup determined by the representation ρ . The $\ker(\rho)$ consists of the inverse image of the identity elements.

In the paradigm of modular flavor symmetry [143], $\ker(\rho)$ was only restricted to principle congruence subgroups $\Gamma(N)$. The image $\text{Im}(\rho)$ is the homogeneous or inhomogeneous finite modular group $\Gamma'_N = \Gamma/\Gamma(N)$ or $\Gamma_N = \Gamma/\pm\Gamma(N)$ and it is taken as the flavor symmetry to address the flavor structure of quarks and leptons. From the view of VVMF, the kernel $\ker(\rho)$ can be a general normal subgroup of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ instead of $\Gamma(N)$, and accordingly the finite modular groups are not necessarily Γ_N or Γ'_N . Thus the framework of modular invariance can be extended significantly by considering VVMFs, and we have more possible choices for the finite modular groups to construct modular invariant models.

In table 7 we list the normal subgroups of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ with index ≤ 72 as well as the corresponding finite modular group, where we omit the few cases for which the finite modular group is abelian. Besides the known principal congruence subgroups $\Gamma(N)$ as well as the inhomogeneous and homogeneous finite modular groups, we see other normal subgroups of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. Additional relators are elements of $\ker(\rho)$, when they are added to the $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ presentation relations $S^4 = (ST)^3 = 1$, $S^2T = TS^2$, the finite modular groups $\text{Im}(\rho) \cong \Gamma / \ker(\rho)$ are produced. Moreover, if the element $S^2 \in \ker(\rho)$, we have $\rho(S^2) = \mathbb{1}_d$. Then the corresponding finite modular group has only even representations, and the VVMFs in these irreps must be of even weights.

It is known that the number of VVMFs in a given irrep ρ_Y generally increases with the modular weight k_Y . However, the module $\mathcal{M}(\rho_Y)$ is finitely generated by $d = \dim \rho_Y$ independent bases denoted by $\{Y_1, \dots, Y_d\}$, thus $Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau)$ can be written uniformly in the form of $Y_{\rho_Y}^{(k_Y)} = \alpha_1 Y_1 + \dots + \alpha_d Y_d$ with $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}[E_4, E_6]$, note that α_i are polynomials of E_4 and E_6 . Some α_i for vanishing for small value of modular weight k_Y , nevertheless there are at most d independent alignments Y_1, Y_2, \dots, Y_d . This implies that the superpotential is strongly constrained by the modular symmetry, and it can only take a finite number of possible forms for a given \mathcal{G}_f , although there are infinite possible weight and representation assignments for the matter fields.

Normal subgroups $\ker(\rho)$			Finite modular groups $\Gamma/\ker(\rho) \cong \text{Im}(\rho)$	
Index	Label	Additional relations	Group structure	GAP Id
6	$\Gamma(2)$	T^2	S_3	[6, 1]
12	–	S^2T^2	$Z_3 \rtimes Z_4 \cong 2D_3$	[12, 1]
	$\pm\Gamma(3)$	S^2, T^3	A_4	[12, 3]
18	–	$ST^{-2}ST^2$	$S_3 \times Z_3$	[18, 3]
24	$\Gamma(3)$	T^3	T'	[24, 3]
	–	S^2T^3		
	$\pm\Gamma(4)$	S^2, T^4	S_4	[24, 12]
	–	$S^2, (ST^{-1}ST)^2$	$A_4 \times Z_2$	[24, 13]
36	–	$S^3T^{-2}ST^2$	$(Z_3 \rtimes Z_4) \times Z_3$	[36, 6]
42	–	$T^6, (ST^{-1}S)^2TST^{-1}ST^2$	$Z_7 \rtimes Z_6$	[42, 1]
	–	$T^6, ST^{-1}ST(ST^{-1}S)^2T^2$		
48	–	S^2T^4	$2O$	[48, 28]
	–	T^8, ST^4ST^{-4}	$GL(2, 3)$	[48, 29]
	$\Gamma(4)$	T^4	$A_4 \rtimes Z_4 \cong S'_4$	[48, 30]
	–	$(ST^{-1}ST)^2$	$A_4 \times Z_4$	[48, 31]
	–	$S^2(ST^{-1}ST)^2$	$T' \times Z_2$	[48, 32]
	–	T^{12}, ST^3ST^{-3}	$((Z_4 \times Z_2) \times Z_2) \times Z_3$	[48, 33]
54	–	$T^6, (ST^{-1}ST)^3$	$(Z_3 \times Z_3) \times Z_6$	[54, 5]
60	$\pm\Gamma(5)$	S^2, T^5	A_5	[60, 5]
72	–	T^{12}, ST^4ST^{-4}	$S_4 \times Z_3$	[72, 42]
	$\pm\Gamma(6)$	$S^2, T^6, (ST^{-1}STST^{-1}S)^2T^2$	$A_4 \times S_3$	[72, 44]

Table 7. The normal subgroups of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ with index less than 78 and the corresponding finite modular groups. It is defined $\pm\Gamma(N) = \{\pm\gamma, \gamma \in \Gamma(N)\}$. Note that $2D_3$ is the binary dihedral group of order 12 and $2O$ is the binary octahedral group which is the Schur cover of permutation group S_4 of type “–”. Additional relators are some elements of $\ker(\rho)$, the quotient group $\Gamma/\ker(\rho)$ is produced when the relations “Additional relators =1” together with $S^4 = (ST)^3 = 1$ and $S^2T = TS^2$ are imposed.

5 CP symmetry and modular invariance

The interplay between the generalized CP symmetry (gCP) and modular symmetry is non-trivial. It is found that the CP transformation can be consistently defined in modular invariant supersymmetric theories with a single modulus [196–198]. In particular, the modular symmetry can constrain the CP transformation laws of the modulus τ , of chiral matter multiplets and of modular forms [198], and several modular invariant models where CP is spontaneously broken have been constructed [155, 164, 165, 178, 198–200]. Analogously for multidimensional moduli space, consistent CP definitions have been examined in the context of symplectic modular invariant theories, where the relevant flavour group is the Siegel modular group [201–203]. The CP-conserving vacua in Calabi-Yau compactifications are discussed in Ref. [201]. In this section we formulate the conditions for generalised CP-

symmetry consistent with modular invariance, and derive the modular transformations of matter fields and modular forms, before discussing CP fixed points and their implications for flavor theories.

5.1 Generalized CP symmetry compatible with modular invariance

In a theory invariant under $\Gamma = SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$, consistent CP transformations correspond to outer automorphism $u(\gamma)$ of Γ [111, 204]:

$$\mathcal{CP} \gamma \mathcal{CP}^{-1} = u(\gamma) \quad . \quad (5.1)$$

Each outer automorphism $u(\gamma)$ of Γ can be described by [205]:

$$u(\gamma) = \chi(\gamma) U \gamma U^{-1}, \quad \text{or} \quad u(\gamma) = \chi(\gamma) \gamma, \quad (5.2)$$

with

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5.3)$$

and the map $\chi(\gamma)$, called character of the modular group, is a homomorphism of Γ into $\{+1, -1\}$. From the relations $S^4 = (ST)^3 = 1$ satisfied by the modular generators S and T , we see the modular group has a trivial character with

$$\chi_1(S) = \chi_1(T) = 1 \quad (5.4)$$

and another nontrivial character with

$$\chi_2(S) = \chi_2(T) = -1. \quad (5.5)$$

Hence the modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ has two independent outer automorphisms $u_{1,2} = \chi_{1,2}(\gamma) U \gamma U^{-1}$, satisfying the following relations:

$$u_1^2 = u_2^2 = (u_1 u_2)^2 = \mathbb{1}. \quad (5.6)$$

Hence the outer automorphism group is isomorphic to a Klein group $K_4 \cong Z_2 \times Z_2 = \{u_1, u_2, u_3 = u_1 u_2, u_4 = \mathbb{1}\}$ ¹⁵. We can derive the action of the outer automorphisms on the modular generators S and T as follows [203]:

$$\begin{aligned} u_1(S) &= S^{-1}, & u_1(T) &= T^{-1}, \\ u_2(S) &= -S^{-1}, & u_2(T) &= -T^{-1}, \\ u_3(S) &= -S, & u_3(T) &= -T, \\ u_4(S) &= S, & u_4(T) &= T. \end{aligned} \quad (5.7)$$

We assume that the CP transformation of modulus τ is linear and, for convenience, we write:

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} (\mathcal{CP})\tau \equiv \tau_{\mathcal{CP}} = p_1 \tau^* + p_2, \quad (5.8)$$

¹⁵We denote by $\mathbb{1}$ the identity element of the outer automorphism.

where p_1 and p_2 are parameters to be determined. The inverse CP transformation reads:

$$\tau^* \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}} \tau_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}^* = \frac{\tau - p_2}{p_1}. \quad (5.9)$$

Enforcing the ‘‘consistency condition chain’’ of Eq. (5.1) on the modular generators S and T for the automorphisms $u_a(\gamma)(a = 1, \dots, 4)$, we can obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{p_2\tau - p_1^2 - p_2^2}{\tau - p_2} &= u_a(S)\tau, \\ \tau + p_1 &= u_a(T)\tau. \end{aligned} \quad (5.10)$$

The elements u_1 and u_2 have the same action on τ and similarly for $u_{3,4}$. The above equation can be straightforwardly solved to obtain

$$p_1 = \begin{cases} -1, & \text{for } u_{1,2} \\ +1, & \text{for } u_{3,4} \end{cases}, \quad p_2 = 0. \quad (5.11)$$

Thus we have $\tau_{\mathcal{CP}} = -\tau^*$ for the automorphisms $u_{1,2}$ and $\tau_{\mathcal{CP}} = \tau^*$ for $u_{3,4}$. Since $\text{Im}(\tau_{\mathcal{CP}}) > 0$, the admissible CP transformation of the modulus τ is [196–198, 206–208]

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} \tau_{\mathcal{CP}} = -\tau^*. \quad (5.12)$$

This represents the correct transformation law of the modulus for both $u_{1,2}$ outer automorphisms and we should instead discard $u_{3,4}$. Notice that the same gCP transformation of τ can be derived from the consistency condition, as shown in the Appendix B. From Eq. (5.12), we see $\tau_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}^* = -\tau$ and the action of \mathcal{CP} on the modulus is involutive with $\mathcal{CP}^2\tau = \tau$.

Now let us check explicitly that the gCP transformation of Eq. (5.12) is indeed compatible with Eq. (5.1). Applying the consistency transformation chain $\mathcal{CP} \rightarrow \gamma \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}^{-1}$ for the modulus τ , we have

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} -\tau^* \xrightarrow{\gamma} -\frac{a\tau^* + b}{c\tau^* + d} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}} = \frac{a\tau - b}{-c\tau + d} = \gamma'\tau. \quad (5.13)$$

Since γ and $-\gamma$ give the same action on modulus τ , we see that the generalized CP transformation indeed corresponds to the automorphism u_1 or u_2 of the modular group with

$$u_{1,2} : \gamma \rightarrow \gamma' = u_{1,2}(\gamma) = \chi_{1,2}(\gamma) U \gamma U^{-1} = \chi_{1,2}(\gamma) \begin{pmatrix} a & -b \\ -c & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma, \quad (5.14)$$

where $\chi_1(\gamma)$ is the trivial character given in Eq. (5.4) and $\chi_2(\gamma)$ is the nontrivial character in Eq. (5.5).

If we perform a modular transformation γ and then the CP transformation of Eq. (5.12), we get

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\gamma} \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d} \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} (\gamma \circ \mathcal{CP})\tau = \frac{-a\tau^* + b}{-c\tau^* + d}, \quad (5.15)$$

which is another allowed CP transformation. Since the theory is invariant under Γ , this choice should not be view as independent from (5.12), which we take as representative element in the class (5.12) with $a = d = 1, b = c = 0$. We can rewrite Eq. (5.15) as

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\gamma \circ \mathcal{CP}} \frac{a'\tau^* + b'}{c'\tau^* + d'} \quad (5.16)$$

with

$$a' = -a, \quad b' = b, \quad c' = -c, \quad d' = d. \quad (5.17)$$

One can check

$$a'd' - b'c' = -ad + bc = -(ad - bc) = -1. \quad (5.18)$$

Note that the gCP transformation on τ always corresponds to minus determinant with $a'd' - b'c' = -1$.

By combining CP and the modular transformations we get the extended modular group $\Gamma^* = GL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and the full symmetry transformation of the complex modulus is [198]

$$\begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma^* : \quad \begin{cases} \tau \rightarrow \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d} & \text{if } ad - bc = 1, \\ \tau \rightarrow \frac{a\tau^* + b}{c\tau^* + d} & \text{if } ad - bc = -1. \end{cases} \quad (5.19)$$

where $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$. The first line of (5.19) refers to a modular transformation, while the second line refers to a CP transformation. For the case of the CP transformation in (5.12) the matrix γ is represented by U in Eq. (5.3). Notice that the action of γ and $-\gamma$ on τ is the same and the full symmetry group acting on moduli is isomorphic to $PGL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \equiv GL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\{\pm 1_2\}$. Here $PGL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is the group of integral 2×2 matrices with determinant ± 1 , with the matrices M and $-M$ being identified.

5.2 CP transformations of matter chiral multiplets φ

For a generic chiral supermultiplets φ , its transformation properties are characterized by $-k_\varphi$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$, where $-k_\varphi$ is the modular weight of φ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$ is an irreducible representation of the finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N . Under a modular transformation γ , the multiplet $\varphi(x)$ transforms according to

$$\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{\gamma} (c\tau + d)^{-k_\varphi} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) \varphi(x), \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma. \quad (5.20)$$

The action of generalized CP symmetry on the multiplet φ is

$$\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} X_{\mathbf{r}} \bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}), \quad (5.21)$$

where $x_{\mathcal{P}} = (t, -\vec{x})$, a bar denotes the hermitian conjugate superfield, and $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ is a unitary matrix that acts on flavor space. If we perform a CP transformation, followed by a modular transformation and subsequently an inverse CP transformation, we end up with

$$\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} X_{\mathbf{r}} \bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}) \xrightarrow{\gamma} X_{\mathbf{r}} (c\tau^* + d)^{-k_\varphi} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) \bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}} (c\tau_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}^* + d)^{-k_\varphi} X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} \varphi(x), \quad (5.22)$$

where $\tau_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}$ is the result of applying the inverse CP transformation \mathcal{CP}^{-1} to the modulus τ . Since the theory is assumed to be invariant under both the modular and CP transformations, the resulting transformation should be amount to another modular transformation γ' , i.e.,

$$(c\tau_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}^* + d)^{-k_\varphi} X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} \varphi(x) = (c_{\gamma'} \tau + d_{\gamma'})^{-k_\varphi} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma') \varphi(x) \quad (5.23)$$

which implies

$$X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \left(\frac{c_{\gamma'} \tau + d_{\gamma'}}{c\tau_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}^* + d} \right)^{-k_\varphi} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma'), \quad (5.24)$$

where we have denoted

$$\gamma' = \begin{pmatrix} a_{\gamma'} & b_{\gamma'} \\ c_{\gamma'} & d_{\gamma'} \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma. \quad (5.25)$$

From the transformation of the modulus τ in Eq. (5.13), we know the element $\gamma' = u_{1,2}(\gamma)$ given in Eq. (5.14), thus we can read out

$$c_{\gamma'} = -\chi_{1,2}(\gamma)c, \quad d_{\gamma'} = \chi_{1,2}(\gamma)d. \quad (5.26)$$

Considering $\tau_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}^* = -\tau$, the consistency condition of Eq. (5.24) for the modular symmetry and generalized CP symmetry becomes

$$X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \chi_{1,2}^{-k_\varphi}(\gamma) \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(u_{1,2}(\gamma)). \quad (5.27)$$

Since the modular group has two possible characters $\chi_{1,2}(\gamma)$ given in Eqs. (5.4,5.5), two kinds of generalized CP transformations could be consistently defined in the context of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. The coresponding consistency conditions are given by [198, 203]

$$X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(S) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S^{-1}), \quad X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(T) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T^{-1}). \quad (5.28)$$

for the gCP transformation corresponding to the automorphism u_1 with trivial character χ_1 in Eq. (5.7). A second gCP transformation corresponding to u_2 with nontrivial character χ_2 could be defined¹⁶, nevertheless it is difficult to build phenomenologically viable models of fermion masses and mixing exploiting this second gCP transformation [178]. Hence we shall be concerned with the gCP transformation determined by Eq. (5.28) in this work.

In the basis where both $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T)$ are symmetric matrices, one has $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S^{-1}) = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^\dagger(S) = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(S)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T^{-1}) = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^\dagger(T) = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(T)$ so that one can determine $X_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbb{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$ up to an irrelevant phase, i.e., the gCP transformation has the canonical form. If all the Clebsch-Gordon coefficients of the finite modular group are real in the above symmetric basis, the gCP symmetry would enforce all coupling constants in the Lagrangian to be real. Thus the real part of modulus τ would be the unique source of CP violation, and gCP symmetry can enhance the predictive power of modular invariant models. For the finite modular groups Γ_N and Γ'_N with level $N \leq 6$, it is known that the symmetric basis can always be achieved.

¹⁶The consistency condition for the second gCP transformation reads as:

$$X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(S) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \sigma \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S^{-1}), \quad X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(T) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \sigma \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T^{-1}), \quad \sigma = (-1)^{-k_\varphi} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S^2).$$

Obviously the second gCP transformation $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ depends on $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S^2)$ and the modular weight k_φ , and it can be defined if and only if the level N is even, the dimension of representation $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$ is even, and the traces of $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S)$ are vanishing [178].

5.3 CP transformations of modular form $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$

Considering a multiplet $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ of modular forms of level N and weight k_Y , it transforms in certain irreducible representation $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$ of the finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N , i.e.

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^{k_Y} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma. \quad (5.29)$$

In general, there can be several linearly independent such multiplets, particularly for higher weight corresponding large k_Y . We start by examining the case where there is only one. Under gCP it transforms as:

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}(-\tau^*). \quad (5.30)$$

We can prove that the modular multiplet $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ has the same gCP transformation as that of matter fields in Eq. (5.21), i.e.,

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(-\tau^*) = X_{\mathbf{r}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\tau). \quad (5.31)$$

In order to show this, we define

$$\tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) = X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^*(-\tau^*), \quad (5.32)$$

where $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ is the solution of the consistency condition Eq. (5.28) for the concerned automorphism u_1 . The modular transformation of $\tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ under a generic element $\gamma \in \Gamma$ is

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma(\tau)) &= X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^*(-(\gamma(\tau))^*) \\ &= X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^*(u_1(\gamma)(-\tau^*)) \\ &= X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} (c\tau + d)^{k_Y} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(u_1(\gamma)) Y_{\mathbf{r}}^*(-\tau^*) \\ &= (c\tau + d)^{k_Y} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) \tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau), \end{aligned} \quad (5.33)$$

where the identities $-(\gamma(\tau))^* = u_1(\gamma)(-\tau^*)$ and $X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(u_1(\gamma))$ have been used¹⁷. Since $\tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ and $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ transform in the same way and, by assumption, there is only one linearly independent such modular form, we conclude that they are proportional, $\tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) \propto Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ which gives:

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(-\tau^*) = \lambda X_{\mathbf{r}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\tau). \quad (5.34)$$

By performing two gCP transformation in succession, we obtain

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) = |\lambda|^2 X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) = |\lambda|^2 Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau), \quad (5.35)$$

where we have chosen the gCP transformation $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ to be a constant unitary symmetric matrix fulfilling $X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = 1$ which corresponds to $\mathcal{CP}^2 = 1$ ¹⁸. The non-vanishing constant λ

¹⁷From Eq. (5.13), we know $\mathcal{CP} \circ \gamma \circ \mathcal{CP}^{-1} = u_1(\gamma)$ which gives $\mathcal{CP} \circ \gamma = u_1(\gamma) \circ \mathcal{CP}$. Consequently we have $\mathcal{CP} \circ \gamma(\tau) = u_1(\gamma) \circ \mathcal{CP}(\tau)$ which leads to $-(\gamma(\tau))^* = u_1(\gamma)(-\tau^*)$. Moreover, From Eq. (5.27), we know $X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(u_1(\gamma))$ which gives $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(u_1(\gamma))$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} = X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(u_1(\gamma))$.

¹⁸The action of \mathcal{CP} in the modulus, see Eq. (5.12), is involutive, that is $\mathcal{CP}^2 \tau = \tau$. The action is \mathcal{CP}^2 on the matter field is $\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}^2} X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* \varphi(x)$. From the consistency condition in Eq. (5.21), we obtain:

$$(c\tau + d)^{-k_{\varphi}} X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} \varphi = (c\tau + d)^{-k_{\varphi}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) \varphi \quad .$$

can be absorbed by an appropriate choice of phase of the whole multiplet $Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau)$ so that we have

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}(\tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}(-\tau^*) = X_{\mathbf{r}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\tau). \quad (5.36)$$

Hence the modular multiplets have the same gCP transformation law as that of matter fields.

If there are s linearly independent multiplets $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^a(\tau)$ ($a = 1, \dots, s$) transforming as in Eq. (5.29), Eq. (5.33) holds individually for all $\tilde{Y}_{\mathbf{r}}^a(\tau) = X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1*} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{a*}(-\tau^*)$ and we have:

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}^a(-\tau^*) = \lambda^a_b X_{\mathbf{r}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{b*}(\tau) \quad , \quad (5.37)$$

where $\lambda^a_c \lambda^{*c}_b X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \delta^a_b \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$. When $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ is involutive with $X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$ we have $\lambda^a_c \lambda^{*c}_b = \delta^a_b$, it is always possible to factorize the matrix λ into $\lambda = \eta^{-1} \eta^*$ and we obtain¹⁹:

$$\eta^a_b Y_{\mathbf{r}}^b(-\tau^*) = X_{\mathbf{r}} [\eta^a_b Y_{\mathbf{r}}^b]^*(\tau) \quad . \quad (5.38)$$

We see that, by performing the change of basis $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^a(\tau) \rightarrow \eta^a_b Y_{\mathbf{r}}^b(\tau)$, Eq. (5.33) holds independently for each multiplet $Y^a(\tau)$. In short, when the action of gCP on the field space is involutive with $X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$, one can properly choose the basis of the modular forms such that matter fields and modular forms transform in a similar way under gCP, i.e.,

$$\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} X_{\mathbf{r}} \overline{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}), \quad Y^a(\tau) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^a(-\tau^*) = X_{\mathbf{r}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{b*}(\tau). \quad (5.39)$$

In this case, it is convenient to move to the basis where $X_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$ ²⁰. Then the consistency condition of Eq. (5.28) implies that the representation matrices $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T)$ of the modular generators are symmetric. As we explained early, if both $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T)$ are symmetric and unitary matrices, we would have $X_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$ which is exactly the canonical CP transformation. If the Clebsh-Gordan coefficients are all real in the adopted basis, the requirement of gCP invariance would enforces all free parameters in the superpotential to be real.

5.4 CP fixed points

In a modular invariant theory with gCP symmetry, the vacuum expectation value of the modulus τ would be the unique source breaking modular and gCP symmetry. However,

By the Schur's Lemma, the product $X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^*$ is proportional to the identity. It acts without conjugating the matter fields and represents the element $\gamma_{\mathcal{CP}^2}$ or, more precisely, the element of the finite group Γ_N or Γ'_N that corresponds to $\gamma_{\mathcal{CP}^2}$. As a consequence we have:

$$X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}} \quad \text{or} \quad X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S^2) = \pm \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}.$$

Therefore we must have $X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$ for the inhomegenous finite modular group Γ_N .

¹⁹If $(\mathbf{1} + \lambda)$ is invertible, we take $\eta = (\mathbf{1} + \lambda)^{-1}$, then $\lambda \eta^{*-1} = \eta^{-1}$. If $(\mathbf{1} + \lambda)$ is not invertible, we can always find a complex number u with $|u| = 1$ such that $-u^2$ is not an eigenvalue of λ . Hence, $\lambda + u^2 \mathbf{1}$ is invertible. In this case, we take $\eta = (u^{-1} \lambda + u \mathbf{1})^{-1}$, then $\lambda \eta^{*-1} = \eta^{-1}$. This construction was given by Prof. Marc van Leeuwen [209].

²⁰The CP transformation matrix $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ would be a unitary and symmetric matrix if $X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$, and the corresponding Takagi factorization is $X_{\mathbf{r}} = \Omega_{\mathbf{r}} \Omega_{\mathbf{r}}^T$ where $\Omega_{\mathbf{r}}$ is a unitary matrix. If we perform a change of basis with a unitary matrix $\Omega_{\mathbf{r}}$ in the field space: $\varphi' = \Omega_{\mathbf{r}}^\dagger \varphi$, it is easy to see that the gCP transformation of φ' is $\varphi'(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} \overline{\varphi'}(x_{\mathcal{P}})$.

there exist certain values of τ which conserve CP. If τ is left invariant by CP transformation of Eq. (5.12), i.e.

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} \tau_{\mathcal{CP}} = -\tau^* = \tau. \quad (5.40)$$

We see τ lies on the imaginary axis, $\Re\tau = 0$. The most general gCP transformation of τ is $\gamma \circ \mathcal{CP}$ given by Eq. (5.15), it is the composition of the a generic modular transformation γ and the CP transformation of Eq. (5.12). Thus the most general value of τ preserving the residual gCP symmetry $\gamma \circ \mathcal{CP}$ satisfies the following condition

$$(\gamma \circ \mathcal{CP})\tau = \tau, \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma, \quad (5.41)$$

which gives

$$\frac{-a\tau^* + b}{-c\tau^* + d} = \tau, \quad (5.42)$$

or equivalently

$$\begin{aligned} c(\Re\tau)^2 - (a+d)\Re\tau + b + c(\Im\tau)^2 &= 0, \\ (a-d)\Im\tau &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (5.43)$$

Thus we have

$$a = d, \quad (5.44)$$

and

$$\Re\tau = \begin{cases} \frac{a}{c} \pm \frac{1}{c} \sqrt{1 - c^2 (\Im\tau)^2}, & c \neq 0 \\ \frac{b}{2a}, & c = 0 \end{cases} \quad (5.45)$$

Without loss of generality, we firstly consider that τ lies in the fundamental domain. Solving the constraints in Eqs. (5.44, 5.45) together with the determinant condition $ad - bc = 1$, we find the CP conserved values of τ are the imaginary axis and the boundary of the fundamental domain \mathcal{D} , the corresponding residual CP symmetry is summarized in table 8. At the intersection points, the residual symmetry is enhanced. For instance, the modulus $\tau = e^{2i\pi/3}$ is invariant under both CP transformations $T^{-1} \circ \mathcal{CP}$ and $S \circ \mathcal{CP}$ so that it preserves the modular symmetry ST which is generated by the two residual CP transformations. Thus the full residual symmetry group of $\tau = e^{2i\pi/3}$ is $(Z_3^{ST} \rtimes Z_2^{S \circ \mathcal{CP}}) \times Z_2^R$ defined as

$$\begin{aligned} (Z_3^{ST} \rtimes Z_2^{S \circ \mathcal{CP}}) \times Z_2^R &= \left\{ ST, R, S \circ \mathcal{CP} \mid R^2 = (S \circ \mathcal{CP})^2 = (ST)^3 = 1, (ST)R = R(ST), \right. \\ &\left. (S \circ \mathcal{CP})R = R(S \circ \mathcal{CP}), (S \circ \mathcal{CP})ST(S \circ \mathcal{CP})^{-1} = (ST)^{-1} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (5.46)$$

Similarly the symmetric point $\tau = i$ is invariant under both modular transformation S and CP transformation \mathcal{CP} , and consequently the residual symmetry group is $Z_4^S \rtimes Z_2^{\mathcal{CP}} =$




Figure 9. The CP conserving lines in the fundamental domain \mathcal{D} are displayed in blue and the corresponding residual CP symmetries are labelled. The intersection points $\tau = e^{\pi i/3}, i, e^{2\pi i/3}$ labelled in red enjoy two different residual CP symmetries so that a residual modular symmetry can be generated. For instance, the self-dual point $\tau = i$ is invariant under both CP transformations $Z_2^{\mathcal{CP}}$ and $Z_2^{S \circ \mathcal{CP}}$, consequently it is also invariant under the modular generator S .

$\{S, \mathcal{CP} | S^4 = 1, \mathcal{CP}^2 = 1, \mathcal{CP} S \mathcal{CP}^{-1} = S^{-1}\}$. Moreover, the symmetric point $\tau = i\infty$ is invariant under T, R and \mathcal{CP} , and therefore it preserves the residual symmetry group

$$(Z^T \times \mathcal{CP}) \times Z_2^R = \{T, R, \mathcal{CP} | R^2 = \mathcal{CP}^2 = 1, \mathcal{CP} T \mathcal{CP}^{-1} = T^{-1}, \mathcal{CP} R = R \mathcal{CP}, TR = RT\}. \quad (5.47)$$

We plot the CP conserving points and the corresponding residual CP symmetries in figure 9. Furthermore we find that all the CP conserving points in the upper half complex plane are related to those in the fundamental domain by some modular transformation, and the corresponding generalized CP stabilizer given by

$$\tau' = \gamma_1 \tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}, \quad \gamma' \circ \mathcal{CP} = \gamma_1 \gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}} \circ \mathcal{CP} \gamma_1^{-1}, \quad (5.48)$$

where γ_1 is an arbitrary modular transformation, $\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ and $\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ take the values summarized in table 8.

$\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$	$\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$	Residual subgroup
± 1	$\{\tau \Re\tau = 0, \Im\tau \geq 1\}$	$Z_2^{\mathcal{CP}} \times Z_2^R$
$\pm T$	$\{\tau \Re\tau = 1/2, \Im\tau \geq \sqrt{3}/2\}$	$Z_2^{T \circ \mathcal{CP}} \times Z_2^R$
$\pm T^{-1}$	$\{\tau \Re\tau = -1/2, \Im\tau \geq \sqrt{3}/2\}$	$Z_2^{T^{-1} \circ \mathcal{CP}} \times Z_2^R$
$\pm S$	$\{\tau (\Re\tau)^2 + (\Im\tau)^2 = 1, \Re\tau \leq 1/2\}$	$Z_2^{S \circ \mathcal{CP}} \times Z_2^R$
$\pm 1, \pm S$	i	$Z_4^S \times Z_2^{\mathcal{CP}}$
$\pm T, \pm S$	$e^{i\pi/3}$	$(Z_3^{TS} \times Z_2^{S \circ \mathcal{CP}}) \times Z_2^R$
$\pm T^{-1}, \pm S$	$e^{2i\pi/3}$	$(Z_3^{ST} \times Z_2^{S \circ \mathcal{CP}}) \times Z_2^R$

Table 8. The CP conserving values of modulus τ in the fundamental domain \mathcal{D} and the corresponding residual symmetry group. The symbol $\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ is defined by the condition $(\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}} \circ \mathcal{CP})\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}} = \tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ which is a special case of Eq. (5.41) with $\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ in the fundamental domain. We would like to mention that the definition of $\gamma \circ \mathcal{CP}$ is given in Eq. (5.15). Notice that the modular generators S and T are given in Eq. (3.4) and $R = S^2$.

5.5 Implications for flavor mixing at CP fixed points

Considering a point $\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ of the fundamental domain where CP is conserved, then there is an element $\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ of Γ such that $(\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}} \circ \mathcal{CP})\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}} = \tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ which gives $\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}(-\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}*}) = \tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$. Taking the imaginary part on both sides of this equation and using the identities $\Im(-\tau^*) = \Im\tau$ and $\Im(\gamma\tau) = \frac{\Im\tau}{|c\tau + d|^2}$, we obtain the automorphy factor

$$|J(\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}, -\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}*})| = 1 \quad (5.49)$$

which implies that $J(\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}, -\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}*})$ is a pure phase. Note that the automorphy factor $J(\gamma, \tau) = c\tau + d$ is defined in Eq. (4.4). We assume that the lepton sector is described by the superpotential:

$$\mathcal{W} = -E_i^c \mathcal{Y}_{ij}^e(\tau) L_j H_d - \frac{1}{2\Lambda} L_i \mathcal{Y}_{ij}^\nu(\tau) L_j H_u H_u, \quad (5.50)$$

where the neutrino masses are described by the Weinberg operator. Under the action of modular transformation γ , the matter multiplets φ ($\varphi = H_{u,d}, E^c, L$) transform as:

$$\varphi \xrightarrow{\gamma} J^{-k_\varphi}(\gamma, \tau) \rho_\varphi(\gamma) \varphi, \quad \varphi \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} X_\varphi \bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}). \quad (5.51)$$

The weights $k_{E^c, L}$ carry a flavour index and $J^{k_{E^c, L}}$ are diagonal matrices in flavour space. The invariance of the \mathcal{W} under the modular transformation γ implies:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}^e(\gamma\tau) &= J^{k_{H_d}} \rho_{H_d}^\dagger(\gamma) J^{k_{E^c}} \rho_{E^c}^*(\gamma) \mathcal{Y}^e(\tau) \rho_L^\dagger(\gamma) J^{k_L}, \\ \mathcal{Y}^\nu(\gamma\tau) &= J^{2k_{H_u}} \rho_{H_u}^{2\dagger}(\gamma) J^{k_L} \rho_L^*(\gamma) \mathcal{Y}^\nu(\tau) \rho_L^\dagger(\gamma) J^{k_L}, \end{aligned} \quad (5.52)$$

On the other hand, the invariance of \mathcal{W} under the CP transformation \mathcal{CP} requires:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}^e(-\tau^*) &= X_{H_d}^\dagger X_{E^c}^* \mathcal{Y}^{e*}(\tau) X_L^\dagger, \\ \mathcal{Y}^\nu(-\tau^*) &= X_{H_u}^{2\dagger} X_L^* \mathcal{Y}^{\nu*}(\tau) X_L^\dagger. \end{aligned} \quad (5.53)$$

From eqs. (5.52) and (5.53), at the point $\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ enjoying residual CP symmetry we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{Y}^{e*}(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) &= \Omega_{H_d} \Omega_{E^c}^T \mathcal{Y}^e(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) \Omega_L, \\ \mathcal{Y}^{\nu*}(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) &= \Omega_{H_u}^2 \Omega_L^T \mathcal{Y}^\nu(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) \Omega_L,\end{aligned}\tag{5.54}$$

where we have defined the unitary matrices:

$$\Omega_\varphi = J^{-k_\varphi}(\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}, -\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}*}) \rho_\varphi(\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) X_\varphi, \quad (\varphi = H_{u,d}, E^c, L).\tag{5.55}$$

Notice that Ω_φ is the CP transformation matrix of the matter multiplet φ for the residual gCP symmetry $\gamma_0^{\mathcal{CP}} \circ \mathcal{CP}$. The charged lepton and neutrino mass matrices are given by $M_e = \mathcal{Y}^e v_d$ and $M_\nu = \mathcal{Y}^\nu v_u^2/\Lambda$. Thus at the point τ enjoying residual CP invariance we have

$$\begin{aligned}\Omega_L^\dagger M_e^\dagger(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) M_e(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) \Omega_L &= \left[M_e^\dagger(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) M_e(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) \right]^*, \\ \Omega_L^\dagger M_\nu^\dagger(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) M_\nu(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) \Omega_L &= \left[M_\nu^\dagger(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) M_\nu(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) \right]^*.\end{aligned}\tag{5.56}$$

We see that the hermitian combination of the neutrino and charged lepton mass matrices $M_\nu^\dagger(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) M_\nu(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}})$ and $M_e^\dagger(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}) M_e(\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}})$ are invariant under a common transformation of the left-handed charged leptons and the left-handed neutrinos, which represents a combination of CP and modular transformations. The unitary matrix Ω_L should be symmetric otherwise the neutrino and the charged lepton mass spectrum would be constrained to be partially degenerate [110]. Furthermore, one can always go to the basis in which $\Omega_L = 1$ by performing basis transformation. Then the conditions eq. (5.56) fulfilled at the CP fixed point $\tau_0^{\mathcal{CP}}$ imply that both Dirac and Majorana CP phases are trivial [110]. Therefore values of moduli deviating from residual CP symmetry fixed points (the fundamental domain boundary or the imaginary axis) are required to accommodate the observed non-degenerate lepton masses and a non-trivial Dirac CP phase.

6 Modular invariance with multiple moduli

More fundamental theory at high energy generally involve extra dimension. For instance, it is known that superstring theory can only be consistently defined in 10 dimensional spacetime, the extra 6 dimensions have to be compactified in the form of a Calabi–Yau manifold. As a consequence, the low energy effective theories at our 4D universe have multiple moduli which depend on the geometry of extra 6 dimensions. In this section, we shall study the scenario of several moduli $\tau_1, \tau_2, \dots, \tau_M$ from the bottom-up approach, starting with factorizable moduli, before discussing non-factorizable generalisations based on symplectic modular invariance, Siegel modular groups and automorphic forms.

6.1 Factorizable moduli

Firstly we consider the direct product of several modular transformation groups $\Gamma^1 \times \Gamma^2 \times \dots \times \Gamma^M$, where each Γ^j for $j = 1, \dots, M$ is the $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ group. The modulus field for each

modular symmetry Γ^j is denoted as τ_j . As shown in Eq. (3.2), any modular transformation γ_j in Γ^j acts on the modulus τ_j as follows [210]

$$\gamma_j : \tau_j \rightarrow \gamma_j \tau_j = \frac{a_j \tau_j + b_j}{c_j \tau_j + d_j}, \quad \gamma_j \in \Gamma^j, \quad (6.1)$$

while other modulus τ_i is invariant under γ_j , i.e., $\gamma_j \tau_i = \tau_i$ for $i \neq j$. Analogous to Eq. (3.8), each modular group Γ^j has the principal congruence subgroup $\Gamma^j(N_j)$, and a series of finite modular groups $\Gamma'_{N_j} = \Gamma^j/\Gamma^j(N_j)$ and $\Gamma''_{N_j} = \Gamma^j/\pm \Gamma^j(N_j)$ can be defined. Notice that N_i is unnecessary to be identical to N_j for $i \neq j$. Thus the finite modular group is extended to the direct product of several finite modular groups $\Gamma''_{N_1} \times \Gamma''_{N_2} \times \cdots \times \Gamma''_{N_M}$, and any Γ''_{N_j} could be Γ'_{N_j} .

The modular transformation of a generic chiral superfield Φ_I is characterized by the modular weight $k_{I,j}$ and the unitary representation $\rho_{\mathbf{r}_I,j}$ of Γ''_{N_j} under each modular group Γ^j , i.e.,

$$\Phi_I \rightarrow \prod_{j=1,\dots,M} (c_j \tau_j + d_j)^{-k_{I,j}} \bigotimes_{j=1,\dots,M} \rho_{\mathbf{r}_I,j}(\gamma_j) \Phi_I, \quad (6.2)$$

where \bigotimes denotes the outer product of the representation matrices for $\rho_{\mathbf{r}_I,1}, \rho_{\mathbf{r}_I,2}, \dots, \rho_{\mathbf{r}_I,M}$. In the framework of the $\mathcal{N} = 1$ global supersymmetry, the most general action invariant under the extended modular group can be written as

$$\mathcal{S} = \int d^4x d^2\theta d^2\bar{\theta} \mathcal{K}(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I; \tau_1, \dots, \tau_M, \bar{\tau}_1, \dots, \bar{\tau}_M) + \left[\int d^4x d^2\theta \mathcal{W}(\Phi_I, \tau_1, \dots, \tau_M) + \text{h.c.} \right]. \quad (6.3)$$

Invariance of the action \mathcal{S} under Eqs. (6.1, 6.2) requires the invariance of the Kähler potential up to a Kähler transformation. Similar to the case of single modulus, the requirement of invariance of the Kähler potential can be easily satisfied and many terms are allowed. For illustration, the minimal Kähler potential is taken as usual.

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{K}(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I; \tau_1, \dots, \tau_M, \bar{\tau}_1, \dots, \bar{\tau}_M) &= - \sum_{j=1}^M h_j \log(-i\tau_j + i\bar{\tau}_j) \\ &+ \sum_I \frac{\bar{\Phi}_I \Phi_I}{\prod_{j=1,\dots,M} (-i\tau_j + i\bar{\tau}_j)^{k_{I,j}}}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.4)$$

where all h_j are positive constants. Since each modular symmetry is independent from each other, one modulus field getting a VEV leaves the rest of the Kähler potential still satisfying the other modular symmetries. If all modulus fields acquire VEVs, the above Kähler potential leads to kinetic terms for the scalar components of the supermultiplets ϕ_I and the modulus fields τ_j as follow

$$\sum_{j=1}^M \frac{h_j}{\langle -i\tau_j + i\bar{\tau}_j \rangle^2} \partial_\mu \bar{\tau}_j \partial^\mu \tau_j + \sum_I \frac{\partial_\mu \bar{\Phi}_I \partial^\mu \Phi_I}{\prod_{j=1,\dots,M} \langle -i\tau_j + i\bar{\tau}_j \rangle^{k_{I,j}}}. \quad (6.5)$$

The superpotential $\mathcal{W}(\Phi_I; \tau_1, \dots, \tau_M)$ is in general a holomorphic function of the moduli τ_1, \dots, τ_M and superfields ϕ_I . Modular invariance imposes strong constraint on the superpotential \mathcal{W} which can be expanded in power series of Φ_I as

$$\mathcal{W}(\Phi_I; \tau_1, \dots, \tau_M) = \sum_n \sum_{\{I_1, \dots, I_n\}} (Y_{I_1 \dots I_n} \Phi_{I_1} \cdots \Phi_{I_n})_{\mathbf{1}}. \quad (6.6)$$

For each term to be modular invariant, the modular forms $Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}$ should transform as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_M) &\rightarrow Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\gamma_1 \tau_1, \dots, \gamma_M \tau_M) \\ &= \prod_{j=1}^M (c_j \tau_j + d_j)^{k_{Y,j}} \bigotimes_{j=1}^M \rho_{\mathbf{r}_{Y,j}}(\gamma_j) Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau_1, \dots, \tau_M), \end{aligned} \quad (6.7)$$

satisfying the conditions

$$\begin{aligned} k_{Y,j} &= k_{I_1,j} + \cdots + k_{I_n,j}, \\ \rho_{\mathbf{r}_{Y,j}} \otimes \rho_{\mathbf{r}_{I_1,j}} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{\mathbf{r}_{I_n,j}} &\ni \mathbf{1}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.8)$$

for $j = 1, \dots, M$.

6.2 Symplectic modular invariance

Siegel modular forms can be thought of as modular forms in more than one variable, they generalize the usual single variable modular forms on $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ in that group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is replaced by the Siegel modular group $\Gamma_g = Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ and the upper half plane is replaced by the Siegel upper half plane \mathcal{H}_g , where the integer $g \geq 1$ is called the degree or genus. The Siegel modular group $\Gamma = Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ arises as the duality group in string Calabi-Yau compactifications [140, 201, 202, 211–219]. Siegel modular forms are relevant in the context of string one-loop corrections [220, 221].

The Siegel modular group $\Gamma = Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ is the group of $2g \times 2g$ matrices with integer entries and satisfy the symplectic condition

$$\gamma^t J \gamma = J, \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1}_g \\ -\mathbf{1}_g & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_g, \quad (6.9)$$

where the superscript t denotes the transpose, and all the four blocks A, B, C, D are g dimensional matrices with integer elements. Thus blocks A, B, C and D satisfy the conditions,

$$A^t C = C^t A, \quad B^t D = D^t B, \quad A^t D - C^t B = \mathbf{1}_g, \quad (6.10)$$

or equivalently

$$AB^t = BA^t, \quad CD^t = DC^t, \quad AD^t - BC^t = \mathbf{1}_g. \quad (6.11)$$

For the lowest genus $g = 1$, the above symplectic condition is exactly the condition of unit determinant of γ . Consequently the Siegel modular group $\Gamma_1 = Sp(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is exactly identical with the usual modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. For any element $\gamma \in \Gamma_g$, both γ^t and γ^{-1} are also elements of Γ_g with

$$\gamma^{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} D^t & -B^t \\ -C^t & A^t \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6.12)$$

The single modulus τ in the upper half plane is generalized to the Siegel upper half plane \mathcal{H}_g which is represented by $g \times g$ symmetric complex matrices with positive definite imaginary part²¹,

$$\mathcal{H}_g = \left\{ \tau \in GL(g, \mathbb{C}) \mid \tau^t = \tau, \quad \text{Im}(\tau) > 0 \right\}. \quad (6.13)$$

The action of $\gamma \in \Gamma_g$ on the Siegel upper half plane \mathcal{H}_g is defined as follow,

$$\tau \rightarrow \gamma\tau = (A\tau + B)(C\tau + D)^{-1}. \quad (6.14)$$

The Siegel modular group Γ_g can be generated by the generators S and T_i with

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1}_g \\ -\mathbf{1}_g & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T_i = \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{1}_g & B_i \\ 0 & \mathbf{1}_g \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.15)$$

where $\{B_i\}$ is a basis for the $g \times g$ integer symmetric matrices. Notice that S coincides with the invariant symplectic form J satisfying $S^2 = -\mathbf{1}_{2g}$. For the case of $g = 2$, without loss of generality we could choose

$$B_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B_3 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (6.16)$$

Under the action of generators S and T_i , the modulus τ transforms as:

$$\tau \xrightarrow{S} -\tau^{-1}, \quad \tau \xrightarrow{T_i} \tau + B_i. \quad (6.17)$$

In a similarly way as the single modulus case, we can define the principal congruence subgroups $\Gamma_g(n)$ of level n as

$$\Gamma_g(n) = \left\{ \gamma \in \Gamma_g \mid \gamma \equiv \mathbf{1}_{2g} \pmod{n} \right\}, \quad (6.18)$$

where n is a generic positive integer, and $\Gamma_g(1) = \Gamma_g$. The group $\Gamma_g(n)$ is a normal subgroup of Γ_g , and the quotient group $\Gamma_{g,n} \equiv \Gamma_g/\Gamma_g(n)$, which is known as finite Siegel modular group, has finite order [222, 223]:

$$|\Gamma_{g,n}| = n^{g(2g+1)} \prod_{p|n} \prod_{1 \leq k \leq g} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^{2k}}\right), \quad (6.19)$$

where the product is over the prime divisors p of n . For the simplest case of $g = 1$, we have

$$|\Gamma_{1,n}| = n^3 \prod_{p|n} \left(1 - \frac{1}{p^2}\right). \quad (6.20)$$

This is consistent with the dimension formula of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}_n)$ [224, 225].

²¹The modulus τ can be parameterized as $\tau = X + iY$ where both X and Y are real symmetric matrices with $Y \neq 0$, and all the eigenvalues of Y are positive. This is exactly the condition of $\text{Im}(\tau) > 0$ in Eq. (6.13).

Modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \equiv \Gamma$	Siegel modular group $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \equiv \Gamma_g$
$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}$ $a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}$ $ad - bc = 1$	$\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ $A, B, C, D \in GL(g, \mathbb{Z})$ $\gamma^t J \gamma = J, \quad J = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbf{1}_g \\ -\mathbf{1}_g & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$H_1 = \{\tau \in \mathbb{C} \text{Im}(\tau) > 0\}$	$H_g = \{\tau \in GL(g, \mathbb{C}) \tau^t = \tau, \text{Im}(\tau) > 0\}$
$\tau \rightarrow \gamma\tau = \frac{a\tau+b}{c\tau+d}$	$\tau \rightarrow \gamma\tau = (A\tau + B)(C\tau + D)^{-1}$
$\Gamma(N) = \{\gamma \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \gamma = \mathbf{1}_2 \pmod{N}\}$	$\Gamma_g(N) = \{\gamma \in Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \gamma = \mathbf{1}_{2g} \pmod{N}\}$
$\Gamma'_N = SL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\Gamma(N)$	$\Gamma_{g,N} = Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})/\Gamma_g(N)$
$Y(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k Y(\tau), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma(N)$	$Y(\gamma\tau) = [\det(C\tau + D)]^k Y(\tau), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma_g(N)$

Table 9. The comparison between the modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ and the Siegel modular group $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$, where g is a positive integer and it corresponds to the genus. Notice that $Sp(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is isomorphic to $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$.

6.2.1 Siegel modular forms and gCP in symplectic modular invariant theory

The Siegel modular forms $Y(\tau)$ of integer weight k and level n at genus g are holomorphic functions of the moduli τ , and they fulfill the following transformation properties under the principal congruence subgroups $\Gamma_g(n)$:

$$Y(\gamma\tau) = [\det(C\tau + D)]^k Y(\tau), \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_g(n). \quad (6.21)$$

For lower levels $n = 1, 2$, by taking $\gamma = -\mathbf{1}_{2g}$ in Eq. (6.21), we can see that the Siegel modular forms at genus g of weight k vanish if kg is odd. The Siegel modular forms of given weight k , level n and genus g expand a linear space $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma_g(n))$ of finite dimensional [144] and there are no non-vanishing forms of negative weight [144]. The product of two Siegel modular forms of weight k, k' at level n and genus g is a Siegel modular form of weight $k + k'$. The full set of Siegel modular forms with respect to $\Gamma_g(n)$ form a positive graded ring $\mathcal{M}(\Gamma_g(n)) = \bigoplus_{k \geq 0} \mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma_g(n))$.

The Siegel modular forms of weight k , level n and genus g are invariant up to the automorphy factor $[\det(C\tau + D)]^k$ under $\Gamma_g(n)$ but they transform under the quotient group $\Gamma_{g,n} \equiv \Gamma_g/\Gamma_g(n)$. Similar to the case $g = 1$ [143, 147], it is always possible to choose a basis $\{Y_i(\tau)\}$ in the space $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma_g(n))$ such that the action of Γ_g on the elements of the basis is described by a unitary representation $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$ of the finite Siegel modular group $\Gamma_{g,n} = \Gamma_g/\Gamma_g(n)$ [226]:

$$Y_i(\gamma\tau) = [\det(C\tau + D)]^k \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma)_{ij} Y_j(\tau), \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma_g. \quad (6.22)$$

At variance with Eq. (6.21), where only transformations of $\Gamma_g(n)$ were considered, in the previous equation the full Siegel modular group Γ_g is acting. The comparison between the

modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \equiv \Gamma$ and the Siegel modular group $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}) \equiv \Gamma_g$ is summarized in table 9. One see that Γ_g is a natural generation of Γ at high genus g , and the matrix elements a, b, c, d are replaced by A, B, C, D which are $g \times g$ integer matrices, and the automorphy factor $c\tau + d$ is replaced by $\det(C\tau + D)$.

Then the modular invariant theory with single modulus sketched in section 3.4 can be straightforwardly generalized to the case with multiple moduli based on the Siegel modular symmetry Γ_g . Analogously each terms of the superpotential should be invariant under the finite Siegel modular group $\Gamma_{g,n}$ and its modular weight should be zero. Moreover, similar to the case of single modulus discussed in section 5.1, the consistent CP transformation of the matrix τ is determined to be [203]

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\text{CP}} \tau_{\text{CP}} = -\tau^*, \quad (6.23)$$

up to a Siegel modular transformation. Combining the above CP and Siegel modular transformations, we get the extended Siegel modular group $\Gamma_g^* = GSp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$ and the full symmetry transformation of the complex moduli is

$$\begin{aligned} \tau &\xrightarrow{\gamma} (A\tau + B)(C\tau + D)^{-1}, \\ \tau &\xrightarrow{g\text{CP}} (-A\tau^* + B)(-C\tau^* + D)^{-1}, \end{aligned} \quad (6.24)$$

where $\gamma = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}$ is the Siegel modular transformation satisfying $\gamma^t J \gamma = J$. The CP symmetry acts on a generic matter chiral supermultiplet φ as follows,

$$\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{\text{CP}} X_{\mathbf{r}} \bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}), \quad (6.25)$$

where $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ is a unitary matrix in the flavor space. The consistency between the CP symmetry and modular symmetry requires $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ should fulfill the following conditions [203],

$$X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(S) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S^{-1}), \quad X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(T_i) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T_i^{-1}). \quad (6.26)$$

In the same fashion as section 5.3, one can show that CP transformation of the modular form multiplets is identical with that of single modulus case, i.e.,

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}^a(\tau) \xrightarrow{\text{CP}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^a(-\tau^*) = \lambda_b^a X_{\mathbf{r}} Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{b*}(\tau), \quad (6.27)$$

with $\lambda_c^a \lambda_b^{*c} X_{\mathbf{r}} X_{\mathbf{r}}^* = \delta_b^a \mathbf{1}_{\mathbf{r}}$, where a, b label linearly independent modular form multiplets of the same type. In the basis where the matrices $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(S)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(T_i)$ are symmetric and unitary, the gCP transformation would coincide with the canonical CP $X_{\mathbf{r}} = \mathbf{1}$ and one can always work with modular forms $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^a(\tau)$ with $\lambda_b^a = \delta_b^a$.

6.2.2 Invariant loci in moduli space and reduced finite Siegel modular group

From Eq. (6.19), we see that the order of the finite Siegel modular group $\Gamma_{g,n}$ increases quickly with the genus g and level n . At the genus $g = 2$, we have [226]

$$\Gamma_{2,2} \cong S_6, \quad \Gamma_{2,3} \cong Sp(4, F_3), \quad (6.28)$$

and

$$|\Gamma_{2,2}| = 720, \quad |\Gamma_{2,3}| = 51840. \quad (6.29)$$

Note that S_6 is the permutation group of six objects, and $Sp(4, F_3)$ is isomorphic to the double covering of Burkhardt group. However, S_6 has no three dimensional irreducible representations to which the three generations of left-handed lepton fields are usually assigned²².

Small finite Siegel modular groups can be obtained by restricting the theory to a subregion Ω of the moduli space \mathcal{H}_g [226]. We define a region Ω whose points τ are individually left invariant under the action of a subgroup H of Γ_g , i.e.

$$h\tau = \tau, \quad h \in H, \quad \tau \in \Omega. \quad (6.30)$$

Because $\gamma\tau = -\gamma\tau$, we also consider the projective group $\bar{H} = H/\{\pm\mathbf{1}_{2g}\}$. Both H and \bar{H} are called stabilizers. The group $N(H)$ that, as a whole, leaves the region Ω invariant includes the elements γ of Γ_g such that:

$$\gamma\tau = \tau', \quad \tau, \tau' \in \Omega, \quad (6.31)$$

which requires

$$\gamma^{-1}H\gamma = H. \quad (6.32)$$

Therefore $N(H)$ is the normalizer of H . Analogously we can define the principal congruence subgroup of $N(H)$, denoted as $N(H, n)$:

$$N(H, n) = \left\{ \hat{\gamma} \in N(H) \mid \hat{\gamma} = \mathbf{1}_{2g} \pmod{n} \right\}. \quad (6.33)$$

Obviously $N(H, n)$ is a subgroup of $\Gamma_g(n)$, and it is also a normal subgroup of $N(H)$. The finite modular subgroup $N_n(H)$ corresponding to the modular subgroup $N(H)$ is the quotient group

$$N_n(H) = N(H)/N(H, n), \quad (6.34)$$

which is a subgroup of finite Siegel modular group $\Gamma_{g,n}$. In short, we can consistently truncate the moduli space to the subspace Ω , and substitute Γ_g and $\Gamma_{g,n}$ with $N(H)$ and $N_n(H)$, respectively. As a result, in our supersymmetric action we can restrict the moduli τ to the region Ω , which supersedes the full moduli space \mathcal{H}_g , and replace the group Γ_g with $N(H)$. An element γ of $N(H)$ induces the transformation laws

$$\begin{cases} \tau \rightarrow \gamma\tau = (A\tau + B)(C\tau + D)^{-1} \\ \varphi_I \rightarrow [\det(C\tau + D)]^{k_I} \rho_{\mathbf{r}_I}(\gamma)\varphi_I \end{cases} \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix} \in N(H), \quad (6.35)$$

where $\rho_{\mathbf{r}_I}(\gamma)$ is a unitary representation of a finite group $N_n(H)$.

²²The S_6 group has two one-dimensional, four five-dimensional, two nine-dimensional, two ten-dimensional and one sixteen-dimensional irreducible representations.

The genus 2 Siegel modular invariant theories is the simplest non trivial generalization of modular invariant supersymmetric theories studied in [138, 139, 143]. The moduli space \mathcal{H}_2 has complex dimension 3 and describes 3 moduli:

$$\tau = \begin{pmatrix} \tau_1 & \tau_3 \\ \tau_3 & \tau_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \det(\text{Im}(\tau)) > 0, \quad \text{Tr}(\text{Im}(\tau)) > 0. \quad (6.36)$$

The invariant loci in Siegel upper half plane \mathcal{H}_2 have been classified by Gottschling [227–229]. It is established that \mathcal{H}_2 has two inequivalent invariant loci of complex dimension two,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \tau_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tau_1 & \tau_3 \\ \tau_3 & \tau_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.37)$$

five inequivalent invariant loci of complex dimension one,

$$\begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tau_1 & 0 \\ 0 & \tau_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tau_1 & 1/2 \\ 1/2 & \tau_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \tau_1 & \tau_1/2 \\ \tau_1/2 & \tau_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.38)$$

and six independent isolated fixed points,

$$\begin{pmatrix} \eta & \frac{1}{2}(\eta - 1) \\ \frac{1}{2}(\eta - 1) & \eta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} i & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix}, \quad \frac{i\sqrt{3}}{3} \begin{pmatrix} 2 & 1 \\ 1 & 2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.39)$$

with $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/5}$, $\eta = \frac{1}{3}(1 + i2\sqrt{2})$, $\omega = e^{2\pi i/3}$. The corresponding stabilizers \bar{H} , the normalizers $N(H)$ and the finite modular group $N_2(H)$ for each locus are given in Ref. [226]. It is remarkable that the restricted finite modular group $N_2(H)$ has small order and it is promising as a flavor symmetry. For instance, $N_2(H)$ is isomorphic to $(S_3 \times S_3) \rtimes Z_2$ and $S_4 \times Z_2$ respectively for the two-dimensional loci in Eq. (6.37). Fermion mass models based on symplectic modular symmetry are given in Refs. [203, 226, 230].

6.3 Multiple moduli and automorphic forms

The modular flavor symmetry with single modulus can be naturally generalized to more general supersymmetric modular invariant theories involving multiple moduli, where a discrete subgroup Γ of a non-compact Lie group G plays the role of flavour symmetry and the symmetry breaking sector spans an Hermitian Symmetric Space which is a coset space of the type $\mathcal{M} = G/K$, here K is a maximal compact subgroup of G [226]. Then the modular forms which are building blocks of Yukawa couplings, would be replaced by the more general automorphic forms [226].

It is notable that the well-known moduli space $\mathcal{H} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{C} | \text{Im}(\tau) > 0\}$ can be equivalently defined as the quotient space G/K [143], where $G = SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ and $K = SO(2)$ is a maximal compact subgroup of G . To be more specific, a generic element \mathfrak{g} of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ can be decomposed into the product of two matrices:

$$SL(2, \mathbb{R}) \ni \mathfrak{g} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{y} & x/\sqrt{y} \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{y} \end{pmatrix} \mathfrak{k}, \quad y > 0, \quad \mathfrak{k} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6.40)$$

where k belongs to $K = SO(2)$, while the first factor in the above decomposition of g is an element of the coset $SL(2, \mathbb{R})/SO(2)$. It is obvious that $\tau_0 = i$ is invariant under the action of $K = SO(2)$,

$$k \cdot i = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix} \cdot i = \frac{\cos \theta i - \sin \theta}{\sin \theta i + \cos \theta} = i. \quad (6.41)$$

Hence any modulus $\tau = x + iy$ ($y > 0$) can be reached from the fixed complex number $\tau_0 = i$ by a $SL(2, \mathbb{R})$ transformation g , i.e.,

$$g \tau_0 = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{y} & x/\sqrt{y} \\ 0 & 1/\sqrt{y} \end{pmatrix} \cdot i = x + iy = \tau. \quad (6.42)$$

This explicitly shows the one-to-one correspondence between the elements of \mathcal{H} and those of $SL(2, \mathbb{R})/SO(2)$.

In a similar fashion, the generic element τ of the multi-dimensional moduli space \mathcal{M} can be represented by the action of $g \in G$ on an element τ_0 left invariant by K :

$$\tau = g \tau_0, \quad g \in G, \quad (6.43)$$

with

$$h \tau_0 = \tau_0, \quad \text{for any } h \in K. \quad (6.44)$$

In finite discrete subgroup Γ of G is chosen as the candidate flavor group, and its action on the moduli τ is given by

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\gamma} \gamma \tau = (\gamma g) \tau_0, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma. \quad (6.45)$$

Given a normal subgroup Γ_{normal} of Γ with finite index, we define the finite group $\Gamma_{finite} = \Gamma/\Gamma_{normal}$. Being finite, the finite group Γ_{finite} admits unitary representations $\rho(\gamma)$. A general transformation of the supermultiplets $\varphi^{(I)}$ of each sector is characterized by the weight k_I and the representation $\rho^{(I)}$ of Γ_{finite} :

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\gamma} \gamma \tau, \quad \varphi^{(I)} \xrightarrow{\gamma} j(\gamma, \tau)^{k_I} \rho^{(I)}(\gamma) \varphi^{(I)}, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma, \quad (6.46)$$

where $j(\gamma, \tau)$ is the automorphy factor and it satisfies the so-called cocycle condition

$$j(\gamma_1 \gamma_2, \tau) = j(\gamma_1, \gamma_2 \tau) j(\gamma_2, \tau). \quad (6.47)$$

In short, the modular invariance of single modulus can be naturally generalized to the case with multiple moduli [231, 232]:

$SL(2, \mathbb{R})$	\rightarrow	Lie group G	
$SO(2)$	\rightarrow	maximal compact subgroup $K \subset G$	
$\mathcal{H} = SL(2, \mathbb{R})/SO(2)$	\rightarrow	$\mathcal{M} = G/K$	
$SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$	\rightarrow	infinite discrete subgroup $\Gamma \subset G$. (6.48)
$\Gamma(N)$	\rightarrow	normal subgroup $\Gamma_{normal} \subset \Gamma$	
Γ'_N	\rightarrow	$\Gamma_{finite} = \Gamma/\Gamma_{normal}$	
$c\tau + d$	\rightarrow	automorphy factor $j(\gamma, \tau)$	

In the rigid $\mathcal{N} = 1$ supersymmetry, a candidate minimal Kähler potential is given by:

$$\mathcal{K}_{\min} = -h \log Z(\tau, \bar{\tau}) + \sum_I Z(\tau, \bar{\tau})^{k_I} |\varphi^{(I)}|^2, \quad Z(\tau, \bar{\tau}) \equiv [j^\dagger(\mathbf{g}, \tau_0) j(\mathbf{g}, \tau_0)]^{-1}, \quad (6.49)$$

where h is a real constant whose sign is chosen to guarantee local positivity of the metric for the moduli τ . By construction, the above potential is invariant under Γ up to a Kähler transformation for a general choice of G , K , Γ , Γ_{normal} and $j(g, \tau)$. Nevertheless this is not the most general Kähler potential invariant under Γ . There are other terms which are compatible with invariance under Γ in a pure bottom-up approach. Generally additional assumptions or inputs from a top-down approach are needed in order to reduce the arbitrariness of the predictions [150, 151, 233, 234].

The superpotential could be expanded in powers of the supermultiplets $\varphi^{(I)}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{W} = \sum_n Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau) \varphi^{(I_1)} \dots \varphi^{(I_n)}. \quad (6.50)$$

The n -th order term is invariant provided the functions $Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau)$ obey:

$$Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\gamma\tau) = j(\gamma, \tau)^{k_Y(n)} \rho^{(Y)}(\gamma) Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau). \quad (6.51)$$

Each term of the superpotential should be invariant under the action of Γ and its total weight should be vanishing such that $k_Y(n)$ and $\rho^{(Y)}$ have to fulfill

$$k_Y(n) + k_{I_1} + \dots + k_{I_n} = 0, \quad \rho^{(Y)} \times \rho^{(I_1)} \times \dots \times \rho^{(I_n)} \supset \mathbf{1},$$

where $\mathbf{1}$ denotes the invariant singlet of the finite group Γ_{finite} . When we restrict to transformation γ of the group Γ_{normal} in eq. (6.51), we obtain:

$$Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\gamma\tau) = j(\gamma, \tau)^{k_Y(n)} Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(\tau), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma_{normal}. \quad (6.52)$$

Thus the function

$$\Psi(g) = j(g, \tau_0)^{-k_Y(n)} Y_{I_1 \dots I_n}(g\tau_0) \quad (6.53)$$

is an automorphic form for G , K and Γ_{normal} . The automorphic form $\Psi(g)$ is a smooth complex function and it satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(\gamma\mathbf{g}) &= \Psi(\mathbf{g}), \quad \gamma \in \Gamma_{normal}, \\ \Psi(gh) &= j(h, \tau_0)^{-1} \Psi(\mathbf{g}), \quad h \in K. \end{aligned} \quad (6.54)$$

Moreover, the automorphic form $\Psi(g)$ is required to be an eigenfunction of all the Casimir operators of G and it should satisfy moderate growth condition [235–237]. The symplectic modular invariant theory in section 6.2 corresponds to the following choice

$$G = Sp(2g, \mathbb{R}), \quad K = Sp(2g, \mathbb{R}) \cap O(2g, \mathbb{R}), \quad \tau_0 = i\mathbf{1}_g, \quad \Gamma = Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z}), \quad \Gamma_{normal} = \Gamma_g(n), \quad (6.55)$$

and the automorphy factor $j(\gamma, \tau) = \det(C\tau + D)$. We can also choose other non-compact Hermitian Symmetric Space as multi-dimensional moduli space which are summarized in table 10, and the symplectic modular group is exactly the type \mathbf{III}_g .

Type	Group G	Compact subgroup K	$\dim_{\mathbb{C}} G/K$
I $_{m,n}$	$U(m, n)$	$U(m) \times U(n)$	mn
II $_m$	$SO^*(2m)$	$U(m)$	$\frac{1}{2}m(m-1)$
III $_m$	$Sp(2m)$	$U(m)$	$\frac{1}{2}m(m+1)$
IV $_m$	$SO(m, 2)$	$SO(m) \times SO(2)$	m
V	$E_{6,-14}$	$SO(10) \times SO(2)$	16
VI	$E_{7,-25}$	$E_6 \times U(1)$	27

Table 10. Irreducible hermitian symmetric manifolds of noncompact type and their complex dimension [226].

7 Fermion mass hierarchies and texture zeros from modular symmetry

The modular symmetry is quite predictive by minimizing the symmetry breaking sector, nevertheless it does not yet provide a convincing explanation of the charged lepton masses. Usually the mass hierarchy is achieved by hand by introducing one parameter for each charged lepton species. The values of the free parameters are adjusted to reproduce the charged lepton masses, which are not predicted, but just fitted as in the Standard Model. In this section, we shall review how the fermion mass hierarchies can be naturally reproduced in the framework of modular symmetry.

7.1 Weighton mechanism

Froggatt-Nielsen (FN) mechanism is a well-known approach to understand the quark and lepton mass hierarchies [238]. The FN mechanism assumes an additional $U(1)_{FN}$ flavor symmetry under which the quarks and leptons carry various charges. The $U(1)_{FN}$ flavor symmetry is spontaneously broken by the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of a new “flavon” field θ , where θ is a neutral scalar under the SM but carries one unit of $U(1)_{FN}$ charge. In the FN mechanism, the fermion Yukawa couplings (except the top quark Yukawa coupling) are forbidden at the renormalisable level due to the $U(1)_{FN}$ symmetry. The small effective Yukawa couplings then originate from non-renormalisable contact operators where the FN charges of fermions are compensated by powers of θ , leading to suppression by powers of the small ratio $\langle\theta\rangle/M_{FN}$, where $\langle\theta\rangle$ and M denote the VEV of θ and the cut-off scale of the contact interaction respectively.

The fermion mass hierarchies can be naturally reproduced in the framework of modular symmetry through the so called weighton mechanism [239]. The mechanism is analogous to the FN mechanism, but without requiring any Abelian symmetry to be introduced, nor any SM singlet flavon to break it. The modular weights of fermion fields play the role of FN charges, and a SM singlet field ϕ with $k_{\phi} = 1$ (i.e. weight -1). The field ϕ plays the role of a flavon and it is called a “weighton”. This mechanism can be illustrated with the benchmark modular invariant model for leptons in [143]. The representation and weight assignments matter fields are assumed to be [143]:

$$L \sim (\mathbf{3}, 1), \quad e^c \sim (\mathbf{1}, 1), \quad \mu^c \sim (\mathbf{1}'', 1), \quad \tau^c \sim (\mathbf{1}', 1), \quad N^c \sim (\mathbf{3}, 1), \quad H_{u,d} \sim (\mathbf{1}, 0), \quad (7.1)$$

where the first numbers in the parentheses denote the transformation under A_4 modular symmetry and the second numbers are the modular weight. Thus the superpotential for the charged lepton Yukawa couplings read as

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d \\ &= \alpha e^c (L_1 Y_1 + L_2 Y_3 + L_3 Y_2) H_d + \beta \mu^c (L_3 Y_3 + L_1 Y_2 + L_2 Y_1) H_d \\ &\quad + \gamma \tau^c (L_2 Y_2 + L_3 Y_1 + L_1 Y_3) H_d,\end{aligned}\tag{7.2}$$

where $Y_{1,2,3}(\tau)$ are the three independent level 3 and weight 2 modular forms given in Eq. (4.33). Consequently the charged lepton Yukawa coupling matrix takes the following form:

$$\mathcal{Y}_e = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha Y_1 & \alpha Y_3 & \alpha Y_2 \\ \beta Y_2 & \beta Y_1 & \beta Y_3 \\ \gamma Y_3 & \gamma Y_2 & \gamma Y_1 \end{pmatrix}.\tag{7.3}$$

For $\tau = i\infty$ the modular triplet has a simple vacuum alignment

$$(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)|_{\tau=i\infty} = (1, 0, 0),\tag{7.4}$$

which can be seen from Eq. (4.34). Hence the charged lepton Yukawa is diagonal in the limit $\tau = i\infty$,

$$\mathcal{Y}_e|_{\tau=i\infty} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \beta & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma \end{pmatrix},\tag{7.5}$$

which implies

$$m_e : m_\mu : m_\tau = \alpha : \beta : \gamma.\tag{7.6}$$

Hierarchical values of the three couplings α, β, γ are necessary to accommodate the observed charged lepton masses. In detailed numerical analysis, the best fit values of modulus and the free couplings are found to be [240]

$$\langle \tau \rangle = 0.0386 + 2.23i, \quad \beta/\alpha = 207.908, \quad \gamma/\alpha = 3673.38,\tag{7.7}$$

which is in agreement with the estimate of Eq. (7.6).

This model can be recast in natural form by introducing a single weighton ϕ which is a SM and A_4 singlet with $k_\phi = 1$. The representation assignments of lepton fields are kept intact while their modular weights are changed as follows [239],

$$\begin{aligned}L &\sim (\mathbf{3}, 1), \quad e^c \sim (\mathbf{1}, -3), \quad \mu^c \sim (\mathbf{1}'', -1), \quad \tau^c \sim (\mathbf{1}', 0), \\ N^c &\sim (\mathbf{3}, 1), \quad H_{u,d} \sim (\mathbf{1}, 0), \quad \phi \sim (\mathbf{1}, 1).\end{aligned}\tag{7.8}$$

Then the superpotential for the charged lepton masses takes the form

$$\mathcal{W}_e = \alpha_e \left(\frac{\phi}{\Lambda}\right)^4 e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta_e \left(\frac{\phi}{\Lambda}\right)^2 \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma_e \frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d,\tag{7.9}$$

which gives rise to a charged lepton Yukawa coupling matrix similar to Eq. (7.3), except that it involves powers of ϕ controlling the hierarchies,

$$\mathcal{Y}_e = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_e \tilde{\phi}^4 Y_1 & \alpha_e \tilde{\phi}^4 Y_3 & \alpha_e \tilde{\phi}^4 Y_2 \\ \beta_e \tilde{\phi}^2 Y_2 & \beta_e \tilde{\phi}^2 Y_1 & \beta_e \tilde{\phi}^2 Y_3 \\ \gamma_e \tilde{\phi} Y_3 & \gamma_e \tilde{\phi} Y_2 & \gamma_e \tilde{\phi} Y_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\phi} \equiv \frac{\langle \phi \rangle}{\Lambda}, \quad (7.10)$$

where $\langle \phi \rangle$ denote the VEV of the weighton ϕ and Λ is a dimensionful cut-off flavor scale. Similar to the usual driving field mechanism familiar from flavon models [241], the weighton may be driven by a leading order superpotential term²³

$$\mathcal{W}_{driv} = \chi \left(Y_1^{(4)} \frac{\phi^4}{M_{fl}^2} - M^2 \right), \quad (7.11)$$

where χ is an A_4 singlet driving superfield with zero modular weight, while M is a free dimensionful mass scale. The F-flatness condition $F_\chi = \frac{\partial \mathcal{W}_{driv}}{\partial \chi} = 0$ applied to Eq. (7.11) then drives a weighton vev, $\langle \phi \rangle = (M^2 M_{fl}^2 / Y_1^{(4)})^{1/4}$. In the limit $\tau \rightarrow i\infty$, the above Yukawa coupling matrix \mathcal{Y}_e is diagonal and the charged lepton mass ratios are

$$m_e : m_\mu : m_\tau = \alpha_e \tilde{\phi}^4 : \beta_e \tilde{\phi}^2 : \gamma_e \tilde{\phi}. \quad (7.12)$$

It is remarkable that the electron, muon and tau masses are suppressed by $\tilde{\phi}^4$, $\tilde{\phi}^2$ and $\tilde{\phi}$ respectively. Assuming order one coefficients $\alpha_e, \beta_e, \gamma_e \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, the charged lepton mass hierarchies can be naturally produced for the small parameter $\tilde{\phi} \approx 1/15$. Furthermore, there will be additional terms corresponding to higher weight modular forms, $Y_3^{(4)}$, compensated by extra powers of weighton fields ϕ , which will give corrections to the charged lepton superpotential [239],

$$\Delta \mathcal{W}_e = \alpha'_e \left(\frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^6 e^c (LY_3^{(4)})_1 H_d + \beta'_e \mu^c \left(\frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^4 (LY_3^{(4)})_{1'} H_d + \gamma'_e \tau^c \left(\frac{\phi}{\Lambda} \right)^3 (LY_3^{(4)})_{1''} H_d, \quad (7.13)$$

which are suppressed by $\tilde{\phi}^2$ with respect to the leading superpotential in Eq. (7.10). The weighton mechanism can also be applied to explain the quark mass hierarchies [239, 242].

7.2 Mass hierarchies, large lepton mixing and residual modular symmetry

As shown in section 3.3, the modular group $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ only has three independent fixed points $\tau_S = i$, $\tau_{ST} = e^{2\pi i/3} = \omega$ and $\tau_T = i\infty$ which are left invariant under the action of S , ST and T . Since certain residual symmetry listed in table 3 is preserved at the fixed points, the modular forms has definite alignments at the modular fixed points. For example, the weight 2 and level 3 modular forms $Y_{1,2,3}(\tau)$ in Eq. (4.34) in the basis of Eq. (4.32) have the following alignments at fixed points:

$$(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \Big|_{\tau=i\infty} = (1, 0, 0),$$

²³A $U(1)_R$ symmetry is necessary in the driving field mechanism, the driving superfield χ carry two unit R charges, the weighton ϕ and Higgs superfields have $R = 0$ and the matter superfields have $R = 1$.

$$\begin{aligned}
(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \Big|_{\tau=i} &= Y_1(i) \left(1, 1 - \sqrt{3}, -2 + \sqrt{3} \right), \\
(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) \Big|_{\tau=\omega} &= Y_1(\omega) \left(1, \omega, -\omega^2/2 \right),
\end{aligned} \tag{7.14}$$

with $Y_1(i) \simeq 1.023$ and $Y_1(\omega) \simeq 0.949$. As a consequence, the residual modular symmetry group would enforce some entries of the fermion mass matrix to be vanishing in proper representation basis of the finite modular group. As the value of the modulus τ moves away from the fixed points, these entries will generically become non-zero. The magnitudes of such residual-symmetry-breaking entries will be controlled by the size of the departure of τ from the fixed points and by the field transformation properties under the residual symmetry group [243–247]. This is shown in what follows.

After electroweak symmetry breaking, the fermion mass term can be generally written as²⁴

$$\mathcal{L}_m = \psi_i^c M_{ij}(\tau) \psi_j. \tag{7.15}$$

The matter superfields $\psi_i^{(c)}$ can be arranged into a column vector $\psi^{(c)}$ transforming under the finite modular symmetry

$$\psi \xrightarrow{\gamma} (c\tau + d)^{-k} \rho(\gamma) \psi, \quad \psi^c \xrightarrow{\gamma} (c\tau + d)^{-k^c} \rho^c(\gamma) \psi^c, \tag{7.16}$$

where $\rho(\gamma)$ and $\rho^c(\gamma)$ are representations of the finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N . Hence each entry $M(\tau)_{ij}$ is a modular form of level N and weight $K \equiv k + k^c$, and modular invariance requires the mass matrix $M(\tau)$ to transform as

$$M(\tau) \xrightarrow{\gamma} M(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^K \rho^c(\gamma)^* M(\tau) \rho(\gamma)^\dagger. \tag{7.17}$$

One can use this transformation rule to constrain the form of the mass matrix $M(\tau)$ by taking τ to be close to the modular fixed points and setting γ to the residual symmetry generator.

- $\tau \rightarrow i\infty$

In modular symmetry models with τ in the vicinity of $i\infty$, it is convenient to choose the T -diagonal basis $\rho^{(c)}(T) = \text{diag}(\rho_i^{(c)})$. The multiplication rule $T^N = 1$ in Eq. (3.10, 3.12) implies generally $(\rho_i^c \rho_j)^* = \zeta^{p_{ij}}$ with $\zeta = e^{2\pi i/N}$ and $0 \leq p_{ij} < N$. Then Eq. (7.17) implies that the entries M_{ij} can be expanded as [245]:

$$M_{ij}(\tau) = a_0 q_N^{p_{ij}} + a_1 q_N^{p_{ij}+N} + a_2 q_N^{p_{ij}+2N} + \dots, \quad q_N \equiv \exp(2\pi i\tau/N) \quad q_N = e^{2\pi i\tau/N} \tag{7.18}$$

in the vicinity of $i\infty$. Hence M_{ij} is of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{p_{ij}})$ with $\epsilon = |q_N| = e^{-2\pi \text{Im}(\tau)/N}$.

- $\tau \rightarrow \omega$

For the analysis of models where τ is in the vicinity of $\tau_{ST} = \omega$, it is convenient to switch to the basis where the product ST is represented by a diagonal matrix, i.e., $\rho^{(c)}(ST) = \text{diag}(\rho_i^{(c)})$, where the diagonal elements are power of ω because of

²⁴For Majorana fermions, ψ and ψ^c are identical and this implies $k^c = k$ and $\rho^c = \rho$.

$(ST)^3 = 1$. Depending on the transformation matrices $\rho^{(c)}(ST)$ and the modular weights k and k^c , it turns out that the entries $M_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{l_{ij}})$ for $\omega^K \rho_i^c \rho_j = \omega^{l_{ij}}$ with $l_{ij} = 0, 1, 2$, where $\epsilon = \left| \frac{\tau - \omega}{\tau - \omega^2} \right|$ [245].

- $\tau \rightarrow i$

In this case, it is convenient to switch to the basis where the modular generator S is represented by a diagonal matrix with $\rho^{(c)}(S) = \text{diag}(\rho_i^{(c)})$, where the diagonal elements are powers of i because of $S^4 = 1$. It is found that the entries $M_{ij} \sim \mathcal{O}(\epsilon^{n_{ij}})$ for $i^K \rho_i^c \rho_j = (-1)^{n_{ij}}$ with $n_{ij} = 0, 1$, where $\epsilon = \left| \frac{\tau - i}{\tau + i} \right|$ [245].

In short, each entry M_{ij} the fermion mass matrix is of order $\mathcal{O}(\epsilon^l)$, where ϵ parameterises the deviation of τ from the fixed points, and the power l can be extracted from products of factors which correspond to representations of the residual symmetry group. It is notable that the value of l only depends on the representations of the matter fields. The fermion mass matrices in the vicinity of modular fixed points have been analyzed for the homogeneous finite modular groups Γ'_N of levels $N \leq 5$, it is found that hierarchical spectra can be obtained for a small list of representation pairs [245], the most promising of which are collected in table 11. Here the coupling constants in modular flavor models are assumed to be of the same order of magnitude, and the modular forms should be properly normalized [248]. Furthermore, it is claimed that the modular invariant models exhibit a universal behavior around the fixed points, and the scaling of fermion masses and mixing parameters is independent of the details of the theory [246, 247].

The three generations of left-handed lepton fields are usually assigned to a triplet of flavor symmetry in order to produce the large lepton mixing angles. In the symmetry limit with τ at the fixed points, the charged lepton and neutrino sectors would share the same residual symmetry so that the lepton mixing matrix would be block diagonal [70] if the lepton masses are non-degenerate. Hence the triplet assignment of left-handed leptons is disfavored in the vicinity of modular fixed points. There are only four cases in which the deviation of τ from the fixed point can generate hierarchical charged-lepton masses together with the viable lepton mixing [245, 249],

- (i) $L \rightsquigarrow 1 \oplus 1 \oplus 1$, $E^c \rightsquigarrow 1 \oplus r$, where 1 is some real singlet of the flavour symmetry, and r is some (possibly reducible) representation such that $r \not\supset 1$;
- (ii) $L \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}^*$, $E^c \rightsquigarrow \mathbf{1}^* \oplus r$, where $\mathbf{1}$ is some complex singlet of the flavour symmetry, $\mathbf{1}^*$ is its conjugate, and r is some (possibly reducible) representation such that $r \not\supset \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}^*$;
- (iii) all charged-lepton masses vanish in the symmetric limit, i.e. the corresponding hierarchical pattern involves only positive powers of ϵ , e.g. $(\epsilon, \epsilon^2, \epsilon^3)$. The small tau lepton mass in comparison to the electroweak scale could be explained in this case, and the three left-handed leptons can be a triplet of the modular group;
- (iv) all light neutrino masses vanish in the symmetric limit, i.e. L decomposes into three (possibly identical) complex singlets none of which are conjugated to each other.

N	Γ'_N (or Γ_N)	Mass ratios	Modulus τ	Viable $\mathbf{r} \otimes \mathbf{r}^c$
2	S_3	$(1, \epsilon, \epsilon^2)$	$\tau \simeq \omega$	$[\mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{1}^{(\prime)}] \otimes [\mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}^{(\prime)} \oplus \mathbf{1}']$
3	$\Gamma'_3 = T'$ (or A_4)	$(1, \epsilon, \epsilon^2)$	$\tau \simeq \omega$	$[\mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{1}'_a] \otimes [\mathbf{1}_b \oplus \mathbf{1}_b \oplus \mathbf{1}''_b]$
			$\tau \simeq i\infty$	$[\mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{1}'_a] \otimes [\mathbf{1}_b \oplus \mathbf{1}_b \oplus \mathbf{1}''_b]$ with $\mathbf{1}_a \neq (\mathbf{1}_b)^*$
4	S'_4 (or S_4)	$(1, \epsilon, \epsilon^2)$	$\tau \simeq \omega$	$[\mathbf{3}_a, \text{ or } \mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{1}^{(\prime)}, \text{ or } \hat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{1}}^{(\prime)}]$ $\otimes [\mathbf{1}_b \oplus \mathbf{1}_b \oplus \mathbf{1}'_b]$
		$(1, \epsilon, \epsilon^3)$	$\tau \simeq i\infty$	$\mathbf{3} \otimes [\mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{1}, \text{ or } \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}']$, $\mathbf{3}' \otimes [\mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{1}', \text{ or } \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{1}']$, $\hat{\mathbf{3}}' \otimes [\hat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{1}}, \text{ or } \hat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{1}}']$, $\hat{\mathbf{3}} \otimes [\hat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{1}}', \text{ or } \hat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \hat{\mathbf{1}}' \oplus \hat{\mathbf{1}}']$
5	A'_5 (or A_5)	$(1, \epsilon, \epsilon^4)$	$\tau \simeq i\infty$	$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}'$

Table 11. Hierarchical mass patterns which can be realized in the vicinity of symmetric points [245]. These patterns are unaffected by the exchange $\mathbf{r} \leftrightarrow \mathbf{r}^c$ and may only be viable for certain weights, where \mathbf{r} and \mathbf{r}^c are representation of ψ and ψ^c respectively. Subscripts run over irreps of a certain dimension, and $\mathbf{1}'''_a = \mathbf{1}_a$ for $N = 3$, while $\mathbf{1}''_a = \mathbf{1}_a$ for $N = 4$. Primes in parenthesis are uncorrelated. Notice the representations without a hat have a direct correspondence with Γ_N representations, while the hatted representations are specific to Γ'_N .

Motivated by the model independent and universal behaviors around the modular fixed points, a concrete model with the S'_4 modular symmetry has been constructed, and the light neutrino masses are generated by the type-I seesaw mechanism [245]. The modular transformations of the lepton fields are assumed to be

$$L_1, L_2 \sim (\hat{\mathbf{1}}, 2), \quad L_3 \sim (\hat{\mathbf{1}}', 2), \quad E^c \sim (\hat{\mathbf{3}}, 4), \quad N^c \sim (\mathbf{3}', 1), \quad (7.19)$$

where the first numbers in the parenthesis denote the transformations under S'_4 and the second numbers are the modular weights. The corresponding superpotential for lepton mass reads [245]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W} = & \left[\alpha_1 \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(4,6)} E^c L_1 \right)_1 + \alpha_2 \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(4,6)} E^c L_1 \right)_1 \right. \\ & + \alpha_3 \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(4,6)} E^c L_2 \right)_1 + \alpha_4 \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(4,6)} E^c L_2 \right)_1 + \alpha_5 \left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4,6)} E^c L_3 \right)_1 \Big] H_d \\ & + \left[g_1 \left(Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(4,3)} N^c L_1 \right)_1 + g_2 \left(Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(4,3)} N^c L_2 \right)_1 + g_3 \left(Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}'}^{(4,3)} N^c L_3 \right)_1 \right] H_u \\ & + \Lambda \left(Y_{\mathbf{2}}^{(4,2)} (N^c)^2 \right)_1. \end{aligned} \quad (7.20)$$

Since L_1 and L_2 are indistinguishable, one of the constants α_i , with $i = 1, \dots, 4$, are effectively not an independent parameter and can be set to zero by a suitable rotation without loss of generality. We choose to set $\alpha_2 = 0$. All the coupling constants are

enforced to be real by the gCP symmetry, and consequently the model depends on 9 effective parameters including $\text{Re } \tau$ and $\text{Im } \tau$. The best fit value of the modulus is found to be $\tau \simeq -0.496 + 0.877i$ which is close to the fixed point ω , the charged lepton mass hierarchies are produced without fine-tuning [245], and the leptonic Dirac CP violation phase is predicted to be around π . See [245] for more numerical results. The closeness of the modulus to the modular symmetry fixed points can also help to explain the quark mass hierarchies [250, 251]. Furthermore, it is shown that the modular symmetry models exhibit a universal behavior in the vicinity of fixed points, independent of details of the models such as the modular weights and representation assignments of matter field under the finite modular groups [247, 252].

7.3 Texture zeros and modular symmetry

Texture zero is an interesting attempt to understand the patterns of fermion masses and flavor mixing, it assumes that some entries of the fermion mass matrices are vanishing in order to reduce the number of free parameters [253–255]. A typical example is the Fritzsch-type quark mass matrices [256, 257]:

$$M_u = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_u & 0 \\ A_u^* & 0 & B_u \\ 0 & B_u^* & C_u \end{pmatrix}, \quad M_d = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A_d & 0 \\ A_d^* & 0 & B_d \\ 0 & B_d^* & C_d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7.21)$$

It relates the Cabibbo angle θ_C to the ratio between the down and strange quark masses via

$$\tan \theta_C \approx \sqrt{\frac{m_d}{m_s}}, \quad (7.22)$$

which is the Gatto-Sartori relation [258]. As regard the texture zero of lepton sector, in the basis of diagonal charged lepton mass matrix, the Majorana neutrino mass matrix can have at most two zero entries and only seven out of the total fifteen two-zero textures are compatible with current experimental data at 3σ level [259–262],

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{A}_1 &: \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \times \\ 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{A}_2 &: \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & \times \\ 0 & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{B}_1 &: \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & 0 & \times \\ 0 & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{B}_2 &: \begin{pmatrix} \times & 0 & \times \\ 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\ \mathbf{B}_3 &: \begin{pmatrix} \times & 0 & \times \\ 0 & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{B}_4 &: \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & \times \\ 0 & \times & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \mathbf{C} &: \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & \times \\ \times & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (7.23)$$

where \times denotes an arbitrary complex number. The phenomenology of texture zeros in both quark and lepton sectors have been widely studied in literature, see Refs. [263, 264] for reviews. Systematical and complete analyses of all possible texture zeros have been carried out for both quark [265] and lepton mass matrices [266]. It is found that the predictivity of pure texture zero models is quite weak and the predictive mass matrices need relations among the non-zero matrix elements. The most straightforward way to impose vanishing Yukawa couplings is by enforcing them with Abelian flavour symmetries [267–269]. In such

$\mathcal{C}_1^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}$			
$\mathcal{C}_2^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathcal{C}_2^{(2)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathcal{C}_2^{(3)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}$	
$\mathcal{C}_3^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & \times \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathcal{C}_3^{(2)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & 0 & \times \\ \times & 0 & \times \\ 0 & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathcal{C}_3^{(3)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{pmatrix}$	
$\mathcal{C}_4^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathcal{C}_4^{(2)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & 0 \\ \times & 0 & 0 \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}$	$\mathcal{C}_4^{(3)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & 0 & \times \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{pmatrix}$	
$\mathcal{C}_6^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & 0 \\ \times & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{pmatrix}$			

Table 12. Texture-zero classification for the (rank-3) charged fermions mass matrices which can be realised from T' modular symmetry, up to row and column permutations. In the notation of Grimus et al [266], $\mathcal{C}_3^{(1)} = 3_1^{(l)}$, $\mathcal{C}_3^{(2)} = 3_2^{(l)}$, $\mathcal{C}_3^{(3)} = 3_3^{(l)}$, $\mathcal{C}_4^{(1)} = 4_4^{(l)}$, $\mathcal{C}_4^{(2)} = 4_1^{(l)}$, $\mathcal{C}_4^{(3)} = 4_2^{(l)}$, $\mathcal{C}_6^{(1)} = 6_1^{(l)}$.

case, the non-zero entries of the fermion mass matrices are uncorrelated since the three generations of matter fields are not linked by the Abelian symmetry group.

One can freely assign the modular weights of matter fields in the bottom-up approach of modular flavor symmetry, thus the modular symmetry has the merits of both abelian flavor symmetry and discrete non-abelian flavor symmetry. Moreover, it is known that modular forms in certain representations of Γ'_N (or Γ_N) are absent at lower weights. In addition, the even weight modular forms at level N are in the irreducible representations of Γ_N [143] while the odd weight modular forms are in the irreducible representations specific to Γ'_N [147]. The structure of modular forms makes the modular symmetry to be a natural framework producing texture zeros of fermion mass matrices. Moreover, the nonzero entries are related by modular symmetry so that modular symmetry can considerably improve the predictive power of texture zero. The possible texture zeros of quark and lepton mass matrices have been systematically analyzed in the context of T' modular symmetry [270, 271]. The possible texture zero patterns of the charged fermions mass matrices and neutrino mass matrix in the T' modular symmetry are summarized in table 12 and table 13 respectively.

It was shown that the two-zero textures of the Majorana neutrino mass matrix can be reproduced from the A_4 modular group [272], where all matter fields were assigned to A_4 singlets and thus correlations among nonzero entries of lepton mass matrices are lost. Moreover, the vanishing entries of fermion mass matrices can naturally appear [70] if the modulus τ is at certain modular fixed point listed in table 3. The nearest neighbor interaction form of the quark mass matrices can be obtained at the fixed point $\tau = \omega$ in the A_4 modular flavor symmetry by taking account multi-Higgs fields [273].

$\mathcal{W}_1^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{W}_1^{(2)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & 0 & \times \\ 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}$
$\mathcal{W}_2^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & \times \\ \times & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{W}_2^{(2)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \times \end{pmatrix}$
$\mathcal{W}_3^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \times \\ 0 & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & \times \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{W}_3^{(2)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$\mathcal{W}_4^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \times \\ 0 & 0 & \times \\ \times & \times & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{W}_4^{(2)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & 0 \\ \times & \times & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{W}_4^{(3)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \times & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \mathcal{W}_4^{(4)} : \begin{pmatrix} \times & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \times \\ 0 & \times & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
$\mathcal{W}_5^{(1)} : \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \times & 0 \\ \times & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$

Table 13. Texture-zero patterns for the Majorana neutrino mass matrix M_ν which can be realised by T' modular symmetry, up to row and column permutations. Notice that only $\mathcal{W}_1^{(1)}, \mathcal{W}_2^{(2)}, \mathcal{W}_3^{(1)}, \mathcal{W}_3^{(2)}, \mathcal{W}_4^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{W}_4^{(4)}$ can be obtained if neutrino masses are described by the Weinberg operator. On the other hand, all the above textures except $\mathcal{W}_4^{(4)}$ can be achieved if neutrino masses are generated via the minimal type I seesaw mechanism. The above texture zeros of neutrino mass matrices have been discussed in [266], see Ref. [271] for the notation correspondence between ours and those of [266].

8 Examples of modular models

In this section we apply the formalism of the previous sections to some examples of concrete models. We begin with some general model building considerations and an overview of models in the current literature. We then discuss a general class of models of leptons based on A_4 before turning to minimal models of leptons (and quarks) based on S'_4 with a single modulus field. Finally we discuss a model of leptons based on three S_4 groups with three moduli fields, the Littlest Modular Seesaw model, so called because it is highly predictive.

8.1 General model building considerations and overview of models

In general, the building blocks of modular flavor symmetry models are modular forms of level N and matter supermultiplets φ which transform in representations ρ_φ of a finite modular group Γ_N (or Γ'_N) and carry certain modular weights k_φ . When considering a particular model, one has to specify both ρ_φ and k_φ of each matter field²⁵, then it is straightforward to write out the modular invariant superpotential for fermion masses by using the modular forms of level N listed in Appendix C.

²⁵The representation ρ_φ and weight k_φ of matter fields can be freely assigned in bottom-up models, while they could possibly be fixed in the top-down approach [150, 151, 233, 234, 274].

Many modular flavor symmetry models for lepton masses and mixing, based on different choices of level, modular weights and representations of matter fields have been proposed. Moreover, the modular symmetry has been also extended to the quark sector to describe the flavor structure of both quarks and leptons with a common modulus τ . A summary of the modular invariant models in the current literature is given in table 14.

In modular invariant models for leptons, the three generations of lepton doublets are usually assigned to be an irreducible triplet of the finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N in order to minimize the number of free parameters and the Kähler potential is assumed to be the minimal form otherwise additional free parameters and sizable corrections would be invoked [149, 270]. The superpotential of charged leptons usually depends only 3 dimensionless parameters. The latter are adjusted to reproduce the charged lepton masses. All the remaining physical observables such as neutrino masses and lepton mixing angles and CP violation phases are usually determined by the VEV of modulus τ and additional two (or three) free couplings. The gCP symmetry could enforce the couplings to be real in certain representation basis and the predictive power of the model would be improved further. Hence the modular invariant models could involve a small number of free parameters, and they can predict not only the lepton mixing but also lepton masses. Moreover, modular symmetry has been used to address the strong CP problem [275, 276], and it is also exploited to new physics beyond SM [277–289]. The moduli in modular flavor symmetric models may possibly play the role of inflaton [288, 290].

	Γ_N/Γ'_N	leptons alone	quarks alone	leptons & quarks
$N = 2$	S_3	[154, 291, 292]	[293]	—
$N = 3$	A_4	[70, 143, 154, 200, 240, 272, 293–315]	[250, 316–318]	[155, 239, 319–322]
	T'	[147, 271, 323]	—	[270, 324]
$N = 4$	S_4	[70, 161, 162, 210, 325–330]	—	[156]
	S'_4	[178, 331]	[332]	[164, 333]
$N = 5$	A_5	[157, 163, 327, 334]	—	—
	A'_5	[285, 335–337]	—	[165]
$N = 6$	$\Gamma_6 \cong S_3 \times A_4$	—	[338]	—
	$\Gamma'_6 \cong S_3 \times T'$	[158]	—	—
$N = 7$	Γ_7	[159]	—	—
	Γ'_7	—	—	—

Table 14. Summary of modular invariant models based on SM gauge group.

8.2 Overview of A_4 modular models

The study of modular symmetry initiated from the modular group A_4 [143], it is instructive to recapitulate the A_4 modular invariant lepton model since it comprises all the essential features of the modular symmetry models. The model is realized at level $N = 3$, and light neutrinos get their masses via the type I see-saw mechanism. Both the left-handed lepton fields L and the right-handed neutrino fields N^c are assumed to be triplet of A_4 , and the three right-handed charged leptons e^c , μ^c and τ^c are assigned to transform as A_4 singlets $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{1}''$ and $\mathbf{1}'$ respectively. All the lepton fields carry one unit of modular weight, and the

Higgs fields $H_{u,d}$ are invariant under A_4 with zero modular weight, i.e.

$$L \sim (\mathbf{3}, 1), \quad e^c \sim (\mathbf{1}, 1), \quad \mu^c \sim (\mathbf{1}'', 1), \quad \tau^c \sim (\mathbf{1}', 1), \quad N^c \sim (\mathbf{3}, 1), \quad H_{u,d} \sim (\mathbf{1}, 0), \quad (8.1)$$

where the first numbers in the parentheses denote the transformation under A_4 modular symmetry and the second numbers are the modular weight. In a standard notation, the superpotential for the charged lepton masses is given by:

$$\mathcal{W}_e = \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d, \quad (8.2)$$

where $Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau) = (Y_1, Y_2, Y_3)^T$ denotes the irreducible triplet of level-3 weight-2 modular forms in Eq. (4.33). The couplings α , β and γ can be made real through redefinition of the fields e^c , μ^c , τ^c . Using the contraction rules of two A_4 triplets in Eq. (C.26), we can read out the charged lepton mass matrix as follow,

$$M_e = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha Y_1(\tau) & \alpha Y_3(\tau) & \alpha Y_2(\tau) \\ \beta Y_2(\tau) & \beta Y_1(\tau) & \beta Y_3(\tau) \\ \gamma Y_3(\tau) & \gamma Y_2(\tau) & \gamma Y_1(\tau) \end{pmatrix} v_d. \quad (8.3)$$

The superpotential relevant to neutrino masses is:

$$\mathcal{W}_\nu = g_1 ((N^c L)_{\mathbf{3}_S} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + g_2 ((N^c L)_{\mathbf{3}_A} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \frac{1}{2} \Lambda_L ((N^c N^c)_{\mathbf{3}_S} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}}, \quad (8.4)$$

where the phase of g_1 can be absorbed into the left-handed lepton field L , while g_2 is complex. The Dirac neutrino mass matrix m_D and heavy Majorana neutrino mass matrix m_N take the following form

$$M_N = \begin{pmatrix} 2Y_1(\tau) & -Y_3(\tau) & -Y_2(\tau) \\ -Y_3(\tau) & 2Y_2(\tau) & -Y_1(\tau) \\ -Y_2(\tau) & -Y_1(\tau) & 2Y_3(\tau) \end{pmatrix} \Lambda_L, \quad (8.5)$$

$$M_D = \begin{pmatrix} 2g_1 Y_1(\tau) & (-g_1 + g_2) Y_3(\tau) & (-g_1 - g_2) Y_2(\tau) \\ (-g_1 - g_2) Y_3(\tau) & 2g_1 Y_2(\tau) & (-g_1 + g_2) Y_1(\tau) \\ (-g_1 + g_2) Y_2(\tau) & (-g_1 - g_2) Y_1(\tau) & 2g_1 Y_3(\tau) \end{pmatrix} v_u.$$

The light neutrino mass matrix is $M_\nu = -M_D^T M_N^{-1} M_D$. Charged lepton masses can be reproduced by adjusting the parameters α , β and γ , while neutrino masses and the lepton mass matrix depend also on additional five parameters: one overall scale $|g_1|^2 v_u^2 / \Lambda_L$, the complex combination g_2/g_1 and the τ VEV. This model can accommodate both normal ordering and inverted ordering neutrino mass spectrum. The best fit values of the free parameters as well as the neutrino masses and mixing parameters at the best fit points are shown in table 15.

In the above original A_4 modular model [143], the right-handed lepton fields e^c , μ^c and τ^c have the same modular weight and they transform as different A_4 singlets. In fact, we can distinguish e^c , μ^c and τ^c through the combination of modular weights and representation assignments under A_4 . If two or all of e^c , μ^c and τ^c are assigned to the same A_4 singlet

Goodness of fit against NuFit 5.2 values without SK atmospheric data										
NO	χ_{\min}^2	$\text{Re}(\tau)$	$\text{Im}(\tau)$	$ g_2/g_1 $	$\text{arg}(g_2/g_1)$	$\frac{ g_1 ^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda_L} (\text{eV})$	$\alpha v_d (\text{MeV})$	β/α	γ/α	
	1.921	0.049	2.264	1.109	1.899	0.049	0.360	210.767	3581.720	
	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	δ_{CP}/π	α_{21}/π	α_{31}/π	$m_1 (\text{eV})$	$m_2 (\text{eV})$	$m_3 (\text{eV})$	$ m_{\beta\beta} (\text{eV})$
	0.303	0.0220	0.575	1.416	0.023	1.014	0.0985	0.0988	0.1105	0.0985
IO	χ_{\min}^2	$\text{Re}(\tau)$	$\text{Im}(\tau)$	$ g_2/g_1 $	$\text{arg}(g_2/g_1)$	$\frac{ g_1 ^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda_L} (\text{eV})$	$\alpha v_d (\text{MeV})$	β/α	γ/α	
	1.129	0.498	1.141	0.968	0.022	0.028	68.517	16.527	4.826×10^{-3}	
	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	δ_{CP}/π	α_{21}/π	α_{31}/π	$m_1 (\text{eV})$	$m_2 (\text{eV})$	$m_3 (\text{eV})$	$ m_{\beta\beta} (\text{eV})$
	0.305	0.0222	0.575	1.745	0.728	0.813	0.0638	0.0644	0.0405	0.0332
Goodness of fit against NuFit 5.2 values with SK atmospheric data										
NO	χ_{\min}^2	$\text{Re}(\tau)$	$\text{Im}(\tau)$	$ g_2/g_1 $	$\text{arg}(g_2/g_1)$	$\frac{ g_1 ^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda_L} (\text{eV})$	$\alpha v_d (\text{MeV})$	β/α	γ/α	
	0.129	0.284	1.871	1.123	4.651	0.032	0.362	3544.019	209.654	
	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	δ_{CP}/π	α_{21}/π	α_{31}/π	$m_1 (\text{eV})$	$m_2 (\text{eV})$	$m_3 (\text{eV})$	$ m_{\beta\beta} (\text{eV})$
	0.303	0.0222	0.445	1.298	1.944	0.933	0.0635	0.0641	0.0809	0.0629
IO	χ_{\min}^2	$\text{Re}(\tau)$	$\text{Im}(\tau)$	$ g_2/g_1 $	$\text{arg}(g_2/g_1)$	$\frac{ g_1 ^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda_L} (\text{eV})$	$\alpha v_d (\text{MeV})$	β/α	γ/α	
	2.793	0.498	1.139	0.971	1.018	0.028	68.431	16.530	4.826×10^{-3}	
	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	δ_{CP}/π	α_{21}/π	α_{31}/π	$m_1 (\text{eV})$	$m_2 (\text{eV})$	$m_3 (\text{eV})$	$ m_{\beta\beta} (\text{eV})$
	0.307	0.0222	0.564	1.731	0.728	0.812	0.0636	0.0642	0.0405	0.0331

Table 15. The best fit values of free couplings and lepton masses and lepton mixing parameters in the original A_4 modular model of Feruglio [143], we use the latest global fit results of NuFIT v5.2 without/with SK atmospheric data [82].

representation, they could be distinguished by different modular weights. The left-handed lepton fields are assigned to be A_4 triplet in order to produce the large lepton mixing angles. Guided by the principle of simplicity, we use the lower weight modular forms of level 3 as much as possible. Then the superpotential for charged lepton masses can take the following ten possible forms [240]:

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}), (k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 6)$

The modular invariant superpotential for charged lepton Yukawa couplings is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \gamma_1 \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \gamma_2 \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1 Y_1 + L_2 Y_3 + L_3 Y_2) H_d \\
&\quad + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1 (Y_1^2 - Y_2 Y_3) + L_2 (Y_2^2 - Y_1 Y_3) + L_3 (Y_3^2 - Y_1 Y_2) \right] H_d \\
&\quad + \gamma_1 \tau^c \left[L_1 (Y_1^3 + 2Y_1 Y_2 Y_3) + L_2 (Y_1^2 Y_3 + 2Y_3^2 Y_2) + L_3 (Y_1^2 Y_2 + 2Y_2^2 Y_3) \right] H_d \\
&\quad + \gamma_2 \tau^c \left[L_1 (Y_3^3 + 2Y_1 Y_2 Y_3) + L_2 (Y_3^2 Y_2 + 2Y_2^2 Y_1) + L_3 (Y_3^2 Y_1 + 2Y_1^2 Y_2) \right] H_d, \quad (8.6)
\end{aligned}$$

where $Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}$ and $Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)}, Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)}$ are weight 4 and weight 6 modular forms at level 3 respectively, and they are given in Eqs. (4.36, 4.37).

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}'), (k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 6)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d + \gamma_1 \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d + \gamma_2 \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1 Y_3 + L_2 Y_2 + L_3 Y_1) H_d \\
&\quad + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1 (Y_2^2 - Y_1 Y_3) + L_2 (Y_3^2 - Y_1 Y_2) + L_3 (Y_1^2 - Y_2 Y_3) \right] H_d
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& +\gamma_1\tau^c \left[L_1(Y_1^2Y_3 + 2Y_3^2Y_2) + L_2(Y_1^2Y_2 + 2Y_2^2Y_3) + L_3(Y_1^3 + 2Y_1Y_2Y_3) \right] H_d \\
& +\gamma_2\tau^c \left[L_1(Y_3^2Y_2 + 2Y_2^2Y_1) + L_2(Y_3^2Y_1 + 2Y_1^2Y_2) + L_3(Y_3^3 + 2Y_1Y_2Y_3) \right] H_d. \quad (8.7)
\end{aligned}$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'')$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 6)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma_1 \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma_2 \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1Y_2 + L_2Y_1 + L_3Y_3) H_d \\
&\quad + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1(Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2) + L_2(Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3) + L_3(Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3) \right] H_d \\
&\quad + \gamma_1 \tau^c \left[L_1(Y_1^2Y_2 + 2Y_2^2Y_3) + L_2(Y_1^3 + 2Y_1Y_2Y_3) + L_3(Y_1^2Y_3 + 2Y_3^2Y_2) \right] H_d \\
&\quad + \gamma_2 \tau^c \left[L_1(Y_3^2Y_1 + 2Y_1^2Y_2) + L_2(Y_3^3 + 2Y_1Y_2Y_3) + L_3(Y_3^2Y_2 + 2Y_2^2Y_1) \right] H_d. \quad (8.8)
\end{aligned}$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}')$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1Y_1 + L_2Y_3 + L_3Y_2) H_d + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1(Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3) + L_2(Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L_3(Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2) \right] H_d + \gamma \tau^c (L_1Y_3 + L_2Y_2 + L_3Y_1) H_d. \quad (8.9)
\end{aligned}$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}'')$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1Y_1 + L_2Y_3 + L_3Y_2) H_d + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1(Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3) + L_2(Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L_3(Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2) \right] H_d + \gamma \tau^c (L_1Y_2 + L_2Y_1 + L_3Y_3) H_d. \quad (8.10)
\end{aligned}$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1})$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1Y_3 + L_2Y_2 + L_3Y_1) H_d + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1(Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3) + L_2(Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L_3(Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3) \right] H_d + \gamma \tau^c (L_1Y_1 + L_2Y_3 + L_3Y_2) H_d. \quad (8.11)
\end{aligned}$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}'')$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1Y_3 + L_2Y_2 + L_3Y_1) H_d + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1(Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3) + L_2(Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L_3(Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3) \right] H_d + \gamma \tau^c (L_1Y_2 + L_2Y_1 + L_3Y_3) H_d. \quad (8.12)
\end{aligned}$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1})$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d \\
&= \alpha e^c (L_1Y_2 + L_2Y_1 + L_3Y_3) H_d + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1(Y_3^2 - Y_1Y_2) + L_2(Y_1^2 - Y_2Y_3) \right. \\
&\quad \left. + L_3(Y_2^2 - Y_1Y_3) \right] H_d + \gamma \tau^c (L_1Y_1 + L_2Y_3 + L_3Y_2) H_d. \quad (8.13)
\end{aligned}$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}')$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 4, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d \\ &= \alpha e^c (L_1 Y_2 + L_2 Y_1 + L_3 Y_3) H_d + \beta \mu^c \left[L_1 (Y_3^2 - Y_1 Y_2) + L_2 (Y_1^2 - Y_2 Y_3) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + L_3 (Y_2^2 - Y_1 Y_3) \right] H_d + \gamma \tau^c (L_1 Y_3 + L_2 Y_2 + L_3 Y_1) H_d.\end{aligned}\quad (8.14)$$

- $(e^c, \mu^c, \tau^c) \sim (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}')$, $(k_{e^c} + k_L, k_{\mu^c} + k_L, k_{\tau^c} + k_L) = (2, 2, 2)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha e^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta \mu^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}'} H_d + \gamma \tau^c (LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}''} H_d \\ &= \alpha e^c (L_1 Y_1 + L_2 Y_3 + L_3 Y_2) H_d + \beta \mu^c (L_1 Y_2 + L_2 Y_1 + L_3 Y_3) H_d \\ &\quad + \gamma \tau^c (L_1 Y_3 + L_2 Y_2 + L_3 Y_1) H_d,\end{aligned}\quad (8.15)$$

which is exactly charged lepton sector of the Feruglio's A_4 modular model [143].

If the right-handed neutrinos N^c are assigned to be a triplet of A_4 , the superpotential of neutrino masses can only take three possible forms in the scenarios with the level 3 and weight 2 modular form [240]:

- $(k_{N^c}, k_L) = (0, 2)$

The neutrino superpotential invariant under the modular symmetry takes the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_\nu &= g_1 ((N^c L)_{\mathbf{3}_S} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + g_2 ((N^c L)_{\mathbf{3}_A} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \Lambda (N^c N^c)_{\mathbf{1}} \\ &= g_1 \left[(2N_1^c L_1 - N_2^c L_3 - N_3^c L_2) Y_1 + (2N_3^c L_3 - N_1^c L_2 - N_2^c L_1) Y_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2N_2^c L_2 - N_1^c L_3 - N_3^c L_1) Y_2 \right] H_u + g_2 \left[(N_2^c L_3 - N_3^c L_2) Y_1 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (N_1^c L_2 - N_2^c L_1) Y_3 + (N_3^c L_1 - N_1^c L_3) Y_2 \right] H_u + \Lambda (N_1^c N_1^c + 2N_2^c N_3^c).\end{aligned}\quad (8.16)$$

- $(k_{N^c}, k_L) = (1, 1)$

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_\nu &= g_1 ((N^c L)_{\mathbf{3}_S} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + g_2 ((N^c L)_{\mathbf{3}_A} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \Lambda ((N^c N^c)_{\mathbf{3}_S} Y)_{\mathbf{1}} \\ &= g_1 \left[(2N_1^c L_1 - N_2^c L_3 - N_3^c L_2) Y_1 + (2N_3^c L_3 - N_1^c L_2 - N_2^c L_1) Y_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (2N_2^c L_2 - N_1^c L_3 - N_3^c L_1) Y_2 \right] H_u + g_2 \left[(N_2^c L_3 - N_3^c L_2) Y_1 + (N_1^c L_2 - N_2^c L_1) Y_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (N_3^c L_1 - N_1^c L_3) Y_2 \right] H_u + 2\Lambda \left[(N_1^c N_1^c - N_2^c N_3^c) Y_1 + (N_3^c N_3^c - N_1^c N_2^c) Y_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (N_2^c N_2^c - N_1^c N_3^c) Y_2 \right].\end{aligned}\quad (8.17)$$

- $(k_{N^c}, k_L) = (1, -1)$

$$\mathcal{W}_\nu = g ((N^c L)_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \Lambda ((N^c N^c)_{\mathbf{3}_S} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
&= g(N_1^c L_1 + N_2^c L_3 + N_3^c L_2)H_u + 2\Lambda \left[(N_1^c N_1^c - N_2^c N_3^c)Y_1 \right. \\
&\quad \left. + (N_3^c N_3^c - N_1^c N_2^c)Y_3 + (N_2^c N_2^c - N_1^c N_3^c)Y_2 \right]. \tag{8.18}
\end{aligned}$$

Combining the charged lepton sector with the neutrino sector, we have 30 simple A_4 modular symmetry model for lepton, and the experimental data can be accommodated for the first two cases of the neutrino sector. We summarize the phenomenologically viable models in table 16, where the predictions for the lightest neutrino masses are presented in the last two columns for the viable models. Notice that the χ^2 function could have more than one local minima at which different predictions for neutrino masses and mixing parameters are reached. A full classification of the A_4 modular models with gCP is performed in [155], and the minimal model can describe the experimental lepton data with only 7 real free parameters.

$(\rho_{e^c}, \rho_{\mu^c}, \rho_{\tau^c})$	k_L	$(k_{e^c}, k_{\mu^c}, k_{\tau^c})$	k_{N^c}	NO (m_1/meV)	IO (m_3/meV)
$(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1})$	2	(0, 2, 4)	0	✓ (5.58)	✓ (0.43)
	1	(1, 3, 5)	1	✓ (11.94)	✓ (25.46)
$(\mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}')$	2	(0, 2, 4)	0	✓ (5.53)	✓ (1.53)
	1	(1, 3, 5)	1	✓ (2.38)	✓ (10.35)
$(\mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'')$	2	(0, 2, 4)	0	✓ (11.32)	✓ (3.99)
	1	(1, 3, 5)	1	✓ (3.02)	✓ (10.98)
$(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}')$	2	(0, 2, 0)	0	✗ (–)	✓ (61.89)
	1	(1, 3, 1)	1	✗ (–)	✗ (–)
$(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}'')$	2	(0, 2, 0)	0	✗ (–)	✓ (50.55)
	1	(1, 3, 1)	1	✓ (40.14)	✓ (25.37)
$(\mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1})$	2	(0, 2, 0)	0	✗ (–)	✓ (40.65)
	1	(1, 3, 1)	1	✓ (6.66)	✓ (25.36)
$(\mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}', \mathbf{1}'')$	2	(0, 2, 0)	0	✓ (42.26)	✓ (53.67)
	1	(1, 3, 1)	1	✓ (28.91)	✓ (10.17)
$(\mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1})$	2	(0, 2, 0)	0	✗ (–)	✓ (22.78)
	1	(1, 3, 1)	1	✓ (6.15)	✓ (40.45)
$(\mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}')$	2	(0, 2, 0)	0	✓ (42.36)	✓ (44.84)
	1	(1, 3, 1)	1	✓ (78.76)	✗ (–)
$(\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}'', \mathbf{1}')$	2	(0, 2, 0)	0	✓ (42.39)	✓ (48.58)
	1	(1, 3, 1)	1	✓ (98.50)	✓ (40.54)

Table 16. Summary of A_4 modular symmetry models for leptons. In the last two columns, we use “✓” (“✗”) denote the models which are (not) compatible with the global fitting results of NuFIT v5.2 without SK atmospheric data [82] at 3σ level, and the predictions for the lightest neutrino mass are presented for viable models. The model in the last line is exactly the Feruglio A_4 modular models discussed earlier.

8.3 Minimal S'_4 modular model for leptons

This model is based on the finite modular symmetry S'_4 [331], the group theory of S'_4 and the explicit expressions of the modular forms of level 4 are listed in Appendix C.3. The neutrino masses are generated by type-I seesaw mechanism with three right-handed neutrinos $N^c = (N_1^c, N_2^c, N_3^c)^T$. In this model, both the left-handed lepton fields L and right-handed neutrinos N^c are assumed to transform as $\mathbf{3}$ under S'_4 , the first two generations of the right-handed charged leptons $E_D^c = (E_1^c, E_2^c)^T$ are assigned to a doublet $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}$ of S'_4 , and the third right-handed charged leptons E_3^c is a S'_4 singlet $\widehat{\mathbf{1}}'$. The representation and weight assignments of the lepton fields are given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{E^c} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{1}}', & \rho_L &= \mathbf{3}, & \rho_{N^c} &= \mathbf{3}, & \rho_{H_u} &= \rho_{H_d} = \mathbf{1}, \\ k_{E_{1,2,3}^c} &= 4, & k_{N^c} &= 1, & k_L &= -1, & k_{H_u} &= k_{H_d} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (8.19)$$

This model can be revised into a supergravity version by simply revising the modular weights of matter fields as $k_{E_{1,2,3}^c} = 9/2$, $k_{N^c} = 3/2$, $k_L = -1/2$ [331].

Then one can read off the modular invariant superpotential for the lepton masses as follow:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha \left(E_D^c L Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}'}^{(3)} \right)_1 H_d + \beta \left(E_D^c L Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(3)} \right)_1 H_d + \gamma \left(E_3^c L Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(3)} \right)_1 H_d, \\ \mathcal{W}_\nu &= g_1 (N^c L)_1 H_u + \Lambda \left((N^c N^c)_{\mathbf{2},s} Y_{\mathbf{2}}^{(2)} \right)_1. \end{aligned} \quad (8.20)$$

We include gCP symmetry in this model, and consequently all coupling constants are enforced to be real since both modular generators S and T are represented by symmetric and unitary matrices and all Clebsch-Gordan coefficients are real in the chosen basis of Appendix C.3. Note that β would be a complex number and the phases of others can be absorbed into fields if gCP is not considered. Using the contraction rules of S'_4 group listed in Appendix C.3, we find the lepton mass matrices are

$$\begin{aligned} M_e &= \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}',1}^{(3)} & -\alpha Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}',3}^{(3)} + \sqrt{3}\beta Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(3)} & -\alpha Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}',2}^{(3)} + \sqrt{3}\beta Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},3}^{(3)} \\ -2\beta Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},1}^{(3)} & \sqrt{3}\alpha Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(3)} + \beta Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},3}^{(3)} & \sqrt{3}\alpha Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},3}^{(3)} + \beta Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(3)} \\ \gamma Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},1}^{(3)} & \gamma Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},3}^{(3)} & \gamma Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} v_d, \\ M_D &= g \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} v_u, & M_N &= \Lambda \begin{pmatrix} 2Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{3}Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)} & -Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} \\ 0 & -Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} & \sqrt{3}Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.21)$$

where $v_d = \langle H_d \rangle$ and $v_u = \langle H_u \rangle$ are VEVs of Higgs fields. Applying the famous seesaw formula, we can obtain the light neutrino mass matrix as follow

$$M_\nu = -M_D^T M_N^{-1} M_D = \frac{g^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)}} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3} Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)}}{Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)2} - 3Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)2}} & \frac{Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)}}{Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)2} - 3Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)2}} \\ 0 & \frac{Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)}}{Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)2} - 3Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)2}} & \frac{\sqrt{3} Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)}}{Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)2} - 3Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8.22)$$

which contributes to the atmospheric mixing angle. It is remarkable that the light neutrino masses are fixed by the modulus τ up to an overall scale $g^2 v_u^2/\Lambda$,

$$m_1 = \frac{1}{|2Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)}|} \frac{g^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda}, \quad m_2 = \frac{1}{|Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} - \sqrt{3}Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)}|} \frac{g^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda}, \quad m_3 = \frac{1}{|Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} + \sqrt{3}Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)}|} \frac{g^2 v_u^2}{\Lambda}. \quad (8.23)$$

In this model, the lepton mass matrices as well as flavor observables only depend on four constants $\alpha, \beta, \gamma, g^2/\Lambda$ plus the complex modulus τ . It is the minimal modular invariant model in the present literature as far as we know. We find that the experimental data of lepton masses and flavor mixing can be accommodated only if the neutrino mass is normal ordering. The best-fit values of the input parameters are determined to be²⁶

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \tau \rangle &= -0.193773 + 1.08321i, & \beta/\alpha &= 1.73048, & \gamma/\alpha &= 0.27031, \\ \alpha v_d &= 244.621 \text{ MeV}, & g^2 v_u^2/\Lambda &= 29.0744 \text{ meV}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.24)$$

where αv_d and $g^2 v_u^2/\Lambda$ are fixed by the measured values of the electron mass and the solar mass squared splitting Δm_{21}^2 respectively [82]. At this best fit point, the lepton masses and flavor mixing parameters are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sin^2 \theta_{12} &= 0.328920, & \sin^2 \theta_{13} &= 0.0218499, & \sin^2 \theta_{23} &= 0.506956, & \delta_{CP} &= 1.34256\pi, \\ \alpha_{21} &= 1.32868\pi, & \alpha_{31} &= 0.544383\pi, & m_e/m_\mu &= 0.00472633, & m_\mu/m_\tau &= 0.0587566, \\ m_1 &= 14.4007 \text{ meV}, & m_2 &= 16.7803 \text{ meV}, & m_3 &= 51.7755 \text{ meV}, \\ m_\beta &= 16.8907 \text{ meV}, & m_{\beta\beta} &= 9.25333 \text{ meV}, \end{aligned} \quad (8.25)$$

which are within the 3σ intervals of the latest global fit NuFIT v5.1 without SK atmospheric data [82]. The charged lepton mass ratios are compatible with their renormalization group (RG) running values at the GUT scale 2×10^{16} GeV, where $M_{\text{SUSY}} = 1$ TeV, $\tan \beta = 5$ is taken as a benchmark [339]. Here m_β is the effective neutrino mass probed by direct kinematic search in tritium beta decay and $m_{\beta\beta}$ is the effective mass in neutrinoless double beta decay. Our predictions for these two effective neutrino masses are far below the present experimental bounds $m_\beta < 0.8$ eV from KATRIN [340] and $m_{\beta\beta} \leq (36 - 156)$ meV from KamLAND-Zen [341] at 90% confidence level. Moreover, the neutrino mass sum is predicted to be $m_1 + m_2 + m_3 = 82.9565$ meV which is compatible with the upper limit of Planck $\sum_i m_i < 120$ meV [342].

It is notable that the light neutrino masses only depend on the complex modulus τ up to the overall scale $g^2 v_u^2/\Lambda$. Therefore the experimental data of $\Delta m_{21}^2/\Delta m_{31}^2$ can efficiently constrain the range of $\langle \tau \rangle$, where $\Delta m_{21}^2 \equiv m_2^2 - m_1^2$ and $\Delta m_{31}^2 \equiv m_3^2 - m_1^2$ are the solar and atmospheric neutrino mass squared differences respectively, as is shown in the blue region of figure 10. After further including the precisely measured values of the reactor angle θ_{13} and

²⁶The determinant of the charged lepton mass matrix is

$$\det[M_e(\tau)] = -96\sqrt{6}v_d^3\gamma(\beta^2 - 3\alpha^2)\eta^{18}(\tau).$$

Consequently the small electron mass can be naturally reproduced for $\beta \approx \pm\sqrt{3}\alpha$. This is the reason why the best fit value $\beta/\alpha = 1.73048$ which is quite close to $\sqrt{3}$.




Figure 10. The region of modulus τ compatible with experimental data, where the gray line is the boundary of the fundamental domain. The blue region represents the feasible range of $\langle\tau\rangle$ compatible with the data $\Delta m_{21}^2/\Delta m_{31}^2$ of the neutrino mass squared difference [82]. The orange area denotes the viable region of $\langle\tau\rangle$ limited only by the measured values of the charged lepton mass ratios and the reactor mixing angle θ_{13} [82, 339].

the charged lepton mass ratios m_e/m_μ , m_μ/m_τ , the modulus VEV $\langle\tau\rangle$ would be limited in two small regions around $-0.19 + 1.08i$ and $0.19 + 1.08i$.

Furthermore, we explore the parameter space of this minimal model. Requiring the three charged lepton masses $m_{e,\mu,\tau}$, the three lepton mixing angles θ_{12} , θ_{13} , θ_{23} and the neutrino squared mass splittings Δm_{21}^2 and Δm_{31}^2 to lie in the experimentally allowed 3σ regions [82], the correlations between the free parameters and flavor observables are shown in figure 11. We see that the atmospheric neutrino mixing angle $\sin^2\theta_{23}$ is predicted to lie in the range of $[0.504, 0.510]$ which is in the second octant, the Dirac CP violation phase δ_{CP} is in the narrow interval $[1.316\pi, 1.364\pi]$. These predictions for θ_{23} and δ_{CP} could be tested in future long baseline neutrino experiments DUNE [343] and T2HK [344]. Moreover, the neutrino mixing angles $\sin^2\theta_{12}$ and $\sin^2\theta_{13}$ also show a certain correlation, this feature is expected to be tested at JUNO [345] which can measure the solar angle θ_{12} with sub-percent precision. Moreover, the Majorana CP violation phases are also found to lie in quite narrow regions $\alpha_{21} \in [1.309\pi, 1.352\pi]$ and $\alpha_{31} \in [0.510\pi, 0.576\pi]$. Consequently we have a definite prediction for the effective Majorana mass $m_{\beta\beta}$ in the interval $[8.543 \text{ meV}, 10.010 \text{ meV}]$ which is within the sensitivity of future ton-scale neutrinoless double beta decay experiments.




Figure 11. The predicted correlations between the input free parameters, neutrino mixing angles, and CP violation phases in the minimal model. The plots only display the points that can reproduce the charged lepton masses, Δm_{21}^2 , Δm_{31}^2 and all the three lepton mixing angles at 3σ level [82]. In the top-right panel, the red dashed lines are the 3σ bounds of the mixing angles. In the bottom right panel for $m_{\beta\beta}$, the blue (red) dashed lines represent the most general allowed regions for normal (inverted) ordering neutrino mass spectrum, where the neutrino oscillation parameter are varied within their 3σ ranges. Moreover, the vertical grey exclusion band stands for the most radical upper bound $\sum_i m_i < 0.12$ eV from Planck [342]. The horizontal grey band represents the present upper limit $m_{\beta\beta} \leq (36 - 156)$ meV from KamLAND-Zen [341].

8.4 Extension of S'_4 modular model to quark sector without GUTs

As summarized in table 14, the modular symmetry is explored to explain the lepton masses and mixing in most case. In a similar way, the modular symmetry can also help to understand the quark mass hierarchies and CKM mixing matrix. It is highly nontrivial to address the experimental data of both quark and lepton sectors with a single modular symmetry in terms of a small number of free parameters. We see that 16 real input parameters [270] or more [316, 319, 321] are required to describe the masses and mixing patterns of quark and lepton in the models based on level $N = 3$ modular group. In the following, we shall present a S'_4 modular symmetry model which can explain the flavor structure of quarks and leptons simultaneously for a common value of modulus τ , and this model involves only 15 real free parameters including the real and imaginary parts of the modulus τ [164].

This model is formulated in the framework of minimal supersymmetric standard model (MSSM), and the gCP symmetry is imposed so that all coupling constants are real in

our working basis. The light neutrino masses are assumed to be generated by the type-I seesaw mechanism. The three generations of left-handed lepton doublets L and right-handed neutrinos N^c are assigned to two triplets $\mathbf{3}$ of S'_4 , while the right-handed charged leptons E_1^c , E_2^c and E_3^c transform as $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{1}}'$ respectively. The modular weights of lepton fields are chosen as $k_{N^c} = 0$, $k_L = 2$, $k_{E_1^c} = 2$, $k_{E_2^c} = 0$ and $k_{E_3^c} = 1$. Then the modular invariant superpotential for lepton masses is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_e &= \alpha_e (E_1^c LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta_e (E_2^c LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \gamma_e (E_3^c LY_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d, \\ \mathcal{W}_\nu &= g_1 (N^c LY_{\mathbf{2}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + g_2 (N^c LY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \Lambda (N^c N^c)_{\mathbf{1}},\end{aligned}\quad (8.26)$$

from which we can read out the lepton mass matrices as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}M_e &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_e Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(4)} & \alpha_e Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(4)} & \alpha_e Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(4)} \\ \beta_e Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} & \beta_e Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2)} & \beta_e Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(2)} \\ \gamma_e Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},1}^{(3)} & \gamma_e Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},3}^{(3)} & \gamma_e Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} v_d, & M_N &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \Lambda, \\ M_D &= \begin{pmatrix} 2g_1 Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} & g_2 Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2)} & -g_2 Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(2)} \\ -g_2 Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2)} & \sqrt{3} g_1 Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)} & -g_1 Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} + g_2 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} \\ g_2 Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(2)} & -g_1 Y_{\mathbf{2},1}^{(2)} - g_2 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} & \sqrt{3} g_1 Y_{\mathbf{2},2}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix} v_u.\end{aligned}\quad (8.27)$$

The phases of α_e , β_e , γ_e , g_1 and Λ can be absorbed by lepton fields, and the coupling g_2 is complex (real) without (with) gCP. As regards the representation assignment of quark fields, we assign the left-handed quarks Q to be triplet $\mathbf{3}$ of S'_4 , u^c , c^c and t^c transform as $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{1}$ and $\hat{\mathbf{1}}'$ respectively under S'_4 , the down type quarks d^c , s^c , b^c are S'_4 singlets $\mathbf{1}'$, $\hat{\mathbf{1}}$, $\hat{\mathbf{1}}'$ respectively. Although both u^c and c^c are invariant under S'_4 , their modular weights are different. The modular weights of quark fields are chosen to satisfy the relations $k_Q = 4 - k_{u^c} = 6 - k_{c^c} = 3 - k_{t^c} = 4 - k_{d^c} = 5 - k_{s^c} = 5 - k_{b^c}$. We can read off the superpotential of the quark sector as follows,

$$\begin{aligned}\mathcal{W}_u &= \alpha_u (u^c QY_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \beta_u (c^c QY_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \gamma_u (c^c QY_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u + \delta_u (t^c QY_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_u, \\ \mathcal{W}_d &= \alpha_d (d^c QY_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \beta_d (s^c QY_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}I}^{(5)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \gamma_d (s^c QY_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}II}^{(5)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d + \delta_d (b^c QY_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(5)})_{\mathbf{1}} H_d.\end{aligned}\quad (8.28)$$

Then the quark mass matrices are given by

$$\begin{aligned}M_u &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_u Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(4)} & \alpha_u Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(4)} & \alpha_u Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(4)} \\ \beta_u Y_{\mathbf{3}I,1}^{(6)} + \gamma_u Y_{\mathbf{3}II,1}^{(6)} & \beta_u Y_{\mathbf{3}I,3}^{(6)} + \gamma_u Y_{\mathbf{3}II,3}^{(6)} & \beta_u Y_{\mathbf{3}I,2}^{(6)} + \gamma_u Y_{\mathbf{3}II,2}^{(6)} \\ \delta_u Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},1}^{(3)} & \delta_u Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},3}^{(3)} & \delta_u Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix} v_u, \\ M_d &= \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_d Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(4)} & \alpha_d Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(4)} & \alpha_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(4)} \\ \beta_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}I,1}^{(5)} + \gamma_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}II,1}^{(5)} & \beta_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}I,3}^{(5)} + \gamma_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}II,3}^{(5)} & \beta_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}I,2}^{(5)} + \gamma_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}}II,2}^{(5)} \\ \delta_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},1}^{(5)} & \delta_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},3}^{(5)} & \delta_d Y_{\hat{\mathbf{3}},2}^{(5)} \end{pmatrix} v_d.\end{aligned}\quad (8.29)$$

The parameters $\alpha_{u,d}$, $\beta_{u,d}$ and $\delta_{u,d}$ can be made real and positive by field redefinition while γ_u and γ_d are complex. If the gCP symmetry is imposed on the model, all couplings are constrained to be real, and γ_u and γ_d are either positive or negative.

It is notable that the model has less free parameters than the number of observable quantities including the masses and mixing parameters of quarks and leptons. We perform a comprehensive numerical scan over the parameter space, we find that good agreement with experimental data can be achieved for the following value of the modulus τ common to quark and lepton sectors,

$$\langle \tau \rangle = -0.2111 + 1.5201i, \quad (8.30)$$

which is mainly determined by the quark masses and CKM mixing parameters. Given this value of τ , the charged lepton masses can be reproduced by adjusting α_e , β_e and γ_e , only two real parameters $g_1^2 v_u^2 / \Lambda$ and g_2 / g_1 describe the nine neutrino observables: three neutrino masses, three neutrino mixing angles and three CP violating phases. The best fit values of the free parameters of both lepton and quark sectors are found to be

$$\begin{aligned} \beta_u / \alpha_u &= 1711.9384, \quad \gamma_u / \alpha_u = 25512.4486, \quad \delta_u / \alpha_u = 90.5459, \\ \alpha_u v_u &= 2.9637 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}, \quad \beta_d / \alpha_d = 234.6646, \quad \gamma_d / \alpha_d = 235.3665, \\ \delta_d / \alpha_d &= 4.0687, \quad \alpha_d v_d = 4.5279 \times 10^{-3} \text{ GeV}, \quad \beta_e / \alpha_e = 1.8514 \times 10^{-3}, \\ \gamma_e / \alpha_e &= 0.0622, \quad g_2 / g_1 = -1.3682, \quad \alpha_e v_e = 1.2485 \text{ GeV}, \quad g_1^2 v_u^2 / \Lambda = 8.1856 \text{ meV}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.31)$$

The masses and mixing parameters of quarks and leptons are predicted to be

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{12}^q &= 0.22751, \quad \theta_{13}^q = 0.003379, \quad \theta_{23}^q = 0.038885, \quad \delta_{CP}^q = 75.5572^\circ, \\ m_u / m_c &= 0.001908, \quad m_c / m_t = 0.002724, \quad m_d / m_s = 0.050120, \quad m_s / m_b = 0.017707, \\ \sin^2 \theta_{12}^l &= 0.35020, \quad \sin^2 \theta_{13}^l = 0.02179, \quad \sin^2 \theta_{23}^l = 0.56443, \\ \delta_{CP}^l &= 266.3662^\circ, \quad \alpha_{21} = 1.1476\pi, \quad \alpha_{31} = 0.1515\pi, \\ m_1 &= 3.5234 \text{ meV}, \quad m_2 = 9.3013 \text{ meV}, \quad m_3 = 50.0901 \text{ meV}, \\ \sum_i m_i &= 62.9149 \text{ meV}, \quad |m_{\beta\beta}| = 2.5405 \text{ meV}. \end{aligned} \quad (8.32)$$

All the observables are in the experimentally preferred regions except that the solar mixing angle θ_{12}^l is slightly larger than its 3σ upper bound. The sum of neutrino masses is determined to be 62.9149 meV, this is compatible with the latest bound $\sum_i m_i < 120$ meV at 95% confidence level from Planck [342].

Recently a more predictive model for quark and lepton has been constructed with the modular binary octahedral symmetry $2O$ ²⁷, and the experimental data can be accommodated by using only 14 real free parameters [346]. It is the minimal modular invariant model for quarks and lepton at present.

8.5 Littlest seesaw model with modular S_4^3 symmetry and three moduli

As explained in section 3.3 and summarized in table 3, there are only three modular symmetry fixed points $\tau_0 = i$, $e^{2\pi i/3}$ and $i\infty$ in the fundamental domain, which are invariant

²⁷As shown in table 7, the binary octahedral group $2O$ belong to the general finite modular group and its group ID is [48, 28]. The group $2O$ is the Schur cover of S_4 of “-” type but distinct from S_4' .

under the action of $\gamma_0 = S$, ST and T respectively. At the fixed point τ_0 fulfilling $\gamma_0\tau_0 = \tau_0$ in Eq. (3.15), using Eq. (4.13) and setting $\gamma = \gamma_0$ and $\tau = \tau_0$, we find that the weight k modular multiplet $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau)$ fulfills the following relation,

$$\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma_0)Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_0) = J^{-k}(\gamma_0, \tau_0)Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_0), \quad (8.33)$$

where $J(\gamma, \tau) = c\tau + d$ is the automorphy factor defined in Eq. (4.4). One can straightforwardly obtain

$$J(\gamma_0, \tau_0) = \begin{cases} -i, & \gamma_0 = S, \quad \tau_0 = i \\ \omega^2, & \gamma_0 = ST, \quad \tau_0 = \omega \\ 1, & \gamma_0 = T, \quad \tau_0 = i\infty \end{cases}. \quad (8.34)$$

Hence the modular multiplets $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_0)$ at the fixed point τ_0 is actually the eigenvector of the representation matrix $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma_0)$ with eigenvalue $J^{-k}(\gamma_0, \tau_0)$. As a consequence, the alignment of $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_0)$ can be easily fixed once the presentation basis is fixed.

Moreover, there are infinite fixed points in the upper half plane with $\tau_f = \gamma'\tau_0$, $\gamma_f = \gamma'\gamma_0\gamma'^{-1}$ satisfying $\gamma_f\tau_f = \tau_f$ for any element $\gamma' \in \bar{\Gamma}$, as shown in Eq. (3.19). The value of the modular form at the fixed point γ_f satisfies²⁸

$$Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_f) = Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\gamma'\tau_0) = J^k(\gamma', \tau_0)\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma')Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_0). \quad (8.35)$$

Therefore the alignment of the modular multiplet $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_f)$ is proportional to $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma')Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_0)$. If $\gamma' \in \Gamma(N)$, then $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma') = \mathbb{1}$ so that we have only a finite number of independent directions of $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_f)$ although there are infinite numbers of fixed points τ_f . It is sufficient to only consider these fixed points τ_f with $\gamma' \in \Gamma_N(\Gamma'_N)$. We give some fixed points and the corresponding alignments of the triplet modular forms of level 4 in table 17, see Ref. [70] for the complete results for all the nonequivalent fixed points.

These alignments at the fixed points could give a rich phenomenology of neutrino mixing in the framework of tri-direct modular approach [70]. In the following, we shall present a Littlest seesaw model with multiple modular symmetry $S_4^A \times S_4^B \times S_4^C$ [72]. In the following, we adopt the S_4 basis of Ref. [70] where the triplet representations $\mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{3}'$ correspond to $\mathbf{3}'$ and $\mathbf{3}$ of [72] respectively. The two columns of the Dirac neutrino mass matrix are triplet modular forms of level 4 with the following alignment at the fixed points²⁹,

$$\begin{aligned} \tau_A = i + 2 : \quad Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}(\tau_A) &= (0, 1, -1), \\ \tau_B = i : \quad Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_B) &= (1, 1 + \sqrt{6}, 1 - \sqrt{6}). \end{aligned} \quad (8.36)$$

The charged lepton Yukawa coupling matrix is enforced to be diagonal through the weights 2, 4, and 6 modular forms in the triplet representation $\mathbf{3}$ of S_4 at $\tau_C = \omega$:

$$\tau_C = \omega : \quad Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_C) = (0, 1, 0), \quad Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}(\tau_C) = (0, 0, 1), \quad Y_{\mathbf{3,II}}^{(6)}(\tau_C) = (1, 0, 0). \quad (8.37)$$

²⁸After some algebra calculation, we can check that the modular multiplet $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_f)$ also fulfills the following property

$$\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma_f)Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_f) = J^{-k}(\gamma_0, \tau_0)Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(k)}(\tau_f).$$

²⁹The second column could also chosen as $\tau_B = \frac{8+i}{5}$, $Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau_B) = (1, 1 - \sqrt{6}, 1 + \sqrt{6})$.

τ	$Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau), Y_{\mathbf{3},\mathbf{I}}^{(6)}(\tau)$	$Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}(\tau), Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(6)}(\tau)$	$Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(4)}(\tau), Y_{\mathbf{3},\mathbf{II}}^{(6)}(\tau)$
i	$(1, 1 + \sqrt{6}, 1 - \sqrt{6})$	$(1, -\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2})$	$(1, 1 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}, 1 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}})$
$i + 1$	$(1, -\frac{\omega}{3}(1 + i\sqrt{2}), -\frac{\omega^2}{3}(1 + i\sqrt{2}))$	$(0, 1, -\omega)$	$(1, \frac{i\omega}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{i\omega^2}{\sqrt{2}})$
$i + 2$	$(1, \frac{1}{3}(-1 + i\sqrt{2}), \frac{1}{3}(-1 + i\sqrt{2}))$	$(0, 1, -1)$	$(1, -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}, -\frac{i}{\sqrt{2}})$
$i + 3$	$(1, \omega(1 + \sqrt{6}), \omega(1 - \sqrt{6}))$	$(1, -\frac{\omega}{2}, -\frac{\omega^2}{2})$	$(1, \omega(1 - \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}), \omega^2(1 + \sqrt{\frac{3}{2}}))$
τ	$Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}(\tau)$	$Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}(\tau), Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(4)}(\tau)$	$Y_{\mathbf{3},\mathbf{II}}^{(6)}(\tau), Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(6)}(\tau)$
ω	$(0, 1, 0)$	$(0, 0, 1)$	$(1, 0, 0)$
$\omega + 1$	$(1, 1, -\frac{1}{2})$	$(1, -\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	$(1, -2, -2)$
$\omega + 2$	$(1, -\frac{\omega^2}{2}, \omega)$	$(1, \omega^2, -\frac{\omega}{2})$	$(1, -2\omega^2, -2\omega)$
$\omega + 3$	$(1, \omega, -\frac{\omega^2}{2})$	$(1, -\frac{\omega}{2}, \omega^2)$	$(1, -2\omega, -2\omega^2)$
$\rho/\sqrt{3}$	$(1, -\frac{\omega}{2}, \omega^2)$	$(1, \omega, -\frac{\omega^2}{2})$	$(1, -2\omega, -2\omega^2)$
$\rho/\sqrt{3} + 1$	$(0, 0, 1)$	$(0, 1, 0)$	$(1, 0, 0)$
$\rho/\sqrt{3} + 2$	$(1, -\frac{1}{2}, 1)$	$(1, 1, -\frac{1}{2})$	$(1, -2, -2)$
$\rho/\sqrt{3} + 3$	$(1, \omega^2, -\frac{\omega}{2})$	$(1, -\frac{\omega^2}{2}, \omega)$	$(1, -2\omega^2, -2\omega)$

Table 17. The alignments of triplet modular forms $Y_{\mathbf{3},\mathbf{3}'}(\tau)$ of level 4 up to weight 6 with the available fixed moduli in orbifolds, where $\rho = e^{i\pi/6}$. We have ignored the overall constant appearing in each alignment.

Notice that the above fixed points as well as the vacuum alignments in Eqs. (8.36, 8.37) are preferred by orbifold constructions [73].

Fields	S_4^A	S_4^B	S_4^C	k_A	k_B	k_C
L	1	1	3	0	0	0
e^c	1	1	1	0	0	-6
μ^c	1	1	1	0	0	-4
τ^c	1	1	1	0	0	-2
N_A^c	1	1	1	-4	0	0
N_B^c	1	1	1	0	-2	0
Φ_{AC}	3	1	3	0	0	0
Φ_{BC}	1	3	3	0	0	0

Yuk/Mass	S_4^A	S_4^B	S_4^C	k_A	k_B	k_C
$Y_e(\tau_C)$	1	1	3	0	0	6
$Y_\mu(\tau_C)$	1	1	3	0	0	4
$Y_\tau(\tau_C)$	1	1	3	0	0	2
$Y_A(\tau_A)$	3	1	1	4	0	0
$Y_B(\tau_B)$	1	3	1	0	2	0
$M_A(\tau_A)$	1	1	1	8	0	0
$M_B(\tau_B)$	1	1	1	0	4	0

Table 18. Transformation properties of fields and modular forms (Yuk/Mass) under the modular symmetries $S_4^A \times S_4^B \times S_4^C$ in the Littlest modular seesaw model [72].

The transformation of the matter fields and the relevant modular forms under the finite modular symmetry group $S_4^A \times S_4^B \times S_4^C$ are listed in table 18, and the $SU(2)$ doublets $H_{u,d}$ are assumed to transform trivially under all flavour symmetries [72]. The superpotential in the charged lepton and neutrino sectors is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_\ell = & [y_e L Y_e(\tau_C) e^c + y_\mu L Y_\mu(\tau_C) \mu^c + y_\tau L Y_\tau(\tau_C) \tau^c] H_d \\ & + \frac{1}{\Lambda} [y_a L \Phi_{AC} Y_A(\tau_A) N_A^c + y_s L \Phi_{BC} Y_B(\tau_B) N_B^c] H_u \end{aligned}$$

$$+\frac{1}{2}M_A(\tau_A)N_A^c N_A^c + \frac{1}{2}M_B(\tau_B)N_B^c N_B^c. \quad (8.38)$$

Given the specific shapes of the modular forms in Eq. (8.37), we obtain a diagonal charged lepton mass matrix for $\tau_C = \omega$:

$$M_e = \begin{pmatrix} y_e & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & y_\mu & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & y_\tau \end{pmatrix} v_d. \quad (8.39)$$

The mass hierarchies of charged leptons are not addressed in this model, and it can be naturally explained through the weighton mechanism without affecting the remaining predictions of the model [72].

Regarding the neutrino sector, $M_A(\tau_A)$ and $M_B(\tau_B)$ are singlet modular forms in the modular space S_4^A, S_4^B with weights $k_A = 8$ and $k_B = 4$, respectively. The term $N_A^c N_B^c$ is forbidden by the symmetries, since it transforms non-trivially under both S_4^A and under S_4^B and there are no one-dimensional modular forms of weight 2 at level 4. Thus the RH neutrino mass matrix is diagonal with

$$M_N = \begin{pmatrix} M_A(\tau_A) & 0 \\ 0 & M_B(\tau_B) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8.40)$$

The neutrino Yukawa couplings involve the bi-triplets flavons Φ_{AC} and Φ_{BC} . As shown in [210], the VEVs of Φ_{AC} and Φ_{BC} can take the following forms

$$\langle \Phi_{AC} \rangle_{i\alpha} = v_{AC}(P_{23})_{i\alpha}, \quad \langle \Phi_{BC} \rangle_{m\alpha} = v_{BC}(P_{23})_{m\alpha}. \quad (8.41)$$

Here again, P_{23} represents the (2,3) row/column-switching transformation matrix, and $\alpha = 1, 2, 3$ corresponds the entries of the triplet of S_4^C , while $i = 1, 2, 3$ ($m = 1, 2, 3$) corresponds to those of S_4^A (S_4^B). The VEV in Eq. (8.41) breaks three modular S_4 's to a single modular S_4 symmetry, and it can be achieved through the standard driving field method, see [210] for details. Choosing the specific fixed points $\tau_A = i + 2$, $\tau_B = i$ for the two remaining moduli fields, we can achieve a flipped CSD(n) structure with $n = 1 - \sqrt{6}$ [70, 210] and the Dirac neutrino mass matrix is³⁰:

$$M_D = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & b \\ a & b(1 - \sqrt{6}) \\ -a & b(1 + \sqrt{6}) \end{pmatrix} v_u, \quad (8.42)$$

with $a = -y_a v_{AC}/\Lambda$, $b = y_s v_{BC}/\Lambda$. The light neutrino mass matrix given by the type-I seesaw mechanism is determined to be

$$M_\nu = m_a \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & -1 \\ 0 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + m_s e^{i\eta} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 - \sqrt{6} & 1 + \sqrt{6} \\ 1 - \sqrt{6} & 7 - 2\sqrt{6} & -5 \\ 1 + \sqrt{6} & -5 & 7 + 2\sqrt{6} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8.43)$$

³⁰Notice that a CSD(n) structure with the second and third entries of the second column interchanged would be achieved if the second modulus is fixed to $\tau_B = (8 + i)/5$, and the corresponding value of n is $n = 1 + \sqrt{6} \simeq 3.45$.

where $m_a = |a|^2 v_u^2 / M_A$, $m_b = |b|^2 v_u^2 / M_B$ and η is the relative phase of the two terms. It is notable that the neutrino mass matrix of Eq. (8.43) only depends on three free parameters m_a , m_s and η are involved in the neutrino mass matrix. One can check that the column vector $(2, -1, -1)^T$ is an eigenvector of m_ν with vanishing eigenvalue and it could only be first column of the lepton mixing matrix to be compatible with the experimental data [82]. Therefore the neutrino mass spectrum is normal ordering, and lightest neutrino is massless $m_1 = 0$, and the lepton mixing matrix is of the following form

$$U_{PMNS} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} & - & - \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & - & - \\ -\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} & - & - \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8.44)$$

where the first column is in common with the tri-bimaximal mixing pattern. As a consequence, the following sum rules arise,

$$3 \cos^2 \theta_{12} \cos^2 \theta_{13} = 2, \quad \cos \delta_{CP} = -\frac{\cot 2\theta_{23}(1 - 5 \sin^2 \theta_{13})}{2 \sin \theta_{13} \sqrt{2 - 6 \sin^2 \theta_{13}}}. \quad (8.45)$$

The model is quite predictive and the light neutrino mass matrix in Eq. (8.43) only depends on three real parameters m_a , m_s and η . We plot the contour plots of $\sin^2 \theta_{13}$, $\sin^2 \theta_{12}$, $\sin^2 \theta_{23}$ and m_2^2/m_3^2 in the plane r versus η/π in figure 12 where $r = m_s/m_a$. We see that the experimental data of $\sin^2 \theta_{23}$ and m_2^2/m_3^2 leave only two small allowed parameter regions in the plane $r - \eta$. These two small regions lead to the same predictions for lepton mixing angles while the CP violation phases are of opposite sign. Thus only the one labelled in red circle in figure 12 is preferred by the present value of δ_{CP} [82]. Once we have the values of r and η , thanks to the high predictivity of the model we can derive all the physical parameters and we can test them against the observed values. The regions of free parameters and lepton mixing parameters allowed the experimental data at 3σ level listed in table 19. Furthermore, this model has been extended to $SU(5)$ Grand Unified Theory (GUT) [347].

9 Modular GUT

It is known that the electromagnetic and weak interactions are unified in the SM, and the SM involves three different gauge groups $SU(3) \times SU(2) \times U(1)$ with independent gauge couplings. Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) are well motivated extensions of the SM, and it unifies the electroweak and strong interactions into a single force. In general, the gauge group of GUTs should include the SM gauge group as a subgroup. The quark and lepton fields within a generation are usually assigned to very few gauge multiplets of GUTs, and consequently GUTs allow to connect the lepton mass matrices with the quark mass matrices. However, the matter fields multiplets in different generations transform in the same way under GUTs consequently the gauge symmetry of GUTs has some constraint on the Yukawa couplings, but can not explain the hierarchies of different Yukawa couplings. In order to understand the different patterns of quark and lepton mixing, one usually imposes flavor symmetry which relates matter fields of three generations so that the strong connection




Figure 12. The contour plots of $\sin^2 \theta_{12}$, $\sin^2 \theta_{13}$, $\sin^2 \theta_{23}$ and m_2^2/m_3^2 in the $\eta/\pi - r$ plane for the modular Littlest seesaw (left) and the flipped version (right) with $n = 1 + \sqrt{6}$. The cyan, red, green and blue areas denote the 3σ regions of $\sin^2 \theta_{23}$, $\sin^2 \theta_{13}$ and m_2^2/m_3^2 respectively. The solid lines denote the 3σ upper bounds, the thin lines denote the 3σ lower bounds and the dashed lines refer to their best fit values, as adopted from NuFIT 5.2 with SK data [82]. The red circle indicates the best fit region.

Modular Littlest seesaw			Flipped modular Littlest seesaw		
	bf	allowed ranges		bf	allowed ranges
η/π	1.240	[1.197, 1.276]	η/π	0.742	[0.725, 0.806]
r	0.0734	[0.0684, 0.0786]	r	0.0758	[0.0683, 0.0786]
$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	0.0223	[0.0205, 0.0240]	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}$	0.0231	[0.0205, 0.0240]
$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	0.318	[0.317, 0.319]	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}$	0.318	[0.317, 0.319]
$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	0.447	[0.408, 0.483]	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}$	0.535	[0.517, 0.595]
δ_{CP}/π	-0.575	[-0.640, -0.522]	δ_{CP}/π	-0.452	[-0.478, -0.354]
β/π	0.474	[0.408, 0.555]	β/π	-0.441	[-0.562, -0.409]
m_2^2/m_3^2	0.0297	[0.0270, 0.0321]	m_2^2/m_3^2	0.0283	[0.0270, 0.0321]

Table 19. The best fit values and the allowed region of the free parameters η and r as well as lepton mixing parameters, where all the lepton mixing angles and neutrino mass squared differences are required to lie in 3σ regions of experimental data [82]. The neutrino mass matrix of the flipped modular Littlest seesaw is given by Eq. (8.43). The second and third entries of the second column of M_D in Eq. (8.42) are permuted in the modular Littlest seesaw.

between the elements of quark and lepton mass matrices. For the case of traditional flavor symmetry, flavons and complicated vacuum alignment are also required in the context of GUTs, see Ref. [137] for a review. As shown in previous sections, the modular flavor symmetry could simplify the vacuum alignment problem significantly. Thus we implement




Figure 13. The diagrammatic sketch combining modular symmetry with GUTs.

the modular symmetry in GUTs to address the mass hierarchies and mixing patterns of quarks and leptons, this paradigm is shown in figure 13. In the following, we shall focus on $SU(5)$ and $SO(10)$ GUTs, before discussing flipped $SU(5)_F \times U(1)_X$.

Level	$\Gamma_N(\Gamma'_N)$	$SU(5)$	$SU(5)_F \times U(1)_X$	$SO(10)$
$N = 2$	S_3	[348, 349]	—	—
$N = 3$	A_4	[350, 351]	[352, 353]	[354, 355]
	T'	—	—	—
$N = 4$	S_4	[71, 347, 356, 357]	—	—
	S'_4	—	—	—
$N = 5$	A_5	—	—	—
	A'_5	—	—	—
$N = 6$	$\Gamma_6 \cong S_3 \times A_4$	—	—	—
	$\Gamma'_6 \cong S_3 \times T'$	[358]	—	—
$N = 7$	Γ_7	—	—	—
	Γ'_7	—	—	—

Table 20. Summary of modular invariant models based on GUTs.

9.1 Modular $SU(5)$

The minimal extension of the SM to GUT is based on the $SU(5)$ gauge group [359], the strong, weak and electromagnetic coupling constants merge into a single coupling constant at high energy of order $10^{15} \sim 10^{16}$ GeV. The observed differences in the couplings at low energy are induced by the renormalization group evolution effect. In $SU(5)$ GUT, all the

15 left-handed quark and lepton fields within each family are embedded into the $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ -plet F and $\mathbf{10}$ -plet T :

$$F = \begin{pmatrix} d_r^c \\ d_g^c \\ d_b^c \\ e \\ -\nu \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & u_b^c & -u_g^c & -u_r & -d_r \\ -u_b^c & 0 & u_r^c & -u_g & -d_g \\ u_g^c & -u_r^c & 0 & -u_b & -d_b \\ u_r & u_g & u_b & 0 & e^c \\ d_r & d_g & d_b & -e^c & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9.1)$$

where the superscript c denotes the charge conjugated fields. The neutrinos are massless in the minimal $SU(5)$ GUT, we introduce the right-handed neutrinos ν^c to generate light neutrino masses through the type-I seesaw mechanism. Note that ν^c are $SU(5)$ singlets. The $SU(5)$ gauge symmetry is spontaneously broken down to the SM gauge group $SU(3)_C \times SU(2) \times U(1)_Y$ by the VEV of the Higgs $H_{\mathbf{24}}$ in the adjoint representation of $SU(5)$. In the minimal $SU(5)$ model, two Higgs multiplets $H_{\mathbf{5}}$ and $H_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}}$ in the fundamental representation $\mathbf{5}$ and antifundamental representation $\bar{\mathbf{5}}$ of $SU(5)$ further break the SM gauge symmetry into $SU(3)_C \times U(1)_{EM}$. The charged leptons and down-type quarks are in the same GUT multiplets, the down type quark mass matrix is the transpose of the charged lepton mass matrix in the minimal $SU(5)$ such that the masses of the charged leptons and down quarks would be identical. The observed mass difference of down quarks and charged leptons can be explained by introducing the Higgs multiplet $H_{\bar{\mathbf{45}}}$ [360]. The corresponding contributions to the charged lepton and down quark mass matrices are different by factor of -3 . If some modular flavor symmetry Γ_N or Γ'_N is imposed in $SU(5)$ GUT, the three generations of matter fields F , T and N would be assigned to transform as irreducible representations of the finite modular groups. Then the most general superpotential for fermion masses can be written as,

$$\mathcal{W} = \nu^c \nu^c f_M(Y) + \nu^c F H_{\mathbf{5}} f_N(Y) + F T H_{\bar{\mathbf{5}}} f_D(Y) + F T H_{\bar{\mathbf{45}}} f'_D(Y) + T T H_{\mathbf{5}} f_U(Y), \quad (9.2)$$

where $f_M(Y)$, $f_N(Y)$, $f_D(Y)$, $f'_D(Y)$ and $f_U(Y)$ are functions of modular forms, and they are fixed by modular invariance. The interplays of the $SU(5)$ GUT and the modular symmetry S_3 [348, 349], A_4 [350, 351], S_4 [71, 356, 357] and $\Gamma'_6 \cong S_3 \times T'$ [358] have been studied. A comprehensive analysis of $SU(5)$ model with A_4 modular symmetry has been performed in [351], the models with two right-handed neutrinos are found to be predictive. The predictions of the phenomenological viable models for the lepton Dirac CP violation phase and the effective mass of the neutrinoless double decay are displayed in figure 14 and figures 15, 16 respectively.

9.2 Modular $SO(10)$

The $SO(10)$ GUT theory embeds all SM fermions of a generation plus a right-handed neutrino into the $\mathbf{16}$ spinor representation of $SO(10)$ [361]. The tensor product of two spinor representations gives

$$\mathbf{16} \otimes \mathbf{16} = \mathbf{10}_S \oplus \mathbf{120}_A \oplus \mathbf{126}_S, \quad (9.3)$$




Figure 14. The predictions for the Dirac CP phase δ_{CP}^l in the viable $SU(5)$ models based on A_4 modular symmetry, see [351] for details of the model.

where the subscripts S and A denote the symmetric and antisymmetric parts of the tensor products respectively in flavor space. Therefore the renormalizable Yukawa interactions for the quark and lepton masses requires the Higgs multiplets in the $SO(10)$ representations **10**, **120** and $\overline{\mathbf{126}}$, and the superpotential of the renormalizable Yukawa couplings is of the following form:

$$\mathcal{W}_Y = \mathcal{Y}_{ij}^{10} \psi_i \psi_j H + \mathcal{Y}_{ij}^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}} \psi_i \psi_j \overline{\Delta} + \mathcal{Y}_{ij}^{120} \psi_i \psi_j \Sigma, \quad (9.4)$$

where $i, j = 1, 2, 3$ are generation indices, ψ refers to the matter fields in the spinor representation **16**, H , $\overline{\Delta}$ and Σ denote the Higgs fields in the representations **10**, $\overline{\mathbf{126}}$ and **120** respectively. Moreover, \mathcal{Y}^{10} , $\mathcal{Y}^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}}$ and \mathcal{Y}^{120} are 3×3 Yukawa matrices in flavor space. The $SO(10)$ gauge symmetry enforces that \mathcal{Y}^{10} and $\mathcal{Y}^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}}$ are symmetric while \mathcal{Y}^{120} is antisymmetric, i.e.

$$\mathcal{Y}_{ij}^{10} = \mathcal{Y}_{ji}^{10}, \quad \mathcal{Y}_{ij}^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}} = \mathcal{Y}_{ji}^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}}, \quad \mathcal{Y}_{ij}^{120} = -\mathcal{Y}_{ji}^{120}. \quad (9.5)$$

The rank of the $SO(10)$ group is equal to five which is one more than SM gauge group, consequently there are a plenty of ways breaking $SO(10)$ to SM. The decomposition of the above Higgs multiplets under the SM gauge symmetry $SU(3)_C \times SU(2)_L \times U(1)_Y$ which are relevant to fermion masses are

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{10} &\supset (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 1/2) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2) \equiv \Phi_d^{10} \oplus \Phi_u^{10}, \\ \mathbf{120} &\supset (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 1/2) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 1/2) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2) \equiv \Phi_d^{120} \oplus \Phi_u^{120} \oplus \Phi_d'^{120} \oplus \Phi_u'^{120}, \\ \overline{\mathbf{126}} &\supset (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, 1/2) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{2}, -1/2) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}, 0) \oplus (\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{3}, 1) \equiv \Phi_d^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}} \oplus \Phi_u^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}} \oplus \overline{\Delta}_R \oplus \overline{\Delta}_L. \end{aligned} \quad (9.6)$$

We see that the $SO(10)$ Higgs fields H , $\overline{\Delta}$ and Σ have eight $SU(2)_L$ doublets Φ_d^{10} , Φ_u^{10} , Φ_d^{120} , Φ_u^{120} , $\Phi_d'^{120}$, $\Phi_u'^{120}$, $\Phi_d^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}}$, $\Phi_u^{\overline{\mathbf{126}}}$ carrying the same quantum numbers as the Higgs doublets H_u and H_d . They can all develop VEVs and thus generate masses of quarks and charged leptons. The light Higgs boson observed at the LHC, is in general a linear combination of these




Figure 15. The predictions for the effective mass of the neutrinoless double beta decay in the viable $SU(5)$ models based on A_4 modular symmetry.

$SU(2)_L$ doublets above. Moreover, the VEVs of the neutral components of the $SU(2)_L$ singlet $\bar{\Delta}_R$ and triplet $\bar{\Delta}_L$ generate the Majorana masses of the heavy right-handed neutrinos and light left-handed neutrinos respectively. Decomposing the Yukawa superpotential in Eq. (9.4), the quark and lepton mass matrices are determined to be

$$\begin{aligned}
M_u &= v_u^{10} \mathcal{Y}^{10} + v_u^{\overline{126}} \mathcal{Y}^{\overline{126}} + (v_u^{120} + v_u'^{120}) \mathcal{Y}^{120}, \\
M_d &= v_d^{10} \mathcal{Y}^{10} + v_d^{\overline{126}} \mathcal{Y}^{\overline{126}} + (v_d^{120} + v_d'^{120}) \mathcal{Y}^{120}, \\
M_e &= v_d^{10} \mathcal{Y}^{10} - 3v_d^{\overline{126}} \mathcal{Y}^{\overline{126}} + (v_d^{120} - 3v_d'^{120}) \mathcal{Y}^{120}, \\
M_D &= v_u^{10} \mathcal{Y}^{10} - 3v_u^{\overline{126}} \mathcal{Y}^{\overline{126}} + (v_u^{120} - 3v_u'^{120}) \mathcal{Y}^{120}, \\
M_R &= v_R^{\overline{126}} \mathcal{Y}^{\overline{126}} \\
M_L &= v_L^{\overline{126}} \mathcal{Y}^{\overline{126}},
\end{aligned} \tag{9.7}$$

where M_D , M_R and M_L are the Dirac and Majorana neutrino mass matrices in type I and type II seesaw mechanism, and the VEVs are defined as

$$v_{u,d}^{10} = \langle \Phi_{u,d}^{10} \rangle, \quad v_{u,d}^{120} = \langle \Phi_{u,d}^{120} \rangle, \quad v_{u,d}'^{120} = \langle \Phi_{u,d}'^{120} \rangle,$$




Figure 16. The continuum of figure 15.

$$v_{u,d}^{\overline{126}} = \langle \Phi_{u,d}^{\overline{126}} \rangle, \quad v_R^{\overline{126}} = \langle \overline{\Delta}_R \rangle, \quad v_L^{\overline{126}} = \langle \overline{\Delta}_L \rangle. \quad (9.8)$$

Hence the $SO(10)$ GUT naturally predicts seesaw mechanism generating neutrino mass, and the light neutrino mass matrix is given by

$$M_\nu = M_L - M_D M_R^{-1} M_D^T, \quad (9.9)$$

which is identical with Eq. (1.20). From the expressions of the fermion mass matrices in Eq. (9.7), we see that all fermion mass matrices are proportional to the same Yukawa matrix if only one of the Higgs fields H , $\overline{\Delta}$, Σ is employed. As a result, both quark and lepton mixing matrices would be a three-dimensional unit matrix. Hence at least two Higgs fields are necessary for realistic fermion spectrum and flavor mixing, and the non-vanishing neutrino masses requires the **126** dimensional Higgs $\overline{\Delta}$ must be present. The minimal choice for the second Higgs is that the **10** dimensional multiplet H , this is the so-called minimal $SO(10)$ GUT.

9.2.1 $SO(10)$ GUT with A_4 modular symmetry

If some modular symmetry Γ_N or Γ'_N is implemented in $SO(10)$ GUT, the different elements of the Yukawa matrices \mathcal{Y}^{10} , $\mathcal{Y}^{\overline{126}}$ and \mathcal{Y}^{120} would be correlated. Since A_4 is the smallest finite modular group with three dimensional irreducible representation, we will take the A_4

modular symmetry to explain the idea of $SO(10)$ modular GUT. The three generations of matter fields $\psi_{1,2,3}$ are assumed to transform as a triplet $\mathbf{3}$ under A_4 modular symmetry³¹, and its modular weight is denoted as k_F . All the three Higgs multiplets H , $\bar{\Delta}$ and Σ are assumed to be invariant under A_4 , thus the known $SO(10)$ breaking patterns would be kept intact even in the presence of modular symmetry. The modular weights of H , $\bar{\Delta}$ and Σ are denoted as k_{10} , $k_{\bar{126}}$ and k_{120} respectively, and one can set $k_{10} = 0$ without loss of generality. Hence the modular invariant superpotential of $SO(10)$ can be written as [354]

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{W}_Y = & \sum_{\mathbf{r}_a} \alpha_a \left((\psi\psi H)_{\mathbf{r}'_a} Y_{\mathbf{r}_a}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \right)_{\mathbf{1}} + \sum_{\mathbf{r}_b} \beta_b \left((\psi\psi\Sigma)_{\mathbf{r}'_b} Y_{\mathbf{r}_b}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}(\tau) \right)_{\mathbf{1}} \\ & + \sum_{\mathbf{r}_c} \gamma_c \left((\psi\psi\bar{\Delta})_{\mathbf{r}'_c} Y_{\mathbf{r}_c}^{(2k_F+k_{\bar{126}})}(\tau) \right)_{\mathbf{1}}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.10)$$

where the A_4 representations $\mathbf{r}_{a,b,c}$ and $\mathbf{r}'_{a,b,c}$ fulfill $\mathbf{r}'_a \otimes \mathbf{r}_a = \mathbf{r}'_b \otimes \mathbf{r}_b = \mathbf{r}'_c \otimes \mathbf{r}_c = \mathbf{1}$. We have denoted $\alpha_a \equiv \alpha_{\mathbf{r}_a}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}$, $\beta_b \equiv \beta_{\mathbf{r}_b}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}$, $\gamma_c \equiv \gamma_{\mathbf{r}_c}^{(2k_F+k_{\bar{126}})}$ for simplicity of notation. We see that the modular symmetry enforces the Yukawa couplings \mathcal{Y}_{ab}^{10} , $\mathcal{Y}_{ab}^{\bar{126}}$ and \mathcal{Y}_{ab}^{120} in Eq. (9.4) are modular forms of level 3. It is remarkable that the $SO(10)$ modular models are completely specified by the modular weights of matter fields and Higgs fields. With the tensor products of the A_4 group listed in Eq. (C.26), one can read out of the Yukawa coupling of \mathcal{Y}^{10} as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{Y}^{10} = & \alpha_1 Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \alpha_2 Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \alpha_3 Y_{\mathbf{1}''}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} + \alpha_S \begin{pmatrix} 2Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & -Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & -Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \\ -Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & 2Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & -Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \\ -Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & -Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & 2Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \end{pmatrix} \\ & + \alpha_A \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \\ Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & 0 & -Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) \\ -Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2k_F+k_{10})}(\tau) & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \end{aligned} \quad (9.11)$$

where all the linearly independent modular forms at weight $2k_F+k_{10}$ should be considered. The Yukawa matrix $\mathcal{Y}^{\bar{126}}$ is of a similar form with α_a and k_{10} replaced by γ_a and $k_{\bar{126}}$ respectively. However, the Yukawa coupling \mathcal{Y}^{120} is antisymmetric and it is determined to be of the following form

$$\mathcal{Y}^{120} = \beta_A \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}(\tau) & Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}(\tau) \\ Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}(\tau) & 0 & -Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}(\tau) \\ -Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}(\tau) & Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2k_F+k_{120})}(\tau) & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

³¹If the matter fields were assigned to be A_4 singlets, the effect of A_4 modular symmetry is equivalent to an Abelian flavour symmetry and consequently the correlations among nonzero entries of lepton mass matrices are lost. Moreover, the modular forms appearing in the lepton mass matrices can be absorbed into the Yukawa coupling constants.

It was found that the experimental data of fermion masses and mixing can be accommodated in both the minimal $SO(10)$ GUT and the extension including the **120** dimensional Higgs field Σ [354]. The right-handed neutrinos naturally appear in $SO(10)$ GUT, the mass and Yukawa coupling of the right-handed neutrinos are closely related to those of quarks and charged leptons. It is notable that the matter-antimatter asymmetry of the Universe could also be generated through leptogenesis in the modular $SO(10) \times A_4$ models [355].

9.3 Modular flipped $SU(5)$

The Flipped $SU(5)$ GUT has been proposed long time ago [362, 363] as an alternative symmetry breaking pattern of the $SO(10)$ gauge group. It is based on the gauge group $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$. Flipped $SU(5)$ GUT can easily be derived naturally from weakly-coupled string theory. Flipped $SU(5)$ GUT can naturally solve the notorious doublet-triplet splitting problem via the missing partner mechanism [364] to and efficiently suppress the proton decay rate [363]. The flipped $SU(5)$ differ from the Georgi-Glashow $SU(5)$ in the manner in which the SM particle fields are embedded into representations of the group. In contrast to Eq. (9.1), the matter representations in the flipped $SU(5)$ model are

$$\tilde{F} = \begin{pmatrix} u_r^c \\ u_g^c \\ u_b^c \\ e \\ -\nu \end{pmatrix} \sim (\bar{\mathbf{5}}, -3), \quad \tilde{T} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & d_b^c & -d_g^c & u_r & d_r \\ -d_b^c & 0 & d_r^c & u_g & d_g \\ d_g^c & -d_r^c & 0 & u_b & d_b \\ -u_r & -u_g & -u_b & 0 & \nu^c \\ -d_r & -d_g & -d_b & -\nu^c & 0 \end{pmatrix} \sim (\mathbf{10}, 1), \quad e^c \sim (\mathbf{1}, 5), \quad (9.12)$$

which flips the position of $u^c \leftrightarrow d^c$, $e^c \leftrightarrow \nu^c$ in the regular $SU(5)$ representations while the remaining unaltered. Notice that the first numbers in bold denote the $SU(5)$ representation while the second numbers stand for the $U(1)_X$ charges in Eq. (9.12). As opposed to the Georgi-Glashow $SU(5)$ which is broken to the SM gauge group via a Higgs multiplet in the **24**-dimensional representation, the flipped $SU(5)$ doesn't require Higgs fields in large dimensional representations. The GUT and electroweak symmetry breaking is driven by the following Higgs fields

$$H \sim (\mathbf{10}, 1), \quad \bar{H} \sim (\bar{\mathbf{10}}, -1), \quad h \sim (\mathbf{5}, -2), \quad \bar{h} \sim (\bar{\mathbf{5}}, 2). \quad (9.13)$$

The superpotential for the Yukawa couplings of quarks and charged leptons is given by

$$\mathcal{W} \supset y_{ij}^D \tilde{T}_i \tilde{T}_j h + y_{ij}^U \tilde{T}_i \tilde{F}_j \bar{h} + y_{ij}^E \tilde{F}_i e_j^c h, \quad (9.14)$$

where y_{ij}^D , y_{ij}^U and y_{ij}^E are the Yukawa coupling matrices of down-type quarks, up-type quarks and charged lepton respectively. In comparison with the Georgi-Glashow $SU(5)$, the down quark and charged lepton Yukawa couplings are not related in flipped $SU(5)$ and they can be adjusted separately. The neutrino masses can be generated through the double seesaw mechanism by introducing three additional superfields $S_{1,2,3} \sim (\mathbf{1}, 0)$ which are invariant under $SU(5) \times U(1)_X$. The superpotential relevant for neutrino masses is given by

$$\mathcal{W} \supset y_{ij}^U \tilde{T}_i \tilde{F}_j \bar{h} + y_{ij}^S \tilde{T}_i S_j \bar{H} + \frac{1}{2} (M_S)_{ij} S_i S_j. \quad (9.15)$$

The Yukawa couplings are not fixed by the GUT gauge symmetry. In order to understand the flavor puzzle of SM from GUT, flavor symmetry acting in flavor space is generally necessary to obtain certain flavor pattern at the GUT scale. One could use the modular symmetry to avoid the complicated vacuum alignment, the three generations of chiral matter fields of the flipped $SU(5)$ would be arranged to be multiplets of Γ_N (or Γ'_N) with certain modular weights. Then all the Yukawa couplings $y_{ij}^D, y_{ij}^U, y_{ij}^E$ and $(M_S)_{ij}$ would be modular forms of level N [352, 353], the quark and lepton mass matrices would depend on a smaller number of free parameters.

10 Top-down approaches

This review is devoted to bottom-up approaches to modular symmetry, and its application to flavor models. However, there are certain aspects of modular symmetry which arise from top-down considerations but which are relevant to model building and which should therefore also be considered in this review. In this section, after briefly introducing the role of modular symmetry in string theory, we turn to a couple of these issues, including eclectic flavor symmetry and moduli stabilisation.

10.1 Modular symmetry from String theory

In the framework of superstring theory and extra dimensions, orbifold compactifications of two extra dimensions are often done on a torus [138, 139] (for a review see [365]) and in superstring theory, the single lattice vector which describes the torus (in the convention that the other lattice vector has unit length and lies along the real axis) is promoted to the status of a field, called the modulus field τ , where its vacuum expectation value (VEV) fixes the geometry of the torus [140–142]. Upon compactification of the six extra dimensions the modular group or its congruence subgroup emerges naturally in the four-dimensional effective theory. The origin of the modular group in particular is attributed to the specific geometry of the compactification manifold.

From the top-down perspective, the superstring theory in 10 dimensions is a promising framework of unifying all four fundamental interactions. The consistency of the theory requires the six-dimensional extra compact space besides our familiar four-dimensional spacetime. It is remarkable that the non-Abelian discrete flavor symmetry such as D_4 and $\Delta(54)$ can arise in certain compactification schemes [366–368]. Moreover, the string duality transformations generate the modular symmetry. The matter fields transform nontrivially under the modular symmetry, consequently the modular symmetry could constrain the flavor structure of quarks and leptons and it enforces the Yukawa couplings to be modular forms [143]. In bottom-up models with modular symmetry alone, the finite modular groups Γ_N and Γ'_N ($N = 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7$) play the role of flavor symmetry, More generally the finite modular groups can be expressed as the quotient groups of $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ over its normal subgroups with finite index [193].

There has been considerable effort devoted to studying modular symmetry arising from orbifolds in top-down Heterotic string constructions [196, 219]. However there is a limited choice of consistent 10d toroidal orbifolds consistent with supersymmetry, for example all

such orbifolds based on $(T^2)^3/(Z_N \times Z_M)$ have been classified [369]. One of these examples, $(T^2)^3/(Z_4 \times Z_2)$, has been recently studied in a bottom-up approach to modular symmetry involving three moduli at their fixed points $i, i+2, \omega$, leading to a minimal predictive (littlest) seesaw model of leptons [73], as discussed earlier in the review.

Apart from Heterotic string theory, modular symmetry is also present in other types of string theory such as Type I, Type IIA, Type IIB, and possibly F-theory. In such explicit constructions of modular family symmetries from string theory, one typically finds very constrained modular weights assignments defined by the compactification [370]. For example, for Type IIB on magnetised branes one typically has $k = -1/2$, while in Type IIA on intersecting branes $k = -1/2 + \text{shift}$ where the shift depends on intersecting numbers and does not alter selection rules [371], as compared to heterotic string theory on a Calabi-Yao manifold where the weights are $k = -1$ for untwisted and $k = -n/2$ for twisted depending on details of compactification [219].

In general, top-down approaches to Heterotic string theory suggest that the finite modular symmetry will typically be accompanied by a non-commuting flavour symmetry leading to so called Eclectic flavour symmetry [150, 151, 233, 274, 372], as we discuss in the following subsection.

10.2 Eclectic flavor symmetry

Motivated by top-down constructions, the idea of eclectic flavor group (EFG) has been proposed in [150, 151], and it has been developed in a series of papers [150, 151, 196, 197, 233, 234, 373]. The eclectic flavor group is a maximal extension of the traditional flavor group by finite modular group, and certain consistency conditions have to be fulfilled in order to consistently combine modular symmetry with traditional flavor symmetry.

Under the action of a traditional flavor transformation g or a modular transformation γ , the complex modulus τ and a generic matter field multiplet ψ transform as follow [143, 147]

$$\begin{cases} \tau \xrightarrow{g} \tau, & \psi \xrightarrow{g} \rho(g)\psi, & g \in G_{\text{fl}}, \\ \tau \xrightarrow{\gamma} \gamma\tau \equiv \frac{a\tau+b}{c\tau+d}, & \psi \xrightarrow{\gamma} (c\tau+d)^{-k_\psi} \rho(\gamma)\psi, & \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma, \end{cases} \quad (10.1)$$

where k_ψ is the modular weight of the matter field multiplet ψ , and $\rho(g)$ and $\rho(\gamma)$ are unitary representations of traditional flavor group G_{fl} and the finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N , respectively. We see that the flavor symmetry transformation leaves the modulus τ invariant. Consequently the traditional flavor symmetry and modular symmetry are distinguished by their action on the modulus τ . Let us first perform a modular transformation $\gamma \in \Gamma$, subsequently a traditional flavor transformation g and last perform the inverse modular transformation γ^{-1} . Since the modulus τ is invariant under this chain of transformations, the resulting transformation should be another traditional flavor symmetry transformation g' [150], i.e.

$$\rho(\gamma)\rho(g)\rho^{-1}(\gamma) = \rho(g'), \quad g, g' \in G_{\text{fl}}, \quad \gamma \in \Gamma. \quad (10.2)$$

This is the consistency condition between traditional flavor group and finite modular group. Eq. (10.2) implies that the modular transformation γ maps the traditional group element

g into another element g' . Therefore Eq. (10.2) defines a automorphism of the traditional flavor group $\mathcal{G}_\mathbb{H}$, i.e.

$$\rho(\gamma)\rho(g)\rho^{-1}(\gamma) = \rho(u_\gamma(g)), \quad \forall g \in G_f, \quad (10.3)$$

where u_γ is an automorphism $u_\gamma : \mathcal{G}_\mathbb{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}_\mathbb{H}$ with $u_\gamma(g) = g'$. If u_γ is the trivial identity automorphism with $u_\gamma = 1$ for any modular transformation γ so that $u_\gamma(g) = g$, the modular symmetry transformation would commute with the flavor symmetry transformation and consequently the eclectic flavor group is the direct product $G_f \times \Gamma_N$ or $G_f \times \Gamma'_N$ [150]. It is called the quasi-eclectic flavor symmetry [374].

Since the finite modular groups Γ_N and Γ'_N can be generated by the two generators S and T , it is sufficient to impose the consistency condition in Eq. (10.3) on the two outer automorphisms u_S and u_T

$$\rho(S)\rho(g)\rho^{-1}(S) = \rho(u_S(g)), \quad \rho(T)\rho(g)\rho^{-1}(T) = \rho(u_T(g)), \quad (10.4)$$

where $\rho(S)$ and $\rho(T)$ are matrix representations of the two automorphisms u_S and u_T respectively, and they should satisfy the multiplication rules of the finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N in Eqs. (3.10, 3.12). In other words, the outer automorphisms u_S and u_T should also satisfy the multiplication rules of the finite modular group Γ_N or Γ'_N :

$$(u_S)^{N_s} = (u_T)^{N_s} = (u_S \circ u_T)^3 = 1, \quad (u_S)^2 \circ u_T = u_T \circ (u_S)^2, \quad (10.5)$$

with $N_s = 4$ for Γ'_N and $N_s = 2$ for Γ_N .

The EFG can be consistently combined with the gCP symmetry. As explained in section 5.1, a new generator K_* corresponding to gCP transformation could be introduced and the modular group $\Gamma \cong SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ is enhanced to $\Gamma^* \cong GL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ [198]:

$$\Gamma^* = \left\{ \tau \xrightarrow{S} -1/\tau, \quad \tau \xrightarrow{T} \tau + 1, \quad \tau \xrightarrow{K_*} -\tau^* \right\}. \quad (10.6)$$

The gCP transformation K_* acts on the modulus τ and the matter field as follows,

$$\tau \xrightarrow{K_*} -\bar{\tau}, \quad \psi(x) \xrightarrow{K_*} \rho(K_*)[\psi^\dagger(t, -\mathbf{x})]^T, \quad (10.7)$$

where the gCP transformation $\rho(K_*)$ is a unitary matrix, and the obvious action of CP on the spinor indices is omitted for the case of ψ being spinor. Requiring that the gCP transformation K_* be of order 2 with $(K_*)^2 = 1$, we can obtain

$$\rho^*(K_*) = \rho^{-1}(K_*). \quad (10.8)$$

The gCP transformation has to be compatible with both the traditional flavor symmetry and the finite modular group, and its allowed form is strongly constrained by the corresponding restricted consistency conditions. The consistency between the EFG and gCP symmetry requires the following consistency conditions have to be satisfied [198, 203]:

$$\rho(K_*)\rho^*(g)\rho^{-1}(K_*) = \rho(u_{K_*}(g)), \quad \forall g \in \mathcal{G}_\mathbb{H}, \quad (10.9)$$

$$\rho(K_*)\rho^*(S)\rho^{-1}(K_*) = \rho^{-1}(S), \quad \rho(K_*)\rho^*(T)\rho^{-1}(K_*) = \rho^{-1}(T), \quad (10.10)$$

flavor group \mathcal{G}_{fl}	GAP ID	$\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{fl}})$	finite modular groups		eclectic flavor group
Q_8	[8, 4]	S_4	without \mathcal{CP}	S_3	$\text{GL}(2, 3)$
			with \mathcal{CP}	–	–
$\mathbb{Z}_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_3$	[9, 2]	$\text{GL}(2, 3)$	without \mathcal{CP}	S_3	$\Delta(54)$
			with \mathcal{CP}	$S_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$	[108, 17]
A_4	[12, 3]	S_4	without \mathcal{CP}	S_3 S_4	S_4 S_4
			with \mathcal{CP}	–	–
T'	[24, 3]	S_4	without \mathcal{CP}	S_3	$\text{GL}(2, 3)$
			with \mathcal{CP}	–	–
$\Delta(27)$	[27, 3]	[432, 734]	without \mathcal{CP}	S_3 T'	$\Delta(54)$ $\Omega(1)$
			with \mathcal{CP}	$S_3 \times \mathbb{Z}_2$ $\text{GL}(2, 3)$	[108, 17] [1296, 2891]
$\Delta(54)$	[54, 8]	[432, 734]	without \mathcal{CP}	T'	$\Omega(1)$
			with \mathcal{CP}	$\text{GL}(2, 3)$	[1296, 2891]

Table 21. Examples of traditional flavor groups, their extensions by finite modular groups and the resulting eclectic flavor groups. Here $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{G}_{\text{fl}})$ denotes the group of automorphisms of the traditional flavor group \mathcal{G}_{fl} . This table is taken from Ref. [150].

where u_{K_*} is an automorphism of the traditional flavor symmetry group \mathcal{G}_{fl} . It is sufficient to consider the element g being the generators of \mathcal{G}_{fl} , and one can fix the explicit form of the gCP transformation $\rho(K_*)$ up to an overall irrelevant phase by solving Eqs. (10.9,10.10). Hence the automorphism u_{K_*} of the traditional flavor group \mathcal{G}_{fl} should satisfy the following relations:

$$(u_{K_*})^2 = 1, \quad u_{K_*} \circ u_S \circ u_{K_*} = u_S^{-1}, \quad u_{K_*} \circ u_T \circ u_{K_*} = u_T^{-1}. \quad (10.11)$$

The EFG extensions of some popular traditional flavor symmetry group are listed in table 21. The scheme of eclectic flavor group is more predictive than the finite modular group and the traditional flavor group alone, and it combines the advantages of both approaches so that both superpotential and Kähler potential would be severely restricted by EFG. Usually only the minimal Kähler potential is adopted in concrete modular models. However, the Kähler potential is less constrained by modular symmetry alone, and the most general Kähler potential compatible with modular symmetry is of the following form [149, 270],

$$\mathcal{K} = (-i\tau + i\bar{\tau})^{-k_\psi} \left(\psi^\dagger \psi \right)_1 + \sum_{n, \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2} c^{(n, \mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2)} (-i\tau + i\bar{\tau})^{-k_\psi + n} \left(\psi^\dagger Y_{\mathbf{r}_1}^{(n)\dagger} Y_{\mathbf{r}_2}^{(n)} \psi \right)_1, \quad (10.12)$$

where ψ stands for a generic matter field multiple with modular weight k_ψ , and $Y_{\mathbf{r}}^{(n)}$ is a weight $n \neq 0$ modular form in the representation \mathbf{r} of finite modular group. Usually only the first term of Eq. (10.12) is taken, this is the so-called minimal Kähler potential.

However, we see that the Kähler potential generally has a lot of terms and the couplings $c^{(n,r_1,r_2)}$ are not suppressed. Consequently these additional terms can be as important as the first term, and thus the predictive power of modular flavor symmetry would be reduced [149]. How to control the Kähler potential is an open question of the modular flavor symmetry approach. The presence of traditional flavor symmetry \mathcal{G}_fl leads to strong constraints on both the modular transformations of matter fields and the Kähler potential. As a result, the minimal Kähler potential can be reproduced and the higher order corrections suppressed by powers of $\langle\Phi\rangle/\Lambda$, where Λ denotes the cutoff scale and $\langle\Phi\rangle$ represents the vacuum expectation value (VEV) of flavons breaking the traditional flavor symmetry. See Refs. [372, 375, 376] for model construction with EFG.

10.3 Modulus stabilization

A long standing problem of string theory is that of finding a successful potential for the moduli fields, one which stabilizes them at a global minimum which corresponds to a de Sitter (dS) vacuum, namely one with a (slightly) positive cosmological constant. The theoretical framework for discussing the issue of moduli stabilisation is that of effective supergravity theories.

For example one approach to modulus stabilisation in Type IIB string theory was that in [377–381]. More recently, in the framework of modular flavour symmetry a 3-form flux in Type IIB models has been considered [142] based on complex structure moduli with a $T^6/(Z_2 \times Z'_2)$ orbifold. The minima of the moduli fields are found to be clustered around the left cusp $\tau = \omega$ in the fundamental domain. Another example involving non-perturbative effects was studied in [199, 382, 383].

In Heterotic string theory, it is traditional to consider non-perturbative effect arising from gaugino condensation [384–386]. The potential for the dilaton, and the Kähler and complex structure moduli is flat at tree level, but threshold corrections [387–390] or world-sheet instantons can modify the potential leading to minima [391]. The effect of modular symmetries on the Kähler moduli has also been considered [392, 393], leading to anti-de Sitter (AdS) vacua with negative cosmological constant. A similar approach was followed in [394] with minima close to the stabiliser $\tau = \omega$.

Recently [395] showed that the AdS vacua can be uplifted to become dS vacua by the effects of matter in the superpotential [396, 397] following the Kachru-Kalosh-Linde-Trivedi (KKLT) scenario [398].

Alternatively, it is possible to realise dS vacua even without introducing the matter superpotential [399] using non-perturbative corrections to the dilaton Kähler potential proposed by Shenker [400]. This leads to metastable dS vacua at $\tau = i$ and ω in some regions of multiple moduli parameter space [401]. The 1-loop correction may lead to the slight deviation from the tree level results of modulus VEV [402].

11 Summary and conclusion

In this review we have systematically reviewed the formalism and applications of modular symmetry to flavour models in general and neutrino mass and mixing models in particular,

from the bottom-up point of view. We began with a survey of neutrino mass and lepton mixing, including a brief history of neutrino mass and mixing in the period of most rapid developments, 1998-2012, then summarised what we have learned, what we still don't know, and why the new paradigm demanded by neutrino physics cannot be consistent with the Standard Model, before mentioning a number of possible mechanisms for the origin of neutrino mass, focussing on various Majorana seesaw mechanisms. We then showed how the PMNS lepton mixing matrix may be constructed and parameterised, and how its parameters are constrained by the latest global fits, before discussing the flavour puzzle of the Standard Model. We then gave a very brief reminder of neutrino mass and mixing models strategies without modular symmetry, starting with some simple patterns of lepton mixing, then introducing family (or flavour) symmetries which can reproduce these structures using the direct approach. This was followed by a discussion of the semi-direct and tri-direct CP approaches, where the simple patterns of lepton mixing receive the necessary corrections to make them phenomenologically viable whilst still maintaining some degree of predictivity due to a subgroup of the family symmetry being preserved in either the charged lepton sector or the neutrino sector, leading to phenomenologically testable sum rules.

We then turned to the main subject of this review, namely a pedagogical introduction to modular symmetry as a candidate for family symmetry, from the bottom-up point of view. Unlike usual flavour symmetries, which act linearly on flavon fields, modular symmetry acts non-linearly on the modulus field, τ , which transforms into $(a\tau + b)/(c\tau + d)$, where a, b, c, d are integers with $ac - bd = 1$. Such symmetry transformations form a Special Linear group of 2×2 matrices whose elements are integers \mathbb{Z} , hence the name $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$. In 6d theories, the modulus field, τ , defines the shape of the compactified 2d torus, and modular symmetry is the group of symmetry transformations on τ which leaves the torus invariant. The modulus field τ , is constrained to lie in the upper half of the complex plane, in a fundamental domain which excludes both a unit circle centred on the origin and real parts of magnitude greater than 0.5, which means that modular symmetry is always necessarily broken. Although there is no value of τ which preserves the modular group, there are some values which preserve part of the symmetry, and these are called fixed points which preserve a residual symmetry or stabilizer. For example $\tau = i$ is invariant under the transformation $\tau \rightarrow 1/(-\tau)$, corresponding to a modular transformation with $a = 0, b = 1, c = -1, d = 0$, which is identified with the 2×2 matrix generator S . We show that there are only three inequivalent fixed points namely $\tau = i, \omega$ and $i\infty$ which play a special role both in string theory, and in phenomenology.

After the introduction to the above full modular group, $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ we introduced its projective subgroup $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ in which transformations related by an overall minus sign are identified (since a, b, c, d all change sign which cancels in the ratio), corresponding to the faithful group action on the modulus field τ . We also introduce their respective principal congruence subgroups, $\Gamma(N)$ and $\bar{\Gamma}(N)$, of level $N = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, which essentially consist of unit matrices mod N . Although all the above groups are infinite, finite discrete subgroups emerge by taking the quotient of the modular groups with their principal congruence subgroups, namely $\Gamma'_N \equiv SL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\Gamma(N)$ and $\Gamma_N \equiv PSL(2, \mathbb{Z})/\bar{\Gamma}(N)$.

The resulting finite groups (which are essentially the interesting finite parts of the

modular groups, once the uninteresting infinite sets of matrices related to unit matrices mod N have been removed) which emerge are well known from their applications to flavour model building, as discussed earlier. For example $\Gamma_{N=3,4,5}$ are isomorphic to A_4, S_4, A_5 , respectively, while $\Gamma'_{N=3,4,5}$ are isomorphic to the respective double cover groups T', S'_4, A'_5 . Modular symmetry not only provides a theoretical origin for such well known flavour groups, which all contain triplet representations and can accommodate three families of fermion representations, but the Yukawa couplings are generally modular forms, which are mathematical functions of τ , which depend on its modular weight, and transform as a representation of the finite modular group. In this framework a Yukawa operator involving fields whose modular weights do not add up to zero, is therefore permitted if the Yukawa coupling is a modular form which carries a weight which balances that of the fields, where the Yukawa coupling itself may transform as a representation of Γ_N or Γ'_N , obviating the need for flavon fields.

We have derived the modular forms of level N and even weight k , using a range of techniques, and showed that they form representations of the finite modular group Γ_N , considering the derivation for $N = 3$ in detail as an example. We then extended the discussion to include the double cover groups Γ'_N with integer modular weights, and the metaplectic covers with rational modular weights. We also introduced the vector valued modular forms, based on a new formalism which is more general than that of quotients of principal congruence subgroups, and allows more general finite modular groups beyond Γ_N or Γ'_N , and their corresponding modular forms, to be identified. In an extensive Appendix, we give the irreducible representations, Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and modular forms of Γ'_N and Γ_N explicitly for the levels $N = 2, 3, 4, 5$.

The interplay between modular symmetry and generalized CP symmetry was then discussed, where we showed that the modulus field should transform under CP as $\tau \rightarrow -\tau^*$, where the minus sign is necessary in order for the modulus field to remain in the upper half of the complex plane. We derived the CP transformation on matter multiplets (which are chiral supermultiplets). We also highlighted the special choice of the symmetric basis of representation matrices, in which the generalised CP transformation on the matter fields become just the canonical CP transformations consisting of unit matrices and complex conjugation, which is always possible for all examples so far studied. The modular forms themselves also transform under CP, which we show to be identical to a corresponding matter field with a similar representation and weight. In the symmetric basis the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients and all coupling constants are real. We noted that τ has CP invariant lines all along the imaginary axis, so that such values would not violate CP, and also showed the other lines along the boundary of the fundamental domain respect certain combinations of residual modular symmetry and CP. For a single modulus on a CP invariant line, we showed that this would lead to all physical CP phases in the lepton sector being trivial, and hence to break CP requires some deviation from these lines. However this conclusion is not true when multiple moduli are considered.

In general, compactification of extra dimensions generally leads to a number of moduli τ_i with $i = 1, 2, \dots$, rather than just the single modulus field τ as often assumed in bottom-up models, and so it is necessary to generalise the above formalism to the case of more than

one modulus field. The geometrically simplest case is that of factorizable tori, which allows a straightforward generalisation of the formalism to the case of multiple moduli. The case of non-factorizable or symplectic multiple moduli, is considered by extending the modular group from $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ to the Siegel group $Sp(2g, \mathbb{Z})$, where we discussed modular forms appropriate to this case, with the simple case of factorizable tori emerging as a limiting case. In practice, $g = 2$ is already quite complicated, where the reduced finite Siegel modular group arises which is more manageable, but still awaits phenomenological exploitation. By contrast, the simple multiple factorizable tori case, also commonly assumed in string theory compactifications, provides a straightforward generalisation with many phenomenological applications already in the literature.

Modular strategies for understanding fermion mass hierarchies were discussed, including the weighton mechanism and appealing to small deviations from the fixed points. The weighton mechanism is analogous to the Froggatt-Nielsen mechanism but without requiring any Abelian symmetry to be introduced. The modular weights play the role of FN charges, and a singlet field with non-zero modular weight plays the role of the FN flavon field, and is called a weighton. Lepton mixing may be successfully addressed in this approach. Alternatively, a second strategy relies on the observation that modular forms may contain zeros at the fixed points. Consider for example the weight 2 level 3 triplet modular form in the standard basis $(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) = (1, 0, 0)$ at $\tau = i\infty$. Under small deviations from this fixed point, the modular form becomes $(Y_1, Y_2, Y_3) = (1, \epsilon, \epsilon^2)$, where $\epsilon \ll 1$, allowing charged lepton hierarchies to be addressed. The requirement of successful lepton mixing is not easy to achieve in this approach, although a successful example has been given. Another approach to reducing the number of free parameters is the idea of texture zeroes in the mass matrices, which arise naturally in the framework of modular symmetry since modular forms in certain representations of Γ_N or Γ'_N are absent at lower weights, with the modular symmetry providing extra predictive power for the non-zero elements.

A variety of examples of modular models exist in the literature based on the SM gauge group and different finite modular groups of levels $N = 2 - 7$. As an example, we gave a detailed overview of a general class of $N = 3$ lepton models based on A_4 with a single modulus field, as in the original Feruglio seesaw model which we showed can still provide a good fit to the data, and more generally assigning the A_4 modular weights and representations of the leptons in all possible ways, and tabulating the phenomenologically successful cases. We then presented a minimal phenomenologically successful model of leptons with a single modulus, based on S'_4 with leptons carrying specific modular weights in specific representations, leading to a six parameter fit to the lepton data. Moving to multiple moduli, we then discussed a highly predictive model based on three S_4 groups, with the three moduli located at the fixed points $i, i + 2$ and ω , capable of reproducing the Littlest Seesaw model, with the lepton data reproduced with only six free parameters (three in the neutrino sector and three required to fit the charged lepton masses). There are also modular models in the literature capable of explaining both leptons and quarks with a single modulus, and we discussed such an example with spontaneously broken CP symmetry.

We then extended the discussion to include Grand Unified Theories (GUTs) based on

modular $SU(5)$, $SO(10)$ and flipped $SU(5)_F \times U(1)$. Most examples concern $SU(5)$, where we summarise all phenomenologically successful A_4 models in terms of the representations and modular weights of the fields, including right-handed neutrinos to provide a type-I seesaw mechanism. We also discuss an analysis of $SO(10)$ models with three Higgs multiplets, where the right-handed neutrinos are a necessary ingredient, but the resulting seesaw mechanism may be type-I or type-II dominated. The three Higgs multiplets of the $SO(10)$ models, namely $\mathbf{10}$, $\overline{\mathbf{126}}$ and $\mathbf{120}$, include the latter two rather large representations which are not readily available in most string constructions. This motivates the study of more string friendly groups such as flipped $SU(5)_F \times U(1)$ where the symmetry breaking and fermion mass structure can be achieved with smaller Higgs representations, and these types of models have also been discussed in the framework of modular symmetry. In the modular invariant models, the exchange of moduli between electrons and neutrinos can induce a non-standard neutrino interactions which can lead to a shift of the neutrino mass matrix in a region with non-vanishing electron number density [303]. Hence the presence of moduli can potentially be tested in neutrino oscillation experiments [303].

Finally we briefly mentioned some issues related to top-down approaches based on string theory, including eclectic flavour symmetry and moduli stabilisation. Although this review is mainly concerned with bottom-up considerations, it is appropriate to recall that the whole subject of modular symmetry is very much inspired by string theory in extra dimensions, and it is important to have this in mind when considering bottom-up models. In particular, six dimensional theories play a crucial role in the interpretation of the modulus field τ , and in general one must expect moduli fields for ten dimensional theories, with three moduli fields for the simplest three-tori compactifications. It is somewhat sobering to realise that many realistic string compactifications lead to exclusively matter fields with half-integer modular weights, as compared the rich choice of modular weights usually assumed in bottom-up models. Another observation is that realistic Heterotic string constructions tend to yield traditional flavour symmetries together with, but not commuting with, the finite modular symmetries, leading to so-called eclectic symmetry models. On the one hand this is very unfortunate, since such symmetries can only be broken at the expense of re-introducing flavon fields (which should be present as massless modes of the string construction), which are the very fields that we wished to be rid of in the beginning. On the other hand this is fortunate, since the presence of the traditional (non-modular) flavour symmetry controls the corrections to the Kähler potential which could not be controlled by modular symmetry alone. This is because the insertion of the dimensionless Yukawa coupling modular forms in a particular representation leads to unsuppressed corrections, while the while the analogous corrections with traditional flavour symmetry involve powers of flavon insertions suppressed by the mass dimensions of the flavon fields. Moreover, realistic eclectic symmetry models, in which the full symmetry is realised as the automorphism of the chosen flavour symmetry, tend to be quite constrained and predictive, containing the advantages of both approaches. Finally we discussed the issue of moduli stabilisation, which is a long standing issue in string theory, and very much related to the discussion of fixed points, with i and ω , or regions close to these fixed points being preferred, while ∞ is considered somewhat unphysical from this point of view.

In conclusion, we have reviewed the idea of finite modular symmetry, motivated from string theory and extra dimensions, and its application to bottom-up flavour models in general and neutrino mass and lepton mixing models in particular. We have seen how the dimensionless Yukawa couplings become dynamical objects, which transform as modular forms, mathematical functions controlled by a single modulus field τ , and which also transform as representations of the finite modular symmetry, rather like flavon fields. The promise of being able to have a well motivated modular origin for the non-Abelian discrete family or flavour symmetry, which is broken without the use of arbitrary flavon fields has led to considerable interest in this approach, and we have summarised the latest formalism and applications of this approach. The string motivations however also lead us to eclectic flavour symmetry which re-introduces traditional flavour symmetry and flavons, together with the finite modular symmetry, which may help to control the Kähler potential and lead to a highly constrained framework. However, in the end, the bottom-up model builder cannot help but feel that we have come full circle and are back again at the beginning where we started with flavons being present once more. We are reminded of the quote by T.S. Eliot: “We shall not cease from exploration and the end of all our exploring will be to arrive where we started and know the place for the first time.” From this point of view, the study of modular symmetry has certainly enriched our understanding of the flavour problem, even if it cannot claim to be the final answer.

Acknowledgements

We are grateful to Jun-Nan Lu and Xiang-Gan Liu for their kind helps in numerical calculations and plotting some of the figures. We acknowledge Peng Chen, Francisco J. de Anda, Ivo de Medeiros Varzielas, Ferruccio Feruglio, Simon J.D. King, Miguel Levy, Cai-Chang Li, Xiang-Gan Liu, Jun-Nan Lu, Bu-Yao Qu, Xin Wang, Chang-Yuan Yao and Ye-Ling Zhou for fruitful collaboration on modular symmetry. GJD is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 11975224, 11835013, 12375104. SFK acknowledges the STFC Consolidated Grant ST/L000296/1 and the European Union’s Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation programme under Marie Skłodowska-Curie grant agreement HIDDeN European ITN project (H2020-MSCA-ITN-2019//860881-HIDDeN).

Appendix

A Derivation of Eq. (4.23)

The well-known modular transformation is

$$\tau \rightarrow \tau' = \gamma\tau = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}, \quad \text{with } ad - bc = 1, \quad (\text{A.1})$$

which implies

$$\frac{d\tau'}{d\tau} = \frac{a(c\tau + d) - c(a\tau + b)}{(c\tau + d)^2} = \frac{ad - bc}{(c\tau + d)^2} = \frac{1}{(c\tau + d)^2} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$\frac{d\tau}{d\tau'} = \frac{1}{\frac{d\tau'}{d\tau}} = (c\tau + d)^2. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Ref. [143] starts from a function $f(\tau)$ which transforms under modular transformation in the following way,

$$f(\tau) \rightarrow f(\tau') = e^{i\alpha}(c\tau + d)^k f(\tau), \quad (\text{A.4})$$

which is exactly Eq. (4.22). Then we can see that the derivative of the $\log f(\tau)$ transforms as

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} \log f(\tau) \rightarrow \frac{d}{d\tau'} \log f(\tau') = \frac{d\tau}{d\tau'} \frac{d}{d\tau} \log f(\tau') \quad (\text{A.5})$$

$$= \frac{d\tau}{d\tau'} \frac{d}{d\tau} \log \left[e^{i\alpha}(c\tau + d)^k f(\tau) \right] \quad (\text{A.6})$$

$$= \frac{d\tau}{d\tau'} \frac{d}{d\tau} \left[\log e^{i\alpha} + \log(c\tau + d)^k + \log f(\tau) \right] \quad (\text{A.7})$$

$$= \frac{d\tau}{d\tau'} \left[\frac{kc}{c\tau + d} + \frac{d}{d\tau} \log f(\tau) \right] \quad (\text{A.8})$$

$$= (c\tau + d)^2 \left[\frac{kc}{c\tau + d} + \frac{d}{d\tau} \log f(\tau) \right] \quad (\text{A.9})$$

$$= (c\tau + d)^2 \frac{d}{d\tau} \log f(\tau) + kc(c\tau + d). \quad (\text{A.10})$$

We have used Eq. (A.3) in above.

B Derive the gCP transformation of the modulus τ from consistency condition

As shown in Eqs. (5.20, 5.21), a chiral supermultiplets φ transforms under modular symmetry and gCP as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} \text{modular symmetry} : \varphi(x) &\xrightarrow{\gamma} (c\tau + d)^{-k_\varphi} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma) \varphi(x), \quad \gamma = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma, \\ \text{gCP} : \varphi(x) &\xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} X_{\mathbf{r}} \bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.1})$$

In order to combine generalized CP symmetry consistently with the modular symmetry consistently, as explain in section 5, the following consistency condition of Eq. (5.24) has to be satisfied:

$$X_{\mathbf{r}} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma) X_{\mathbf{r}}^{-1} = \left(\frac{c_{\gamma'} \tau + d_{\gamma'}}{c_{\mathcal{P}^{-1}}^* + d} \right)^{-k_\varphi} \rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma'), \quad \gamma' = \begin{pmatrix} a_{\gamma'} & b_{\gamma'} \\ c_{\gamma'} & d_{\gamma'} \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma. \quad (\text{B.2})$$

Since the matrices $X_{\mathbf{r}}$, $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(\gamma)$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}(\gamma')$ are independent of the moduli τ , the overall factor has to be a constant:

$$\frac{c_{\gamma'} \tau + d_{\gamma'}}{c_{\mathcal{P}^{-1}}^* + d} = \lambda_\gamma, \quad (\text{B.3})$$

where λ_γ is a complex parameter with $|\lambda_\gamma| = 1$ because both $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ and $\rho_{\mathbf{r}}$ and unitary matrices. In general, the value of λ_γ depends on γ . The constraint in Eq. (B.3) allows to

determine the gCP transformation of the modulus τ [198]. Applying the above condition of Eq. (B.3) to the generator $\gamma = S$, we obtain

$$c_{S'}\tau + d_{S'} = -\lambda_S\tau^*_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}}, \quad (\text{B.4})$$

which leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \tau^*_{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}} &= -\frac{1}{\lambda_S}(c_{S'}\tau + d_{S'}) = -\lambda_S^*(c_{S'}\tau + d_{S'}), \\ \tau_{\mathcal{CP}} &= -\frac{1}{c_{S'}}(\lambda_S\tau^* + d_{S'}). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B.5})$$

Then we proceed to consider the consistency chain $\mathcal{CP} \rightarrow T \rightarrow \mathcal{CP}^{-1}$:

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} -\frac{1}{c_{S'}}(\lambda_S\tau^* + d_{S'}) \xrightarrow{T} -\frac{1}{c_{S'}}[\lambda_S(\tau^* + 1) + d_{S'}] \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}^{-1}} \tau - \frac{\lambda_S}{c_{S'}}, \quad (\text{B.6})$$

where the CP transformation of τ in Eq. (B.5) has been used. The resulting transformation should be a modular transformation, consequently the combination $\lambda_S/c_{S'}$ should be a real integer. Since $|\lambda_S| = 1$ and $c_{S'}$ is an integer so we should have

$$\lambda_S = \pm 1, \quad c'_{S'} = \pm 1, \quad (\text{B.7})$$

which implies that $d_{S'}/c_{S'}$ is an integer as well. Furthermore the requirement $\text{Im}\tau_{\mathcal{CP}} > 0$ entails $\lambda_S = c_{S'} = \pm 1$. As a consequence, the \mathcal{CP} transformation rule of the complex modulus τ in Eq. (B.5) is

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} n - \tau^*, \quad (\text{B.8})$$

where $n = d_{S'}/c_{S'}$ is some integer. Let us consider the composition $\mathcal{CP}' = \mathcal{CP} \circ T^n$ of the CP transformation \mathcal{CP} and the modular transformation T^n ,

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} -\tau^* + n \xrightarrow{T^n} -\tau^*. \quad (\text{B.9})$$

This composition transformation \mathcal{CP}' acts on the chiral superfield $\varphi(x)$ as

$$\varphi(x) \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}} X_{\mathbf{r}}\bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}) \xrightarrow{T^n} X_{\mathbf{r}}\rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(T^n)\bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}) = X'_{\mathbf{r}}\bar{\varphi}(x_{\mathcal{P}}), \quad X'_{\mathbf{r}} \equiv X_{\mathbf{r}}\rho_{\mathbf{r}}^*(T^n). \quad (\text{B.10})$$

We see that $X'_{\mathbf{r}}$ the same properties as the original CP transformation up to a redefinition of $X_{\mathbf{r}}$. As shown in Eq. (B.9),

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}'} -\tau^*. \quad (\text{B.11})$$

Thus we derive exactly the same gCP transformation rule of τ as Eq. (5.12). It is obvious that the modulus τ is invariant under two successive CP transformation, i.e.

$$\tau \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}'} -\tau^* \xrightarrow{\mathcal{CP}'} \tau, \quad (\text{B.12})$$

such that $\mathcal{CP}'^2 = 1$ is satisfied. Without loss of generality, we could choose the generators of the full symmetry group to be \mathcal{CP}' , S , T instead of \mathcal{CP} , S , T . With a slight abuse of notation, in this paper we shall denote \mathcal{CP}' as \mathcal{CP} and $X'_{\mathbf{r}}$ as $X_{\mathbf{r}}$ for notation simplicity.

C Finite modular groups Γ'_N and Γ_N and modular forms of level N

In this appendix, we shall give the irreducible representations and the Clebsch-Gordon of Γ'_N and Γ_N for the level $N = 2, 3, 4, 5$. The definitions of Γ_N and Γ'_N are given in Eq. (3.9) and Eq. (3.11) respectively. Both group generators S and T would be represented by symmetric matrices in all irreducible representations, consequently the gCP transformation would reduce to the canonical CP transformation with $X_r = \mathbf{1}_r$ [198, 203], as shown in section 5.2. We shall also report the explicit expressions of the modular forms at level N .

C.1 $N = 2$

The groups Γ'_2 and Γ_2 are isomorphic to the S_3 group which is the symmetry group of a regular triangle. S_3 can be generated by S and T fulfilling the following relations [90]

$$S^2 = T^2 = (ST)^3 = 1. \quad (\text{C.1})$$

The six elements of S_3 are divided to three conjugacy classes

$$1C_1 = \{1\}, \quad 3C_2 = \{S, T, TST\}, \quad 2C_3 = \{ST, TS\}. \quad (\text{C.2})$$

where nC_k denotes a conjugacy class with n elements and the subscript k is the order of the elements. The finite modular group S_3 has two singlet representations $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1}'$, and one double representation $\mathbf{2}$. The modular generators S and T are represented by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{1} : & \quad S = 1, & \quad T = 1, \\ \mathbf{1}' : & \quad S = 1, & \quad T = -1, \\ \mathbf{2} : & \quad S = -\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{3} \\ \sqrt{3} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.3})$$

The Kronecker products between different irreducible representations can be obtained from the character table

$$\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}' = \mathbf{1}', \quad \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{2}, \quad \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2}, \quad (\text{C.4})$$

For the tensor product of the singlet $\mathbf{1}'$ with a doublet $\mathbf{2}$, we have

$$\mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{2}, \quad \text{with } \mathbf{2} = \alpha \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ -\beta_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C.5})$$

The contraction rules for two S_3 doublets are found to be

$$\mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2}, \quad \text{with } \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} = \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \mathbf{1}' = \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \mathbf{2} = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.6})$$

As shown in Eq. (4.2), there is no odd weight modular form of level 2. From the dimension formula of Eq. (4.3a), we know that the linear space of weight $2k$ and level 2 modular forms

has dimension $k + 1$. At weight 2, there are two linearly independent modular forms of level 2, and they can be arranged into a doublet of S_3 [154]:

$$Y_2^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1(\tau) \\ Y_2(\tau) \end{pmatrix} \quad (\text{C.7})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\tau) &= \frac{i}{4\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\tau/2)}{\eta(\tau/2)} + \frac{\eta'((\tau+1)/2)}{\eta((\tau+1)/2)} - 8 \frac{\eta'(2\tau)}{\eta(2\tau)} \right], \\ Y_2(\tau) &= \frac{\sqrt{3}i}{4\pi} \left[\frac{\eta'(\tau/2)}{\eta(\tau/2)} - \frac{\eta'((\tau+1)/2)}{\eta((\tau+1)/2)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.8})$$

The q -expansion of the modular forms $Y_{1,2}(\tau)$ is given by

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\tau) &= 1/8 + 3q + 3q^2 + 12q^3 + 3q^4 + 18q^5 + 12q^6 + 24q^7 + 3q^8 + 39q^9 + 18q^{10} \dots, \\ Y_2(\tau) &= \sqrt{3}q^{1/2}(1 + 4q + 6q^2 + 8q^3 + 13q^4 + 12q^5 + 14q^6 + 24q^7 + 18q^8 + 20q^9 \dots) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.9})$$

The higher weight modular forms of level 2 are the product of Y_1 and Y_2 as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1^{(4)} &= \left(Y_2^{(2)} Y_2^{(2)} \right)_1 = Y_1^2 + Y_2^2, \quad Y_2^{(4)} = \left(Y_2^{(2)} Y_2^{(2)} \right)_2 = \begin{pmatrix} Y_2^2 - Y_1^2 \\ 2Y_1 Y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \\ Y_1^{(6)} &= \left(Y_2^{(2)} Y_2^{(4)} \right)_1 = 3Y_1 Y_2^2 - Y_1^3, \quad Y_1'^{(6)} = \left(Y_2^{(2)} Y_2^{(4)} \right)_{1'} = 3Y_1^2 Y_2 - Y_2^3, \\ Y_2^{(6)} &= \left(Y_2^{(2)} Y_1^{(4)} \right)_2 = (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.10})$$

The modular form multiplets of level 2 are summarized in table 22.

C.2 $N = 3$

The $\Gamma'_3 \cong T'$ group is the double covering of the tetrahedral group $\Gamma_3 \cong A_4$. All the elements of T' can be generated by three generators S , T and R which obey the following relations³² [147]:

$$S^2 = R, \quad (ST)^3 = T^3 = R^2 = 1, \quad RT = TR. \quad (\text{C.11})$$

The generator R commutes with all elements of the group, and the center of T' is the Z_2 subgroup generated by R . The group A_4 can be reproduced by setting $R = 1$. The 24 elements of T' group belong to 7 conjugacy classes:

$$\begin{aligned} 1C_1 &: 1, \\ 1C_2 &: R, \\ 6C_4 &: S, T^{-1}ST, TST^{-1}, SR, T^{-1}STR, TST^{-1}R, \\ 4C_6 &: TR, TSR, STR, T^{-1}ST^{-1}R, \\ 4C_3 &: T^{-1}, ST^{-1}R, T^{-1}SR, TSTR, \end{aligned}$$

³²Alternatively the T' group can be generated by S and T fulfilling $S^4 = T^3 = (ST)^3 = 1$, $S^2T = TS^2$.

$$\begin{aligned}
4C'_3 &: T, TS, ST, T^{-1}ST^{-1}, \\
4C'_6 &: ST^{-1}, T^{-1}S, TST, T^{-1}R.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.12}$$

The T' group has a triplet representation $\mathbf{3}$ and three singlets representations $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{1}'$ and $\mathbf{1}''$ in common with A_4 . In addition, it has three two-dimensional spinor representations $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}'$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}''$. In our working basis, the generators S , and T are represented by the following symmetric and unitary matrices:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} &: S = 1, & T = 1, \\
\mathbf{1}' &: S = 1, & T = \omega, \\
\mathbf{1}'' &: S = 1, & T = \omega^2, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} &: S = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & T = \begin{pmatrix} \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' &: S = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & T = \begin{pmatrix} \omega^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' &: S = -\frac{i}{\sqrt{3}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{3} &: S = \frac{1}{3} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 2 & 2 \\ 2 & -1 & 2 \\ 2 & 2 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega^2 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{C.13}$$

with $\omega = e^{i2\pi/3}$. Notice the generator $R = 1$ in the unhatted representations and $R = -1$ in the unhatted representations. Obviously the representation matrices of S and T are unitary and symmetric in all irreducible representations. Notice that the two-dimensional representation matrices are related to those of Refs. [147, 270] by a similarity transformation, while the remaining ones are the same. The Kronecker products between different irreducible representations of T' are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}^a \otimes \mathbf{r}^b &= \mathbf{r}^b \otimes \mathbf{1}^a = \mathbf{r}^{a+b \pmod{3}}, \quad \text{for } \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{1}, \widehat{\mathbf{2}}, \\
\mathbf{1}^a \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{1}^a = \mathbf{3}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}^a \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}^b &= \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{1}^{a+b+1 \pmod{3}}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}^a \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}^a = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'', \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \mathbf{3}_S \oplus \mathbf{3}_A \oplus \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{1}'',
\end{aligned} \tag{C.14}$$

where $a, b = 0, 1, 2$ and we have denoted $\mathbf{1} \equiv \mathbf{1}^0$, $\mathbf{1}' \equiv \mathbf{1}^1$, $\mathbf{1}'' \equiv \mathbf{1}^2$ for singlet representations and $\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{2}}^0$, $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{2}}^1$, $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \equiv \widehat{\mathbf{2}}^2$ for the doublet representations. The notations $\mathbf{3}_S$ and $\mathbf{3}_A$ stand for the symmetric and antisymmetric triplet combinations respectively. In the following, we report the Clebsch-Gordon (CG) coefficients of the T' group in the chosen basis. We shall use α_i (β_i) to denote the elements of the first (second) representation of the product.

$$\mathbf{1}^a \otimes \mathbf{1}^b = \mathbf{1}^{a+b \pmod{3}} \sim \alpha\beta, \tag{C.15}$$

$$\mathbf{1}^a \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}^b = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}^{a+b \pmod{3}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta_1 \\ \alpha\beta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{C.16}$$

$$\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta_1 \\ \alpha\beta_2 \\ \alpha\beta_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.17})$$

$$\mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta_3 \\ \alpha\beta_1 \\ \alpha\beta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.18})$$

$$\mathbf{1}'' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha\beta_2 \\ \alpha\beta_3 \\ \alpha\beta_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.19})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' = \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{3} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}' \sim \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_1) \\ -\alpha_1\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.20})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' = \mathbf{1}'' \oplus \mathbf{3} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}'' \sim \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_1) \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.21})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{3} \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{1} \sim \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_1) \\ -\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.22})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.23})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.24})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}}'' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.25})$$

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \mathbf{3}_S \oplus \mathbf{3}_A \oplus \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{1}'' \quad \text{with} \quad \begin{cases} \mathbf{3}_S \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ 2\alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{3}_A \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{1} \sim \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \mathbf{1}' \sim \alpha_3\beta_3 + \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \mathbf{1}'' \sim \alpha_2\beta_2 + \alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_1 \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.26})$$

The linear space spanned by level 3 and weight k modular forms has dimension $k + 1$, and a general vector $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(3))$ in the linear space can be explicitly constructed by using the Dedekind eta function $\eta(\tau)$:

$$\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(3)) = \sum_{m+n=k; m, n \geq 0} c_{mn} \frac{\eta^{3m}(3\tau)\eta^{3n}(\tau/3)}{\eta^{m+n}(\tau)} = \sum_{m+n=k; m, n \geq 0} c_{mn} \left[\frac{\eta^3(3\tau)}{\eta(\tau)} \right]^m \left[\frac{\eta^3(\tau/3)}{\eta(\tau)} \right]^n, \quad (\text{C.27})$$

where c_{mn} are general complex coefficients and $\eta(\tau)$ is the Dedekind eta-function defined in Eq. (4.19). There are two linearly independent weight 1 and level 3 modular forms which can be arranged in a T' doublet:

$$Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(1)}(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1(\tau) \\ Y_2(\tau) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.28})$$

with

$$Y_1(\tau) = \sqrt{2} \frac{\eta^3(3\tau)}{\eta(\tau)}, \quad Y_2(\tau) = -\frac{\eta^3(3\tau)}{\eta(\tau)} - \frac{1}{3} \frac{\eta^3(\tau/3)}{\eta(\tau)}. \quad (\text{C.29})$$

The q -expansion of $Y_{1,2}(\tau)$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\tau) &= \sqrt{2} q^{1/3} (1 + q + 2q^2 + 2q^4 + q^5 + 2q^6 + q^8 + 2q^9 + 2q^{10} + 2q^{12} + \dots), \\ Y_2(\tau) &= -1/3 - 2q - 2q^3 - 2q^4 - 4q^7 - 2q^9 - 2q^{12} - 4q^{13} + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.30})$$

Notice that $Y_1(\tau)$ and $Y_2(\tau)$ are algebraically independent. The level-3 modular form of integer weight are polynomials of degree k in $Y_1(\tau)$ and $Y_2(\tau)$, and higher-weight modular forms can be constructed from tensor product of lower-weight ones.

To be more specific, the weight-2 modular forms can be generated from the tensor products of two $Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)}$,

$$Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} = \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} \right)_{\mathbf{3}} = \left(Y_2^2, \quad \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_2, \quad -Y_1^2 \right)^T. \quad (\text{C.31})$$

Then we can use the weight 1 and weight 2 modular forms to construct the weight 3 modular forms,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\hat{2}}^{(3)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} \right)_{\hat{2}} = \left(3Y_1 Y_2^2, \quad -\sqrt{2} Y_1^3 - Y_2^3 \right)^T, \\ Y_{\hat{2}''}^{(3)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} \right)_{\hat{2}''} = \left(-Y_1^3 + \sqrt{2} Y_2^3, \quad 3Y_2 Y_1^2 \right)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.32})$$

At weight $k = 4$, we find five independent modular forms which can be arranged into two singlets $\mathbf{1}$ and $\mathbf{1}'$ and a triplet of T' ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}}^{(3)} \right)_{\mathbf{3}} = \left(-\sqrt{2} Y_1^3 Y_2 - Y_2^4, \quad -Y_1^4 + \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_2^3, \quad -3Y_1^2 Y_2^2 \right)^T, \\ Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(4)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}}^{(3)} \right)_{\mathbf{1}'} = -\sqrt{2} Y_1^4 - 4Y_1 Y_2^3, \\ Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}''}^{(3)} \right)_{\mathbf{1}} = 4Y_1^3 Y_2 - \sqrt{2} Y_2^4. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.33})$$

Notice that the contraction $\left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}''}^{(3)} \right)_{\mathbf{3}} = -Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)}$. The above weight 4 modular forms can also be obtained from the tensor products $\left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} \right)_{\mathbf{3}}$, $\left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} \right)_{\mathbf{1}'}$, $\left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} \right)_{\mathbf{1}}$ with $Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)}$ in Eq. (C.31). In particular, using Eqs. (C.26, C.31) it is obvious to see the constraint

$$\left(Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} \right)_{\mathbf{1}''} = 0, \quad (\text{C.34})$$

which was previously obtained from the q -expansion in [143]. Similarly, the independent weight 5 modular forms can be constructed from the tensor products of weight 1 and weight 4 modular forms as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\hat{2}}^{(5)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)} \right)_{\hat{2}} = \left[-2\sqrt{2} Y_1^3 Y_2 + Y_2^4 \right] (Y_1, \quad Y_2)^T, \\ Y_{\hat{2}'}^{(5)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)} \right)_{\hat{2}'} = \left[-Y_1^4 - 2\sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_2^3 \right] (Y_1, \quad Y_2)^T, \\ Y_{\hat{2}''}^{(5)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)} \right)_{\hat{2}''} = \left(5Y_1^3 Y_2^2 - \sqrt{2} Y_2^5, \quad -\sqrt{2} Y_1^5 + 5Y_1^2 Y_2^3 \right)^T. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.35})$$

Notice that $Y_{\hat{2}}^{(5)}$ and $Y_{\hat{2}'}^{(5)}$ are proportional to the contractions $Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)}$ and $Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(4)}$ respectively. Finally, the linearly independent weight 6 modular forms of level 3 can be decomposed into one singlet $\mathbf{1}$ and two triplets $\mathbf{3}$ under T' ,

$$\begin{aligned} Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}}^{(5)} \right)_{\mathbf{3}} = \left[-2\sqrt{2} Y_1^3 Y_2 + Y_2^4 \right] \left(Y_2^2, \quad \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_2, \quad -Y_1^2 \right)^T, \\ Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}'}^{(5)} \right)_{\mathbf{3}} = \left[-Y_1^4 - 2\sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_2^3 \right] \left(-Y_1^2, \quad Y_2^2, \quad \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_2 \right)^T, \\ Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(6)} &= \left(Y_{\hat{2}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{2}''}^{(5)} \right)_{\mathbf{1}} = \sqrt{2} Y_2^6 - \sqrt{2} Y_1^6 + 10Y_1^3 Y_2^3. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.36})$$

We summarize the level 3 modular forms up to weight 6 in table 22.

$k \backslash N$	2	3	4	5
1	—	$Y_2^{(1)}$	$Y_{3'}^{(1)}$	$Y_6^{(1)}$
2	$Y_2^{(2)}$	$Y_3^{(2)}$	$Y_2^{(2)}, Y_3^{(2)}$	$Y_3^{(2)}, Y_{3'}^{(2)}, Y_5^{(2)}$
3	—	$Y_2^{(3)}, Y_{2''}^{(3)}$	$Y_{1'}^{(3)}, Y_3^{(3)}, Y_{3'}^{(3)}$	$Y_{4'}^{(3)}, Y_{6I}^{(3)}, Y_{6II}^{(3)}$
4	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_2^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_{1'}^{(4)}, Y_3^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_2^{(4)}, Y_3^{(4)}, Y_{3'}^{(4)}$	$Y_1^{(4)}, Y_3^{(4)}, Y_{3'}^{(4)}, Y_4^{(4)}, Y_{5I}^{(4)}, Y_{5II}^{(4)}$
5	—	$Y_{\widehat{2}}^{(5)}, Y_{\widehat{2}'}^{(5)}, Y_{\widehat{2}''}^{(5)}$	$Y_2^{(5)}, Y_3^{(5)}, Y_{3'I}^{(5)}, Y_{3'II}^{(5)}$	$Y_2^{(5)}, Y_{2'}^{(5)}, Y_{2''}^{(5)}, Y_{4'}^{(5)}, Y_{6I}^{(5)}, Y_{6II}^{(5)}, Y_{6III}^{(5)}$
6	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{1'}^{(6)}, Y_2^{(6)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{3I}^{(6)}, Y_{3II}^{(6)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{1'}^{(6)}, Y_2^{(6)}, Y_{3I}^{(6)}, Y_{3II}^{(6)}, Y_{3'}^{(6)}$	$Y_1^{(6)}, Y_{3I}^{(6)}, Y_{3II}^{(6)}, Y_{3'II}^{(6)}, Y_{4I}^{(6)}, Y_{4II}^{(6)}, Y_{5I}^{(6)}, Y_{5II}^{(6)}$

Table 22. Summary of modular forms up to weight 6 and level 5. Note that the odd weight modular forms are in the hatted representations of Γ'_N while the even weight modular forms are in the unhatted representations of Γ'_N .

C.3 $N = 4$

The homogeneous finite modular group $\Gamma'_4 \cong S'_4$ is the double covering of $\Gamma_4 \cong S_4$ which is the symmetry group of a cube. It has 48 elements, and it can be generated by three generators S, T and R obeying the following relations:

$$S^2 = R, \quad (ST)^3 = T^4 = R^2 = 1, \quad TR = RT. \quad (\text{C.37})$$

The group ID of S'_4 in GAP [177] is [48, 30]. Notice that S_4 is not a subgroup of S'_4 , it is isomorphic to the quotient group of S'_4 over Z_2^R , i.e., $S_4 \cong S'_4/Z_2^R$, where $Z_2^R = \{1, R\}$ is the center and a normal subgroup of S'_4 . Hence the group S_4 can be reproduced by setting $R = 1$. Note that S'_4 is isomorphic to the semidirect product of A_4 with Z_4 , namely $S'_4 \cong A_4 \rtimes Z_4$. Therefore it can be expressed in terms of another set of generators s, t and r satisfying the relations:

$$s^2 = (st)^3 = t^3 = 1, \quad r^4 = 1, \quad rsr^{-1} = s, \quad rtr^{-1} = (st)^2, \quad (\text{C.38})$$

where s and t generate a A_4 subgroup, r generates a Z_4 subgroup, and the last two relations define the semidirect product “ \rtimes ”. The generators s, t and r are related to S, T and R by

$$\begin{aligned} s &= T^2 R, & t &= (ST)^2, & r &= T, \\ S &= t^2 r^3, & T &= r, & R &= r^2 s. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.39})$$

All the elements of S'_4 group can be divided into 10 conjugacy classes:

$$\begin{aligned} 1C_1 &= \{1\}, \\ 1C_2 &= \{R\} = (1C_1) \cdot R, \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
3C_2 &= \{T^2, ST^2S^3, (ST^2)^2\}, \\
3C'_2 &= \{T^2R, ST^2S, (ST^2)^2R\} = (3C_2) \cdot R, \\
8C_3 &= \{ST, TS, (ST)^2, (TS)^2, TS^3T^2, T^2ST^3, T^2S^3T, T^3ST^2\}, \\
6C_4 &= \{S, TST^3, T^2ST^2, T^3ST, TST^2S^3, ST^2S^3T\}, \\
6C'_4 &= \{T, ST^2, T^2S, T^3S^2, TST, STS^3\}, \\
6C''_4 &= \{SR, TST^3R, T^2ST^2R, T^3STR, TST^2S, ST^2S^3TR\} = (6C_4) \cdot R, \\
6C'''_4 &= \{TR, ST^2R, T^2SR, T^3, TSTR, STS\} = (6C'_4) \cdot R, \\
8C_6 &= \{STR, TSR, (ST)^2R, (TS)^2R, TS^3T^2R, T^2ST^3R, \\
&\quad T^2S^3TR, T^3ST^2R\} = (8C_3) \cdot R.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.40}$$

Note that one half of these conjugacy classes can be written as the product of the other half with R . The group S'_4 has four singlet representations $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}', \widehat{\mathbf{1}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{1}}'$, two doublet representations $\mathbf{2}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}$, and four triplet representations $\mathbf{3}, \mathbf{3}', \widehat{\mathbf{3}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{3}}'$. The representation matrices of the generators S and T are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} : & \quad S = 1, & \quad T = 1, \\
\mathbf{1}' : & \quad S = -1, & \quad T = -1, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{1}} : & \quad S = i, & \quad T = -i, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{1}}' : & \quad S = -i, & \quad T = i, \\
\mathbf{2} : & \quad S = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \sqrt{3} \\ \sqrt{3} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} : & \quad S = \frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \sqrt{3} \\ \sqrt{3} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = -i \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{3} : & \quad S = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -1 & 1 \\ \sqrt{2} & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{3}' : & \quad S = -\frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -1 & 1 \\ \sqrt{2} & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = -\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{3}} : & \quad S = \frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -1 & 1 \\ \sqrt{2} & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = -i \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{3}}' : & \quad S = -\frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -1 & 1 \\ \sqrt{2} & 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = i \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & i & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -i \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.41}$$

In the unhatted representations $\mathbf{1}, \mathbf{1}', \mathbf{2}, \mathbf{3}$ and $\mathbf{3}'$, the generator $R = \mathbf{1}$ is an identity matrix so that S'_4 can not be distinguished from S_4 in these representations. We have the generator $R = -\mathbf{1}$ in the hatted representations $\widehat{\mathbf{1}}, \widehat{\mathbf{1}}', \widehat{\mathbf{2}}, \widehat{\mathbf{3}}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{3}}'$, these representations are novel and specific to S'_4 . The character table of S'_4 can be straightforwardly obtained from the representation matrices in Eq. (C.41), as shown in table 23. The Kronecker products

Classes	$1C_1$	$1C_2$	$3C_2$	$3C'_2$	$8C_3$	$6C_4$	$6C'_4$	$6C''_4$	$6C'''_4$	$8C_6$
G	1	R	T^2	T^2R	ST	S	T	SR	TR	STR
$\mathbf{1}$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$\mathbf{1}'$	1	1	1	1	1	-1	-1	-1	-1	1
$\widehat{\mathbf{1}}$	1	-1	-1	1	1	i	$-i$	$-i$	i	-1
$\widehat{\mathbf{1}}'$	1	-1	-1	1	1	$-i$	i	i	$-i$	-1
$\mathbf{2}$	2	2	2	2	-1	0	0	0	0	-1
$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}$	2	-2	-2	2	-1	0	0	0	0	1
$\mathbf{3}$	3	3	-1	-1	0	-1	1	-1	1	0
$\mathbf{3}'$	3	3	-1	-1	0	1	-1	1	-1	0
$\widehat{\mathbf{3}}$	3	-3	1	-1	0	$-i$	$-i$	i	i	0
$\widehat{\mathbf{3}}'$	3	-3	1	-1	0	i	i	$-i$	$-i$	0

Table 23. Character table of S'_4 , the representative element of each conjugacy class is given in the second row.

between different irreducible representations S'_4 read as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1} &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{1}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' = \mathbf{1}, & \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}} &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}, \\
\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}' &= \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}, & \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}', \\
\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{2} &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{2} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} = \mathbf{2}, & \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \mathbf{2} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \mathbf{2} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}, \\
\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} = \mathbf{3}, & \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{3}}, \\
\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{3}' &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' &= \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{3}}', \\
\mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2}, & \mathbf{2} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} &= \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}, \\
\mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{2} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} &= \mathbf{2} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}', \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} &= \mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}', \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}' &= \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} = \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' = \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}', & \mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' &= \mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} = \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}'. \quad (\text{C.42})
\end{aligned}$$

In the following, we report all CG coefficients of S'_4 in the form of $\alpha \otimes \beta$, we use $\alpha_i(\beta_i)$ to denote the component of the left (right) basis vector $\alpha(\beta)$. The notations **I**, **II** and **III** stand for singlet, doublet and triplet representations of S'_4 respectively.

• $\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{I} \rightarrow \mathbf{I}$,

$$\left. \begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1} &\rightarrow \mathbf{1}_s, & \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{1}' &\rightarrow \mathbf{1}' \\
\mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}} &\rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}}, & \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' &\rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \\
\mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{1}' &\rightarrow \mathbf{1}_s, & \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}} &\rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \\
\mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' &\rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}}, & \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}} &\rightarrow \mathbf{1}'_s \\
\widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' &\rightarrow \mathbf{1}, & \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' &\rightarrow \mathbf{1}'_s
\end{aligned} \right\} \text{with } \mathbf{I} \sim \alpha\beta$$

- $\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{II} \rightarrow \mathbf{II}$,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} n=0 \\ n=1 \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{2}}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \\ \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, \quad \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \rightarrow \mathbf{2}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \end{array} \right\} \text{with } \mathbf{II} \sim \alpha M^{(n)} \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \end{pmatrix},$$

where $M^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $M^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, and the same convention is adopted below.

- $\mathbf{I} \otimes \mathbf{III} \rightarrow \mathbf{III}$,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \mathbf{3}, \quad \mathbf{1} \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \mathbf{3}' \\ \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}, \quad \mathbf{1} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \\ \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \mathbf{3}', \quad \mathbf{1}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}', \quad \mathbf{1}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \mathbf{3}', \quad \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \mathbf{3} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}', \quad \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \mathbf{3}, \quad \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \mathbf{3}' \end{array} \right\} \text{with } \mathbf{III} \sim \alpha \begin{pmatrix} \beta_1 \\ \beta_2 \\ \beta_3 \end{pmatrix}$$

- $\mathbf{II} \otimes \mathbf{II} \rightarrow \mathbf{I}_1 \oplus \mathbf{I}_2 \oplus \mathbf{II}$,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} n=0 \\ n=1 \end{array} \right\} \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{2} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}'_a \oplus \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{2}_s \\ \mathbf{2} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{1}'_s \oplus \mathbf{2}_s \end{array} \right\} \text{with } \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{I}_1 \sim \alpha_1 \beta_2 - \alpha_2 \beta_1 \\ \mathbf{I}_2 \sim \alpha_1 \beta_1 + \alpha_2 \beta_2 \\ \mathbf{II} \sim M^{(n)} \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_1 \beta_1 + \alpha_2 \beta_2 \\ \alpha_1 \beta_2 + \alpha_2 \beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

- $\mathbf{II} \otimes \mathbf{III} \rightarrow \mathbf{III}_1 \oplus \mathbf{III}_2$,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \\ \mathbf{2} \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{3} \\ \mathbf{2} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \\ \mathbf{2} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{3} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \end{array} \right\} \text{with } \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{III}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1 \beta_1 \\ -\alpha_1 \beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2 \beta_3 \\ -\alpha_1 \beta_3 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2 \beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{III}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} -2\alpha_2 \beta_1 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1 \beta_3 + \alpha_2 \beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1 \beta_2 + \alpha_2 \beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array}$$

- $\mathbf{III} \otimes \mathbf{III} \rightarrow \mathbf{I} \oplus \mathbf{II} \oplus \mathbf{III}_1 \oplus \mathbf{III}_2$,

$$\left. \begin{array}{l}
n=0 \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{2}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_s \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \\
\mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{2}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_s \\
\mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \\
\widehat{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \mathbf{1} \oplus \mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \\
\\
n=1 \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}' \rightarrow \mathbf{1}' \oplus \mathbf{2} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{3} \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \\
\mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \widehat{\mathbf{1}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{3}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}} \rightarrow \mathbf{1}'_s \oplus \mathbf{2}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_s \\
\widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{3}}' \rightarrow \mathbf{1}'_s \oplus \mathbf{2}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_s
\end{array} \right\} \text{with} \begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{I} \sim \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_2 \\
\mathbf{II} \sim M^{(n)} \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{III}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{III}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_3\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_1\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_1 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix}
\end{array}$$

C.3.1 Integer weight modular forms of level 4

The linear space spanned by the weight k modular forms at level 4 has dimension $2k + 1$, and a general vector $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(4))$ in the linear space can be explicitly constructed by using the theta constants [172]:

$$\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(4)) = \sum_{m+n=2k, m, n \geq 0} c_{mn} \theta_2^m(\tau) \theta_3^n(\tau), \quad (\text{C.43})$$

where c_{mn} are general complex coefficients and the theta constants is defined as

$$\begin{aligned}
\theta_2(\tau) &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{2\pi i \tau (m+1/2)^2} = 2q^{1/4} (1 + q^2 + q^6 + q^{12} + \dots), \\
\theta_3(\tau) &= \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{2\pi i \tau m^2} = 1 + 2q + 2q^4 + 2q^9 + 2q^{16} + \dots
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.44})$$

Hence the weight k modular forms of level 4 can be expressed as the homogeneous polynomials of degree $2k$ in θ_1 and θ_2 . In the following, we report the explicit expressions of the S'_4 modular multiplets up to weight 6 in the working basis of Eq. (C.41). We prefer to use $\vartheta_1(\tau) = \theta_3(\tau)$, $\vartheta_2(\tau) = -\theta_2(\tau)$ since $\vartheta_1(\tau)$ and $\vartheta_2(\tau)$ turns out to be one-half weight modular forms and they form a doublet of the metaplectic cover of S'_4 [172].

- $k_Y = 1$

$$Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}'}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\vartheta_1\vartheta_2 \\ -\vartheta_2^2 \\ \vartheta_1^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{C.45})$$

- $k_Y = 2$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\mathbf{2}}^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4 \\ -2\sqrt{3}\vartheta_1^2\vartheta_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_1^4 - \vartheta_2^4 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1^3\vartheta_2 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1\vartheta_2^3 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.46})$$

- $k_Y = 3$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{1}'}}^{(3)} &= \vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 (\vartheta_1^4 - \vartheta_2^4), \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(3)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 4\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1^3 \vartheta_2^3 \\ \vartheta_1^6 + 3\vartheta_1^2 \vartheta_2^4 \\ -\vartheta_2^2 (3\vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}'}}^{(3)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 (\vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4) \\ \vartheta_2^6 - 5\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^2 \\ 5\vartheta_1^2 \vartheta_2^4 - \vartheta_1^6 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.47}$$

- $k_Y = 4$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{1}}}^{(4)} &= \vartheta_1^8 + 14\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 + \vartheta_2^8, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(4)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_1^8 - 10\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 + \vartheta_2^8 \\ 4\sqrt{3}\vartheta_1^2 \vartheta_2^2 (\vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(4)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_2^8 - \vartheta_1^8 \\ \sqrt{2}\vartheta_2 (\vartheta_1^7 + 7\vartheta_1^3 \vartheta_2^4) \\ \sqrt{2}\vartheta_1 (\vartheta_2^7 + 7\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^3) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}'}}^{(4)} &= \vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 (\vartheta_1^4 - \vartheta_2^4) \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 \\ -\vartheta_2^2 \\ \vartheta_1^2 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.48}$$

- $k_Y = 5$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(5)} &= \vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 (\vartheta_1^4 - \vartheta_2^4) \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{3}\vartheta_1^2 \vartheta_2^2 \\ \vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}}}^{(5)} &= \begin{pmatrix} -8\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1^3 \vartheta_2^3 (\vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4) \\ \vartheta_1^2 (\vartheta_1^8 - 14\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 - 3\vartheta_2^8) \\ \vartheta_2^2 (3\vartheta_1^8 + 14\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 - \vartheta_2^8) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}'I}}^{(5)} &= \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 (\vartheta_1^8 - 10\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 + \vartheta_2^8) \\ \vartheta_2^2 (13\vartheta_1^8 + 2\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 + \vartheta_2^8) \\ -\vartheta_1^2 (\vartheta_1^8 + 2\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 + 13\vartheta_2^8) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{3}'II}}^{(5)} &= (\vartheta_1^8 + 14\vartheta_1^4 \vartheta_2^4 + \vartheta_2^8) \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\vartheta_1 \vartheta_2 \\ -\vartheta_2^2 \\ \vartheta_1^2 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.49}$$

- $k_Y = 6$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(6)} &= \vartheta_1^{12} - 33\vartheta_1^8\vartheta_2^4 - 33\vartheta_1^4\vartheta_2^8 + \vartheta_2^{12}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{1}'}^{(6)} &= \vartheta_1^2\vartheta_2^2(\vartheta_1^4 - \vartheta_2^4)^2, \\
Y_{\mathbf{2}}^{(6)} &= (\vartheta_1^8 + 14\vartheta_1^4\vartheta_2^4 + \vartheta_2^8) \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4 \\ -2\sqrt{3}\vartheta_1^2\vartheta_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)} &= \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_1^{12} - 11\vartheta_1^8\vartheta_2^4 + 11\vartheta_1^4\vartheta_2^8 - \vartheta_2^{12} \\ -\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1^3\vartheta_2(\vartheta_1^8 - 22\vartheta_1^4\vartheta_2^4 - 11\vartheta_2^8) \\ \sqrt{2}\vartheta_1\vartheta_2^3(11\vartheta_1^8 + 22\vartheta_1^4\vartheta_2^4 - \vartheta_2^8) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)} &= (\vartheta_1^8 + 14\vartheta_2^4\vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^8) \begin{pmatrix} \vartheta_1^4 - \vartheta_2^4 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1^3\vartheta_2 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1\vartheta_2^3 \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(6)} &= \vartheta_1\vartheta_2(\vartheta_1^4 - \vartheta_2^4) \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{2}\vartheta_1\vartheta_2(\vartheta_1^4 + \vartheta_2^4) \\ \vartheta_2^6 - 5\vartheta_1^4\vartheta_2^2 \\ 5\vartheta_1^2\vartheta_2^4 - \vartheta_1^6 \end{pmatrix}. \tag{C.50}
\end{aligned}$$

The above modular forms of level 4 are listed in table 22. The higher weight modular forms can be constructed from the tensor products of the above modular multiplets.

C.4 $N = 5$

The finite modular group Γ_5' which is the double covering of the icosahedral group A_5 , can be generated by three generators S , T and R which obey the following rules,

$$S^2 = R, \quad T^5 = (ST)^3 = R^2 = 1, \quad RT = TR, \tag{C.51}$$

or equivalently

$$S^4 = T^5 = (ST)^3 = 1, \quad S^2T = TS^2. \tag{C.52}$$

The group A_5 is reproduced by setting $R = 1$. The group A_5' has 120 elements which is twice as many elements as A_5 , and all the elements can be divided into the 9 conjugacy classes as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
1C_1 &= \{1\}, \\
1C_2 &= \{R\} = (1C_1) \cdot R, \\
20C_3 &= \{ST, TS, S^3T^4, T^4S^3, T^2ST^4, T^2S^3T^2, T^3ST^3, T^3S^3T, T^4ST^2, TS^3T^3, \\
&\quad T^2ST^3S, T^3ST^2S, ST^2ST^3, ST^3ST^2, S^3T^3ST, TST^3S^3, S^3T^2ST^4, \\
&\quad T^4ST^2S^3, ST^2ST^2S, TST^3ST\}, \\
30C_4 &= \{S, SR, T^2ST^3, T^2ST^3R, T^3ST^2, T^3ST^2R, T^4ST, T^4STR, TST^4, TST^4R, \\
&\quad ST^2ST, ST^2STR, TST^2S, TST^2SR, ST^3ST^2S, ST^3ST^2SR, ST^2ST^3S, ST^2ST^3SR, \\
&\quad T^2ST^3ST^2, T^2ST^3ST^2R, T^3ST^3ST, T^3ST^3STR, TST^3ST^3, TST^3ST^3R, \\
&\quad ST^2ST^3ST, ST^2ST^3STR, TST^3ST^2S, TST^3ST^2SR, T^2ST^3ST^2S, T^2ST^3ST^2SR\},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
12C_5 &= \{T, T^4, T^3S, ST^3, S^3T^2, T^2S^3, T^2ST, TST^2, S^3TS, TS^3T, T^3S^3T^4, T^4S^3T^3\}, \\
12C'_5 &= \{T^2, T^3, S^3T^2S, S^3T^3S, T^2ST^2S, ST^2ST^2, T^3ST^3S, ST^3ST^3, T^2ST^3ST, \\
&\quad TST^3ST^2, T^3ST^2ST^4, T^4ST^2ST^3\}, \\
20C_6 &= \{STR, TSR, S^3T^4R, T^4S^3R, T^2ST^4R, T^2S^3T^2R, T^3ST^3R, T^3S^3TR, T^4ST^2R, \\
&\quad TS^3T^3R, T^2ST^3SR, T^3ST^2SR, ST^2ST^3R, ST^3ST^2R, S^3T^3STR, TST^3S^3R, \\
&\quad S^3T^2ST^4R, T^4ST^2S^3R, ST^2ST^2SR, TST^3STR\} = (20C_3) \cdot R, \\
12C_{10} &= \{TR, T^4R, T^3SR, ST^3R, S^3T^2R, T^2S^3R, T^2STR, TST^2R, S^3TSR, TS^3TR, \\
&\quad T^3S^3T^4R, T^4S^3T^3R\} = (12C_5) \cdot R, \\
12C'_{10} &= \{T^2R, T^3R, S^3T^2SR, S^3T^3SR, T^2ST^2SR, ST^2ST^2R, T^3ST^3SR, ST^3ST^3R, \\
&\quad T^2ST^3STR, TST^3ST^2R, T^3ST^2ST^4R, T^4ST^2ST^3R\} = (12C'_5) \cdot R. \tag{C.53}
\end{aligned}$$

The number of conjugacy classes is the same as the inequivalent irreducible representations. In addition to the five inequivalent irreducible representations **1**, **3**, **3'**, **4**, **5** of the A_5 group, A'_5 has four inequivalent representations $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}'$, $\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{6}}$. The explicit forms of the generators

S and T in each of the irreducible representations are given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1} : & \quad S = 1, & \quad T = 1, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} : & \quad S = i\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}\phi}} \begin{pmatrix} \phi & 1 \\ 1 & -\phi \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_5^2 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_5^3 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' : & \quad S = i\sqrt{\frac{1}{\sqrt{5}\phi}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \phi \\ \phi & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_5 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_5^4 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{3} : & \quad S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -\sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2} \\ -\sqrt{2} & -\phi & \frac{1}{\phi} \\ -\sqrt{2} & \frac{1}{\phi} & -\phi \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_5 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_5^4 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{3}' : & \quad S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} \\ \sqrt{2} & -\frac{1}{\phi} & \phi \\ \sqrt{2} & \phi & -\frac{1}{\phi} \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_5^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_5^3 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{4} : & \quad S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \frac{1}{\phi} & \phi & -1 \\ \frac{1}{\phi} & -1 & 1 & \phi \\ \phi & 1 & -1 & \frac{1}{\phi} \\ -1 & \phi & \frac{1}{\phi} & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_5^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_5^3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_5^4 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}' : & \quad S = i\sqrt{\frac{1}{5\sqrt{5}\phi}} \begin{pmatrix} -\phi^2 & \sqrt{3}\phi & -\sqrt{3} & -\frac{1}{\phi} \\ \sqrt{3}\phi & \frac{1}{\phi} & -\phi^2 & -\sqrt{3} \\ -\sqrt{3} & -\phi^2 & -\frac{1}{\phi} & -\sqrt{3}\phi \\ -\frac{1}{\phi} & -\sqrt{3} & -\sqrt{3}\phi & \phi^2 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} \omega_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_5^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_5^3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_5^4 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\mathbf{5} : & \quad S = \frac{1}{5} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \sqrt{6} & \sqrt{6} & \sqrt{6} & \sqrt{6} \\ \sqrt{6} & \frac{1}{\phi^2} & -2\phi & \frac{2}{\phi} & \phi^2 \\ \sqrt{6} & -2\phi & \phi^2 & \frac{1}{\phi^2} & \frac{2}{\phi} \\ \sqrt{6} & \frac{2}{\phi} & \frac{1}{\phi^2} & \phi^2 & -2\phi \\ \sqrt{6} & \phi^2 & \frac{2}{\phi} & -2\phi & \frac{1}{\phi^2} \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \omega_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_5^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_5^3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_5^4 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}} : & \quad S = i\sqrt{\frac{1}{5\sqrt{5}\phi}} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & \phi & \frac{1}{\phi} & \sqrt{2}\phi & \sqrt{2} & \phi^2 \\ \phi & 1 & \phi^2 & \sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2}\phi & -\frac{1}{\phi} \\ \frac{1}{\phi} & \phi^2 & 1 & -\sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2}\phi & -\phi \\ \sqrt{2}\phi & \sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2} & -\phi & -1 & \sqrt{2}\phi \\ \sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2}\phi & \sqrt{2}\phi & -1 & \phi & \sqrt{2} \\ \phi^2 & -\frac{1}{\phi} & -\phi & \sqrt{2}\phi & \sqrt{2} & -1 \end{pmatrix}, & \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \omega_5 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_5^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_5^3 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \omega_5^4 \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{C.54}$$

where $\phi = (1 + \sqrt{5})/2$ is the golden ratio, and ω_5 is the quintic unit root $\omega_5 = e^{2\pi i/5}$. In the single-valued representations $\mathbf{1}$, $\mathbf{3}$, $\mathbf{3}'$, $\mathbf{4}$ and $\mathbf{5}$, the generator R is represented by the identity matrix $\mathbf{1}$, and the elements of A_5' are described by the same set of matrices which represent the elements in A_5 , consequently the group A_5' can not be distinguished from the group A_5 with these representations. The generator R is -1 in the double-valued representations $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}$, $\widehat{\mathbf{2}}'$, $\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{6}}$. Taking trace of the representation matrices, the character table of the A_5' group can be obtained and shown in table 24. From the character table, one can straightforwardly calculate the multiplication rules of the irreducible representations as follows,

Classes	$1C_1$	$1C_2$	$20C_3$	$30C_4$	$12C_5$	$12C'_5$	$12C''_5$	$20C_6$	$12C_{10}$
G	1	R	ST	S	T	T^2	S^3T	RT	T^2R
$\mathbf{1}$	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1
$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}$	2	-2	-1	0	$-\phi$	$\frac{1}{\phi}$	1	ϕ	$-\frac{1}{\phi}$
$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}'$	2	-2	-1	0	$\frac{1}{\phi}$	$-\phi$	1	$-\frac{1}{\phi}$	ϕ
$\mathbf{3}$	3	3	0	-1	ϕ	$-\frac{1}{\phi}$	0	ϕ	$-\frac{1}{\phi}$
$\mathbf{3}'$	3	3	0	-1	$-\frac{1}{\phi}$	ϕ	0	$-\frac{1}{\phi}$	ϕ
$\mathbf{4}$	4	4	1	0	-1	-1	1	-1	-1
$\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'$	4	-4	1	0	-1	-1	-1	1	1
$\mathbf{5}$	5	5	-1	1	0	0	-1	0	0
$\widehat{\mathbf{6}}$	6	-6	0	0	1	1	0	-1	-1

Table 24. Character table of A'_5 , where G stands for the representative element of each conjugacy class.

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} &= \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_s, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' &= \mathbf{4}, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}', & \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3}' &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{6}}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{4} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' &= \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{5}, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{5} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{5} = \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{4} = \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5}, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' &= \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_s, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}', \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{4} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' &= \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{5}, & \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{4} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5}, \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} &= \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_s, & \mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}' &= \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5}, & \mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}, \\
\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{5} &= \mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{5} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5}, & \mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2, \\
\mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' &= \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_s, & \mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}, & \mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2, \\
\mathbf{4} \otimes \mathbf{4} &= \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{5}_s, & \mathbf{4} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' &= \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2, \\
\mathbf{4} \otimes \mathbf{5} &= \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5}_1 \oplus \mathbf{5}_2, & \mathbf{4} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_2 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' &= \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}'_s \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{5}_a, & \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \otimes \mathbf{5} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4}_1 \oplus \mathbf{4}_2 \oplus \mathbf{5}_1 \oplus \mathbf{5}_2, \\
\mathbf{5} \otimes \mathbf{5} &= \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{4}_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_{1,s} \oplus \mathbf{5}_{2,s}, \\
\mathbf{5} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_2 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_3, \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_{1,s} \oplus \mathbf{3}_{2,s} \oplus \mathbf{3}'_{1,s} \oplus \mathbf{3}'_{2,s} \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{4}_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_{1,s} \oplus \mathbf{5}_{2,a} \oplus \mathbf{5}_{3,a}, \tag{C.55}
\end{aligned}$$

where the subscripts **s** and **a** denote symmetric and antisymmetric combinations respectively. For the product decomposition $\mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2$, $\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2$ refer to the two sextet representations appearing in the tensor products of $\mathbf{3}$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{6}}$, and similar notations are adopted for other tensor products. We now list the Clebsch-Gordan coefficients which are quite useful in model construction. we use α_i to indicate the elements of the first representation of the product and β_i to indicate those of the second representation.

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}} = \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_s \text{ with } \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}_a \sim \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \mathbf{3}_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.56})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' = \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.57})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \text{ with } \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.58})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.59})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{4} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_3 + \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_3 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.60})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 + \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.61})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \mathbf{5} = \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_2\beta_4 + \alpha_1\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 - 2\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -2\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \alpha_2\beta_3 - 2\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ -2\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.62})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \mathbf{3}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_1\beta_5 \\ \alpha_2\beta_6 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \alpha_1\beta_6 \\ \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_5 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 - 2\alpha_1\beta_6 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_6 - 2\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + 2\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 - 2\alpha_2\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.63})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' = \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_s \text{ with } \begin{cases} \mathbf{1}_a \sim \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \mathbf{3}'_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.64})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{3} = \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.65})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \text{ with } \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.66})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{4} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.67})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' = \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \mathbf{3}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ -2\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ -2\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.68})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \mathbf{5} = \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ -2\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_5 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 3\alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ 3\alpha_2\beta_2 + \alpha_1\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_1 + 2\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 - 2\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.69})$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \begin{cases} \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 \\ \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_6 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ 3\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_3 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_6 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 - 3\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C.70})$$

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3} = \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_s \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{1}_s \sim \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \mathbf{3}_a \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5}_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.71})$$

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_3\beta_3 \\ -\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.72})$$

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{4} = \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{3}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 \\ 3\alpha_3\beta_3 + \alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - 3\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ -2\alpha_2\beta_3 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.73})$$

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} -3\alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_2 \\ -2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_3 + 3\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 \\ -2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_2 - 2\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_3 - 2\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.74})$$

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \mathbf{5} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_5 - 2\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{3}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \alpha_1\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_3\beta_3 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - 3\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ 3\alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 - 2\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_4 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 - 2\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 + \alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.75})$$

$$\mathbf{3} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ -\alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 - 2\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_5 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_6 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - 2\alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 + \alpha_1\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_6 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.76})$$

$$\mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{3}' = \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_s \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{1}_s \sim \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \mathbf{3}'_a \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5}_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.77})$$

$$\mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{4} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5} \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_3 - 3\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 + 2\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ -2\alpha_2\beta_1 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ 3\alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.78})$$

$$\mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_3 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_4 - 3\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 + 3\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_3\beta_2 - 3\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ 3\alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_4 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.79})$$

$$\mathbf{3}' \otimes \mathbf{5} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5} \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_3 + \alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{3}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 - 2\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 + 3\alpha_2\beta_5 - 2\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_2 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_3 - 3\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - 2\alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.80})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{3}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \quad \text{with} \quad & \left\{ \begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_3\beta_6 \\ \alpha_1\beta_5 + \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}' &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_6 - 3\alpha_2\beta_2 - 2\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ 3\alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 - 2\alpha_1\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \alpha_2\beta_5 - \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \alpha_3\beta_6 - \alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_3\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_4 - \alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 + \alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{C.81}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{4} \otimes \mathbf{4} = \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{5}_s \quad \text{with} \quad & \left\{ \begin{aligned}
\mathbf{1}_s &\sim \alpha_4\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_3 \\
\mathbf{3}_a &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{3}'_a &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_1\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{4}_s &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_3\beta_3 + \alpha_4\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_4\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \alpha_4\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + \alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{5}_s &\sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix}
\end{aligned} \right. \tag{C.82}
\end{aligned}$$

$$\mathbf{4} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' = \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \alpha_4\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_4\beta_1 \\ \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_1 - 2\alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 + 2\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_2 - 2\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_3 - 2\alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.83})$$

$$\mathbf{4} \otimes \mathbf{5} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4} \oplus \mathbf{5}_1 \oplus \mathbf{5}_2 \text{ with } \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_5 + 3\alpha_3\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_4 - 2\alpha_3\beta_2 - 3\alpha_2\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{3}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ 2\alpha_4\beta_4 + 3\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 - 2\alpha_1\beta_3 - 3\alpha_4\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_1 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} 4\alpha_3\beta_3 + 2\alpha_1\beta_5 + 2\alpha_4\beta_2 + 4\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ 4\alpha_1\beta_1 + 2\sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ 2\sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_4 + 2\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ 2\alpha_3\beta_1 + 2\sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ 4\alpha_4\beta_1 + 2\sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.84})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{4} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} &= \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}_1' \\
&\quad \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}_2' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2
\end{aligned}
\quad \text{with} \quad
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 + \alpha_3\beta_6 - \alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_4\beta_6 + \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_3\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_4\beta_4 + \alpha_3\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}_1' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_6 - \alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_6 \\ \alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_4\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}_2' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + 2\alpha_3\beta_6 - \alpha_2\beta_1 - 2\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + 2\alpha_4\beta_6 + \alpha_3\beta_2 + 2\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ -\alpha_3\beta_4 - \alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 \\ \alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_6 - \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_4\beta_6 - \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \alpha_1\beta_5 + \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 \\ \alpha_2\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 \\ 2\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ -2\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix}
\end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.85})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}_1' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{4}}_1' &= \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}'_s \\
&\quad \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{5}_a
\end{aligned}
\quad \text{with} \quad
\left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{1}_a \sim \alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\
\mathbf{3}_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} 3\alpha_4\beta_1 + 3\alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{3}'_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_4\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_4 - 3\alpha_3\beta_2 - 3\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{4}_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_4\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_4\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_3\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{5}_a \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 \end{pmatrix}
\end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.86})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \otimes \mathbf{5} = & \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \\
& \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2
\end{aligned}
\quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 - 2\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \alpha_4\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + 2\alpha_1\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - 2\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 + \alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_4\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \alpha_3\beta_5 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 + 2\alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix}
\end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.87})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}' \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = \mathbf{3} \oplus \mathbf{3}' \oplus \mathbf{4}_1 \\
\oplus \mathbf{4}_2 \oplus \mathbf{5}_1 \oplus \mathbf{5}_2 \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{3} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1\beta_6 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_4\beta_4 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_5 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{3}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_3 + 2\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_6 \\ 3\alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_5 - \alpha_3\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_6 + 3\alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{4}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_6 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_4\beta_6 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 \\ -\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{4}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 - 2\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 - 2\alpha_3\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_6 + 2\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_2 - 2\alpha_3\beta_1 \\ -\sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_3\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{5}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_3\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_6 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_6 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{5}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_6 \\ 2\alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_4\beta_6 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 - 2\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix}
\end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.88})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{5} \otimes \mathbf{5} = & \mathbf{1}_s \oplus \mathbf{3}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}'_a \\
& \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{4}_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_{1,s} \\
& \oplus \mathbf{5}_{2,s}
\end{aligned}
\quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\mathbf{1}_s \sim \alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_5\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_5 + \alpha_4\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_4 \\
\mathbf{3}_a \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\alpha_4\beta_3 + \alpha_2\beta_5 - \alpha_5\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{3}'_a \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_4\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 + 2\alpha_2\beta_5 - 2\alpha_5\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{4}_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} 4\alpha_4\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_5\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_5 \\ 4\alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \alpha_5\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_5 \\ 4\alpha_5\beta_5 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_4 - \alpha_3\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_3 \\ 4\alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_4\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{4}_a \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{5}_{1,s} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_5\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_5 - 2\alpha_4\beta_3 - 2\alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 - 2\alpha_3\beta_1 - 2\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_5 - 2\alpha_4\beta_1 - 2\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \alpha_5\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_5 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\
\mathbf{5}_{2,s} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_1\beta_1 + \alpha_4\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\alpha_5\beta_2 - 2\alpha_2\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_4 - 2\alpha_2\beta_1 - 2\alpha_1\beta_2 \\ \alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \alpha_4\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_3 - 2\alpha_5\beta_1 - 2\alpha_1\beta_5 \end{pmatrix}
\end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.89})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathbf{5} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = & \widehat{\mathbf{2}} \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_1 \\
& \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_2 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \\
& \oplus \widehat{\mathbf{6}}_3 \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l}
\widehat{\mathbf{2}} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_4\beta_6 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 - 2\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_5 \\ 2\alpha_4\beta_1 + \alpha_3\beta_3 + 2\alpha_5\beta_6 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{2}}' \sim \begin{pmatrix} 3\alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_2\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_4 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 - 2\alpha_3\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_6 + 3\alpha_5\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 + 2\alpha_4\beta_3 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \alpha_5\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_6 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 - 2\alpha_2\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \alpha_4\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - 2\alpha_5\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_4 - \alpha_5\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_6 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_3 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_6 \\ \alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_3 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 + \alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_6 - 2\alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_3 - 2\alpha_1\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_4 + \alpha_1\beta_6 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_1 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_2 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_3 - 2\alpha_3\beta_5 - \alpha_4\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_2 + 2\alpha_4\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 - \alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 + 2\alpha_5\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \alpha_4\beta_6 + 2\alpha_3\beta_2 + 2\alpha_2\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_1 \\ 2\alpha_5\beta_6 - 2\alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_4\beta_2 - \alpha_3\beta_3 \\ \alpha_3\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_2 + 2\alpha_2\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\
\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_3 \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_6 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_4 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_6 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_1 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_2 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_6 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_2 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_5 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix}
\end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.90})
\end{aligned}$$

$$\widehat{\mathbf{6}} \otimes \widehat{\mathbf{6}} = \mathbf{1}_a \oplus \mathbf{3}_{1,s} \oplus \mathbf{3}_{2,s} \oplus \mathbf{3}'_{1,s} \oplus \mathbf{3}'_{2,s} \oplus \mathbf{4}_s \oplus \mathbf{4}_a \oplus \mathbf{5}_{1,s} \oplus \mathbf{5}_{2,a} \oplus \mathbf{5}_{3,a} \quad \text{with} \quad \left\{ \begin{array}{l} \mathbf{1}_a \sim \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_6\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_6 + \alpha_5\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \mathbf{3}_{1,s} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_6\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_6 - \alpha_2\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_5\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{3}_{2,s} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_2\beta_2 + 2\alpha_5\beta_4 + 2\alpha_4\beta_5 - 2\alpha_1\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - 2\alpha_6\beta_4 - 2\alpha_4\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 - 2\alpha_5\beta_3 - 2\alpha_3\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{3}'_{1,s} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_2 + \alpha_6\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_6 \\ \alpha_6\beta_5 + \alpha_5\beta_6 - \alpha_4\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_4 \\ -\alpha_5\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_5 - \alpha_4\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{3}'_{2,s} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_2\beta_2 - \alpha_1\beta_1 - \alpha_6\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_6 - \alpha_5\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_5 \\ \alpha_4\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - \alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_6 + \alpha_5\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_5 + \alpha_5\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4}_s \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_1 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_6\beta_4 + \alpha_4\beta_6 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_5 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_3 - 3\alpha_4\beta_1 - 3\alpha_1\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_6\beta_5 - \alpha_5\beta_6 \\ 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_6 + \alpha_5\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_5 - 3\alpha_5\beta_2 - 3\alpha_2\beta_5 - \alpha_4\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_1 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_2 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_6 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_4 - \alpha_5\beta_3 - \alpha_3\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{4}_a \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_4\beta_6 - \alpha_6\beta_4 \\ \alpha_4\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_4 + \alpha_2\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_2 + \alpha_6\beta_5 - \alpha_5\beta_6 \\ \alpha_5\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_5 + \alpha_5\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_5 + \alpha_3\beta_4 - \alpha_4\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_6 + \alpha_3\beta_5 - \alpha_5\beta_3 \\ -\sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5}_{1,s} \sim \begin{pmatrix} 2\alpha_5\beta_5 + \alpha_3\beta_1 + \alpha_1\beta_3 + \alpha_3\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_6 \\ 2\alpha_3\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_4 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_5 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_6 \\ 2\alpha_6\beta_6 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_3 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_5 \\ 2\alpha_4\beta_4 + \alpha_6\beta_2 + \alpha_2\beta_6 - \alpha_6\beta_1 - \alpha_1\beta_6 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_3 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_5 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5}_{2,a} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \alpha_1\beta_2 - \alpha_2\beta_1 + 2\alpha_5\beta_4 - 2\alpha_4\beta_5 + \alpha_3\beta_6 - \alpha_6\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_4 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_6\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_4 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_4\beta_3 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_5\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_6 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_6\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \\ \mathbf{5}_{3,a} \sim \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2}\alpha_2\beta_1 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_1\beta_2 + \sqrt{2}\alpha_5\beta_4 - \sqrt{2}\alpha_4\beta_5 + 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_3\beta_6 - 2\sqrt{2}\alpha_6\beta_3 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_1 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_3 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_3\beta_2 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_6\beta_4 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_6 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_1 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_4 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_4\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_4 \\ \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_2 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_2\beta_5 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_1\beta_5 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_1 \\ \sqrt{3}\alpha_6\beta_1 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_1\beta_6 + \sqrt{6}\alpha_5\beta_3 - \sqrt{6}\alpha_3\beta_5 + \sqrt{3}\alpha_2\beta_6 - \sqrt{3}\alpha_6\beta_2 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right. \quad (\text{C.91})$$

C.4.1 Integer weight modular forms of level 5

The linear space of modular forms of positive integer weight k and level 5 has dimension $5k+1$. A general vector $\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(5))$ in the linear space can be explicitly constructed through the Dedekind eta-function and Klein form as follow [153, 165]:

$$\mathcal{M}_k(\Gamma(5)) = \sum_{m+n=5k, m,n \geq 0} c_{mn} \frac{\eta^{15k}(5\tau)}{\eta^{3k}(\tau)} \mathfrak{F}_{\frac{1}{5},0}^m(5\tau) \mathfrak{F}_{\frac{2}{5},0}^n(5\tau), \quad (\text{C.92})$$

where the Dedekind eta-function $\eta(\tau)$ is defined in Eq. (4.19) and Klein form $\mathfrak{k}_{(r_1, r_2)}(\tau)$ is given by [160, 167–169]:

$$\mathfrak{k}_{(r_1, r_2)}(\tau) = q_z^{(r_1-1)/2} (1 - q_z) \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n q_z) (1 - q^n q_z^{-1}) (1 - q^n)^{-2}, \quad (\text{C.93})$$

with $q_z = e^{2\pi iz}$ and $z = r_1\tau + r_2$. From Eq. (C.92), we know that the modular space of level 5 can be generated by $F_1(\tau)$ and $F_2(\tau)$,

$$F_1(\tau) = \frac{\eta^3(5\tau)\mathfrak{k}_{\frac{2}{5},0}(5\tau)}{\eta(\tau)^{3/5}}, \quad F_2(\tau) = \frac{\eta^3(5\tau)\mathfrak{k}_{\frac{1}{5},0}(5\tau)}{\eta(\tau)^{3/5}}, \quad (\text{C.94})$$

which turn out to be weight $1/5$ modular forms of level 5 [165, 179]. Each modular form of integer weight k and level 5 can be written as a polynomial of degree $5k$ in $F_1(\tau)$ and $F_2(\tau)$:

$$\sum_{n=0}^{5k} c_n F_1^n(\tau) F_2^{5k-n}(\tau). \quad (\text{C.95})$$

Because $F_1(\tau)$ and $F_2(\tau)$ are algebraically independent, all terms in above polynomial are linearly independent, and obviously the number of independent terms matches with the correct dimension $5k + 1$. Without loss of generality, we can choose a set of basis vectors of the weight 1 modular space as

$$F_1^5(\tau), \quad F_1^4(\tau)F_2(\tau), \quad F_1^3(\tau)F_2^2(\tau), \quad F_1^2(\tau)F_2^3(\tau), \quad F_1(\tau)F_2^4(\tau), \quad F_2^5(\tau). \quad (\text{C.96})$$

In the representation basis of Eq. (C.54), the above six modular forms can be organized into a six dimensional representation $\widehat{\mathbf{6}}$ of $\Gamma'_5 = A'_5$:

$$Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)}(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} F_1^5 + 2F_2^5 \\ 2F_1^5 - F_2^5 \\ 5F_1^4 F_2 \\ 5\sqrt{2}F_1^3 F_2^2 \\ -5\sqrt{2}F_1^2 F_2^3 \\ 5F_1 F_2^4 \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} Y_1(\tau) \\ Y_2(\tau) \\ Y_3(\tau) \\ Y_4(\tau) \\ Y_5(\tau) \\ Y_6(\tau) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{C.97})$$

which fulfills the identities in Eqs. (4.13,4.14). The q -expansion of the modular forms $Y_{1,2,3,4,5,6}$ reads as

$$\begin{aligned} Y_1(\tau) &= 1 + 5q + 10q^3 - 5q^4 + 5q^5 + 10q^6 + 5q^9 + \dots, \\ Y_2(\tau) &= 2 + 5q + 10q^2 + 5q^4 + 5q^5 + 10q^6 + 10q^7 - 5q^9 + \dots, \\ Y_3(\tau) &= 5q^{1/5} (1 + 2q + 2q^2 + q^3 + 2q^4 + 2q^5 + 2q^6 + q^7 + 2q^8 + 2q^9 + \dots), \\ Y_4(\tau) &= 5\sqrt{2}q^{2/5} (1 + q + q^2 + q^3 + 2q^4 + q^6 + q^7 + 2q^8 + q^9 + \dots), \\ Y_5(\tau) &= -5\sqrt{2}q^{3/5} (1 + q^2 + q^3 + q^4 - q^5 + 2q^6 + q^8 + q^9 + \dots), \\ Y_6(\tau) &= 5q^{4/5} (1 - q + 2q^2 + 2q^6 - 2q^7 + 2q^8 + q^9 + \dots). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C.98})$$

The higher weight modular forms can be constructed from tensor products of $Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)}(\tau)$. For example, there are 11 independent weight 2 modular forms of level 5, which can be decomposed into two triplets and a quintet transforming in the $\mathbf{3}$, $\mathbf{3}'$ and $\mathbf{5}$ irreducible representations of A'_5 . Without loss of generality we can choose the weight 2 and level 5 modular forms as

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)})_{\mathbf{3}_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} -2(Y_1 Y_2 + Y_4 Y_5 - Y_3 Y_6) \\ \sqrt{2}(Y_5^2 - 2Y_2 Y_3) \\ -\sqrt{2}(Y_4^2 + 2Y_1 Y_6) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(2)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)})_{\mathbf{3}'_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} 2(Y_1 Y_2 + Y_3 Y_6) \\ 2Y_5 Y_6 - 2Y_2 Y_4 \\ -2(Y_3 Y_4 + Y_1 Y_5) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)})_{\mathbf{5}_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{6}(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \\ 2(Y_5^2 + Y_1 Y_3 + Y_2 Y_3 + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_6) \\ 2(Y_3^2 + \sqrt{2}(Y_2 Y_4 + Y_5 Y_6)) \\ 2(Y_6^2 + \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_4 - \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_5) \\ 2(Y_4^2 - \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_5 + (Y_2 - Y_1) Y_6) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C.99}$$

The linear space of modular forms of weight $k = 3$ and level 5 has dimension $5k + 1 = 16$, and they can be decomposed into a quartet and two sextets transforming as $\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'$ and $\widehat{\mathbf{6}}$ under A'_5 ,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'}^{(3)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(2)})_{\widehat{\mathbf{4}}'} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{6} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(2)} - \sqrt{3} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(2)} + \sqrt{6} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(2)} \\ -2Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(2)} + Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(2)} - 3Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(2)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(2)} \\ -2Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(2)} - Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(2)} + (3Y_1 + Y_2) Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(2)} \\ -\sqrt{6} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(2)} - \sqrt{6} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(2)} + \sqrt{3} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}I}}^{(3)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)})_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_1} = \begin{pmatrix} -Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} - \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2)} \\ Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} + \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2)} \\ Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} - \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2)} \\ \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} \\ Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2)} \\ \sqrt{2} Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2)} - Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}II}}^{(3)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)})_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}_3} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{5},1}^{(2)} + \sqrt{3} \left(Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{5},2}^{(2)} - \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{5},3}^{(2)} - \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{5},4}^{(2)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{5},5}^{(2)} \right) \\ \sqrt{2} Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{5},1}^{(2)} + \sqrt{3} \left(Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{5},2}^{(2)} - \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{5},3}^{(2)} + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{5},4}^{(2)} - Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{5},5}^{(2)} \right) \\ \sqrt{3} \left(Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{5},2}^{(2)} - Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{5},2}^{(2)} + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{5},5}^{(2)} \right) - 2\sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{5},1}^{(2)} \\ \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{5},1}^{(2)} + \sqrt{6} \left(Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{5},2}^{(2)} + (Y_2 - Y_1) Y_{\mathbf{5},3}^{(2)} \right) \\ \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{5},1}^{(2)} - \sqrt{6} \left(Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{5},4}^{(2)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{5},4}^{(2)} - Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{5},5}^{(2)} \right) \\ \sqrt{3} \left(\sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{5},2}^{(2)} + (Y_1 + Y_2) Y_{\mathbf{5},5}^{(2)} \right) - 2\sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{5},1}^{(2)} \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned} \tag{C.100}$$

where we denote the notation $Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(2)} \equiv (Y_{\mathbf{3},1}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{3},2}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{3},3}^{(2)})^T$, $Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(2)} \equiv (Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(2)})^T$ and $Y_{\mathbf{5}}^{(2)} \equiv (Y_{\mathbf{5},1}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{5},2}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{5},3}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{5},4}^{(2)}, Y_{\mathbf{5},5}^{(2)})^T$, and similar notations are adopted for the modular forms in the following.

The weight 4 modular multiplets can be generated from the tensor product of $Y_{\mathbf{6}}^{(1)}$ and the modular forms of weight 3. We find there are 21 linearly independent modular forms which can be chosen to be

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}I}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{1}_a} = Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,1}^{(3)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,2}^{(3)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,3}^{(3)} - Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,6}^{(3)} + Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,4}^{(3)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,5}^{(3)}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}II}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{3}_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} -Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,2}^{(3)} - Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,1}^{(3)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,6}^{(3)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,5}^{(3)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,4}^{(3)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,3}^{(3)} \\ -\sqrt{2} Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,3}^{(3)} - \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,2}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,5}^{(3)} \\ -\sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,6}^{(3)} - \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,4}^{(3)} - \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,1}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}I}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{3}'_{2,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} -Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)} - Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} - Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \\ Y_4 (Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)} - Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)}) - \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + (Y_2 - Y_1) Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} \\ Y_5 (Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} + Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)}) + (Y_1 + Y_2) Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{4}}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}I}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{4}_a} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} - Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} + Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \\ Y_4 (Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} - Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)}) - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \\ Y_5 (Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} + Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)}) - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} - Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} \\ \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} - \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{5}I}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}I}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{5}_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} -\sqrt{6} (Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)}) \\ Y_3 (Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} + Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)}) + Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} + 2Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \\ \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)} + 2Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} (Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} + Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)}) \\ -\sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} - \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} + 2Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \\ Y_6 (Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)} - Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)}) - \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + 2Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} - \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{5}II}^{(4)} &= (Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{\mathbf{6}I}}^{(3)})_{\mathbf{5}_{2,a}} = \begin{pmatrix} -Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} + Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)} - Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + 2Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} - 2Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} \\ \sqrt{6} (Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} - Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)}) \\ \sqrt{3} (Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)} - Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)}) \\ \sqrt{3} (-Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(3)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(3)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(3)} + Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(3)}) \\ \sqrt{6} (Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(3)} - Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(3)}) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

Notice that each entry of these weight four modular forms can be expressed as quartic polynomial of $Y_{1,2,3,4,5,6}$. In a same manner, we can obtain the weight 5 modular multiplets

as follow,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}}^{(5)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{5II}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{2}} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3} Y_4 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} - 2 Y_3 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} + Y_1 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + 2 Y_2 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + Y_6 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} - \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \\ -\sqrt{3} Y_5 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} - \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} + Y_3 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + 2 Y_1 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} - Y_2 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} + 2 Y_6 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\hat{\mathbf{2}}'}^{(5)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{5II}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{2}'} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6} Y_3 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} + 3 Y_1 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} + Y_2 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} - 2 Y_6 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + 2 \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \\ \sqrt{6} Y_6 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} - 2 \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + 2 Y_3 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} - Y_1 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} + 3 Y_2 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\hat{\mathbf{4}}'}^{(5)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{5II}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{4}'} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6} Y_3 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} - 2 Y_2 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} + Y_6 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} - \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \\ \sqrt{3} \left(Y_1 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + Y_2 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} - Y_6 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \right) \\ \sqrt{3} \left(\sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} - Y_3 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + (Y_1 - Y_2) Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} \right) \\ -\sqrt{6} Y_6 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} - \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} - \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + Y_3 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} - 2 Y_1 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}I}^{(5)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{6}} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 Y_{1,1}^{(4)} \\ Y_2 Y_{1,1}^{(4)} \\ Y_3 Y_{1,1}^{(4)} \\ Y_4 Y_{1,1}^{(4)} \\ Y_5 Y_{1,1}^{(4)} \\ Y_6 Y_{1,1}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}II}^{(5)} = (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\mathbf{3}'}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{6}} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(4)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(4)} \\ Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(4)} - Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(4)} \\ Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(4)} + Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(4)} \\ Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(4)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(4)} \\ Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(4)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{3}',3}^{(4)} \\ Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{3}',2}^{(4)} - Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{3}',1}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}III}^{(5)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{5II}^{(4)})_{\mathbf{6}_2} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{3} Y_1 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} - 2 Y_5 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} - Y_4 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \\ \sqrt{3} Y_2 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} - Y_5 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + 2 Y_4 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} \\ -\sqrt{3} Y_3 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} - Y_5 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} + 2 Y_4 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \\ 2 Y_3 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} - Y_1 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + 2 Y_2 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + Y_6 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} \\ -Y_3 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} - 2 Y_1 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} - Y_2 Y_{5II,4}^{(4)} + 2 Y_6 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \\ -\sqrt{3} Y_6 Y_{5II,1}^{(4)} + 2 Y_5 Y_{5II,2}^{(4)} + Y_4 Y_{5II,3}^{(4)} + \sqrt{2} Y_2 Y_{5II,5}^{(4)} \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

In the end, we give the linearly independent weight 6 modular multiplets of level 5,

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{\mathbf{1}}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}II}^{(5)})_{\mathbf{1}_a} = Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,1}^{(5)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,2}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,3}^{(5)} + Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,4}^{(5)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,5}^{(5)} - Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}II,6}^{(5)}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}I}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}I}^{(5)})_{\mathbf{3}_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} -Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(5)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(5)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(5)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(5)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(5)} \\ -\sqrt{2} \left(Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(5)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(5)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(5)} \right) \\ -\sqrt{2} \left(Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(5)} + Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(5)} \right) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}II}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}III}^{(5)})_{\mathbf{3}_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} -Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,1}^{(5)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,2}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,3}^{(5)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,4}^{(5)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,5}^{(5)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,6}^{(5)} \\ -\sqrt{2} \left(Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,2}^{(5)} + Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,3}^{(5)} - Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,5}^{(5)} \right) \\ -\sqrt{2} \left(Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,1}^{(5)} + Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,4}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}III,6}^{(5)} \right) \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{\mathbf{3}I'}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}}^{(1)} Y_{\hat{\mathbf{6}}I}^{(5)})_{\mathbf{3}'_{1,s}} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(5)} + Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(5)} \\ -Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,2}^{(5)} - Y_2 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(5)} + Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,6}^{(5)} \\ -Y_5 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,1}^{(5)} - Y_4 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,3}^{(5)} - Y_3 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,4}^{(5)} - Y_1 Y_{\mathbf{6}I,5}^{(5)} \end{pmatrix},
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_{3'II}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\widehat{6}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{6III}}^{(5)})_{3',s} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_2 Y_{\widehat{6III},1}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\widehat{6III},2}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\widehat{6III},3}^{(5)} + Y_3 Y_{\widehat{6III},6}^{(5)} \\ -Y_4 Y_{\widehat{6III},2}^{(5)} - Y_2 Y_{\widehat{6III},4}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\widehat{6III},5}^{(5)} + Y_5 Y_{\widehat{6III},6}^{(5)} \\ -Y_5 Y_{\widehat{6III},1}^{(5)} - Y_4 Y_{\widehat{6III},3}^{(5)} - Y_3 Y_{\widehat{6III},4}^{(5)} - Y_1 Y_{\widehat{6III},5}^{(5)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{4I}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\widehat{6}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{2}'}^{(5)})_4 = \begin{pmatrix} Y_4 Y_{\widehat{2}',2}^{(5)} - \sqrt{2} Y_1 Y_{\widehat{2}',1}^{(5)} \\ \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\widehat{2}',1}^{(5)} + Y_5 Y_{\widehat{2}',2}^{(5)} \\ Y_4 Y_{\widehat{2}',1}^{(5)} + \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\widehat{2}',2}^{(5)} \\ -Y_5 Y_{\widehat{2}',1}^{(5)} - \sqrt{2} Y_2 Y_{\widehat{2}',2}^{(5)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{4II}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\widehat{6}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{4}'}^{(5)})_{4_1} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 Y_{\widehat{4}',1}^{(5)} - \sqrt{3} Y_6 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} - \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\widehat{4}',4}^{(5)} \\ -Y_3 Y_{\widehat{4}',1}^{(5)} - \sqrt{3} Y_2 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} - \sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\widehat{4}',4}^{(5)} \\ \sqrt{2} Y_4 Y_{\widehat{4}',1}^{(5)} - \sqrt{3} Y_1 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\widehat{4}',4}^{(5)} \\ -\sqrt{2} Y_5 Y_{\widehat{4}',1}^{(5)} - \sqrt{3} Y_3 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)} - Y_2 Y_{\widehat{4}',4}^{(5)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{5I}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\widehat{6}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{4}'}^{(5)})_{5_1} = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{6} (Y_5 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} + Y_4 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)}) \\ \sqrt{6} Y_2 Y_{\widehat{4}',1}^{(5)} + \sqrt{2} Y_6 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} + Y_5 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)} - \sqrt{3} Y_4 Y_{\widehat{4}',4}^{(5)} \\ \sqrt{2} (-\sqrt{3} Y_3 Y_{\widehat{4}',1}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} + Y_2 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)}) \\ \sqrt{2} (-Y_3 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)} - Y_2 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)} + \sqrt{3} Y_6 Y_{\widehat{4}',4}^{(5)}) \\ -\sqrt{3} Y_5 Y_{\widehat{4}',1}^{(5)} - Y_4 Y_{\widehat{4}',2}^{(5)} + \sqrt{2} Y_3 Y_{\widehat{4}',3}^{(5)} + \sqrt{6} Y_1 Y_{\widehat{4}',4}^{(5)} \end{pmatrix}, \\
Y_{5II}^{(6)} &= (Y_{\widehat{6}}^{(1)} Y_{\widehat{6II}}^{(5)})_{5_{2,a}} = \begin{pmatrix} -Y_2 Y_{\widehat{6II},1}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\widehat{6II},2}^{(5)} - Y_6 Y_{\widehat{6II},3}^{(5)} + 2Y_5 Y_{\widehat{6II},4}^{(5)} - 2Y_4 Y_{\widehat{6II},5}^{(5)} + Y_3 Y_{\widehat{6II},6}^{(5)} \\ \sqrt{6} (Y_1 Y_{\widehat{6II},3}^{(5)} - Y_3 Y_{\widehat{6II},1}^{(5)}) \\ \sqrt{3} (Y_4 Y_{\widehat{6II},2}^{(5)} - Y_2 Y_{\widehat{6II},4}^{(5)} + Y_6 Y_{\widehat{6II},5}^{(5)} - Y_5 Y_{\widehat{6II},6}^{(5)}) \\ \sqrt{3} (-Y_5 Y_{\widehat{6II},1}^{(5)} - Y_4 Y_{\widehat{6II},3}^{(5)} + Y_3 Y_{\widehat{6II},4}^{(5)} + Y_1 Y_{\widehat{6II},5}^{(5)}) \\ \sqrt{6} (Y_2 Y_{\widehat{6II},6}^{(5)} - Y_6 Y_{\widehat{6II},2}^{(5)}) \end{pmatrix}.
\end{aligned}$$

We see that the linear space of modular forms of level 5 and weight 6 has dimension 31 which is in agreement with the dimension formula $5k + 1 = 5 \times 6 + 1 = 31$. The above modular multiplets and their representations under A'_5 are listed in table 22.

For higher level $N = 6$ and $N = 7$, the interested readers can refer to Refs. [158, 159] for the details of relevant group theory and modular forms.

References

- [1] **Super-Kamiokande** Collaboration, Y. Fukuda *et al.*, “Evidence for oscillation of atmospheric neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81** (1998) 1562–1567, [arXiv:hep-ex/9807003](#).
- [2] **SNO** Collaboration, Q. R. Ahmad *et al.*, “Measurement of the rate of $\nu_e + d \rightarrow p + p + e^-$ interactions produced by ^8B solar neutrinos at the Sudbury Neutrino Observatory,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87** (2001) 071301, [arXiv:nucl-ex/0106015](#).
- [3] **Daya Bay** Collaboration, F. P. An *et al.*, “Observation of electron-antineutrino disappearance at Daya Bay,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 171803, [arXiv:1203.1669 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [4] **RENO** Collaboration, J. K. Ahn *et al.*, “Observation of Reactor Electron Antineutrino Disappearance in the RENO Experiment,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** (2012) 191802, [arXiv:1204.0626 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [5] N. Arkani-Hamed, L. J. Hall, H. Murayama, D. Tucker-Smith, and N. Weiner, “Small neutrino masses from supersymmetry breaking,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 115011, [arXiv:hep-ph/0006312](#).
- [6] H. Murayama and A. Pierce, “Realistic Dirac leptogenesis,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89** (2002) 271601, [arXiv:hep-ph/0206177](#).
- [7] B. Thomas and M. Toharia, “Lepton flavor violation and supersymmetric Dirac leptogenesis,” *Phys. Rev. D* **75** (2007) 013013, [arXiv:hep-ph/0607285](#).
- [8] P.-H. Gu and H.-J. He, “Neutrino Mass and Baryon Asymmetry from Dirac Seesaw,” *JCAP* **12** (2006) 010, [arXiv:hep-ph/0610275](#).
- [9] P.-H. Gu, “Unified mass origin at TeV for dark matter and Dirac neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **661** (2008) 290–294, [arXiv:0710.1044 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [10] P. Langacker, “Neutrino Masses from the Top Down,” *Ann. Rev. Nucl. Part. Sci.* **62** (2012) 215–235, [arXiv:1112.5992 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [11] N. Memenga, W. Rodejohann, and H. Zhang, “ A_4 flavor symmetry model for Dirac neutrinos and sizable U_{e3} ,” *Phys. Rev. D* **87** no. 5, (2013) 053021, [arXiv:1301.2963 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [12] C.-S. Chen and L.-H. Tsai, “Peccei-Quinn symmetry as the origin of Dirac Neutrino Masses,” *Phys. Rev. D* **88** no. 5, (2013) 055015, [arXiv:1210.6264 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [13] Y. Farzan and E. Ma, “Dirac neutrino mass generation from dark matter,” *Phys. Rev. D* **86** (2012) 033007, [arXiv:1204.4890 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [14] G.-J. Ding and Y.-L. Zhou, “Dirac Neutrinos with S_4 Flavor Symmetry in Warped Extra Dimensions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **876** (2013) 418–452, [arXiv:1304.2645 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [15] A. Aranda, C. Bonilla, S. Morisi, E. Peinado, and J. W. F. Valle, “Dirac neutrinos from flavor symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** no. 3, (2014) 033001, [arXiv:1307.3553 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [16] W. Wang and Z.-L. Han, “Naturally Small Dirac Neutrino Mass with Intermediate $SU(2)_L$ Multiplet Fields,” *JHEP* **04** (2017) 166, [arXiv:1611.03240 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [17] S. Kanemura, K. Sakurai, and H. Sugiyama, “Probing Models of Dirac Neutrino Masses via the Flavor Structure of the Mass Matrix,” *Phys. Lett. B* **758** (2016) 465–472, [arXiv:1603.08679 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [18] Y. Fujimoto, K. Hasegawa, T. Nagasawa, K. Nishiwaki, M. Sakamoto, and K. Tatsumi, “Active Dirac neutrinos via $SU(2)_L$ doublets in 5d,” *JHEP* **06** (2016) 178, [arXiv:1601.05265 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [19] J. W. F. Valle and C. A. Vaquera-Araujo, “Dynamical seesaw mechanism for Dirac neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **755** (2016) 363–366, [arXiv:1601.05237 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [20] E. Ma and O. Popov, “Pathways to Naturally Small Dirac Neutrino Masses,” *Phys. Lett. B* **764** (2017) 142–144, [arXiv:1609.02538 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [21] D. Borah and A. Dasgupta, “Naturally Light Dirac Neutrino in Left-Right Symmetric Model,” *JCAP* **06** (2017) 003, [arXiv:1702.02877 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [22] W. Wang, R. Wang, Z.-L. Han, and J.-Z. Han, “The $B - L$ Scotogenic Models for Dirac Neutrino Masses,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **77** no. 12, (2017) 889, [arXiv:1705.00414 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [23] C.-Y. Yao and G.-J. Ding, “Systematic Study of One-Loop Dirac Neutrino Masses and Viable Dark Matter Candidates,” *Phys. Rev. D* **96** no. 9, (2017) 095004, [arXiv:1707.09786 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: *Phys.Rev.D* 98, 039901 (2018)].
- [24] C.-Y. Yao and G.-J. Ding, “Systematic analysis of Dirac neutrino masses from a dimension five operator,” *Phys. Rev. D* **97** no. 9, (2018) 095042, [arXiv:1802.05231 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [25] P. D. Bolton, F. F. Deppisch, C. Hati, S. Patra, and U. Sarkar, “Alternative formulation of left-right symmetry with $B - L$ conservation and purely Dirac neutrinos,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 3, (2019) 035013, [arXiv:1902.05802 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [26] S. Saad, “Simplest Radiative Dirac Neutrino Mass Models,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **943** (2019) 114636, [arXiv:1902.07259 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [27] K. Earl, C. S. Fong, T. Gregoire, and A. Tonerio, “Mirror Dirac leptogenesis,” *JCAP* **03** (2020) 036, [arXiv:1903.12192 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [28] S. F. King, D. Marfatia, and M. H. Rahat, “Towards distinguishing Dirac from Majorana neutrino mass with gravitational waves,” [arXiv:2306.05389 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [29] S. Weinberg, “Varieties of Baryon and Lepton Nonconservation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **22** (1980) 1694.
- [30] P. Minkowski, “ $\mu \rightarrow e\gamma$ at a Rate of One Out of 10^9 Muon Decays?,” *Phys. Lett. B* **67** (1977) 421–428.
- [31] M. Gell-Mann, P. Ramond, and R. Slansky, “Complex Spinors and Unified Theories,” *Conf. Proc. C* **790927** (1979) 315–321, [arXiv:1306.4669 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [32] T. Yanagida, “Horizontal gauge symmetry and masses of neutrinos,” *Conf. Proc. C* **7902131** (1979) 95–99.
- [33] S. L. Glashow, “The Future of Elementary Particle Physics,” *NATO Sci. Ser. B* **61** (1980) 687.
- [34] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, “Neutrino Mass and Spontaneous Parity Nonconservation,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **44** (1980) 912.
- [35] J. Schechter and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino Masses in $SU(2) \times U(1)$ Theories,” *Phys. Rev. D* **22** (1980) 2227.
- [36] M. Magg and C. Wetterich, “Neutrino Mass Problem and Gauge Hierarchy,” *Phys. Lett. B* **94** (1980) 61–64.

- [37] G. Lazarides, Q. Shafi, and C. Wetterich, “Proton Lifetime and Fermion Masses in an SO(10) Model,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **181** (1981) 287–300.
- [38] R. N. Mohapatra and G. Senjanovic, “Neutrino Masses and Mixings in Gauge Models with Spontaneous Parity Violation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **23** (1981) 165.
- [39] C. Wetterich, “Neutrino Masses and the Scale of B-L Violation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **187** (1981) 343–375.
- [40] R. Foot, H. Lew, X. G. He, and G. C. Joshi, “Seesaw Neutrino Masses Induced by a Triplet of Leptons,” *Z. Phys. C* **44** (1989) 441.
- [41] J. Hernandez-Garcia and S. F. King, “New Weinberg operator for neutrino mass and its seesaw origin,” *JHEP* **05** (2019) 169, [arXiv:1903.01474 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [42] S. F. King and T. Yanagida, “Testing the see-saw mechanism at collider energies,” *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **114** (2006) 1035–1043, [arXiv:hep-ph/0411030](#).
- [43] M. Drees, S. Pakvasa, X. Tata, and T. ter Veldhuis, “A Supersymmetric resolution of solar and atmospheric neutrino puzzles,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 5335–5339, [arXiv:hep-ph/9712392](#).
- [44] A. Zee, “A Theory of Lepton Number Violation, Neutrino Majorana Mass, and Oscillation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **93** (1980) 389. [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 95, 461 (1980)].
- [45] K. S. Babu, “Model of ‘Calculable’ Majorana Neutrino Masses,” *Phys. Lett. B* **203** (1988) 132–136.
- [46] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, and G. R. Dvali, “The Hierarchy problem and new dimensions at a millimeter,” *Phys. Lett. B* **429** (1998) 263–272, [arXiv:hep-ph/9803315](#).
- [47] K. R. Dienes, E. Dudas, and T. Gherghetta, “Neutrino oscillations without neutrino masses or heavy mass scales: A Higher dimensional seesaw mechanism,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **557** (1999) 25, [arXiv:hep-ph/9811428](#).
- [48] N. Arkani-Hamed, S. Dimopoulos, G. R. Dvali, and J. March-Russell, “Neutrino masses from large extra dimensions,” *Phys. Rev. D* **65** (2001) 024032, [arXiv:hep-ph/9811448](#).
- [49] G. R. Dvali and A. Y. Smirnov, “Probing large extra dimensions with neutrinos,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **563** (1999) 63–81, [arXiv:hep-ph/9904211](#).
- [50] R. Barbieri, P. Creminelli, and A. Strumia, “Neutrino oscillations from large extra dimensions,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **585** (2000) 28–44, [arXiv:hep-ph/0002199](#).
- [51] R. N. Mohapatra and J. W. F. Valle, “Neutrino Mass and Baryon Number Nonconservation in Superstring Models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **34** (1986) 1642.
- [52] A. E. Faraggi and E. Halyo, “Neutrino masses in superstring derived standard - like models,” *Phys. Lett. B* **307** (1993) 311–317, [arXiv:hep-th/9303060](#).
- [53] N. Haba, C. Hattori, M. Matsuda, T. Matsuoka, and D. Mochinaga, “A Large Majorana mass from Calabi-Yau superstring models,” *Phys. Lett. B* **337** (1994) 63–68, [arXiv:hep-ph/9311298](#).
- [54] G. Cleaver, M. Cvetič, J. R. Espinosa, L. L. Everett, and P. Langacker, “Intermediate scales, mu parameter, and fermion masses from string models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **57** (1998) 2701–2715, [arXiv:hep-ph/9705391](#).
- [55] S. F. King, “Atmospheric and solar neutrinos with a heavy singlet,” *Phys. Lett. B* **439** (1998) 350–356, [arXiv:hep-ph/9806440](#).

- [56] S. F. King, “Atmospheric and solar neutrinos from single right-handed neutrino dominance and U(1) family symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **562** (1999) 57–77, [arXiv:hep-ph/9904210](#).
- [57] S. F. King, “Large mixing angle MSW and atmospheric neutrinos from single right-handed neutrino dominance and U(1) family symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **576** (2000) 85–105, [arXiv:hep-ph/9912492](#).
- [58] P. H. Frampton, S. L. Glashow, and T. Yanagida, “Cosmological sign of neutrino CP violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **548** (2002) 119–121, [arXiv:hep-ph/0208157](#).
- [59] S. F. King, “Predicting neutrino parameters from SO(3) family symmetry and quark-lepton unification,” *JHEP* **08** (2005) 105, [arXiv:hep-ph/0506297](#).
- [60] S. Antusch, S. F. King, C. Luhn, and M. Spinrath, “Trimaximal mixing with predicted θ_{13} from a new type of constrained sequential dominance,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **856** (2012) 328–341, [arXiv:1108.4278 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [61] S. F. King, “Minimal predictive see-saw model with normal neutrino mass hierarchy,” *JHEP* **07** (2013) 137, [arXiv:1304.6264 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [62] S. F. King, “Littlest Seesaw,” *JHEP* **02** (2016) 085, [arXiv:1512.07531 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [63] S. F. King and C. Luhn, “Littlest Seesaw model from $S_4 \times U(1)$,” *JHEP* **09** (2016) 023, [arXiv:1607.05276 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [64] P. Ballett, S. F. King, S. Pascoli, N. W. Prouse, and T. Wang, “Precision neutrino experiments vs the Littlest Seesaw,” *JHEP* **03** (2017) 110, [arXiv:1612.01999 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [65] S. F. King, S. Molina Sedgwick, and S. J. Rowley, “Fitting high-energy Littlest Seesaw parameters using low-energy neutrino data and leptogenesis,” *JHEP* **10** (2018) 184, [arXiv:1808.01005 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [66] S. F. King, “Minimal see-saw model predicting best fit lepton mixing angles,” *Phys. Lett. B* **724** (2013) 92–98, [arXiv:1305.4846 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [67] S. F. King, “A model of quark and lepton mixing,” *JHEP* **01** (2014) 119, [arXiv:1311.3295 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [68] F. Björkeröth and S. F. King, “Testing constrained sequential dominance models of neutrinos,” *J. Phys. G* **42** no. 12, (2015) 125002, [arXiv:1412.6996 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [69] P.-T. Chen, G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and C.-C. Li, “A New Littlest Seesaw Model,” *J. Phys. G* **47** no. 6, (2020) 065001, [arXiv:1906.11414 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [70] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, X.-G. Liu, and J.-N. Lu, “Modular S_4 and A_4 symmetries and their fixed points: new predictive examples of lepton mixing,” *JHEP* **12** (2019) 030, [arXiv:1910.03460 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [71] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and C.-Y. Yao, “Modular $S_4 \times SU(5)$ GUT,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 5, (2021) 055034, [arXiv:2103.16311 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [72] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. F. King, and M. Levy, “Littlest modular seesaw,” *JHEP* **02** (2023) 143, [arXiv:2211.00654 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [73] F. J. de Anda and S. F. King, “Modular flavour symmetry and orbifolds,” *JHEP* **06** (2023) 122, [arXiv:2304.05958 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [74] F. Costa and S. F. King, “Neutrino mixing sum rules and the Littlest Seesaw,” [arXiv:2307.13895 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [75] R. N. Mohapatra, “Mechanism for Understanding Small Neutrino Mass in Superstring Theories,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56** (1986) 561–563.
- [76] E. K. Akhmedov, M. Lindner, E. Schnapka, and J. W. F. Valle, “Dynamical left-right symmetry breaking,” *Phys. Rev. D* **53** (1996) 2752–2780, [arXiv:hep-ph/9509255](#).
- [77] E. K. Akhmedov, M. Lindner, E. Schnapka, and J. W. F. Valle, “Left-right symmetry breaking in NJL approach,” *Phys. Lett. B* **368** (1996) 270–280, [arXiv:hep-ph/9507275](#).
- [78] S. F. King, “Constructing the large mixing angle MNS matrix in seesaw models with right-handed neutrino dominance,” *JHEP* **09** (2002) 011, [arXiv:hep-ph/0204360](#).
- [79] **Particle Data Group** Collaboration, R. L. Workman and Others, “Review of Particle Physics,” *PTEP* **2022** (2022) 083C01.
- [80] S. F. King, A. Merle, and A. J. Stuart, “The Power of Neutrino Mass Sum Rules for Neutrinoless Double Beta Decay Experiments,” *JHEP* **12** (2013) 005, [arXiv:1307.2901 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [81] **Daya Bay** Collaboration, D. Adey *et al.*, “Measurement of the Electron Antineutrino Oscillation with 1958 Days of Operation at Daya Bay,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121** no. 24, (2018) 241805, [arXiv:1809.02261 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [82] I. Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz, and A. Zhou, “The fate of hints: updated global analysis of three-flavor neutrino oscillations,” *JHEP* **09** (2020) 178, [arXiv:2007.14792 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [83] S. F. King and C. Luhn, “Neutrino Mass and Mixing with Discrete Symmetry,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **76** (2013) 056201, [arXiv:1301.1340 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [84] S. F. King, A. Merle, S. Morisi, Y. Shimizu, and M. Tanimoto, “Neutrino Mass and Mixing: from Theory to Experiment,” *New J. Phys.* **16** (2014) 045018, [arXiv:1402.4271 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [85] S. F. King, “Models of Neutrino Mass, Mixing and CP Violation,” *J. Phys. G* **42** (2015) 123001, [arXiv:1510.02091 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [86] F. Feruglio and A. Romanino, “Lepton flavor symmetries,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **93** no. 1, (2021) 015007, [arXiv:1912.06028 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [87] Z.-z. Xing, “Flavor structures of charged fermions and massive neutrinos,” *Phys. Rept.* **854** (2020) 1–147, [arXiv:1909.09610 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [88] S. F. King, “Neutrino mass models,” *Rept. Prog. Phys.* **67** (2004) 107–158, [arXiv:hep-ph/0310204](#).
- [89] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, “Discrete Flavor Symmetries and Models of Neutrino Mixing,” *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82** (2010) 2701–2729, [arXiv:1002.0211 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [90] H. Ishimori, T. Kobayashi, H. Ohki, Y. Shimizu, H. Okada, and M. Tanimoto, “Non-Abelian Discrete Symmetries in Particle Physics,” *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **183** (2010) 1–163, [arXiv:1003.3552 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [91] H. Minakata and A. Y. Smirnov, “Neutrino mixing and quark-lepton complementarity,” *Phys. Rev. D* **70** (2004) 073009, [arXiv:hep-ph/0405088](#).
- [92] P. F. Harrison, D. H. Perkins, and W. G. Scott, “Tri-bimaximal mixing and the neutrino oscillation data,” *Phys. Lett. B* **530** (2002) 167, [arXiv:hep-ph/0202074](#).
- [93] Z.-z. Xing, “Nearly tri bimaximal neutrino mixing and CP violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **533** (2002) 85–93, [arXiv:hep-ph/0204049](#).

- [94] X. G. He and A. Zee, “Some simple mixing and mass matrices for neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **560** (2003) 87–90, [arXiv:hep-ph/0301092](#).
- [95] V. D. Barger, S. Pakvasa, T. J. Weiler, and K. Whisnant, “Bimaximal mixing of three neutrinos,” *Phys. Lett. B* **437** (1998) 107–116, [arXiv:hep-ph/9806387](#).
- [96] S. Davidson and S. F. King, “Bimaximal neutrino mixing in the MSSM with a single right-handed neutrino,” *Phys. Lett. B* **445** (1998) 191–198, [arXiv:hep-ph/9808296](#).
- [97] G. Altarelli, F. Feruglio, and L. Merlo, “Revisiting Bimaximal Neutrino Mixing in a Model with $S(4)$ Discrete Symmetry,” *JHEP* **05** (2009) 020, [arXiv:0903.1940](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [98] D. Meloni, “Bimaximal mixing and large θ_{13} in a SUSY $SU(5)$ model based on S_4 ,” *JHEP* **10** (2011) 010, [arXiv:1107.0221](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [99] A. Datta, F.-S. Ling, and P. Ramond, “Correlated hierarchy, Dirac masses and large mixing angles,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **671** (2003) 383–400, [arXiv:hep-ph/0306002](#).
- [100] Y. Kajiyama, M. Raidal, and A. Strumia, “The Golden ratio prediction for the solar neutrino mixing,” *Phys. Rev. D* **76** (2007) 117301, [arXiv:0705.4559](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [101] L. L. Everett and A. J. Stuart, “Icosahedral ($A(5)$) Family Symmetry and the Golden Ratio Prediction for Solar Neutrino Mixing,” *Phys. Rev. D* **79** (2009) 085005, [arXiv:0812.1057](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [102] F. Feruglio and A. Paris, “The Golden Ratio Prediction for the Solar Angle from a Natural Model with A_5 Flavour Symmetry,” *JHEP* **03** (2011) 101, [arXiv:1101.0393](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [103] G.-J. Ding, L. L. Everett, and A. J. Stuart, “Golden Ratio Neutrino Mixing and A_5 Flavor Symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **857** (2012) 219–253, [arXiv:1110.1688](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [104] W. Rodejohann, “Unified Parametrization for Quark and Lepton Mixing Angles,” *Phys. Lett. B* **671** (2009) 267–271, [arXiv:0810.5239](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [105] C. H. Albright, A. Dueck, and W. Rodejohann, “Possible Alternatives to Tri-bimaximal Mixing,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **70** (2010) 1099–1110, [arXiv:1004.2798](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [106] J. E. Kim and M.-S. Seo, “Quark and lepton mixing angles with a dodeca-symmetry,” *JHEP* **02** (2011) 097, [arXiv:1005.4684](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [107] S. F. King and C. Luhn, “On the origin of neutrino flavour symmetry,” *JHEP* **10** (2009) 093, [arXiv:0908.1897](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [108] C. Luhn, “Trimaximal TM_1 neutrino mixing in S_4 with spontaneous CP violation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **875** (2013) 80–100, [arXiv:1306.2358](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [109] S. F. King and C. Luhn, “Trimaximal neutrino mixing from vacuum alignment in A_4 and S_4 models,” *JHEP* **09** (2011) 042, [arXiv:1107.5332](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [110] F. Feruglio, C. Hagedorn, and R. Ziegler, “Lepton Mixing Parameters from Discrete and CP Symmetries,” *JHEP* **07** (2013) 027, [arXiv:1211.5560](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [111] M. Holthausen, M. Lindner, and M. A. Schmidt, “CP and Discrete Flavour Symmetries,” *JHEP* **04** (2013) 122, [arXiv:1211.6953](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [112] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, C. Luhn, and A. J. Stuart, “Spontaneous CP violation from vacuum alignment in S_4 models of leptons,” *JHEP* **05** (2013) 084, [arXiv:1303.6180](#) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [113] F. Feruglio, C. Hagedorn, and R. Ziegler, “A realistic pattern of lepton mixing and masses from S_4 and CP,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **74** (2014) 2753, [arXiv:1303.7178](#) [[hep-ph](#)].

- [114] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and A. J. Stuart, “Generalised CP and A_4 Family Symmetry,” *JHEP* **12** (2013) 006, [arXiv:1307.4212 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [115] C.-C. Li and G.-J. Ding, “Generalised CP and trimaximal TM_1 lepton mixing in S_4 family symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **881** (2014) 206–232, [arXiv:1312.4401 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [116] S. F. King and T. Neder, “Lepton mixing predictions including Majorana phases from $\Delta(6n^2)$ flavour symmetry and generalised CP,” *Phys. Lett. B* **736** (2014) 308–316, [arXiv:1403.1758 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [117] C. Hagedorn, A. Meroni, and E. Molinaro, “Lepton mixing from $\Delta(3n^2)$ and $\Delta(6n^2)$ and CP,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **891** (2015) 499–557, [arXiv:1408.7118 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [118] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and T. Neder, “Generalised CP and $\Delta(6n^2)$ family symmetry in semi-direct models of leptons,” *JHEP* **12** (2014) 007, [arXiv:1409.8005 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [119] G.-J. Ding and S. F. King, “Generalized CP and $\Delta(3n^2)$ Family Symmetry for Semi-Direct Predictions of the PMNS Matrix,” *Phys. Rev. D* **93** (2016) 025013, [arXiv:1510.03188 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [120] C.-C. Li and G.-J. Ding, “Lepton Mixing in A_5 Family Symmetry and Generalized CP,” *JHEP* **05** (2015) 100, [arXiv:1503.03711 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [121] A. Di Iura, C. Hagedorn, and D. Meloni, “Lepton mixing from the interplay of the alternating group A_5 and CP,” *JHEP* **08** (2015) 037, [arXiv:1503.04140 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [122] P. Ballett, S. Pascoli, and J. Turner, “Mixing angle and phase correlations from A_5 with generalized CP and their prospects for discovery,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** no. 9, (2015) 093008, [arXiv:1503.07543 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [123] C.-C. Li, C.-Y. Yao, and G.-J. Ding, “Lepton Mixing Predictions from Infinite Group Series $D_{9n,3n}^{(1)}$ with Generalized CP,” *JHEP* **05** (2016) 007, [arXiv:1601.06393 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [124] C.-C. Li, J.-N. Lu, and G.-J. Ding, “ A_4 and CP symmetry and a model with maximal CP violation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **913** (2016) 110–131, [arXiv:1608.01860 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [125] C.-Y. Yao and G.-J. Ding, “CP Symmetry and Lepton Mixing from a Scan of Finite Discrete Groups,” *Phys. Rev. D* **94** no. 7, (2016) 073006, [arXiv:1606.05610 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [126] P. Chen, C.-C. Li, and G.-J. Ding, “Lepton Flavor Mixing and CP Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **91** (2015) 033003, [arXiv:1412.8352 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [127] P. Chen, C.-Y. Yao, and G.-J. Ding, “Neutrino Mixing from CP Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **92** no. 7, (2015) 073002, [arXiv:1507.03419 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [128] L. L. Everett, T. Garon, and A. J. Stuart, “A Bottom-Up Approach to Lepton Flavor and CP Symmetries,” *JHEP* **04** (2015) 069, [arXiv:1501.04336 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [129] J.-N. Lu and G.-J. Ding, “Alternative Schemes of Predicting Lepton Mixing Parameters from Discrete Flavor and CP Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 1, (2017) 015012, [arXiv:1610.05682 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [130] J.-N. Lu and G.-J. Ding, “Quark and lepton mixing patterns from a common discrete flavor symmetry with a generalized CP symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 5, (2018) 055011, [arXiv:1806.02301 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [131] S.-j. Rong, “Lepton mixing patterns from the group $\Sigma(36 \times 3)$ with a generalized CP transformation,” *Phys. Rev. D* **95** no. 7, (2017) 076014, [arXiv:1604.08482 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [132] C.-C. Li, J.-N. Lu, and G.-J. Ding, “Toward a unified interpretation of quark and lepton mixing from flavor and CP symmetries,” *JHEP* **02** (2018) 038, [arXiv:1706.04576 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [133] J.-N. Lu and G.-J. Ding, “Dihedral flavor group as the key to understand quark and lepton flavor mixing,” *JHEP* **03** (2019) 056, [arXiv:1901.07414 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [134] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and C.-C. Li, “Tri-Direct CP in the Littlest Seesaw Playground,” *JHEP* **12** (2018) 003, [arXiv:1807.07538 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [135] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and C.-C. Li, “Lepton mixing predictions from S_4 in the tridirect CP approach to two right-handed neutrino models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **99** no. 7, (2019) 075035, [arXiv:1811.12340 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [136] S. F. King and G. G. Ross, “Fermion masses and mixing angles from SU(3) family symmetry,” *Phys. Lett. B* **520** (2001) 243–253, [arXiv:hep-ph/0108112](#).
- [137] S. F. King, “Unified Models of Neutrinos, Flavour and CP Violation,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **94** (2017) 217–256, [arXiv:1701.04413 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [138] S. Ferrara, D. Lust, A. D. Shapere, and S. Theisen, “Modular Invariance in Supersymmetric Field Theories,” *Phys. Lett. B* **225** (1989) 363.
- [139] S. Ferrara, . D. Lust, and S. Theisen, “Target Space Modular Invariance and Low-Energy Couplings in Orbifold Compactifications,” *Phys. Lett. B* **233** (1989) 147–152.
- [140] K. Ishiguro, T. Kobayashi, and H. Otsuka, “Symplectic modular symmetry in heterotic string vacua: flavor, CP, and R-symmetries,” *JHEP* **01** (2022) 020, [arXiv:2107.00487 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [141] D. Cremades, L. E. Ibanez, and F. Marchesano, “Computing Yukawa couplings from magnetized extra dimensions,” *JHEP* **05** (2004) 079, [arXiv:hep-th/0404229](#).
- [142] K. Ishiguro, T. Kobayashi, and H. Otsuka, “Landscape of Modular Symmetric Flavor Models,” *JHEP* **03** (2021) 161, [arXiv:2011.09154 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [143] F. Feruglio, *Are neutrino masses modular forms?*, pp. 227–266. 2019. [arXiv:1706.08749 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [144] J. H. Bruinier, G. V. D. Geer, G. Harder, and D. Zagier, *The 1-2-3 of Modular Forms*. Universitext. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2008.
- [145] F. Diamond and J. M. Shurman, *A first course in modular forms*, vol. 228 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2005.
- [146] R. de Adelhart Toorop, F. Feruglio, and C. Hagedorn, “Finite Modular Groups and Lepton Mixing,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **858** (2012) 437–467, [arXiv:1112.1340 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [147] X.-G. Liu and G.-J. Ding, “Neutrino Masses and Mixing from Double Covering of Finite Modular Groups,” *JHEP* **08** (2019) 134, [arXiv:1907.01488 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [148] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, M. Levy, and Y.-L. Zhou, “Symmetries and stabilisers in modular invariant flavour models,” *JHEP* **11** (2020) 085, [arXiv:2008.05329 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [149] M.-C. Chen, S. Ramos-Sánchez, and M. Ratz, “A note on the predictions of models with modular flavor symmetries,” *Phys. Lett. B* **801** (2020) 135153, [arXiv:1909.06910 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [150] H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sánchez, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Eclectic Flavor Groups,” *JHEP* **02** (2020) 045, [arXiv:2001.01736 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [151] H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Lessons from eclectic flavor symmetries,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **957** (2020) 115098, [arXiv:2004.05200 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [152] H. Ohki, S. Uemura, and R. Watanabe, “Modular flavor symmetry on a magnetized torus,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 8, (2020) 085008, [arXiv:2003.04174 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [153] D. Schultz, “Notes on Modular Forms.” <https://faculty.math.illinois.edu/~schult25/ModFormNotes.pdf>, 2015.
- [154] T. Kobayashi, K. Tanaka, and T. H. Tatsuishi, “Neutrino mixing from finite modular groups,” *Phys. Rev. D* **98** no. 1, (2018) 016004, [arXiv:1803.10391 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [155] C.-Y. Yao, J.-N. Lu, and G.-J. Ding, “Modular Invariant A_4 Models for Quarks and Leptons with Generalized CP Symmetry,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 102, [arXiv:2012.13390 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [156] B.-Y. Qu, X.-G. Liu, P.-T. Chen, and G.-J. Ding, “Flavor mixing and CP violation from the interplay of an S_4 modular group and a generalized CP symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 7, (2021) 076001, [arXiv:2106.11659 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [157] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and X.-G. Liu, “Neutrino mass and mixing with A_5 modular symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 11, (2019) 115005, [arXiv:1903.12588 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [158] C.-C. Li, X.-G. Liu, and G.-J. Ding, “Modular symmetry at level 6 and a new route towards finite modular groups,” *JHEP* **10** (2021) 238, [arXiv:2108.02181 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [159] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, C.-C. Li, and Y.-L. Zhou, “Modular Invariant Models of Leptons at Level 7,” *JHEP* **08** (2020) 164, [arXiv:2004.12662 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [160] S. Lang, *Introduction to modular forms*, vol. 222 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2012.
- [161] J. T. Penedo and S. T. Petcov, “Lepton Masses and Mixing from Modular S_4 Symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **939** (2019) 292–307, [arXiv:1806.11040 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [162] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, S. T. Petcov, and A. V. Titov, “Modular S_4 models of lepton masses and mixing,” *JHEP* **04** (2019) 005, [arXiv:1811.04933 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [163] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, S. T. Petcov, and A. V. Titov, “Modular A_5 symmetry for flavour model building,” *JHEP* **04** (2019) 174, [arXiv:1812.02158 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [164] X.-G. Liu, C.-Y. Yao, and G.-J. Ding, “Modular invariant quark and lepton models in double covering of S_4 modular group,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 5, (2021) 056013, [arXiv:2006.10722 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [165] C.-Y. Yao, X.-G. Liu, and G.-J. Ding, “Fermion masses and mixing from the double cover and metaplectic cover of the A_5 modular group,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 9, (2021) 095013, [arXiv:2011.03501 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [166] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, H. Otsuka, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, “Modular symmetry by orbifolding magnetized $T^2 \times T^2$: realization of double cover of Γ_N ,” *JHEP* **11** (2020) 101, [arXiv:2007.06188 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [167] D. S. Kubert and S. Lang, *Modular Units*. Grundlehren der mathematischen Wissenschaften 244, Springer-Verlag, New York- Berlin, 1981.
- [168] S. Lang, *Elliptic functions*, vol. 112 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 1987.
- [169] I. S. Eum, J. K. Koo, and D. H. Shin, “A modularity criterion for klein forms, with an application to modular forms of level 13,” *Journal of Mathematical Analysis and Applications* **375** no. 1, (2011) 28–41.

- [170] F. Strömberg, “Weil representations associated with finite quadratic modules,” *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **275** no. 1-2, (2013) 509–527.
- [171] H. Cohen and F. Strömberg, *Modular forms*, vol. 179. American Mathematical Soc., 2017.
- [172] X.-G. Liu, C.-Y. Yao, B.-Y. Qu, and G.-J. Ding, “Half-integral weight modular forms and application to neutrino mass models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 11, (2020) 115035, [arXiv:2007.13706 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [173] G. Shimura, “Modular forms of half integral weight,” in *Modular Functions of One Variable I*, pp. 57–74. Springer, 1973.
- [174] J. F. R. Duncan and D. A. McGady, “Modular Forms on the Double Half-Plane,” [arXiv:1806.09875 \[math.NT\]](#).
- [175] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, S. Takada, T. H. Tatsuishi, and H. Uchida, “Revisiting modular symmetry in magnetized torus and orbifold compactifications,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 10, (2020) 105010, [arXiv:2005.12642 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [176] J. H. Bruinier and O. Stein, “The weil representation and hecke operators for vector valued modular forms,” *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **264** no. 2, (2010) 249.
- [177] The GAP Group, *GAP – Groups, Algorithms, and Programming, Version 4.12.0*, 2020. <https://www.gap-system.org>.
- [178] P. Novichkov, J. Penedo, and S. Petcov, “Double Cover of Modular S_4 for Flavour Model Building,” [arXiv:2006.03058 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [179] T. Ibukiyama, “Modular forms of rational weights and modular varieties,” in *Abhandlungen aus dem Mathematischen Seminar der Universität Hamburg*, vol. 70, p. 315, Springer. 2000.
- [180] T. Ibukiyama, “Graded rings of modular forms of rational weights,” *Research in Number Theory* **6** no. 1, (2020) 1–13.
- [181] Y. Almumin, M.-C. Chen, V. Knapp-Pérez, S. Ramos-Sánchez, M. Ratz, and S. Shukla, “Metaplectic Flavor Symmetries from Magnetized Tori,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 078, [arXiv:2102.11286 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [182] R. Bruggeman, Y. Choie, and N. Diamantis, *Holomorphic automorphic forms and cohomology*, vol. 253. American Mathematical Society, 2018.
- [183] H. Aoki *et al.*, “On jacobi forms of real weights and indices,” *Osaka Journal of Mathematics* **54** no. 3, (2017) 569–585.
- [184] Y. I. Manin, “Modular forms of real weights and generalised dedekind symbols,” *Research in the Mathematical Sciences* **5** no. 1, (2018) 2.
- [185] M. Knopp and G. Mason, “Vector-valued modular forms and poincaré series,” *Illinois Journal of Mathematics* **48** no. 4, (2004) 1345–1366.
- [186] P. Bantay and T. Gannon, “Vector-valued modular functions for the modular group and the hypergeometric equation,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:0705.2467* (2007) .
- [187] C. Marks and G. Mason, “Structure of the module of vector-valued modular forms,” *Journal of the London Mathematical Society* **82** no. 1, (2010) 32–48.
- [188] T. Gannon, “The theory of vector-valued modular forms for the modular group,” in *Conformal field theory, automorphic forms and related topics*, pp. 247–286. Springer, 2014.

- [189] C. Franc and G. Mason, “Hypergeometric series, modular linear differential equations and vector-valued modular forms,” *The Ramanujan Journal* **41** no. 1, (2016) 233–267.
- [190] C. Franc and G. Mason, “On the structure of modules of vector-valued modular forms,” *The Ramanujan Journal* **47** no. 1, (2018) 117–139.
- [191] K. S. Rao, *Linear algebra and group theory for physicists*, vol. 6. Springer, 2006.
- [192] C. E. Marks, *Classification of vector-valued modular forms of dimension less than six*. University of California, Santa Cruz, 2009.
- [193] X.-G. Liu and G.-J. Ding, “Modular flavor symmetry and vector-valued modular forms,” *JHEP* **03** (2022) 123, [arXiv:2112.14761 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [194] G. Mason, “2-dimensional vector-valued modular forms,” *The Ramanujan Journal* **17** no. 3, (2008) 405–427.
- [195] I. Tuba and H. Wenzl, “Representations of the braid group b_3 and of $sl(2, z)$,” *Pacific Journal of Mathematics* **197** no. 2, (2001) 491–510.
- [196] A. Baur, H. P. Nilles, A. Trautner, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Unification of Flavor, CP, and Modular Symmetries,” *Phys. Lett. B* **795** (2019) 7–14, [arXiv:1901.03251 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [197] A. Baur, H. P. Nilles, A. Trautner, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “A String Theory of Flavor and CP,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **947** (2019) 114737, [arXiv:1908.00805 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [198] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, S. T. Petcov, and A. V. Titov, “Generalised CP Symmetry in Modular-Invariant Models of Flavour,” *JHEP* **07** (2019) 165, [arXiv:1905.11970 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [199] T. Kobayashi, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, T. H. Tatsuishi, and H. Uchida, “CP violation in modular invariant flavor models,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 5, (2020) 055046, [arXiv:1910.11553 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [200] H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, “Spontaneous CP violation by modulus τ in A_4 model of lepton flavors,” *JHEP* **03** (2021) 010, [arXiv:2012.01688 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [201] K. Ishiguro, T. Kobayashi, and H. Otsuka, “Spontaneous CP violation and symplectic modular symmetry in Calabi-Yau compactifications,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **973** (2021) 115598, [arXiv:2010.10782 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [202] A. Baur, M. Kade, H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Siegel modular flavor group and CP from string theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **816** (2021) 136176, [arXiv:2012.09586 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [203] G.-J. Ding, F. Feruglio, and X.-G. Liu, “CP symmetry and symplectic modular invariance,” *SciPost Phys.* **10** no. 6, (2021) 133, [arXiv:2102.06716 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [204] M.-C. Chen, M. Fallbacher, K. T. Mahanthappa, M. Ratz, and A. Trautner, “CP Violation from Finite Groups,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **883** (2014) 267–305, [arXiv:1402.0507 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [205] I. Reiner, “Automorphisms of the symplectic modular group,” *Transactions of the American Mathematical Society* **80** no. 1, (1955) 35–50.
- [206] B. S. Acharya, D. Bailin, A. Love, W. A. Sabra, and S. Thomas, “Spontaneous breaking of CP symmetry by orbifold moduli,” *Phys. Lett. B* **357** (1995) 387–396, [arXiv:hep-th/9506143](#). [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 407, 451–451 (1997)].
- [207] T. Dent, “CP violation and modular symmetries,” *Phys. Rev. D* **64** (2001) 056005, [arXiv:hep-ph/0105285](#).

- [208] J. Giedt, “CP violation and moduli stabilization in heterotic models,” *Mod. Phys. Lett. A* **17** (2002) 1465–1473, [arXiv:hep-ph/0204017](#).
- [209] <https://math.stackexchange.com/questions/501992/a-problem-on-a-complex-matrix-complex-conjugate-to-its-inverse>.
- [210] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. F. King, and Y.-L. Zhou, “Multiple modular symmetries as the origin of flavor,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 5, (2020) 055033, [arXiv:1906.02208 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [211] S. Cecotti, S. Ferrara, and L. Girardello, “Geometry of Type II Superstrings and the Moduli of Superconformal Field Theories,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **4** (1989) 2475.
- [212] S. Cecotti, “Homogeneous Kahler Manifolds and T Algebras in $N = 2$ Supergravity and Superstrings,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **124** (1989) 23–55.
- [213] S. Cecotti, “ $N = 2$ Supergravity, Type Iib Superstrings and Algebraic Geometry,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **131** (1990) 517–536.
- [214] L. J. Dixon, V. Kaplunovsky, and J. Louis, “On Effective Field Theories Describing (2,2) Vacua of the Heterotic String,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **329** (1990) 27–82.
- [215] P. Candelas and X. de la Ossa, “Moduli Space of Calabi-Yau Manifolds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **355** (1991) 455–481.
- [216] A. Strominger, “SPECIAL GEOMETRY,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **133** (1990) 163–180.
- [217] S. Ferrara, C. Kounnas, D. Lust, and F. Zwirner, “Duality invariant partition functions and automorphic superpotentials for (2,2) string compactifications,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **365** (1991) 431–466.
- [218] A. Font, “Periods and duality symmetries in Calabi-Yau compactifications,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **391** (1993) 358–388, [arXiv:hep-th/9203084](#).
- [219] H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, A. Trautner, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Orbifolds from $Sp(4, \mathbb{Z})$ and their modular symmetries,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **971** (2021) 115534, [arXiv:2105.08078 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [220] P. Mayr and S. Stieberger, “Moduli dependence of one loop gauge couplings in (0,2) compactifications,” *Phys. Lett. B* **355** (1995) 107–116, [arXiv:hep-th/9504129](#).
- [221] S. Stieberger, “(0,2) heterotic gauge couplings and their M theory origin,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **541** (1999) 109–144, [arXiv:hep-th/9807124](#).
- [222] M. Koecher, “Zur theorie der modulfunktionen n-ten grades,” *Mathematische Zeitschrift* **59** (1954) .
- [223] A. Fiorentino, *On modular and cusp forms with respect to the congruence subgroup, over which the map given by the gradients of odd Theta functions in genus 2 factors, and related topics*. 2013.
- [224] R. C. Gunning, *Lectures on Modular Forms*. Princeton, New Jersey USA, Princeton University Press, 1962.
- [225] B. Schoeneberg, *Elliptic Modular Functions - An Introduction*.
- [226] G.-J. Ding, F. Feruglio, and X.-G. Liu, “Automorphic Forms and Fermion Masses,” *JHEP* **01** (2021) 037, [arXiv:2010.07952 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [227] E. Gottschling, “Über die fixpunkte der siegelschen modulgruppe,” *Mathematische Annalen* **143** no. 2, (1961) 111–149.

- [228] E. Gottschling, “Über die fixpunktuntergruppen der siegelschen modulgruppe,” *Mathematische Annalen* **143** no. 5, (1961) 399–430.
- [229] E. Gottschling, “Die uniformisierbarkeit der fixpunkte eigentlich diskontinuierlicher gruppen von biholomorphen abbildungen,” *Mathematische Annalen* **169** no. 1, (1967) 26–54.
- [230] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, “ $Sp(6, \mathbb{Z})$ modular symmetry in flavor structures: quark flavor models and Siegel modular forms for $\widehat{\Delta}(96)$,” [arXiv:2310.17978](https://arxiv.org/abs/2310.17978) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [231] F. Feruglio, “The flavour puzzle as a vacuum problem,” *PoS DISCRETE2020-2021* (2022) 007.
- [232] F. Feruglio, “Automorphic Forms and Fermion Masses,” in *14th International Workshop on Lie Theory and Its Applications in Physics*. 2022.
- [233] H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos–Sánchez, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Eclectic flavor scheme from ten-dimensional string theory – I. Basic results,” *Phys. Lett. B* **808** (2020) 135615, [arXiv:2006.03059](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.03059) [[hep-th](#)].
- [234] H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos–Sánchez, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Eclectic flavor scheme from ten-dimensional string theory - II detailed technical analysis,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **966** (2021) 115367, [arXiv:2010.13798](https://arxiv.org/abs/2010.13798) [[hep-th](#)].
- [235] A. Borel, “Automorphic forms on reductive groups,” *Automorphic forms and Applications, IAS/Park City Mathematics Series* **12** (2007) 5–40.
- [236] A. Borel, “Introduction to automorphic forms,” *1966 Algebraic Groups and Discontinuous Subgroups (Proc. Sympos. Pure Math., Boulder, Colo., 1965)* **9** (1965) 199–210.
- [237] H. Klingen, B. Bollobas, and W. Fulton, *Introductory Lectures on Siegel Modular Forms*. Cambridge Studies in Advanced Mathematics. Cambridge University Press, 1990. <https://books.google.com.hk/books?id=9wYIwLkCiBIC>.
- [238] C. D. Froggatt and H. B. Nielsen, “Hierarchy of Quark Masses, Cabibbo Angles and CP Violation,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **147** (1979) 277–298.
- [239] S. J. D. King and S. F. King, “Fermion mass hierarchies from modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **09** (2020) 043, [arXiv:2002.00969](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.00969) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [240] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and X.-G. Liu, “Modular A_4 symmetry models of neutrinos and charged leptons,” *JHEP* **09** (2019) 074, [arXiv:1907.11714](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.11714) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [241] G. Altarelli and F. Feruglio, “Tri-bimaximal neutrino mixing, $A(4)$ and the modular symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **741** (2006) 215–235, [arXiv:hep-ph/0512103](https://arxiv.org/abs/hep-ph/0512103).
- [242] H. Kuranaga, H. Ohki, and S. Uemura, “Modular origin of mass hierarchy: Froggatt-Nielsen like mechanism,” *JHEP* **07** (2021) 068, [arXiv:2105.06237](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.06237) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [243] H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, “Modular invariant flavor model of A_4 and hierarchical structures at nearby fixed points,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 1, (2021) 015005, [arXiv:2009.14242](https://arxiv.org/abs/2009.14242) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [244] F. Feruglio, V. Gherardi, A. Romanino, and A. Titov, “Modular invariant dynamics and fermion mass hierarchies around $\tau = i$,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 242, [arXiv:2101.08718](https://arxiv.org/abs/2101.08718) [[hep-ph](#)].
- [245] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, and S. T. Petcov, “Fermion mass hierarchies, large lepton

- mixing and residual modular symmetries,” *JHEP* **04** (2021) 206, [arXiv:2102.07488 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [246] F. Feruglio, “The irresistible call of $\tau = i$,” [arXiv:2211.00659 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [247] F. Feruglio, “Fermion masses, critical behavior and universality,” *JHEP* **03** (2023) 236, [arXiv:2302.11580 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [248] S. T. Petcov, “On the Normalisation of the Modular Forms in Modular Invariant Theories of Flavour,” [arXiv:2311.04185 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [249] Y. Reyimuaji and A. Romanino, “Can an unbroken flavour symmetry provide an approximate description of lepton masses and mixing?,” *JHEP* **03** (2018) 067, [arXiv:1801.10530 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [250] S. T. Petcov and M. Tanimoto, “ A_4 Modular Flavour Model of Quark Mass Hierarchies close to the Fixed Point $\tau = i\infty$,” [arXiv:2306.05730 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [251] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, M. Levy, J. T. Penedo, and S. T. Petcov, “Quarks at the modular S_4 cusp,” [arXiv:2307.14410 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [252] F. Feruglio, “Universal Predictions of Modular Invariant Flavor Models near the Self-Dual Point,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130** no. 10, (2023) 101801, [arXiv:2211.00659 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [253] H. Fritzsch, “Calculating the Cabibbo Angle,” *Phys. Lett. B* **70** (1977) 436–440.
- [254] S. Weinberg, “The Problem of Mass,” *Trans. New York Acad. Sci.* **38** (1977) 185–201.
- [255] F. Wilczek and A. Zee, “Discrete Flavor Symmetries and a Formula for the Cabibbo Angle,” *Phys. Lett. B* **70** (1977) 418. [Erratum: *Phys.Lett.B* 72, 504 (1978)].
- [256] H. Fritzsch, “Weak Interaction Mixing in the Six - Quark Theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **73** (1978) 317–322.
- [257] H. Fritzsch, “Quark Masses and Flavor Mixing,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **155** (1979) 189–207.
- [258] R. Gatto, G. Sartori, and M. Tonin, “Weak Selfmasses, Cabibbo Angle, and Broken $SU(2) \times SU(2)$,” *Phys. Lett. B* **28** (1968) 128–130.
- [259] P. H. Frampton, S. L. Glashow, and D. Marfatia, “Zeroes of the neutrino mass matrix,” *Phys. Lett. B* **536** (2002) 79–82, [arXiv:hep-ph/0201008](#).
- [260] Z.-z. Xing, “Texture zeros and Majorana phases of the neutrino mass matrix,” *Phys. Lett. B* **530** (2002) 159–166, [arXiv:hep-ph/0201151](#).
- [261] H. Fritzsch, Z.-z. Xing, and S. Zhou, “Two-zero Textures of the Majorana Neutrino Mass Matrix and Current Experimental Tests,” *JHEP* **09** (2011) 083, [arXiv:1108.4534 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [262] D. Meloni, A. Meroni, and E. Peinado, “Two-zero Majorana textures in the light of the Planck results,” *Phys. Rev. D* **89** no. 5, (2014) 053009, [arXiv:1401.3207 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [263] H. Fritzsch and Z.-z. Xing, “Mass and flavor mixing schemes of quarks and leptons,” *Prog. Part. Nucl. Phys.* **45** (2000) 1–81, [arXiv:hep-ph/9912358](#).
- [264] M. Gupta and G. Ahuja, “Flavor mixings and textures of the fermion mass matrices,” *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **27** (2012) 1230033, [arXiv:1302.4823 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [265] P. O. Ludl and W. Grimus, “A complete survey of texture zeros in general and symmetric quark mass matrices,” *Phys. Lett. B* **744** (2015) 38–42, [arXiv:1501.04942 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [266] P. O. Ludl and W. Grimus, “A complete survey of texture zeros in the lepton mass matrices,” *JHEP* **07** (2014) 090, [arXiv:1406.3546 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: *JHEP* 10, 126 (2014)].
- [267] W. Grimus, A. S. Joshipura, L. Lavoura, and M. Tanimoto, “Symmetry realization of texture zeros,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **36** (2004) 227–232, [arXiv:hep-ph/0405016](#).
- [268] R. González Felipe and H. Serôdio, “Abelian realization of phenomenological two-zero neutrino textures,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **886** (2014) 75–92, [arXiv:1405.4263 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [269] H. B. Camara, R. G. Felipe, and F. R. Joaquim, “Minimal inverse-seesaw mechanism with Abelian flavour symmetries,” *JHEP* **05** (2021) 021, [arXiv:2012.04557 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [270] J.-N. Lu, X.-G. Liu, and G.-J. Ding, “Modular symmetry origin of texture zeros and quark lepton unification,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 11, (2020) 115020, [arXiv:1912.07573 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [271] G.-J. Ding, F. R. Joaquim, and J.-N. Lu, “Texture-zero patterns of lepton mass matrices from modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **03** (2023) 141, [arXiv:2211.08136 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [272] D. Zhang, “A modular A_4 symmetry realization of two-zero textures of the Majorana neutrino mass matrix,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **952** (2020) 114935, [arXiv:1910.07869 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [273] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, M. Tanimoto, and H. Uchida, “Texture zeros of quark mass matrices at fixed point $\tau = \omega$ in modular flavor symmetry,” [arXiv:2207.04609 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [274] A. Baur, M. Kade, H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “The eclectic flavor symmetry of the \mathbb{Z}_2 orbifold,” *JHEP* **02** (2021) 018, [arXiv:2008.07534 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [275] F. Feruglio, A. Strumia, and A. Titov, “Modular invariance and the QCD angle,” *JHEP* **07** (2023) 027, [arXiv:2305.08908 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [276] Y. H. Ahn and S. K. Kang, “Simple Modular invariant model for Quark, Lepton, and flavored-QCD axion,” [arXiv:2306.14467 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [277] T. Nomura and H. Okada, “A modular A_4 symmetric model of dark matter and neutrino,” *Phys. Lett. B* **797** (2019) 134799, [arXiv:1904.03937 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [278] H. Okada and Y. Shoji, “Dirac dark matter in a radiative neutrino model,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **31** (2021) 100742, [arXiv:2003.11396 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [279] H. Okada and Y. Shoji, “A radiative seesaw model with three Higgs doublets in modular A_4 symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **961** (2020) 115216, [arXiv:2003.13219 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [280] X. Zhang and S. Zhou, “Inverse seesaw model with a modular S_4 symmetry: lepton flavor mixing and warm dark matter,” *JCAP* **09** (2021) 043, [arXiv:2106.03433 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [281] M. Tanimoto and K. Yamamoto, “Electron EDM arising from modulus τ in the supersymmetric modular invariant flavor models,” *JHEP* **10** (2021) 183, [arXiv:2106.10919 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [282] T. Kobayashi, H. Okada, and Y. Orikasa, “Dark matter stability at fixed points in a modular A_4 symmetry,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **37** (2022) 101080, [arXiv:2111.05674 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [283] T. Kobayashi and H. Otsuka, “On stringy origin of minimal flavor violation,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **82** no. 1, (2022) 25, [arXiv:2108.02700 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [284] T. Kobayashi, H. Otsuka, M. Tanimoto, and K. Yamamoto, “Modular symmetry in the SMEFT,” *Phys. Rev. D* **105** no. 5, (2022) 055022, [arXiv:2112.00493 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [285] M. K. Behera and R. Mohanta, “Linear Seesaw in A_5 ’ Modular Symmetry With Leptogenesis,” *Front. in Phys.* **10** (2022) 854595, [arXiv:2201.10429 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [286] T. Kobayashi, H. Otsuka, M. Tanimoto, and K. Yamamoto, “Lepton flavor violation, lepton $(g - 2)_{\mu,e}$ and electron EDM in the modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **08** (2022) 013, [arXiv:2204.12325 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [287] P. Mishra, M. K. Behera, and R. Mohanta, “Neutrino phenomenology, W-mass anomaly, and muon $(g-2)$ in a minimal type-III seesaw model using a T ’ modular symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** no. 11, (2023) 115004, [arXiv:2302.00494 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [288] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, F. Kaneko, T. Kobayashi, and H. Otsuka, “Moduli inflation from modular flavor symmetries,” *JHEP* **06** (2023) 187, [arXiv:2303.02947 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [289] T. Nomura and H. Okada, “Quark and lepton model with flavor specific dark matter and muon $g - 2$ in modular A_4 and hidden $U(1)$ symmetries,” [arXiv:2304.13361 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [290] Y. Gunji, K. Ishiwata, and T. Yoshida, “Subcritical regime of hybrid inflation with modular A_4 symmetry,” *JHEP* **11** (2022) 002, [arXiv:2208.10086 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [291] H. Okada and Y. Orikasa, “Modular S_3 symmetric radiative seesaw model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 11, (2019) 115037, [arXiv:1907.04716 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [292] D. Meloni and M. Parriciatu, “A simplest modular S_3 model for leptons,” [arXiv:2306.09028 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [293] T. Kobayashi, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, T. H. Tatsuishi, and H. Uchida, “Finite modular subgroups for fermion mass matrices and baryon/lepton number violation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **794** (2019) 114–121, [arXiv:1812.11072 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [294] T. Kobayashi, N. Omoto, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, and T. H. Tatsuishi, “Modular A_4 invariance and neutrino mixing,” *JHEP* **11** (2018) 196, [arXiv:1808.03012 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [295] J. C. Criado and F. Feruglio, “Modular Invariance Faces Precision Neutrino Data,” *SciPost Phys.* **5** no. 5, (2018) 042, [arXiv:1807.01125 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [296] P. P. Novichkov, S. T. Petcov, and M. Tanimoto, “Trimaximal Neutrino Mixing from Modular A_4 Invariance with Residual Symmetries,” *Phys. Lett. B* **793** (2019) 247–258, [arXiv:1812.11289 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [297] T. Nomura and H. Okada, “A two loop induced neutrino mass model with modular A_4 symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **966** (2021) 115372, [arXiv:1906.03927 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [298] T. Nomura, H. Okada, and O. Popov, “A modular A_4 symmetric scotogenic model,” *Phys. Lett. B* **803** (2020) 135294, [arXiv:1908.07457 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [299] T. Asaka, Y. Heo, T. H. Tatsuishi, and T. Yoshida, “Modular A_4 invariance and leptogenesis,” *JHEP* **01** (2020) 144, [arXiv:1909.06520 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [300] T. Nomura, H. Okada, and S. Patra, “An inverse seesaw model with A_4 -modular symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **967** (2021) 115395, [arXiv:1912.00379 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [301] T. Kobayashi, T. Nomura, and T. Shimomura, “Type II seesaw models with modular A_4 symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **102** no. 3, (2020) 035019, [arXiv:1912.00637 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [302] X. Wang, “Lepton flavor mixing and CP violation in the minimal type-(I+II) seesaw model with a modular A_4 symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **957** (2020) 115105, [arXiv:1912.13284 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [303] G.-J. Ding and F. Feruglio, “Testing Moduli and Flavon Dynamics with Neutrino Oscillations,” *JHEP* **06** (2020) 134, [arXiv:2003.13448 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [304] M. Aoki and D. Kaneko, “A hybrid seesaw model and hierarchical neutrino flavor structures based on A_4 symmetry,” *PTEP* **2021** no. 2, (2021) 023B06, [arXiv:2009.06025 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [305] T. Asaka, Y. Heo, and T. Yoshida, “Lepton flavor model with modular A_4 symmetry in large volume limit,” *Phys. Lett. B* **811** (2020) 135956, [arXiv:2009.12120 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [306] M. Kashav and S. Verma, “Broken scaling neutrino mass matrix and leptogenesis based on A_4 modular invariance,” *JHEP* **09** (2021) 100, [arXiv:2103.07207 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [307] H. Okada, Y. Shimizu, M. Tanimoto, and T. Yoshida, “Modulus τ linking leptonic CP violation to baryon asymmetry in A_4 modular invariant flavor model,” *JHEP* **07** (2021) 184, [arXiv:2105.14292 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [308] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and J. a. Lourenco, “Two A_4 modular symmetries for Tri-Maximal 2 mixing,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **979** (2022) 115793, [arXiv:2107.04042 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [309] D. W. Kang, J. Kim, T. Nomura, and H. Okada, “Natural mass hierarchy among three heavy Majorana neutrinos for resonant leptogenesis under modular A_4 symmetry,” *JHEP* **07** (2022) 050, [arXiv:2205.08269 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [310] M. Abbas and S. Khalil, “Modular A_4 Symmetry With Three-Moduli and Flavor Problem,” [arXiv:2212.10666 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [311] M. R. Devi, “Retrieving texture zeros in 3+1 active-sterile neutrino framework under the action of A_4 modular-invariants,” [arXiv:2303.04900 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [312] S. Centelles Chuliá, R. Kumar, O. Popov, and R. Srivastava, “Neutrino Mass Sum Rules from Modular \mathcal{A}_4 Symmetry,” [arXiv:2308.08981 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [313] T. Nomura, H. Okada, and H. Otsuka, “Texture zeros realization in a three-loop radiative neutrino mass model from modular A_4 symmetry,” [arXiv:2309.13921 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [314] R. Kumar, P. Mishra, M. K. Behera, R. Mohanta, and R. Srivastava, “Predictions from scoto-seesaw with A_4 modular symmetry,” [arXiv:2310.02363 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [315] T. Kobayashi, T. Nomura, H. Okada, and H. Otsuka, “Modular flavor models with positive modular weights: a new lepton model building,” [arXiv:2310.10091 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [316] H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, “CP violation of quarks in A_4 modular invariance,” *Phys. Lett. B* **791** (2019) 54–61, [arXiv:1812.09677 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [317] S. T. Petcov and M. Tanimoto, “ A_4 modular flavour model of quark mass hierarchies close to the fixed point $\tau = \omega$,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **83** no. 7, (2023) 579, [arXiv:2212.13336 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [318] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, “Quark mass hierarchies and CP violation in $A_4 \times A_4 \times A_4$ modular symmetric flavor models,” *JHEP* **07** (2023) 134, [arXiv:2302.03326 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [319] H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, “Towards unification of quark and lepton flavors in A_4 modular invariance,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** no. 1, (2021) 52, [arXiv:1905.13421 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [320] M. Abbas, “Fermion masses and mixing in modular A_4 Symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 5, (2021) 056016, [arXiv:2002.01929 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [321] H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, “Quark and lepton flavors with common modulus τ in A_4 modular symmetry,” *Phys. Dark Univ.* **40** (2023) 101204, [arXiv:2005.00775 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [322] T. Nomura, H. Okada, and Y. Orikasa, “Quark and lepton flavor model with leptoquarks in a modular A_4 symmetry,” *Eur. Phys. J. C* **81** no. 10, (2021) 947, [arXiv:2106.12375 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [323] H. Okada and Y. Orikasa, “Lepton mass matrix from double covering of A_4 modular flavor symmetry*,” *Chin. Phys. C* **46** no. 12, (2022) 123108, [arXiv:2206.12629 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [324] P. Beneš, H. Okada, and Y. Orikasa, “Towards unification of lepton and quark mass matrices from double covering of modular A_4 flavor symmetry,” [arXiv:2212.07245 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [325] T. Kobayashi, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, and T. H. Tatsuishi, “New A_4 lepton flavor model from S_4 modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **02** (2020) 097, [arXiv:1907.09141 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [326] S. F. King and Y.-L. Zhou, “Trimaximal TM_1 mixing with two modular S_4 groups,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 1, (2020) 015001, [arXiv:1908.02770 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [327] J. C. Criado, F. Feruglio, and S. J. D. King, “Modular Invariant Models of Lepton Masses at Levels 4 and 5,” *JHEP* **02** (2020) 001, [arXiv:1908.11867 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [328] X. Wang and S. Zhou, “The minimal seesaw model with a modular S_4 symmetry,” *JHEP* **05** (2020) 017, [arXiv:1910.09473 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [329] X. Wang, “Dirac neutrino mass models with a modular S_4 symmetry,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **962** (2021) 115247, [arXiv:2007.05913 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [330] T. Nomura and H. Okada, “Linear seesaw model with a modular S_4 flavor symmetry*,” *Chin. Phys. C* **46** no. 5, (2022) 053101, [arXiv:2109.04157 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [331] G.-J. Ding, X.-G. Liu, and C.-Y. Yao, “A minimal modular invariant neutrino model,” *JHEP* **01** (2023) 125, [arXiv:2211.04546 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [332] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, J. Kawamura, and T. Kobayashi, “Quark masses and CKM hierarchies from S'_4 modular flavor symmetry,” [arXiv:2301.07439 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [333] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, J. Kawamura, and T. Kobayashi, “Quark and lepton hierarchies from S_4' modular flavor symmetry,” *Phys. Lett. B* **842** (2023) 137977, [arXiv:2302.11183 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [334] I. de Medeiros Varzielas and J. a. Lourenco, “Two A_5 modular symmetries for Golden Ratio 2 mixing,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **984** (2022) 115974, [arXiv:2206.14869 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [335] X. Wang, B. Yu, and S. Zhou, “Double covering of the modular A_5 group and lepton flavor mixing in the minimal seesaw model,” *Phys. Rev. D* **103** no. 7, (2021) 076005, [arXiv:2010.10159 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [336] X. Wang and S. Zhou, “Explicit perturbations to the stabilizer $\tau = i$ of modular A'_5 symmetry and leptonic CP violation,” *JHEP* **07** (2021) 093, [arXiv:2102.04358 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [337] M. K. Behera and R. Mohanta, “Inverse seesaw in A'_5 modular symmetry,” *J. Phys. G* **49** no. 4, (2022) 045001, [arXiv:2108.01059 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [338] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, “Quark hierarchical structures in modular symmetric flavor models at level 6,” *Phys. Rev. D* **107** no. 5, (2023) 055014, [arXiv:2301.03737 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [339] S. Antusch and V. Maurer, “Running quark and lepton parameters at various scales,” *JHEP* **11** (2013) 115, [arXiv:1306.6879 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [340] **KATRIN** Collaboration, M. Aker *et al.*, “Direct neutrino-mass measurement with sub-electronvolt sensitivity,” *Nature Phys.* **18** no. 2, (2022) 160–166, [arXiv:2105.08533 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [341] **KamLAND-Zen** Collaboration, S. Abe *et al.*, “Search for the Majorana Nature of Neutrinos in the Inverted Mass Ordering Region with KamLAND-Zen,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130** no. 5, (2023) 051801, [arXiv:2203.02139 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [342] **Planck** Collaboration, N. Aghanim *et al.*, “Planck 2018 results. VI. Cosmological parameters,” *Astron. Astrophys.* **641** (2020) A6, [arXiv:1807.06209 \[astro-ph.CO\]](#). [Erratum: *Astron.Astrophys.* 652, C4 (2021)].
- [343] **DUNE** Collaboration, R. Acciarri *et al.*, “Long-Baseline Neutrino Facility (LBNF) and Deep Underground Neutrino Experiment (DUNE): Conceptual Design Report, Volume 2: The Physics Program for DUNE at LBNF,” [arXiv:1512.06148 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [344] **Hyper-Kamiokande Proto-** Collaboration, K. Abe *et al.*, “Physics potential of a long-baseline neutrino oscillation experiment using a J-PARC neutrino beam and Hyper-Kamiokande,” *PTEP* **2015** (2015) 053C02, [arXiv:1502.05199 \[hep-ex\]](#).
- [345] **JUNO** Collaboration, Z. Djuricic *et al.*, “JUNO Conceptual Design Report,” [arXiv:1508.07166 \[physics.ins-det\]](#).
- [346] G.-J. Ding, X.-G. Liu, J.-N. Lu, and M.-H. Weng, “Modular binary octahedral symmetry for flavor structure of Standard Model,” [arXiv:2307.14926 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [347] I. de Medeiros Varzielas, S. F. King, and M. Levy, “A Modular $SU(5)$ Littlest Seesaw,” [arXiv:2309.15901 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [348] T. Kobayashi, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, and T. H. Tatsuishi, “Modular S_3 -invariant flavor model in $SU(5)$ grand unified theory,” *PTEP* **2020** no. 5, (2020) 053B05, [arXiv:1906.10341 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [349] X. Du and F. Wang, “SUSY breaking constraints on modular flavor S_3 invariant $SU(5)$ GUT model,” *JHEP* **02** (2021) 221, [arXiv:2012.01397 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [350] F. J. de Anda, S. F. King, and E. Perdomo, “ $SU(5)$ grand unified theory with A_4 modular symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 1, (2020) 015028, [arXiv:1812.05620 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [351] P. Chen, G.-J. Ding, and S. F. King, “ $SU(5)$ GUTs with A_4 modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **04** (2021) 239, [arXiv:2101.12724 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [352] G. Charalampous, S. F. King, G. K. Leontaris, and Y.-L. Zhou, “Flipped $SU(5)$ with modular A_4 symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **104** no. 11, (2021) 115015, [arXiv:2109.11379 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [353] X. K. Du and F. Wang, “Flavor structures of quarks and leptons from flipped $SU(5)$ GUT with A_4 modular flavor symmetry,” *JHEP* **01** (2023) 036, [arXiv:2209.08796 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [354] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, and J.-N. Lu, “ $SO(10)$ models with A_4 modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **11** (2021) 007, [arXiv:2108.09655 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [355] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, J.-N. Lu, and B.-Y. Qu, “Leptogenesis in $SO(10)$ models with A_4 modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **10** (2022) 071, [arXiv:2206.14675 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [356] Y. Zhao and H.-H. Zhang, “Adjoint $SU(5)$ GUT model with modular S_4 symmetry,” *JHEP* **03** (2021) 002, [arXiv:2101.02266 \[hep-ph\]](#).

- [357] S. F. King and Y.-L. Zhou, “Twin modular S_4 with $SU(5)$ GUT,” *JHEP* **04** (2021) 291, [arXiv:2103.02633 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [358] Y. Abe, T. Higaki, J. Kawamura, and T. Kobayashi, “Fermion hierarchies in $SU(5)$ grand unification from Γ'_6 modular flavor symmetry,” *JHEP* **08** (2023) 097, [arXiv:2307.01419 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [359] H. Georgi and S. L. Glashow, “Unity of All Elementary Particle Forces,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **32** (1974) 438–441.
- [360] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, “A New Lepton - Quark Mass Relation in a Unified Theory,” *Phys. Lett. B* **86** (1979) 297–300.
- [361] H. Fritzsch and P. Minkowski, “Unified Interactions of Leptons and Hadrons,” *Annals Phys.* **93** (1975) 193–266.
- [362] S. M. Barr, “A New Symmetry Breaking Pattern for $SO(10)$ and Proton Decay,” *Phys. Lett. B* **112** (1982) 219–222.
- [363] J. P. Derendinger, J. E. Kim, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Anti- $SU(5)$,” *Phys. Lett. B* **139** (1984) 170–176.
- [364] I. Antoniadis, J. R. Ellis, J. S. Hagelin, and D. V. Nanopoulos, “Supersymmetric Flipped $SU(5)$ Revitalized,” *Phys. Lett. B* **194** (1987) 231–235.
- [365] E. D’Hoker and J. Kaidi, “Lectures on modular forms and strings,” [arXiv:2208.07242 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [366] T. Kobayashi, S. Raby, and R.-J. Zhang, “Searching for realistic 4d string models with a Pati-Salam symmetry: Orbifold grand unified theories from heterotic string compactification on a $Z(6)$ orbifold,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **704** (2005) 3–55, [arXiv:hep-ph/0409098](#).
- [367] T. Kobayashi, H. P. Nilles, F. Ploger, S. Raby, and M. Ratz, “Stringy origin of non-Abelian discrete flavor symmetries,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **768** (2007) 135–156, [arXiv:hep-ph/0611020](#).
- [368] H. Abe, K.-S. Choi, T. Kobayashi, and H. Ohki, “Non-Abelian Discrete Flavor Symmetries from Magnetized/Intersecting Brane Models,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **820** (2009) 317–333, [arXiv:0904.2631 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [369] M. Fischer, M. Ratz, J. Torrado, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Classification of symmetric toroidal orbifolds,” *JHEP* **01** (2013) 084, [arXiv:1209.3906 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [370] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, H. Otsuka, S. Takada, and H. Uchida, “Remark on modular weights in low-energy effective field theory from type II string theory,” *JHEP* **04** (2023) 003, [arXiv:2301.10356 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [371] T. Kobayashi and H. Otsuka, “Classification of discrete modular symmetries in Type IIB flux vacua,” *Phys. Rev. D* **101** no. 10, (2020) 106017, [arXiv:2001.07972 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [372] G.-J. Ding, S. F. King, C.-C. Li, X.-G. Liu, and J.-N. Lu, “Neutrino mass and mixing models with eclectic flavor symmetry $\Delta(27) \times T$,” *JHEP* **05** (2023) 144, [arXiv:2303.02071 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [373] A. Baur, M. Kade, H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “Completing the eclectic flavor scheme of the Z_2 orbifold,” *JHEP* **06** (2021) 110, [arXiv:2104.03981 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [374] M.-C. Chen, V. Knapp-Perez, M. Ramos-Hamud, S. Ramos-Sanchez, M. Ratz, and

- S. Shukla, “Quasi–eclectic modular flavor symmetries,” *Phys. Lett. B* **824** (2022) 136843, [arXiv:2108.02240 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [375] A. Baur, H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, A. Trautner, and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, “The first string-derived eclectic flavor model with realistic phenomenology,” *JHEP* **09** (2022) 224, [arXiv:2207.10677 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [376] C.-C. Li and G.-J. Ding, “Eclectic flavor group $\Delta(27) \rtimes S_3$ and lepton model building,” [arXiv:2308.16901 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [377] S. B. Giddings, S. Kachru, and J. Polchinski, “Hierarchies from fluxes in string compactifications,” *Phys. Rev. D* **66** (2002) 106006, [arXiv:hep-th/0105097](#).
- [378] S. Gukov, C. Vafa, and E. Witten, “CFT’s from Calabi-Yau four folds,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **584** (2000) 69–108, [arXiv:hep-th/9906070](#). [Erratum: Nucl.Phys.B 608, 477–478 (2001)].
- [379] G. Curio, A. Klemm, D. Lust, and S. Theisen, “On the vacuum structure of type II string compactifications on Calabi-Yau spaces with H fluxes,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **609** (2001) 3–45, [arXiv:hep-th/0012213](#).
- [380] S. Ashok and M. R. Douglas, “Counting flux vacua,” *JHEP* **01** (2004) 060, [arXiv:hep-th/0307049](#).
- [381] F. Denef and M. R. Douglas, “Distributions of nonsupersymmetric flux vacua,” *JHEP* **03** (2005) 061, [arXiv:hep-th/0411183](#).
- [382] T. Kobayashi, Y. Shimizu, K. Takagi, M. Tanimoto, and T. H. Tatsuishi, “ A_4 lepton flavor model and modulus stabilization from S_4 modular symmetry,” *Phys. Rev. D* **100** no. 11, (2019) 115045, [arXiv:1909.05139 \[hep-ph\]](#). [Erratum: Phys.Rev.D 101, 039904 (2020)].
- [383] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, and Y. Yamada, “Moduli trapping mechanism in modular flavor symmetric models,” *JHEP* **08** (2023) 081, [arXiv:2307.13230 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [384] M. Dine, R. Rohm, N. Seiberg, and E. Witten, “Gluino Condensation in Superstring Models,” *Phys. Lett. B* **156** (1985) 55–60.
- [385] H. P. Nilles, “Dynamically Broken Supergravity and the Hierarchy Problem,” *Phys. Lett. B* **115** (1982) 193.
- [386] S. Ferrara, L. Girardello, and H. P. Nilles, “Breakdown of Local Supersymmetry Through Gauge Fermion Condensates,” *Phys. Lett. B* **125** (1983) 457.
- [387] V. S. Kaplunovsky, “One Loop Threshold Effects in String Unification,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **307** (1988) 145–156, [arXiv:hep-th/9205068](#). [Erratum: Nucl.Phys.B 382, 436–438 (1992)].
- [388] L. J. Dixon, V. Kaplunovsky, and J. Louis, “Moduli dependence of string loop corrections to gauge coupling constants,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **355** (1991) 649–688.
- [389] I. Antoniadis, K. S. Narain, and T. R. Taylor, “Higher genus string corrections to gauge couplings,” *Phys. Lett. B* **267** (1991) 37–45.
- [390] I. Antoniadis, E. Gava, and K. S. Narain, “Moduli corrections to gauge and gravitational couplings in four-dimensional superstrings,” *Nucl. Phys. B* **383** (1992) 93–109, [arXiv:hep-th/9204030](#).
- [391] M. Cicoli, S. de Alwis, and A. Westphal, “Heterotic Moduli Stabilisation,” *JHEP* **10** (2013) 199, [arXiv:1304.1809 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [392] A. Font, L. E. Ibanez, D. Lust, and F. Quevedo, “Supersymmetry Breaking From Duality Invariant Gaugino Condensation,” *Phys. Lett. B* **245** (1990) 401–408.

- [393] E. Gonzalo, L. E. Ibáñez, and A. M. Uranga, “Modular symmetries and the swampland conjectures,” *JHEP* **05** (2019) 105, [arXiv:1812.06520 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [394] P. P. Novichkov, J. T. Penedo, and S. T. Petcov, “Modular flavour symmetries and modulus stabilisation,” *JHEP* **03** (2022) 149, [arXiv:2201.02020 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [395] V. Knapp-Perez, X.-G. Liu, H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, and M. Ratz, “Matter matters in moduli fixing and modular flavor symmetries,” [arXiv:2304.14437 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [396] O. Lebedev, H. P. Nilles, and M. Ratz, “De Sitter vacua from matter superpotentials,” *Phys. Lett. B* **636** (2006) 126–131, [arXiv:hep-th/0603047](#).
- [397] O. Lebedev, V. Lowen, Y. Mambrini, H. P. Nilles, and M. Ratz, “Metastable Vacua in Flux Compactifications and Their Phenomenology,” *JHEP* **02** (2007) 063, [arXiv:hep-ph/0612035](#).
- [398] S. Kachru, R. Kallosh, A. D. Linde, and S. P. Trivedi, “De Sitter vacua in string theory,” *Phys. Rev. D* **68** (2003) 046005, [arXiv:hep-th/0301240](#).
- [399] J. M. Leedom, N. Righi, and A. Westphal, “Heterotic de Sitter beyond modular symmetry,” *JHEP* **02** (2023) 209, [arXiv:2212.03876 \[hep-th\]](#).
- [400] S. H. Shenker, “The Strength of nonperturbative effects in string theory,” in *Cargese Study Institute: Random Surfaces, Quantum Gravity and Strings*, pp. 809–819. 8, 1990.
- [401] S. F. King and X. Wang, “Modulus stabilisation in the multiple-modulus framework,” [arXiv:2310.10369 \[hep-ph\]](#).
- [402] T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, R. Sakuma, and Y. Yamada, “Radiative correction on moduli stabilization in modular flavor symmetric models,” [arXiv:2310.15604 \[hep-ph\]](#).