

# Modular Family Symmetry in F-Theory GUTs from the Bottom-up

Vasileios Basiouris<sup>\*1</sup>, Miguel Crispim Romão<sup>†2,3,4</sup>, Stephen F. King<sup>‡4</sup>, and George K. Leontaris<sup>§1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Physics Department, University of Ioannina, 45110, Ioannina, Greece

<sup>2</sup>Institute for Particle Physics Phenomenology, Department of Physics, Durham University, Durham DH1 3LE, U.K.

<sup>3</sup>Laboratório de Instrumentação e Física Experimental de Partículas, Escola de Ciências, Departamento de Física, Universidade do Minho, 4701-057 Braga, Portugal

<sup>4</sup>School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Southampton, Southampton SO17 1BJ, United Kingdom

July 10, 2024

## Abstract

Finite modular family symmetry can emerge from top-down approaches based on heterotic string theory or Type IIB string theory. We show that, in addition to such approaches, it can also emerge from local F-Theory bottom-up constructions. As a first example of the new approach, we have analysed in detail a concrete F-Theory Fluxed  $SU(5)$  Grand Unified Theory (GUT) with modular  $S_4$  family symmetry. The model fits the fermion mass and mixing data very well and serves as a demonstration of the bottom-up approach to modular family symmetry in F-Theory fluxed GUTs.

Report Number: IPPP/24/42

## 1 Introduction

The predictive power of discrete flavour symmetries in fermion mass hierarchies has long been emphasised. In attempting to explain the fermion mass hierarchies and mixings, various non-abelian discrete groups were successfully applied as family symmetries to numerous extensions of the standard model (see e.g. [1] and references therein).

---

<sup>\*</sup>v.basiouris@uoi.gr

<sup>†</sup>miguel.romao@durham.ac.uk

<sup>‡</sup>s.f.king@soton.ac.uk

<sup>§</sup>leonta@uoi.gr

Such family symmetry must be spontaneously broken by vacuum expectation values (VEVs) of scalar flavon fields, leading to the vacuum alignment problem, which leads to additional complications. Modular invariance was suggested to overcome such complications [2]. In the simplest examples, the only flavon is a complex modulus  $\tau$  that transforms under the modular group  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ . Finite modular symmetries  $\Gamma_N$  can emerge as the quotient group of  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  with one of its principal congruence subgroups  $\Gamma(N)$  of level  $N$ . Yukawa couplings are represented by modular forms which transform under the finite level  $N$  quotient group,  $\Gamma_N$ , that further restricts the possible mass textures and increases the predictive power of the effective theory. Subsequently, such finite modular family symmetry has been widely studied from the top-down and bottom-up perspectives (see e.g. [3, 4] for recent reviews).

From the top-down perspective, there have been attempts to investigate such symmetries in the context of heterotic superstring motivated models [5]. Indeed, upon orbifold compactification of the six extra dimensions, the modular group and its congruence group emerge 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.

Another example is an effective supergravity model from Type IIB compactification [6, 7]. Its massless spectrum contains several moduli which correspond to deformations of the Calabi-Yau (CY) manifold. Among them, the complex structure, the Kähler and the axio-dilaton, the latter being a complex scalar combination  $\tau$  where the real part is the RR axion  $C_0$  and its imaginary is the inverse of the string coupling  $g_s^{-1} = e^{-\phi}$  where  $\phi$  is the dilaton field. Taking into account that the massless spectrum is described by an associated supergravity and the fact that  $g_s$  takes only positive values, the field  $\tau$  admits values subject to  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ , which is nothing else than S-duality.

Several quantities and parameters of the effective theory, such as the Kähler potential, the superpotential, and Yukawa couplings, depend on the field  $\tau$  and have well-defined transformation properties under (some congruence group of)  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$ . Analogously, in toroidal compactifications, there are discrete symmetries, dubbed T-dualities, which relate Type IIB theory with compactification radius  $R$  to Type IIA associated with the inverse radius  $1/R$ . Constraints similar to the above mentioned are also expected to be imposed on the effective theory (see [8] and review [9]).

In this paper, we extend these ideas to the rich framework of local F-Theory, which can be applied using bottom-up constructions. We discuss the explicit constructions of Yukawa couplings in F-Theory as integrals of overlapping wavefunctions around the intersection of matter curves, each a Riemannian surface. In this construction, the wavefunctions are solutions to the equations of motion of the compactified Yang-Mills (YM) theory on the 7-branes, which the solutions have an undetermined holomorphic dependency on the coordinates of the matter curve. This observation leads us to conclude that the structure of the Yukawa couplings will depend on the complex structure moduli of the matter curves in such a way that if these curves exhibit modular symmetries, then the Yukawa couplings can be modular forms associated with these symmetries.

Using this observation, we argue that one may explicitly construct fluxed GUTs

with discrete modular symmetry, within a bottom-up approach where the fields on chosen matter curves, subject to specified fluxes, transform as a representation of a discrete modular family group and carry assigned modular weights. Additionally, the Yukawa matrices, arising from the overlapping wavefunction integrals at matter curve intersections, are promoted to modular forms of appropriate weight. As a first example of the new approach, we have analysed in detail a concrete F-Theory Fluxed  $SU(5)$  GUT with modular  $S_4$  family symmetry. We show that, although the model fits the data very well, with the best point having vanishing  $\chi^2$ , it is over-parameterised and therefore lacks predictive power. Nevertheless, it provides some insight into fermion mass hierarchies and serves as a demonstration of the bottom-up approach to modular family symmetry in F-Theory fluxed GUTs.

This work is organised as follows. In section 2 we revise modular symmetry invariant field theories to set notation and definitions. In section 3 we discuss the origin of discrete finite modular symmetries in F-Theory compactifications in three stages: in section 3.1 we discuss the existence of Type IIB vacua, which is a perturbative limit of F-Theory, with explicit finite modular symmetry and how the modular symmetry of the background geometry mixes with the axio-dilaton modular symmetry; in section 3.2 we discuss how the Yukawa couplings in Type IIB and F-Theory depend on the axio-dilaton and transform under its modular symmetry; then, in section 3.3 we review how the Yukawa couplings are obtained in F-Theory and argue that they inherit modular symmetry properties from the geometry of the matter curves supporting the matter fields. Equipped with these arguments, in section 4 we present an F-Theory fluxed GUT with modular symmetry, including a fit to experimental data in section 4.1. In section 5 we conclude and provide an outlook for our framework.

## 2 Modular Symmetry Invariant Supersymmetric Field Theories

In this section, we introduce modular forms of even weight, following [2] to set the notation and definitions that we will be using for the rest of this work. We first define the homogeneous modular group,  $\Gamma$ , is composed of  $2 \times 2$  matrices such that

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

$\Gamma$  has two generators,  $S$  and  $T$ , which respect

$$S^4 = (ST)^3 = I, \quad (2)$$

where  $I$  is the identity element, and can be represented in matrix form as

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (3)$$

Another closely related group is the inhomogeneous modular group,  $\bar{\Gamma}$ , which is the group of linear fraction transformations,  $\gamma$ , acting on the upper half complex plane,  $\mathcal{H} = \{\tau \in \mathbb{C}, \Im(\tau) > 0\}$ , as

$$\tau \mapsto \gamma\tau = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d}, \text{ s.t. } a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}, ad - bc = 1. \quad (4)$$

Since the elements  $\pm\gamma$  produce the same linear fractional transformation, we can see that this group is related to  $\Gamma$  as

$$\bar{\Gamma} = \Gamma / \{\pm I\} = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} / \{\pm \mathbb{I}\} \mid a, b, c, d \in \mathbb{Z}, ad - bc = 1 \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity  $2 \times 2$  matrix, and we note that it is isomorphic to the projective matrix group  $PSL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \cong SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) / \{\pm I\}$ .  $\bar{\Gamma}$  is also generated by  $S$  and  $T$ , but since  $I$  and  $-I$  are identified, we have  $S^2 = I$ , and they act on a complex number  $\tau \in \mathcal{H}$  as

$$S : \tau \mapsto -\frac{1}{\tau}, \quad T : \tau \mapsto \tau + 1 \quad (6)$$

An important sequence of subgroups of  $\Gamma$  are the principal congruence subgroups of level  $N$ ,  $\Gamma(N)$ , which are given by

$$\Gamma(N) = \left\{ \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \in \Gamma \mid \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \pmod{N} \right\}, \quad (7)$$

which are infinite normal subgroups of  $\Gamma$ . Since the congruence of unity are all the integers, we have  $\Gamma(1) = \Gamma$ . Furthermore, we define  $\bar{\Gamma}(N) = \Gamma(N) / \{\pm I\}$  for  $N = 1, 2$ , and since  $-I$  is not an element of  $\Gamma(N)$  for  $N > 2$  we have  $\bar{\Gamma}(N) = \Gamma(N)$  for  $N > 2$ .

The quotients  $\Gamma_N = \bar{\Gamma} / \bar{\Gamma}(N)$  are called inhomogeneous finite modular groups of level  $N$ . They are finite and discrete, and are generated by  $S$  and  $T$  respecting

$$S^2 = (ST)^3 = T^N = I. \quad (8)$$

Inhomogeneous finite modular groups  $\Gamma_N$  have been studied in great detail in the literature [2, 10–13], with  $\Gamma_2 \cong S_3$ ,  $\Gamma_3 \cong A_4$ ,  $\Gamma_4 \cong S_4$ , and  $\Gamma_5 \cong A_5$ , as well as higher levels [14, 15]. For a full, comprehensive, list see [4] and references therein.

An important aspect of modular symmetries is the notion of modular forms that are holomorphic functions of a complex parameter  $\tau \in \mathcal{H}$ , which we will take to be the modulus of a compact space, with special transformation properties. A modular form  $f(\tau)$ , of weight  $k$  and level  $N$  is a holomorphic function of  $\gamma \in \mathcal{H}$  that under the action of  $\gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}(N)$  transforms as

$$f(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k f(\tau), \quad \forall \gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}(N), \quad (9)$$

and it can be shown [16] that, for even  $k$ , these span a finite dimension linear space,  $\mathcal{M}_k(\bar{\Gamma}(N))$ , and in which it is possible to find a basis such that the modular forms furnish a representation of the inhomogeneous finite modular group  $\Gamma_N$

$$f_r(\gamma\tau) = (c\tau + d)^k \rho_r(\gamma) f_r(\tau), \quad \forall \gamma \in \bar{\Gamma}, \quad (10)$$

where  $\gamma$  is a representative element of  $\Gamma_N$ ,  $\rho_r(\gamma)$  is the representation matrix of  $\gamma$  in the representation  $r$  of  $\Gamma_N$ .

We will now use these to build supersymmetric theories with modular invariance, in order to construct a framework for model building. We will follow [2, 17] and provide the uniform notation and definitions that we will use for the remainder of this work.

An  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetric theory is defined by two functions: the Kähler potential,  $K(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau})$  - a real function of the chiral superfields  $\{\Phi_I\}$  and the moduli  $\{\tau\}$  - and the superpotential  $W(\Phi, \tau)$  - a holomorphic function of the same superfields. We will consider the case where there is only one modulus field.

The superpotential admits the generic expansion

$$W(\Phi_I, \tau) = \sum_n Y_{I_1, \dots, I_n} \Phi_{I_1} \dots \Phi_{I_n} , \quad (11)$$

where the couplings  $Y_{I_1, \dots, I_n} \Phi_{I_1}$  are modular forms of weight  $k_Y$ , and will then transform under the action of  $\bar{\Gamma}$ . The chiral superfields,  $\{\Phi_I\}$ , will also transform non-trivially, but are otherwise not modular forms. Under the action of modular group, we have

$$\tau \mapsto \gamma\tau = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d} \quad (12)$$

$$\Phi_I \mapsto (c\tau + d)^{-k_I} \rho_I(\gamma) \Phi_I \quad (13)$$

$$Y_{I_1, \dots, I_n} \mapsto (c\tau + d)^{k_Y} \rho_Y(\gamma) Y_{I_1, \dots, I_n} \quad (14)$$

where  $\gamma$  is an element of  $\bar{\Gamma}$ , and  $\rho_I(\gamma)$  and  $\rho_Y(\gamma)$  are representation matrices of  $\gamma$  in the finite modular subgroup,  $\Gamma_N$ ,  $-k_I$  and  $k_Y$  are modular weights. Therefore, superpotential level invariance is obtained when the sum of the modular weights for each coupling vanish, and if there is a singlet in the product of representations

$$k_Y = k_{I_1} + \dots k_{I_n} \quad (15)$$

$$\mathbf{1} \subset \rho_Y \rho_{I_1} \dots \rho_{I_n} . \quad (16)$$

When considering the full supergravity theory, the relevant defining quantity which needs to be invariant is the Kähler function,  $G(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau})$ , given by

$$G(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau}) = K(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau}) + \ln W(\Phi_I, \tau) + \ln \bar{W}(\bar{\Phi}_I, \bar{\tau}) . \quad (17)$$

This allows for the sum of modular weights to be non-vanishing at the superpotential level, as long as the leftover is absorbed by the Kähler potential through a Kähler transformation. However, to do so one usually needs an explicit form of the Kähler potential. For example, if one considers a Kähler potential with the customary no-scale structure with a chiral superfield expansion

$$K(\Phi_I, \bar{\Phi}_I, \tau, \bar{\tau}) = -h \ln(-i(\tau - \bar{\tau})) + \sum_I (-i(\tau - \bar{\tau}))^{-k_I} |\Phi_I|^2 , \quad (18)$$

with  $h$  a positive number, the superpotential now transforms as

$$W(\Phi, \tau) \mapsto (c\tau + d)^{-h} W(\Phi, \tau) . \quad (19)$$

This effectively amounts to change the condition for vanishing modular weights to

$$k_Y = k_{I_1} + \dots k_{I_n} - h , \quad (20)$$

whilst each superpotential coupling still needs to be an  $\Gamma_N$  invariant singlet.

### 3 The Origin of Discrete Finite Modular Symmetry from Type IIB to F-Theory

We now discuss how the finite modular symmetry can arise in F-Theory constructions. We first revisit Type IIB (the perturbative limit of F-Theory) vacua with discrete finite modular symmetry and explicitly obtain an  $S_4$  invariant vacuum. We then turn to F-Theory, which inherits the S-duality from Type IIB, to identify the axio-dilaton modular symmetry, which endows the matter Yukawa couplings with modular symmetry transformation properties. Finally, we present our conjecture that F-Theory matter curves can carry a geometric modular symmetry, which will manifest itself in the Yukawa couplings, endowing F-Theory fluxed GUTs with a discrete modular family symmetry.

#### 3.1 Finite Modular Symmetry in Type IIB Orientifold Toroidal Compactifications

We now discuss the origins of finite modular symmetries in Type IIB string theory. To this effect, we will study, expanding on [6] Type IIB orientifold compactifications, where one can stabilise the moduli in a vacuum that is invariant to finite modular symmetries. The starting point is Type IIB, which exhibits an explicit modular invariance for the axio-dilaton irrespective of the details of the compact space. Upon choosing a factorisable toroidal orientifold for the compactification,  $T^6/\mathbb{Z}_2 = (T_1^2 \times T_2^2 \times T_3^2)/\mathbb{Z}_2$  the theory will also manifest the modular invariance associated with the complex structure moduli of each of the tori, in other words we will have  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau \otimes (\otimes_{i=1}^3 SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_i)$  before the complex structure moduli are stabilised by Type IIB flux configurations. Once the fluxes acquire nonvanishing VEVs, we will show that the supersymmetry preserving vacuum transforms non-trivially under a congruence subgroup of order  $N$ ,  $\bar{\Gamma}(N)$ , of the original modular symmetries, therefore breaking the preserved symmetry to  $\Gamma_N$ .

As mentioned, we start with the Type IIB string theory, which is characterised by the strong-weak coupling duality (S-duality for short) which relates the theory with string coupling  $g_s$  to that with  $g_s^{-1}$ . S-duality is a non-perturbative symmetry based on the  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  modular group and is realised by the axio-dilaton modulus  $\tau$  whose imaginary component is identified with the inverse string coupling

$$\tau = C_0 + ie^{-\phi} \equiv C_0 + i\frac{1}{g_s} \equiv C_0 + is , \quad (21)$$

where  $\phi$  is the dilaton, and for convenience the definition  $s = g_s^{-1}$  has been introduced.

The four-dimensional (4d) effective action of the string moduli is described by the Kähler potential and the superpotential, both dependent on the complex structure moduli. The Kähler potential is parametrised in terms of the moduli and the axio-dilaton

$$K = -\ln(-i(\tau - \bar{\tau})) - 2\ln(\mathcal{V}) - 2\ln\left(e^{-\frac{3}{2}\phi} \int J \wedge J \wedge J\right), \quad (22)$$

where  $\phi$  is the dilaton,  $\tau$  is the axio-dilaton defined in (21),  $\mathcal{V}$  is the volume of the compactified space, and  $J$  its Kähler form  $dJ = 0$  which depends on the complex coordinates  $z^i$  and  $g_{i\bar{j}}$  the Kähler metric, and in its most general form is given by

$$J = ig_{i\bar{j}} dz^i \wedge d\bar{z}^j.$$

The superpotential for the moduli fields, is given by the standard Gukov-Vafa-Witten formula

$$W = \int G_3 \wedge \Omega, \quad (23)$$

where the three form flux  $G_3$  and the holomorphic three form  $\Omega$  are given

$$G_3 = F_3 - \tau H_3 \quad (24)$$

$$\Omega = dz_1 \wedge dz_2 \wedge dz_3. \quad (25)$$

Finally, for the toroidal case we define  $z_i = x_i + \tau_i y_i$  so that,

$$dz_i = dx_i + \tau^i dy^i,$$

where  $z_i$  corresponds to the three complex coordinates of the compactified space, and  $\tau^i$  are the complex structure moduli of the orientifold. In general, the complex structure moduli form a matrix,  $\tau^{ij}$ , parameterising the 3-cycles of the compactification, but here we take it to be a diagonal matrix, as we will be considering factorisable toroidal orientifolds.

Let now the basis for 3-forms be  $(\alpha_i, \beta^j)$

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_0 &= dx^1 \wedge dx^2 \wedge dx^3, & \alpha_i &= \frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ilm} dx^l \wedge dx^m \wedge dy^i \\ \beta^0 &= dy^1 \wedge dy^2 \wedge dy^3, & \beta^i &= -\frac{1}{2} \epsilon_{ilm} dy^l \wedge dy^m \wedge dx^i, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where we notice that there is no sum in  $i = 1, 2, 3$ , and we have

$$\int \alpha_i \wedge \beta^j = \delta_i^j, \quad (27)$$

where the integral is over the compact space.

The 3-form field strengths are expanded in terms of the basis as

$$\begin{aligned} F_3 &= m^0 \alpha_0 + m^i \alpha_i + n_i \beta^i + n_0 \beta^0 \\ H_3 &= p^0 \alpha_0 + p^i \alpha_i + q_i \beta^i + q_0 \beta^0 , \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

where  $m$ ,  $n$ ,  $p$ , and  $q$  are quantised flux components, and are therefore integer valued. In fact, in the absence of exotic O3-planes, these are all even integers. The 3-form fluxes induce a D3-brane charge which has to fulfill a tadpole cancellation condition

$$N_{D3} + \frac{1}{2} N_{\text{flux}} = \frac{1}{4} N_{O3} , \quad (29)$$

where  $N_{D3}$  is the number of D3-branes,  $N_{O3}$  the number of O3-planes to be set by the details of the compactified space, and

$$N_{\text{flux}} = \int H_3 \wedge F_3 , \quad (30)$$

which can be explicitly evaluated to obtain

$$p^0 n_0 - q_0 m^0 + \sum_i (p^i n_i - q_i m^i) = 2 \left( \frac{1}{4} N_{O3} - N_{D3} \right) . \quad (31)$$

The most general form of the superpotential for the moduli fields in the basis presented above is then

$$\begin{aligned} W &= (m^0 - \tau p^0)(\prod_j \tau_j) - (m^i - \tau p^i)(\prod_{j \neq i} \tau_j) - (n_i - \tau q_i) \tau^i - (n_0 - \tau q_0) \\ &= \tau_1 \tau_3 \tau_2 (m^0 - p^0 \tau) - \tau_3 \tau_2 (m^1 - p^1 \tau) - \tau_1 \tau_3 (m^2 - p^2 \tau) - \tau_1 \tau_2 (m^3 - p^3 \tau) - \\ &\quad - \tau_1 (n_1 - \tau q_1) - \tau_2 (n_2 - \tau q_2) - \tau_3 (n_3 - \tau q_3) - (n_0 - \tau q_0) . \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

The non-vanishing flux components will fix the moduli along flat directions, where the potential is minimised,  $D_\tau W = D_{\tau_k} W = 0$ , without breaking supersymmetry. Along these flat directions, the invariance of the fluxes under the modular symmetries of the axio-dilaton,  $\tau$ , and the complex structure moduli,  $\tau_i$ , will lead to vacua which are invariant under a finite modular subgroup. To see this, we focus on factorisable toroidal orientifold compactification  $T^6/\mathbb{Z}_2 = (T_1^2 \times T_2^2 \times T_3^2)/\mathbb{Z}_2$ .

The Type IIB action and the superpotential, eq. (23), are invariant under the axio-dilaton modular symmetry,  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau$ , according to which the axio-dilaton and the 3-forms  $F_3$ ,  $H_3$  transform as [18]

$$\tau' = R(\tau) = \frac{a\tau + b}{c\tau + d} \quad (33)$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} F'_3 \\ H'_3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F_3 \\ H_3 \end{pmatrix} , \quad R \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau . \quad (34)$$

Furthermore, since the compactified space is a factorised torus, we can identify three complex moduli  $\tau_i$ , where each has its own modular symmetry for vanishing fluxes.



Each torus  $T_i$ , is defined as the quotient of the complex plane  $\mathbb{C}/\Lambda_i$ , where  $\Lambda_i$  is a lattice spanned by the vectors  $\mathbf{e}_i = (e_{y_i}, e_{x_i})^T = (\tau_i, 1)^T$ . One can further define  $\xi_i = (y_i, x_i)^T$  where the coordinates  $x_i \in [0, 1)$ ,  $y_i \in [0, 1]$  and  $z_i$  are introduced according to [19]

$$z_i = \xi_i^T \mathbf{e}_i \equiv (y_i, x_i) \begin{pmatrix} e_{y_i} \\ e_{x_i} \end{pmatrix} \quad (35)$$

and for  $(e_{y_i}, e_{x_i})^T = (\tau_i, 1)^T$  in particular,

$$z_i = (y_i, x_i) \begin{pmatrix} \tau_i \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} \equiv x_i + \tau_i y_i z . \quad (36)$$

Under modular symmetry  $SL(2, \mathbf{Z})$

$$R_i = \begin{pmatrix} a_i & b_i \\ c_i & d_i \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_i \in SL(2, \mathbf{Z}) \quad (37)$$

the vectors  $\mathbf{e}_i$  transform according to

$$\mathbf{e}'_i = R_i \mathbf{e}_i . \quad (38)$$

Both vectors,  $\mathbf{e}'$  and  $\mathbf{e}_i$ , span the same lattice, and, since  $R_i R_i^{-1} = I$ ,

$$z = (y_i, x_i) R_i R_i^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} e_{y_i} \\ e_{x_i} \end{pmatrix} = e'_{x_i} (x'_i + \tau'_i y'_i),$$

where the modulus  $\tau_i$  describes the shape of the torus transforms as

$$\tau_i = \frac{e_{y_i}}{e_{x_i}} \mapsto \tau'_i = \frac{e'_{y_i}}{e'_{x_i}} = \frac{a_i \tau_i + b_i}{c_i \tau_i + d_i} . \quad (39)$$

Thus, we recover the modular symmetry transformation presented in the previous section. This transformation also affects the real coordinates

$$z_i = (y_i, x_i) \mathbf{e}_i \mapsto z'_i = (y'_i, x'_i) \mathbf{e}'_i = (y'_i, x'_i) R_i \mathbf{e}_i , \quad (40)$$

therefore, modular invariance implies that  $(y_i, x_i)$  transform under  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_i$  as

$$\begin{pmatrix} y'_i \\ x'_i \end{pmatrix} = (R_i^{-1})^T \begin{pmatrix} y_i \\ x_i \end{pmatrix} . \quad (41)$$

For the remaining of the analysis, it is useful to consider the transformation properties of the 1-forms. Thus, for the torus  $T_i^2$ , according to the above reasoning, we have [19]

$$\omega = \omega_l d\xi_i^l, \quad d\xi_i^k = \begin{pmatrix} dy_i^k \\ dx_i^k \end{pmatrix}, \quad \omega'_k = R_{kl} \omega_l . \quad (42)$$

As can be readily checked, an immediate consequence of the above setup is that the holomorphic 3-form  $\Omega$ , defined in eq. (25), transforms as

$$\Omega \mapsto \frac{\Omega}{\prod_{i=1}^3 (c_i \tau_i + d_i)} . \quad (43)$$

Furthermore, for a factorisable orientifold, in the large volume limit, the last term of the Kähler potential, eq. (22), takes the explicit form

$$-2 \ln \left( e^{-\frac{3}{2}\phi} \int J \wedge J \wedge J \right) = -\ln (i(\tau_1 - \bar{\tau}_1)(\tau_2 - \bar{\tau}_2)(\tau_3 - \bar{\tau}_3)) , \quad (44)$$

and under  $\otimes_{i=1}^3 SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_i$  transforms as

$$\begin{aligned} -\ln (i(\tau_1 - \bar{\tau}_1)(\tau_2 - \bar{\tau}_2)(\tau_3 - \bar{\tau}_3)) &\mapsto -\ln (i(\tau_1 - \bar{\tau}_1)(\tau_2 - \bar{\tau}_2)(\tau_3 - \bar{\tau}_3)) \\ &\quad + \ln \left( \prod_{i=1}^3 |c_i \tau_i + d_i|^2 \right) , \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

where we notice that the extra term cancels exactly the factor from eq. (43) in the supergravity action, which implies that  $G_3$  needs to be invariant under the tori modular symmetries.

Therefore, under the axio-dilaton and the three tori modular symmetries, both 3-forms  $H_3$ ,  $F_3$ , and the real coordinates pairs  $(x_i, y_i)$  on which the 3-form basis is defined transform non-trivially, while  $G_3$  itself remains invariant under the tori modular symmetries. This will imprint non-trivial constraints on the flux data. Furthermore, along flat directions of the superpotential, the flux data allowed by modular invariance will fix the moduli. To see this, we first introduce the following configuration for the fluxes

$$p_3 = -f m^0, \quad q_1 = f m^2, \quad q_2 = f m^1, \quad q_0 = f n_3, \quad (46)$$

where  $f$  is an integer. For this set of fluxes, the superpotential is given by

$$W = (f\tau - \tau_3) (\tau_1 (m^2 - m^0 \tau_2) + m^1 \tau_2 + n_3) . \quad (47)$$

Using the definition (42), the 3-forms can now be written as [19]

$$F_3 = A_{ij} d\xi_1^i \wedge d\xi_2^j \wedge dx_3 , \quad (48)$$

$$H_3 = B_{ij} d\xi_1^i \wedge d\xi_2^j \wedge dy_3 , \quad (49)$$

where  $B_{ij} = -f A_{ij}$  with

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} -n_3 & m^1 \\ m^2 & m^0 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (50)$$

Under the transformation of the modular symmetries associated with the tori  $i = 1, 2$ , i.e.  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_1 \times SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_2$ , the 3-forms  $F_3$ ,  $H_3$  transform as

$$F_3 \mapsto (R_1^{-1} A (R_2^{-1})^T)_{ij} d\xi_1^i \wedge d\xi_2^j \wedge dx_3 \quad (51)$$

$$H_3 \mapsto (R_1^{-1} A (R_2^{-1})^T)_{ij} d\xi_1^i \wedge d\xi_2^j \wedge dx_3 , \quad (52)$$

and in order for  $G_3$  to remain invariant the following relation must hold true

$$R_1^{-1}A(R_2^{-1})^T = A . \quad (53)$$

This imposes non-trivial constraints on the values of the flux data. We now consider the superpotential in eq. (47) and its flat supersymmetric directions,  $\partial_\tau W = \partial_{\tau_i} W = W = 0$ , which yield

$$\tau_3 = f\tau \quad (54)$$

$$\tau_1 = \frac{-n_3 - m^1\tau_2}{m^2 - m^0\tau_2} . \quad (55)$$

From eq. (54), we see that for  $f = 1$  the axio-dilaton  $\tau$  and the complex structure  $\tau_3$  are identified,  $\tau = \tau_3$ . This implies that the diagonal  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z}) \subset SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau \times SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_{\tau_3}$  remains unbroken by the vacuum

$$\tau'_3 = R_3(\tau_3) = R(\tau) = \tau' , \quad (56)$$

and therefore we have  $R = R_3$ , effectively connecting the axio-dilaton modular symmetry with that of the torus  $T_3^2$ .

We now focus on the symmetries associated with the tori with labels  $i = 1, 2$ . Following the above discussion, we first solve eq. (53) with respect to  $R_2$

$$R_2 = A^T(R_1^{-1})^T(A^{-1})^T . \quad (57)$$

Next from eq. (50) we have

$$A^T = \begin{pmatrix} -n_3 & m^2 \\ m^1 & m^0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A^{-1})^T = \frac{1}{m^1m^2 + m^0n_3} \begin{pmatrix} -m^0 & m^2 \\ m^1 & n_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (58)$$

from which we finally get<sup>1</sup>

$$R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{m^1m^2a_1 + m^0m^2b_1 + m^1n_3c_1 + m^0n_3d_1}{m^1m^2 + m^0n_3} & \frac{-(m^2)^2b_1 + (n_3)^2c_1 + m^2n_3(a_1 - d_1)}{m^1m^2 + m^0n_3} \\ \frac{(m^0)^2b_1 - (m^1)^2c_1 + m^0m^1(a_1 - d_1)}{m^1m^2 + m^0n_3} & \frac{m^0n_3b_1 - m^0m^2b_1 - m^1n_3c_1 + m^1m^2d_1}{m^1m^2 + m^0n_3} \end{pmatrix} . \quad (59)$$

The above result generalises that of [6], which can be reproduced in the limit  $(n_3, m^0) \rightarrow 0$ . Furthermore, one can show that the vacuum direction set by eq. (55) is invariant under  $\tau_1 \mapsto \tau'_1 = R_1(\tau_1)$  and  $\tau_2 \mapsto \tau'_2 = R_2(\tau_2)$  with  $R_2$  given by eq. (59). Being an element of  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_2$ , the entries of  $R_2$  are integers, and the determinant equals unity. This is not a trivial requirement, as the entries are now parametrically defined by the entries of an  $R_1$  element and flux data. However, we can find which congruence subgroup,  $\Gamma(N)$ ,

<sup>1</sup>Here we make use of  $\det(R_1) = 1$  to simplify the denominator in eq. (58) arising from  $(R_1)^{-1}$ .

of  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_2$  the matrix  $R_2$  belongs to. To do this, we first consider the case where the following relations hold

$$m^1 = -2m^0, \quad m^0 = n_3, \quad n_3 = xm^2. \quad (60)$$

With these,  $R_2$  can be expressed as

$$R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{x(b_1 - 2c_1 + d_1x) - 2a_1}{x^2 - 2} & \frac{-b_1 + x(a_1 + c_1x - d_1)}{x^2 - 2} \\ \frac{-4c_1 + x(-2a_1 + b_1x + 2d_1)}{x^2 - 2} & \frac{x(a_1x - b_1 + 2c_1) - 2d_1}{x^2 - 2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (61)$$

We can now find the explicit congruence subgroup of level  $N$  to which  $R_2$  corresponds to, once the fluxes are fixed. To do so, we first inspect the off-diagonal terms in eq. (61). The requirement that  $R_2 \in SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_2$  readily suggests that  $q_1$  is proportional to  $x^2 - 2$  while  $s_1$  is proportional to  $(x^2 - 2)/4$ . Therefore, we can identify  $\Gamma(4/(x^2 - 2)^2)$  as the principal congruence subgroup of  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_1$  of level  $N = 4/(x^2 - 2)^2$ . Since  $N$  needs to be an integer, it can take only two possible values

$$N = \begin{cases} 1 & , \quad x = -2, 0, 2 \\ 4 & , \quad x = -1, 1 \end{cases}. \quad (62)$$

We observe that the values  $x = -2, 0, 2$  lead to  $N = 1$ , i.e., a trivial finite modular group, hence we focus on the second solution,  $x^2 = 1$  with  $N = 4$ . In this case, eq. (61) takes the form

$$R_2 = \begin{pmatrix} -x(b_1 - 2c_1 + d_1x) + 2a_1 & b_1 - x(a_1 + c_1x - d_1) \\ 4c_1 - x(-2a_1 + b_1x + 2d_1) & -x(a_1x - b_1 + 2c_1) + 2d_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (63)$$

Additionally, if  $R_1 \in \Gamma(4/(x^2 - 2)^2)$ , we have

$$b_1 = c_1 = 0 \quad \text{mod } 4/(x^2 - 2)^2 \quad (64)$$

$$a_1 = d_1 = 1 \quad \text{mod } 4/(x^2 - 2)^2, \quad (65)$$

which leads to

$$R_2 \quad \text{mod } 4/(x^2 - 2)^2 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad \text{mod } 4/(x^2 - 2)^2, \quad (66)$$

regardless of the sign of  $x$ . Therefore, we have encountered the principal congruence subgroup of level  $N = 4/(x^2 - 2)^2 = 4$  of the homogeneous modular groups associated with the moduli with labels  $i = 1, 2$ , which will lead to a finite modular group  $\Gamma_4 \simeq \bar{\Gamma}/\bar{\Gamma}(4) \simeq S_4$ . An explicit choice of fluxes that produces a vacuum that breaks the full modular group to  $\Gamma_4$  is

$$\{m^1 = -4, m^2 = 2, m^0 = 2, n_3 = 2\}, \quad (67)$$

which produces the total flux, c.f. eq. (31),  $N_{\text{flux}} = 8$ . To check if this is a valid Type IIB solution, we first notice that the factorisable toroidal orientifold  $T^6/\mathbb{Z}_2 = (T_1^2 \times T_2^2 \times T_3^2)/\mathbb{Z}_2$  has 64 fixed points, each associated with an O3-plane. To preserve  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  SUSY in 4d, there cannot be anti-D3-branes, for which  $N_{D3} \geq 0$ . Therefore,  $N_{\text{flux}} = 8$  is consistent with the tadpole cancellation condition eq. (29)

$$N_{\text{flux}} = 2 \left( \frac{1}{4} N_{O3} - N_{D3} \right) = 2(16 - N_{D3}) \leq 32 . \quad (68)$$

In summary, in this section, we have derived the supersymmetric conditions on the fluxes of the moduli superpotential which predict an  $S_4$  finite modular group from Type IIB orientifold compactification. However, this result pertains only to the Type IIB supergravity action and does not include matter fields and their interactions. To address this, we now move towards F-Theory constructions.

### 3.2 The axio-dilaton in Type IIB and F-Theory

The axio-dilaton is related to the string coupling  $g_s$  as  $\tau = C_0 + i/g_s$ . In Type IIB (and its geometric counterpart, F-Theory which inherits S-duality from Type IIB) the Yukawa coupling is expected to depend on the string coupling  $g_s$  as

$$\lambda(g_s, z_i) = g_s^\alpha \lambda(z_i) , \quad (69)$$

but it is also expected to depend on the complex structure moduli through  $z_i = x_i + \tau_i y_i$ , and possible flux parameters. These moduli fields will each transform under their respective  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})$  symmetries. In this subsection we shall be concerned with the axio-dilaton which is common to both Type IIB and F-Theory.

The Yukawa coupling  $\lambda$  will then be transformed under the  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau$ , modular group associated with the axio-dilaton. From eq. (21)

$$\tau - \bar{\tau} = 2is \rightarrow \text{Im}\tau \equiv s = \frac{\tau - \bar{\tau}}{2i} = \frac{1}{g_s} , \quad (70)$$

and therefore

$$\frac{1}{g_s} \equiv \text{Im}\tau \rightarrow \text{Im}\tau' = \frac{ad - bc}{|c\tau + d|^2} \text{Im}\tau = \frac{1}{|c\tau + d|^2} \text{Im}\tau \equiv \frac{1}{|c\tau + d|^2} \frac{1}{g_s} , \quad (71)$$

where the fact that  $ad - bc = 1$  has been utilised. Hence, for an arbitrary power of  $g_s$ , we have

$$\gamma g_s^{-\alpha} = \frac{g_s^{-\alpha}}{|c\tau + d|^{2\alpha}} . \quad (72)$$

Focusing on  $\alpha = 1$ , for the  $T$  generator we have  $a = b = 1, c = 0, d = 1$ , and hence

$$\tau \rightarrow \tau + 1 \quad : \quad C_0 \rightarrow C_0 + 1, \quad s \rightarrow s . \quad (73)$$

On the other hand, for the  $S$  generator we take  $a = 0, b = 1, c = -1, d = 0$ , and so the denominator in eq. (72) becomes

$$|c\tau + d|^2 = \tau\bar{\tau} = C_0^2 + s^2, \quad (74)$$

and therefore the transformation acquires a specific structure given only in terms of the axion  $C_0$  and the inverse string coupling  $g_s^{-1} = s$

$$\tau \rightarrow -\frac{1}{\tau} \quad : \quad C_0 \rightarrow -\frac{C_0}{C_0^2 + s^2}, \quad s \rightarrow \frac{s}{C_0^2 + s^2}. \quad (75)$$

This case is known as strong-weak duality or S-duality since it transforms the string coupling  $g_s$  to its inverse  $g_s^{-1}$ .

Recall now that the axio-dilaton part of the tree-level Kähler potential is

$$K = -\log(-i(\tau - \bar{\tau})) + \dots = -\log\left(\frac{\tau - \bar{\tau}}{2i}\right) - \log(2) + \dots = -\log(s) + \dots, \quad (76)$$

so that the  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau$  transformation implies that  $-\log(s) \rightarrow -\log\frac{s}{|c\tau+d|^2}$  and thus the exponential  $e^K$  transforms as

$$e^K \rightarrow |c\tau + d|^2 e^K. \quad (77)$$

On the other hand, the gravitino mass is

$$m_{3/2}^2 = e^K |W|^2, \quad (78)$$

and since it must stay invariant we must have

$$W \rightarrow \frac{W}{c\tau + d} \Rightarrow |W|^2 \rightarrow \frac{|W|^2}{|c\tau + d|^2}. \quad (79)$$

It is now apparent that if S-duality is to be maintained by the perturbative superpotential Yukawa couplings [20], then the fields must have transformation properties with respect to it. A generic trilinear term with a tree-level Yukawa coupling of MSSM fields has the form

$$W \supset \lambda_{ij}(g_s) f_i f_j h. \quad (80)$$

In the simplest context, the Yukawa coupling could simply be taken  $\lambda_{ij}(g_s) \rightarrow \lambda_{ij}(z_k) g_s^{-1/2}$  where the parameters  $\lambda_{ij}(z_k)$  may depend on other moduli fields. Then, the  $\tau \rightarrow -1/\tau$  transformation discussed above entails

$$\lambda \propto g_s^{-1/2} \xrightarrow{\tau \rightarrow -\frac{1}{\tau}} \frac{g_s^{-1/2}}{|C_0^2 + g_s^{-2}|^{1/2}}, \quad (81)$$

which matches exactly the transformation property of the tree-level superpotential  $W$  w.r.t. axio-dilaton  $\tau$ .

In a more general context, as we will see, the dependence of the Yukawa couplings on moduli fields is more involved and non-zero modular weights for the matter fields  $f_i, f_j, h$

should also be considered. Furthermore, the Yukawa couplings, which are  $3 \times 3$  matrices in the flavour space, could transform non-trivially under the congruence group left over from the supersymmetric conditions imposed on fluxes of the moduli superpotential part. The specific choice of fluxes of the previous section indicates that the underlying flavour symmetry governing the Yukawa lagrangian is  $\Gamma_4 \simeq \Gamma/\bar{\Gamma}(4) \simeq S_4$  with Yukawa matrices being certain modular forms which belong to specific representations of the  $S_4$  group. Additional restrictions are expected to be derived from the geometric structure of the compactification manifold to further suggest a specific implementation of the above scenario. In the following, we continue with F-Theory, where some of these hints become more transparent.

### 3.3 Yukawa Couplings and Fermion Mass Matrices in F-Theory

We now turn our attention to the Yukawa couplings in F-Theory. Our starting point is an effective F-Theory GUT model, which is derived from an ADE-type singularity with the world-volume of a 7-brane that wraps the space  $R^{3,1} \times S$  with  $S$  being a Kähler manifold of two complex dimensions  $z_1, z_2$ . At low energies, F-Theory is described by an eight-dimensional YM theory on  $R^{3,1} \times S$  which must be topologically twisted to preserve  $N = 1$  supersymmetry.

The compactification space is a fibred eight-dimensional space (CY fourfold  $CY_4$ ) where the fibre over the base  $B_3 = CY_3$  associated with the six-dimensional compact space is described by a two-dimensional torus whose modulus is the axio-dilaton  $\tau = C_0 + ie^{-\phi} = C_0 + i/g_s$ . Therefore, the  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau$  S-duality describes the variation of the modulus  $\tau$  of the 2-torus over the compactification manifold. The geometric configuration consists of 7-branes filling the Minkowski 4D-space while wrapping a 4D ‘surface’  $S$  – associated with some GUT symmetry – which is a complex Kähler manifold so that supersymmetry is preserved. The four-dimensional effective F-Theory model arises upon compactification of the eight-dimensional theory on  $S$ . The possible GUT groups, in particular, are associated with specific types of geometric singularities where the modulus  $\tau$  acquires certain values. The massless fields of the low energy spectrum reside on Riemann surfaces, called matter curves, formed by 7-branes intersecting the GUT surface, while Yukawa couplings are formed at specific points where triple intersections of matter curves occur.<sup>2</sup>

Within this framework, the corresponding gauge theory is that of the eight-dimensional  $N = 1$  supersymmetric YM theory with minimal field content. The bosonic spectrum, in particular, includes the gauge field  $A$  and a holomorphic two-form scalar  $\Phi$ . Both fields are found in the adjoint representation and descend from the decomposition of the 10-dimensional gauge field  $\mathcal{A}$ . Since 7-branes are wrapped on a curved  $R^{(3,1)} \times S$  space,

---

<sup>2</sup>Equivalently, the torus over  $B_3$  can be described by the Weierstraß equation  $y^2 = x^3 + f(z)x^2 + g(z)$ , where  $z$  is a coordinate of the complex projective space  $CP^1$  (Riemann sphere). Then  $\tau = \tau(z) = C_0(z) + ie^{-\phi(z)}$  and singularities occur at  $\Delta(z_i) = 0$ . The torus is associated with the invariant  $j(\tau(z))$ , which, together with the vanishing of  $\Delta$  determines  $\tau \sim \frac{1}{2\pi i} \log(z - z_i)$ . Hence, for given  $z$ ,  $\tau$  is fixed. Also, going around the singularity, there is a shift to the real part of the modulus  $C_0 \rightarrow C_0 + 1$  that corresponds to  $\tau \rightarrow \tau + 1$  of  $SL(2, \mathbb{Z})_\tau$ .

unbroken  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  supersymmetry requires  $\Phi$  to be a holomorphic (2,0)-form as a result of the topological twisting [21].<sup>3</sup>

The superpotential  $W_{8d}$  of the eight-dimensional fields and an associated D-term take the form

$$W_{8d} = m_*^4 \int_S \text{Tr}(F \wedge \Phi), \quad D = \int_S \omega \wedge F + \frac{1}{2}[\Phi, \bar{\Phi}], \quad (82)$$

where  $F = dA - iA \wedge A$  and  $\omega = ig/2(dz_1 \wedge \bar{d}z_1 + dz_2 \wedge \bar{d}z_2)$  is the Kähler form on  $S$ .

The eight-dimensional fields can be organised as one  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  vector multiplet,  $\mathbf{V}$ , and two  $\mathcal{N} = 1$  chiral supermultiplets,  $\mathbf{A}_{\bar{m}}$  and  $\mathbf{\Phi}_{mn}$ ,

$$\mathbf{V} = (A_\mu, \eta^\alpha, \mathcal{D}) \quad (83)$$

$$\mathbf{A}_{\bar{m}} = (A_{\bar{m}}, \psi_{\bar{m}}^\alpha, \mathcal{G}_{\bar{m}}) \quad (84)$$

$$\mathbf{\Phi}_{mn} = (\varphi_{mn}, \chi_{mn}^\alpha, \mathcal{H}_{mn}), \quad (85)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_{\bar{m}}, \mathcal{H}_{\bar{m}\bar{n}}$  are  $F$ -term components, and  $\mathcal{D}$  represents the  $D$ -term, whilst,  $\eta^{\dot{\alpha}}, \psi_{\bar{m}}^\alpha, \chi_{mn}^{\dot{\alpha}}$  are the fermionic components, which, in the twisted YM theory are associated with a zero, one- and two-form respectively [23],

$$\eta^{\dot{\alpha}}, \psi^\alpha = \psi_{\bar{m}}^\alpha d\bar{z}^{\bar{m}}, \quad \chi^{\dot{\alpha}} = \bar{\chi}_{\bar{m}\bar{n}}^{\dot{\alpha}} d\bar{z}^{\bar{m}} \wedge d\bar{z}^{\bar{n}}.$$

The indices  $m, n$  take the values 1,2, the complex scalars  $A_{\bar{m}}, \varphi_{mn}$  have dimensions of mass  $M$  and  $\mathcal{G}, \mathcal{H}, \mathcal{D}$  of squared mass  $M^2$ .

To preserve the supersymmetric vacuum, all variations of the eight-dimensional fields must vanish. In the context of the four-dimensional theory, this corresponds to imposing the F- and D-flatness of the superpotential. Minimising the superpotential (82) and imposing D-flatness, one arrives at the following equations

$$\bar{\partial}_A \Phi = 0 \quad (86)$$

$$F^{(2,0)} = 0 \quad (87)$$

$$\omega \wedge F + \frac{1}{2}[\Phi^\dagger, \Phi] = 0. \quad (88)$$

The above equations have long been derived in reference [21] and are the basic ingredients for studying the properties of fields in generic 7-brane configurations. Here, we are interested in solutions for massless fields residing on 7-brane configurations. The equations can be solved by expanding the fields  $A, \Phi$  assuming linear fluctuations around the background:

$$A_{\bar{m}} \rightarrow \langle A_{\bar{m}} \rangle + a_{\bar{m}}, \quad \Phi \rightarrow \langle \Phi \rangle + \varphi, \quad (89)$$

with the definitions

$$a = a_{\bar{z}_1} d\bar{z}_1 + a_{\bar{z}_2} d\bar{z}_2, \quad \varphi = \varphi_{\bar{z}_1 \bar{z}_2} d\bar{z}_1 \wedge d\bar{z}_2. \quad (90)$$

---

<sup>3</sup>Within such an F-Theory framework it is well known that there are many complex structure moduli, associated with the positions of the 7-branes. The positions of the 7-branes are determined by tuning the complex structure moduli and can produce additional structure in the elliptic fibration [22].



Then, keeping only linear terms regarding the fluctuations  $\varphi, a$ , in the holomorphic gauge the EoM take the form

$$\bar{\partial}_{\langle A \rangle} a = 0 \quad (91)$$

$$\bar{\partial}_{\langle A \rangle} \varphi - i[a, \langle \bar{\Phi} \rangle] = 0 \quad (92)$$

$$\omega \wedge \partial_{\langle A \rangle} a - \frac{1}{2}[\langle \bar{\Phi} \rangle, \varphi] = 0 . \quad (93)$$

Substituting the expansions of the fields into (82) it is found that the holomorphic trilinear Yukawa coupling is written in terms of  $\phi$  and  $a$  as follows

$$W_{\text{Yuk}} = -im_*^4 \int_S \text{Tr}(\varphi \wedge a \wedge a) , \quad (94)$$

where  $m_*$  is the scale associated with the supergravity limit of F-Theory.

The fluctuations  $\varphi$  and  $a$  can be determined by solving the equations (91-93) for a variety of diagonal or non-diagonal backgrounds [24, 25], the latter being known as T-branes [24]. They are associated with the zero-modes residing on the matter curves and when three of the latter define triple intersection a Yukawa coupling is formed. Depending on the details of the model, it is often the case that multiple zero-modes are accommodated on the same matter curve.

It can be shown that the general form of the solution for zero modes localised on a specific matter curve, say  $z_2$ , takes the generic form

$$\varphi = R_a \chi_a = R_a f(z_2) g(z_1, \bar{z}_1, q) e^{-\sqrt{M_{z_1}^4 + m^4} z_1 \bar{z}_1} e^{\pm 2M_{z_2}^2 z_2 \bar{z}_2} , \quad (95)$$

where  $M_{z_i}$  appear when fluxes are also introduced <sup>4</sup>

It can be observed that locally the solution is described by a Gaussian profile, with its peak along the matter curve and waning out along the transverse direction  $z_1$ . The function  $f(z_2)$  is a holomorphic function of  $z_2$  left undetermined from the equations of motion and  $R_a$  encodes the group structure [25] associated with the background. Analogous solutions can be written for the other intersecting matter curves in the vicinity of the triple intersection. The integration (94) <sup>5</sup> is performed over the three overlapping wavefunctions where all of them are peaked at the triple intersection and since they are strongly localised, the integral can be restricted to a small region near the intersection point. At every triple intersection the gauge symmetry is enhanced and generically zero-mode states are assembled into representations of the higher symmetry. At the same time, multiple states accommodated on a certain matter curve may be organised into representations of the underlying symmetry of the complex structure of the matter curve.

<sup>4</sup>For example, in a  $U(3)$  model the flux assumes the form  $\langle F \rangle = -(2i/3)M^2(\bar{z}_1 \wedge dz_1 - \bar{z}_2 \wedge dz_2)\text{diag}(1, -2, 1)$ . In a generic context, however, when non-Abelian T-branes are considered, a non-primitive flux is required  $\omega \wedge F \neq 0$  to satisfy the D-term [25]. For a comprehensive presentation, see review [26].

<sup>5</sup>In section 3 eq (3.28) of [24]- using the notion of twisted one-forms, the connection  $\psi = a + \hat{\kappa} \wedge \varphi$ ,  $\hat{\kappa} = g^{1\bar{i}} g^{2\bar{j}} \bar{\Omega}_{\bar{i}\bar{j}z} d\bar{z}$  is implemented - and the Yukawa coupling receives a symmetric form. See the appendix for the relevant computation.

Furthermore, assuming for example toroidal compactifications, the function  $f$  may depend explicitly on the complex structure moduli of the curve, and thus it is conceivable that they may transform as modular forms, as we argue in the next section.

We discuss now the overall dependence of the Yukawa couplings on the mass scales of the theory, and their relation to the axio-dilaton modulus [27]. In string frame, the overall scale  $m_*$  in (94), is given by  $m_*^8 = m_s^8 g_s^{-2}$  [27], hence, the resulting dependence of the Yukawa coupling on  $g_s$  is (see details in section 4 of [27])

$$\lambda \propto \frac{m_*^4}{m_s^4} = \frac{1}{g_s} . \quad (96)$$

The string coupling is related to the GUT scale. Indeed, let  $\mathcal{V}_S \sim R_S^4 \sim 1/m_{GUT}^4$  be the volume of the GUT surface and  $\mathcal{V}_B \sim R^6$  that of the base  $B_3$  of the fibration. Compactification to four dimensions implies  $M_{Pl}^2 \approx m_*^8 \mathcal{V}_B$  while from the kinetic term of the field strength it follows  $\alpha_{GUT}^{-1} \approx m_*^4 \mathcal{V}_S$ . Combining these relations we obtain a rough estimate

$$\frac{1}{\alpha_{GUT}} \sim m_*^4 \mathcal{V}_S = \frac{m_*^4}{m_s^4} \frac{m_s^4}{m_{GUT}^4} = \frac{m_s^4}{m_{GUT}^4} \frac{1}{g_s} , \quad (97)$$

Taking into account the various normalisation effects, the dependence on  $g_s$  is more involved. One finds [25, 28]

$$\lambda = C a_{GUT}^{3/4} , \quad (98)$$

where  $C$  may depend on other moduli fields via the wavefunctions of the form (95) involved in the triple intersections. This implies that S-duality symmetry is preserved only if the undetermined parts of the wavefunctions associated with the Yukawa coupling under consideration exhibit the appropriate dependence on  $g_s$ .

## 4 Bottom-up Approach to F-Theory Fluxed GUTs with Finite Discrete Modular Symmetry

Hitherto, we described a basic F-Theory approach to Yukawa couplings and presented a generic solution for the EoM. From the above analysis we inferred that the Yukawa coupling inherits group properties encoded in the matter wavefunctions. The latter depend on the complex structure moduli through holomorphic functions of the complex coordinates  $z_i$  left unspecified by the EoM. Nevertheless, from the preceding sections and more particularly from Section 3.1, we know that the fluxed superpotential of the moduli fields is subject to modular restrictions. Therefore, if the Yukawa sector for the ordinary matter of the superpotential is required to retain the same modular symmetry or a subgroup thereof, its origin is expected to come from the yet unspecified part of that solution. We are then given the opportunity to consider the wavefunctions transformed as modular forms. For example,

$$f(\tau_i) \rightarrow (c\tau_i + d)^{-k_i} f(\tau_i) , \quad (99)$$

where  $\tau_i$  is a complex structure modulus associated with the complex coordinate  $z_i$ . Additionally, the holomorphic Yukawa coupling, being formed at the intersection of three matter curves, would be naturally transformed in a non-trivial representation of the congruence subgroup of the modular group.

To illustrate the main idea of the bottom-up approach to F-Theory fluxed GUTs with modular symmetry, we give a simple example of an  $SU(5)$  GUT embedded in  $E_6$  which has been derived in an F-Theory framework [29]. The novel feature of this example is the inclusion of an  $S_4$  finite modular family symmetry.

As has already been pointed out, in this context matter fields reside on curves which are formed at the intersections of 7-branes with the GUT surface  $S$ , itself wrapped with 7-branes. We consider a divisor with an  $E_6$  geometric singularity which, according to the F-Theory prescription, corresponds to an  $E_6$  gauge symmetry of the effective theory. In the present setup, there are three matter curves accommodating three  $27_{t'_i}$  representations of  $E_6$ . These are distinguished from each other by the weights  $t'_i$  of the  $SU(3)$  Cartan subalgebra ( $t'_1 + t'_2 + t'_3 = 0$ ). We impose a  $\mathbb{Z}_2$  monodromy  $t'_1 \leftrightarrow t'_2$ , and hence only two distinct matter curves remain, e.g.  $\Sigma_{27_{t'_{1,3}}}$ , and use  $U(1)$  fluxes to reduce the gauge symmetry down to  $SU(5)$ . Alternatively, one may derive this model starting from the maximum admissible (well behaved) singularity that corresponds to a  $E_8$  gauge symmetry subsequently decomposed to

$$E_8 \supset SU(5) \times SU(5)_\perp \supset SU(5) \times U(1)_{t_i}^4, \quad \sum_{i=1}^5 t_i = 0, \quad (100)$$

where now  $t_i$  correspond to the Cartan subalgebra of  $SU(5)_\perp$ . The  $E_6$  and  $SU(5) \times SU(5)_\perp$  properties of the matter and Higgs multiplets are given in Table 1. Due to the aforementioned restrictions on  $t'_i$  and the monodromy imposed, the only allowed trilinear  $E_6$  term in the superpotential is  $W \supset 27_{t'_1} 27_{t'_1} 27_{t'_3}$ . We then assign the fermion supermultiplets to  $27_{t'_1}$  and the Higgs fields to  $27_{t'_3}$ .

We break the  $SU(5)$  gauge symmetry by turning on a flux along  $U(1)_Y \in SU(5)$ , which also splits the 10 and  $\bar{5}$  representations of  $SU(5)$ . However, anomaly cancellation conditions impose constraints on the multiplicities of the latter which are as follows:

$$M_{10_M} = M_{5_1} = -M_{5_2} = -M_{5_3}, \quad M_{10_2} = -M_{5_4} = -M_{5_5} = M_{5_{H_u}}. \quad (101)$$

Furthermore, to eliminate extraneous and exotic matter derived from the decomposition of the 78-dimensional representation, we impose the conditions

$$M_{10_3} = M_{10_4} = M_{5_6} = N_8 = N_9 = 0, \quad (102)$$

These imply that [29]

$$\tilde{N} \equiv N_7. \quad (103)$$

The SM zero mode states derived from the complete  $27_{t'_i}$  representations after various successive symmetry-breaking stages with the  $U(1)$  fluxes shown in the last column of

$E_6$	$SO(10)$	$SU(5)$	Weight
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$\bar{5}_3$	$t_1 + t_5$
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$10_M$	$t_1$
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$\theta_{15}$	$t_1 - t_5$
$27_{t'_1}$	10	$5_1$	$-t_1 - t_3$
$27_{t'_1}$	10	$\bar{5}_2$	$t_1 + t_4$
$27_{t'_1}$	1	$\theta_{14}$	$t_1 - t_4$
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$\bar{5}_5$	$t_3 + t_5$
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$10_2$	$t_3$
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$\theta_{35}$	$t_3 - t_5$
$27_{t'_3}$	10	$5_{H_u}$	$-2t_1$
$27_{t'_3}$	10	$\bar{5}_4$	$t_3 + t_4$
$27_{t'_3}$	1	$\theta_{34}$	$t_3 - t_4$

Table 1:  $SO(10)$  and  $SU(5)$  decompositions of  $27 \in E_6$ . The  $SU(5)$  indices in  $5_i, 10_j$  representations designate their origin of the corresponding matter curve ( $\Sigma_{5_i}$  and  $\Sigma_{10_j}$ ), and  $10_M$  accommodates ordinary matter fields.

Table 2. Their multiplicities are expressed in terms of the flux integers which have remained undetermined by the consistency conditions mentioned above.

In the present work, an explicit model is constructed by choosing the fluxes given in table 3. This choice leads to the spectrum given in table 4 where both the down quarks and leptons originate from  $27_{t'_1}$ . As we have argued in the previous section, the states supported on a matter curve will inherit modular symmetry properties related to the complex structure moduli parametrising that curve. Therefore, states supported on a given curve are expected to have the same modular weights and to furnish full representations of the discrete modular group that survives the compactification. Imposing these modular symmetry properties in the above representations, a version of the model presented above with non-trivial discrete modular group  $S_4$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{W} = & \alpha (u_{1,2}^c Q_{1,2} Y_1^{(4)})_1 H_u + \beta (u_{1,2}^c Q_{1,2} Y_2^{(4)})_1 H_u + \gamma (u_3^c Q_3 Y_1^{(4)})_1 H_u + \delta (u_{1,2}^c Q_3 Y_2^{(4)})_1 H_u \\
& + \left( \alpha' (d_{1,2}^c Q_{1,2} Y_1^{(6)})_1 H_d + \beta' (d_{1,2}^c Q_{1,2} Y_2^{(6)})_1 H_d + \gamma'_1 (d_3^c Q_{1,2} Y_{2,1}^{(8)})_1 H_d \right. \\
& \left. + \gamma' (d_3^c Q_{1,2} Y_{2,2}^{(8)})_1 H_d + \delta' (d_{1,2}^c Q_3 Y_2^{(6)})_1 H_d + \epsilon' (d_3^c Q_3 Y_1^{(8)})_1 H_d \right) \frac{\theta_{31}}{M}, \quad (104)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $M$  is the F-Theory characteristic compactification scale and we will set, for simplicity,  $\theta_{31}/M \simeq 1$  as we expect the VEVs of the singlets to be close to the scale  $M$  and this quantity can be reabsorbed into the definition of the primed coefficients.

$E_6$	$SO(10)$	$SU(5)$	Weight vector	$N_Y$	$M_{U(1)}$	SM particle content
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$\bar{5}_3$	$t_1 + t_5$	$\tilde{N}$	$-M_{5_3}$	$-M_{5_3}d^c + (-M_{5_3} + \tilde{N})L$
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$10_M$	$t_1$	$-\tilde{N}$	$-M_{5_3}$	$-M_{5_3}Q + (-M_{5_3} + \tilde{N})u^c + (-M_{5_3} - \tilde{N})e^c$
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$\theta_{15}$	$t_1 - t_5$	0	$-M_{5_3}$	$-M_{5_3}\nu^c$
$27_{t'_1}$	10	$5_1$	$-t_1 - t_3$	$-\tilde{N}$	$-M_{5_3}$	$-M_{5_3}D + (-M_{5_3} - \tilde{N})H_u$
$27_{t'_1}$	10	$\bar{5}_2$	$t_1 + t_4$	$\tilde{N}$	$-M_{5_3}$	$-M_{5_3}\bar{D} + (-M_{5_3} + \tilde{N})H_d$
$27_{t'_1}$	1	$\theta_{14}$	$t_1 - t_4$	0	$-M_{5_3}$	$-M_{5_3}S$
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$\bar{5}_5$	$t_3 + t_5$	$-\tilde{N}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}d^c + (M_{5_{H_u}} - \tilde{N})L$
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$10_2$	$t_3$	$\tilde{N}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}Q + (M_{5_{H_u}} - \tilde{N})u^c + (M_{5_{H_u}} + \tilde{N})e^c$
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$\theta_{35}$	$t_3 - t_5$	0	$M_{5_{H_u}}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}\nu^c$
$27_{t'_3}$	10	$5_{H_u}$	$-2t_1$	$\tilde{N}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}D + (M_{5_{H_u}} + \tilde{N})H_u$
$27_{t'_3}$	10	$\bar{5}_4$	$t_3 + t_4$	$-\tilde{N}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}\bar{D} + (M_{5_{H_u}} - \tilde{N})H_d$
$27_{t'_3}$	1	$\theta_{34}$	$t_3 - t_4$	0	$M_{5_{H_u}}$	$M_{5_{H_u}}S$

Table 2: Complete 27s of  $E_6$  and their  $SO(10)$  and  $SU(5)$  decompositions. The indices of the  $SU(5)$  non-trivial states 10, 5 refer to the labelling of the corresponding matter curve (we use the notation of [30]). We impose the extra conditions on the integers  $N_Y$  and  $M_{U(1)}$  from the requirement of having complete 27s of  $E_6$  and no 78 matter. The  $SU(5)$  matter states decompose into SM states as  $\bar{5} \rightarrow d^c, L$  and  $10 \rightarrow Q, u^c, e^c$  with right-handed neutrinos  $1 \rightarrow \nu^c$ , while the  $SU(5)$  Higgs states decompose as  $5 \rightarrow D, H_u$  and  $\bar{5} \rightarrow \bar{D}, H_d$ , where  $D, \bar{D}$  are exotic colour triplets and antitriplets. We identify RH neutrinos as  $\nu^c = \theta_{15,35}$  and extra singlets from the 27 as  $S = \theta_{14,34}$ .

According to the superpotential (104), the up-type quarks Yukawa matrix is given by

$$\lambda_u = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) - \beta(Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) & 2\beta Y_1 Y_2 & \delta(Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) \\ 2\beta Y_1 Y_2 & \alpha(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) + \beta(Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) & 2\delta Y_1 Y_2 \\ 0 & 0 & \gamma(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (105)$$

and for the down-type quarks, the relevant Yukawa matrix is written as

$$\lambda_d = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha' Y_1(3Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) - \beta' Y_1(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \beta' Y_2(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \delta' Y_1(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \\ \beta' Y_2(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \alpha' Y_1(3Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) + \beta' Y_1(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \delta' Y_2(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \\ \gamma'(Y_1^2 - 3Y_2^2)Y_1^2 + \gamma'_1(Y_2^2 - Y_1^2)(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \gamma' Y_1 Y_2(Y_1^2 - 3Y_2^2) + 2\gamma'_1 Y_1 Y_2(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \epsilon'(Y_1^2 + Y_2^2)^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (106)$$

The charged leptons have the same Yukawa matrix structure as the down-type quarks. However, inspecting the spectrum of F-Theory zero modes in table 4, we see that the three families of  $L, Q, e^c$ , and  $d^c$  descend from different linear combinations of UV states from F-Theory zero modes. Therefore, the superpotential coefficients for the down-type

$M_{10_M}$	$M_{5_3}$	$M_{5_1}$	$M_{5_2}$	$M_{10_2}$	$M_{5_5}$	$M_{5_4}$	$M_{H_u}$	$M_{\theta_{15}}$	$\tilde{N}$
4	-4	3	-3	-1	1	0	0	2	1

Table 3: The choice of Fluxes used in this model.

$E_6$	$SO(10)$	$SU(5)$	Weight vector	$N_Y$	$M_{U(1)}$	SM particle content	Low energy spectrum
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$\bar{5}_3$	$t_1 + t_5$	1	4	$4d^c + 5L$	$3d^c + 3L$
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$10_M$	$t_1$	-1	4	$4Q + 5u^c + 3e^c$	$3Q + 3u^c + 3e^c$
$27_{t'_1}$	16	$\theta_{15}$	$t_1 - t_5$	0	3	$3\nu^c$	-
$27_{t'_1}$	10	$5_1$	$-t_1 - t_3$	-1	3	$3D + 2H_u$	-
$27_{t'_1}$	10	$\bar{5}_2$	$t_1 + t_4$	1	3	$3\bar{D} + 4H_d$	$H_d$
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$\bar{5}_5$	$t_3 + t_5$	-1	-1	$\bar{d}^c + 2\bar{L}$	-
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$10_2$	$t_3$	1	-1	$\bar{Q} + 2\bar{u}^c$	-
$27_{t'_3}$	16	$\theta_{35}$	$t_3 - t_5$	0	0	-	-
$27_{t'_3}$	10	$5_{H_u}$	$-2t_1$	1	0	$H_u$	$H_u$
$27_{t'_3}$	10	$\bar{5}_4$	$t_3 + t_4$	-1	0	$\bar{H}_d$	-
$27_{t'_3}$	1	$\theta_{34}$	$t_3 - t_4$	0	1	$\theta_{34}$	-
-	1	$\theta_{31}$	$t_3 - t_1$	0	4	$\theta_{31}$	-
-	1	$\theta_{53}$	$t_5 - t_3$	0	1	$\theta_{53}$	-
-	1	$\theta_{14}$	$t_1 - t_4$	0	3	$\theta_{14}$	-
-	1	$\theta_{45}$	$t_4 - t_5$	0	2	$\theta_{45}$	-

Table 4: Complete 27s of  $E_6$  and their  $SO(10)$  and  $SU(5)$  decompositions. We use the notation of ref [30] for the indices of the  $SU(5)$  states and impose the extra conditions on the integers  $N_Y$  and  $M_{U(1)}$  from the requirement of having complete 27s of  $E_6$  and no 78 matter. The  $SU(5)$  matter states decompose into SM states as  $\bar{5} \rightarrow d^c, L$  and  $10 \rightarrow Q, u^c, e^c$  with right-handed neutrinos  $1 \rightarrow \nu^c$ , while the  $SU(5)$  Higgs states decompose as  $5 \rightarrow D, H_u$  and  $\bar{5} \rightarrow \bar{D}, H_d$ , where  $D, \bar{D}$  are exotic colour triplets and antitriplets. We identify RH neutrinos as  $\nu^c = \theta_{15}$ . Extra singlets are needed to give mass to neutrinos and exotics and to ensure F- and D- flatness.

quarks and the charged leptons are not the same, leading to a realisation of a Georgi-Jarlskog mechanism [31]. We then write down the charged leptons Yukawa matrix as

$$\lambda_L = \begin{pmatrix} \alpha'' Y_1 (3Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) - \beta'' Y_1 (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \beta'' Y_2 (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \delta'' Y_1 (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \\ \beta'' Y_2 (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \alpha'' Y_1 (3Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) + \beta'' Y_1 (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \delta'' Y_2 (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \\ \gamma'' (Y_1^2 - 3Y_2^2) Y_1^2 + \gamma_1'' (Y_2^2 - Y_1^2) (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \gamma'' Y_1 Y_2 (Y_1^2 - 3Y_2^2) + 2\gamma_1'' Y_1 Y_2 (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) & \epsilon'' (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2)^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (107)$$

MSSM fields	Matter Curves	Charge	$S_4$	k
$Q_{1,2}, u_{1,2}^c, e_{1,2}^c$	$10_M$	$t_1$	2	2
$Q_3, u_3^c, e_3^c$	$10_M$	$t_1$	1	2
$d_{1,2}^c, L_{1,2}$	$\bar{5}_3$	$t_1 + t_5$	2	4
$d_3^c, L_3$	$\bar{5}_3$	$t_1 + t_5$	1	6
$H_u$	$5_{H_u}$	$-2t_1$	1	0
$H_d$	$5_2$	$t_1 + t_4$	1	0
$\nu^c$	$\theta_{15}$	$t_1 - t_5$	3	0

Table 5: Perpendicular charges, modular weights, and  $S_4$  discrete modular group representations associated with the matter curves hosting the model from table 4.

where the modular form components have the same dependence on  $\tau_d$  as those appearing in the down-type quark Yukawa matrix.

In the following discussion, we are going to sketch a scenario in which conjugate right-handed neutrinos are identified with the singlets  $\theta_{15}$ , which are included in the particle spectrum of the F-Theory model. Since these fields are considered as degrees of freedom that lie in the transverse space of the matter curves [32], this fact leads us to consider the case that they do not carry any modular weight. However, a simple model is presented here in which the singlets transform as a triplet under the  $S_4$  modular symmetry. In addition to the singlets mentioned before, more degrees of freedom are needed to give a Majorana mass to  $\theta_{15}$ , leading to the implementation of a (type-I) seesaw scenario for the light neutrino masses. An important condition is that the additional singlets of the model have to cancel the perpendicular charges of coupling.

The superpotential, following the transformation properties of Table (5), is written as:

$$\mathcal{W}_\nu = \zeta (\nu^c L_{1,2} Y_3^{(4)})_1 H_u + \eta (\nu^c L_3 Y_3^{(6)})_1 H_u + \lambda (\nu^c \nu^c)_1 \frac{\theta_{53}^2 \theta_{31}^2}{M^3}, \quad (108)$$

where in the last coupling stands for the Majorana mass term of the conjugate right-handed neutrinos. Given the first two couplings the Yukawa matrix responsible for the neutrino Dirac mass can be written as:

$$\lambda_\nu = \begin{pmatrix} -2\zeta Y_2 Y_3 & 0 & \eta Y_1 (Y_4^2 - Y_5^2) \\ -\frac{1}{2}\zeta(\sqrt{3}Y_1 Y_4 + Y_2 Y_5) & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\zeta(\sqrt{3}Y_1 Y_5 + Y_2 Y_4) & -\eta Y_3 (Y_1 Y_4 + \sqrt{3}Y_2 Y_5) \\ -\frac{1}{2}\zeta(\sqrt{3}Y_1 Y_5 + Y_2 Y_4) & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2}\zeta(\sqrt{3}Y_1 Y_4 + Y_2 Y_5) & \eta Y_3 (Y_1 Y_5 + \sqrt{3}Y_2 Y_4) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (109)$$

where the modular form components depend on the same modulus of the up-type quark,  $\tau_u$ , and the conjugate right-handed neutrino Majorana mass matrix can be easily read

out as

$$M_R = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \lambda \frac{\theta_{53}^2 \theta_{31}^2}{M^3}, \quad (110)$$

where we will take  $\lambda \theta_{53}^2 \theta_{31}^2 / M^3 = \tilde{\lambda} M_{GUT}$ .

Given the above matrices, we could implement a type-I seesaw mechanism in our model to explain the neutrino masses. The light neutrino mass matrix is given by:

$$M_\nu = -M_D^T M_R^{-1} M_D, \quad (111)$$

where  $M_D = v \lambda_\nu$ , with  $v = 173$  GeV being the Standard Model Higgs vacuum expectation value.

#### 4.1 Numerical study

We now perform a brief numerical study to find whether the model presented above and explicitly stated by the superpotential in eq. (104) can provide a good fit to quark masses and mixing. To do so, we will compare the model predictions against the values of the quark masses and mixing data at the GUT scale, which, for  $\tan \beta = 5$ , can be found in table 6. The neutrino data are taken from the latest NuFit 5.3, [33] and is shown in table 7 alongside the charged lepton Yukawa eigenvalues.

Quark and CKM Data			
$y_d$	$(4.81 \pm 1.06) \times 10^{-6}$	$\theta_{12}$	$13.027^\circ \pm 0.0814^\circ$
$y_s$	$(9.52 \pm 1.03) \times 10^{-5}$	$\theta_{23}$	$2.054^\circ \pm 0.384^\circ$
$y_b$	$(6.95 \pm 0.175) \times 10^{-3}$	$\theta_{13}$	$0.1802^\circ \pm 0.0281^\circ$
$y_u$	$(2.92 \pm 1.81) \times 10^{-6}$	$\delta_{CP}$	$69.21^\circ \pm 6.19^\circ$
$y_c$	$(1.43 \pm 0.100) \times 10^{-3}$		
$y_t$	$0.534 \pm 0.0341$		

Table 6: Quark and CKM data [34–36].

We use the effective Yukawa coupling matrices for the quarks, eqs. (105) and (106), as well as for the neutrinos, eqs. (109) and (110), to compute the predictions and compare them to the data in tables 6 and 7. Although the coefficients of the superpotential are in principle calculable in F-Theory (see, for example, [25, 28, 37] for Yukawa couplings and [38] for R-Parity violating terms), in this work we will consider these coefficients as free parameters and leave the study of their computation for future work. Additionally, we also have the dependency on the complex structure moduli fields parametrising the geometry of the matter curves, from which the matter fields inherit their discrete modular symmetry properties. Since up- and down-type quark Yukawas emerge at different



Lepton and PMNS Data			
$y_e$	$(1.97 \pm 0.024) \times 10^{-6}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{12}^L$	$0.307 \pm 0.012$
$y_\mu$	$(4.16 \pm 0.05) \times 10^{-4}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{23}^L$	$0.572 \pm 0.023$
$y_\tau$	$(7.07 \pm 0.073) \times 10^{-3}$	$\sin^2 \theta_{13}^L$	$(2.203 \pm 0.58) \times 10^{-2}$
$\Delta m_{12}^2$	$(7.41 \pm 0.21) \times 10^{-5} \text{ eV}^2$	$\delta_{CP}^L$	$197^\circ \pm 41^\circ$
$\Delta m_{13}^2$	$(2.511 \pm 0.027) \times 10^{-3} \text{ eV}^2$		

Table 7: Lepton and PMNS data. Neutrino masses are given in normal ordering [33–36]. When the uncertainty interval is asymmetric, the larger values was taken in the analysis for the Gaussian likelihood profile.

intersection points in the internal geometry between different curves, the geometry describing each Yukawa coupling is in general different from each other and parametrised by its own modulus, i.e. the components of the modular forms appearing in the up- and down-type Yukawas can depend on different moduli fields,  $\tau_u$  and  $\tau_d$ , respectively. However, the charged leptons (neutrino) Yukawa matrix arises from the same intersection as the down-type (up-type) quark Yukawas and should therefore depend on the same modulus. Therefore, our (effective) parametric freedom encompasses:

- Four complex coefficients ( $\alpha, \beta, \delta, \gamma$ ) and a complex modulus ( $\tau_u$ ) for the up-type Yukawa matrix,
- three complex coefficients ( $\zeta, \eta, \tilde{\lambda}$ ) for the neutrino sector (as well as a dependency on  $\tau_u$ ),
- six coefficients ( $\alpha', \beta', \gamma', \gamma'_1, \epsilon'$ ) and one complex modulus ( $\tau_d$ ) for the down-type Yukawa matrix,
- six coefficients ( $\alpha'', \beta'', \gamma'', \gamma''_1, \epsilon''$ ) for the charged lepton Yukawa matrix (as well as a dependency on  $\tau_d$ ).

This sums up to a total of 19 complex parameters, or 38 real parameters. Although this seems to over-parameterise our problem, as we only have 19 observables in tables 6 and 7, we must reiterate that the complex coefficients are in principle calculable in F-Theory and that the analysis present here simplifies this step.

To find whether we can jointly fit all observables, we employ an artificial intelligence search algorithm called Covariant Matrix Approximation Evolutionary Strategy (CMAES) [39], which was first proposed in [40] to simplify the task of finding valid points in highly constrained multidimensional BSM parameter spaces.<sup>6</sup> CMAES can be seen as a population-based optimisation algorithm that can find minima of any arbitrary function, irrespective of its continuity and differentiability. Therefore, we will

<sup>6</sup>See also [41] for a recent application to the  $Z_3$  3HDM, where CMAES was shown to have up to nine orders of magnitude improvement in sampling efficiency over random sampling.

use CMAES to minimise the minus log-likelihood of the data,  $D$ , given a point of the parameter space,  $\theta$ ,<sup>7</sup>

$$-llh(D|\theta) = \sum_i \frac{(\bar{\mu}_i - \mu_i(\theta))^2}{2\sigma_i^2}, \quad (112)$$

where  $i$  runs over the observables,  $\mu_i(\theta)$  is the prediction for the observable  $i$  given a parameter space point  $\theta$ , the data,  $D$ , are comprised of the set of tuples  $\{(\bar{\mu}_i, \sigma_i)\}$ , where  $\bar{\mu}_i$ ,  $\sigma_i$  are, respectively, the central and  $1\text{-}\sigma$  uncertainty values of the observables and are listed in tables 6 and 7, and we have assumed a Gaussian profile likelihood for the data. We implemented CMAES using the `python` package `cmaes` [42], and we performed 1000 independent runs, each running until converged to a minimum of eq. (112), and kept all points whose observable predictions were within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ .<sup>8</sup> The parameters of our model were bounded, so that the superpotential coefficients remain perturbative and the moduli take values in their fundamental domain with an upper bound on the imaginary part

$$\left\{ \tau_i \in \mathbb{C}, \text{ s.t. } |\Re(\tau_i)| \leq 0.5 \wedge \sqrt{1 - \Re(\tau_i)^2} \leq \Im(\tau_i) \leq 10 \right\}, i = u, d. \quad (113)$$

Multiple successful runs converged, generating  $18 \times 10^6$  points that fit all observables within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The best point across all runs, that minimises the eq. (112) at a value  $1.15 \times 10^{-15}$  (i.e., effectively with vanishing  $\chi^2$  or likelihood of 1), is given by the set of parameters (to up to one decimal digit)

$$\begin{aligned} (\alpha, \beta, \delta, \gamma) &= (-1.8 \times 10^{-3} + 1.8 \times 10^{-5}i, 4.5 \times 10^{-5} - 1.4 \times 10^{-4}i, \\ &\quad 3.2 \times 10^{-4} + 1.8 \times 10^{-3}i, 1.8 \times 10^{-1} + 4.0 \times 10^{-2}i) \\ (\lambda', \beta', \gamma', \gamma'_1, \epsilon') &= (2.1 \times 10^{-5} - 8.8 \times 10^{-8}i, -3.3 \times 10^{-5} + 3.2 \times 10^{-8}i, \\ &\quad -4.4 \times 10^{-5} + 7.2 \times 10^{-5}i, -2.3 \times 10^{-4} - 2.3 \times 10^{-4}i, \\ &\quad -7.7 \times 10^{-5} + 1.4 \times 10^{-4}i, 1.3 \times 10^{-4} - 4.6 \times 10^{-3}i) \\ (\zeta, \eta, \tilde{\lambda}) &= (-6.1 \times 10^{-2} + 9.1 \times 10^{-1}i, -1.5 \times 10^{-1} + 7.2 \times 10^{-3}i, \\ &\quad 1.8 \times 10^{-1} + 5.3 \times 10^{-2}i) \\ (\lambda'', \beta'', \gamma'', \gamma''_1, \epsilon'') &= (7.5 \times 10^{-5} + 1.4 \times 10^{-7}i, 2.7 \times 10^{-4} - 7.3 \times 10^{-7}i, \\ &\quad -1.0 \times 10^{-3} + 1.9 \times 10^{-3}i, 1.2 \times 10^{-4} + 2.6 \times 10^{-8}i, \\ &\quad -2.9 \times 10^{-3} + 4.1 \times 10^{-5}i, 4.2 \times 10^{-4} - 1.7 \times 10^{-3}i) \\ \tau_u &= -4.1 \times 10^{-1} + 9.1 \times 10^{-1}i \\ \tau_d &= -5.0 \times 10^{-1} + 1.2i, \end{aligned} \quad (114)$$

<sup>7</sup>Or, equivalently, to minimise the sum of the  $\chi^2$ .

<sup>8</sup>This methodology is justified by the fact that our goal is not to draw a complete portrait of the parameter space, but rather to find examples of viable points.

where we organised the parameters by mass sector. We notice that the point above requires some hierarchy between superpotential coefficients which should be around the same order, e.g.  $|\gamma| \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$  whereas  $|\alpha| \sim \mathcal{O}(10^{-3})$ . This hierarchy between coefficients of operators arising from the intersection of the same matter curves at the same intersection point is at odds with our F-Theory expectations, which requires further study involving their explicit computation.

In fig. 1 we show the values of the moduli field that were obtained by CMAES, where we see that lower values of the imaginary part of the moduli are preferred, and most points have  $\Im(\tau_i) \lesssim 2$ . We omit scatter plots for the remaining parameters as these are, in principle, computable in F-Theory, and the details of their numerical realisation are left to future study. We also note that one should not attempt to make statistical interpretations of the results of CMAES, as it is not an algorithm designed to populate a posterior (as Monte Carlo Markov Chains do in Bayesian inference) as it produces points through the path of quickest descent of the loss function (and therefore the points should also not be used for frequentist interpretations as one usually does with random sampling). However, all points are within  $3\text{-}\sigma$  of all observables and therefore have a very high likelihood, or, conversely, a very small  $\chi^2$ .




Figure 1:  $\tau_u$  and  $\tau_d$  values for the CMAES scan. All the points hold predictions within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The red star point represents the best fit point, eq. (114). Dashed line represents the boundary of the fundamental domain.

We first look at the results pertaining to the quark data. In fig. 2 we can observe the resulting values for the up-type quark Yukawa eigenvalues of points obtained, and in fig. 3 we present the equivalent plots for the down-type quarks. We see that many points can be arbitrarily close to the central value, but also span the region within the

$3\text{-}\sigma$  limits, showing that the model produces a good fit to the data. The same can be observed in fig. 4 for the CKM mixing angle and CP violating phase.




Figure 2: Up-type quark Yukawa eigenvalues obtained for the CMAES scan. All the points hold predictions within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The red star point represents the best fit point, eq. (114). The dashed (full) lines represent the central value ( $3\text{-}\sigma$  bounds) from table 6.




Figure 3: Down-type quark Yukawa eigenvalues obtained for the CMAES scan. All the points hold predictions within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The red star point represents the best fit point, eq. (114). The dashed (full) lines represent the central value ( $3\text{-}\sigma$  bounds) from table 6.




Figure 4: CKM angles and CP phase obtained for the CMAES scan. All the points hold predictions within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The red star point represents the best fit point, eq. (114). The dashed (full) lines represent the central value ( $3\text{-}\sigma$  bounds) from table 6.

In figs. 5 to 7 we can arrive at similar conclusions regarding the charged lepton Yukawa eigenvalues, neutrinos squared mass differences, PMNS mixing angles, and CP violating phase.




Figure 5: Charged leptons Yukawa eigenvalues obtained for the CMAES scan. All the points hold predictions within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The red star point represents the best fit point, eq. (114). The dashed (full) lines represent the central value ( $3\text{-}\sigma$  bounds) from table 7.




Figure 6: Neutrino squared mass differences obtained for the CMAES scan. All the points hold predictions within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The red star point represents the best fit point, eq. (114). The dashed (full) lines represent the central value ( $3\text{-}\sigma$  bounds) from table 7.




Figure 7: PMNS angles and CP phase obtained for the CMAES scan. All the points hold predictions within  $3\text{-}\sigma$ . The red star point represents the best fit point, eq. (114). The dashed (full) lines represent the central value ( $3\text{-}\sigma$  bounds) from table 7.

The above results show that our model can fit the data very well, with the best point having a likelihood close to unity or, conversely, a vanishingly small  $\chi^2$ . However, the problem is over-parametrised by the number of superpotential coefficients, which, although in principle calculable in F-Theory, are considered free parameters in this analysis. To assess whether we can reduce the parametric freedom, we considered alternative scenarios with reduced parametric freedom with respect to the moduli. In our first alternative scenario, we fixed the moduli to take the same values (i.e.  $\tau_u = \tau_d$  but otherwise allowed the moduli to take values in the fundamental domain eq. (113)) even though our



F-Theory construction naturally provides distinct moduli for each Yukawa type. The scans converged successfully as before, from which we can conclude that our model does not require two independent moduli to fit the data.

For the second case, we fixed the moduli to special values  $\tau_u, \tau_d \in \{i, i\infty, \omega = \exp(2\pi i/3)\}$  (but not necessarily equal). In this scenario, CMAES failed to find points that fit the data. To further study this scenario, we restricted the problem to only fit the quark data, and even then the best-case scenario was for the configuration  $\tau_u = i\infty, \tau_d = i$ , for which we were able to fit all the observables within  $3\text{-}\sigma$  except for the  $\theta_{12}$  angle of the CKM matrix. The fact that the best-case scenario relies on  $\tau_u = i\infty$  suggests that it is indeed not possible to find good points that fit all the data with the moduli stabilised at special values, as we have seen in fig. 1 that the scans showed a preference for small values of  $\Im(\tau_i)$ .

Therefore, we conclude that, despite being over-parameterised, the model works with fewer parameters although we lack F-Theoretical motivations to restrict their number. The realisation of a model with fewer parameters within the framework presented in this paper is left to future work, as well as the computation of the superpotential coefficients.

## 5 Summary and Conclusions

In this work we have shown that finite modular family symmetry can emerge from local F-Theory constructions. Such theories provide a rich framework for the application of modular family symmetry using bottom-up constructions. As a first example of the new approach, we have analysed in detail a concrete F-Theory Fluxed  $SU(5)$  GUT with modular  $S_4$  family symmetry. The model fits the fermion mass and mixing data very well and serves as a demonstration of the bottom-up approach to modular family symmetry in F-Theory fluxed GUTs. Indeed this example represents the first F-Theory fluxed GUT with discrete modular family symmetry.

To accomplish this, we first discussed in detail the origins of discrete modular symmetries in F-Theory in section 3, and analysed an explicit model in section 4. In section 3 we argued that in F-Theory the Yukawa couplings should inherit modular symmetry properties from the axio-dilaton and the complex structure moduli of the theory. In section 3.1 we revisited an explicit Type IIB construction where the vacuum transforms non-trivially under the normal congruence subgroup of the modular symmetry, breaking it to a discrete modular group. This construction has the important feature that the modular symmetry associated with the axio-dilaton, initially independent of the modular symmetries of the background orbifold, is aligned with the modular symmetry of one of the directions of the orbifold in supersymmetric preserving vacuum.

The result from section 3.1 is crucial as the Yukawa couplings in F-Theory are known expected on the axio-dilaton. In section 3.2 this is explicitly discussed, and we argue that if S-duality is to be maintained by the perturbative superpotential, then the fields must transform under the action of the axio-dilaton modular symmetry.

The conclusions of sections 3.1 and 3.2 are further expanded in section 3.3 where we discussed the explicit constructions of Yukawa couplings in F-Theory as integrals of

overlapping wavefunctions around the intersection of matter curves, each a Riemannian surface. In this construction, the wavefunctions are solutions to EoM of the compactified YM theory on the 7-branes, which the solutions have an undetermined holomorphic dependency on the coordinates of the matter curve. This observation leads us to conclude that the structure of the Yukawa couplings will depend on the complex structure moduli of the matter curves in a way that, if these curves exhibit modular symmetries, then the Yukawa couplings can be modular forms associated with these symmetries.

Equipped with the insights gathered in section 3, we finally set out to explicitly construct a fluxed GUT with discrete modular symmetry in section 4. The model discussed is an extension of a model already presented in the literature, where the fields are now furnishing a representation of a discrete modular family group, in our case  $S_4$ , and carry modular weights. Additionally, the Yukawa matrices, arising from the overlapping wavefunction integrals at matter curve intersections, are promoted to modular forms of appropriate weight. In section 4.1 we show that the model fits the data very well, with the best point having vanishing  $\chi^2$ , although it is over-parameterised with respect to superpotential coefficients.

In conclusion, we have shown that finite modular family symmetry can plausibly emerge from local F-Theory constructions. As a first example of this approach, we have analysed a concrete F-Theory Fluxed  $SU(5)$  GUT example with modular  $S_4$  family symmetry, opening up new avenues of model building in this rich framework. Although this approach looks promising, we have identified aspects that need further detailed exploration, such as the explicit construction of global F-Theory models with matter curves exhibiting modular symmetries and the explicit computation of the Yukawa couplings in the presence of such geometries which are in principle calculable in F-Theory. We leave these issues for future work.

## Acknowledgements

MCR is supported by the STFC under Grant No. ST/T001011/1. 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 HIDE-DeN European ITN project (H2020-MSCA-ITN-2019//860881-HIDDeN). GKL would like to thank the staff of the Mainz Institute for Theoretical Physics (MITP) for their kind hospitality where part of this work has been carried out.

## A Appendix

### A.1 Definitions of modular forms

For the modular group  $\Gamma_4 \cong S_4$ , there are five linearly independent modular forms of the lowest non-trivial weight  $k = 2$ , denoted as  $Y_i(\tau)$  for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 5$ , which form a doublet 2 and a triplet  $3'$  under the modular  $S_4$  symmetry transformations, namely,

$$Y_2^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1(\tau) \\ Y_2(\tau) \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_{3'}^{(2)} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_3(\tau) \\ Y_4(\tau) \\ Y_5(\tau) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (115)$$

$$Y_1^{(4)} = Y_1^2 + Y_2^2, \quad Y_2^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_2^2 - Y_1^2 \\ 2Y_1Y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_3^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} -2Y_2Y_3 \\ \sqrt{3}Y_1Y_5 + Y_2Y_4 \\ \sqrt{3}Y_1Y_4 + Y_2Y_5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_{3'}^{(4)} = \begin{pmatrix} 2Y_1Y_3 \\ \sqrt{3}Y_2Y_5 - Y_1Y_4 \\ \sqrt{3}Y_2Y_4 - Y_1Y_5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (116)$$

$$Y_1^{(6)} = Y_1(3Y_2^2 - Y_1^2), \quad Y_{1'}^{(6)} = Y_2(3Y_1^2 - Y_2^2), \quad (117)$$

$$Y_2^{(6)} = (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_1 \\ Y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_3^{(6)} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_1(Y_4^2 - Y_5^2) \\ Y_3(Y_1Y_5 + \sqrt{3}Y_2Y_4) \\ -Y_3(Y_1Y_4 + \sqrt{3}Y_2Y_5) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (118)$$

$$Y_{3',1}^{(6)} = (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_3 \\ Y_4 \\ Y_5 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_{3',2}^{(6)} = \begin{pmatrix} Y_2(Y_5^2 - Y_4^2) \\ -Y_3(Y_2Y_5 - \sqrt{3}Y_1Y_4) \\ Y_3(Y_2Y_4 - \sqrt{3}Y_1Y_5) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (119)$$

and

$$Y_1^{(8)} = (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2)^2, \quad Y_{2,1}^{(8)} = (Y_1^2 + Y_2^2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_2^2 - Y_1^2 \\ 2Y_1Y_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad Y_{2,1}^{(8)} = (Y_1^2 - 3Y_2^2) \begin{pmatrix} Y_1^2 \\ Y_1Y_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (120)$$

The expressions of modular forms can be derived with the help of the Dedekind  $\eta$  function

$$\eta(\tau) = q^{1/24} \prod_{n=1}^{\infty} (1 - q^n), \quad q = e^{2\pi i \tau}, \quad (121)$$

and its derivative

$$Y(\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_6 | \tau) \equiv \frac{d}{d\tau} \left[ \alpha_1 \log \eta\left(\tau + \frac{1}{2}\right) + \alpha_2 \log \eta(4\tau) + \alpha_3 \log \eta\left(\frac{\tau}{4}\right) + \alpha_4 \log \eta\left(\frac{\tau+1}{4}\right) + \alpha_5 \log \eta\left(\frac{\tau+2}{4}\right) + \alpha_6 \log \eta\left(\frac{\tau+3}{4}\right) \right], \quad (122)$$

with the coefficients  $\alpha_i$  (for  $i = 1, 2, \dots, 6$ ) fulfilling  $\alpha_1 + \dots + \alpha_6 = 0$ . More explicitly, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_1(\tau) &\equiv iY(1, 1, -1/2, -1/2, -1/2, -1/2|\tau), \\
Y_2(\tau) &\equiv iY(0, 0, \sqrt{3}/2, -\sqrt{3}/2, \sqrt{3}/2, -\sqrt{3}/2|\tau), \\
Y_3(\tau) &\equiv iY(1, -1, 0, 0, 0, 0|\tau), \\
Y_4(\tau) &\equiv iY(0, 0, -1/\sqrt{2}, i/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}, -i/\sqrt{2}|\tau), \\
Y_5(\tau) &\equiv iY(0, 0, -1/\sqrt{2}, -i/\sqrt{2}, 1/\sqrt{2}, i/\sqrt{2}|\tau). \tag{123}
\end{aligned}$$

In the above computations, we have used the following Fourier expansions of the modular forms:

$$\begin{aligned}
Y_1 &= -3\pi \left( 39q^9 + 3q^8 + 24q^7 + 12q^6 + 18q^5 + 3q^4 + 12q^3 + 3q^2 + 3q + \frac{1}{8} \right), \\
Y_2 &= 3\sqrt{3}\pi\sqrt{q} (18q^8 + 24q^7 + 14q^6 + 12q^5 + 13q^4 + 8q^3 + 6q^2 + 4q + 1), \\
Y_3 &= \pi \left( 26q^9 + 6q^8 - 16q^7 + 24q^6 - 12q^5 + 6q^4 - 8q^3 + 6q^2 - 2q + \frac{1}{4} \right), \\
Y_4 &= -\sqrt{2}\pi\sqrt[4]{q} (48q^8 + 30q^7 + 31q^6 + 32q^5 + 18q^4 + 14q^3 + 13q^2 + 6q + 1), \\
Y_5 &= -4\sqrt{2}\pi q^{3/4} (12q^8 + 8q^7 + 10q^6 + 6q^5 + 5q^4 + 6q^3 + 3q^2 + 2q + 1). \tag{124}
\end{aligned}$$

## References

- [1] S. F. King and C. Luhn, Rept. Prog. Phys. **76** (2013), 056201 doi:10.1088/0034-4885/76/5/056201 [arXiv:1301.1340 [hep-ph]].
- [2] F. Feruglio, doi:10.1142/9789813238053\_0012 [arXiv:1706.08749 [hep-ph]].
- [3] T. Kobayashi and M. Tanimoto, [arXiv:2307.03384 [hep-ph]].
- [4] G. J. Ding and S. F. King, [arXiv:2311.09282 [hep-ph]].
- [5] H. P. Nilles, S. Ramos-Sanchez, A. Trautner and P. K. S. Vaudrevange, Nucl. Phys. B **971** (2021), 115534 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2021.115534 [arXiv:2105.08078 [hep-th]].
- [6] T. Kobayashi and H. Otsuka, Phys. Rev. D **101** (2020) no.10, 106017 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.101.106017 [arXiv:2001.07972 [hep-th]].
- [7] S. Kikuchi, T. Kobayashi, K. Nasu, H. Otsuka, S. Takada and H. Uchida, JHEP **04** (2023), 003 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2023)003 [arXiv:2301.10356 [hep-th]].
- [8] S. Ferrara, D. Lust and S. Theisen, Phys. Lett. B **233** (1989), 147-152 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(89)90631-X

- [9] E. D'Hoker and J. Kaidi, [arXiv:2208.07242 [hep-th]].
- [10] T. Kobayashi, K. Tanaka and T. H. Tatsuishi, Phys. Rev. D **98** (2018) no.1, 016004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.98.016004 [arXiv:1803.10391 [hep-ph]].
- [11] C. Y. Yao, J. N. Lu and G. J. Ding, JHEP **05** (2021), 102 doi:10.1007/JHEP05(2021)102 [arXiv:2012.13390 [hep-ph]].
- [12] B. Y. Qu, X. G. Liu, P. T. Chen and G. J. Ding, Phys. Rev. D **104** (2021) no.7, 076001 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.104.076001 [arXiv:2106.11659 [hep-ph]].
- [13] G. J. Ding, S. F. King and X. G. Liu, Phys. Rev. D **100** (2019) no.11, 115005 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.100.115005 [arXiv:1903.12588 [hep-ph]].
- [14] C. C. Li, X. G. Liu and G. J. Ding, JHEP **10** (2021), 238 doi:10.1007/JHEP10(2021)238 [arXiv:2108.02181 [hep-ph]].
- [15] G. J. Ding, S. F. King, C. C. Li and Y. L. Zhou, JHEP **08** (2020), 164 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2020)164 [arXiv:2004.12662 [hep-ph]].
- [16] Fred Diamond and Jerry Michael Shurman. *A first course in modular forms*, volume 228. Springer, 2005.
- [17] S. J. D. King and S. F. King, JHEP **09** (2020), 043 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2020)043 [arXiv:2002.00969 [hep-ph]].
- [18] J. H. Schwarz, Phys. Lett. B **360** (1995), 13-18 [erratum: Phys. Lett. B **364** (1995), 252] doi:10.1016/0370-2693(95)01405-5 [arXiv:hep-th/9508143 [hep-th]].
- [19] A. Hebecker, P. Henkenjohann and L. T. Witkowski, JHEP **12** (2017), 033 doi:10.1007/JHEP12(2017)033 [arXiv:1708.06761 [hep-th]].
- [20] A. Font, L. E. Ibanez, D. Lust and F. Quevedo, Phys. Lett. B **249** (1990), 35-43 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(90)90523-9
- [21] C. Vafa and E. Witten, Nucl. Phys. B **431** (1994), 3-77 doi:10.1016/0550-3213(94)90097-3 [arXiv:hep-th/9408074 [hep-th]].
- [22] M. Dierigl and J. J. Heckman, Phys. Rev. D **103** (2021) no.6, 066006 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.103.066006 [arXiv:2012.00013 [hep-th]].
- [23] C. Beasley, J. J. Heckman and C. Vafa, JHEP **01** (2009), 058 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/01/058 [arXiv:0802.3391 [hep-th]].
- [24] S. Cecotti, M. C. N. Cheng, J. J. Heckman and C. Vafa, [arXiv:0910.0477 [hep-th]].
- [25] L. Aparicio, A. Font, L. E. Ibanez and F. Marchesano, JHEP **08** (2011), 152 doi:10.1007/JHEP08(2011)152 [arXiv:1104.2609 [hep-th]].

- [26] A. Font, J. Phys. Conf. Ser. **651** (2015) no.1, 012009 doi:10.1088/1742-6596/651/1/012009
- [27] C. Beasley, J. J. Heckman and C. Vafa, JHEP **01** (2009), 059 doi:10.1088/1126-6708/2009/01/059 [arXiv:0806.0102 [hep-th]].
- [28] G. K. Leontaris and G. G. Ross, JHEP **02** (2011), 108 doi:10.1007/JHEP02(2011)108 [arXiv:1009.6000 [hep-th]].
- [29] J. C. Callaghan, S. F. King, G. K. Leontaris and G. G. Ross, JHEP **04** (2012), 094 doi:10.1007/JHEP04(2012)094 [arXiv:1109.1399 [hep-ph]].
- [30] E. Dudas and E. Palti, JHEP **09** (2010), 013 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2010)013 [arXiv:1007.1297 [hep-ph]].
- [31] H. Georgi and C. Jarlskog, Phys. Lett. B **86** (1979), 297-300 doi:10.1016/0370-2693(79)90842-6
- [32] V. Bouchard, J. J. Heckman, J. Seo and C. Vafa, JHEP **01** (2010), 061 doi:10.1007/JHEP01(2010)061 [arXiv:0904.1419 [hep-ph]].
- [33] I. Esteban, M. C. Gonzalez-Garcia, M. Maltoni, T. Schwetz and A. Zhou, JHEP **09** (2020), 178 doi:10.1007/JHEP09(2020)178 [arXiv:2007.14792 [hep-ph]].
- [34] S. Antusch and V. Maurer, JHEP **11** (2013), 115 doi:10.1007/JHEP11(2013)115 [arXiv:1306.6879 [hep-ph]].
- [35] F. Björkeröth, F. J. de Anda, I. de Medeiros Varzielas and S. F. King, JHEP **06** (2015), 141 doi:10.1007/JHEP06(2015)141 [arXiv:1503.03306 [hep-ph]].
- [36] H. Okada and M. Tanimoto, Phys. Dark Univ. **40** (2023), 101204 doi:10.1016/j.dark.2023.101204 [arXiv:2005.00775 [hep-ph]].
- [37] J. J. Heckman and C. Vafa, Nucl. Phys. B **837** (2010), 137-151 doi:10.1016/j.nuclphysb.2010.05.009 [arXiv:0811.2417 [hep-th]].
- [38] M. Crispim Romão, A. Karozas, S. F. King, G. K. Leontaris and A. K. Meadowcroft, Phys. Rev. D **93** (2016) no.12, 126007 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.93.126007 [arXiv:1512.09148 [hep-ph]].
- [39] Hansen, N. & Ostermeier, A. Completely Derandomized Self-Adaptation in Evolution Strategies. *Evolutionary Computation*. **9**, 159-195 (2001)
- [40] F. A. de Souza, M. Crispim Romão, N. F. Castro, M. Nikjoo and W. Porod, Phys. Rev. D **107** (2023) no.3, 035004 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.107.035004 [arXiv:2206.09223 [hep-ph]].
- [41] J. C. Romão and M. Crispim Romão, Phys. Rev. D **109** (2024) no.9, 095040 doi:10.1103/PhysRevD.109.095040 [arXiv:2402.07661 [hep-ph]].

- [42] Nomura, M. & Shibata, M. *cmaes* : A Simple yet Practical Python Library for CMA-ES. *ArXiv Preprint arXiv:2402.01373*. (2024)